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#### Abstract

The gross-output multifactor productivity index for U.S. food manufacturing grew 0.19 percent per year between 1975 and 1997. This productivity growth is low when compared with an estimate of 1.25 percent per year for the whole manufacturing sector. Low investment in research and development (R\&D) could be one reason. Although productivity has been relatively low, food manufacturing output has grown significantly at 1.88 percent over the last two decades. Indeed, the expansion of combined factor inputs provided significant impetus to food manufacturing output. Food manufacturing is materials-intensive, and declining real producer prices of crude food and feedstuffs fueled the expansion of input utilization and drove down prices of processed foods paid by consumers.
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## Summary

This study measures the productivity of U.S. food manufacturing to explore its input-output relationships during 1975-97. The gross output (the value of shipments net of changes in inventories) of the food manufacturing sector grew 1.88 percent yearly, reaching an annual average of $\$ 353$ billion in 1995-97. The net output (gross output minus the cost of material inputs and purchased services), which shows the industry's contribution to the Nation's gross domestic product (GDP), increased 3.58 percent yearly. In 1995-97, the annual average net output was $\$ 135$ billion (about 38 percent of the gross output), with the 62 -percent difference accounted for by expenditures on material inputs.

Annual employment growth in the food manufacturing sector averaged just 0.12 percent between 1975 and 1997. However, new capital expenditures, measured at 1982 prices, show a yearly increase from $\$ 6.3$ billion in 1975-79 to $\$ 8.8$ billion in 1995-97, a growth rate of 2.39 percent. Similarly, capital services costs increased 1.41 percent annually from $\$ 9$ billion in $1975-79$ to $\$ 11.2$ billion in 1995-97. Slow growth in employment, coupled with the increase of capital expenditures, is evidence that capital is substituting for labor by providing each employee with more and better capital to work with.

To measure the productivity of the U.S. food manufacturing sector, this study calculates multifactor and labor productivity indexes. The multifactor productivity index measures the rate of output growth in excess of growth due simply to increases in combined factor inputs. The labor productivity index measures the rate of growth in output per labor-hour devoted to the production of that output.

Two approaches are applied to measure the multifactor and labor productivity indexes of U.S. food manufacturing. The gross-output approach specifies gross output as a function of capital, labor, energy, and all intermediate material inputs. Alternatively, the net-output approach specifies net output as a function of labor and capital inputs only. The two approaches produce substantially different productivity measurements, mainly because material costs constitute more than 60 percent of the food manufacturing sector's gross output. The ratios for some food manufacturing industries, like meat products and fats and oils, reached 74 and 79 percent, respectively, in 1995-97. Consequently, including or excluding material inputs as a component in a production function will substantially affect the results of measured productivity indexes.

For interpreting food manufacturing productivity, the gross-output productivity indexes should be used to assess technology changes over time because this model includes as many factor inputs as available data sources allow, and the potential change effects from unmeasured inputs can be avoided. The gross-output multifactor productivity index for food manufacturing grew 0.19 percent per year between 1975 and 1997. This slow growth rate is consistent with the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) estimate of 0.45 percent using different data. Both estimates of productivity indexes are low when compared with the BLS estimate of 1.25 percent per year for the whole manufacturing sector over the same period of time. The reason for the lower productivity growth in food manufacturing is not fully understood, but low investment in research and development (R\&D) could be one reason. The economic implications of slow growth in food manufacturing productivity are threefold.

First, instead of productivity growth, the expansion of combined factor inputs provided significant impetus to food manufacturing output. U.S. food manufacturing gross output grew 1.88 percent yearly during 1975-97. During this period, the combined capital, labor, energy, and material inputs grew at an average rate of 1.69 percent yearly, with material inputs growing fastest at 2.25 percent. Food manufacturing is materials-intensive, and a 3.6 -percent decline in real producer prices of crude food and feedstuffs fueled the expansion of input utilization.

Second, the productivity growth of food manufacturing contributed little to price declines in recent years. The real producer price of processed foods declined an average 2.13 percent per year over the period 1975-97. Researchers have hypothesized that advances in food manufacturing productivity would explain the decline in real prices of processed foods. According to this study, however, it was a decrease in the prices of crude food and feedstuffs that drove down the prices of processed foods paid by consumers.

Third, heightened merger and acquisition activity in recent years has had little effect on changes in food manufacturing productivity. According to Mergerstat Review, which tracked purchases valued at $\$ 1$ million or higher and transfers of ownership involving at least 10 percent of a company's equity, the pace of merger and acquisition activity in food processing increased steadily from 60 transactions in 1991 to 157 in 1998. On the basis of slow growth in the multifactor productivity index, it appears that recent heightened merger and acquisition activity has had little effect on food manufacturing productivity.

In evaluating the contribution of food manufacturing to the growth of the Nation's GDP, productivity indexes from the net-output approach should be used, because net output is defined the same as gross-product-originating (value-added) GDP. Both the net output and labor productivity indexes exhibit a steady increase, implying that the contribution of food manufacturing to the Nation's GDP has increased over time. This study also evaluates the effects of a 10 -percent increase in both capital and labor inputs and finds that food manufacturing's net output would increase by $\$ 4.3$ billion. In addition, a 10-percent increase in capital input alone would increase the sector's capital intensity, and consequently its labor productivity, by $\$ 1.43$ per worker-hour. A 10-percent increase in labor input alone would reduce the sector's capital intensity and reduce its labor productivity by $\$ 1.58$ per worker-hour.
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## Introduction

Advances in industrial productivity-measured as the rate of output growth in excess of growth due to increases in factor inputs-are a significant source of increase in national income and improvements in the standard of living and global competitiveness. Most agricultural productivity studies in the United States have focused on productivity changes and the relationship between inputs and outputs at the farm level. Considerably less attention has been devoted to research on productivity beyond the farmgate, such as food manufacturing. Only a few studies (e.g., Ball and Chambers; Heien; MacDonald and Ollinger) addressed the productivity of U.S. food manufacturing industries. This study contributes to the gap in food manufacturing research with a focus on measuring the productivity of U.S. food manufacturing.
U.S. food manufacturing plays an important role in the U.S. food system, stretching from farms and ranches to retail food markets, and has contributed significantly to the Nation's economic growth. According to the Annual Survey of Manufactures, the U.S. food manufacturing sector accounted for 10.3 percent of the value of shipments and 9 percent of employment from all U.S. manufacturing sectors in 2000. This study measures the productivity growth of the food manufacturing sector and provides information pertaining to the following questions: What are the productivity trends of food manufacturing? What are the sources of growth in food manufacturing outputs? Does productivity explain a decline in real prices of processed foods in recent years? How does food manufacturing contribute to the Nation's gross domestic product (GDP)?

In addition, the food manufacturing industries have undergone substantial structural changes in recent years because of mergers and acquisitions and a trend toward substituting computers and automated machines for human operations. To better understand the effects of this evolution on the performance of
food manufacturing industries, this study analyzes industry production structure and answers the following questions: What are the input-output relationships of food manufacturing? Is there any evidence showing that capital is substituting for labor? Have the recent mergers and acquisitions affected food manufacturing productivity?

Although Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) productivity indicators are available for all U.S. manufacturing sectors, this study uses different data and focuses on measuring productivity changes in food manufacturing specifically for the following reasons. First, this study provides net-output (value-added) productivity measures as a linkage to the gross-product-originating GDP to meet the gap caused by the elimination of productivity indexes from BLS news releases of productivity trends for all manufacturing sectors since 1994. Second, the food manufacturing industries are fundamentally different from other manufacturing industries in the sense that food processing is quite materialsintensive. Instead of using the BLS productivity index alone, it is necessary to explore the detailed inputoutput relationships of food manufacturing. Third, it is useful for this study to compile data and establish a data bank for food manufacturing suitable for online analysis, estimation of productivity changes, and some other productivity-related issues.

This study begins by focusing on the input-output relationships of U.S. food manufacturing with respect to the growth of production and the utilization of labor, capital, and material inputs. Particular attention is given to identify some data sources for factor inputs and outputs that can be used for measuring productivity. The second part of this study discusses the methodology for measuring productivity and its application to U.S. food manufacturing. Since productivity growth is most closely identified with technological gains, the goal of the methodology is to measure these gains as the rate of output growth in excess of growth due simply to increases in combined factor inputs.

Before measuring productivity, it is necessary to understand the input-output relationships of U.S. food manufacturing with respect to the growth of production and the utilization of labor, capital, and material inputs. For easy presentation of a sample period covering 1975-97, each table throughout this study summarizes economic information by dividing the whole sample period into five subperiods with a 5-year interval for most periods and showing the average of annual data in each period. All values are measured at 1982 constant prices.

The data used in this study were compiled mainly from the Bureau of the Census in its Census of Manufactures and the Annual Survey of Manufactures (ASM), and from the Bureau of Labor Statistics for various producer price indexes including the price of processed foods and feeds. The data refer to an aggregate food manufacturing sector by the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) System code 20 (Food and Kindred Products) and its nine three-digit coded industries for 1975-97. Those food industries are (201) meat products, (202) dairy products, (203) preserved fruits and vegetables, (204) grain mill products, (205) bakery products, (206) sugar and confectionery products, (207) fats and oils, (208) beverages, and (209) miscellaneous food and kindred products.

The data in the 1997 Census of Manufactures were published for the first time on the basis of the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS). This system is different from the SIC classification system used in previous censuses. To construct consistent time-series data dating back to 1975, this study compiles the 1997 data into a framework along with the SIC classification system. A comparability of product codes and the compiling procedure used for converting NAICS data into SIC data are listed in Appendix A.

## Gross and Net Outputs

According to the Census of Manufactures, two commonly used output indicators are the value of shipments and the value added. The value of shipments covers the received or receivable net selling values of all products shipped at the plants excluding freight and taxes. The value added is derived by subtracting the cost of materials, supplies, containers, fuel, and elec-
tricity from the value of shipments, but it still contains the cost of purchased services. Thus, the cost of purchased services must be subtracted from the value added to obtain a consistent measurement of the gross-product-originating (value-added) GDP without double-counting the value of sales.

For productivity analysis, gross output is calculated as the adjusted value of shipments by the net change of inventories and then deflated by the producer price index of processed foods and feeds. Similarly, net output is calculated as the "net value added" by subtracting the cost of purchased services from the value added and then deflated by the producer price index of processed foods and feeds. Both gross output and net output are used as output indicators for measuring productivity. In particular, net output may be used as an indicator to show the contribution of an industry to the Nation's GDP.

The costs of purchased services for each food manufacturing industry are available only in the 1992 and 1997 Censuses but not in the ASM. To determine the cost of purchased services for other years, this study first calculates the average ratios of the cost of purchased services to the value of shipments for each food industry in the two Censuses. Then, these ratios are used to determine the approximate cost of purchased services in each industry for the missing years. The ratios in terms of percentage are food sector (1.35 percent), meats (1.3), dairy (1.17), preserved fruits and vegetables (1.5), grain mill products (1.4), bakery products (1.65), sugar and confections (1.62), fats and oils (1.08), beverages (1.3), and miscellaneous foods (1.3). These ratios are less than 2 percent of the value of shipments across food industries, and the errors of approximation for measuring the net value added should be small.

In table 1, the yearly value of U.S. food manufacturing gross output measured at 1982 prices increased from $\$ 258$ billion in 1975-79 to $\$ 353$ billion in 1995-97, an average annual growth rate of 1.9 percent. Most food industries tended to grow at 2-3 percent except for fats and oils, which showed virtually no growth. In 199597, the meat product industry was dominant in gross output valued at $\$ 79.8$ billion, followed by beverages at $\$ 51.5$ billion. For net output, food manufacturing as a whole increased from a yearly average of $\$ 72$ billion

Table 1—Outputs of food manufacturing, 1975-1997

|  | 1975-79 | 1980-84 | 1985-89 | 1990-94 | 1995-97 | Average annual growth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Gross output (million \$ at 1982 prices) |  |  |  |  | Percent |
| Food sector | 258,325 | 278,389 | 302,510 | 330,374 | 352,926 | 1.88 |
| Meat products | 65,326 | 66,045 | 69,177 | 76,712 | 79,799 | 1.45 |
| Dairy products | 34,126 | 37,919 | 40,780 | 42,650 | 43,904 | 1.52 |
| Preserved fruits \& vegetables | 26,703 | 29,824 | 34,246 | 38,495 | 39,402 | 2.31 |
| Grain mill products | 29,389 | 31,876 | 34,718 | 40,662 | 44,927 | 2.13 |
| Bakery products | 16,510 | 17,532 | 21,021 | 23,175 | 25,241 | 2.11 |
| Sugar and confections | 14,688 | 16,358 | 17,110 | 18,409 | 19,847 | 1.23 |
| Fats and oils | 19,061 | 17,849 | 16,356 | 15,910 | 17,992 | 0.49 |
| Beverages | 31,185 | 37,724 | 43,139 | 46,242 | 51,500 | 2.77 |
| Miscellaneous foods | 21,317 | 23,263 | 25,962 | 28,119 | 30,313 | 2.77 |
|  | Net output (million \$ at 1982 prices) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Food sector | 71,653 | 83,420 | 105,245 | 122,668 | 135,166 | 3.58 |
| Meat products | 9,553 | 9,891 | 12,243 | 14,995 | 19,045 | 3.86 |
| Dairy products | 7,043 | 7,973 | 10,098 | 11,634 | 11,838 | 2.99 |
| Preserved fruits \& vegetables | 9,817 | 11,611 | 15,316 | 17,979 | 18,503 | 3.88 |
| Grain mill products | 8,264 | 10,012 | 13,502 | 16,865 | 17,473 | 3.78 |
| Bakery products | 9,090 | 10,111 | 12,878 | 14,094 | 15,556 | 2.98 |
| Sugar and confections | 5,056 | 6,122 | 7,321 | 8,327 | 9,174 | 3.41 |
| Fats and oils | 2,635 | 2,698 | 2,860 | 3,155 | 3,267 | 1.90 |
| Beverages | 12,621 | 15,729 | 19,617 | 22,463 | 25,432 | 3.83 |
| Miscellaneous foods | 7,574 | 9,273 | 11,411 | 13,154 | 14,878 | 3.98 |
| Ratio of net output to gross output (percent) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Food sector | 27.74 | 29.97 | 34.79 | 37.13 | 38.30 |  |
| Meat products | 14.62 | 14.98 | 17.70 | 19.55 | 23.87 |  |
| Dairy products | 20.64 | 21.03 | 24.76 | 27.28 | 26.96 |  |
| Preserved fruits \& vegetables | 36.76 | 38.93 | 44.72 | 46.70 | 46.96 |  |
| Grain mill products | 28.12 | 31.41 | 38.89 | 41.48 | 38.89 |  |
| Bakery products | 55.06 | 57.67 | 61.26 | 60.82 | 61.63 |  |
| Sugar and confections | 34.42 | 37.42 | 42.79 | 45.24 | 46.22 |  |
| Fats and oils | 13.83 | 15.12 | 17.48 | 19.83 | 18.16 |  |
| Beverages | 40.47 | 41.70 | 45.47 | 48.58 | 49.38 |  |
| Miscellaneous foods | 35.53 | 39.86 | 43.95 | 46.78 | 49.08 |  |

Note: All values are deflated by the producer price index of processed foods and feeds.
Source: USDA/Economic Research Service.
in 1975-79 to $\$ 135$ billion in 1995-97, with an average annual growth rate of 3.7 percent. For most individual industries, average yearly growth rates ranged from about 3-4 percent. The beverages industry was dominant at $\$ 25.4$ billion in 1995-97, followed by the meat products industry at $\$ 19$ billion.

Table 1 shows that the ratio of net output to gross output increased from 27.7 percent in 1975-79 to 38.3 percent in 1995-97 for the food sector as a whole. This increase reflects a decrease in the share of material costs relative to the value of output over time. For individual industries, the meat industry significantly
increased this ratio from 14.6 percent in 1975-79 to 23.9 percent in 1995-97, probably because of cheaper meat materials available for processing, especially for sausage and poultry meat products. On the other hand, highly processed, differentiated, and convenient consumer goods are high value-added products. Thus, the ratio increased from 55 percent in 1975-79 to 61.6 percent in 1995-97 for the bakery products industry.

Figure 1 shows the different ratios of net output to gross output across the food manufacturing industries and the whole food sector in 1995-97. In general, the food manufacturing sector is materials-intensive with a

Figure 1
Ratio of net output to gross output, 1995-97 average
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Source: USDA/Economic Research Service.
ratio of 38.3 percent, meaning a cost of about $\$ 62$ on materials consumed for producing $\$ 100$ of gross output. The ratio for fats and oils was relatively small, only 18 percent. Other low-ratio industries are meats ( 23.9 percent) and dairy products ( 27 percent). This is because farm commodities as food materials for processing constitute a major share of processing costs for these products. On the other hand, bakery products are relatively value-intensive products with a ratio of 61.6 percent, because the bakery industry has high labor costs for processing and direct store delivery.
Beverages are also value-intensive, with a ratio of 49.4 percent due to low material costs, high advertising expenditures, and the value added to shipments by high-profit soft-drink syrup makers.

## Labor Input

The employment data in the census consist of two categories of workers: production and nonproduction. Production workers, including those engaged in fabricating, processing, assembling, packing, and other services, are closely associated with the production operations at food manufacturing plants. All other employees, such as those engaged in factory supervision above the working foreman level and those in sales, credit, and clerical positions at manufacturing plants, are classified as nonproduction workers.

The U.S. food manufacturing sector employed a yearly average of 1.5 million employees in 1975-79, gradually decreasing to 1.4 million in 1985-89, and then increasing back to 1.5 million employees in 1995-97 (table 2). These total employment numbers are important indicators commonly used to observe whether there is a
recession in general economic activities. Meat products and miscellaneous foods were the only industries that increased employment over the sample period, with average yearly growth rates of 1.9 and 1.4 percent, respectively. The number of employees in other industries showed yearly decreases, especially in fats and oils ( -1.8 percent) and beverages ( -1.4 percent). Figure 2 shows the distribution of employees across different food manufacturing industries using the 1995-97 average. Significant shares are found in the meat products ( 29 percent), bakery products ( 14 percent), and preserved fruits and vegetables ( 13 percent) industries.

For measuring productivity, production worker-hours (hours worked or paid for at the plant, including actual overtime hours) are used as an indicator of labor input

Figure 2

## Composition of employment, 1995-97 average



Source: USDA/Economic Research Service.

Table 2-Labor inputs of food manufacturing, 1975-1997

| $1975-79$ | $1980-84$ | $1985-89$ | $1990-94$ | $1995-97$ | Average <br> annual growth |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


|  |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Food sector | 1,536 |
| Meat products | 312 |
| Dairy products | 159 |
| Preserved fruits \& vegetables | 233 |
| Grain mill products | 114 |
| Bakery products | 232 |
| Sugar and confections | 103 |
| Fats and oils | 42 |
| Beverages | 201 |
| Miscellaneous foods | 141 |


|  |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Food sector | 458 |
| Meat products | 56 |
| Dairy products | 72 |
| Preserved fruits \& vegetables | 35 |
| Grain mill products | 34 |
| Bakery products | 94 |
| Sugar and confections | 21 |
| Fats and oils | 12 |
| Beverages | 99 |
| Miscellaneous foods | 35 |

Number of nonproduction employees $(1,000)$

| 438 | 419 | 404 | 405 | -0.59 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 52 | 54 | 58 | 64 | 0.92 |
| 60 | 54 | 51 | 48 | -2.23 |
| 37 | 37 | 36 | 35 | 0.46 |
| 33 | 32 | 33 | 31 | -0.45 |
| 90 | 89 | 83 | 85 | -0.18 |
| 19 | 18 | 19 | 20 | -0.15 |
| 11 | 10 | 9 | 8 | -1.16 |
| 98 | 85 | 71 | 70 | -1.59 |
| 38 | 40 | 44 | 43 | 0.60 |

Production worker-hours (million)

| Food sector | 2,125 | 2,054 | 2,007 | 2,223 | 2,317 | 0.57 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Meat products | 506 | 515 | 564 | 708 | 774 | 2.28 |
| Dairy products | 180 | 170 | 174 | 179 | 179 | -0.06 |
| Preserved fruits \& vegetables | 374 | 354 | 334 | 351 | 347 | -0.29 |
| Grain mill products | 169 | 155 | 145 | 157 | 159 | -0.37 |
| Bakery products | 269 | 251 | 241 | 262 | 272 | -0.05 |
| Sugar and confections | 160 | 151 | 141 | 145 | 145 | -0.25 |
| Fats and oils | 65 | 58 | 43 | 41 | 40 | -2.02 |
| Beverages | 203 | 190 | 160 | 148 | 152 | -0.96 |
| Miscellaneous foods | 198 | 210 | 206 | 232 | 248 | 1.86 |

Source: USDA/Economic Research Service.
for production workers. As shown in table 2, the meat products industry increased production worker-hours substantially from 506 million hours in 1975-79 to 774 million hours in 1995-97, an average yearly growth rate of 2.3 percent. Similarly, there is a significant increase of worker-hours in the miscellaneous foods industry from 198 million hours to 248 million hours over the sample period with a yearly growth rate of 1.9 percent. The fats and oils and beverages industries decreased by 2 and 1 percent, respectively. All other food industries showed no significant change in worker-hours.

The number of nonproduction employees, constituting about one-third of total employees, is used to represent the labor input for nonproduction workers. Similar to production workers, the number of nonproduction employees for most industries decreased, especially for the dairy industry, with a 2-percent average annual rate of decrease over the sample period. In 1995-97, the bakery products and beverage industries employed the most nonproduction workers, 85,000 and 70,000 persons, respectively.

## Capital Input

In measuring the gross book value of depreciable assets, the assets at the beginning of the year, plus new capital expenditures, less capital retirements, equals assets at the end of the year. Therefore, annual new capital expenditures are a major component in the accumulation of assets over time. In table 3, the new capital expenditures in the food manufacturing sector measured at 1982 prices show an average annual growth rate of 2.4 percent from $\$ 6.3$ billion in 1975-79 to $\$ 8.8$ billion in 1995-97. For individual industries, new capital expenditures also increased over the sample period. The growth rates are high for dairy products, bakery products, and miscellaneous foods, each between 3.7-4 percent. Meat products, preserved fruits and vegetables, and grain mill products are next, each about 3 percent. The meat products, preserved fruits and vegetables, grain mill products, and beverages industries had annual capital expenditures of more than $\$ 1$ billion in 1995-97.

