Full Research Article

Effects of switching between production systems in dairy farming

ANTONIO ALVAREZ[1], CARLOS ARIAS[2]

[1] University of Oviedo and *Oviedo Efficiency Group*
[2] University of León and *Oviedo Efficiency Group*

Abstract. The increasing intensification of dairy farming in Europe has sparked an interest in studying the economic consequences of this process. However, empirically classifying farms as extensive or intensive is not a straightforward task. In recent papers, *Latent Class Models* (*LCM*) have been used to avoid an ad-hoc split of the sample into intensive and extensive dairy farms. A limitation of current specifications of *LCM* is that they do not allow farms to switch between different productive systems over time. This feature of the model is at odds with the process of intensification of the European dairy industry in recent decades. We allow for changes of production system over time by estimating a single *LCM* model but splitting the original panel into two periods, and find that the probability of using the intensive technology increases over time. Our estimation proposal opens up the possibility of studying the effects of intensification not only across farms but also over time.

Keywords. Dairy farms, intensification, latent class model, panel data.

JEL Codes. C23, D24, Q12

1. Introduction

The number of dairy farms in the European Union has fallen dramatically in recent decades and continues to decline. Given that farm output remains roughly at quota level, over the same period the average size of dairy herds has increased steadily. At the same time, genetic and management improvements in dairy cattle have permitted large increases in milk production per cow. These structural changes have provided the basis for the propagation of intensive systems of production in the dairy sector. In fact, intensification is often mentioned as a feature of structural change, reinforcing the interest in the analysis of the impact of intensification on productivity and efficiency. The relationship between structural change and intensification has an interesting aspect in our empirical example since institutional and geographical reasons make it difficult to grow by accruing more land.

---
* Corresponding author: carlos.arias@unileon.es.

Some of the farms are small, with fragmented land and located in hilly areas (del Corral *et al.*, 2011). Obviously, the cessation of these farms does not increase the land available for the farms that stay in production and that are mainly located in flatter coastal areas.

Extensive dairy farming, on the other hand, consists of producing milk using mainly on-farm produced forage with low stocking rates. Fostering production using extensive systems has often been an explicit goal of agricultural policy, justified by factors such as environmental soundness, improved animal welfare, or use of abundant land in some areas. In contrast to this, many dairy farms in Europe have gone in the opposite direction, adopting more intensive production systems.

Despite the importance of the intensification process and the intense policy debates it has generated, few papers have studied the intensification of dairy farming using economic analysis. Most articles have adopted a technical perspective, describing the physical changes of the process (e.g., Simpson and Conrad, 1993), while very few have analyzed the economic consequences of this process (some exceptions are Alvarez *et al.*, 2008, 2010, and Nehring *et al.*, 2011).

From an empirical point of view, the coexistence of both extensive and intensive farms implies that there are two different technologies in the sector. This runs contrary to the assumption of a common technology for all farms which is the most frequent in the production literature. However, there is also awareness among researchers of the estimation bias that arises if such an assumption is unrealistic. For this reason, several approaches have been followed in dairy sector studies in order to account for the likely existence of different technologies. The most basic one is to drop a number of farms from the sample on the grounds that they may operate under a different technology (Tauer and Belbase, 1987). A second approach is to split the sample into several groups based on some observable farm characteristics. For example, Hoch (1962) divided the sample into two groups based on the location of farms, while Newman and Matthews (2006) considered two different technologies depending on the number of outputs each farm produces.

Classifying farms as intensive or extensive is not as straightforward as it might appear. For example, Nehring *et al.* (2011) used the number of cows per hectare in order to split the sample. However, the stocking rate partition does not fully describe the production system as other aspects such as the productivity of cows or the share of concentrates in the feed ration could also be taken into account. In this paper we avoid an ex-ante classification of farms as extensive or intensive by estimating a Latent Class Model (*LCM*). This model assumes that several unknown technologies (classes) have generated the sample, and allows for the estimation of the parameters of the different technologies plus the probability that each observation has been generated by a specific technology.

To the best of our knowledge, the starting point of previous models in the literature is a set-up and estimation proposal that assumes that the probability of each observation belonging to a class (i.e. using an intensive or extensive technology) is constant over time. This implies that changes during the period of analysis, no matter how dramatic, do not lead to a farm being labeled as belonging to a different class (use of a different technology). Such an assumption becomes increasingly untenable as the number of observed periods gets larger.

The objective of the present paper is twofold. First, we wish to determine whether the intensification process that has been taking place in recent decades has come to an end or whether dairy farms are still switching from extensive to more intensive produc-

tion systems. For this purpose, we make a simple methodological proposal to circumvent the assumption of class probability being constant over time. Second, we are interested in analyzing the effects of intensification on farms' efficiency. In particular, for given inputs we would like to know whether intensive farms have the potential to produce more output than extensive farms, and if so, the degree to which intensive farms achieve such potential.

