



The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search
<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>
aesearch@umn.edu

Papers downloaded from AgEcon Search may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.

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

Staff Papers Series

STAFF PAPER P91-43

October 1991

Economies of Scale in Agriculture: A Reexamination of the Evidence

Yoav Kislev and Willis Peterson



Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics

University of Minnesota
Institute of Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108

STAFF PAPER P91-43

October 1991

**Economies of Scale in Agriculture:
A Reexamination of the Evidence**

Yoav Kislev and Willis Peterson

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

Economies of Scale in Agriculture: A Reexamination of the Evidence

Yoav Kislev and Willis Peterson

Abstract

It is generally accepted that agricultural production is characterized by increasing returns to scale. In this paper we examine the evidence allegedly supporting this assertion and come to the conclusion that the hypothesis of increasing returns is not warranted. The essence of our argument is that if increasing returns were important we would have seen huge "food factories" dominating the industry. Instead, the dominating form of organization is the family unit and farms come in a multitude of sizes--as can be expected in a constant cost industry.

October, 1991

ECONOMIES OF SCALE IN AGRICULTURE: A REEXAMINATION OF THE EVIDENCE

Yoav Kislev and Willis Peterson*

Prevented from conducting controlled experiments, the data economists work with are far from ideal. Measurement errors abound, important variables are unobserved, not all simultaneity can be accounted for, and we often use state, regional, or national aggregates to estimate structural parameters relating to individual firms or households. As a result, every measurement and estimated parameter can be questioned. Confidence is gained when quantitative results can be corroborated by observations on independent sets of data and, particularly, by analyses of different aspects of the same problem. With these observations in mind, we reexamine in this paper the evidence for economies of scale in the U.S. agriculture.

Average farm size has grown markedly in the U.S. Between 1929 and 1987 output per farm increased more than 6 times and land per farm expanded almost three-fold (Table 1, lines 1, 2). This long term growth of farm size has led people to believe that large farms are more efficient than small ones. As a result there appears to be widespread concern that family farms are an endangered species, eventually to be

* Hebrew University and University of Minnesota respectively. Presented at the *festschrift* symposium in honor of D. Gale Johnson, Chicago Mercantile Exchange, May 3 and 4, 1991. Comments and suggestions on previous drafts of the paper from John Antle, Bruce Gardner, and Vasant Sukhatme are gratefully acknowledged. Errors of fact or logic are our own. The first draft of the paper was written when Yoav Kislev was with the World Bank Research Department.

Table 1

Agricultural Data - per Farm Output, Inputs, and Prices

	<u>Unit</u>	<u>1929</u>	<u>1949</u>	<u>1959</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1982</u>	<u>1987</u>
1. Gross Output	\$1000	11.2	27.2	37.2	52.1	78.6	81.3	73.1	71.5
2. Value Added	\$1000	8.2	20.4	24.7	31.2	47.6	45.9	39.7	36.7
3. Land	acres	157	216	303	389	440	449	440	461
4. Family Labor	labor years	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.9
5. Hired Labor	labor years	.4	.3	.5	.4	.4	.5	.7	.6
6. PT Farming	percent	12	23	30	40	36	42	43	35
7. Machinery	\$1000	5.1	11.5	26.1	33.2	39.9	56.3	63.4	77.2
8. Land Prices	\$ per acre	319	253	365	524	650	879	935	472
9. Land Rent	\$ per acre	--	--	54	81	146	125	101	58
10. Diesel Fuel	\$ per gallon	--	.71	.65	.55	.84	.80	1.31	.71
11. Custom Rate	\$ per acre	16.62	13.91	13.56	11.52	18.63	15.76	16.12	12.43
12. Mfg. Wages	\$ per week	165	257	344	393	407	427	388	406
13. Wage-rental	index	30	57	78	104	67	83	74	100

Note: All dollar values in constant 1987 prices, deflated by the CPI. See Appendix for description of data and sources.

replaced by large corporate enterprises. This implies a belief that there are economies of scale in U.S. agriculture. This belief is critically examined in the paper.

For most of us "economies of scale in agriculture" mean (a) that the production function for the typical firm in the industry is characterized by increasing returns to scale, and (b) that small farms are less efficient than larger ones. We start with the first meaning of the scale economies and comment on issues associated with size distribution at the end of the section.

