

Bratulescu (Manolache), Alexandra Marina

Conference Paper

Study regarding the size and profile of farm holdings

Provided in Cooperation with:

The Research Institute for Agriculture Economy and Rural Development (ICEADR), Bucharest

Suggested Citation: Bratulescu (Manolache), Alexandra Marina (2020) : Study regarding the size and profile of farm holdings, In: Agrarian Economy and Rural Development - Realities and Perspectives for Romania. International Symposium. 11th Edition, The Research Institute for Agricultural Economy and Rural Development (ICEADR), Bucharest, pp. 357-362

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/234414>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

STUDY REGARDING THE SIZE AND PROFILE OF FARM HOLDINGS

BRATULESCU (MANOLACHE) ALEXANDRA MARINA¹

Abstract: *Agricultural land and other agricultural production resources are distributed on farms of different types and shapes. They also differ in the size of the resources held, with special reference to the area and / or the number of animals. The production results depend, of course, on the volume of resources, as well as on the way in which they are valued, although their low degree of concentration, in the case of family farms, makes the exploitation process more difficult. This paper is based on the analysis of statistical data from a quantitative and qualitative point of view, highlighting the determination of the degree of uniformity, the number of agricultural holdings and their size at regional level.*

Keywords: *agricultural holdings, size, area, regional*

JEL classification: *A10,Q10*

INTRODUCTION

Agricultural land and other agricultural production resources are distributed on farms of different types and shapes. They also differ by the size of the resources held, with special reference to the area and / or the number of animals. The production results depend, of course, on the volume of resources, as well as on the way in which they are valued, although the low degree of their concentration, in the case of family farms, complicates the exploitation process.

The approach, from both angles, leads to the use of two concepts: the size (physical) and the size (economic dimension) of agricultural holdings. The second concept tends to become dominant in the conditions of intensifying agriculture and achieving integration at the level of some agricultural holdings, although the approach of their dimensional conditions, from different countries, is found in the literature.

The concept of "professional" exploitation is used in the European Union. A professional holding is defined as a holding large enough to provide a main activity to the operator and a sufficient income level to meet the needs of his family.

Size includes the relationship to a number of elements:

- the area or number of animals raised (ie the physical size of the holding);
- the level of production intensity (some branches and crops are more intensive due to their specificity, giving higher productions per hectare; the intensity can be amplified by capital investments);
- the management exercised in each holding, taking into account its propagated effects on the economic performance of any unit;
- the way of managing the production factors, with reference, especially, to their allocation and combination;
- the level of prices of agricultural and agri-food products, which determines the size of turnover;

¹ Bratulescu (Manolache) Alexandra Marina, USAMVB PhD student, e-mail: bratulescu.alexandra@iceadr.ro

- integration of agricultural activities with processing; by processing some agricultural products, value is added, which increases the proportions of the size.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

In this paper we want to analyze the size and profile of agricultural holdings in Romania. Next, the physical dimension of agricultural holdings in our country was analyzed, both from a structural point of view, by development regions, and from the point of view of dynamics.

Thus, with the help of data provided by the National Institute of Statistics through the latest Structural Surveys in Agriculture (ASA 2013 and ASA 2016) it was possible to perform this comparative analysis between development regions and between farms over the 3 years.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Table 1. Agricultural area by legal status of agricultural holdings by development regions in 2013 (hectares)

Development regions	Individual farms	Authorized natural persons, individual enterprises, family enterprises	Total
NORTHWEST	1273990.49	64091.37	1338081.86
CENTER	1097505.85	32346.21	1129852.06
NORTH EAST	1229786.36	70193.58	1299979.94
SOUTH EAST	808845.79	167401.76	976247.55
BUCHAREST-ILFOV	22147.1	1213.31	23360.41
SOUTH MOUNTAIN	913283.88	112402.72	1025686.6
SOUTH - WEST OLTENIA	1141930.68	33051.67	1174982.35
WEST	778933.14	47097.54	826030.68
TOTAL	6746625.44	524381.94	7271007.38

Source: Structural Purchase in Agriculture (A.S.A) 2013

The data presented in table 1 show that out of the total agricultural area of Romania in 2013 of 7,271 thousand hectares, individual agricultural holdings had a share of 92.8%, the difference of 7.2% representing the area related to PFAs, enterprises individual and family.

By development regions, the highest shares for individual farms belonged to the South-West and Central regions, respectively 97, 2% and 97.1%, with the lowest shares being in the South-Muntenia regions (89%) and Southeast (82.8%).

