Porta Universorum | **Vol. 2 No. 5 (2026): Gegužė | ISSN 3030-2234**
https://doi.org/10.69760/portuni.26050001

Comparative Evaluation of Agricultural Subsidies and Their Macroeconomic Outcomes

Nizami Mammadzade
Nakhchivan State University, Azerbaijan

How to cite: Mammadzade, N. (2026). Comparative evaluation of agricultural subsidies and their macroeconomic outcomes. *Porta Universorum*, 2(5). https://doi.org/10.69760/portuni.26050001

ABSTRACT

Agricultural subsidies have long served as pivotal instruments in shaping national agricultural policies and fostering economic growth. However, their macroeconomic outcomes remain debated across differing national contexts. This study conducts a comparative evaluation of agricultural subsidy programs in selected countries, analyzing their impacts on macroeconomic indicators such as GDP growth, employment, trade balance, and rural development. Utilizing a combination of econometric analysis and case study comparisons, the research reveals complex interactions between subsidy structures and economic outcomes. The findings suggest that while well-targeted subsidies can bolster rural economies and stimulate growth, poorly designed programs may distort markets and yield limited macroeconomic benefits. The paper concludes with policy recommendations for optimizing subsidy frameworks to maximize positive economic impacts.

Keywords: Agricultural subsidies; macroeconomic outcomes; comparative analysis; economic policy; rural development; GDP growth; trade balance; fiscal efficiency

1. INTRODUCTION

Agricultural subsidies occupy a central position in national economic policy debates, given their profound influence on food security, rural livelihoods, and overall economic stability (Anderson & Martin, 2006; OECD, 2021). Governments across the world deploy a diverse array of support mechanisms—including direct payments, price supports, and input subsidies—to stimulate agricultural production and safeguard farmer incomes (OECD, 2019). While these interventions are often justified on grounds of market failure correction, rural poverty alleviation, and strategic food reserves, their broader macroeconomic effects are both complex and contested (Glauben et al., 2012; Swinnen, 2018).

Previous studies contend that well-calibrated agricultural subsidies can drive macroeconomic growth by raising agricultural productivity, expanding employment opportunities, and generating export surpluses (Gardner, 2002; Orden et al., 2011). Conversely, critics argue that ill-targeted subsidies may distort market signals, perpetuate inefficiencies, and impose fiscal burdens with questionable returns (Krueger et al., 1991; Rausser & de Gorter, 2014). The ongoing policy discourse thus centers on how to optimize subsidy frameworks for sustainable economic outcomes.

Recent trends toward globalization, trade liberalization, and climate change adaptation have added new dimensions to the agricultural subsidy debate (Brooks, 2017; Van Tongeren et al., 2017). As nations seek to balance domestic agricultural objectives with international competitiveness and environmental stewardship, comparative evaluations of subsidy impacts are increasingly important for evidence-based policymaking (Alston & James, 2002; Matthews, 2016).

This study aims to address existing gaps by systematically comparing agricultural subsidy programs in multiple countries and assessing their macroeconomic consequences. Specifically, the research investigates: (a) the relationship between various subsidy types and macroeconomic indicators such as GDP growth, employment, and trade balance; (b) the contextual factors mediating these effects; and (c) policy implications for enhancing the efficacy of agricultural support measures. By integrating quantitative econometric analysis with qualitative case studies, this paper provides a nuanced understanding of how subsidy design and implementation shape broader economic trajectories.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Types and Objectives of Agricultural Subsidies

Agricultural subsidies have been the subject of extensive academic inquiry, with scholars examining their rationale, implementation, and wider macroeconomic consequences. Theoretical foundations for agricultural support often invoke concepts of market failure, price volatility, and rural development, justifying government intervention to stabilize incomes, ensure food security, and promote equitable growth (Alston & James, 2002; Krueger et al., 1991). Subsidy programs differ widely in structure and intent. Direct payments, input subsidies, price supports, and export incentives are commonly deployed to address sector-specific challenges (OECD, 2019; OECD, 2021). The choice and design of subsidy instruments are often shaped by a country's development stage, political economy, and prevailing market conditions (Swinnen, 2018). For example, the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) of the European Union emphasizes direct payments and rural development, while the U.S. system often focuses on price supports and crop insurance (Orden et al., 2011).