We consider four dimensions of the problem: sources of scale economies, measurement of the phenomenon, the implied consequences and explanation of farm size growth. We argue that the scale economies hypothesis can be questioned on both conceptual and statistical grounds, and that it is not, in general, consistent with historical evidence. But we should perhaps make it clear at the outset that we do not think that size never matters. We do not believe, for example, that a dairy farm with one cow produces at the same average cost as a 200-cow operation. What we do propose is that agriculture is not typically characterized by increasing returns at the prevailing size distribution. The paper details this assertion.

Sources

It is a simple truism that if the world is exactly multiplied, production will also exactly double (Friedman). But we are not interested in the returns to multiplication of every aspect of production. Rather, changes in scale are changes in the physical dimensions of production assets and in factor flows while the environment, entrepreneurship and often also management stay the same. Then scale effects are

mixed. For example, it takes less than twice as much material to build a fence around a 640 acre farm as it does for a 320 acre operation. On the other hand, increasing management difficulties reduce efficiency as scale expands. Scale economies in an industry reflect the sum total of these effects.

Economies of scale in agriculture have been attributed to indivisibility of assets. Hayami and Ruttan assert, "The scale economies usually stem from the lumpiness or indivisibility of fixed capital" (p.146). But it is hard to find long run indivisibilities on the farm. Returns to scale is a long run concept, and in the long run the size distributions of machinery, land, structures, irrigation systems, herds, and flocks are continuous, not lumpy. Tractors and their implements come in a variety of sizes from the eight horse power hand driven garden types to the 350 horse power, 4-wheel drive behemoths. Other machines also come in a variety of sizes. In the few cases where large machines are the most efficient such as combine harvesters and cotton pickers, rental markets develop.

The human agent may be the most lumpy input. But in this case, the option of part-time farming on the one hand and large operation with hired labor on the other, makes it possible to scale the size of farm and the labor of the family to the available managerial ability. We consider part-time farming below. At this point we come to the conclusion that among the conventional inputs of land, labor, and capital, long run indivisibilities should not be given serious consideration as a source of economies of scale.

In spite of the apparent lack of indivisibilities, suppose for the sake of argument that the typical farm's long run average total cost curve is U-shaped. As the industry adjusts towards the least cost point, scale economies should be gradually eliminated. At the minimum point, returns to scale are constant. In other words, returns to scale are a temporary phenomenon. (Griliches, 1963, p.232). Taking the sum of the coefficients from a Cobb-Douglas production function as a measure of scale economies, the value should converge to one. Yet as will be shown in the following section, this has not occurred.

Another possibility is that economies of scale are created by reduced uncertainty due to government intervention in agriculture (Madden and Partenheimer, p. 103). However, government has been intervening since the 1930's. Adjustment should have been completed by now.

In a dynamic version of the U-shaped cost curve, it is hypothesized that technological progress results in the production of new and larger machines that are more efficient than the older and smaller ones. Perhaps this is what Bieri, de Janvry, and Schmitz (p. 802) had in mind: "the rate of increase in farm size in the future will be determined, to a large extent, by the rate at which the machine companies manufacture larger and larger equipment." But there is an identification problem here. Although the dynamic hypothesis is consistent with the observation that farms and machines have grown in size, and that measured economies of scale have not declined, it is not consistent with the growth and continued popularity of part-time farming. Nor is this hypothesis consistent with the observed cessation of the growth in farm size which

occurred from the mid-1970's to the early 1980's without a corresponding halt to the progression of new technology, or the ability to produce still larger machines. Below we argue that the growth in optimum farm size induced changes in size of machines, rather than the other way around.

We turn now to size distribution. An "asset" that is clearly fixed on the farm, particularly for the family unit, is entrepreneurial ability and management. This fixity raises important econometric issues which are discussed below. Here we note that even if management is fixed for the individual farm, it varies markedly among farms. With varying managerial ability, farms will differ in size in an industry in equilibrium, even if they all faced identical input prices and operated on a constant returns production function. Some of them may be part-time farms. Here again, as with machines, adjustment should have eliminated the measured scale effects, if farms were not of optimal size (ability adjusted) in the past.

Differences in managerial ability are, however, not the only generators of variation in farm size. Another factor is differences in the prices of inputs, labor in particular. People with low opportunity cost of labor--old farmers, spouses without permanent employment, regular workers who draw non-pecuniary returns from farming and rural life--may operate relatively small farms, many of them part-time operations, which do not reach optimal size when labor is priced at full cost. In this sense economies of scale might be said to exist in agriculture even when the industry is in equilibrium.