Table 2. Share of agricultural holdings by development regions (%)

Development regions	Individual farms	Authorized natural persons, individual enterprises, family enterprises	Total
NORTHWEST	18.9%	12.2%	18.4%
CENTER	16.3%	6.2%	15.5%
NORTH EAST	18.2%	13.4%	17.9%
SOUTH EAST	12.0%	31.9%	13.4%
BUCHAREST-ILFOV	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%
SOUTH MOUNTAIN	13.5%	21.4%	14.1%
SOUTH - WEST OLTENIA	16.9%	6.3%	16.2%
WEST	11.5%	9.0%	11.4%
TOTAL	100	100	100

Source: Structural Purchase in Agriculture (A.S.A) 2013

Regarding the share of areas occupied by the categories of agricultural holdings, we note that in 2013 the highest shares of individual agricultural holdings were reported in the North West

and North East regions (18.9% and 18.2%), the most low shares being registered in the regions.e West and Bucharest-Ilfov (11.5% and 0.3%).

If we refer to the agricultural representations represented by PFAs, individual and family enterprises, on the first positions were located the South-East and South-Muntenia regions (with weights of 31.9% and 21.4%), and in the last Centru and Bucharest-Ilfov regional positions (with shares of 6.2% and 0.2%).

Table 3. Agricultural area by legal status of agricultural holdings by development regions in 2016 - hectares

Development regions	Individual farms	Authorized natural persons, individual enterprises, family enterprises	Total
NORTHWEST	1158429.61	86247.54	1244677.15
CENTER	952690.09	38765.44	991455.53
NORTH EAST	1140868.47	65001.94	1205870.41
SOUTH EAST	683249.5	211031.3	894280.8
BUCHAREST-ILFOV	20679.96	32.3	20712.26
SOUTH MOUNTAIN	782217.43	107371.58	889589.01
SOUTH - WEST OLTENIA	934394.87	33803.9	968198.77
WEST	666148.67	45323.49	711472.16
TOTAL	6338678.6	587577.49	6926256.09

Source: Structural Purchase in Agriculture (A.S.A) 2016

Compared to the situation in 2013, we note that in 2016, at a total agricultural area of 6,926 thousand hectares (lower by 4.8%), individual farms were 91.5% (a decrease of 1.3%) , committing at the same time to the area owned by PFA, individual enterprises and family businesses. The development regions of Bucharest-Ilfov and South-West Oltenia registered the highest shares for individual agricultural holdings (99.8% and 96.5%), at the opposite pole being the same regions South Muntenia and South East (87.9 % and South East 76.4%).

Table 4. Share of agricultural holdings by development regions (%)

Development regions	Individual farms	Authorized natural persons, individual enterprises, family enterprises	Total
NORTHWEST	18.3%	14.7%	18.0%
CENTER	15.0%	6.6%	14.3%
NORTH EAST	18.0%	11.1%	17.4%
SOUTH EAST	10.8%	35.9%	12.9%
BUCHAREST-ILFOV	0.3%	0.01%	0.3%
SOUTH MOUNTAIN	12.3%	18.3%	12.8%
SOUTH - WEST OLTENIA	14.7%	5.8%	14.0%
WEST	10.5%	7.7%	10.3%
TOTAL	100	100	100

Source: Structural Purchase in Agriculture (A.S.A) 2016

At the level of 2016, for individual agricultural holdings both the first and last places were occupied by the same development regions mentioned in 2013. Regarding PFAs, as well as individual and family enterprises, the highest shares were recorded. in the South East and South Muntenia regions (35.9% and 18.3%), and the last two positions belonged to the South West Oltenia and Bucharest-Ilfov development regions (5.8% and 0.01%).

Table 5. Agricultural holdings, utilized agricultural area and utilized agricultural area returned on average to one agricultural holding, development regions 2013

Development regions	Total agricultural holdings (number)	Agricultural holdings that used agricultural area (number)	Agricultural area used (hectares)	Agricultural area used on a holding (hectares)
NORTHWEST	499857	497714	1783184	3.57
CENTER	358471	350857	1693990	4.73
NORTH EAST	754533	742127	1937081	2.57
SOUTH EAST	433043	424478	2092496	4.83
BUCHAREST-ILFOV	25316	23757	75572.66	2.99
SOUTH MOUNTAIN	753585	732890	2250949	2.99
SOUTH - WEST OLTENIA	557850	548220	1574195	2.82
WEST	247001	243722	1648382	6.67
TOTAL	3629656	3563765	13055850	3.6

Source: Structural Purchase in Agriculture (A.S.A) 2013

Of the 3,630 thousand agricultural holdings in the country in 2013, the North East and South Muntenia development regions had the highest shares (20.8% and 20.7%), the lowest percentages being reported in the regions West and Bucharest- Ilfov (6.8% and 0.7%).

The situation is similar in 2016, with small differences between the regions presented above and the fact that the total number of farms is lower by 5.7% compared to 2013. Regarding the agricultural holdings that used the agricultural area, it is noted that In the two years of analysis, their number, expressed as a percentage, is very close to that of the total holdings, thus maintaining the positions held by the different development regions.