The flow of capital services derived from the stock of capital assets for equipment and structures in an industry is commonly considered as capital input in measuring productivity. In this study, considering the limitation of data, the annual cost of capital services is approximated as the sum of depreciation charges for fixed assets and interest costs on the average value of fixed assets at the beginning and ending of that year. The cost of capital services is then deflated by the producer price index of capital equipment for use as capital input in measuring productivity.

To measure depreciation charges, data are available and reported only for 1977-85. Depreciation charges for the remaining period are projected on the basis of a log-linear regression by fitting the depreciation charges (D) as a function of beginning-of-year structure and equipment assets (K) for 1977-85. A complete listing of fitted depreciation equations for all individual food manufacturing industries is listed in Appendix B. For example, the following is a fitted depreciation equation for the food manufacturing sector:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\ln \mathrm{D}=-3.3203+1.0630 \ln \mathrm{~K} \quad \mathrm{R}^{2}=0.99 \tag{0.0292}
\end{equation*}
$$

The figure in parenthesis is the standard error. The estimated coefficient is statistically significant with a 1 -percent increase in fixed assets causing a 1.06 -percent increase in the depreciation charge.

The cost of interest on fixed assets is calculated by multiplying the average yearly value of fixed assets by the interest rates. These interest rates are obtained from the Survey of Current Business (SCB) with the Moody's Corporate Industrial Bond Rate from SCB prior to 1994. Yields on new high-grade corporate bonds are used for 1994 and thereafter, because Moody's rates are not available in the latter period.

In table 3, the charges of capital services in the food manufacturing sector increased by 1.41 percent annually from $\$ 9$ billion in 1975-79 to $\$ 11.2$ billion in 1995-97. In contrast with a declining employment trend, the increase of capital services is evidence that capital is substituting for labor by providing each employee with more and better capital to work with. The charges of capital services varied across the food manufacturing industries depending on their capital intensity in the production process. Taking 1995-97 as an example, the cost of capital services is highest for the beverage industry, at $\$ 2.1$ billion, followed by grain mill products at $\$ 1.7$ billion, and preserved fruits and vegetables at $\$ 1.6$ billion. In terms of annual growth rate, the grain mill products industry was ranked highest at 2.7 percent, followed by miscellaneous foods at 2.1 percent.

Finally, the ratio of the new capital expenditures to the gross output of an industry can be viewed as an indicator to reflect the rate of investment of the industry. This average annual rate of investment for the food manufacturing sector was 2.6 percent in 1995-97. For individual industries, figure 3 shows that the annual rates of investment in 1995-97 were high (at 3 percent or more) for the sugar and confections, bakery products, grain mill products, preserved fruits and vegetables, and beverages industries. The high investment rate is probably related to new product introduction and rapid technological changes in these industries that require new equipment.

## Material and Energy Inputs

In addition to payments for labor input and capital services, the cost of production in food manufacturing includes materials and purchased fuel and electricity. In this study, materials (including raw materials, semifinished goods, and containers) and fuel and electricity are considered as separate inputs in measuring productivity. The quantity of material inputs is determined as the cost of materials adjusted by a net change in inventories and then deflated by the producer price index of

Table 3-Capital inputs of food manufacturing, 1975-1997

| $1975-79$ | $1980-84$ | $1985-89$ | $1990-94$ | $1995-97$ | Average <br> annual growth |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


|  | New capital expenditures (million \$ at 1982 prices) |  |  |  |  | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Food sector | 6,320 | 6,298 | 6,583 | 7,388 | 8,837 | 2.39 |
| Meat products | 740 | 674 | 799 | 984 | 1,240 | 3.01 |
| Dairy products | 561 | 604 | 671 | 726 | 897 | 4.00 |
| Preserved fruits \& vegetables | 774 | 816 | 953 | 1,150 | 1,157 | 3.29 |
| Grain mill products | 836 | 828 | 1,036 | 1,109 | 1,365 | 3.22 |
| Bakery products | 526 | 457 | 591 | 704 | 790 | 3.72 |
| Sugar and confections | 461 | 456 | 494 | 589 | 626 | 2.68 |
| Fats and oils | 356 | 329 | 257 | 268 | 335 | 1.85 |
| Beverages | 1,553 | 1,591 | 1,185 | 1,132 | 1,585 | 2.63 |
| Miscellaneous foods | 513 | 542 | 597 | 726 | 841 | 3.67 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Charges of capital services (million $\$$ at 1982 prices) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Food sector | 9,013 | 11,967 | 11,354 | 10,716 | 11,209 | 1.41 |
| Meat products | 1,075 | 1,335 | 1,228 | 1,260 | 1,381 | 1.60 |
| Dairy products | 907 | 1,096 | 1,061 | 1,032 | 1,114 | 1.18 |
| Preserved fruits \& vegetables | 1,150 | 1,547 | 1,519 | 1,538 | 1,550 | 1.40 |
| Grain mill products | 1,121 | 1,535 | 1,536 | 1,545 | 1,702 | 2.67 |
| Bakery products | 793 | 962 | 954 | 945 | 1,010 | 1.26 |
| Sugar and confections | 760 | 945 | 857 | 816 | 846 | 0.64 |
| Fats and oils | 506 | 686 | 580 | 485 | 467 | 0.27 |
| Beverages | 1,966 | 2,871 | 2,659 | 2,164 | 2,113 | 1.04 |
| Miscellaneous foods | 735 | 990 | 960 | 931 | 1,027 | 2.12 |

Ratio of new capital expenditures to gross output (percent)

| Food sector | 2.12 | 2.20 | 2.24 | 2.34 | 2.63 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Meat products | 0.99 | 0.99 | 1.19 | 1.34 | 1.63 |
| Dairy products | 1.43 | 1.55 | 1.69 | 1.78 | 2.14 |
| Preserved fruits \& vegetables | 2.54 | 2.68 | 2.86 | 3.14 | 3.08 |
| Grain mill products | 2.47 | 2.52 | 3.07 | 2.86 | 3.19 |
| Bakery products | 2.77 | 2.53 | 2.89 | 3.19 | 3.28 |
| Sugar and confections | 2.71 | 2.72 | 2.99 | 3.35 | 3.31 |
| Fats and oils | 1.62 | 1.79 | 1.61 | 1.76 | 1.94 |
| Beverages | 4.31 | 4.11 | 2.83 | 2.56 | 3.24 |
| Miscellaneous foods | 2.12 | 2.26 | 2.37 | 2.71 | 2.92 |

Note: All values are deflated by the producer price index of capital equipment.
Source: USDA/Economic Research Service.
crude foodstuffs and feeds. The energy input is measured as the cost of purchased fuels and electricity deflated by the producer price index of intermediate energy goods.

In table 4, the cost of materials for the food manufacturing sector measured at 1982 prices grew steadily at 2.3 percent yearly from $\$ 167$ billion to $\$ 243$ billion over the sample period. The growth rates of most individual industries were 2-3 percent yearly. For example, the meat products industry spent the most on materi-als-about $\$ 69$ billion in 1995-97-more than double that of most other food industries. The cost of pur-
chased fuel and electricity is also shown in table 4. For the food manufacturing sector, the cost of energy utilization measured at 1982 prices was lowest at $\$ 5$ billion in 1980-84. This is consistent with petroleumbased fuels prices which reached their peak in that period. The ratio of energy costs to gross output (not shown in the table) is 1.3 percent for the general food sector, and the ratios are under 2 percent for the vast majority of the food manufacturing industries.

The ratios of material costs to gross output for the sample period are presented in the lower part of table 4 and in figure 4 for 1995-97. In general, food manu-

Figure 3
Ratio of new capital expenditures to gross output, 1995-97 average


Source: USDA/Economic Research Service.

Figure 4
Ratio of material cost to gross output, 1995-97 average
Percent


Source: USDA/Economic Research Service.
facturing is materials-intensive, with material costs constituting about 60 percent or more of the value of gross output in the food manufacturing sector. The ratios of material costs to gross output vary widely among the food manufacturing industries. Taking 1995-97, for example, the ratio is highest for the fats and oils industry, at 79 percent, reflecting the industry's heavy dependence on materials like soybeans for crushing or semi-refined soybean oil for refining. Also,
the ratio is high for the meat and dairy industriesslightly more than 70 percent-because these industries have little value added using relatively expensive meats and milk as raw materials for processing highly standardized products. On the other hand, the ratio for the bakery industry is the lowest ( 35.4 percent) because the industry uses more production workers and adds more value to flour and other ingredients from other processors.

Table 4-Material and energy inputs of food manufacturing, 1975-97

|  | $1975-79$ | $1980-84$ | $1985-89$ | $1990-94$ | $1995-97$ | Average <br> annual growth |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Cost of materials (million \$ at 1982 prices) | Percent |  |  |
| Food sector | 167,032 | 182,239 | 206,508 | 228,299 | 243,087 | 2.25 |
| Meat products | 50,415 | 53,307 | 60,576 | 68,764 | 68,841 | 2.06 |
| Dairy products | 24,407 | 28,299 | 32,515 | 34,366 | 36,114 | 2.29 |
| Preserved fruits \& vegetables | 14,976 | 16,762 | 19,522 | 22,170 | 22,927 | 2.53 |
| Grain mill products | 18,848 | 20,219 | 21,815 | 25,847 | 30,247 | 2.57 |
| Bakery products | 6,433 | 6,692 | 8,208 | 9,625 | 10,406 | 2.22 |
| Sugar and confections | 8,355 | 9,373 | 10,075 | 10,916 | 11,692 | 1.54 |
| Fats and oils | 14,783 | 13,991 | 14,037 | 14,110 | 16,572 | 1.55 |
| Beverages | 16,570 | 20,521 | 24,545 | 26,147 | 29,043 | 3.23 |
| Miscellaneous foods | 12,377 | 13,075 | 15,216 | 16,354 | 17,245 | 3.52 |


|  | Cost of fuels and electricity |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| energy | (million $\$$ at 1982 prices) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Food sector | 5,297 | 5,015 | 6,372 | 6,237 | 6,649 | 0.20 |
| Meat products | 674 | 688 | 944 | 937 | 1,015 | 0.41 |
| Dairy products | 614 | 573 | 762 | 704 | 709 | 0.10 |
| Preserved fruits \& vegetables | 740 | 715 | 879 | 894 | 929 | 0.24 |
| Grain mill products | 779 | 732 | 1,082 | 1,116 | 1,291 | 0.45 |
| Bakery products | 343 | 319 | 467 | 470 | 495 | 0.37 |
| Sugar and confections | 583 | 466 | 478 | 466 | 479 | -0.12 |
| Fats and oils | 572 | 538 | 563 | 482 | 516 | 0.14 |
| Beverages | 618 | 598 | 717 | 638 | 684 | 0.23 |
| Miscellaneous foods | 375 | 386 | 482 | 529 | 533 | 0.44 |

Ratio of material cost to gross output (percent)

| Food sector | 70.0 | 67.2 | 62.5 | 60.5 | 59.2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Meat products | 83.5 | 82.8 | 80.1 | 78.4 | 74.1 |
| Dairy products | 77.3 | 76.5 | 73.0 | 70.5 | 70.7 |
| Preserved fruits \& vegetables | 60.7 | 57.7 | 52.2 | 50.4 | 50.0 |
| Grain mill products | 69.4 | 65.1 | 57.6 | 55.6 | 57.9 |
| Bakery products | 42.1 | 39.2 | 35.8 | 36.3 | 35.4 |
| Sugar and confections | 61.4 | 58.9 | 53.9 | 51.9 | 50.6 |
| Fats and oils | 84.0 | 80.5 | 78.6 | 77.6 | 79.1 |
| Beverages | 57.5 | 55.8 | 52.0 | 49.5 | 48.4 |
| Miscellaneous foods | 62.6 | 57.7 | 53.6 | 50.9 | 48.8 |

Note: The value of materials is deflated by the producer price index of crude foodstuffs and feedstuffs.
The value of fuels and electricity is deflated by the producer price index of intermediate energy goods.
Source: USDA/Economic Research Service.

In productivity studies, the rates of technological change, which reflect changes in an industrial output for a given input bundle, may be measured by using a production function similar to that developed by Solow. Alternatively, rates of technological change which reflect changes in the cost of obtaining a given output may be measured by using a cost function such as that used in Ball and Chambers. This study applies a production function approach because it provides useful information for a direct explanation about the source of output growth.

The data used in this study are mainly compiled from the Bureau of the Census's Annual Survey of Manufactures and Census of Manufacturing. Two common production indicators, the value of shipments and the value added, are available in the data sources. This study uses both indicators as the output of a production function for measuring productivity indexes. The potential difference in productivity measurements from these production indicators is an issue addressed in this study. Following is a brief explanation of the methodology used to measure the multifactor and labor productivity indexes, and a method to modify the model for application to U.S. food manufacturing.

## Derivation of Productivity Measures

In productivity studies, multifactor productivity is derived by taking account of various inputs into the productivity measurement. To measure the multifactor productivity index, the underlying production function is assumed to be Hicks' neutral technical change. The general form of the production function with n -factor inputs at time $t$ can be written as:

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q_{t}=A_{t} f\left(X_{1 t}, X_{2 t}, \ldots, X_{n t}\right), \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where variables are $\mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{t}}$ (real output), $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{it}}$ (input of the ith factor, $\mathrm{i}=1,2, . ., \mathrm{n}$ ), and $\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{t}}$ (index of Hicks' neutral technical change or multifactor productivity). Although the assumption of neutral technical change may be rigid, this production function provides a framework for easy interpretation of the causes of productivity changes.

Differentiating equation (1) with respect to time $t$, the derived output growth equation becomes

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left(\mathrm{dQ}_{\mathrm{l}} / \mathrm{dt}\right) / \mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{t}}=\left(\mathrm{dA}_{\mathrm{l}} / \mathrm{dt}\right) / \mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{t}}+ \\
& \Sigma_{\mathrm{i}}\left(\partial \mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{t}} / \partial \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{it}}\right)\left(\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{it}} / \mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{t}}\right)\left(\mathrm{dX}_{\mathrm{it}} \mathrm{dt}\right) / \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{it}} \tag{2}
\end{align*}
$$

Equation (2) shows the rate of change in output as the sum of the rate of change in multifactor productivity, $\left(\mathrm{dA}_{\mathrm{t}} / \mathrm{dt}\right) / \mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{t}}$, and a weighted average of the rates of change in various inputs $\left(\mathrm{dX}_{\mathrm{it}} / \mathrm{dt}\right) / \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{it}}$. The weight is expressed by $\left(\partial \mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{t}} / \partial \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{it}}\right)\left(\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{it}} / \mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{t}}\right)$, which is the elasticity of output with respect to the ith input, showing the percentage change in output per 1-percent change in the ith input.

In addition, under the assumption that a competitive economy is operating at longrun equilibrium, the marginal products of all inputs are equal to their respective real market prices as $\partial \mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{t}} / \partial \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{it}}=\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{it}} / \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{t}}$, with new variables $W_{i t}$ (price of the ith input) and $P_{t}$ (price of output). Substituting this expression for the elasticity of output in equation (2), and then using $\mathrm{S}_{\text {it }}$ (cost share of the ith input) to represent $W_{i t} X_{i t} / P_{t} Q_{t}$, the multifactor productivity index can be shown as:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left(\mathrm{dA}_{\mathrm{t}} / \mathrm{dt}\right) / \mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{t}}=\left(\mathrm{dQ}_{\mathrm{L}} / \mathrm{dtt}\right) / \mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{t}}- \\
& \Sigma_{\mathrm{i}}\left[\mathrm{~S}_{\mathrm{it}}\left(\mathrm{dX}_{\mathrm{it}} / \mathrm{dt}\right) / \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{it}}\right] \tag{3}
\end{align*}
$$

The competition in output markets indicates that the capital price reflects a competitive rate of return ensuring that all revenues are spent on inputs. In other words, the summation of all input cost shares equals 1 ( $\Sigma_{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{it}}=1$ ). Thus, the multifactor productivity index, showing the ability to produce more output from the same input, is calculated by subtracting an index series for the combined changes of various inputs from the index series for output changes. Different inputs are aggregated into one input measure by weighting (multiplying) the index series of each input by its share in the total cost of output.

Furthermore, the productivity index of the jth input can be shown as:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left(\mathrm{dQ}_{\mathrm{t}} / \mathrm{dt}\right) / \mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{t}}-\left(\mathrm{dX}_{\mathrm{ji}} / \mathrm{dt}\right) / \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{jt}}=\left(\mathrm{d} \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{l}} / \mathrm{dt}\right) / \mathrm{At}+ \\
& \Sigma_{\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{i} \neq \mathrm{j}} \mathrm{~S}_{\mathrm{it}}\left[\left(\mathrm{~d} \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{it}} / \mathrm{dt}\right) / \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{it}}-\left(\mathrm{d} \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{jt}} / \mathrm{dt}\right) / \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{jt}}\right] \tag{4}
\end{align*}
$$

In particular, if the jth input is regarded as labor, then this equation represents labor productivity.
Accordingly, labor productivity, showing the rate of change in output per worker on the left-hand side of equation, is determined by two components: techno-
logical progress and the quantities of capital goods and other inputs available to each worker.

## The Törnqvist Index Approximation

The rates of change in equations (3) and (4) are expressed in the Divisia index such as $\left(\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{t}} / \mathrm{dt}\right) / \mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{t}}$ for the change of output and require using continuous data for the presentation. For empirical application, however, the Törnqvist index is commonly used as a discrete approximation of the Divisia index. More specifically, for example, the rate of change of output $\left(\mathrm{dQ}_{\mathrm{t}} / \mathrm{dt}\right) / \mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{t}}$ $=\left(\mathrm{d} \ln \mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{t}} / \mathrm{dt}\right)$ can be approximated by $\ln \left(\mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{t}} / \mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{t}-1}\right)$. Similarly, the rate of change of the ith input $\left(\mathrm{dX}_{\mathrm{it}} / \mathrm{dt}\right)$ / $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{it}}=\left(\mathrm{d} \ln \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{it}} / \mathrm{dt}\right)$ can be approximated by $\ln \left(\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{it}} / \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{it}-1}\right)$. In addition, since the variables are expressed in consecutive change of observed data, an ideal weight $S_{i t}$ in the brackets of equations (3) and (4) should be the average shares of $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{it}}$ and $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{it}-1}$; that is, $1 / 2\left(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathrm{it}}+\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{it}-1}\right)$.

Therefore, by applying the Törnqvist index as a discrete approximation of the Divisia index, the multifactor productivity in equation (3) can be expressed as:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \ln \left(\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{l}} / \mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{t}-1}\right)=\ln \left(\mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{t}} / \mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{t}-1}\right)- \\
& \Sigma_{\mathrm{i}}\left[1 / 2\left(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathrm{it}}+\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{it}-1}\right) \ln \left(\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{it}} / \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{it}-1}\right)\right] \tag{5}
\end{align*}
$$

This expression shows that the rate of change of multifactor productivity $\ln \left(\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{t}} / \mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{t}-1}\right)$ is the difference between the rate of change in output $\ln \left(\mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{t}} / \mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{t}-1}\right)$ and a weighted average of the rates of change of all factor inputs in the bracket. This methodology was used by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and a discussion of the model for two factors (labor and capital) in a production function was documented in Mark and Waldorf.

Similarly, the Törnqvist index approximation of the productivity index of the $j$ th input in equation (4) becomes:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \ln \left(\mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{t}} / \mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{t}-1}\right)-\ln \left(\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{j} /} / \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{jt}-1}\right)= \\
& \ln \left(\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{t}} / \mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{t}-1}\right)+\Sigma_{\mathrm{i},}, \mathrm{i} f \mathrm{j}^{1 / 2\left(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathrm{it}}+\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{it}-1}\right)} \\
& {\left[\ln \left(\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{it}} / \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{it}-1}\right)-\ln \left(\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{jl}} \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{jt}-1}\right)\right]} \tag{6}
\end{align*}
$$

Again, if the jth input is regarded as labor, then this equation represents labor productivity. The above expression in natural logarithmic form shows that the rate of change of labor productivity is equal to the sum of the rate of change of multifactor productivity and the contribution of the changes in all other inputs per unit of labor to output.

While the above procedures for measuring productivity can be easily implemented, one might question that the underlying assumption of perfect competition may not be appropriate to the food manufacturing sector, which may be characterized by oligopoly. Ideally, we need to perform some tests on the potential oligopoly structure of the food manufacturing sector, but these tests are beyond the scope of this study. A noted paper by Azzam et al. incorporated information about markups, demand, and cost parameters into the measurement of productivity. This set of extraneous information, however, is obtained from different sources, and may introduce errors in the productivity measurement because the extraneous information is not obtained within the same framework as the measurement of productivity changes.

## Empirical Modeling

In applying the methodology of measuring productivity for the U.S. food manufacturing industries, two commonly used output indicators (the value of shipments and the value added) are available in the Census of Manufactures and Annual Survey of Manufactures. By using these output indicators, this study applies two approaches to specify a production function for measuring the multifactor and labor productivity indexes.

One is the gross-output approach, such that the adjusted value of shipments is a function of capital, labor, energy, and material inputs as follows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{t}}=\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{t}} \mathrm{f}\left(\mathrm{~K}_{\mathrm{t}}, \mathrm{La}_{\mathrm{t}}, \mathrm{Lb}_{\mathrm{t}}, \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{t}}, \mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{t}}\right), \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $Q_{t}$ is the gross output defined as the value of shipments adjusted by the net change in inventories measured at 1982 prices, with the producer price index of processed foods and feeds as a deflator. $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{t}}$ represents capital services charges measured at 1982 prices, with the producer price index of capital equipment as a deflator. Capital services charges are approximated as the sum of depreciation charges for fixed assets and interest costs on the average value of fixed assets at the beginning and ending of that year. The labor inputs are divided into two components: production and nonproduction workers. $\mathrm{La}_{\mathrm{t}}$ represents production workerhours, and $\mathrm{Lb}_{\mathrm{t}}$ is the number of nonproduction employees. $E_{t}$ represents purchased fuels and electricity at 1982 prices, with the producer price index for intermediate energy goods as a deflator. $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{t}}$ is the cost
of materials at 1982 prices, with the producer price index of crude foodstuffs and feedstuffs as a deflator. $A_{t}$ is the index of multifactor productivity for the value of shipments. This gross-output production function represents a production structure that includes the contribution of all factor inputs that are available in the data sources.