Can we attribute the phenomenon of part-time farming with the dimensions it reaches in modern agriculture to the low-cost hypothesis? Between 1949 and 1969, a period when farm size grew rapidly, the incidence of part-time farming, as measured by the share of operators working 100 days or more off their farms, nearly doubled. In 1987 this figure was nearly three times larger than in 1929 (Table 1, line 6). Hence the low opportunity cost hypothesis implies that over the last several decades the share of people willingly accepting relatively low returns to labor grew significantly. Moreover, with technological advancement, the share of purchased inputs increased and terms of trade worsened, squeezing out inefficient farms--while part-timing increased. Considering this evidence, it is hard not to come to the conclusion, that even if economies of scale exist in agriculture, they are of minor magnitude and significance.

Another type of observed economies of scale, this time transitory, arises when some farmers lag behind the others as the economic environment changes and optimal farm size is growing. Then operators who are late to recognize the changing circumstances, produce in sub-optimal farms and at genuinely high costs. Late-comers may affect measured returns to scale in the industry, but being transitory, this phenomenon is not an indication of economies of scale which is a long run static concept.

Measurement

Several methods have been employed to test for the existence of scale economies including the survival technique, synthetic firm studies, and the sum of the coefficients of Cobb-Douglas production functions.

According to the survival technique (Stigler, Saving), growth of firms in an industry is an indication that large firms are more efficient than small ones; that is, economies of scale exist. However, the application of this method to agriculture is problematic. An implicit assumption of the method is that economic conditions have not changed. This is not true for American agriculture. Also, in this sector, the labor input per farm has not grown (Table 1, lines 4 and 5). Thus the large increase in size cannot be the text book case of increasing returns to scale.

If both increasing returns and rising cost of labor prevail, farms may grow in size while labor input is reduced (relatively or absolutely). But then an identification problem arises: which was the factor causing growth? We suggest below that changing relative cost of labor, not scale economies, induced farm growth. Moreover, by the logic of the survival technique, the existence of part-time farming, and particularly the fact that it increased during the 1950's and 1960's suggests the absence of economies of scale in agriculture.

Synthetic firm studies are reviewed by Madden and Partenheimer. The difficulty with these studies is that problems of management and coordination and differences in skills and ability of farmers cannot be appropriately accounted for. These problems are considered the major sources of diseconomies of scale. Unless they can be taken account of, the measurement of scale economies by synthetic cost studies is meaningless.

Summing the coefficients of Cobb-Douglas production functions is probably the most common method of measuring scale economies in agriculture, although not the only method (see for example, Kumbhaker, Biswas, and Bailey; Hornbaker, Dixon and Sonka;

Moschini). To update the results of previous studies, we fitted an aggregate agricultural production function to U.S. data for the census years 1978, 1982, and 1987. To ensure comparability with the earlier studies, we utilized as much as possible the original Griliches (1964) specification and the Cobb-Douglas form. With five inputs (15 variables) and only 48 observations, the outcome of the more general translog form cannot be relied upon. The results are presented in Table 2.

A summary of the sum of coefficients for the census years 1949 to 1987 obtained from previous studies and from Table 2 is shown in Table 3. The Davis study also followed the Griliches specification.

With the exception of 1964, the sum of coefficients averaged in the neighborhood of 1.3 from 1949 through 1974, with no discernable trend. The 1978-82-87 sums are almost identical to the earlier estimates. Thus there is no evidence to suggest that the sum of coefficients is converging to one. The remarkable thing about these results is that the sum of coefficients is relatively constant and larger than one during the entire 1949-87 period. This includes the time when farm size grew rapidly, 1949-1974, when farm size was relatively stable, 1974-1982, and when farm size grew modestly, 1982-1987. If the sum of the coefficients is an indicator of scale economies, one would expect it to be larger when farm size grew rapidly than when it did not. Whatever the sum of coefficients is picking up, it does not appear to be measuring economies of scale.

The findings of scale economies reported in Tables 2 and 3 as well as similar results from previous studies can be questioned on grounds that the inability to measure management causes the sum of coefficients to be biased upward. Unlike the labor input

TABLE 2. *Production Functions

<u>INPUTS</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1982</u>	<u>1987</u>
Land and Bldgs.	.103(2.63)	.110(2.25)	.128(3.73)
Labor	.267(5.17)	.270(4.52)	.219(3.70)
Machinery	.231(3.75)	.272(3.29)	.150(2.79)
Fert. and Chemicals	.274(9.24)	.206(7.00)	.272(9.06)
Other	.427(14.5)	.427(10.9)	.521(13.7)
R ²	.977	.962	.971
Sum of Coef.	1.30	1.29	1.29

* Figures in parentheses are t-ratios. See Appendix for description of variables.