In order to fulfill these two objectives, in the empirical section of the paper we use a panel of dairy farms in Northern Spain to illustrate the feasibility of estimating a *LCM* with time-varying probabilities. Our objectives are firstly to measure the changes over time in the probability of belonging to a class (technology) and secondly to analyze the effects on production potential and efficiency of dairy farm intensification[1]. Unlike previous studies, our methodological proposal allows us to look specifically at the farms that might have tilted towards a more intensive production system in the period of analysis.

The organization of the paper is the following. In the next section we describe the model. In section 3, we present the data and the empirical model. In section 4 we show the econometric estimation of the latent class models. In section 5 there is a discussion of the empirical results. The paper ends with some conclusions.

2. The Model

We use a *LCM* to analyze the extent of intensification in our dataset. The initial step is to check whether the *LCM* identifies different technologies and if those technologies represent different degrees of intensification. The starting point is a log-linear stochastic production frontier (Orea and Kumbhakar, 2004) such as:

$$\ln y_{it} = \ln f\left(x_{it}\right)\big|_j + v_{it}\big|_j - u_{it}\big|_j \tag{1}$$

where x is a vector of inputs, y a single output, v a symmetric random disturbance, and u a one-sided random disturbance that measures technical inefficiency. Subscript i *(i=1,…,N)* denotes firms, t *(t=1,…,T)* denotes time, and subscript j *(j=1,…,J)* indicates a technology in a finite set. The vertical bar means that there is a different production function (different parameters) for each class j. We assume that, conditional on each class, the random disturbances v and u follow a normal and a truncated normal random distribution respectively.

In a latent class model we need to consider three likelihood functions. The first is the likelihood function of a firm i at time t belonging to class j:

$$LF_{ijt} = g\left(y_{it}, x_{it}, \Theta_j\right) \tag{2}$$

where Θ_j represents the set of parameters of technology (class) j, and g denotes the likelihood function of a production frontier (Kumbhakar and Lovell, 2000). The second is the likelihood function of a firm i conditional on class j, obtained as the product of the likeli-

---

[1] The present paper is related with a strand of literature linking technological choices with efficiency. As an example, Kompas and Nhu Che (2006) studied the effect of different technologies on the efficiency of dairy farms by including in the inefficiency model a set of variables reflecting technological choices.

hood functions in each period.

$$LF_{ij} = \prod_{t=1}^{T} LF_{ijt} = \prod_{t=1}^{T} g\left(y_{it}, x_{it}, \Theta_j\right) \tag{3}$$

Finally, the unconditional likelihood function of firm i is calculated averaging the likelihood conditional on each class using the prior probabilities of class membership P_{ij} as weights:

$$LF_i = \sum_{j=1}^{J} LF_{ij} P_{ij} \tag{4}$$

Prior probabilities can be interpreted as the probabilities attached to class j membership (Greene, 2005). These prior probabilities can be parameterized using a multinomial logit model:

$$P_{ij} = \frac{\exp\left(\delta_j z_i\right)}{\sum_{j=1}^{J} \exp\left(\delta_j z_i\right)} \tag{5}$$

where z_i is a vector of "separating variables" and δ_j a vector of parameters to be estimated. The "separating variables" are related to the adoption of a technology and, as a result, can be used as explanatory variables of the prior probability of using that technology.

After estimation of the model in (1) by maximum likelihood a "posterior probability" can be computed as:

$$\text{Pr}_{ij} = \frac{LF_{ij} P_{ij}}{\sum_{j=1}^{J} LF_{ij} P_{ij}} \tag{6}$$

As equation (6) shows, the prior probability of class membership for each farm is weighted by the empirical likelihood that the farm belongs to that class. This implies that the ability of each technology to explain the observed production of a farm is incorporated in the calculation of the posterior probability. In a sense, the estimates obtained with the parsimonious parametric model of the prior probability are complemented with information on individual fit to provide a more accurate evaluation of the probability of class membership. In fact, the posterior probability is considered the best estimate of class membership (Greene, 2005), and as such, the value of this probability is the criterion that we will use for determining whether a farm is using a particular technology.

As mentioned above, a subtle feature of the *LCM* for panel data is that prior probabilities are modeled as time invariant. In practical terms, time-invariant probabilities amount

to assuming that changes in farms over time do not affect the classification of a farm as intensive or extensive. However, we expect some farms to change the use of inputs during the period of analysis in ways that suggest tilting towards intensive farming.