The net-output approach uses net output or the net value added as an output in a production function. Net output is calculated by subtracting the cost of materials, supplies, containers, fuel, electricity, and purchased services from the value of shipments and then deflating by the producer price index of processed foods and feeds. The net output represents the value that is added, by the application of capital and labor, to intermediate inputs in converting those inputs to finished products. Therefore, capital and labor are the relevant inputs in generating the net output of an industry, and a production function for the net output is specified as follows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q_{t}^{*}=A_{t}^{*} *\left(K_{t}, L a_{t}, L b_{t}\right), \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $Q_{t}^{*}$ is the quantity of net output or net value added, and $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{t}}, \mathrm{La}_{\mathrm{t}}$, and $\mathrm{Lb}_{\mathrm{t}}$ are defined the same as in equation 7 . $A_{t}{ }^{*}$ is the index of multifactor productivity for the net value added.

The existence of this net-output production function, as discussed in Gullickson, requires that the production of gross output (as shown in equation 7) be characterized by value-added separability, in which intermediate inputs cannot be the source of productivity growth. In other words, intermediate inputs are excluded from consideration in the net-output model on the assumption that they are insignificant to the analysis of productivity growth. With this restrictive assumption, the purpose of measuring net-output productivity from equation 8 is to calculate an industry's contribution to the Nation's GDP in a simple and straightforward way. For interpreting industry productivity, however, the gross-output model specification is generally preferred.

Both the gross-output and net-output approaches are applied to measure the multifactor and labor productivity indexes of the food manufacturing sector and its associated nine industries. The gross-output approach relates the adjusted value of shipments as a function of capital, labor, energy, and all intermediate materials as shown in equation 7 , while the net-output approach relates the net value added as a function of labor and capital as shown in equation 8 . The detailed empirical results of yearly productivity indexes and related measures obtained from both approaches are reported in Appendix C. This section focuses mainly on the productivity results compiled in tables $5-10$, in which average figures for each of 5 subperiods (four 5 -year periods and one final 3-year period) are presented.

## Gross-Output Productivity Measures

Table 5 presents the gross-output productivity results of the food manufacturing sector. As indicated in the table, the annual rate of change in multifactor productivity (4) is obtained by subtracting the combined inputs (2) from the gross output (1). The annual rate of change in labor productivity (5) is a summation of the capital and other input intensity per unit of labor (3) and multifactor productivity (4).

In table 5, the gross-output multifactor productivity index for food manufacturing grew 0.19 percent a year between 1975 and 1997. The productivity growth of food manufacturing shows a gain of 1.7 percent in 1975-79, then a loss of 1.38 percent in 1980-84, rebounding to 1.08 percent in 1985-89, before decreasing to a negative rate of -0.63 percent in 1995-97. The slow growth rate found in this study is consistent with the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) estimate of 0.45 percent using different data. As shown in figure 5a, both the study's and BLS' productivity indexes show a trend of slow growth, moving up and down within 10 percent along a level slightly above the base year 1975.

Both the study's and BLS' estimates of productivity indexes are low when compared with the BLS estimate of 1.25 percent a year for the whole manufacturing sector over the same period of time. The reason for the lower productivity growth in food manufacturing is not fully understood, but low investment in research and development (R\&D) could be one reason. This study found that real private sector R\&D expenditures for food manufacturing in the period 1975-97 grew 2.22 percent a year on average (table 6). These R\&D expenditures represent only 0.23 percent of sales. Over the same period, the R\&D expenditures for food manufacturing even grew slower than similar expenditures

Table 5-Gross-output productivity and price of the food manufacturing sector, 1975-97

|  |  | 1975-79 | 1980-84 | 1985-89 | 1990-94 | 1995-97 | Average annual growth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Calculated annual change rate (percent) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gross output | (1) | 2.96 | 1.27 | 1.68 | 2.04 | 1.51 | 1.88 |
| Inputs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Combined inputs | (2) | 1.26 | 2.65 | 0.60 | 1.88 | 2.14 | 1.69 |
| Nonlabor/labor intensity | (3) | 0.00 | 4.58 | -0.41 | -0.13 | 1.62 | 1.14 |
| Productivity: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Multifactor productivity | (4)=(1)-(2) | 1.70 | -1.38 | 1.08 | 0.16 | -0.63 | 0.19 |
| Labor productivity | $(5)=(3)+(4)$ | 1.70 | 3.21 | 0.67 | 0.03 | 0.99 | 1.33 |
| BLS multifactor productivity: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Food and kindred products |  | 1.12 | 1.43 | -0.18 | -0.35 | 0.29 | 0.45 |
| Whole manufacturing |  | 1.20 | 1.22 | 1.26 | 0.87 | 1.98 | 1.25 |
| Real processed food price |  | -2.45 | -3.58 | -1.28 | -2.27 | -0.46 | -2.13 |

Notes: Gross output = real adjusted value of shipments; Combined inputs = weighted average of all inputs;
Nonlabor/labor input = nonlabor intensity or combined nonlabor inputs per worker-hour;
Real processed food price is deflated by the consumer price index.
BLS Multifactor productivity is compiled from the BLS website (http://stats.bls.gov/mfp/mprdload.html).
Source: USDA/Economic Research Service.
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## The food sector: Gross-output multifactor productivity and real output price



Source: USDA/Economic Research Service.
for agricultural input industries such as agricultural chemicals and plant breeding. Also, the National Science Foundation estimated that the real private R\&D expenditures of all industries grew at much faster rates of 5.78 percent yearly in the same period.

Although productivity has been relatively low, food manufacturing output has grown significantly over the last two decades. According to this study, it was the expansion of combined factor inputs that provided the major impetus to the sector's output. Gross output measured at 1982 prices grew 1.88 percent a year during 1975-97. During this period the combined capital, labor, energy, and material inputs grew at an average annual rate of 1.69 percent. Material inputs grew the fastest at 2.25 percent a year. Food manufacturing is
materials-intensive with material costs constituting about 60 percent or more of the value of gross output. A 3.06-percent annual decline in real producer prices of crude food and feedstuffs in the period 1975-97 fueled the expansion of input utilization.

This expansion of food manufacturing output benefited U.S. and global consumers. The real producer price of processed foods declined on average 2.13 percent a year between 1975 and 1997 (table 5 and fig. 5a). Researchers have hypothesized that advances in food manufacturing productivity would explain the decline in real prices of processed foods. To explain the cause of decline, this study estimates a log-linear regression by expressing the real producer price of processed foods $\left(\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{t}}\right)$ at time t as a function of the multifactor productivity index $\left(\mathrm{A}_{t}\right)$ and the real price index of crude food and feedstuffs ( $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{t}}$ ) represented for material cost. The empirical results of the fitted price equation covering 1975-97 for the food manufacturing sector are shown below:

$$
\ln \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{t}}=2.5593-0.1381 \ln \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{t}}+\underset{(0.128)}{0.5854} \ln \mathrm{~F}_{\mathrm{t}} \quad \mathrm{R}^{2}=\underset{(0.0173)}{0.99}
$$

The figures in parentheses are the standard errors. The estimated coefficient implies that a 1-percent decrease in the price index of crude food and feedstuffs $\left(\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{t}}\right)$ would reduce the real price of processed foods by 0.59 percent, and is statistically significant. The effect of a 1-percent increase in multifactor productivity $\left(\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{t}}\right)$, however, would reduce the real price of processed food by only 0.14 percent, but would not be statistically significant. The results found in this study indicate that a decrease in the prices of crude food and feed-

Table 6-Private research and development (R\&D) expenditures, 1975-97

|  | $1975-79$ | $1980-84$ | $1985-89$ | $1990-94$ | $1995-97$ <br> Average <br> annual growth |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total agricultural inputs | 865 | 1,091 | 1,163 | 1,396 | 1,548 | 4.04 |
| Plant breeding | 89 | 123 | 173 | 237 | 288 | 6.31 |
| Agricultural chemicals | 346 | 522 | 606 | 754 | 804 | 5.60 |
| Farm machinery | 304 | 312 | 234 | 231 | 271 | 1.95 |
| Veterinary pharmaceuticals | 125 | 134 | 151 | 174 | 185 | 2.56 |
| Food manufacturing products |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 604 | 687 | 609 | 644 | 2.22 |
| Total agricultural R\&D | 1,362 | 1,695 | 1,850 | 2,005 | 2,192 | 3.34 |
| All U.S. industries |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: USDA/Economic Research Service; Data for all U.S.industries are compiled from National Science Foundation.
stuffs drove down the prices of processed foods paid by consumers. Productivity growth apparently contributed little to the price decline.

Another issue of much public interest has been the effect of many mergers and acquisitions in recent years on food manufacturing productivity. According to Mergerstat Review, which tracked purchases valued at $\$ 1$ million or higher and transfers of ownership involving at least 10 percent of a company's equity, the pace of merger and acquisition activity in food processing increased steadily from 60 transactions in 1991 to 157 in 1998 (table 7). Annually, there was an average of 97 transactions involving 12 foreign buyers and 24 foreign sellers. Meanwhile, the number of transactions valued at $\$ 100$ million or more increased from 10 in 1991 to 23 in 1998, with an annual average of 17 . On the basis of the measured multifactor productivity index, it appears that heightened merger and acquisition activity had little effect on productivity. Some argued that R\&D labs were consolidated and total resources reduced in association with a high number of mergers and acquisitions (Connor and Schiek, p. 385).

In measuring labor productivity, the major focus was on the productivity of production workers, who constitute more than 70 percent of the total labor force. As shown in table 5, the average annual rate of change in labor productivity was 1.33 percent. Labor productivity increased over all subperiods, with a peak at 3.21 percent in 1980-84, mainly because of the high growth of nonlabor input intensity, at an annual rate of 4.58 percent. Multifactor productivity, however, showed a negative growth rate of -1.38 percent in 1980-84. The labor productivity index (fig. 5b) moved steadily upward until leveling off somewhat after 1985, while

Figure 5b

## The food sector: Gross-output labor productivity



Source: USDA/Economic Research Service.
the nonlabor intensity index closely mirrored this movement. Evidently, a yearly 1.33-percent growth in labor productivity was closely related to improvements in nonlabor intensity per production worker, especially with workers having more and better machinery.

Table 8 presents the gross-output productivity results of each food manufacturing industry. In the table, the average rates of change in multifactor productivity range from -0.42 for meat products to 1.12 percent for beverages. Many food industries stay roughly even with the level in the base year 1975 with small gains and losses over the subperiods. In 1980-84, the multifactor productivity index sharply decreased for most food industries. For example, multifactor productivity of the dairy industry was estimated at -1.92 percent, because the growth rate of output was only 2.25 per-

Table 7-U.S. food processing merger and acquisition activity, 1990-1998

|  | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 <br> Annual <br> average |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Number of transactions ${ }^{1}$ | 60 | 75 | 74 | 84 | 86 | 111 | 130 | 157 | 97 |
| Number transactions of |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 26 |
| $\quad \$ 100$ million more | 10 | 8 | 11 | 17 | 20 | 19 | 23 | 17 |  |
| Foreign buyers | 8 | 8 | 6 | 13 | 13 | 12 | 15 | 23 | 12 |
| Foreign sellers | 14 | 26 | 30 | 20 | 17 | 24 | 32 | 31 | 24 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Value offered, million \$ | 3,101 | 4,328 | 3,525 | 11,061 | 10,833 | 8,287 | 10,856 | 11,450 | 7,930 |
| Foreign buyers value, million \$ | 543 | 446 | 930 | 4,248 | 6,187 | 425 | 3,041 | 1,382 | 2,150 |
| Foreign sellers value, million \$ | 721 | 2,976 | 1,705 | 381 | 1,844 | 2,812 | 3,435 | 6,170 | 2,505 |

[^0]Table 8-Gross-output productivity of the food manufacturing industries, 1975-97

|  |  | $1975-79$ | $1980-84$ | $1985-89$ | $1990-94$ | $1995-97$ | Average <br> annual growth |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 8-Gross-output productivity of the food manufacturing industries, 1975-97--Continued

|  | $1975-79$ | $1980-84$ | $1985-89$ | $1990-94$ | $1995-97$ | Average <br> annual growth |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


|  | Calculated annual change rate (percent) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sugar and confections |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gross output | (1) | -2.46 | 3.19 | 0.66 | 1.98 | 2.61 | 1.23 |
| Inputs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Combined inputs | (2) | -3.26 | 3.49 | -0.79 | 2.04 | 1.70 | 0.72 |
| Nonlabor/labor intensity | (3) | -3.87 | 4.51 | 0.30 | 1.25 | 2.36 | 1.00 |
| Productivity: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Multifactor productivity | (4)=(1)-(2) | 0.80 | -0.30 | 1.44 | -0.06 | 0.92 | 0.51 |
| Labor productivity | $(5)=(3)+(4)$ | -3.08 | 4.21 | 1.75 | 1.18 | 3.27 | 1.51 |
| Fats and oils |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gross output | (1) | 3.55 | -1.82 | -1.55 | -0.54 | 5.35 | 0.49 |
| Inputs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Combined inputs | (2) | 1.69 | 0.53 | -2.46 | 1.06 | 5.62 | 0.87 |
| Nonlabor/labor intensity | (3) | -0.59 | 6.06 | 1.06 | 2.11 | 7.42 | 3.00 |
| Productivity: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Multifactor productivity | (4)=(1)-(2) | 1.86 | -2.34 | 0.91 | -1.59 | -0.27 | -0.38 |
| Labor productivity | $(5)=(3)+(4)$ | 1.28 | 3.72 | 1.98 | 0.51 | 7.15 | 2.62 |
| Beverages |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gross output | (1) | 3.96 | 3.32 | 1.72 | 2.70 | 2.15 | 2.77 |
| Inputs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Combined inputs | (2) | 2.31 | 4.41 | -1.14 | 0.56 | 2.69 | 1.65 |
| Nonlabor/labor intensity | (3) | 1.82 | 7.35 | 2.74 | 0.49 | -0.39 | 2.68 |
| Productivity: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Multifactor productivity | $(4)=(1)-(2)$ | 1.65 | -1.09 | 2.87 | 2.15 | -0.54 | 1.12 |
| Labor productivity | $(5)=(3)+(4)$ | 3.48 | 6.26 | 5.61 | 2.64 | -0.92 | 3.80 |
| Miscellaneous foods |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gross output | (1) | 7.61 | 1.40 | 1.32 | 3.01 | 0.63 | 2.77 |
| Inputs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Combined inputs | (2) | 5.35 | 2.29 | 0.75 | 1.93 | 2.95 | 2.50 |
| Nonlabor/labor intensity | (3) | -0.39 | 3.09 | 0.11 | -0.22 | 1.09 | 0.75 |
| Productivity: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Multifactor productivity | $(4)=(1)-(2)$ | 2.27 | -0.89 | 0.56 | 1.08 | -2.33 | 0.27 |
| Labor productivity | $(5)=(3)+(4)$ | 1.87 | 2.20 | 0.68 | 0.86 | -1.24 | 1.02 |

Notes: Gross output = real adjusted value of shipments; Combined inputs = weighted average of all inputs; Nonlabor/labor input = nonlabor intensity or combined nonlabor inputs per worker-hour.
Source: USDA/Economic Research Service.
cent, far less than the 4.17-percent growth of the combined inputs. Some significant decreases in multifactor productivity in 1980-84 occurred in fats and oils (-2.34 percent) and meats ( -2.12 percent). In 1995-97, the multifactor productivity indexes of most food industries showed little change or were negative for industries like grain mill products ( -3.2 percent) and miscellaneous foods ( -2.33 percent).

The labor productivity index increased steadily for most food industries and was closely related to
increased use of inputs other than labor. Table 8 shows that the average annual rates of change in labor productivity range from -0.77 for meat products to 3.8 percent for beverages. In contrast to low multifactor productivity in 1980-84, the annual rate of change in labor productivity of the dairy industry was 3.72 percent because of a high growth rate ( 5.64 percent) of nonlabor intensity. In 1980-84, the labor productivity indexes showed significant increases in preserved fruits and vegetables ( 5.27 percent), grain mill products ( 5.61 percent), bakery products ( 5.22 percent),
sugar and confections ( 4.21 percent), fats and oils ( 3.72 percent), and beverages ( 6.26 percent).

In 1995-97, fats and oils as a capital-intensive industry registered remarkably high labor productivity with an annual rate of 7.15 percent, which was related to the 7.42 -percent increase in nonlabor intensity. For other industries, some high labor productivity growth rates were found in sugar and confections ( 3.27 percent), grain mill products ( 2.25 percent), and bakery products ( 2.46 percent), but others showed only a small increase.

Figures 6a to 6i show the movements of gross output, multifactor productivity, and labor productivity for nine food industries in 1975-97. The general pattern of variations for most industries was similar to variations in the overall food manufacturing sector, characterized by a steady upward movement of the gross output and labor productivity. On the other hand, the multifactor productivity indexes moved downward or were slightly above the base year level.

## Net-Output Productivity Measures

The main purpose of measuring net-output productivity is to show the industry's contribution to the Nation's gross domestic product (GDP). Given the measured input-output relationships, a change in the quantity of inputs will affect the amount of combined inputs and capital intensity per production worker so that the quantity of net value added and labor productivity will be affected simultaneously. Therefore, net-output productivity results are useful indicators for showing the contribution of food manufacturing to the Nation's GDP.

Table 9 presents the net-output productivity results of the food manufacturing sector. The results are obtained
from a production function in which the net output (real net value added) is a function of capital and labor. The information is arranged similar to that in table 5 by dividing the whole sample period into five subperiods. As indicated in the table, the annual rate of change in the multifactor productivity (4) is obtained by subtracting the combined inputs of capital and labor (2) from the net output (1). The annual rate of change in labor productivity (5) is a summation of capital intensity per worker-hour (3) and multifactor productivity (4).

In table 9, multifactor productivity of the net value added was characterized by a yearly 2.73 -percent growth. The annual rate of change was 3.1 percent in 1975-79, increasing to a peak of 5.41 percent in 198589 before slowing to 4.21 percent in 1990-94 and -0.91 percent in 1995-97. The gains in the multifactor productivity index constituted the major force of growth in the net value added, which grew at an annual rate of 3.58 percent. The contribution of combined labor and capital inputs to the growth of the net value added, however, was not certain; there were significant contributions of 3.05 percent in 1980-84 and 2.58 percent in 1995-97, but not in other subperiods.

Table 9 also shows that the average annual rate of change in labor productivity was 3.03 percent. The productivity index showed a gain of 2.99 percent in 1975-79, reaching a peak of 5.43 percent in 1980-84 before slowing to 2.71 percent in 1985-89 and 1.14 percent in 1995-97. The rates of change in technological progress and capital intensity per production worker determine the rates of change in labor productivity. For example, the average annual rate of change in labor productivity peaked at 5.43 percent in 1980-84, mainly because of the high annual rates of growth in

Table 9—Net-output productivity of the food manufacturing sector, 1975-97

|  |  | $1975-79$ | $1980-84$ | $1985-89$ | $1990-94$ | 1995-97 <br> Average <br> annual growth |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Calculated | annual change rate (percent) |  |
| Net output | $(1)$ | 4.24 | 3.50 | 3.73 | 4.13 | 1.66 | 3.58 |  |
| Inputs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ Combined inputs | $(2)$ | 1.15 | 3.05 | -1.68 | -0.08 | 2.58 | 0.85 |  |
| $\quad$ Capital/labor intensity | $(3)$ | -0.11 | 4.99 | -2.69 | -2.09 | 2.06 | 0.31 |  |
| Productivity: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ Multifactor productivity | $(4)=(1)-(2)$ | 3.10 | 0.45 | 5.41 | 4.21 | -0.91 | 2.73 |  |
| Labor productivity | $(5)=(3)+(4)$ | 2.99 | 5.43 | 2.71 | 2.12 | 1.14 | 3.03 |  |

Notes: Net output = real net value added; Combined inputs = weighted average of all inputs;
Capital/labor input = capital intensity or capital services per worker-hour.
Source: USDA/Economic Research Service.
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capital intensity of 4.99 percent. In 1975-79, however, labor productivity was 2.99 percent, mainly because of a significant increase in multifactor productivity of 3.1 percent. In general, it is difficult to ascertain the contribution of multifactor productivity or capital intensity to the growth of net-output labor productivity in the food manufacturing sector.

Figure 7a shows that the multifactor productivity index was in general moving upward continuously along with the net-output index during 1975-97, while the combined capital and labor inputs index showed little change. Figure 7b shows that the labor productivity

Figure 7a
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Figure 7b
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Source: USDA/Economic Research Service.
index is moving upward continuously along with the net-output index during 1975-97, while the multifactor productivity index decreases slightly before 1981 and then increases steadily over most years. The combined capital and nonproduction worker intensity index trended upward before 1985 and declined thereafter.

Table 10 presents the net-output productivity results of each food manufacturing industry. The average growth rates of the multifactor productivity indexes vary widely across industries ranging from grain mill products ( 1.99 percent) to beverages ( 3.66 percent). Multifactor productivity accounted for the major growth of net value added in some subperiods, but in other subperiods the combined labor and capital inputs contributed significantly to changes in net value added. In the meat industry, for example, the average growth rate of net value added in 1995-97 was 7.92 percent because of a 4.16-percent increase in multifactor productivity and a 3.76-percent increase in combined inputs. In 1980-84, the annual increase of net value added was 1.18 percent, mainly spurred by a 1.3 -percent increase in combined inputs. In 1985-89, however, the annual increase of net value added was 4.4 percent, mainly due to a 3.7-percent increase in multifactor productivity.

Regarding net-output labor productivity, table 10 shows that most of the average annual changes in labor productivity are positive ranging from meat products (1.64 percent) to beverages ( 4.85 percent), implying that the productivity index increased over time. In 1980-84, the increase of capital intensity was vital to the growth of labor productivity for most industries. For example, in the grain mill products, a 7.89 -percent increase in capital intensity during that period caused a 7.59 -percent increase in labor productivity. On the other hand, the average annual rates of change in capital intensity for most food industries was negative in 1985-89 and 1990-94, which affected labor productivity during those subperiods. For example, the average growth rate of capital intensity for meat products was -3.76 percent in 1985-89, causing labor productivity to drop by 0.06 percent, substantially lower than the 3.7-percent increase in multifactor productivity.

