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## Motivation and objectives

> Two typical simultaneous trends in developed countries
$\downarrow$ Number of farms
$\uparrow$ Average size of farms in terms of UAA
$>$ Does this mean farmland concentration (FLC) ?
The distribution of hectares among farms
> Objectives
Measure farmland concentration


$$
F L C=0
$$

Distribution in space and evolution in time
with particular attention on agricultural policies

## Measuring farmland concentration

> The Lorenz curve and the Gini coefficient

| Size Class | \# farms | \# hectares |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Less than 1 ha | 33015 | 12874 |
| 1 to 2 ha | 28832 | 41894 |
| 2 to 5 ha | 53985 | 179104 |
| 5 to 10 ha | 44686 | 319130 |
| 10 to 20 ha | 50787 | 729405 |
| 20 to 50 ha | 98791 | 3361998 |
| 50 to 75 ha | 62387 | 3846365 |
| 75 to 100 ha | 44111 | 3825540 |
| 100 to 150 ha | 49223 | 5972464 |
| 150 to 200 ha | 22232 | 3812169 |
| More than 200 ha | 18871 | 5254886 |



## A parametric Lorenz curve

> A functional form proposed by Rasche et al. (1980)

$$
L(u)=\left(1-(1-u)^{\alpha}\right)^{1 / \beta}
$$

$>$ Then

$$
G=1-\frac{2}{\alpha} B(1 / \alpha, 1+1 / \beta)
$$

$>$ In this example:
Empirical Gini: 0.581
Parametric Gini: 0.587


## A 2-step econometric approach

> Step 1: a non linear least-square fit of the Lorenz curve

$$
\begin{aligned}
& h=L(n)+\varepsilon \\
& \text { with } \quad L(n)=\left(1-(1-u)^{\alpha}\right)^{1 / \beta} \\
& \\
& \quad \alpha=f\left(X ; \theta_{\alpha}\right) \\
& \\
& \\
& \\
& \\
& \\
& 0<\alpha\left(X ; \theta_{\beta}\right) \\
& 0<\alpha \leq 1
\end{aligned}
$$

> Step 2: a linear regression

$$
\hat{G}=\gamma_{0}+\sum_{l} \gamma_{l} \cdot Z_{l}+\varepsilon
$$

## Data used

> Lorenz curves: Farm Structures Surveys for France
12 years from 1963 to 2007
90 "départements" (NUTS3)
11 size classes (except for some dates: min. 8, max. 13)
> Explanatory variables
Step 1: constant, trend, fixed effects and interactions
Step 2: variables which are assumed to

- change the number and size of farms
- alleviate or favor concentration
agricultural (incl. structural) policies control variables
At the "département" level and lagged variables whenever possible


## Results - step 1 (1/2)

$>$ Adjusted $\mathrm{R}^{2}=.999$ (11520 obs.)
> Distribution of $\hat{G}$



## Results - step 1 (2/2)

## $>$ The effect of time

| Parameter | Estimate |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\alpha$ | $0.00307^{* * *}$ |
|  | $(0.00084)$ |
| $\beta$ | $-0.00489^{* * *}$ |
|  | $(0.00085)$ |




## Results - step 2

|  | Estimate | Robust Std. Err | t stat. | $\mathrm{P}>\|\mathrm{t}\|$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Constant | 0.1035709 | 0.4607447 | 0.22 | 0.822 |
| Av. UAA 1967 | $\mathbf{- 0 . 0 0 0 7 5 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 0 2 5 6 1}$ | $\mathbf{- 2 . 9 4}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 3}$ |
| Share >50 years old | 0.8554284 | 0.6542553 | 1.31 | 0.191 |
| Av. rate decrease N | -0.0852655 | 0.0741984 | -1.15 | 0.251 |
| Income / LFU (-1) | 0.0000003 | 0.0000002 | 1.56 | 0.119 |
| Milk Quota | $\mathbf{0 . 0 7 1 2 3 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 4 2 0 4 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 6 9}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 9 1}$ |
| Mountain. Area | $\mathbf{- 0 . 0 3 9 2 5 4}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 6 9 9 4 4}$ | $\mathbf{- 5 . 6 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 0}$ |
| 1 $^{\text {st }}$ Pillar (-1) | -0.0000507 | 0.0000916 | -0.55 | 0.580 |
| 2 $^{\text {nd }}$ Pillar (-1) | $\mathbf{- 0 . 0 0 0 9 3 5 6}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 0 3 6 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{- 2 . 5 6}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 1 1}$ |
| 1P+2P / Prod. (-1) | $\mathbf{- 0 . 1 6 1 6 2 4 9}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 4 7 4 5 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{- 3 . 4 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1}$ |
| Farmer Settl. (-1) | $\mathbf{- 0 . 0 0 0 0 1 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 0 0 1 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 . 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 7 3}$ |
| Early Retir. (-1) | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 0 3 7 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 0 1 9 5 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 5 8}$ |
| Consol. area (-1) | -0.0002859 | 0.0002043 | -1.40 | 0.162 |
| SAFER's activity (-1) | 0.0022338 | 0.0017889 | 1.25 | 0.212 |
| Share Agr. added v. (-1) | 1.2399170 | 1.0250420 | 1.21 | 0.227 |
| Share UAA (-1) | $\mathbf{- 0 . 2 5 7 5 1 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 1 8 0 5 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 4 . 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 0}$ |
| Ar. land price (-1) | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 0 0 1 6 3}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 0 0 0 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{8 . 5 8}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 0}$ |

> 988 observations
$>$ Adjusted $\mathrm{R}^{2}=0.434$
> Significant at 5\%
With positive impact
With negative impact
$>$ Significant at 10\%

## Main conclusions

> FLC: a multi-dimensional concept
$>$ Increase in FLC is not a systematic feature
> Main factors influencing FLC
Land scarcity
Structural policies (incl. milk quotas)
CAP 2nd pillar payments

## Perspectives

## $>$ A one-step method

Directly derive the impact of explanatory variables on $G$

$$
\hat{\gamma}_{l}=\frac{\partial \hat{G}}{\partial X_{l}}=\hat{\alpha}_{l} \frac{\partial \hat{G}}{\partial \alpha}+\hat{\beta}_{l} \frac{\partial \hat{G}}{\partial \beta}
$$

But puzzling preliminary results:

| 2 steps |  | 1 step |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Estimate | $\mathrm{P}>\|\mathrm{t}\|$ | Estimate | $\mathrm{P}>\|\mathrm{t}\|$ |
| $\ldots$ |  |  |  |  |
| Share >50 years | 0.8554284 | 0.191 | -0.2059332 | 0.413 |
| 1P+2P / Prod (-1) | -0.1616249 | $0.001^{* * *}$ | -0.1840513 | 0.392 |
| SAFER's act. $(-1)$ | 0.0022338 | 0.212 | 0.0012697 | $0.026^{* *}$ |
| Share UAA $(-1)$ | -0.2575128 | $0.000^{* * *}$ | -0.2001216 | $0.000^{* * *}$ |

Any comment or suggestion?

## Thank you for your attention!