Table 3. Sum of Coefficients, Farm Size, and the Wage-Rental Ratio
 United States, 1949-87.

<u>Source</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Sum of Coef.</u>	<u>Farm Size: Acres</u>	<u>Wage-Rental Ratio (1987=100)</u>
Griliches	1949-54-59	1.28	216,242,303	56,70,78
Davis	1964	1.18	352	89
"	1969	1.28	389	104
"	1974	1.28	440	67
Table 2	1978	1.29	449	83
"	1982	1.29	440	74
"	1987	1.30	461	100

that can in principle be measured correctly, management is unobservable. In general, one may expect management to be complementary to most other inputs--an operator with greater ability can manage a larger operation. Thus management is correlated with size and economies of scale will tend to be overestimated. Other unobserved fixed factors have a similar effect on the estimates. The following analysis of this issue is due to Mundlak; it was later expanded by Hoch and Mundlak, and by Hoch. It is recapitulated here in some detail because of its importance.

Let the firm (farm) production function be

$$(1) Y = F(X, M)$$

where Y = output

X = a vector of observable inputs

M = firm specific factors, management or other fixed factors.

In general M is unobserved and not measured. The estimated production function is then,

$$(2) Y = f(X).$$

With the specification in (2), firms are on different functions--each according to its M value.

Better environmental conditions, more productive soil, superior location, as well as better management--are all reflected in higher (often unobserved) firm specific factors. Consequently, complementarity prevails between the firm specific factors and other inputs. As a result, total inputs (observed plus unobserved) will be underestimated

on large farms relative to small farms, biasing regression coefficients, and giving the appearance that large farms are more efficient than small ones.

Given panel data and assuming that the farm specific effects are constant over the period of observation, the bias can be eliminated if, instead of OLS estimates of the pooled function, a covariance analysis is employed; that is, if firm dummy variables are included in the analysis. In covariance analysis the regression is estimated not from the original observations, but from deviations from the firm means. If, as assumed, M is constant, the deviations are all zeros and all firms are on the same function. The estimated coefficients are then unbiased "within" firm estimates.

Hoch summarized 6 previous studies that had reported both OLS and analysis of covariance of farm level production functions. In all 6 cases, the sum of the coefficients in the covariance analysis was less than 85 percent of the sum calculated from the OLS estimates and in all cases the sum was smaller than 1. In his own analysis of dairy farms, reported in the same paper, Hoch found that covariance analysis reduced the sum of coefficients to levels smaller than one for 10 samples of farms producing milk for market. He found, however, increasing returns to scale (and higher sums of coefficients) for two samples of dairies producing for manufacturing. To our knowledge this is the only reported evidence of covariance analysis increasing the sum of the coefficients, and the only case in which increasing returns were found with covariance analysis.

When farm level data are not used, agricultural production functions are usually estimated for the average farm in a state, a region, or a country. Random aggregation within regions cancels out farm specific effects and eliminates the associated specification

biases. However, regions are also characterized by regional specific effects, such as soil, climate or economic circumstances, and in samples of individual farms coming from different regions, the regional effects have to be accounted for. Again, one way to do it is to include regional dummy variables in the regressions. Failure to include such dummies, failure to account for the regional specific effects, results in specification biases. These specification biases are augmented by regional aggregation. Hence the bias in the estimated sums of the coefficients in Cobb-Douglas functions is likely to be more serious when the observations are regional or country averages than when they are farm level data (Kislev).

Since soil, climate and other growing conditions differ among the states, one would expect the sum of coefficients to be biased upward. For an additional test of this hypothesis, we conducted a covariance analysis for the inter-country productivity estimates of Hayami and Ruttan. They found increasing returns to scale for the developed countries in their sample and constant returns for the developing countries. We recalculated their regression for the developed countries (Q21 in their Table 6-2) but with country dummies. The sum of the coefficients was 1.320 without the dummies and 1.077 with the dummies. The latter sum was not significantly different from 1 (the standard error of the sum was 0.119). In another study, Capalbo reports decreasing returns to scale ($\sum b_i = .8$) from an aggregate agricultural production function estimated by OLS from time series data (Capalbo). However the data employed in this study were aggregate output and inputs rather than per farm observations. Consequently nothing

can be said about scale economies from these results. Scale economies relates to the size of the firm not to the size of the industry.

