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Introduction

- The U.S. cattle industry contributes about 2.2% of total U.S. greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions (IPCC 2006; USEPA 2010).
- Adoption of prescribed grazing (PG) can reduce GHG emissions from beef cattle production, but may increase production costs.
- Grass-fed beef commands a price premium among consumers (e.g., Umberger et al. 2009; Xue et al. 2010), but consumer willingness-to-pay (WTP) for grass-fed beef produced with a management-intensive prescribed grazing program that reduces GHG emissions is unknown.

Objectives

Estimate the WTP for beef produced using PG, along with the product- and individual-specific factors that determine WTP.

Survey and Data

Data collected via an online survey of beef consumers administered by GiK® Custom Research in April/May of 2013. Survey fielded to 1,705 panel members, with 905 complete responses. Hypothetical “Raised Carbon Friendly” (RCF) label designed to differentiate beef grown using a PG program from other beef products. Survey instrument provided consumers with information about current climate issues, GHG emissions from agriculture and beef production, and an overview of PG and the hypothetical RCF beef label.

Survey collected information about:
- Beef consumption behavior of respondents;
- Support for the RCF program and, for those who expressed support, WTP for beef with RCF label using a single-bounded, referendum type, contingent valuation question (CV) where WTP bids were stated in dollar amounts but based on a percentage (5%, 10%, 20%, 30%, or 40%) of the individual household’s estimated annual beef expenditures; and
- Familiarity with PG and grass-fed beef, participation in environmental organizations, sources of environmental information, and opinions about the food industry, food safety, food policy, environmental regulation, and climate change. Responses to survey questions were supplemented with previously-collected demographic information for panel members.

Methodology

Two models used:

First, a Generalized Ordered Logit model (Fu 1998; Williams 2006) was used to analyze the likelihood of consumer support and positive WTP for the RCF program (the dependent variable was characterized by a set of ordered choices). Model was chosen over other ordinal dependent variable models because it relaxes the proportional odds assumption so effects of independent variables are allowed to vary with cut points.

Second, a Probit with Sample Selection model (Heckman 1979; Greene 2003) was applied to estimate WTP values for the RCF certification. This approach assumes that choice made in CV question and choice made in support RCF question are correlated.

Generalized Ordered Logit

**Alternatives:**
1. “Do not support RCF,” 2. (“Support RCF but not willing to pay”) and 3. (“Support and willing to pay”).

**GOL model:**

\[
p(X > j) = g(X\theta_j) = \text{exp}(X\theta_j) / (1 + \sum_{i=1}^{J} \text{exp}(X\theta_i))
\]

where \( H_j \) is an ordinal dependent variable reflecting the extent of individual support for the RCF program and RCF-labeled beef; \( X \) is vector of independent variables; and \( \theta_j \) is vector of parameters.

**Probabilities of each outcome are:**

\[
P(H=1) = 1 - g(X\theta), P(H=2) = g(X\theta_1) - g(X\theta_2), P(H=3) = g(X\theta_2)
\]

**Probit with Sample Selection**

Selection equation for support RCF:

\[
s_i = \beta_i + c_i
\]

where \( c_i \) are jointly normally distributed with zero means and variances equal to 1, with correlation between the two error terms \( \rho \).

The log-likelihood function is:

\[
l = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \ln[I_i] = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \ln[\Phi_1(x_i\beta_i + c_i)] - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \ln[\Phi_1(-x_i\beta_i - r_i)] + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \ln[1 - \Phi_2(x_i\beta_i - r_i)]
\]

where the parameters \( \beta_i, r_i \) are estimated using the maximum likelihood method.

WTP is:

\[
\text{WTP} = \frac{\sum X\beta_i}{\rho}
\]

Empirical Models

**Results and Conclusions**

Respondents who are younger (Age), earn higher incomes (Household Income), have made donations for environmental purposes (Donate to Environmental Groups), believe climate change is occurring and are concerned about climate issues (Climate Change Concern), are more concerned about food prices (Low Food Prices), agree that food retailers and taxpayers should pay GHG mitigation costs (Source of Mitigation Costs), and purchase organic foods and local products (Buy Organic/Local Food) are more likely to support the RCF program.

Annual household WTP of those who support the RCF program for the RCF-certified products estimated at the sample mean is $1,944.44 (confidence interval at 5% = [194.56, 194.53]), or about 9.75% of the sample mean of estimated annual household expenditures on beef ($1,995).

**Conclusions**

- Results suggest some consumers value and would pay a premium to help cover the costs incurred in reducing GHG through the adoption of PG.
- Market mechanisms (i.e., production certifications or labels) could be used to indirectly subsidize beef farmer participation in program to reduce GHG emissions.
- Results helpful in designing consumer supported PG program such as an RCF program.
- Additional research is needed to compare the aggregate premium with costs of producing beef using PG.