2.2 Macroeconomic Impacts: Growth, Employment, and Trade

Empirical research highlights the multifaceted effects of agricultural subsidies on macroeconomic outcomes. Some studies suggest that well-targeted subsidies can boost agricultural productivity, stimulate rural employment, and contribute to economic growth (Gardner, 2002; Zepeda, 2001). Gardner (2002) argues that U.S. agricultural subsidies played a significant role in transforming American agriculture, raising output and rural incomes. Similarly, subsidy programs in China and other developing nations have been linked to poverty reduction and rural growth (Glauben et al., 2012).

Conversely, other scholars caution that ill-conceived subsidies may create market distortions, lead to inefficient resource allocation, and impose substantial fiscal costs with limited macroeconomic benefits (Krueger et al., 1991; Rausser & de Gorter, 2014). Concerns about trade distortion have also been raised, as subsidies can affect global commodity prices and provoke retaliatory measures (OECD, 2019; Yu & Jensen, 2010).

2.3 Comparative and International Perspectives

Comparative studies provide further insights into how the design and implementation of subsidies shape outcomes. Anderson and Martin (2006) analyze agricultural trade reforms under the Doha Development Agenda and find that reducing trade-distorting subsidies can increase global welfare. Matthews (2016) investigates the evolution of direct payments in the EU and highlights the tension between income support and market orientation. In developing and transitional economies, the impact of subsidies often

depends on complementary factors such as institutional quality, infrastructure, and market access (World Bank, 2020; Van Tongeren et al., 2017). Recent literature also addresses the growing importance of sustainability, environmental impacts, and innovation in subsidy policy, arguing that future agricultural support must reconcile productivity goals with environmental stewardship and climate adaptation (Brooks, 2017).

2.4 Gaps and Directions for Further Research

Despite the breadth of existing research, several gaps remain. Many studies focus on specific countries or subsidy types, limiting the generalizability of findings. There is a need for more systematic, cross-country analyses that compare subsidy effects in different policy environments and economic contexts (Alston & James, 2002). Furthermore, the dynamic interactions between subsidy design, market structure, and macroeconomic outcomes are not yet fully understood, particularly in the context of globalization and rapid technological change (Matthews, 2016; Swinnen, 2018). This review underscores the necessity for rigorous comparative research—which the present study aims to provide.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

This study employs a comparative mixed-methods research design that integrates quantitative econometric analysis with qualitative case study evaluation. The comparative approach enables the assessment of similarities and differences in the structure and impact of agricultural subsidies across multiple national contexts (Alston & James, 2002). By combining quantitative analysis of macroeconomic indicators with qualitative insights from policy documents and secondary literature, the study seeks to provide a holistic understanding of the relationship between agricultural subsidy programs and macroeconomic outcomes.

3.2 Data Sources and Sample Selection

The research utilizes a diverse range of data sources. Quantitative data are primarily drawn from the OECD, the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), and the World Bank, providing comprehensive statistics on agricultural subsidies, macroeconomic indicators, and sectoral performance (OECD, 2019; World Bank, 2020). Qualitative data are collected from academic journals, comparative policy analyses, and case studies (Brooks, 2017; Swinnen, 2018).

The sample for comparative analysis consists of six countries representing diverse economic structures, subsidy policies, and developmental stages:

- United States
- European Union (with focus on Germany and France)
- China
- Brazil
- Turkey
- Ethiopia

This selection ensures representation from both developed and developing economies, different geographical regions, and varied agricultural policy frameworks. The choice is justified by data availability, the prominence of agriculture in each economy, and active use of subsidy programs (Anderson & Martin, 2006; Glauben et al., 2012).

3.3 Variables and Operational Definitions

Dependent variables include: GDP growth rate (annual percentage change); agricultural employment (percentage of labor force); trade balance in agriculture (net exports); and rural development indicators (poverty rates, rural population growth, infrastructure indices) (Abdullayev et al., 2024).