Our aim, therefore, is to circumvent the assumption of time-invariant probabilities in the empirical analysis. For that purpose, we estimate a single *LCM* model for the whole period of analysis but split the observations for each farm into two periods, where the first period roughly corresponds to (*t=1,…,T/2*) and the second period to (*t=T/2+1,...,T*). In this approach, farm *i* is considered to be a different farm in each of the two periods. As a result, the probability of class membership is constant for a given farm during each of the two periods but can change from the first period to the second. Alvarez and del Corral (2010) report time-varying probabilities of class membership in the conventional Panel *LCM* through a slight modification of equation (6). They use as weighting factor of prior probabilities the likelihood function of each observation in each year (LF_{ijt} in equation 2) instead of the likelihood function of each farm (LF_{ij} in equation 3). This computational choice allows them to report time variation of a feature of the model, latent class probability, assumed to be constant over time for estimation purposes. Therefore, the time variation of probability reported is akin to variation around a constant mean. Instead, our estimation proposal avoids such problems by allowing class probability to change from the first sub period to the second while being constant in each sub period.

In principle, it is possible to divide the original sample in three or more sub periods. However, the time length of the panel shortens accordingly, causing econometric and numerical problems. In fact, the limit of this increasingly finer division in sub periods would be to estimate a pooled model. This amounts to treating the dataset as a cross section of farms instead of taking into account the existence of a panel. In this case, in each observation farm *i* is treated as a different farm, thereby allowing probabilities of class membership to vary freely over time. The downside is that we disregard the information provided by observing the same farm in several periods and that the computed probabilities of class membership are not necessarily parsimonious. Indeed, it would be possible to observe some farms moving repeatedly from one class to the other. All in all, this approach seems prone to numerical problems and to difficulties in interpreting the results. In fact, in the empirical application that we propose the *LCM* with pooled data failed to converge.

3. Data and empirical model

The data used in the empirical analysis consist of a balanced panel of *128* Spanish dairy farms observed over the *12* year period from *1999* to *2010*. In general, the units in the sample are small to medium-sized family farms. In Table 1, we show the evolution of the average value of a set of variables related to intensification such as milk, number of cows, land, stocking rate, milk yield per cow, milk per hectare and purchased concentrate per cow.

Table 1 shows that, on average, farm output has grown during the sample period (64%) through an increase in the number of cows (44%) but much less so in land (16%). The stocking rate (23%), milk yield per cow (13%), milk per hectare (41%) and purchased concentrate per cow (6%) all grow in the period analyzed. In summary, these descriptive statistics depict a process of farm growth with intensification.

Table 1. Evolution of intensification features (sample means).

Year	Milk (l)	Cows	Land (ha)	Cows per hectare	Milk per cow (l)	Milk per hectare (l)	Purchased concentrate per cow (kg)
1999	233250	33	18	1,97	6823	13657	3291
2000	253326	35	18	2,02	7005	14365	3266
2001	279077	37	18	2,17	7200	15896	3370
2002	312127	40	18	2,35	7419	17783	3434
2003	313470	41	18	2,38	7292	17675	3451
2004	332461	43	18	2,41	7501	18420	3465
2005	348243	43	19	2,42	7729	19027	3483
2006	361358	44	19	2,41	7877	19323	3470
2007	360131	45	19	2,41	7841	19089	3554
2008	362113	45	20	2,39	7661	18765	3557
2009	363012	46	20	2,40	7591	18912	3537
2010	383172	47	21	2,43	7699	19304	3489
% increase 1999-2010	64%	44%	16%	23%	13%	41%	6%

The empirical specification of the production function is translog. We have chosen a flexible functional form in order to avoid imposing unnecessary a priori restrictions on the technologies to be estimated. The empirical counterpart of equation (1) is the following translog production frontier:

$$\ln y_{it} = \beta_0 \mid_j + \sum_{k=1}^{5} \beta_k \mid_j \ln x_{kit} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{5} \sum_{l=1}^{5} \beta_{kl} \mid_j \ln x_{kit} \ln x_{lit} + \sum_{m=2}^{12} \gamma_m \mid_j TD_m + v_{it} \mid_j - u_{it} \mid_j \qquad (7)$$

The dependent variable (y) is the production of milk (liters). We have considered only one output since these farms are highly specialized (more than 90% of farm income comes from dairy sales). Five inputs are included: (x_1) number of cows, (x_2) purchased feed (kilograms), (x_3) 'farm expenses' (includes expenditure on inputs used to produce forage crops, namely seeds, sprays, fertilizers, fuel, and machinery depreciation), (x_4) 'animal expenses', such as veterinary, medicines, milking and other expenses, and (x_5) land. All monetary variables are expressed in constant euros of 2004. Additionally, *11* time dummy variables (*TD_m=1 if t=m, TD_m=0 otherwise*) were introduced to control for factors that affect all farms in the same way in a particular year but which vary over time, such as weather (the excluded period is 1999).