Before leaving this section, a caveat should be added about covariance analysis. In general, random errors in the measurement of the observed variables cause underestimation of the regression coefficients. Griliches (1985) shows that covariance analysis may exacerbate the effect of measurement errors. By giving up "between" variability we run into the danger of increasing the "noise to signal" ratio. For our discussion of economies of scale, this possibility is particularly worrying--empirical observations are never error free. The message here is, again, that one cannot rely on a single source of evidence. Continuing with the survey of evidence, we turn now to the examination of the consequences of scale economies.

Consequences

Returns to scale, if they actually exist in agriculture, affect significantly both the economics of agriculture and our understanding of the farm sector. As long as the sources of the phenomenon are not clearly defined, the term "economies of scale," just like the term "technical change," is, in a sense, a name for our ignorance. To see how ignorant, consider the following. Between 1929 and 1987 gross output per farm in the U.S. increased 6.4 fold (Table 1, line 1). If inputs were all accounted for and perfectly measured, and constant returns to scale prevailed, inputs also would have increased 6.4 times and output per unit of input would have remained constant. If in fact the agricultural production function is homogeneous of degree 1.3, then the input growth

necessary to achieve a 6.4 fold growth in output would have been 4.2 instead of 6.4 ($4.2^{1.3} = 6.4$). In other words, over one-third of the increase in per farm output would be left unexplained [$(6.4-4.2)/6.4 = .35$]. As a degree of homogeneity, 1.3 is a very large number.

Economies of scale also affect the distribution of the returns to the factors of production. If, again, the production function is homogeneous of degree 1.3, and inputs are paid their VMPs, the sum total of payment to all factors will be \$1.30 for each dollar of output (Euler's Theorem). If, however, land and management constrain the size of the farm, and all other factors are purchased freely on the market (including own labor which can also be regarded as "purchased" in a free market), then prices will equal VMPs for the purchased inputs--land and management becoming the residual claimants. By the estimates of Table 2, in which management is not included, the production elasticity of land (its factor share) is .12. It follows that the purchased inputs receive $.88 \times \$1.30 = \1.14 for each dollar of output. This leaves land with a negative return. Of course, such an outcome is implausible. Land rents and land prices have not been zero (Table 1, lines 8 and 9).

Dynamic consideration can, however, be used to explain positive land values in the face of negative residual returns. If scale economies are viewed as a temporary disequilibrium, then as farms grow to a size sufficiently large to capture all scale economies so that constant returns prevail, the residual return to land will at this point become positive. Given a sufficiently low rate of interest, the discounted present value of these positive future returns also could be positive. However, this argument does not

explain the positive land rents which prevailed throughout the period. Nor does it explain the apparent inability of land buyers to revise their expectations after decades of allegedly negative residual returns to land. A realization that increasing returns were not temporary should have led to a decrease in real land prices during the 1970's. Just the opposite occurred. Changes in inflationary expectations along with changes in real rates of interest appear to have had a larger impact on real land prices during the 1970's and 1980's than changes in expectations regarding the attainment of a constant returns to scale equilibrium. A likely reason is that land buyers and sellers did not perceive a disequilibrium to exist. Neither is there any evidence in the land market literature of the existence of such a disequilibrium.

Farm Growth

The major consequence attributed to economies of scale is growth of farm size. And indeed American farms grew significantly up to the mid 1970's (Table, lines 1, 2, and 3). However, economies of scale are not the only force driving farm growth. In an earlier paper we presented an alternative explanation; namely, that capital intensity and farm size are determined by the price ratio between labor and machinery (Kislev and Peterson, 1982). For farming, the price of labor is the alternative earning opportunities outside agriculture (Table 1, line 12). The cost of machinery is harder to measure. Theoretically it is the rental price. In agriculture a rental market for machinery services exists in the form of custom work for hire. We, therefore, measured the cost of machinery services as the real value of custom rates in combine harvesting of wheat (Table 1, line 11).

From 1929 to 1974, real custom rates declined. The increase in quality of machines and the decrease in the real cost of energy likely were important factors contributing to this decline. At the same time the opportunity cost of farm labor increased (Table 1, line 12) causing the wage to rental ratio to increase even more (line 13). These relative price changes provided farmers with an incentive to increase the amount of machinery on farms enabling the family farm to cultivate a larger amount of land and in order to maintain parity income growth with the nonfarm sector. Similarly, operators of livestock enterprises were able to enlarge their herds and flocks due to a higher capital intensity. In our paper virtually all of the growth in farm size over the 1930-70 period is explained by the model without reference to "economies of scale" or "technological change." The increase in real nonfarm earnings provided an incentive for many farmers to leave agriculture for alternative occupations. The "pull" effect of higher nonfarm wages appears to have dominated the "push" effect of lower machine costs (Peterson and Kislev). In turn, off-farm migration increased the land available to each remaining farmer. Seen from this perspective, as urban wages rise, farmers are induced to either move to town, or those that remain full-time farmers, to increase the amount of resources at their command to keep income in parity with alternative occupations.