Figures 8 a to 8 i show the movements of net output, multifactor productivity, and labor productivity for the nine food industries in 1975-97. These indexes moved upward continuously over time, but their growth rates varied among industries. For dairy products, bakery products, and sugar and confections, all three indexes were closely correlated. For grain mill products and
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Table 10—Net-output productivity of the food manufacturing industries, 1975-97

| $1975-79$ | $1980-84$ | $1985-89$ | $1990-94$ | $1995-97$ | Average <br> annual growth |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


|  | Calculated annual change rate (percent) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Meat products |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net output | (1) | 1.62 | 1.18 | 4.40 | 5.34 | 7.92 | 3.86 |
| Inputs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Combined inputs | (2) | 0.30 | 1.30 | 0.70 | 2.07 | 3.76 | 1.49 |
| Capital/labor intensity | (3) | -0.91 | 2.10 | -3.76 | -2.08 | 2.14 | -0.72 |
| Productivity: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Multifactor productivity | $(4)=(1)-(2)$ | 1.32 | -0.11 | 3.70 | 3.27 | 4.16 | 2.37 |
| Labor productivity | $(5)=(3)+(4)$ | 0.41 | 1.99 | -0.06 | 1.19 | 6.30 | 1.64 |
| Dairy products |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net output | (1) | 3.54 | 2.65 | 3.73 | 2.93 | 1.71 | 2.99 |
| Inputs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Combined inputs | (2) | -2.52 | 2.74 | -1.07 | -0.30 | 3.80 | 0.37 |
| Capital/labor intensity | (3) | -2.12 | 4.21 | -2.13 | -0.21 | 3.12 | 0.47 |
| Productivity: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Multifactor productivity | $(4)=(1)-(2)$ | 6.06 | -0.10 | 4.80 | 3.23 | -2.09 | 2.62 |
| Labor productivity | $(5)=(3)+(4)$ | 3.94 | 4.12 | 2.68 | 3.02 | 1.03 | 3.09 |
| Preserved fruits and vegetables |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net output | (1) | 6.03 | 5.04 | 4.28 | 2.94 | -0.04 | 3.88 |
| Inputs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Combined inputs | (2) | 1.96 | 2.93 | -1.06 | 0.72 | -0.98 | 0.81 |
| Capital/labor intensity | (3) | 0.07 | 5.33 | -0.57 | 0.07 | 0.23 | 1.14 |
| Productivity: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Multifactor productivity | (4)=(1)-(2) | 4.07 | 2.11 | 5.33 | 2.22 | 0.95 | 3.06 |
| Labor productivity | $(5)=(3)+(4)$ | 4.14 | 7.44 | 4.77 | 2.29 | 1.17 | 4.21 |
| Grain mill products |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net output | (1) | 4.28 | 4.16 | 6.05 | 4.64 | $-2.74$ | 3.78 |
| Inputs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Combined inputs | (2) | 1.71 | 4.46 | -0.85 | 0.42 | 4.14 | 1.79 |
| Capital/labor intensity | (3) | 1.98 | 7.89 | -1.95 | -0.59 | 4.68 | 2.21 |
| Productivity: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Multifactor productivity | (4)=(1)-(2) | 2.57 | -0.30 | 6.91 | 4.22 | -6.87 | 1.99 |
| Labor productivity | $(5)=(3)+(4)$ | 4.54 | 7.59 | 4.96 | 3.64 | -2.19 | 4.20 |
| Bakery products |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net output | (1) | 2.44 | 3.39 | 2.91 | 4.15 | 1.21 | 2.98 |
| Inputs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Combined inputs | (2) | -0.74 | 2.03 | -0.69 | 0.51 | 2.15 | 0.58 |
| Capital/labor intensity | (3) | -0.77 | 4.87 | -1.58 | -1.82 | 3.83 | 0.72 |
| Productivity: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Multifactor productivity | (4)=(1)-(2) | 3.17 | 1.37 | 3.60 | 3.65 | -0.95 | 2.40 |
| Labor productivity | $(5)=(3)+(4)$ | 2.40 | 6.24 | 2.02 | 1.83 | 2.88 | 3.12 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | inued-- |

Table 10-Net-output productivity of the food manufacturing industries, 1975-97--Continued

|  |  | 1975-79 | 1980-84 | 1985-89 | 1990-94 | 1995-97 | Average annual growth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Calculated annual change rate (percent) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sugar and confections |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net output | (1) | 2.60 | 4.89 | 2.85 | 3.05 | 3.58 | 3.41 |
| Inputs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Combined inputs | (2) | 0.44 | 2.59 | -2.62 | 0.51 | 0.69 | 0.28 |
| Capital/labor intensity | (3) | -0.17 | 3.61 | -1.54 | -0.28 | 1.35 | 0.56 |
| Productivity: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Multifactor productivity | $(4)=(1)-(2)$ | 2.16 | 2.29 | 5.48 | 2.54 | 2.88 | 3.13 |
| Labor productivity | $(5)=(3)+(4)$ | 1.99 | 5.91 | 3.94 | 2.26 | 4.24 | 3.69 |
| Fats and oils |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net output | (1) | 9.77 | -6.14 | 3.00 | 2.93 | 1.25 | 1.90 |
| Inputs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Combined inputs | (2) | 2.57 | 2.59 | -4.99 | -2.69 | 1.56 | -0.47 |
| Capital/labor intensity | (3) | 0.29 | 8.13 | -1.46 | -1.64 | 3.36 | 1.65 |
| Productivity: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Multifactor productivity | (4)=(1)-(2) | 7.20 | -8.74 | 7.99 | 5.62 | -0.31 | 2.37 |
| Labor productivity | $(5)=(3)+(4)$ | 7.50 | -0.60 | 6.52 | 3.98 | 3.05 | 4.03 |
| Beverages |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net output | (1) | 4.84 | 4.54 | 3.47 | 4.01 | 1.55 | 3.83 |
| Inputs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Combined inputs | (2) | 2.89 | 4.10 | -4.17 | -3.05 | 2.57 | 0.17 |
| Capital/labor intensity | (3) | 2.40 | 7.04 | -0.28 | -3.11 | -0.50 | 1.19 |
| Productivity: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Multifactor productivity | (4)=(1)-(2) | 1.95 | 0.45 | 7.64 | 7.06 | -1.02 | 3.66 |
| Labor productivity | $(5)=(3)+(4)$ | 4.36 | 7.48 | 7.36 | 3.95 | -1.52 | 4.85 |
| Miscellaneous foods |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net output | (1) | 6.34 | 4.66 | 1.50 | 5.93 | 0.55 | 3.98 |
| Inputs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Combined inputs | (2) | 2.51 | 3.29 | -1.22 | 0.88 | 4.30 | 1.71 |
| Capital/labor intensity | (3) | -3.23 | 4.09 | -1.86 | -1.27 | 2.44 | -0.04 |
| Productivity: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Multifactor productivity | $(4)=(1)-(2)$ | 3.83 | 1.37 | 2.72 | 5.05 | -3.75 | 2.26 |
| Labor productivity | (5) $=(3)+(4)$ | 0.60 | 5.46 | 0.86 | 3.78 | -1.32 | 2.23 |

Notes: Net output = real net value added; Combined inputs = weighted average of all inputs;
Capital/labor input = capital intensity or capital services per worker-hours.
Source: USDA/Economic Research Service.
preserved fruits and vegetables, there was a close correlation between the output and labor productivity indexes. For beverages and fats and oils, there was a close correlation between the output and multifactor productivity indexes.

The net-output productivity results are useful indicators for showing the contribution of food manufacturing to the Nation's GDP. This report concludes by assessing the effects of an increase in capital, labor
(including production and nonproduction workers), or both by 10 percent on the rates of change in net value added and labor productivity. The upper part of table 11 presents the simulated results, showing the increases in net value added compared with the yearly average for 1995-97. These base values, for example, are $\$ 135$ billion for the food sector and $\$ 19$ billion for meat products. The simulated results indicate that an increase in capital input by 10 percent would increase the net value added of the food sector by $\$ 3.3$ billion,
mainly from capital-intensive industries: beverages ( $\$ 681$ million), grain mill products ( $\$ 476$ million), and preserved fruits and vegetables ( $\$ 463$ million). A 10percent increase in labor would increase the net value added of the food sector by $\$ 995$ million, with the meat industry contributing the most among industries ( $\$ 227$ million) because of its labor-intensive meatpacking operations. The increase of both capital and labor would increase the value added of the food sector by $\$ 4.3$ billion, with beverages contributing the most among all industries ( $\$ 808$ million).

The lower part of table 11 presents the simulated results, showing the increases in labor productivity compared with the yearly average in 1995-97. The base value of the food sector was $\$ 58.34$ for the net value added per production worker-hour. Beverages and grain mill products, heavily capital-intensive industries, ranked high in labor productivity (\$167.1
and $\$ 109.73$ per worker-hour, respectively). On the other hand, labor productivity of the labor-intensive meat products industry ranked the lowest among the food industries-only $\$ 24.61$ per worker-hour. A 10percent increase in capital input alone would increase the food manufacturing sector's capital intensity, and consequently its labor productivity, by $\$ 1.43$ per work-er-hour. Most of the increases in labor productivity were realized by capital-intensive industries: $\$ 4.47$ per worker-hour for beverages and $\$ 2.99$ per worker-hour for grain mill products. A 10-percent increase in labor input alone would reduce the entire food manufacturing sector's capital intensity and cause a decrease in labor productivity of $\$ 1.58$ per worker-hour. Finally, an increase of both capital and employees would yield a small increase in labor productivity of the food sector ( 15 cents per worker-hour), because of the countereffects of changes between capital and labor.

Table 11-Effects of increases in inputs on net value added and labor productivity

|  | Base value | Changes in value added as a 10-percent increase of: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Capital | Labor | Both capital and labor |
| Million \$ at 1982 prices |  |  |  |  |
| Food sector | 135,166 | 3,299 | 995 | 4,294 |
| Meat products | 19,045 | 378 | 227 | 605 |
| Dairy products | 11,838 | 278 | 98 | 376 |
| Preserved fruits \& vegetables | 18,503 | 463 | 125 | 588 |
| Grain mill products | 17,473 | 476 | 79 | 555 |
| Bakery products | 15,556 | 342 | 152 | 494 |
| Sugar and confections | 9,174 | 224 | 67 | 291 |
| Fats and oils | 3,267 | 84 | 20 | 104 |
| Beverages | 25,432 | 681 | 127 | 808 |
| Miscellaneous foods | 14,878 | 372 | 100 | 473 |
| Changes in net value added per worker-hour (dollars) |  |  |  |  |
| Food sector | 58.34 | 1.43 | -1.58 | 0.15 |
| Meat products | 24.61 | 0.49 | -0.55 | 0.07 |
| Dairy products | 65.99 | 1.55 | -1.79 | 0.24 |
| Preserved fruits \& vegetables | 53.29 | 1.33 | -1.43 | 0.10 |
| Grain mill products | 109.73 | 2.99 | -3.17 | 0.18 |
| Bakery products | 57.30 | 1.26 | -1.51 | 0.25 |
| Sugar and confections | 63.22 | 1.55 | -1.69 | 0.15 |
| Fats and oils | 82.19 | 2.12 | -2.31 | 0.19 |
| Beverages | 167.14 | 4.47 | -4.90 | 0.42 |
| Miscellaneous foods | 59.93 | 1.50 | -1.66 | 0.16 |

Note: All values are measured at 1982 prices deflated by producer price of processed foods and feeds.
Base value = yearly ave rage value in 1995-97. Labor = production and nonproduction workers.
Source: USDA/Economic Research Service.

This report uses gross-output and net-output approaches to measure multifactor and labor productivity indexes of the U.S. food manufacturing sector. The grossoutput approach relates the adjusted value of shipments as a function of capital, labor, energy, and all intermediate materials, while the net-output approach relates the net value added as a function of labor and capital. This study finds a striking difference in the multifactor productivity indexes obtained through different approaches. The gross-output approach yields no significant changes in multifactor productivity over the sample period, while the net-output approach indicates a steady increase in the productivity index.

The cause for different multifactor productivity results may be explained below. The productivity index is calculated by subtracting the rates of change in the combined input index from the output index. In the grossoutput model, materials are considered both as input and output of a production function. If the cost of materials constitutes a large portion of the value of shipments, the rate of change in the output index would be close to the combined input index, causing the measured multifactor productivity index to be small. In the net-output model, materials are not included in output or considered as input in a production function. The difference in the rates of change between the net value added and the combined capital and labor inputs-that is, the net-output multifactor productivity index-shows more degrees of freedom to vary than under the gross-output model.

In fact, the food manufacturing sector is materialsintensive, with material costs constituting about 60 percent or more of the value of gross output. The ratios for some food manufacturing industries, such as meat products and fats and oils, even reach 75 percent or higher. These two industries depend on either relatively expensive meats as raw materials for processing or heavy use of soybeans for crushing or semi-refined soybean oil for refining. Consequently, including or excluding materials as a component in a production function will substantially affect the results of measured productivity indexes. Basically, the economic meaning of the productivity measurements from the two approaches is different, and they represent different applications. There are certain advantages for applying either the gross-output or net-output
approach to measure the productivity indexes of the U.S. food manufacturing sector.

Results obtained from the gross-output approach should be used for interpreting food manufacturing productivity trends. The gross-output approach measures the ability to produce higher gross output from the same level of all inputs because of technological change. Under this approach, the production function is a comprehensive representation of a production structure that includes the contribution of all factor inputs available from the data sources. Therefore, the measured gross-output productivity index may closely represent technology changes over time, while the potential change effects from unmeasured inputs can be avoided. On the other hand, a distinct drawback of applying the net-output approach is the assumption that materials inputs are separable from other inputs and cannot be the source of productivity growth. The Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) apparently supports using the gross-output results to explain productivity trends. Gullickson indicated that the BLS has not included net-output productivity indexes in its news release of productivity trends for all manufacturing industries since 1994.

Productivity indexes obtained from the net-output approach should be used for evaluating the contribution of food manufacturing to the growth of the Nation's GDP, mainly because the definition of net output is the same as for gross-product-originating (value-added) GDP. As a common practice to evaluate the Nation's GDP in any year, the level of GDP is frequently regarded as dependent on the input of labor measured in worker-hours multiplied by the labor productivity measure as real value added per worker-hour. Therefore, the net-output labor productivity index using the net value added as output in a production function may directly show the contribution of the food manufacturing industries to the Nation's GDP. In addition, net-output labor productivity, which depends solely on capital and labor inputs, can be easily interpreted as dependent on technological progress and the quantity of capital goods available to workers. This provides a framework for easy interpretation of the substitution relationships between capital and labor inputs. These advantages in application, however, are not available in the gross-output labor productivity measure.
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The data used in this study were compiled mainly from the Census of Manufactures and the Annual Survey of Manufactures SIC code 20 (Food and Kindred Products) and its nine three-digit industries for 1975-97 published by the Census Bureau of the U.S. Department of Commerce. The Census Bureau conducts the economic census (including food manufacturing) every 5 years, covering years ending in 2 and 7, (e.g., 1992 and 1997). In addition, the Census Bureau conducts the Annual Survey of Manufactures (ASM) in each of the 4 years between the economic censuses. The ASM is a probability-based sample of approximately 58,000 establishments and collects many of the same industry statistics as the economic census including employment, payroll, value of shipments, etc. However, there are some selected statistics not included in the ASM. Among these are the number of companies and establishments, detailed product and materials data, and sub-State geographic data.

The data in the 1997 Census of Manufactures were published for the first time on the basis of the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS), which is different from the Standard Industrial

Classification System (SIC) used in previous censuses. For food manufacturing industries, there is substantial difference in product classification between the NAICS and the SIC systems. For example, dog and cat food and other animal foods are included in animal food (code 3111) in the NAICS, but they are included in grain mill products (code 204) in the SIC. In the NAICS, seafood product preparation and packaging (code 3117) is added as a product category, but is included in miscellaneous food (code 209) under the SIC system.

To construct consistent time-series data dating back to 1975, this study converts the 1997 data under the NAICS classification system into a framework along with the SIC classification system. The converting procedure follows the Census Bureau's classification codes published on the web site "1997 Economic Census: Bridge Between SIC and NAICS." A list of the comparability of product codes used for converting the NAICS data into SIC data is presented in Appendix table A. For example, in the meat products, SIC code 2011 (meatpacking plants) is nearly equivalent to NAICS code 311611 (animal, except poultry, slaughtering).

## Appendix table A-Comparability of product codes between SIC and NAICS for food and kindred products

|  | SIC code |  | NAICS code * |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Meat products | 201 |  |  |  |
| Fresh frozen meat | 2011 | Meatpacking plants | 311611 | Animal (except poultry) slaughtering (99.9\%) |
| Sausage | 2013 | Sausages and other prepared meats | 311612 | Meat processed from carcasses (93\%) |
| Poultry | 2015 | Poultry slaughtering and processing | 311615 | Poultry processing |
|  |  |  | 311999 | All other miscellaneous food (21\%) |
| Dairy products | 202 |  |  |  |
| Creamery butter | 2021 | Creamery butter | 311512 | Creamery butter |
| Cheese | 2022 | Cheese, natural and processed | 311513 | Cheese |
| Dry condensed milk | 2023 | Dry, condensed and evaporated dairy products | 311514 | Dry, condensed and evaporated dairy products |
| Ice cream | 2024 | Ice cream and frozen desserts | 311520 | Ice cream and frozen dessert |
| Fluid milk | 2026 | Fluid milk | 311511 | Fluid milk |
| Preserved fruits |  |  |  |  |
| Canned specialty | 2032 | Canned specialties | 311422 | Speciality canning |
|  |  |  | 311999 | All other miscellaneous food (2\%) |
| Canned fruits and vegetables | 2033 | Canned fruits and vegetables | 311421 | Fruit and vegetable canning (91\%) |
| Dried fruits and vegetables | 2034 | Dehydrated fruits, vegetables, and soups | 311423 | Dried and dehydrated food (94\%) |
| Pickles | 2035 | Pickles, sauces, and salad dressings | 311941 | Pickles, sauces, and salad dressings (96\%) |
|  |  |  | 311421 | Fruit and vegetable canning (9\%) |
| Frozen fruits and vegetables | 2037 | Frozen fruits and vegetables | 311411 | Frozen fruit, juice, and vegetable |
| Frozen specialties | 2038 | Frozen specialties | 311412 | Frozen specialty food |
| Grain mill products | 204 |  |  |  |
| Flour and gain mill products | 2041 | Flour and other grain mill products | 311211 | Flour milling |
| Breakfast cereals | 2043 | Cereal breakfast foods | 311230 | Breakfast cereal |
| Rice | 2044 | Rice milling | 311212 | Rice milling |
| Prepared flour mixes | 2045 | Prepared flour mixes and doughs | 311822 | Flour mixes and dough from flour |
| Wet corn | 2046 | Wet corn milling | 311221 | Wet corn milling |
| Dog and cat food | 2047 | Dog and cat food | 311111 | Dog and cat food |
| Prepared feeds | 2048 | Prepared feeds | 311119 | Other animal food |
|  |  |  | 311611 | Animal (except poultry) slaughtering (0.1\%) |
| Bakery products | 205 |  |  |  |
| Cookies and crackers | 2052 | Cookies and crackers | 311821 | Cookies and crackers |
|  |  |  | 311919 | Potato chips and other snack food (6\%) |
|  |  |  | 311812 | Commercial bakeries (0.2\%) |
| Frozen bakery | 2053 | Frozen bakery products, except bread | 311813 | Frozen cake, pie, and other pastry |
| Sugar and confections | 206 |  |  |  |
| Raw cane sugar | 2061 | Raw cane sugar | 311311 | Sugarcane mills |
| Cane sugar | 2062 | Cane sugar refining | 311312 | Cane sugar refining |
| Beet sugar | 2063 | Beet sugar | 311313 | Beet sugar |
| Candy | 2064 | Candy and other confectionery products and chewing gum | $3113302$ | 2 Confectionery products from chocolate (commercial) |
|  |  | Nonchocolate confectionery manufacturing | 3113402 | 2 Nonchocolate confectionery (commercial) |
| Chocolate | 2066 | Chocolate and cocoa products | 311320 | Chocolate and confectionery from cacao beans |
| Nuts and peanuts | 2068 | Salted and roasted nuts and seeds | 311911 | Roasted nuts and peanut butter (80\%) |

## Appendix table A-Comparability of product codes between SIC and NAICS for food and kindred products--Continued

| Fats and oils | 207 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Soybean oil | 2075 | Soybean oil mills | 311222 | Soybean processing |
|  |  |  | 311225 | Fats and oils refining and blending (12\%) |
| Other oilseed | 2076 | Vegetable and cotton oil mills | 311223 | Other oilseed processing |
|  |  |  | 311225 | Fats and oils refining and blending (2\%) |
| Animal fats and oils | 2077 | Animal and marine fats and oils | 311613 | Rendering and meat byproduct processing |
|  |  |  | 311711 | Seafood canning (1\%) |
| Edible fats and oils | 2079 | Edible fats and oils | 311225 | Fats and oils refining and blending (86\%) |
| Beverages | 208 |  |  |  |
| Malt beverages | 2082 | Malt beverages | 312120 | Breweries |
| Malt | 2083 | Malt | 311213 | Malt |
| Wines | 2084 | Wines, brandy, and brandy spirits | 312130 | Wineries |
| Distillery | 2085 | Distilled and blended liquors | 312140 | Distilleries |
| Soft drink | 2086 | Soft drink | 312111 | Soft drink |
|  | 2086 | Bottled water | 312112 | Bottled water |
| Flavoring syrups | 2087 | Flavoring syrup and concentrate | 311930 | Flavoring syrup and concentrate |
|  |  |  | 311942 | Spice and extract (20\%) |
|  |  |  | 311999 | All other miscellaneous food (8\%) |
| Miscellaneous foods | 209 |  |  |  |
| Seafood canned | 2091 | Canned and cured fish and seafoods | 311711 | Seafood canning (99\%) |
| Seafood fresh | 2092 | Fresh or frozen prepared fish | 311712 | Fresh and frozen seafood processing |
| Roasted coffee | 2095 | Roasted coffee | 311920 | Coffee and tea (90\%) |
| Potato chips | 2096 | Potato chips and similar snacks | 311919 | Potato chips and other snack food (94\%) |
| Manufactured ice | 2097 | Manufactured ice | 312113 | Manufactured ice |
| Macaroni and spaghetti | 2098 | Macaroni and spaghetti | 311823 | Dry pasta |
| Food preparation | 2099 | Food preparations | 311830 | Tortilla |
|  |  |  | 311942 | Spice and extract (80\%) |
|  |  |  | 311991 | Perishable prepared food |
|  |  |  | 311999 | All other miscellaneous food (69\%) |
|  |  |  | 311423 | Dried and dehydrated food (6\%) |
|  |  |  | 311911 | Roasted nuts and peanut butter (20\%) |
|  |  |  | 311920 | Coffee and tea (10\%) |
|  |  |  | 311941 | Mayonnaise, dressing \& sauce (4\%) |