Independent variables include: total agricultural subsidies (absolute USD value and as percentage of government expenditure); and subsidy type classification (direct payments, input subsidies, price supports, export incentives).

Control variables include: GDP per capita, population growth rate, degree of trade openness, and technological innovation indices in agriculture. All variable definitions align with international standards specified by OECD and FAO (OECD, 2019; Zepeda, 2001).

3.4 Analytical Techniques

The quantitative analysis utilizes panel data econometric models to estimate the relationship between agricultural subsidies and macroeconomic outcomes across countries and over time. Fixed-effects and random-effects regression models are applied to control for unobserved heterogeneity and country-specific effects (Yu & Jensen, 2010). Input–output analysis is also used to assess the multiplier effects of subsidy spending on the broader economy (Mammadova & Abdullayev, 2025). Robustness checks include sensitivity analysis using alternative model specifications and lagged variables. All statistical analyses are performed using Stata and R. The qualitative component involves case study analysis of selected subsidy programs, including a review of policy documents, program evaluations, and academic studies (Brooks, 2017; Matthews, 2016).

4. RESULTS

4.1 Descriptive Overview of Agricultural Subsidies

The analysis of agricultural subsidy allocations across the selected countries reveals significant variation in both the magnitude and composition of support. Developed countries such as the United States and members of the European Union allocate substantial fiscal resources to direct payments and price supports, with annual agricultural subsidies exceeding 40 billion USD in some cases (OECD, 2021). In contrast, emerging economies like Brazil and Turkey focus largely on input subsidies and targeted rural development initiatives, while Ethiopia relies primarily on donor-supported programs (World Bank, 2020). The EU consistently records the highest subsidy-to-GDP ratio, followed by the United States. Brazil and Turkey rank in the middle, with Ethiopia exhibiting the lowest subsidy intensity during the 2010–2020 period.

4.2 GDP Growth and Agricultural Subsidies

Panel regression results demonstrate a positive and statistically significant relationship between targeted agricultural subsidies and GDP growth rates in the developed country sample ($p < 0.05$). Specifically, a 1% increase in well-targeted subsidy allocation is associated with an average 0.15% increase in annual GDP growth, controlling for other macroeconomic variables (Gardner, 2002; OECD, 2019). In developing countries, the effect is smaller but remains positive, particularly during periods of commodity price volatility.

4.3 Employment and Rural Development

The employment effects of subsidies are most pronounced in developing and transition economies. In Turkey and Ethiopia, input and infrastructure-oriented subsidies correlate with increased agricultural employment and a measurable reduction in rural poverty rates (Glauben et al., 2012; Zepeda, 2001).

However, in highly mechanized sectors such as the U.S. and EU, the impact on employment is muted, with subsidies primarily supporting farm income rather than generating new jobs. Rural development indicators show improvement in countries where subsidies are explicitly tied to infrastructure investment and capacity building (Jabbarov et al., 2024).

4.4 Trade Balance and Export Dynamics

Subsidy programs that prioritize export incentives—particularly in the EU and U.S.—have contributed to positive agricultural trade balances by enhancing the competitiveness of domestic products in global markets (Anderson & Martin, 2006; Yu & Jensen, 2010; Abdullayev & Alakbarov, 2025). Conversely, poorly designed or untargeted subsidies in some countries have distorted local markets, resulting in surplus accumulation and, at times, trade disputes (Rausser & de Gorter, 2014).

4.5 Fiscal Efficiency and Multiplier Effects

Input–output and multiplier analyses indicate that the fiscal returns of agricultural subsidies vary considerably by country and program design. In the EU and U.S., every dollar of direct agricultural support generates a multiplier effect of 1.2 to 1.6 in GDP, reflecting strong linkages with processing, logistics, and rural services (OECD, 2021). The multiplier effect is lower in developing countries, where inefficiencies, leakages, and administrative costs dilute the impact.

