

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
<a href="http://ageconsearch.umn.edu">http://ageconsearch.umn.edu</a>
<a href="mailto:aesearch@umn.edu">aesearch@umn.edu</a>

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.

## INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF AGRARIAN AFFAIRS Vol. III, No. 3, September 1962

# Contemporary Problems in the Economics of Agriculture

Produced by the University of Oxford Institute of Agrarian Affairs in conjunction with the International Association of Agricultural Economists

Price 10s. 6d. net
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON

#### GROUP 2(a). FARM MANAGEMENT

Chairman: Erly Dias Brandao, Brazil Secretary: Donald K. Freebairn, Mexico

#### Consultants

Mario Pereira, Portugal Emilio Montero, Uruguay

Gregorio Alfaro, Costa Rica Nelson Amaral, Uruguay Alberto Amigo, Argentina Luis Gerardo Cardenas, Peru Angel Paredes Díaz, Peru Guillermo Guerra, Colombia Ciro Salvador Gutiérrez, Argentina Ivan Katchuro, U.S.S.R. José Carlos Kohout, Argentina Vladimir Koulijov, U.S.S.R. Heraclio A. Lombardo, Panama Mateo Vázquez Morales, Mexico Miguel A. Muñoz, Costa Rica Juan F. Romero Ordeig, Spain Luis García de Oteyza, Spain Oscar Benavides Robles, Costa Rica Manuel Hernández Ruiz, Mexico Alexander Tchehovski, U.S.S.R. Angel R. Vaquero, El Salvador Alvaro F. Villalobos, Peru Venedict Vinogradov, U.S.S.R.

#### Translated from Spanish

Discussion of research methods led to an appreciation of the necessity for careful formulation of the problems to be studied, of specific definition of objectives and of the establishment of working hypotheses to guide investigation. Accepting these factors as fundamental, the group spent most of its time discussing more specific problems in carrying out research.

Delineation of specific regions to be studied was considered important. Working in a homogeneous area helps to formulate meaningful problems and simplifies the task of suggesting likely solutions. This applies to each of three types of study: (a) those designed to help guide farmers in their decision making, (b) those designed to study the problems of development of a region, and (c) studies of a macroeconomic nature for the determination of agricultural policy. Emphasis was given to alternative methods of delineating regions for those studies designed to help farmers in their decisions. It was suggested that a 'natural region' could be defined which would be homogeneous with respect to ecological conditions of temperature, rainfall, soils and agrarian structure, along with generally similar locational factors with respect to transport and market opportunities. Some members believed that types-of-farming regions should be defined and used for farm-management studies. Those who have done this recognize the difficulties they encounter because of inadequate data. They are dependent on using the smallest census reporting units which are often too large (with single reporting units overlapping two or more natural divisions between types-of-farming regions). There is also the problem of making a number of arbitrary decisions in defining a type-offarming region.

Today farm management research workers have numerous alternative methods of analysis. Discussion turned on group comparisons or tabular analysis, budgeting, production function analysis and, briefly, on linear programming. Some of the group believed that simple description and the use of group comparisons or tabular analysis are the only appropriate methods at this stage of research experience in Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking countries. They held that there is a natural sequence in the development of research in farm management and that descriptive analysis and group comparisons are the starting-point. After experience has been gained with this method and after a large stock of reliable data has been accumulated. the researcher can use more powerful analytical models. The objection to this limited approach is that a problem should be carefully formulated, that specific objectives should be established, and that all possible alternative methods of attacking the problem should be considered. The method of analysis to be selected should be the one which promises the best results considering the human and financial resources and the time available for studying the problem.

Differing views of methods of analysis were due to differing views of the sources of data for research. Data can be obtained from a number of sources, including farm surveys, farm accounting, experimental results, and engineering processes. The principal sources used by members of the group have been farm surveys and farm accounts. In actual experience a wide variation in results has been obtained from the survey method. The proportion of valid records has varied from 20 to 95 per cent. with different investigators. Some of this has been due to differences in the standards used for evaluating the validity of records, but another factor is the differences in farming conditions in various parts of the world.

Those who achieve only about 20 per cent. valid records on a probability-type survey have tended to select farms for inclusion in their studies. The selection is subjective, based on confidence in the enumerator and on an evaluation of 'typical' farms in the area. Other investigators who have higher percentages of valid records in their surveys have objected to the use of subjective considerations in the



GROUP 2 (a). FARM MANAGEMENT

#### First row, left to right:

Mateo Vázquez Morales, Mexico Ciro Salvador Gutierrez, Argentina Alberto Amigo, Argentina Jose Carlos Kohout, Argentina Donald K. Freebairn, Mexico Erly Dias Brandao, Brazil Mario Pereira, Portugal Emilio Montero, Uruguay Luis García de Oteyza, Spain Juan F. Romero Ordeig, Spain Alexander Tchehovski, U.S.S.R. Vladimir Koulijov, U.S.S.R.

#### Second row, left to right:

Angel R. Vaquero, El Salvador
Oscar Benavides Robles, Costa Rica
Manuel Hernández Ruiz, Mexico
Miguel A. Muñoz, Costa Rica
Nelson Amaral, Uruguay
Heraclio A. Lombardo, Panama
Gregorio Alfaro, Costa Rica
Alvaro F. Villalobos, Peru
Luis Gerardo Cardenas, Peru
Angel Paredes Díaz, Peru
Guillermo Guerra, Colombia
Ivan Katchuro, U.S.S.R.
Venedict Vinogradov, U.S.S.R.

selection of the sample. They want to determine the problems of a zone and therefore need to know about all the farmers. A purposive sampling technique can be efficient depending on the uses to which the resulting data will be put.

There was agreement that the results of farm management investigation must get into the hands of farmers in such a manner that they can understand the results and try to apply them in their farm business decisions. Some members have enjoyed particular success in getting the results of studies based on group comparisons back to farmers. They have also used the results of budget analysis in research related to supervised credit programmes. There was complete agreement that farm management specialists cannot and should not be asked to calculate costs of production for the purposes of price fixing. The group was divided in opinion as to whether or not the incidence of overhead costs can be determined with sufficient accuracy to justify cost studies for helping to select optimum enterprise combinations on particular farms or for evaluating interregional competition for producing particular products.

Among methods advocated for improving methods of communication between workers in farm management in Latin America was one to the effect that an organization such as the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences should develop a Spanish terminology on the subject.