[^1]Appendix B: Estimated Capital Depreciation Equations

To measure depreciation charges for capital, data are available and reported only for 1977-85. Depreciation charges for the remaining period 1986-97 are projected on the basis of a log-linear regression by fitting the depreciation charges $\left(D_{t}\right)$ at time $t$ as a function of beginning-of-year structure and equipment assets $\left(\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{t}}\right)$ for 1977-85. That is,

$$
\ln \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{t}}=\alpha+\beta \ln \mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{t}} .
$$

A complete listing of fitted depreciation equations for the food manufacturing sector and all individual food manufacturing industries is listed in the following table:

## Appendix table B-Estimation results of capital depreciation equations

|  | Estimated constant | Estimated slope | R -square | D.W. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Food sector | $\begin{gathered} \hline-3.3203 \\ (0.3156) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.0630 \\ (0.0292) \end{array}$ | 0.99 | 2.60 |
| Meat products | $\begin{array}{r} -2.5058 \\ (1.2503) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.0028 \\ (0.1460) \end{array}$ | 0.87 | 2.61 |
| Dairy products | $\begin{array}{r} -2.9143 \\ (0.7790) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.0412 \\ (0.0927) \end{array}$ | 2.61 | 1.68 |
| Preserved fruits and vegetables | $\begin{array}{r} -3.2090 \\ (0.4354) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.0591 \\ (0.0497) \end{array}$ | 0.98 | 1.86 |
| Grain mill products | $\begin{array}{r} -3.8491 \\ (0.9448) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.1222 \\ (0.1076) \end{array}$ | 0.94 | 1.70 |
| Bakery products | $\begin{array}{r} -3.4243 \\ (0.7369) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.1039 \\ (0.0891) \end{array}$ | 0.96 | 2.18 |
| Sugar and confections | $\begin{array}{r} -2.8632 \\ (0.6141) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.0051 \\ (0.0737) \end{array}$ | 0.96 | 1.92 |
| Fats and oils | $\begin{array}{r} -4.0580 \\ (0.3755) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.1716 \\ (0.0473) \end{array}$ | 0.99 | 3.16 |
| Beverages | $\begin{gathered} -3.7038 \\ (0.4264) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.1149 \\ (0.0457) \end{array}$ | 0.99 | 1.84 |
| Miscellaneous foods | $\begin{array}{r} -1.1906 \\ (0.9152) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.8327 \\ (0.1108) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0.89 | 1.34 |

Notes: The depreciation equation is a log-linear form by fitting the depreciation charges as a function of the assets at the beginning-of-year. For each pair of estimates, the upper part is the estimated coefficient, and the lower part in parentheses is the standard error. D.W. = DurbinWatson statistic.
Source: USDA/Economic Research Service.

For applying the methodology of measuring productivity to U.S. food manufacturing, two commonly used output indicators, the value of shipments and value added, are available in the Census of Manufactures and the Annual Survey of Manufactures. Therefore, two alternative approaches in specifying a production function for measuring multifactor and labor productivity indexes are applied in this study. One approach is specifying the "gross" output or real adjusted value of shipments as a function of capital, labor, and intermediate materials inputs. The results from the grossoutput approach are presented in appendix tables C1 to C10. Another approach is specifying the "net" output or real net value-added as a function of capital and
labor inputs. The results from the net-output approach are presented in appendix tables C 11 to C 20 .

Each table contains the detailed results of yearly productivity indexes and related measures. The upper part of each table shows the calculated annual rates of changes in output, inputs, and multifactor and labor productivity indexes. The lower part of each table shows and the generated index values using 1975 as the base year. These index series showing the movements of the generated index numbers for output, multifactor, and labor productivity are the input information for use in the figures appearing in the text.

Appendix table C-1—Gross-output productivity of the food manufacturing sector

| Year | Output | Inputs |  | Productivity |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (1) | Combined <br> (2) | Nonlabor/labor <br> (3) | Multifactor $(4)=(1)-(2)$ | Labor $(5)=(3)+(4)$ |
| Calculated annual change rate (percent) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1976 | 7.49 | 3.30 | 1.78 | 4.19 | 5.97 |
| 1977 | 2.01 | 2.85 | 2.41 | -0.83 | 1.58 |
| 1978 | 3.02 | 0.96 | -1.17 | 2.06 | 0.89 |
| 1979 | -0.70 | -2.08 | -3.01 | 1.39 | -1.62 |
| 1980 | 0.24 | 4.40 | 5.48 | -4.16 | 1.32 |
| 1981 | 2.74 | 5.17 | 7.03 | -2.43 | 4.60 |
| 1982 | 2.06 | 4.01 | 7.94 | -1.94 | 6.00 |
| 1983 | 0.31 | -2.44 | -0.31 | 2.75 | 2.44 |
| 1984 | 0.99 | 2.09 | 2.79 | -1.10 | 1.68 |
| 1985 | 2.21 | 4.39 | 6.21 | -2.18 | 4.03 |
| 1986 | 0.44 | -1.60 | -1.14 | 2.04 | 0.90 |
| 1987 | 4.45 | 2.94 | -1.47 | 1.51 | 0.04 |
| 1988 | 2.21 | -0.96 | -3.06 | 3.18 | 0.12 |
| 1989 | -0.89 | -1.75 | -2.60 | 0.86 | -1.73 |
| 1990 | 1.83 | 2.38 | -0.46 | -0.54 | -1.00 |
| 1991 | 0.73 | 3.36 | 2.62 | -2.63 | -0.02 |
| 1992 | 4.92 | 2.07 | -2.02 | 2.85 | 0.83 |
| 1993 | 1.95 | -2.04 | -3.43 | 3.99 | 0.56 |
| 1994 | 0.78 | 3.62 | 2.64 | -2.85 | -0.21 |
| 1995 | 2.75 | 2.31 | 1.67 | 0.44 | 2.11 |
| 1996 | -1.78 | -4.08 | -3.51 | 2.29 | -1.21 |
| 1997 | 3.56 | 8.18 | 6.70 | -4.63 | 2.07 |
| Generated index number (1975=100) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1975 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 1976 | 107.5 | 103.3 | 101.8 | 104.2 | 106.0 |
| 1977 | 109.7 | 106.2 | 104.2 | 103.3 | 107.6 |
| 1978 | 113.0 | 107.3 | 103.0 | 105.5 | 108.6 |
| 1979 | 112.2 | 105.0 | 99.9 | 106.9 | 106.8 |
| 1980 | 112.5 | 109.7 | 105.4 | 102.5 | 108.2 |
| 1981 | 115.5 | 115.3 | 112.8 | 100.0 | 113.2 |
| 1982 | 117.9 | 119.9 | 121.8 | 98.0 | 120.0 |
| 1983 | 118.3 | 117.0 | 121.4 | 100.7 | 122.9 |
| 1984 | 119.5 | 119.5 | 124.8 | 99.6 | 125.0 |
| 1985 | 122.1 | 124.7 | 132.5 | 97.4 | 130.0 |
| 1986 | 122.6 | 122.7 | 131.0 | 99.4 | 131.2 |
| 1987 | 128.1 | 126.3 | 129.1 | 100.9 | 131.3 |
| 1988 | 130.9 | 125.1 | 125.1 | 104.1 | 131.4 |
| 1989 | 129.8 | 122.9 | 121.9 | 105.0 | 129.2 |
| 1990 | 132.1 | 125.8 | 121.3 | 104.5 | 127.9 |
| 1991 | 133.1 | 130.1 | 124.5 | 101.7 | 127.8 |
| 1992 | 139.7 | 132.8 | 122.0 | 104.6 | 128.9 |
| 1993 | 142.4 | 130.1 | 117.8 | 108.8 | 129.6 |
| 1994 | 143.5 | 134.8 | 120.9 | 105.7 | 129.4 |
| 1995 | 147.4 | 137.9 | 122.9 | 106.2 | 132.1 |
| 1996 | 144.8 | 132.2 | 118.6 | 108.6 | 130.5 |
| 1997 | 150.0 | 143.1 | 126.5 | 103.6 | 133.2 |

Appendix table C-2-Gross-output productivity of the meat products industry


|  | Calculated annual change rate (percent) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1976 | 6.75 | 4.10 | 2.17 | 2.65 | 4.82 |
| 1977 | -3.17 | 0.22 | 0.86 | -3.39 | -2.53 |
| 1978 | 10.00 | 7.38 | 4.56 | 2.62 | 7.18 |
| 1979 | 0.68 | -3.26 | -4.00 | 3.95 | -0.05 |
| 1980 | -5.89 | -1.58 | -3.93 | -4.30 | -8.23 |
| 1981 | 1.35 | 4.67 | 6.88 | -3.32 | 3.56 |
| 1982 | 1.45 | 5.42 | 5.53 | -3.96 | 1.57 |
| 1983 | -3.48 | -4.41 | -3.17 | 0.94 | -2.23 |
| 1984 | -0.31 | -0.36 | 2.46 | 0.04 | 2.50 |
| 1985 | -0.31 | 4.21 | 3.83 | -4.52 | -0.69 |
| 1986 | 1.32 | 3.04 | -1.27 | -1.72 | -2.99 |
| 1987 | 8.37 | 8.87 | -0.34 | -0.50 | -0.84 |
| 1988 | 1.02 | -3.60 | -9.08 | 4.62 | -4.46 |
| 1989 | -0.75 | -1.68 | -4.60 | 0.93 | -3.67 |
| 1990 | 3.94 | 4.39 | -0.72 | -0.45 | -1.17 |
| 1991 | -1.67 | 5.08 | 2.67 | -6.75 | -4.09 |
| 1992 | 5.21 | 4.27 | -1.47 | 0.94 | -0.53 |
| 1993 | 3.97 | 1.00 | -2.96 | 2.96 | 0.00 |
| 1994 | -2.75 | -0.76 | -4.26 | -2.00 | -6.25 |
| 1995 | 1.84 | 0.64 | 1.78 | 1.20 | 2.98 |
| 1996 | -3.72 | -6.65 | -7.51 | 2.93 | -4.58 |
| 1997 | 7.99 | 10.16 | 5.01 | -2.18 | 2.83 |
|  | Generated index number (1975=100) |  |  |  |  |
| 1975 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 1976 | 106.7 | 104.1 | 102.2 | 102.7 | 104.8 |
| 1977 | 103.4 | 104.3 | 103.0 | 99.2 | 102.2 |
| 1978 | 113.7 | 112.0 | 107.7 | 101.8 | 109.5 |
| 1979 | 114.5 | 108.4 | 103.4 | 105.8 | 109.4 |
| 1980 | 107.7 | 106.6 | 99.4 | 101.2 | 100.4 |
| 1981 | 109.2 | 111.6 | 106.2 | 97.9 | 104.0 |
| 1982 | 110.8 | 117.7 | 112.1 | 94.0 | 105.6 |
| 1983 | 106.9 | 112.5 | 108.5 | 94.9 | 103.3 |
| 1984 | 106.6 | 112.1 | 111.2 | 94.9 | 105.9 |
| 1985 | 106.3 | 116.8 | 115.4 | 90.6 | 105.1 |
| 1986 | 107.7 | 120.3 | 114.0 | 89.1 | 102.0 |
| 1987 | 116.7 | 131.0 | 113.6 | 88.6 | 101.1 |
| 1988 | 117.9 | 126.3 | 103.3 | 92.7 | 96.6 |
| 1989 | 117.0 | 124.2 | 98.5 | 93.6 | 93.1 |
| 1990 | 121.6 | 129.6 | 97.8 | 93.2 | 92.0 |
| 1991 | 119.6 | 136.2 | 100.4 | 86.9 | 88.2 |
| 1992 | 125.8 | 142.0 | 98.9 | 87.7 | 87.8 |
| 1993 | 130.8 | 143.5 | 96.0 | 90.3 | 87.8 |
| 1994 | 127.2 | 142.4 | 91.9 | 88.5 | 82.3 |
| 1995 | 129.5 | 143.3 | 93.6 | 89.5 | 84.7 |
| 1996 | 124.7 | 133.7 | 86.5 | 92.2 | 80.8 |
| 1997 | 134.7 | 147.3 | 90.9 | 90.2 | 83.1 |

Appendix table C-3-Gross-output productivity of the dairy products industry

| Year | Output | Inputs |  | Productivity |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Combined | Nonlabor/labor | Multifactor |  |


|  | Calculated annual change rate (percent) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1976 | 11.45 | 7.44 | 7.87 | 4.02 | 11.89 |
| 1977 | -0.03 | 1.47 | 5.49 | -1.50 | 3.99 |
| 1978 | -1.42 | -3.93 | -4.50 | 2.51 | -1.99 |
| 1979 | -1.27 | -5.78 | -8.07 | 4.51 | -3.56 |
| 1980 | 3.49 | 7.61 | 10.70 | -4.12 | 6.58 |
| 1981 | 5.58 | 8.75 | 9.09 | -3.16 | 5.93 |
| 1982 | 3.47 | 6.65 | 11.16 | -3.18 | 7.98 |
| 1983 | 1.85 | 0.12 | 1.94 | 1.73 | 3.67 |
| 1984 | -3.15 | -2.26 | -4.68 | -0.89 | -5.56 |
| 1985 | 3.71 | 8.47 | 9.07 | -4.76 | 4.31 |
| 1986 | 0.58 | -0.64 | -1.00 | 1.22 | 0.22 |
| 1987 | 4.02 | 2.51 | -1.58 | 1.51 | -0.07 |
| 1988 | 0.09 | -3.48 | -8.24 | 3.57 | -4.67 |
| 1989 | -1.97 | -1.33 | 2.01 | -0.65 | 1.36 |
| 1990 | 2.62 | 3.62 | 3.73 | -1.00 | 2.73 |
| 1991 | -2.64 | 0.58 | 1.03 | -3.21 | -2.18 |
| 1992 | 8.40 | 4.39 | -0.54 | 4.01 | 3.46 |
| 1993 | -2.81 | -4.73 | -3.92 | 1.92 | -2.00 |
| 1994 | -0.80 | 4.15 | 8.16 | -4.95 | 3.21 |
| 1995 | 2.63 | 4.30 | 2.16 | -1.67 | 0.50 |
| 1996 | -0.25 | -5.32 | -4.42 | 5.07 | 0.64 |
| 1997 | -0.10 | 5.25 | 4.47 | -5.35 | -0.88 |
|  | Generated index number (1975=100) |  |  |  |  |
| 1975 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 1976 | 111.5 | 107.4 | 107.9 | 104.0 | 111.9 |
| 1977 | 111.4 | 109.0 | 113.8 | 102.5 | 116.4 |
| 1978 | 109.8 | 104.7 | 108.7 | 105.0 | 114.0 |
| 1979 | 108.4 | 98.7 | 99.9 | 109.8 | 110.0 |
| 1980 | 112.2 | 106.2 | 110.6 | 105.2 | 117.2 |
| 1981 | 118.5 | 115.5 | 120.6 | 101.9 | 124.2 |
| 1982 | 122.6 | 123.2 | 134.1 | 98.7 | 134.1 |
| 1983 | 124.9 | 123.3 | 136.7 | 100.4 | 139.0 |
| 1984 | 120.9 | 120.5 | 130.3 | 99.5 | 131.2 |
| 1985 | 125.4 | 130.7 | 142.1 | 94.8 | 136.9 |
| 1986 | 126.2 | 129.9 | 140.7 | 95.9 | 137.2 |
| 1987 | 131.2 | 133.1 | 138.5 | 97.4 | 137.1 |
| 1988 | 131.3 | 128.5 | 127.1 | 100.8 | 130.7 |
| 1989 | 128.8 | 126.8 | 129.6 | 100.2 | 132.5 |
| 1990 | 132.1 | 131.4 | 134.5 | 99.2 | 136.1 |
| 1991 | 128.6 | 132.2 | 135.8 | 96.0 | 133.1 |
| 1992 | 139.4 | 138.0 | 135.1 | 99.8 | 137.7 |
| 1993 | 135.5 | 131.4 | 129.8 | 101.8 | 135.0 |
| 1994 | 134.4 | 136.9 | 140.4 | 96.7 | 139.3 |
| 1995 | 138.0 | 142.8 | 143.4 | 95.1 | 140.0 |
| 1996 | 137.6 | 135.2 | 137.1 | 99.9 | 140.9 |
| 1997 | 137.5 | 142.3 | 143.2 | 94.6 | 139.7 |

Appendix table C-4-Gross-output productivity of the preserved fruits and vegetables industry

| Year | Output | Inputs |  |  | Productivity |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Combined | Nonlabor/labor | Multifactor |  |


|  | Calculated annual change rate (percent) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1976 | 7.26 | 0.37 | 2.97 | 6.89 | 9.86 |
| 1977 | 10.16 | 9.39 | 2.85 | 0.77 | 3.61 |
| 1978 | 2.49 | 1.07 | -1.80 | 1.42 | -0.39 |
| 1979 | -1.18 | -0.41 | -1.15 | -0.77 | -1.92 |
| 1980 | -2.53 | 3.22 | 6.81 | -5.74 | 1.06 |
| 1981 | 1.75 | 3.96 | 6.64 | -2.21 | 4.43 |
| 1982 | 6.89 | 4.62 | 11.40 | 2.28 | 13.68 |
| 1983 | 2.20 | -1.46 | 0.39 | 3.67 | 4.06 |
| 1984 | 6.03 | 6.02 | 3.09 | 0.01 | 3.10 |
| 1985 | 3.67 | 5.63 | 7.58 | -1.96 | 5.62 |
| 1986 | -0.18 | -5.02 | -3.24 | 4.85 | 1.60 |
| 1987 | -0.85 | -0.88 | 1.20 | 0.04 | 1.24 |
| 1988 | 1.80 | 0.16 | -0.36 | 1.64 | 1.28 |
| 1989 | 5.01 | 2.05 | -0.80 | 2.96 | 2.16 |
| 1990 | 2.81 | 4.22 | 1.11 | -1.41 | -0.30 |
| 1991 | 4.25 | 5.21 | 3.59 | -0.96 | 2.63 |
| 1992 | -1.42 | -3.16 | -2.26 | 1.74 | -0.52 |
| 1993 | 2.53 | -1.36 | -0.44 | 3.88 | 3.44 |
| 1994 | 3.01 | 5.88 | 5.57 | -2.87 | 2.70 |
| 1995 | 0.33 | 1.55 | -0.35 | -1.22 | -1.57 |
| 1996 | -3.37 | -5.41 | -3.14 | 2.05 | -1.10 |
| 1997 | 0.19 | 0.54 | 3.80 | -0.35 | 3.45 |
|  | Generated index number (1975=100) |  |  |  |  |
| 1975 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 1976 | 106.7 | 104.1 | 102.2 | 102.7 | 104.8 |
| 1977 | 103.4 | 104.3 | 103.0 | 99.2 | 102.2 |
| 1978 | 113.7 | 112.0 | 107.7 | 101.8 | 109.5 |
| 1979 | 114.5 | 108.4 | 103.4 | 105.8 | 109.4 |
| 1980 | 107.7 | 106.6 | 99.4 | 101.2 | 100.4 |
| 1981 | 109.2 | 111.6 | 106.2 | 97.9 | 104.0 |
| 1982 | 110.8 | 117.7 | 112.1 | 94.0 | 105.6 |
| 1983 | 106.9 | 112.5 | 108.5 | 94.9 | 103.3 |
| 1984 | 106.6 | 112.1 | 111.2 | 94.9 | 105.9 |
| 1985 | 106.3 | 116.8 | 115.4 | 90.6 | 105.1 |
| 1986 | 107.7 | 120.3 | 114.0 | 89.1 | 102.0 |
| 1987 | 116.7 | 131.0 | 113.6 | 88.6 | 101.1 |
| 1988 | 117.9 | 126.3 | 103.3 | 92.7 | 96.6 |
| 1989 | 117.0 | 124.2 | 98.5 | 93.6 | 93.1 |
| 1990 | 121.6 | 129.6 | 97.8 | 93.2 | 92.0 |
| 1991 | 119.6 | 136.2 | 100.4 | 86.9 | 88.2 |
| 1992 | 125.8 | 142.0 | 98.9 | 87.7 | 87.8 |
| 1993 | 130.8 | 143.5 | 96.0 | 90.3 | 87.8 |
| 1994 | 127.2 | 142.4 | 91.9 | 88.5 | 82.3 |
| 1995 | 129.5 | 143.3 | 93.6 | 89.5 | 84.7 |
| 1996 | 124.7 | 133.7 | 86.5 | 92.2 | 80.8 |
| 1997 | 134.7 | 147.3 | 90.9 | 90.2 | 83.1 |