During the 1970's, history extended our experiment in a new direction and provided new evidence when the wage to rental ratio sharply declined (Table 1, line 13). As shown in Table 3, there is a strong correlation between changes in the wage-rental ratio and changes in farm size. From 1949 to 1969 the wage-rental ratio steadily increased, along with farm size. Coinciding with the energy crisis in the mid 1970's, the

wage-rental ratio exhibited a sharp decrease. At the same time, growth in farm size abruptly stopped. Average farm size remained relatively constant over the next ten years. During the mid 1980's, the wage-rental ratio resumed its upward trend. The latest figures show a resumption of the growth in farm size during this time.

In general, the wage-rental ratio provides a better explanation for changes in farm size, and a better predictor of these changes, than the sum of coefficients which exhibited no decline towards unity when farm size growth ceased.

Because farms are operated by a constant amount of quality adjusted labor, much of the increased machinery input has taken the form of larger machines, although new machines such as tomato and fruit harvesters and cotton pickers, also have been developed. Technologically, large machines could have been built a long time ago and indeed they were built--earth moving equipment for example. In fact the first four-wheel-drive tractors were assembled by farmers in the 1950's, so widespread and simple was the technology. Only afterwards did the machinery companies produce these large tractors. Here, as in other cases, the companies reacted to economic changes, once they were reflected in demand. The decision of manufacturers to build larger machines is not an exogenous factor determining farm size.

One might argue that the U.S. income tax law which taxed the earnings from capital at lower rates than earnings from labor through investment credits and accelerated depreciation promoted the growth of large capital intensive farms. This may be true, although Batte and Sonka report that increasing marginal income tax rates reduced the advantages of large scale farms (Batte and Sonka). To the extent that the

income tax law reduced the price of capital relative to that of labor, it would, according to our farm size model, have contributed to the increase in farm size. But unless the tax law continued to lower the price of capital, it would have resulted in a once and for all change in equilibrium farm size, not a continued increase.

Farm mechanization can be viewed a process of induced innovation. Changing factor prices for agriculture, including the price of energy, induced the machine companies to produce more efficient and larger machines. These changes also induced agricultural research to produce appropriate biological and chemical technologies. Changes in factor prices induced the suppliers of factors and technology to innovate. An alternative view, that innovations occurred on the farm which in turn increased the demand for machinery even at higher real prices, cannot be supported by any evidence that we know of (Kislev and Peterson, 1981).

Concluding Remarks

We have conducted a multidimensional examination of the hypothesis that agricultural production is characterized by increasing returns to scale and find that it is not supported by the evidence. We focused on general trends: determinants of average farm size and its growth. Our conclusion does not deny the possibility that economies of scale exist in certain types of farms or periods, but that such economies do not explain overall growth in unit size in agriculture. Of course, at a point in time farm size will exhibit substantial variation around the mean because of differences in managerial ability

among farmers (Sumner and Leiby). The better the manager, the larger the output that minimizes average total cost.

We found again that the evidence supports the hypothesis that farm size is endogenously determined by the wage rental ratio as it affects machinery on farms and farm size. Since labor per farm has been relatively constant, deepening capital intensity has taken the form of larger machinery. As always, some farmers are earlier adopters of larger machines; others follow with a lag. Statistical estimates and synthetic analysis may then indicate returns to scale as the latecomers close the gap. But short run disequilibria should not be confused with scale economies which are a static concept, to be viewed in a long run context after adjustment has run its course.

Discarding "economies of scale" as an explanation of farm growth eliminates a lacuna in our understanding of the economics of the farm sector. At the same time the discussion highlights an old-new puzzle: what are the economic, technological, and institutional factors that support the family unit as the dominant form of organization and maintain it through periods of large economic and technical change? The solution to this puzzle will do much to improve our understanding of the structure of agriculture.

References

Batte, Marvin, T. and Steven T. Sonka. "Before and After Tax Size Economies: An Example for Cash Grain Production in Illinois." American Journal of Agricultural Economics. 67(1985):600-609.