Prior to estimation each input was divided by its geometric mean. In this way, the first order coefficients of the Translog production function β_k^j can be interpreted as output elasticities evaluated at the geometric mean of the inputs.

The prior probabilities of class membership are assumed to be a function of two "separating variables": the natural logarithm of the stocking rate (cows per hectare) and

the natural logarithm of purchased concentrate feed per cow. Since prior probabilities are modeled as time-invariant in each sub period, the separating variables are averaged over time within each period.

4. Econometric estimation

In this section, we report the main results of the estimation of two latent class models by maximum likelihood:
a) Panel model, i.e. using panel data and time-invariant class membership probabilities.
b) Split-panel model, i.e., estimating a single *LCM* model but allowing the probabilities of class membership to differ over time. This is achieved by splitting the sample into two periods where the probability of class membership is constant within each period but can change for the 'same' farm from the first period to the second. In other words, the estimation proceeds by treating each farm in the second period as a different farm.

In both models two latent classes were found.[2] As mentioned above, we make the prior probability of belonging to a latent class a function of two variables: 'cows per hectare of land' and 'purchased concentrate per cow'. Since these variables measure the degree of intensification of a dairy operation, we have labeled as "intensive" the latent class which shows positive estimates of the coefficients of both 'separating' variables in the prior probability equation. The estimates of the prior probability function of the intensive class for both models are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Prior probability equation for the intensive class.

	Panel model	Split-panel model
Constant	-11.906*	-13.112**
ln(cows/land)	1.7919**	.8632*
ln(concentrate/cows)	1.3510*	1.5513**

*, **, Significantly different from zero at 0.05 and 0.01 significance levels respectively
Standard errors reported in Tables A1 and A2 in the Appendix

Next, the farms were classified as *Intensive* using the highest (greater than 0.5) estimated posterior probabilities (equation 6) since these provide the best estimates of class membership for an individual (Greene, 2005). In Table 3 we show descriptive statistics of the two groups (intensive and extensive) for the two models estimated.

The descriptive statistics of each group roughly agree with the labels we gave to the classes based on the effects of intensification variables on the probability of being in each

---

[2] We also tried to fit a model with three classes but it did not converge.

Table 3. Characteristics of the estimated production classes (sample means).

	Panel model		Split-panel model	
	Intensive	Extensive	Intensive	Extensive
Observations	804	732	798	738
Milk (l)	365442	280884	371525	274994
Cows	42.7	40.3	43.2	39.9
Land (ha)	18.0	19.8	18.3	19.6
Cows per hectare	2.45	2.16	2.4	2.1
Milk per cow (l)	8129	6745	8202	6677
Milk per hectare (l)	20329	14779	20428	14718
Purchased concentrate per cow (Kg)	3533	3352	3579	3304

class. As expected, intensive farms have larger values of key variables such as milk per cow, milk per hectare and feed per cow. Intensive farms are also larger in terms of milk production but are rather similar to extensive farms in terms of land. In our view, the explanation for this result is that marginal increases of land are unlikely to be an option for farmers due to the fact that most abandonments take place in less favoured (mountainous) areas while remaining farms are mainly located in the coastal plain, so that the land available after some farms shut down cannot be used by the remaining farms. For this reason, farmers who wish to increase production need to use more feed per cow and in some cases buy more productive cows, thereby becoming more intensive.

In Table 4 we report the output elasticities for the two groups evaluated at the geometric mean of the sample. The differences in the elasticities across groups can be seen as evidence of different technological characteristics. The complete set of estimated parameters of the production functions are reported in Tables *A1* and *A2* in the Appendix.

All elasticities, with one exception, are significantly different from zero at conventional levels of significance. Despite the different assumptions behind the two models, the

Table 4. Output elasticities evaluated at the geometric mean of the sample.

	Panel model		Split-panel model	
	Intensive	Extensive	Intensive	Extensive
Cows	.7176**	.4626**	.7491**	.4553**
Feed	.2969**	.3623**	.2737**	.3685**
Farm expenses	.0405**	.0718**	.0508 **	.0767**
Animal expenses	.0296**	.0964**	.0206 *	.0789**
Land	.0368**	.0339**	.0214	.0295*

*, **, Significantly different from zero at 0.05 and 0.01significance level, respectively

output elasticities evaluated at the sample geometric mean are similar between them. The similarity between the estimates and farm classifications obtained suggests that the differences between the two models (time varying versus constant latent class probability) are a significant but moderate feature of the sample.