Appendix table C-5-Gross-output productivity of the grain mill products industry


|  | Calculated annual change rate (percent) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1976 | 5.14 | 1.46 | 2.45 | 3.68 | 6.13 |
| 1977 | 0.86 | 2.09 | 4.95 | -1.24 | 3.72 |
| 1978 | -4.16 | -4.18 | -6.10 | 0.02 | -6.07 |
| 1979 | 0.93 | -1.43 | -2.31 | 2.36 | 0.05 |
| 1980 | 3.96 | 6.71 | 8.55 | -2.74 | 5.80 |
| 1981 | 5.70 | 8.60 | 11.33 | -2.90 | 8.43 |
| 1982 | -2.64 | -0.20 | 6.14 | -2.43 | 3.71 |
| 1983 | 3.87 | -0.56 | 0.49 | 4.43 | 4.93 |
| 1984 | 0.00 | 2.93 | 8.10 | -2.93 | 5.16 |
| 1985 | 0.75 | 1.14 | 5.05 | -0.38 | 4.66 |
| 1986 | -2.68 | -5.74 | -5.16 | 3.06 | -2.10 |
| 1987 | 6.29 | 4.55 | -2.96 | 1.74 | -1.22 |
| 1988 | 6.69 | 3.82 | 1.55 | 2.87 | 4.42 |
| 1989 | 4.49 | 2.67 | 2.48 | 1.82 | 4.29 |
| 1990 | 0.18 | 0.39 | 0.06 | -0.22 | -0.15 |
| 1991 | 1.09 | 3.30 | 3.50 | -2.21 | 1.29 |
| 1992 | 6.01 | 4.05 | -1.84 | 1.96 | 0.13 |
| 1993 | 2.99 | -2.78 | -3.21 | 5.77 | 2.56 |
| 1994 | 2.26 | 4.91 | 6.35 | -2.66 | 3.69 |
| 1995 | 4.75 | 3.21 | 0.97 | 1.54 | 2.51 |
| 1996 | -3.02 | 2.47 | 5.46 | -5.49 | -0.03 |
| 1997 | 3.37 | 9.03 | 9.91 | -5.65 | 4.26 |
|  | Generated index number (1975=100) |  |  |  |  |
| 1975 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 1976 | 105.1 | 101.5 | 102.5 | 103.7 | 106.1 |
| 1977 | 106.0 | 103.6 | 107.5 | 102.4 | 110.1 |
| 1978 | 101.6 | 99.3 | 101.0 | 102.4 | 103.4 |
| 1979 | 102.6 | 97.8 | 98.6 | 104.8 | 103.4 |
| 1980 | 106.6 | 104.4 | 107.1 | 102.0 | 109.4 |
| 1981 | 112.7 | 113.4 | 119.2 | 99.0 | 118.7 |
| 1982 | 109.7 | 113.1 | 126.5 | 96.6 | 123.1 |
| 1983 | 114.0 | 112.5 | 127.1 | 100.9 | 129.1 |
| 1984 | 114.0 | 115.8 | 137.4 | 97.9 | 135.8 |
| 1985 | 114.9 | 117.1 | 144.4 | 97.5 | 142.1 |
| 1986 | 111.8 | 110.4 | 136.9 | 100.5 | 139.1 |
| 1987 | 118.8 | 115.4 | 132.9 | 102.3 | 137.4 |
| 1988 | 126.8 | 119.8 | 134.9 | 105.2 | 143.5 |
| 1989 | 132.5 | 123.0 | 138.3 | 107.1 | 149.7 |
| 1990 | 132.7 | 123.5 | 138.3 | 106.9 | 149.4 |
| 1991 | 134.1 | 127.6 | 143.2 | 104.5 | 151.4 |
| 1992 | 142.2 | 132.8 | 140.6 | 106.6 | 151.6 |
| 1993 | 146.5 | 129.1 | 136.0 | 112.7 | 155.4 |
| 1994 | 149.8 | 135.4 | 144.7 | 109.7 | 161.2 |
| 1995 | 156.9 | 139.8 | 146.1 | 111.4 | 165.2 |
| 1996 | 152.1 | 143.2 | 154.1 | 105.3 | 165.2 |
| 1997 | 157.3 | 156.2 | 169.3 | 99.4 | 172.2 |

Appendix table C-6-Gross-output productivity of the bakery products industry

| Year | Output | Inputs |  | Productivity |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Combined <br> (2) | Nonlabor/labor <br> (3) | Multifactor $(4)=(1)-(2)$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Labor } \\ (5)=(3)+(4) \end{gathered}$ |


|  | Calculated annual change rate (percent) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1976 | 6.74 | -0.59 | -4.45 | 7.33 | 2.88 |
| 1977 | -4.41 | -6.12 | 2.71 | 1.71 | 4.42 |
| 1978 | -1.85 | -0.01 | -0.36 | -1.83 | -2.19 |
| 1979 | 0.67 | -0.49 | -5.26 | 1.16 | -4.11 |
| 1980 | 0.53 | 5.93 | 5.08 | -5.39 | -0.31 |
| 1981 | 4.05 | 4.25 | 6.79 | -0.20 | 6.60 |
| 1982 | 4.14 | 1.90 | 12.28 | 2.24 | 14.52 |
| 1983 | 0.31 | -5.10 | -1.60 | 5.40 | 3.81 |
| 1984 | 2.84 | 5.51 | 4.15 | -2.67 | 1.48 |
| 1985 | 9.02 | 3.98 | 5.99 | 5.04 | 11.03 |
| 1986 | 0.49 | -3.75 | -1.56 | 4.24 | 2.68 |
| 1987 | 8.44 | 5.50 | -3.93 | 2.94 | -0.99 |
| 1988 | -2.60 | 0.13 | -0.63 | -2.73 | -3.36 |
| 1989 | -0.98 | -0.17 | 1.40 | -0.81 | 0.59 |
| 1990 | 1.08 | 0.71 | 0.27 | 0.36 | 0.63 |
| 1991 | 1.37 | 2.19 | 0.63 | -0.82 | -0.19 |
| 1992 | 7.05 | 2.16 | -2.69 | 4.89 | 2.21 |
| 1993 | 3.24 | -1.13 | -2.63 | 4.37 | 1.74 |
| 1994 | 4.01 | 5.56 | 2.29 | -1.55 | 0.75 |
| 1995 | 1.24 | 2.25 | 1.28 | -1.01 | 0.27 |
| 1996 | -3.49 | -4.60 | -1.26 | 1.11 | -0.15 |
| 1997 | 4.62 | 6.72 | 9.37 | -2.10 | 7.27 |
|  | Generated index number (1975=100) |  |  |  |  |
| 1975 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 1976 | 106.7 | 99.4 | 95.6 | 107.3 | 102.9 |
| 1977 | 102.0 | 93.3 | 98.1 | 109.2 | 107.4 |
| 1978 | 100.1 | 93.3 | 97.8 | 107.2 | 105.1 |
| 1979 | 100.8 | 92.9 | 92.6 | 108.4 | 100.8 |
| 1980 | 101.3 | 98.4 | 97.4 | 102.6 | 100.4 |
| 1981 | 105.5 | 102.5 | 104.0 | 102.4 | 107.1 |
| 1982 | 109.8 | 104.5 | 116.7 | 104.6 | 122.6 |
| 1983 | 110.2 | 99.2 | 114.9 | 110.3 | 127.3 |
| 1984 | 113.3 | 104.6 | 119.6 | 107.4 | 129.2 |
| 1985 | 123.5 | 108.8 | 126.8 | 112.8 | 143.4 |
| 1986 | 124.1 | 104.7 | 124.8 | 117.5 | 147.3 |
| 1987 | 134.6 | 110.5 | 119.9 | 121.0 | 145.8 |
| 1988 | 131.1 | 110.6 | 119.2 | 117.7 | 140.9 |
| 1989 | 129.8 | 110.4 | 120.8 | 116.7 | 141.7 |
| 1990 | 131.2 | 111.2 | 121.2 | 117.2 | 142.6 |
| 1991 | 133.0 | 113.7 | 121.9 | 116.2 | 142.4 |
| 1992 | 142.4 | 116.1 | 118.6 | 121.9 | 145.5 |
| 1993 | 147.0 | 114.8 | 115.5 | 127.2 | 148.0 |
| 1994 | 152.9 | 121.2 | 118.2 | 125.3 | 149.1 |
| 1995 | 154.8 | 123.9 | 119.7 | 124.0 | 149.5 |
| 1996 | 149.4 | 118.2 | 118.2 | 125.4 | 149.3 |
| 1997 | 156.3 | 126.1 | 129.2 | 122.7 | 160.2 |

Appendix table C-7-Gross-output productivity of the sugar and confections industry

| Year | Output | Inputs |  | Productivity |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (1) | Combined <br> (2) | Nonlabor/labor <br> (3) | Multifactor $(4)=(1)-(2)$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Labor } \\ (5)=(3)+(4) \end{gathered}$ |


|  | Calculated annual change rate (percent) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1976 | -6.18 | -5.97 | -13.40 | -0.20 | -13.60 |
| 1977 | 0.04 | -2.46 | -2.40 | 2.50 | 0.10 |
| 1978 | -2.37 | -4.79 | -1.78 | 2.43 | 0.65 |
| 1979 | -1.35 | 0.19 | 2.09 | -1.54 | 0.54 |
| 1980 | 17.16 | 16.74 | 18.80 | 0.42 | 19.22 |
| 1981 | -1.43 | 3.59 | 2.30 | -5.02 | -2.72 |
| 1982 | -5.19 | -4.99 | -1.39 | -0.20 | -1.59 |
| 1983 | 2.66 | -2.43 | -1.42 | 5.09 | 3.66 |
| 1984 | 2.77 | 4.56 | 4.30 | -1.79 | 2.50 |
| 1985 | -0.48 | 0.26 | 5.07 | -0.74 | 4.33 |
| 1986 | 1.28 | -0.35 | 1.50 | 1.63 | 3.13 |
| 1987 | 5.59 | 1.05 | 0.41 | 4.54 | 4.95 |
| 1988 | -1.22 | -2.21 | -1.92 | 0.98 | -0.94 |
| 1989 | -1.89 | -2.68 | -3.54 | 0.79 | -2.75 |
| 1990 | 0.83 | 2.94 | 0.01 | -2.11 | -2.10 |
| 1991 | 4.14 | 3.49 | 5.09 | 0.64 | 5.73 |
| 1992 | 4.01 | 0.32 | 0.04 | 3.69 | 3.73 |
| 1993 | 1.55 | -1.90 | -3.83 | 3.45 | -0.38 |
| 1994 | -0.66 | 5.35 | 4.94 | -6.00 | -1.07 |
| 1995 | 2.36 | 0.77 | 0.84 | 1.58 | 2.42 |
| 1996 | 1.63 | -3.38 | -1.81 | 5.01 | 3.21 |
| 1997 | 3.85 | 7.70 | 8.03 | -3.84 | 4.19 |
|  | Generated index number (1975=100) |  |  |  |  |
| 1975 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 1976 | 93.8 | 94.0 | 86.6 | 99.8 | 86.4 |
| 1977 | 93.9 | 91.7 | 84.5 | 102.3 | 86.5 |
| 1978 | 91.6 | 87.3 | 83.0 | 104.8 | 87.1 |
| 1979 | 90.4 | 87.5 | 84.8 | 103.2 | 87.5 |
| 1980 | 105.9 | 102.1 | 100.7 | 103.6 | 104.3 |
| 1981 | 104.4 | 105.8 | 103.0 | 98.4 | 101.5 |
| 1982 | 99.0 | 100.5 | 101.6 | 98.2 | 99.9 |
| 1983 | 101.6 | 98.1 | 100.1 | 103.2 | 103.5 |
| 1984 | 104.4 | 102.6 | 104.4 | 101.3 | 106.1 |
| 1985 | 103.9 | 102.8 | 109.7 | 100.6 | 110.7 |
| 1986 | 105.3 | 102.5 | 111.4 | 102.2 | 114.2 |
| 1987 | 111.2 | 103.5 | 111.8 | 106.9 | 119.9 |
| 1988 | 109.8 | 101.3 | 109.7 | 107.9 | 118.7 |
| 1989 | 107.7 | 98.5 | 105.8 | 108.8 | 115.5 |
| 1990 | 108.6 | 101.4 | 105.8 | 106.5 | 113.0 |
| 1991 | 113.1 | 105.0 | 111.2 | 107.2 | 119.5 |
| 1992 | 117.6 | 105.3 | 111.2 | 111.1 | 124.0 |
| 1993 | 119.5 | 103.3 | 107.0 | 115.0 | 123.5 |
| 1994 | 118.7 | 108.8 | 112.2 | 108.1 | 122.2 |
| 1995 | 121.5 | 109.7 | 113.2 | 109.8 | 125.2 |
| 1996 | 123.5 | 106.0 | 111.1 | 115.3 | 129.2 |
| 1997 | 128.2 | 114.1 | 120.1 | 110.8 | 134.6 |

Appendix table C-8-Gross-output productivity of the fats and oils industry


|  | Calculated annual change rate (percent) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1976 | 5.05 | 2.99 | 1.55 | 2.06 | 3.60 |
| 1977 | 5.15 | 4.78 | 2.42 | 0.37 | 2.79 |
| 1978 | 3.97 | 2.87 | -3.17 | 1.10 | -2.07 |
| 1979 | 0.05 | -3.88 | -3.14 | 3.92 | 0.78 |
| 1980 | -5.65 | -1.34 | 3.34 | -4.31 | -0.97 |
| 1981 | -4.70 | -3.58 | 1.49 | -1.11 | 0.38 |
| 1982 | -7.82 | -0.51 | 5.35 | -7.32 | -1.96 |
| 1983 | 1.34 | 0.28 | 8.92 | 1.05 | 9.98 |
| 1984 | 7.74 | 7.77 | 11.22 | -0.03 | 11.18 |
| 1985 | -8.57 | -2.24 | 6.92 | -6.32 | 0.60 |
| 1986 | -13.12 | -11.86 | -3.18 | -1.26 | -4.44 |
| 1987 | -0.31 | 0.42 | 4.45 | -0.73 | 3.72 |
| 1988 | 22.35 | 14.55 | 10.29 | 7.79 | 18.08 |
| 1989 | -8.08 | -13.18 | -13.18 | 5.10 | -8.08 |
| 1990 | -5.73 | -1.58 | 3.42 | -4.15 | -0.73 |
| 1991 | -4.21 | 1.31 | 4.53 | -5.52 | -0.99 |
| 1992 | -0.06 | -0.08 | -5.95 | 0.03 | -5.93 |
| 1993 | 5.22 | 1.96 | 3.88 | 3.26 | 7.14 |
| 1994 | 2.10 | 3.68 | 4.65 | -1.58 | 3.07 |
| 1995 | 2.79 | 4.14 | 5.37 | -1.35 | 4.02 |
| 1996 | 3.07 | -2.62 | -1.88 | 5.69 | 3.81 |
| 1997 | 10.19 | 15.34 | 18.76 | -5.15 | 13.61 |
|  | Generated index number (1975=100) |  |  |  |  |
| 1975 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 1976 | 105.0 | 103.0 | 101.5 | 102.1 | 103.6 |
| 1977 | 110.5 | 107.9 | 104.0 | 102.4 | 106.5 |
| 1978 | 114.8 | 111.0 | 100.7 | 103.6 | 104.3 |
| 1979 | 114.9 | 106.7 | 97.5 | 107.6 | 105.1 |
| 1980 | 108.4 | 105.3 | 100.8 | 103.0 | 104.1 |
| 1981 | 103.3 | 101.5 | 102.3 | 101.8 | 104.5 |
| 1982 | 95.2 | 101.0 | 107.8 | 94.4 | 102.4 |
| 1983 | 96.5 | 101.3 | 117.4 | 95.4 | 112.6 |
| 1984 | 104.0 | 109.1 | 130.6 | 95.4 | 125.2 |
| 1985 | 95.1 | 106.7 | 139.6 | 89.3 | 126.0 |
| 1986 | 82.6 | 94.0 | 135.1 | 88.2 | 120.4 |
| 1987 | 82.3 | 94.4 | 141.2 | 87.6 | 124.9 |
| 1988 | 100.7 | 108.2 | 155.7 | 94.4 | 147.5 |
| 1989 | 92.6 | 93.9 | 135.2 | 99.2 | 135.5 |
| 1990 | 87.3 | 92.4 | 139.8 | 95.1 | 134.5 |
| 1991 | 83.6 | 93.7 | 146.1 | 89.8 | 133.2 |
| 1992 | 83.6 | 93.6 | 137.4 | 89.8 | 125.3 |
| 1993 | 87.9 | 95.4 | 142.8 | 92.8 | 134.3 |
| 1994 | 89.8 | 98.9 | 149.4 | 91.3 | 138.4 |
| 1995 | 92.3 | 103.0 | 157.4 | 90.1 | 144.0 |
| 1996 | 95.1 | 100.3 | 154.5 | 95.2 | 149.4 |
| 1997 | 104.8 | 115.7 | 183.5 | 90.3 | 169.8 |

Appendix table C-9-Gross-output productivity of the beverages industry

| Year | Output | Inputs |  | Productivity |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (1) | Combined <br> (2) | Nonlabor/labor <br> (3) | Multifactor <br> (4)=(1)-(2) | Labor $(5)=(3)+(4)$ |


|  | Calculated annual change rate (percent) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1976 | 4.96 | -0.07 | 1.56 | 5.04 | 6.60 |
| 1977 | 5.93 | 4.61 | 4.51 | 1.32 | 5.83 |
| 1978 | 5.80 | 4.34 | 1.72 | 1.47 | 3.19 |
| 1979 | -0.84 | 0.36 | -0.51 | -1.20 | -1.71 |
| 1980 | 3.97 | 8.74 | 11.43 | -4.77 | 6.66 |
| 1981 | 5.98 | 7.84 | 11.32 | -1.86 | 9.46 |
| 1982 | 6.49 | 6.92 | 9.68 | -0.43 | 9.24 |
| 1983 | 1.26 | -3.32 | -1.13 | 4.58 | 3.45 |
| 1984 | -1.09 | 1.88 | 5.45 | -2.97 | 2.48 |
| 1985 | 7.11 | 7.14 | 8.20 | -0.03 | 8.18 |
| 1986 | 3.09 | -1.48 | 3.74 | 4.57 | 8.31 |
| 1987 | 0.75 | -2.55 | 5.96 | 3.30 | 9.26 |
| 1988 | 1.47 | -3.03 | -1.13 | 4.50 | 3.36 |
| 1989 | -3.81 | -5.80 | -3.06 | 2.00 | -1.06 |
| 1990 | 0.44 | 0.55 | 1.50 | -0.11 | 1.40 |
| 1991 | 4.69 | 2.46 | 3.01 | 2.23 | 5.24 |
| 1992 | 5.99 | 0.55 | -1.43 | 5.44 | 4.02 |
| 1993 | -0.87 | -5.39 | -8.84 | 4.53 | -4.32 |
| 1994 | 3.26 | 4.60 | 8.19 | -1.35 | 6.85 |
| 1995 | 4.81 | 2.89 | 2.35 | 1.92 | 4.27 |
| 1996 | 0.30 | -3.85 | -1.95 | 4.15 | 2.20 |
| 1997 | 1.35 | 9.02 | -1.56 | -7.67 | -9.23 |
| Generated index number (1975=100) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1975 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 1976 | 105.0 | 99.9 | 101.6 | 105.0 | 106.6 |
| 1977 | 111.2 | 104.5 | 106.1 | 106.4 | 112.8 |
| 1978 | 117.6 | 109.1 | 108.0 | 108.0 | 116.4 |
| 1979 | 116.7 | 109.5 | 107.4 | 106.7 | 114.4 |
| 1980 | 121.3 | 119.0 | 119.7 | 101.6 | 122.0 |
| 1981 | 128.5 | 128.4 | 133.2 | 99.7 | 133.6 |
| 1982 | 136.9 | 137.2 | 146.1 | 99.3 | 145.9 |
| 1983 | 138.6 | 132.7 | 144.5 | 103.8 | 151.0 |
| 1984 | 137.1 | 135.2 | 152.4 | 100.7 | 154.7 |
| 1985 | 146.8 | 144.8 | 164.9 | 100.7 | 167.4 |
| 1986 | 151.4 | 142.7 | 171.0 | 105.3 | 181.3 |
| 1987 | 152.5 | 139.0 | 181.2 | 108.8 | 198.0 |
| 1988 | 154.7 | 134.8 | 179.2 | 113.7 | 204.7 |
| 1989 | 148.9 | 127.0 | 173.7 | 116.0 | 202.5 |
| 1990 | 149.5 | 127.7 | 176.3 | 115.8 | 205.4 |
| 1991 | 156.5 | 130.9 | 181.6 | 118.4 | 216.1 |
| 1992 | 165.9 | 131.6 | 179.0 | 124.8 | 224.8 |
| 1993 | 164.5 | 124.5 | 163.2 | 130.5 | 215.1 |
| 1994 | 169.8 | 130.2 | 176.6 | 128.7 | 229.8 |
| 1995 | 178.0 | 134.0 | 180.7 | 131.2 | 239.6 |
| 1996 | 178.5 | 128.8 | 177.2 | 136.7 | 244.9 |
| 1997 | 180.9 | 140.4 | 174.4 | 126.2 | 222.3 |