Bieri, Jurg, Alain de Janvry and Andrew Schmitz. "Agricultural Technology and the Distribution of Welfare Gains." American Journal of Agricultural Economics. 54(1972):801-8.

Capalbo, Susan M. "A Comparison of Econometric Models of U.S. Agricultural Productivity and Aggregate Technology," Ch. 5 in Susan M. Capalbo and John M. Antle (eds.) Agricultural Productivity, Measurement and Explanation, Resources for the Future, 1988.

Davis, Jeffrey, "Stability of the Research Production Coefficient for U.S. Agriculture," Unpublished Ph.D Dissertation, Univ. of Minn. 1979.

Friedman, Milton, Price Theory, Chicago: Aladine, 1962.

Griliches, Zvi, "Data Problems in Econometrics." Handbook of Econometrics, ed. Z. Griliches and M. Intriligator. Amsterdam: North Holland, 1985.

_____, "The Source of Measured Productivity Growth: United States Agriculture, 1940-60." Journal of Political Economy. 71(1963):331-346.

_____, "Research Expenditures, Education, and the Aggregate Agricultural Production Function", American Economic Review. 54(1964) 961-974.

Hayami, Yujiro and Vernon W. Ruttan. Agricultural Development, An International Perspective. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985, 2nd edition.

Hoch, Irving. "Estimation of Production Function Parameters Combining Time Series and Cross-Section Data." Econometrica. 30(1962):34-53.

Hornbaker, R. H., B. L. Dixon and S. T. Sonka, "Estimating Production Activity Costs for Multioutput Firms with a Random Coefficient Regression Model," AJAE, 71(1989):167-77.

Kislev, Yoav, "Overestimates of Returns to Scale in Agriculture--A Case of Synchronized Aggregation," Journal of Farm Economics. 48(1966)967-83.

Kislev, Yoav and Willis Peterson. "Induced Innovations and Farm Mechanization." American Journal of Agricultural Economics. 63(1981):562-65.

_____, "Prices, Technology and Farm Size", Journal of Political Economy. 90(1982):578-595.

Kumbhakar, S. C., B. Biswas and D. Bailey. "A Study of Economic Efficiency of Utah Farmers: A System Approach." Review of Economics and Statistics, 71(1989):595-604.

Madden, Patrick J. and Earl J. Partenheimer. "Evidence of Economies and Diseconomies of Farm Size." Size, Structure, and Future of Farms ed. Gordon A. Ball and Earl O. Heady. Ames: Iowa University Press, 1972.

Moschini, G. "Nonparametric and Semiparametric Estimation: An Analysis of Multiproduct Returns to Scale," AJAE, 72(1990):589-96.

Mundlak, Yair, "Empirical Production Function Free of Management Bias." Journal of Farm Economics. 43(1968):44-56.

Mundlak, Yair and Irving Hoch, "Consequences of Alternative Specifications in Estimation of Cobb-Douglas Production Functions," Econometrica, 33(1965): 814-28.

Peterson, Willis and Yoav Kislev. "The Cotton Harvester in Retrospect: Labor Displacement or Replacement?" Journal of Economic History, 46(1986):199-216.

Ruttan, Vernon W. "Scale, Size, Technology and Structure: A Personal Perspective," in Lindon J. Robinson (ed.) Determinants of Farm Size and Structure, Department of Agricultural Economics, Michigan State University, Dec. 1988.

Saving, Thomas R. "Estimation of Optimum Size of Plant by the Survivor Technique." Quarterly Journal of Economics, 75(1961):569-607.

Stigler, George, J. "The Economies of Scale." Journal of Law and Economics, 1(1958):54-71.

Sumner, D. A. and J. D. Leiby. An Econometric Analysis of the Effects of Human Capital, Size and Growth Among Dairy Farms," AJAE 69:(1987)465-70.

Appendix

Data Sources and Definitions for Table 1.

Unless otherwise noted, all references are published by the Government Printing Office in Washington.

1. **Gross Output:** Cash receipts from farming plus value of home consumption from Agricultural Statistics, respective years. In all cases number of farms are from Agricultural Statistics.
2. **Value Added:** Gross output less feed, seed, livestock, fertilizer, and miscellaneous expenses from Agricultural Statistics, respective years.
3. **Land:** Acres per farm from the Agricultural Census, respective years.
4. **Family Labor:** Number of family laborers per farm as reported in Agricultural Statistics 1957, 1967, and 1984, adjusted for quality by the following procedure: Income by years of schooling completed for rural males, ages 25-64, as reported by the 1980 Census of Population, was multiplied by the proportion of rural farm males in each schooling category and summed. The resulting weighted averages for the census years 1940-1980 were then utilized to construct a labor quality index, 1980-100. The labor quality indexes for the other four census years are as follows. 1940: 80, 1950: 82, 1960: 86, 1970: 93. The 1940 quality index is used to adjust the 1929 labor figure while the 1970 index was used to adjust the 1969 and 1974 figures. The 1980 index of 100 was applied to the 1978, and 1987 figures.
5. **Hired Labor:** Data source and quality adjustment procedure are the same as for family labor.