On the other hand, it is interesting to note that there are wide differences between the parameters of the two latent classes (within each model). For example, the output elasticity with respect to cows is almost twice as large in the intensive group as it is in the extensive group. On the other hand, the output elasticity of feed is always larger in the extensive group. These different elasticities imply large differences in marginal productivity of inputs across technologies (extensive or intensive), especially for cows and feed.

5. Empirical analysis of intensification and efficiency

In this section we use the results of the estimation of the *LCM* to analyze a set of issues with important policy implications. First, we are interested in studying the evolution of the intensification process over time. Second, we want to analyze the differences in technical efficiency between intensive and extensive farms.

5.1. Evolution of intensification over time

We want to check if the probability of adopting the intensive technology increases over time. We should note that this analysis is only possible in the split-panel model proposed in the present paper and not in the conventional panel *LCM*.

For this purpose, we regress the posterior probabilities of being in the intensive class against individual dummies (fixed effects) and a binary variable (d_t) that takes the value zero for the first half of the period analyzed and one for the second half. This is an unconditional analysis over time and is clearly different from the conditional analysis of prior probabilities that could be achieved by including a time trend in equation (5). In the conditional analysis, prior probabilities can change over time, keeping input use and separating variables constant. In the unconditional analysis performed here, the posterior probability varies over time due to changes in the use of key inputs such as feed, cows or land.

The equation to be estimated is the following:

$$\mathrm{Pr}_{ijt} = a_i \big|_j + b \big|_j \, d_t + w_{it} \big|_j \tag{8}$$

where j denotes the latent class and w is a random disturbance assumed to follow a normal distribution with zero mean and constant variance. In each class, we have estimated the posterior probability for each individual ($i=1,…,128$) and for each period ($t=1,..,12$). Expression (8) represents a general proposal with J different classes. In this case, there would only be $J-1$ free equations since the dependent variable, the posterior probability, adds up to one. As we are considering only two latent classes (*Intensive* and *Extensive*) in our setting, we only have one relevant equation. We choose to estimate the equation corresponding to the posterior probability of the *Intensive* Class.

Table 5 shows the estimated coefficient of the time binary variable ($b|_j$) for the Posterior probability of *Intensive Class* in the Split-panel model. This coefficient is positive and significantly different from zero, indicating that the probability of being classified as an intensive farm is larger in the second period. We interpret this result as evidence of "intensification" of dairy production in our sample over the period analyzed.

In our view, the average change over time of the probability of belonging to the intensive class provides evidence of farms in the sample tilting towards an intensive production system. Additionally, the change in class probability between the two periods allows for some descriptive analysis of the subset of farms that have switched production system in the conventional sense of crossing the threshold defined by a class probability of 0.5. In particular, 13 extensive farms became intensive in the second period, while 8 farms switched from intensive to extensive. In Table 6 we show the characteristics of the farms that changed to a different production system.

The farms that become intensive in the second period reflect the typical transformation pattern: increase in the stocking rate and feed per cow, resulting in higher milk per cow and per hectare. On the other hand, the farms that switch from the intensive to the extensive class keep the stocking rate unchanged but reduce the amount of feed per cow, lowering milk per cow and per hectare. We would like to stress two features of this exercise: first, its descriptive and exploratory nature since the *0.5* probability cut-off point that defines intensive or extensive farms is arbitrary; second, the intensification measured by the increase in the probability of being in a latent class is an average effect compatible with farms moving in both directions.

Table 5. Analysis of the evolution over time of posterior probabilities.

Coefficient ($b|_{intensive}$)	Standard Error	t-statistic
.0363	.0099	3.28

Fixed effects not shown

Table 6. Characteristics of the farms that switch production system over time.

	From extensive to intensive		From intensive to extensive	
	Period 1 Extensive	Period 2 Intensive	Period 1 Intensive	Period 2 Extensive
Farms	13	13	8	8
Milk (l)	279777	383108	269831	301237
Cows	37.2	42.9	35.3	42.5
Land (ha)	16.5	16.6	14.8	17.7
Cows per hectare	2.1	2.4	2.4	2.4
Milk per cow (l)	7061	8381	7456	7004
Milk per hectare (l)	15796	21242	18246	17191
Feed per cow (Kg)	3483	3824	3307	3204

5.2. The effect of intensification on dairy farm efficiency

In this section, we want to explore the effect of intensification on production efficiency. Two questions are addressed. First, are intensive farms more efficient than extensive farms? Second, which technology is more productive (i.e., does one of the two frontiers lie above the other one)?