Appendix table C-10-Gross-output productivity of the miscellaneous foods industry


|  | Calculated annual change rate (percent) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1976 | 25.00 | 16.14 | 8.44 | 8.86 | 17.30 |
| 1977 | 10.08 | 10.62 | -1.03 | -0.54 | -1.57 |
| 1978 | 1.45 | -2.95 | -8.05 | 4.41 | -3.65 |
| 1979 | -6.07 | -2.41 | -0.93 | -3.66 | -4.59 |
| 1980 | -0.14 | 4.33 | 6.17 | -4.47 | 1.70 |
| 1981 | 2.51 | 2.41 | 1.42 | 0.10 | 1.52 |
| 1982 | 5.60 | 5.85 | 5.10 | -0.25 | 4.85 |
| 1983 | -2.75 | -3.06 | 0.27 | 0.31 | 0.58 |
| 1984 | 1.80 | 1.92 | 2.50 | -0.12 | 2.38 |
| 1985 | 2.59 | 4.88 | 7.89 | -2.28 | 5.61 |
| 1986 | 6.14 | 2.10 | 4.28 | 4.04 | 8.32 |
| 1987 | 4.18 | 1.00 | -7.73 | 3.18 | -4.55 |
| 1988 | -1.64 | -3.93 | -2.32 | 2.30 | -0.03 |
| 1989 | -4.69 | -0.27 | -1.55 | -4.41 | -5.97 |
| 1990 | 4.12 | 1.77 | -4.75 | 2.35 | -2.40 |
| 1991 | 0.72 | 4.17 | 5.95 | -3.44 | 2.50 |
| 1992 | 5.85 | 1.96 | -5.49 | 3.89 | -1.60 |
| 1993 | 3.48 | -3.52 | -1.71 | 7.00 | 5.29 |
| 1994 | 0.88 | 5.27 | 4.89 | -4.39 | 0.50 |
| 1995 | 3.65 | 2.74 | 0.07 | 0.91 | 0.98 |
| 1996 | -2.19 | -5.03 | -8.74 | 2.84 | -5.91 |
| 1997 | 0.42 | 11.15 | 11.94 | -10.72 | 1.21 |
|  | Generated index number (1975=100) |  |  |  |  |
| 1975 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 1976 | 125.0 | 116.1 | 108.4 | 108.9 | 117.3 |
| 1977 | 137.6 | 128.5 | 107.3 | 108.3 | 115.5 |
| 1978 | 139.6 | 124.7 | 98.7 | 113.0 | 111.2 |
| 1979 | 131.1 | 121.7 | 97.8 | 108.9 | 106.1 |
| 1980 | 130.9 | 126.9 | 103.8 | 104.0 | 107.9 |
| 1981 | 134.2 | 130.0 | 105.3 | 104.1 | 109.6 |
| 1982 | 141.7 | 137.6 | 110.6 | 103.9 | 114.9 |
| 1983 | 137.8 | 133.4 | 110.9 | 104.2 | 115.6 |
| 1984 | 140.3 | 135.9 | 113.7 | 104.1 | 118.3 |
| 1985 | 144.0 | 142.6 | 122.7 | 101.7 | 124.9 |
| 1986 | 152.8 | 145.6 | 127.9 | 105.8 | 135.3 |
| 1987 | 159.2 | 147.0 | 118.0 | 109.2 | 129.2 |
| 1988 | 156.6 | 141.2 | 115.3 | 111.7 | 129.2 |
| 1989 | 149.2 | 140.9 | 113.5 | 106.8 | 121.4 |
| 1990 | 155.4 | 143.3 | 108.1 | 109.3 | 118.5 |
| 1991 | 156.5 | 149.3 | 114.5 | 105.5 | 121.5 |
| 1992 | 165.7 | 152.2 | 108.3 | 109.6 | 119.6 |
| 1993 | 171.4 | 146.9 | 106.4 | 117.3 | 125.9 |
| 1994 | 172.9 | 154.6 | 111.6 | 112.1 | 126.5 |
| 1995 | 179.3 | 158.9 | 111.7 | 113.2 | 127.8 |
| 1996 | 175.3 | 150.9 | 101.9 | 116.4 | 120.2 |
| 1997 | 176.1 | 167.7 | 114.1 | 103.9 | 121.7 |

Appendix table C-11-Net-output productivity of the food manufacturing sector


|  | Calculated annual change rate (percent) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1976 | 12.82 | -1.39 | -2.92 | 14.21 | 11.30 |
| 1977 | 1.40 | -2.10 | -2.54 | 3.50 | 0.96 |
| 1978 | 2.83 | 4.28 | 2.15 | -1.45 | 0.70 |
| 1979 | -0.08 | 3.80 | 2.87 | -3.87 | -1.00 |
| 1980 | 1.67 | 8.94 | 10.02 | -7.27 | 2.75 |
| 1981 | 1.56 | 5.77 | 7.63 | -4.21 | 3.42 |
| 1982 | 10.08 | 2.60 | 6.53 | 7.48 | 14.01 |
| 1983 | 3.09 | -6.18 | -4.05 | 9.27 | 5.22 |
| 1984 | 1.08 | 4.12 | 4.82 | -3.05 | 1.77 |
| 1985 | 8.03 | -1.78 | 0.04 | 9.82 | 9.85 |
| 1986 | 5.43 | -8.09 | -7.62 | 13.52 | 5.89 |
| 1987 | 6.32 | 2.29 | -2.12 | 4.03 | 1.92 |
| 1988 | 1.72 | 1.91 | -0.19 | -0.19 | -0.37 |
| 1989 | -2.88 | -2.73 | -3.58 | -0.14 | -3.72 |
| 1990 | 3.93 | 1.28 | -1.56 | 2.65 | 1.10 |
| 1991 | 2.71 | -1.69 | -2.43 | 4.40 | 1.96 |
| 1992 | 8.61 | -0.85 | -4.94 | 9.46 | 4.52 |
| 1993 | 2.69 | -4.46 | -5.86 | 7.16 | 1.30 |
| 1994 | 2.70 | 5.31 | 4.32 | -2.61 | 1.71 |
| 1995 | 3.73 | -0.16 | -0.79 | 3.89 | 3.10 |
| 1996 | -6.16 | 2.25 | 2.82 | -8.41 | -5.59 |
| 1997 | 7.41 | 5.64 | 4.15 | 1.77 | 5.92 |
|  | Generated index number (1975=100) |  |  |  |  |
| 1975 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 1976 | 112.8 | 98.6 | 97.1 | 114.2 | 111.3 |
| 1977 | 114.4 | 96.5 | 94.6 | 118.2 | 112.4 |
| 1978 | 117.6 | 100.7 | 96.6 | 116.5 | 113.1 |
| 1979 | 117.5 | 104.5 | 99.4 | 112.0 | 112.0 |
| 1980 | 119.5 | 113.8 | 109.4 | 103.8 | 115.1 |
| 1981 | 121.4 | 120.4 | 117.7 | 99.5 | 119.0 |
| 1982 | 133.6 | 123.5 | 125.4 | 106.9 | 135.7 |
| 1983 | 137.7 | 115.9 | 120.3 | 116.8 | 142.8 |
| 1984 | 139.2 | 120.7 | 126.1 | 113.3 | 145.3 |
| 1985 | 150.4 | 118.5 | 126.2 | 124.4 | 159.6 |
| 1986 | 158.6 | 108.9 | 116.6 | 141.2 | 169.0 |
| 1987 | 168.6 | 111.4 | 114.1 | 146.9 | 172.3 |
| 1988 | 171.5 | 113.5 | 113.9 | 146.6 | 171.6 |
| 1989 | 166.6 | 110.4 | 109.8 | 146.4 | 165.3 |
| 1990 | 173.1 | 111.9 | 108.1 | 150.3 | 167.1 |
| 1991 | 177.8 | 110.0 | 105.5 | 156.9 | 170.3 |
| 1992 | 193.1 | 109.0 | 100.3 | 171.7 | 178.0 |
| 1993 | 198.3 | 104.2 | 94.4 | 184.0 | 180.4 |
| 1994 | 203.7 | 109.7 | 98.5 | 179.2 | 183.5 |
| 1995 | 211.3 | 109.5 | 97.7 | 186.2 | 189.1 |
| 1996 | 198.3 | 112.0 | 100.4 | 170.6 | 178.6 |
| 1997 | 212.9 | 118.3 | 104.6 | 173.6 | 189.1 |

Appendix table C-12-Net-output productivity of the meat products industry

| Year | Output | Inputs |  | Productivity |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (1) | Combined <br> (2) | Nonlabor/labor (3) | Multifactor $(4)=(1)-(2)$ | Labor $(5)=(3)+(4)$ |
| Calculated annual change rate (percent) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1976 | 6.65 | -0.86 | -2.79 | 7.51 | 4.73 |
| 1977 | -4.93 | -2.24 | -1.60 | -2.69 | -4.29 |
| 1978 | 3.52 | 4.58 | 1.76 | -1.06 | 0.70 |
| 1979 | 1.23 | -0.27 | -1.01 | 1.51 | 0.50 |
| 1980 | -2.17 | 7.84 | 5.49 | -10.01 | -4.52 |
| 1981 | -2.34 | 1.10 | 3.31 | -3.44 | -0.13 |
| 1982 | 8.24 | 5.26 | 5.37 | 2.99 | 8.36 |
| 1983 | -1.75 | -6.90 | -5.66 | 5.15 | -0.50 |
| 1984 | 3.93 | -0.82 | 2.00 | 4.75 | 6.74 |
| 1985 | 12.20 | -0.74 | -1.12 | 12.93 | 11.82 |
| 1986 | 1.54 | -4.22 | -8.53 | 5.76 | -2.77 |
| 1987 | 0.93 | 5.15 | -4.06 | -4.22 | -8.28 |
| 1988 | 4.83 | 3.50 | -1.98 | 1.33 | -0.66 |
| 1989 | 2.50 | -0.20 | -3.12 | 2.70 | -0.42 |
| 1990 | 8.90 | 4.23 | -0.88 | 4.66 | 3.78 |
| 1991 | -5.16 | 1.23 | -1.19 | -6.39 | -7.58 |
| 1992 | 9.64 | 1.14 | -4.60 | 8.50 | 3.90 |
| 1993 | 6.14 | -1.89 | -5.85 | 8.02 | 2.17 |
| 1994 | 7.18 | 5.62 | 2.12 | 1.56 | 3.68 |
| 1995 | 11.86 | 0.23 | 1.37 | 11.63 | 13.00 |
| 1996 | -13.10 | 3.95 | 3.09 | -17.04 | -13.95 |
| 1997 | 25.00 | 7.10 | 1.95 | 17.89 | 19.84 |
| Generated index number (1975=100) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1975 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 1976 | 106.7 | 99.1 | 97.2 | 107.5 | 104.7 |
| 1977 | 101.4 | 96.9 | 95.7 | 104.6 | 100.2 |
| 1978 | 105.0 | 101.4 | 97.3 | 103.5 | 100.9 |
| 1979 | 106.3 | 101.1 | 96.4 | 105.1 | 101.4 |
| 1980 | 104.0 | 109.0 | 101.6 | 94.6 | 96.9 |
| 1981 | 101.5 | 110.2 | 105.0 | 91.3 | 96.7 |
| 1982 | 109.9 | 116.0 | 110.7 | 94.0 | 104.8 |
| 1983 | 108.0 | 108.0 | 104.4 | 98.9 | 104.3 |
| 1984 | 112.2 | 107.1 | 106.5 | 103.6 | 111.3 |
| 1985 | 125.9 | 106.3 | 105.3 | 117.0 | 124.5 |
| 1986 | 127.8 | 101.8 | 96.3 | 123.7 | 121.0 |
| 1987 | 129.0 | 107.1 | 92.4 | 118.5 | 111.0 |
| 1988 | 135.2 | 110.8 | 90.6 | 120.0 | 110.3 |
| 1989 | 138.6 | 110.6 | 87.7 | 123.3 | 109.8 |
| 1990 | 151.0 | 115.3 | 87.0 | 129.0 | 114.0 |
| 1991 | 143.2 | 116.7 | 85.9 | 120.8 | 105.3 |
| 1992 | 157.0 | 118.0 | 82.0 | 131.1 | 109.4 |
| 1993 | 166.6 | 115.8 | 77.2 | 141.6 | 111.8 |
| 1994 | 178.6 | 122.3 | 78.8 | 143.8 | 115.9 |
| 1995 | 199.7 | 122.6 | 79.9 | 160.5 | 131.0 |
| 1996 | 173.6 | 127.4 | 82.4 | 133.2 | 112.7 |
| 1997 | 217.0 | 136.5 | 84.0 | 157.0 | 135.1 |

Appendix table C-13-Net-output productivity of the dairy products industry

| Year | Output | Inputs |  | Productivity |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (1) | Combined <br> (2) | Nonlabor/labor <br> (3) | Multifactor $(4)=(1)-(2)$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Labor } \\ (5)=(3)+(4) \end{gathered}$ |


|  | Calculated annual change rate (percent) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1976 | 9.17 | -4.94 | -4.50 | 14.10 | 9.60 |
| 1977 | 2.61 | -3.39 | 0.63 | 6.01 | 6.63 |
| 1978 | -3.26 | -1.93 | -2.50 | -1.33 | -3.83 |
| 1979 | 5.65 | 0.20 | -2.09 | 5.45 | 3.35 |
| 1980 | 1.02 | 6.93 | 10.02 | -5.91 | 4.11 |
| 1981 | 0.78 | 7.21 | 7.55 | -6.43 | 1.12 |
| 1982 | 3.56 | 0.36 | 4.87 | 3.20 | 8.08 |
| 1983 | 7.88 | -2.72 | -0.91 | 10.60 | 9.70 |
| 1984 | -0.01 | 1.93 | -0.49 | -1.93 | -2.42 |
| 1985 | 4.31 | -1.32 | -0.73 | 5.64 | 4.91 |
| 1986 | 11.55 | -7.17 | -7.53 | 18.72 | 11.19 |
| 1987 | 7.39 | 2.65 | -1.44 | 4.74 | 3.30 |
| 1988 | 0.74 | 2.65 | -2.11 | -1.91 | -4.02 |
| 1989 | -5.34 | -2.16 | 1.17 | -3.18 | -2.00 |
| 1990 | 1.77 | 1.71 | 1.82 | 0.06 | 1.88 |
| 1991 | 4.25 | -2.19 | -1.74 | 6.44 | 4.70 |
| 1992 | 16.10 | -0.97 | -5.90 | 17.07 | 11.16 |
| 1993 | -3.23 | -4.62 | -3.81 | 1.39 | -2.41 |
| 1994 | -4.25 | 4.58 | 8.59 | -8.83 | -0.24 |
| 1995 | -0.38 | 0.72 | -1.41 | -1.10 | -2.52 |
| 1996 | -4.39 | 1.94 | 2.84 | -6.33 | -3.50 |
| 1997 | 9.89 | 8.72 | 7.95 | 1.17 | 9.12 |
|  | Generated index number (1975=100) |  |  |  |  |
| 1975 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 1976 | 109.2 | 95.1 | 95.5 | 114.1 | 109.6 |
| 1977 | 112.0 | 91.8 | 96.1 | 121.0 | 116.9 |
| 1978 | 108.4 | 90.1 | 93.7 | 119.4 | 112.4 |
| 1979 | 114.5 | 90.2 | 91.7 | 125.9 | 116.2 |
| 1980 | 115.7 | 96.5 | 100.9 | 118.4 | 120.9 |
| 1981 | 116.5 | 103.4 | 108.5 | 110.8 | 122.3 |
| 1982 | 120.7 | 103.8 | 113.8 | 114.3 | 132.2 |
| 1983 | 130.2 | 101.0 | 112.8 | 126.5 | 145.0 |
| 1984 | 130.2 | 102.9 | 112.3 | 124.0 | 141.5 |
| 1985 | 135.8 | 101.6 | 111.4 | 131.0 | 148.4 |
| 1986 | 151.5 | 94.3 | 103.0 | 155.5 | 165.0 |
| 1987 | 162.7 | 96.8 | 101.6 | 162.9 | 170.5 |
| 1988 | 163.9 | 99.4 | 99.4 | 159.8 | 163.6 |
| 1989 | 155.2 | 97.2 | 100.6 | 154.7 | 160.3 |
| 1990 | 157.9 | 98.9 | 102.4 | 154.8 | 163.4 |
| 1991 | 164.6 | 96.7 | 100.6 | 164.8 | 171.0 |
| 1992 | 191.1 | 95.8 | 94.7 | 192.9 | 190.1 |
| 1993 | 184.9 | 91.3 | 91.1 | 195.6 | 185.5 |
| 1994 | 177.1 | 95.5 | 98.9 | 178.3 | 185.1 |
| 1995 | 176.4 | 96.2 | 97.5 | 176.4 | 180.4 |
| 1996 | 168.7 | 98.1 | 100.3 | 165.2 | 174.1 |
| 1997 | 185.4 | 106.6 | 108.3 | 167.1 | 190.0 |

Appendix table C-14-Net-output productivity of the preserved fruits and vegetables industry


|  | Calculated annual change rate (percent) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1976 | 15.86 | -3.52 | -0.92 | 19.38 | 18.45 |
| 1977 | 11.11 | 1.44 | -5.11 | 9.67 | 4.57 |
| 1978 | 0.67 | 3.30 | 0.43 | -2.63 | -2.21 |
| 1979 | -3.51 | 6.61 | 5.87 | -10.13 | -4.26 |
| 1980 | -3.12 | 8.65 | 12.24 | -11.77 | 0.48 |
| 1981 | 2.28 | 5.14 | 7.83 | -2.86 | 4.97 |
| 1982 | 17.00 | 1.89 | 8.68 | 15.11 | 23.79 |
| 1983 | 3.68 | -5.42 | -3.57 | 9.10 | 5.53 |
| 1984 | 5.35 | 4.41 | 1.48 | 0.94 | 2.42 |
| 1985 | 6.47 | -0.41 | 1.54 | 6.87 | 8.42 |
| 1986 | 7.33 | -7.50 | -5.72 | 14.83 | 9.11 |
| 1987 | 0.07 | 1.58 | 3.66 | -1.51 | 2.15 |
| 1988 | 2.97 | 2.44 | 1.92 | 0.53 | 2.45 |
| 1989 | 4.56 | -1.39 | -4.24 | 5.95 | 1.71 |
| 1990 | 0.49 | 3.12 | 0.01 | -2.63 | -2.62 |
| 1991 | 6.82 | 0.20 | -1.42 | 6.62 | 5.21 |
| 1992 | 2.98 | -0.42 | 0.49 | 3.40 | 3.88 |
| 1993 | 2.48 | -4.53 | -3.62 | 7.01 | 3.39 |
| 1994 | 1.91 | 5.23 | 4.91 | -3.31 | 1.60 |
| 1995 | -2.15 | -0.66 | -2.56 | -1.49 | -4.04 |
| 1996 | -3.40 | 0.90 | 3.17 | -4.30 | -1.13 |
| 1997 | 5.44 | -3.19 | 0.07 | 8.63 | 8.70 |
|  | Generated index number (1975=100) |  |  |  |  |
| 1975 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 1976 | 115.9 | 96.5 | 99.1 | 119.4 | 118.5 |
| 1977 | 128.7 | 97.9 | 94.0 | 130.9 | 123.9 |
| 1978 | 129.6 | 101.1 | 94.4 | 127.5 | 121.1 |
| 1979 | 125.0 | 107.8 | 100.0 | 114.6 | 116.0 |
| 1980 | 121.1 | 117.1 | 112.2 | 101.1 | 116.5 |
| 1981 | 123.9 | 123.1 | 121.0 | 98.2 | 122.3 |
| 1982 | 145.0 | 125.5 | 131.5 | 113.0 | 151.4 |
| 1983 | 150.3 | 118.7 | 126.8 | 123.3 | 159.8 |
| 1984 | 158.3 | 123.9 | 128.7 | 124.5 | 163.7 |
| 1985 | 168.6 | 123.4 | 130.7 | 133.0 | 177.4 |
| 1986 | 180.9 | 114.1 | 123.2 | 152.8 | 193.6 |
| 1987 | 181.1 | 115.9 | 127.7 | 150.5 | 197.8 |
| 1988 | 186.4 | 118.8 | 130.1 | 151.3 | 202.6 |
| 1989 | 194.9 | 117.1 | 124.6 | 160.3 | 206.1 |
| 1990 | 195.9 | 120.8 | 124.6 | 156.0 | 200.7 |
| 1991 | 209.3 | 121.0 | 122.9 | 166.4 | 211.1 |
| 1992 | 215.5 | 120.5 | 123.5 | 172.0 | 219.3 |
| 1993 | 220.8 | 115.0 | 119.0 | 184.1 | 226.8 |
| 1994 | 225.1 | 121.0 | 124.8 | 178.0 | 230.4 |
| 1995 | 220.2 | 120.3 | 121.7 | 175.3 | 221.1 |
| 1996 | 212.7 | 121.3 | 125.5 | 167.8 | 218.6 |
| 1997 | 224.3 | 117.5 | 125.6 | 182.3 | 237.6 |

Appendix table C-15-Net-output productivity of the grain mill products industry


|  | Calculated annual change rate (percent) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1976 | 11.74 | -1.33 | -0.33 | 13.07 | 12.73 |
| 1977 | 3.69 | 0.63 | 3.49 | 3.06 | 6.55 |
| 1978 | -2.92 | 6.19 | 4.27 | -9.11 | -4.84 |
| 1979 | 4.60 | 1.35 | 0.47 | 3.25 | 3.72 |
| 1980 | 5.06 | 11.20 | 13.04 | -6.14 | 6.90 |
| 1981 | 2.82 | 8.99 | 11.72 | -6.17 | 5.55 |
| 1982 | 4.94 | 1.79 | 8.13 | 3.15 | 11.29 |
| 1983 | 7.62 | -9.16 | -8.11 | 16.78 | 8.67 |
| 1984 | 0.36 | 9.49 | 14.66 | -9.14 | 5.52 |
| 1985 | 10.91 | -1.42 | 2.49 | 12.33 | 14.83 |
| 1986 | 4.34 | -10.56 | -9.97 | 14.90 | 4.92 |
| 1987 | 10.98 | 4.33 | -3.19 | 6.65 | 3.46 |
| 1988 | 3.13 | 4.02 | 1.74 | -0.88 | 0.86 |
| 1989 | 0.91 | -0.64 | -0.83 | 1.55 | 0.71 |
| 1990 | 4.79 | 2.10 | 1.77 | 2.69 | 4.46 |
| 1991 | 3.06 | -1.86 | -1.66 | 4.92 | 3.26 |
| 1992 | 7.58 | -0.07 | -5.96 | 7.65 | 1.69 |
| 1993 | 5.41 | -4.55 | -4.98 | 9.96 | 4.98 |
| 1994 | 2.37 | 6.48 | 7.91 | -4.11 | 3.80 |
| 1995 | 8.59 | 0.90 | -1.33 | 7.69 | 6.36 |
| 1996 | -25.64 | 3.22 | 6.21 | -28.87 | -22.65 |
| 1997 | 8.83 | 8.28 | 9.16 | 0.55 | 9.72 |
| Generated index number (1975=100) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1975 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 1976 | 111.7 | 98.7 | 99.7 | 113.1 | 112.7 |
| 1977 | 115.9 | 99.3 | 103.1 | 116.5 | 120.1 |
| 1978 | 112.5 | 105.4 | 107.6 | 105.9 | 114.3 |
| 1979 | 117.7 | 106.9 | 108.1 | 109.3 | 118.6 |
| 1980 | 123.6 | 118.8 | 122.2 | 102.6 | 126.7 |
| 1981 | 127.1 | 129.5 | 136.5 | 96.3 | 133.8 |
| 1982 | 133.4 | 131.8 | 147.6 | 99.3 | 148.9 |
| 1983 | 143.5 | 119.8 | 135.6 | 116.0 | 161.8 |
| 1984 | 144.1 | 131.1 | 155.5 | 105.4 | 170.7 |
| 1985 | 159.8 | 129.3 | 159.4 | 118.4 | 196.0 |
| 1986 | 166.7 | 115.6 | 143.5 | 136.1 | 205.7 |
| 1987 | 185.0 | 120.6 | 138.9 | 145.1 | 212.8 |
| 1988 | 190.8 | 125.5 | 141.3 | 143.8 | 214.6 |
| 1989 | 192.5 | 124.7 | 140.1 | 146.0 | 216.2 |
| 1990 | 201.8 | 127.3 | 142.6 | 150.0 | 225.8 |
| 1991 | 207.9 | 124.9 | 140.2 | 157.3 | 233.1 |
| 1992 | 223.7 | 124.8 | 131.9 | 169.4 | 237.1 |
| 1993 | 235.8 | 119.2 | 125.3 | 186.3 | 248.9 |
| 1994 | 241.4 | 126.9 | 135.2 | 178.6 | 258.4 |
| 1995 | 262.1 | 128.0 | 133.4 | 192.3 | 274.8 |
| 1996 | 194.9 | 132.1 | 141.7 | 136.8 | 212.5 |
| 1997 | 212.1 | 143.1 | 154.7 | 137.6 | 233.2 |