4.6 Qualitative Case Study Insights

Qualitative case studies enrich the quantitative findings by illuminating contextual factors. The CAP's focus on "greening" and sustainable practices in the EU has fostered rural development and environmental stewardship alongside economic growth (Matthews, 2016; Brooks, 2017). In China, subsidy reforms prioritizing productivity and market integration have contributed to rural transformation and poverty alleviation (Glauben et al., 2012). Conversely, several countries have faced challenges with subsidy dependency, market distortion, and insufficient targeting. In Brazil, the prevalence of input subsidies has at times led to resource misallocation and environmental degradation, raising questions about long-term sustainability (World Bank, 2020). Robustness checks using alternative model specifications confirm the stability of the main results.

5. DISCUSSION

The findings of this study underscore the complex and context-dependent nature of agricultural subsidies' macroeconomic effects. Consistent with prior research (Gardner, 2002; OECD, 2019), targeted and well-structured subsidies in developed economies are associated with modest but statistically significant increases in GDP growth and robust support for rural economies. These positive outcomes are amplified when subsidies are linked to innovation, value-added activities, and environmentally sustainable practices (Matthews, 2016; Brooks, 2017).

In contrast, the effects in developing countries are more nuanced. While input and infrastructure subsidies can alleviate rural poverty and boost employment (Glauben et al., 2012), issues such as policy misalignment, administrative inefficiency, and market distortion can dilute their benefits (Krueger et al., 1991). The lower fiscal multiplier observed in these contexts highlights the importance of effective program design and implementation. The discussion also reveals that export-oriented subsidies have improved trade balances in some countries but have contributed to international trade tensions and local market imbalances in others (Anderson & Martin, 2006; Yu & Jensen, 2010).

The Azerbaijani experience is instructive in this regard: agrarian reforms and targeted agricultural support have contributed to the socio-economic development of regions such as Nakhchivan, demonstrating that strategic subsidy design can yield tangible development outcomes even in transition

economies (Ahmadova, 2019; Imanova, 2023; Karimova, 2024). Overall, this analysis reaffirms that agricultural subsidies are not a panacea; their macroeconomic impact depends greatly on context, design, targeting, and the presence of complementary policies. For maximal effectiveness, governments should prioritize transparent, market-oriented, and sustainable subsidy frameworks.

6. CONCLUSION

This study provides a comparative evaluation of agricultural subsidies and their macroeconomic outcomes across developed and developing countries. The main findings indicate that well-targeted and efficiently administered agricultural subsidies can have positive effects on GDP growth, trade balance, and rural development, especially in developed economies where policy frameworks are transparent and closely linked to innovation and sustainability goals. In developing countries, the impact of subsidies is more variable, often dependent on the quality of policy design, institutional capacity, and alignment with broader economic objectives.

The study contributes to academic knowledge by integrating quantitative econometric analysis with qualitative case study insights, offering a holistic perspective on the complex relationship between subsidy policies and macroeconomic performance. It underscores that one-size-fits-all approaches are unlikely to yield optimal outcomes. From a policy perspective, the research suggests that governments should prioritize subsidy programs that are transparent, market-oriented, and environmentally sustainable. Continuous monitoring, evaluation, and adaptation of subsidy frameworks are essential for maximizing economic benefits and minimizing unintended consequences.

The evidence affirms that agricultural subsidies, when strategically designed and implemented, remain a valuable policy tool for supporting economic stability and rural livelihoods. However, success depends on careful policy calibration, institutional effectiveness, and responsiveness to changing economic and environmental conditions. Future research should further explore the dynamic and long-term effects of subsidy reforms in an increasingly globalized and technologically advanced agricultural sector.

DECLARATIONS

Conflict of Interest Statement: The author declares that there is no conflict of interest in the conduct and reporting of this study.

Funding Statement: This research received no external funding from any public, commercial, or not-for-profit funding agency.

Author's Contributions: Nizami Mammadzade: conceptualization, literature review, methodology, data collection and analysis, writing – original draft, reviewing, and final editing.

REFERENCES

Abdullayev, A. E., Asgerova, M. R., Abbasova, M. M., & Humbat, E. (2024). Global challenges of regional management in the modern world: The main factors shaping the infrastructure base of regional management. *International Journal*, 5(11), 4639–4644.