The level of technical efficiency can be calculated as the ratio between current output and potential output, as defined by the technological frontier. An output-oriented index of technical efficiency can be computed as:

$$TE_{it} \mid_j = \exp\left(-u_{it} \mid_j\right) \tag{9}$$

Subscript j in equation (9) indicates that the technical efficiency index can be calculated with respect to each of the Latent Class frontiers (Orea and Kumbhakar, 2004). In our case, we can thus consider two different frontiers. Table 7 shows the average technical efficiency for the two technologies.

Table 7. Average efficiency of the estimated classes (intensive/extensive).

	Panel Model		Split-Panel Model	
	Intensive Frontier	Extensive Frontier	Intensive Frontier	Extensive Frontier
Full sample	.92	.92	.91	.93
Intensive farms	.94	.96	.94	.96
Extensive farms	.88	.89	.87	.89

As can be seen, for the full sample the average level of technical efficiency is quite similar both between models (Panel vs. Split-Panel) and between latent technologies (*Intensive* frontier vs. *Extensive* frontier). However, if we consider the two groups of farms separately, a very interesting result is found: intensive farms have a higher level of technical efficiency in all the four frontiers. Additionally, the average technical efficiency is higher in the extensive frontier than in the intensive one.

This last result seems to indicate that the latent frontier of the *Intensive Group* dominates the other, that is, for any given set of inputs it is possible to produce more output with the intensive technology. We try to shed some light on this issue by calculating the difference in frontier output between the two frontiers using the actual inputs of the farms:

$$D_{it} = \ln \hat{y}_{it}^I - \ln \hat{y}_{it}^E \tag{10}$$

where $\ln \hat{y}_{it}^I \quad \ln \hat{y}_{it}^E$ is the (log of) frontier output of farm i at time t evaluated at the intensive (extensive) technology. Table 8 shows the average value of the differences between the frontiers (D_{it}) calculated using the actual inputs of the farms for the full sample as well as for the two classes.

As the differences between the frontiers are calculated using natural logs, D_{it} can be interpreted approximately as the percentage difference of potential output between both frontiers. The intensive frontier is, on average, *9.6%* above the extensive frontier in the panel model, while this difference is *10.8%* in the split-panel model.

The relationship between technical efficiency and intensification can be explored further by analyzing the correlation between the estimated indexes of efficiency and the probability of being in the intensive class. As technical efficiency is time-varying and so is the probability in the split-panel model, we have included a time dummy as a control variable in the regression. By doing so, we avoid confounding the effect of the change of probability over time with the effect of time.

Table 8. Average difference between the frontier output of the two technologies.

	Panel model	Split-panel model
Full sample	.0962	.1080
Intensive farms	.0883	.0988
Extensive farms	.1049	.1180

Table 9. Relationship between technical efficiency and intensification.

	Panel model		Split-panel model			
	OLS		OLS		OLS with farm dummies	
	Intensive frontier	Extensive frontier	Intensive frontier	Extensive frontier	Intensive frontier	Extensive frontier
Probability of intensive class	0.0607**	0.0658**	0.0786**	0.0752**	0.0545**	0.0439**
Time dummy	-0.0010**	0.0009**	-0.0014**	0.0007*	-0.0013**	0.0008**

*, **, Significantly different from zero at 0.05 and 0.01significance level, respectively

In Table 9, we show the results of regressing the level of technical efficiency against the probability of being in the intensive class and a time dummy that takes the value 1 for the second period. We show the results for both models (Panel and Split-panel) and for both frontiers (*Intensive* and *Extensive*). In the Split-panel model we perform two different estimations: standard *OLS* and *OLS* with farm dummy variables. The inclusion of individual effects is not possible in the conventional Panel model because the probability of class membership is constant over time.

We find common patterns of results for both models and estimators. The probability of being in the intensive class increases the level of technical efficiency with respect to both frontiers in the two models and for both estimation methods. The coefficient of

the time dummy indicates that the index of technical efficiency estimated using the extensive frontier increases over time while the index of technical efficiency estimated using the intensive frontier decreases over time. This result is probably due to different patterns across frontiers of the yearly shifts of the production frontier measured by the coefficients of the time dummy variables. The time dummy coefficients of the intensive frontier (Tables A1 and A2 in the appendix) show a clear upward trend at the beginning of the period followed by a fall in the final years. The upward shift of the production frontier over time is compatible with decreasing technical efficiency if the movements of the frontier are due to productive improvements of a subset of leading farms while other farms do not move immediately towards the shifted frontier. On the other hand, the extensive frontier features smaller and erratic shifts over time. In our view, it is not surprising to observe farms approaching, on average, a production frontier with no sudden upward shifts.