Table 6. Agricultural holdings, utilized agricultural area and used agricultural area that returned on average on an agricultural holding, development regions 2016

Development regions	Total agricultural holdings (number)	Agricultural holdings that used agricultural area (number)	Agricultural area used (hectares)	Agricultural area used on a holding (hectares)
NORTHWEST	478490	475485	1783215	3.73
CENTER	330953	323388	1512476	4.57
NORTH EAST	720242	708442	1909254	2.65
SOUTH EAST	410215	394361	2064806	5.03
BUCHAREST-ILFOV	21022	20121	64277.05	3.06
SOUTH MOUNTAIN	694664	669044	2114709	3.04
SOUTH - WEST OLTENIA	539545	528861	1479931	2.74
WEST	226895	222483	1573869	6.94
TOTAL	3422026	3342185	12502535	3.65

Source: Structural Purchase in Agriculture (A.S.A) 2016

From the analysis of the agricultural area used, it results that in 2013 and 2016, the South-Muntenia and South-East development regions occupied the first positions (by 17.3% - 16.9% and 16% - 16.5%) South-West Oltenia and Bucharest-Ilfov, standing out with the smallest areas in the country (12% - 11.8% and 0.6% - 0.5%).

A reference indicator in the field, the agricultural area used on a farm registered in Romania an average of 3.6 - 3.65 hectares in the two years of analysis, highlighting the West and Center development regions (6.67-6, 97 hectares and 4.73-4.57 hectares), the smallest areas being registered in the North-East and South-West Oltenia regions (2.57-2.65 hectares and 2.82-2.74 hectares).

CONCLUSION

The size of an agricultural holding is mainly represented by the land area or the number of animals kept. It is expressed in physical quantities (hectares, animal heads). In a broader sense, the size is also represented by the technical apparatus of production and the labor force used. From an economic point of view, it is of some size, able to provide conditions for the development of other existing resources and a certain level of income. It is unanimously accepted that a larger size favors an increase in the use of labor, fixed and working capital, etc., having, in the conditions of commercial agriculture, direct and beneficial consequences on the economic and social viability of farms. farm.

The concept of "professional" exploitation is used in the European Union. A professional holding is defined as a holding large enough to provide a main activity to the operator and a sufficient income level to meet the needs of his family.

The issue of the size of agricultural units is an element of "structural policy", and will retain the attention and concerns of agricultural policy makers, producers, various entrepreneurs who invest in agricultural business, and is related to the transition to a practice of oriented agriculture. moreover, to the market.

Even if we estimate the units according to result indicators, the "field of production" of each cannot be neglected, given the influence it has on their absolute size. It is true, however, that under the mentioned conditions - intensification and integration at the unit level - the magnitude of the results becomes, for the most part, the effect of such processes. In view of this, it appears natural that the size should be regarded as specific to the holding directly producing agricultural (not agri-food) products or, as the case may be, to the subdivisions of an undertaking.

The dimensional structures in our agriculture vary depending on the type of farm and even its shape. After the application of the mentioned law, changes took place not only regarding the type of holdings, but also the size of those that continued to exist, in one form or another, and the newly constituted ones present various dimensional characteristics.

If we refer to joint-stock agricultural companies, the known conditions in which former state-owned agricultural enterprises arose and operated (see ownership), which allowed frequent roundings and disassemblies and, implicitly, changes in size, led to the formation of units and subunits with different areas and, respectively, herds of animals, but of large scale, although there were, from this point of view, more or less significant differences between them.

Among the factors that acted, in that period, on their size, we mention: profile and specialization; natural-economic area; the production technology practiced; the level of technical endowment and the efficiency of the technical means, etc.

Thus, the size of enterprises and farms where large crops (cereals, technical plants, etc.) were practiced was larger than that found in the case of the same units and subunits in fruit, viticulture or vegetable cultivation, mainly due to the different level of intensity that, in the latter case, it greatly amplifies the proportions of the production activity, its inclusion in the managerial process being more difficult or impossible in the conditions of large dimensions, but also the influence of other factors, such as, for example, lower degree of mechanization. , higher consumption of manual labor in the mentioned branches.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ancheta Structurală în Agricultură -2013 (A.S.A)
2. Ancheta Structurală în Agricultură -2016 (A.S.A)
3. <https://www.academia.edu/11583387/> CONCENTRAREA PROPIETĂȚII FUNNCIARE, DIMENSIUUNEA ȘI MĂRIMEA EXPLOATAȚIILOR AGRICOLE
4. Madr.ro/ agricultura ecologică
5. <https://www.revista-ferma.ro/articole/dezvoltare-rurala/dimensiunea-exploatatiiilor-agricole>