



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.

1987

[Notes on technology]

Symposium:

Synthesizing Structure and Technological Changes

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
DAVIS

SEP 15 1987

Agricultural Economics Library

Topic:

Modelling Structure/Technology Relationships

"Sub-Topic":

"Reflect One or Two Experiences You Consider Important"

Structure of What?

- size distribution of "farms" (issue - what are "real" farms?)
- distribution of human capital (see Cunningham-Dunlop 1987; Macartney, 1987)

What Technology?

Hypothesis:

if the new "bio" technology is really more management-intensive and less tied to purchase of capital in which the technology is embodied,
then "bio" technology adoption rates
and the net returns to "adopting" a given level of "bio" technology should be relatively more associated with "MANAGERIAL ABILITY"

Background:

Previous research has shown that managerial ability, to the extent it is capture by years of formal education, contributes positively to net returns. (For Canadian examples, see Furtan and Bollman, AJAE, November, 1979 and Cunningham-Dunlop, 1987.) This was in the context of machinery and petro-chemical (eg. fertilizer) technology utilization.

Bollman, Ray D.

AAEA-1987

More recent research (Shapiro et al, AJAE, May, 1987) addresses the issue of whether structure influences growth rates. (The answer was yes, but not enough to prevent continuing concentration from "spontaneous drift".) Since growth rates are not random across all firm sizes, a model of farm firm growth may be specified (eg. Sumner, AJAE, May, 1987). For a descriptive presentation, see Bollman (1983).

STATISTICS CANADA'S COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE IN ADDRESSING THE HYPOTHESIS

Statistics Canada has an Agriculture - Population Linkage of the Census of Agriculture questionnaire and the Census of Population questionnaire that provides socio-economic information (eg. formal years of schooling) for each member of the census-farm operator household.

Statistics Canada has a micro longitudinal match of Census of Agriculture questionnaires for 1966, 1971, 1976, 1981, and soon for 1986. This allows us to monitor the changes at the micro level (Glabb, 1987).

We can see who is moving to what parts of the structure. We do not have good information on the technology being used. Nevertheless considerable valuable analysis could be undertaken, for example, using "150 H.P. tractors" or "summerfallow intensity" (eg. Macartney, 1984,1987) as evidence of the level of "technology".

To address the hypothesis directly, we should know who is using what technology. If we did, we could see how structure influences technology (eg. what farmers in what parts of the structure are using what technology). If we asked the same question on technology for two consecutive censuses, then we could see how technology influences structure. For example, do most of the individuals with technology "X" in fact expand their operation. Do most farmers with technology "Y" in fact quit farming?

It seems the best we can do now is to assume that more farmers are using say, embryo transplants now and this should require a higher managerial expertise (proxied by years of schooling) which should have a bigger bang for the buck now than before. However, if the embryo transplants (to continue this example) arrive on the farm as veterinary services, this would appear to be the same as the former new technology of, say, combines arriving on the farm already embodied in an input (see Jensen and Pope, 1987). Thus, I am not sure how to test my hypothesis with the data at hand!

REFERENCES

Bollman, Ray D. (1983), "Expanding and Declining Farm Firms: Number and Implications", Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics, Proceedings, Vol. 31, pp. 134-42.

Cunningham-Dunlop, Catherine (1986), "The Effect of Education on Farm Profit and Productivity in Canada", Unpublished MSc. Thesis, University of British Columbia.

Furton, W.H. and Ray D. Bollman (1979), "Returns to Operator Education in Saskatchewan", American Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol. 61, No. 2 (May), pp. 318-321.

Glabb, Brian (1987), "Farm Structure: Stocks and Flows, 1966-1981", Unpublished paper, Policy Branch, Agriculture Canada.

Jensen, Farrell E. and C. Arden Pope III (1987), "The Changing Structure of U.S. Agriculture and Implications for Research in Agribusiness Firms", Agribusiness, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 139-150.

Macartney, Les (1984), Prairie Summerfallow Intensity: An Analysis of 1981 Census Data, (Ottawa: Statistics Canada, Agriculture Division, Working Paper No. 8).

Macartney, Les (1987), "The Impact of Education on Summerfallow Use in the Canadian Prairies", Journal of Soil and Water Conservation, Vol. 42, No. 2, pp. 114-117.

Shapiro, Daniel, Ray D. Bollman and Philip Ehrensaft (1987), "Farm Size and Growth in Canada", American Journal of Agricultural Economics, May.

(Notes prepared by Ray Bollman, Statistics Canada
August 1987)