Additionally, the Split-panel model provides a subtle result: the probability of being in the intensive class changes across farms and increases over time (on average). In other words, there are two sources of variation. The coefficient of the probability using plain *OLS* is estimated using both sources of variation. However, the coefficient of the probability using *OLS* with farm dummy variables is estimated using only the over time variability. The results show that the estimates of the coefficient of probability are 0.0545 (intensive) and 0.0439 (extensive) when using only changes over time, while the same estimates increase to 0.0786 (intensive) and 0.0752 (extensive) when using both cross-section and time variation of the posterior probability. In summary, it seems that the bulk of the change in efficiency caused by changes in the probability of being in the intensive class can be attributed to changes over time of this probability.

4. Conclusions

The assumption of time-invariant prior probability of a latent class can be circumvented by estimating a single *LCM* but splitting the original panel into two or more periods. This proposal allows for the estimation of the technology of different production systems without an assumption that becomes increasingly untenable as the period of years analyzed increases. On the positive side, our proposal is simple and straightforward. On the negative side, it is not part of a formal model. As a result, there is no clear rationale for choosing the number of periods in which the original panel should be split.

By splitting the original panel into two periods, we find in our empirical application that the probability of being in the "intensive dairy" class increases over time. This result can be interpreted as evidence of dairy farming intensification over the sample period.

We find differences in technical efficiency if we split the sample in terms of the production system using the posterior probability of each latent class. More precisely, the average technical efficiency is higher for farms that belong to the intensive latent class. Additionally, the intensive frontier dominates the extensive frontier, indicating that the intensive technology is more productive that the extensive one. This result can be seen as an economic rationale for the observed trend towards the intensification of dairy farms.

What are the policy implications of these findings? Given that the intensive technology is more productive and that intensive farms are more efficient, i.e. produce closer to their frontier than extensive farms, it seems that the trend towards intensification will

continue in the near future. This trend can be seen as a problem if the environmental consequences of intensification are taken into account.

The new reform of the Common Agricultural Policy may also affect farmers' technology choices. On the one hand, the phasing out of milk quotas may result in higher production. In this sense, intensive farms will find it easier to boost production since they do not depend heavily on forage. At the same time, productivity and efficiency gains associated with intensification can be a plus on a more competitive environment. On the other hand, the new direct payment scheme which will move towards a uniform payment per hectare may lower the incentives to adopt intensive systems.

References

Alvarez, A., del Corral, J., Solis, D. and Pérez, J.A. (2008). Does Intensification Help to Improve the Economic Efficiency of Dairy Farms? *Journal of Dairy Science* 91(9): 3693-3698.

Alvarez, A. and del Corral, J. (2010). Identifying Different Technologies Using a Latent Class Model. Extensive versus Intensive Dairy Farms. *European Review of Agricultural Economics* 37(2): 231-250.

del Corral, J., Perez, J.A. and Roibas, D. (2011). The Impact of Land Fragmentation on Milk Production. *Journal of Dairy Science* 94(1): 517-525.

Greene, W. (2005). Reconsidering Heterogeneity in Panel Data Estimators of the Stochastic Frontier Model. *Journal of Econometrics* 126(2): 269-303.

Hoch, I. (1962). Estimation of Production Function Parameters Combining Time-Series and Cross-Section Data. *Econometrica* 30(1): 34-53.

Kompas, T. and Nhu Che, T. (2006). Technology Choice and Efficiency on Australian Dairy Farms. *Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics* 50(1): 65-83.

Kumbhakar, S.C. and Lovell, C.A.K. (2000). Stochastic Frontier Analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Newman, C. and Matthews, A. (2006). The Productivity Performance of Irish Dairy Farms 1984-2000: A Multiple Output Distance Function Approach. *Journal of Productivity Analysis* 26(2): 191-205.

Nehring, R., Sauer, J. Gillespie, J. and Hallahan, C. (2011). Intensive versus Extensive Dairy Production Systems: Dairy States in the Eastern and Midwestern U.S. and Key Pasture Countries the E.U.: Determining the Competitive Edge. Selected Paper prepared for presentation at the Southern Agricultural Economics Association Annual Meeting, Corpus Christi, TX.

Orea, L. and Kumbhakar, S.C. (2004). Efficiency Measurement Using a Latent Class Stochastic Frontier Model. *Empirical Economics* 29(1): 169-183.

Simpson, J. R. and Conrad, J.H. (1993). Intensification of Cattle Production Systems in Central America: Why and When. *Journal of Dairy Science* 76(6): 1744-1752.

Tauer, L. and Belbase, K. P. (1987). Technical Efficiency of New York Dairy Farms. *Northeastern Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics* 16(1): 10-16.

Appendix

Table A.1. Estimation of the Panel Model.