6. Part-time (PT) Farming: Proportion of farm operators working 100 days or more off the farm as reported by the Census of Agriculture, 1929, 1949, 1959, 1974, 1978, and 1987.
7. Machinery: Stock of machines on farms obtained by summing the value of shipments over the preceding 15 years, each year deflated by the CPI. Data sources: Statistical Abstract, 1928 and Agricultural Statistics, respective years.
8. Land price: Value of land per acre, excluding buildings, as reported by USDA/ERS, "Farm Real Estate Historical Series Data", Statistical Bulletins 520, 1973 and 738, 1985, and Agricultural Statistics, 1988.
9. Land rent: Cash rent per acre of cropland, 1969-1982, in the following eight midwestern states: MI, WI, MN OH, IN, IL, IA, and MO. Data source: USDA, ERS and ESCS, Farm Real Estate Market Developments" 1972, 1977, 1981, 1985, and 1989. Rental data for these states are not available prior to 1967. The 1959 figure was estimated by the following procedure: Oscar Burt reports a rental figure of \$17 per acre for Illinois in 1959 (Burt, p. 26). His 1969 figure for Illinois is \$30 per acre. The corresponding figure of 1969 for the eight midwestern states is \$25 per acre, or 83 percent of the Illinois rent. We therefore estimated the 1959 rent for the eight states as $.83 \times \$17 = \14 in current year prices, or \$54 in constant 1987 prices. Figures for 1987 are from USDA, ERS, Agricultural Land Values and Markets: Outlook and Situation Report, June, 1988.
10. Diesel fuel: Data source: Agricultural Statistics, 1953, 1963, 1973, 1977, 1981, and 1988. Figure for 1949 is price of distillate.

11. Custom Rate: Charge per acre of custom harvesting of wheat in Kansas. The 1929 figure is from L.A. Reynoldson et. al., "The Combined Harvester - Thresher in the Great Plains", USDA Technical Bulletin,, no. 70 (February 1928), P. 35. The 1949 rate is from H.J. Friesen et. al. "1952-53 Custom rates for Farm Operators in Central Kansas", Kansas Agricultural Economic Report, no. 59 (1953)p. 14. The remaining custom rates are from an annual publication, "Kansas Custom Rates", 1970, 1975, 1980, and 1989, published by the Kansas Crop and Livestock Reporting Service.
12. Manufacturing wages: Gross weekly earnings in manufacturing as reported in the Economic Report of the President, 1969, and 1990.
13. Line 12 divided by line 11, expressed as an index, 1987-100.

Description of Production Function Variables

Output Sales plus value of home consumption plus inventory change plus government program payments. The sales figures are from the Census of Agriculture, respective years. Figures other than sales are from USDA, ERS, Economic Indicators of the Farm Sector, 1988. All values are in constant 1977 prices. Each State's output was deflated by a weighted average USDA price index for livestock and crops with weights equal to the proportion of livestock and crop output in each state.

Land and Buildings. Value from Census of Agriculture, respective years deflated state by state by the land and buildings price index, with each state equal to 100 in 1977.

Labor Operator plus hired labor from the Census of Agriculture. Operator labor was adjusted for proportion of farmers working 200 or more days off the farm. Hired labor was converted to days by dividing by the farm wage rate from Agricultural Statistics. In the 1980 Census of Population, differences among states in the educational level of farm people are negligible. Hence adjusting labor for quality differences had no effect on the coefficients.

Machinery Annual depreciation from "Farm Income Data: A Historical Perspective," USDA, ERS, Statistical Bulletin 740, May 1986, deflated by custom rate price index for combine harvesting of wheat in Kansas.

Fertilizer and Chemicals. Value from Census of Agriculture, respective years. deflated by the USDA fertilizer price index.

Other All other production expenses from Census of Agriculture, respective years, deflated by the USDA farm and motor supplies price index. All price indexes, except custom rates, are from Agricultural Statistics.

All variables are measured on a per farm basis.