Appendix table C-16-Net-output productivity of the bakery products industry


|  | $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)=(1)-(2)$ | $(5)=(3)+(4)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Calculated annual change rate $($ percent $)$ |  |  |  |  |
| 1976 | 13.17 | -0.89 | -4.75 | 14.06 | 9.31 |
| 1977 | -2.30 | -7.30 | 1.54 | 4.99 | 6.53 |
| 1978 | -1.64 | 3.45 | 3.10 | -5.10 | -1.99 |
| 1979 | 0.52 | 1.79 | -2.98 | -1.27 | -4.25 |
| 1980 | -0.18 | 7.43 | 6.59 | -7.61 | -1.02 |
| 1981 | 4.59 | 3.13 | 5.67 | 1.46 | 7.13 |
| 1982 | 7.68 | 0.74 | 11.12 | 6.95 | 18.07 |
| 1983 | 1.67 | -8.26 | -4.76 | 9.93 | 5.17 |
| 1984 | 3.20 | 7.11 | 5.74 | -3.91 | 1.84 |
| 1985 | 11.49 | -1.34 | 0.67 | 12.83 | 13.50 |
| 1986 | 2.55 | -6.81 | -4.63 | 9.36 | 4.73 |
| 1987 | 10.06 | 4.70 | -4.73 | 5.36 | 0.63 |
| 1988 | -4.59 | 2.84 | 2.08 | -7.43 | -5.35 |
| 1989 | -4.96 | -2.85 | -1.29 | -2.11 | -3.40 |
| 1990 | 1.55 | 0.13 | -0.31 | 1.42 | 1.10 |
| 1991 | 2.64 | -0.20 | -1.76 | 2.84 | 1.07 |
| 1992 | 8.82 | 0.10 | -4.74 | 8.72 | 3.98 |
| 1993 | 2.78 | -3.41 | -4.91 | 6.19 | 1.28 |
| 1994 | 4.98 | 5.92 | 2.66 | -0.94 | 1.72 |
| 1995 | 0.08 | 0.51 | -0.46 | -0.42 | -0.89 |
| 1996 | -2.63 | 1.63 | 4.98 | -4.26 | 0.71 |
| 1997 | 6.17 | 4.32 | 6.97 | 1.85 | 8.82 |


|  | Generated index number $1975=100.0$ |  |  |  | 100.0 |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1975 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 109.3 |
| 1976 | 113.2 | 99.1 | 95.2 | 114.1 | 116.4 |
| 1977 | 110.6 | 91.9 | 96.7 | 119.8 | 114.1 |
| 1978 | 108.7 | 95.0 | 99.7 | 113.7 | 109.3 |
| 1979 | 109.3 | 96.8 | 96.7 | 112.2 | 108.2 |
| 1980 | 109.1 | 103.9 | 103.1 | 103.7 | 115.9 |
| 1981 | 114.1 | 107.2 | 109.0 | 105.2 | 136.8 |
| 1982 | 122.9 | 108.0 | 121.1 | 112.5 | 143.9 |
| 1983 | 124.9 | 99.1 | 115.3 | 123.7 | 146.5 |
| 1984 | 128.9 | 106.1 | 121.9 | 118.8 | 166.3 |
| 1985 | 143.8 | 104.7 | 122.8 | 134.1 | 174.2 |
| 1986 | 147.4 | 97.5 | 117.1 | 146.6 | 175.3 |
| 1987 | 162.2 | 102.1 | 111.5 | 154.5 | 165.9 |
| 1988 | 154.8 | 105.0 | 113.9 | 143.0 | 160.3 |
| 1989 | 147.1 | 102.0 | 112.4 | 140.0 | 162.0 |
| 1990 | 149.4 | 102.2 | 112.0 | 142.0 | 163.8 |
| 1991 | 153.3 | 102.0 | 110.1 | 146.0 | 170.3 |
| 1992 | 166.9 | 102.1 | 104.8 | 158.7 | 172.5 |
| 1993 | 171.5 | 98.6 | 99.7 | 168.6 | 175.4 |
| 1994 | 180.0 | 180.4 | 102.3 | 167.0 | 173.9 |
| 1995 | 175.4 | 186.3 | 104.9 | 101.9 | 156.3 |

Appendix table C-17-Net-output productivity of the sugar and confections industry


|  | Calculated annual change rate (percent) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1976 | 10.76 | 0.42 | -7.01 | 10.34 | 3.34 |
| 1977 | 5.78 | -2.09 | -2.02 | 7.86 | 5.84 |
| 1978 | -1.54 | -0.84 | 2.17 | -0.69 | 1.48 |
| 1979 | -4.58 | 4.28 | 6.17 | -8.86 | -2.69 |
| 1980 | 19.86 | 8.74 | 10.80 | 11.12 | 21.92 |
| 1981 | -12.22 | 5.80 | 4.51 | -18.02 | -13.51 |
| 1982 | 13.24 | -0.54 | 3.06 | 13.78 | 16.84 |
| 1983 | 2.44 | -5.10 | -4.09 | 7.54 | 3.44 |
| 1984 | 1.11 | 4.06 | 3.79 | -2.95 | 0.84 |
| 1985 | 7.21 | -4.14 | 0.67 | 11.35 | 12.02 |
| 1986 | 3.71 | -8.69 | -6.84 | 12.40 | 5.56 |
| 1987 | 4.48 | 1.52 | 0.87 | 2.96 | 3.84 |
| 1988 | 0.83 | 1.01 | 1.30 | -0.18 | 1.12 |
| 1989 | -1.97 | -2.82 | -3.67 | 0.85 | -2.82 |
| 1990 | 1.66 | 2.43 | -0.50 | -0.77 | -1.27 |
| 1991 | 6.03 | -2.29 | -0.69 | 8.32 | 7.63 |
| 1992 | 8.22 | -0.42 | -0.70 | 8.64 | 7.94 |
| 1993 | 0.12 | -3.45 | -5.38 | 3.57 | -1.81 |
| 1994 | -0.77 | 6.26 | 5.85 | -7.04 | -1.18 |
| 1995 | 1.89 | -0.55 | -0.48 | 2.44 | 1.96 |
| 1996 | 2.99 | 1.37 | 2.95 | 1.62 | 4.57 |
| 1997 | 5.85 | 1.27 | 1.60 | 4.59 | 6.19 |
|  | Generated index number (1975=100) |  |  |  |  |
| 1975 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 1976 | 110.8 | 100.4 | 93.0 | 110.3 | 103.3 |
| 1977 | 117.2 | 98.3 | 91.1 | 119.0 | 109.4 |
| 1978 | 115.4 | 97.5 | 93.1 | 118.2 | 111.0 |
| 1979 | 110.1 | 101.7 | 98.8 | 107.7 | 108.0 |
| 1980 | 131.9 | 110.5 | 109.5 | 119.7 | 131.7 |
| 1981 | 115.8 | 117.0 | 114.4 | 98.1 | 113.9 |
| 1982 | 131.2 | 116.3 | 117.9 | 111.7 | 133.1 |
| 1983 | 134.4 | 110.4 | 113.1 | 120.1 | 137.7 |
| 1984 | 135.8 | 114.9 | 117.4 | 116.5 | 138.8 |
| 1985 | 145.6 | 110.1 | 118.2 | 129.8 | 155.5 |
| 1986 | 151.1 | 100.6 | 110.1 | 145.9 | 164.1 |
| 1987 | 157.8 | 102.1 | 111.1 | 150.2 | 170.4 |
| 1988 | 159.1 | 103.1 | 112.5 | 149.9 | 172.4 |
| 1989 | 156.0 | 100.2 | 108.4 | 151.2 | 167.5 |
| 1990 | 158.6 | 102.7 | 107.8 | 150.0 | 165.4 |
| 1991 | 168.2 | 100.3 | 107.1 | 162.5 | 178.0 |
| 1992 | 182.0 | 99.9 | 106.3 | 176.5 | 192.1 |
| 1993 | 182.2 | 96.4 | 100.6 | 182.8 | 188.6 |
| 1994 | 180.8 | 102.5 | 106.5 | 170.0 | 186.4 |
| 1995 | 184.2 | 101.9 | 106.0 | 174.1 | 190.0 |
| 1996 | 189.7 | 103.3 | 109.1 | 176.9 | 198.7 |
| 1997 | 200.8 | 104.6 | 110.9 | 185.1 | 211.0 |

Appendix table C-18-Net-output productivity of the fats and oils industry


|  | Calculated annual change rate (percent) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1976 | 24.39 | -0.38 | -1.82 | 24.77 | 22.94 |
| 1977 | -33.32 | -1.52 | -3.88 | -31.79 | -35.68 |
| 1978 | 33.69 | 8.67 | 2.64 | 25.02 | 27.66 |
| 1979 | 14.32 | 3.51 | 4.24 | 10.82 | 15.06 |
| 1980 | -11.19 | 8.20 | 12.88 | -19.40 | -6.51 |
| 1981 | -18.90 | 7.87 | 12.95 | -26.77 | -13.83 |
| 1982 | 11.18 | 1.30 | 7.15 | 9.88 | 17.04 |
| 1983 | 10.98 | -9.47 | -0.83 | 20.45 | 19.62 |
| 1984 | -22.78 | 5.06 | 8.50 | -27.83 | -19.34 |
| 1985 | -0.30 | -7.07 | 2.09 | 6.76 | 8.86 |
| 1986 | 4.12 | -10.85 | -2.17 | 14.97 | 12.81 |
| 1987 | 20.34 | -3.17 | 0.86 | 23.50 | 24.37 |
| 1988 | 14.15 | 0.90 | -3.36 | 13.24 | 9.88 |
| 1989 | -23.30 | -4.75 | -4.75 | -18.55 | -23.30 |
| 1990 | 17.56 | -1.93 | 3.06 | 19.50 | 22.56 |
| 1991 | -10.54 | -4.08 | -0.85 | -6.47 | -7.32 |
| 1992 | -0.74 | -3.44 | -9.31 | 2.70 | -6.61 |
| 1993 | 7.71 | -7.20 | -5.28 | 14.91 | 9.63 |
| 1994 | 0.67 | 3.21 | 4.19 | -2.54 | 1.64 |
| 1995 | 5.01 | -2.43 | -1.20 | 7.43 | 6.24 |
| 1996 | -11.61 | 0.78 | 1.52 | -12.39 | -10.86 |
| 1997 | 10.34 | 6.33 | 9.75 | 4.01 | 13.76 |
|  | Generated index number (1975=100) |  |  |  |  |
| 1975 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 1976 | 124.4 | 99.6 | 98.2 | 124.8 | 122.9 |
| 1977 | 82.9 | 98.1 | 94.4 | 85.1 | 79.1 |
| 1978 | 110.9 | 106.6 | 96.9 | 106.4 | 101.0 |
| 1979 | 126.8 | 110.4 | 101.0 | 117.9 | 116.2 |
| 1980 | 112.6 | 119.4 | 114.0 | 95.0 | 108.6 |
| 1981 | 91.3 | 128.8 | 128.7 | 69.6 | 93.6 |
| 1982 | 101.5 | 130.5 | 137.9 | 76.5 | 109.5 |
| 1983 | 112.7 | 118.1 | 136.8 | 92.1 | 131.0 |
| 1984 | 87.0 | 124.1 | 148.4 | 66.5 | 105.7 |
| 1985 | 86.7 | 115.3 | 151.5 | 71.0 | 115.0 |
| 1986 | 90.3 | 102.8 | 148.3 | 81.6 | 129.8 |
| 1987 | 108.7 | 99.6 | 149.5 | 100.8 | 161.4 |
| 1988 | 124.1 | 100.5 | 144.5 | 114.1 | 177.3 |
| 1989 | 95.2 | 95.7 | 137.6 | 92.9 | 136.0 |
| 1990 | 111.9 | 93.8 | 141.9 | 111.1 | 166.7 |
| 1991 | 100.1 | 90.0 | 140.6 | 103.9 | 154.5 |
| 1992 | 99.3 | 86.9 | 127.6 | 106.7 | 144.3 |
| 1993 | 107.0 | 80.7 | 120.8 | 122.6 | 158.2 |
| 1994 | 107.7 | 83.3 | 125.9 | 119.5 | 160.8 |
| 1995 | 113.1 | 81.2 | 124.4 | 128.3 | 170.8 |
| 1996 | 100.0 | 81.9 | 126.3 | 112.4 | 152.3 |
| 1997 | 110.3 | 87.0 | 138.6 | 116.9 | 173.2 |

Appendix table C-19-Net-output productivity of the beverages industry


|  | Calculated annual change rate (percent) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1976 | 8.92 | -0.01 | 1.62 | 8.94 | 10.56 |
| 1977 | 7.08 | -1.65 | -1.75 | 8.74 | 6.98 |
| 1978 | 6.75 | 6.93 | 4.31 | -0.18 | 4.13 |
| 1979 | -3.38 | 6.30 | 5.42 | -9.67 | -4.25 |
| 1980 | 2.77 | 10.78 | 13.47 | -8.01 | 5.46 |
| 1981 | 5.68 | 6.70 | 10.19 | -1.03 | 9.16 |
| 1982 | 12.62 | 4.82 | 7.58 | 7.80 | 15.38 |
| 1983 | 3.90 | -5.42 | -3.23 | 9.32 | 6.09 |
| 1984 | -2.26 | 3.60 | 7.17 | -5.86 | 1.31 |
| 1985 | 8.53 | -1.98 | -0.91 | 10.51 | 9.60 |
| 1986 | 5.72 | -9.82 | -4.60 | 15.54 | 10.94 |
| 1987 | 3.22 | -2.09 | 6.42 | 5.31 | 11.73 |
| 1988 | 3.21 | -0.76 | 1.13 | 3.97 | 5.11 |
| 1989 | -3.34 | -6.20 | -3.45 | 2.86 | -0.60 |
| 1990 | 0.16 | -2.74 | -1.79 | 2.90 | 1.11 |
| 1991 | 6.74 | -4.96 | -4.41 | 11.70 | 7.29 |
| 1992 | 9.71 | -3.96 | -5.94 | 13.67 | 7.73 |
| 1993 | -1.87 | -6.74 | -10.20 | 4.87 | -5.33 |
| 1994 | 5.33 | 3.18 | 6.77 | 2.15 | 8.92 |
| 1995 | 3.64 | -1.09 | -1.63 | 4.73 | 3.10 |
| 1996 | 0.93 | 1.64 | 3.54 | -0.71 | 2.83 |
| 1997 | 0.08 | 7.16 | -3.42 | -7.07 | -10.50 |
|  | Generated index number (1975=100) |  |  |  |  |
| 1975 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 1976 | 108.9 | 100.0 | 101.6 | 108.9 | 110.6 |
| 1977 | 116.6 | 98.3 | 99.8 | 118.5 | 118.3 |
| 1978 | 124.5 | 105.1 | 104.1 | 118.2 | 123.2 |
| 1979 | 120.3 | 111.8 | 109.8 | 106.8 | 117.9 |
| 1980 | 123.6 | 123.8 | 124.6 | 98.2 | 124.4 |
| 1981 | 130.7 | 132.1 | 137.3 | 97.2 | 135.8 |
| 1982 | 147.2 | 138.5 | 147.7 | 104.8 | 156.7 |
| 1983 | 152.9 | 131.0 | 142.9 | 114.6 | 166.2 |
| 1984 | 149.4 | 135.7 | 153.2 | 107.9 | 168.4 |
| 1985 | 162.2 | 133.0 | 151.8 | 119.2 | 184.5 |
| 1986 | 171.5 | 120.0 | 144.8 | 137.8 | 204.7 |
| 1987 | 177.0 | 117.4 | 154.1 | 145.1 | 228.7 |
| 1988 | 182.7 | 116.5 | 155.8 | 150.8 | 240.4 |
| 1989 | 176.6 | 109.3 | 150.4 | 155.1 | 239.0 |
| 1990 | 176.8 | 106.3 | 147.7 | 159.6 | 241.6 |
| 1991 | 188.8 | 101.0 | 141.2 | 178.3 | 259.2 |
| 1992 | 207.1 | 97.0 | 132.8 | 202.7 | 279.3 |
| 1993 | 203.2 | 90.5 | 119.3 | 212.6 | 264.4 |
| 1994 | 214.1 | 93.4 | 127.4 | 217.2 | 288.0 |
| 1995 | 221.9 | 92.4 | 125.3 | 227.4 | 297.0 |
| 1996 | 223.9 | 93.9 | 129.7 | 225.8 | 305.4 |
| 1997 | 224.1 | 100.6 | 125.3 | 209.8 | 273.3 |

Appendix table C-20-Net-output productivity of the miscellaneous foods industry


|  | Calculated annual change rate (percent) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1976 | 25.42 | -1.24 | -8.93 | 26.66 | 17.72 |
| 1977 | -3.81 | -6.43 | -18.08 | 2.62 | -15.46 |
| 1978 | 8.70 | 5.73 | 0.63 | 2.97 | 3.60 |
| 1979 | -4.95 | 11.97 | 13.45 | -16.92 | -3.47 |
| 1980 | 1.78 | 8.03 | 9.87 | -6.25 | 3.62 |
| 1981 | 10.01 | 7.69 | 6.69 | 2.32 | 9.01 |
| 1982 | 10.51 | 1.19 | 0.44 | 9.32 | 9.76 |
| 1983 | -3.22 | -3.96 | -0.63 | 0.74 | 0.11 |
| 1984 | 4.24 | 3.50 | 4.08 | 0.75 | 4.83 |
| 1985 | 3.29 | -1.33 | 1.68 | 4.62 | 6.30 |
| 1986 | 7.25 | -7.60 | -5.42 | 14.85 | 9.43 |
| 1987 | 12.53 | 4.80 | -3.93 | 7.73 | 3.81 |
| 1988 | -2.00 | 1.50 | 3.11 | -3.49 | -0.39 |
| 1989 | -13.57 | -3.48 | -4.76 | -10.09 | -14.85 |
| 1990 | 10.95 | 2.58 | -3.93 | 8.37 | 4.44 |
| 1991 | -1.45 | -1.56 | 0.22 | 0.11 | 0.33 |
| 1992 | 10.16 | 0.76 | -6.68 | 9.40 | 2.72 |
| 1993 | 9.26 | -4.12 | -2.31 | 13.38 | 11.07 |
| 1994 | 0.74 | 6.75 | 6.37 | -6.01 | 0.36 |
| 1995 | 3.12 | 0.04 | -2.63 | 3.08 | 0.45 |
| 1996 | 0.37 | 2.91 | -0.81 | -2.54 | -3.35 |
| 1997 | -1.84 | 9.96 | 10.75 | -11.79 | -1.05 |
|  | Generated index number (1975=100) |  |  |  |  |
| 1975 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 1976 | 125.4 | 98.8 | 91.1 | 126.7 | 117.7 |
| 1977 | 120.6 | 92.4 | 74.6 | 130.0 | 99.5 |
| 1978 | 131.1 | 97.7 | 75.1 | 133.8 | 103.1 |
| 1979 | 124.6 | 109.4 | 85.2 | 111.2 | 99.5 |
| 1980 | 126.9 | 118.2 | 93.6 | 104.2 | 103.1 |
| 1981 | 139.6 | 127.3 | 99.8 | 106.7 | 112.4 |
| 1982 | 154.2 | 128.8 | 100.3 | 116.6 | 123.4 |
| 1983 | 149.3 | 123.7 | 99.6 | 117.5 | 123.5 |
| 1984 | 155.6 | 128.0 | 103.7 | 118.3 | 129.5 |
| 1985 | 160.7 | 126.3 | 105.5 | 123.8 | 137.7 |
| 1986 | 172.4 | 116.7 | 99.7 | 142.2 | 150.6 |
| 1987 | 194.0 | 122.3 | 95.8 | 153.2 | 156.4 |
| 1988 | 190.1 | 124.1 | 98.8 | 147.8 | 155.8 |
| 1989 | 164.3 | 119.8 | 94.1 | 132.9 | 132.6 |
| 1990 | 182.3 | 122.9 | 90.4 | 144.0 | 138.5 |
| 1991 | 179.6 | 121.0 | 90.6 | 144.2 | 139.0 |
| 1992 | 197.9 | 121.9 | 84.5 | 157.7 | 142.7 |
| 1993 | 216.2 | 116.9 | 82.6 | 178.9 | 158.5 |
| 1994 | 217.8 | 124.8 | 87.8 | 168.1 | 159.1 |
| 1995 | 224.6 | 124.8 | 85.5 | 173.3 | 159.8 |
| 1996 | 225.4 | 128.5 | 84.8 | 168.9 | 154.5 |
| 1997 | 221.3 | 141.3 | 94.0 | 149.0 | 152.9 |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Mergers are included only if the purchase price was at least $\$ 1$ million and transfers of ownership involved at least 10 percent of a company's equity.
    Source: Mergerstat Review. Selected issues.

[^1]:    * The percent in parentheses indicates that the percentage of a NAICS code is allocated to a corresponding SIC code.

    Source: U.S. Census Bureau. 1997 Economic Census: Bridge Between SIC and NAICS: Food and kindred products. (http://www.Census.gov/epcd/ec97brdg)