Variable	Class 1		Class 2	
	Coefficient	Std. Error	Coefficient	Std. Error
Constant	12.5724	.0158	12.542	.0152
Cows (lnx1)	.7176	.0213	.4626	.0241
Feed (lnx2)	.2969	.0137	.3623	.0152
Crop (lnx3)	.0405	.0067	.0718	.0080
Animal (lnx4)	.0296	.0091	.0964	.0110
Land (lnx5)	.0368	.0104	.0339	.0125
(lnx1)2	.2030	.1445	-.0854	.1096
(lnx2)2	.0257	.0486	-.1737	.0612
(lnx3)2	.0575	.0152	.0523	.0149
(lnx4)2	-.0731	.0247	.0069	.0320
(lnx5)2	.2857	.0398	-.0624	.0542
lnx1lnx2	-.3277	.0641	.0663	.0732
lnx1lnx3	-.0999	.0395	.0103	.0301
lnx1lnx4	.3738	.0532	-.0394	.0561
lnx1lnx5	-.2055	.0584	-.0263	.0657
lnx2lnx3	.1055	.0238	-.0608	.0219
lnx2lnx4	-.0960	.0321	.0827	.0369
lnx2lnx5	.1288	.0405	-.0160	.0413
lnx3lnx4	-.0307	.0149	.0025	.0164
lnx3lnx5	-.0426	.0196	.0196	.0231
lnx4lnx5	-.0619	.0275	.0138	.0282
TD00	.0206	.0129	.0072	.0172
TD01	.0366	.0131	-.0046	.0173
TD02	.0358	.0130	.0243	.0175
TD03	.0313	.0131	-.0181	.0173
TD04	.0519	.0131	.0038	.0171
TD05	.0707	.0132	.0359	.0172
TD06	.0952	.0132	.0366	.0173
TD07	.0839	.0132	.0378	.0175
TD08	.0529	.0134	-.0156	.0175
TD09	.0559	.0134	-.0275	.0177
TD10	.0661	.0139	.0032	.0172
Sigma	.0909	.0078	.1537	.0064
Lambda	1.0506	.3484	2.7329	.3866
Prior probability equation				
Constant	-11.906	5.2881		
Ln(cows/land)	1.7919	.6078		
Ln(concentrate/cows)	1.3510	.6600		

Table A.2. Estimation of the Split-Panel Model.

Variable	Class 1		Class 2	
	Coefficient	Std. Error	Coefficient	Std. Error
Constant	12.5754	.0135	12.536	.0146
Cows (lnx1)	.7491	.0203	.4553	.0211
Feed (lnx2)	.2737	.0148	.3685	.0149
Crop (lnx3)	.0508	.0068	.0767	.0078
Animal (lnx4)	.0206	.0093	.0789	.0118
Land (lnx5)	.0214	.0115	.0295	.0136
(lnx1)2	.2943	.1448	-.0405	.1092
(lnx2)2	.0121	.0460	-.0964	.0645
(lnx3)2	.0732	.0147	.0410	.0134
(lnx4)2	-.0530	.0263	-.0447	.0331
(lnx5)2	.2786	.0400	.0407	.0609
lnx1lnx2	-.3067	.0613	-.0549	.0693
lnx1lnx3	-.1158	.0375	-.0217	.0316
lnx1lnx4	.2953	.0530	.0704	.0591
lnx1lnx5	-.2457	.0563	.0135	.0596
lnx2lnx3	.0825	.0226	-.0131	.0217
lnx2lnx4	-.0526	.0331	.0418	.0396
lnx2lnx5	.1130	.0410	-.0562	.0452
lnx3lnx4	-.0275	.0151	.0003	.0160
lnx3lnx5	-.0263	.0199	-.0053	.0224
lnx4lnx5	-.0350	.0274	.0306	.0289
TD00	.0201	.0126	-.0013	.0162
TD01	.0376	.0129	-.0108	.0174
TD02	.0351	.0133	.0238	.0188
TD03	.0283	.0130	-.0151	.0166
TD04	.0471	.0132	.0099	.0165
TD05	.0660	.0128	.0408	.0167
TD06	.0917	.0130	.0457	.0167
TD07	.0790	.0129	.0463	.0172
TD08	.0531	.0131	-.0143	.0171
TD09	.0563	.0131	-.0292	.0172
TD10	.0697	.0134	.0007	.0170
Sigma	.0883	.0067	.1497	.0060
Lambda	1.1750	.3155	3.0344	.4630
Prior probability equation				
Constant	-13.112	4.2444		
Ln(cows/land)	.8632	.3943		
Ln(concentrate/ cows)	1.5513	.5247		