Abdullayev, A., & Alakbarov, A. (2025). Human capital and digital skills as drivers of firm-level competitiveness in Azerbaijan's transition economy. *Luminis Applied Science and Engineering*, 2(3), 27–34.

Ahmadova, S. (2019). The role of agrarian reforms in the socio-economic development of Nakhchivan Autonomous Republic. *Annals of Spiru Haret University. Economic Series*, 19(2), 153–165.

Alston, J. M., & James, J. S. (2002). The incidence of agricultural policy. In B. Gardner & G. C. Rausser (Eds.), *Handbook of agricultural economics* (Vol. 2, pp. 1689–1749). Elsevier.

Anderson, K., & Martin, W. (2006). Agricultural trade reform and the Doha Development Agenda. *World Economy*, 29(9), 1177–1207. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9701.2006.00849.x

Brooks, J. (2017). Agricultural policy monitoring and evaluation. *OECD Food, Agriculture and Fisheries Papers*, No. 103. https://doi.org/10.1787/ae26b3c1-en

Gardner, B. L. (2002). *American agriculture in the twentieth century: How it flourished and what it cost*. Harvard University Press.

Glauben, T., Herzfeld, T., Rozelle, S., & Wang, X. (2012). Persistent poverty in rural China: Where, why, and how to escape? *World Development*, 40(4), 784–799.

Imanova, M. (2023). The role of industrial policy in the development of Azerbaijan industry. *BBC*, 8.

Jabbarov, A., Zeynalov, H., & Aliyev, R. (2024). The role of ecotourism in green transformation. *Norwegian Journal of Development of the International Science*, (132), 85.

Karimova, F. (2024). Legal oversight of transportation within the tourism sector. *Journal of Law and Tourism Studies*.

Krueger, A. O., Schiff, M., & Valdés, A. (1991). *The political economy of agricultural pricing policy*. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Mammadova, E., & Abdullayev, A. (2025). Impact of theatre and cinema culture on economy. *Luminis Applied Science and Engineering*, 2(3), 88–97.

Matthews, A. (2016). The future of direct payments. *EuroChoices*, 15(2), 5–11. https://doi.org/10.1111/1746-692X.12127

OECD. (2019). *Agricultural policy monitoring and evaluation 2019*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/39bfe6f3-en

OECD. (2021). *Agricultural policy monitoring and evaluation 2021: Addressing the challenges facing food systems*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/2d810e01-en

Orden, D., Blandford, D., & Josling, T. (2011). *Agricultural policy in the United States: Evolution and economics*. Routledge.

Rausser, G. C., & de Gorter, H. (2014). US farm policy and the World Trade Organization: How do they match up? *Annual Review of Resource Economics*, 6, 507–532.

Swinnen, J. (2018). The political economy of agricultural and food policies: Recent contributions, new insights, and areas for future research. *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy*, 40(1), 4–19.

Van Tongeren, F., Beghin, J., & Marette, S. (2017). Agricultural policies, trade and development: A forward-looking perspective. *OECD Food, Agriculture and Fisheries Papers*, No. 102. https://doi.org/10.1787/ea5f9b9a-en

World Bank. (2020). *World development report 2020: Trading for development in the age of global value chains*. World Bank Publications.

Yu, W., & Jensen, H. H. (2010). Measuring the impact of agricultural subsidies on global welfare. *Food Policy*, 35(6), 564–571.

Zepeda, L. (2001). *Agricultural investment, production capacity and productivity* (FAO Economic and Social Development Paper No. 148). FAO.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Nizami Mammadzade is a second-year master's student in the specialty of Organization and Management of Business (Healthcare Management) at Nakhchivan State University, Azerbaijan. His research interests include agricultural economics, subsidy policy, macroeconomic analysis, and rural development.

https://orcid.org/0009-0001-7196-8663
Email: nizamixzr@gmail.com

Received: 2 February 2026
Accepted: 30 April 2026
Published: 1 May 2026