

Piras, Simone; Vittuari, Matteo; Möllers, Judith; Herzfeld, Thomas

Article — Accepted Manuscript (Postprint)

Remittance inflow and smallholder farming practices: The case of Moldova

Land Use Policy

Provided in Cooperation with:

Leibniz Institute of Agricultural Development in Transition Economies (IAMO), Halle (Saale)

Suggested Citation: Piras, Simone; Vittuari, Matteo; Möllers, Judith; Herzfeld, Thomas (2018) : Remittance inflow and smallholder farming practices: The case of Moldova, Land Use Policy, ISSN 0264-8377, Elsevier, Amsterdam [u.a.], Vol. 70, pp. 654-665, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2017.10.050> , <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264837717310487>

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/244227>

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.



<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Remittance inflow and smallholder farming practices. The case of Moldova

Simone Piras^{a*}, Matteo Vittuari^a, Judith Möllers^b, Thomas Herzfeld^{b,c}

a Department of Agricultural and Food Sciences, University of Bologna, viale Giuseppe Fanin 50, 40127 Bologna, Italy

b Department Agricultural Policy, Leibniz Institute of Agricultural Development in Transition Economies (IAMO), Theodor-Lieser-Straße 2, 06120 Halle, Saale, Germany

c Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg, Universitätsplatz 10, 06108 Halle, Saale, Germany

This is a “Post-print” accepted manuscript, which has been published in “Land Use Policy”.

Please cite this article as follows: Piras, S., Vittuari, M., Möllers, J., Herzfeld, T. (2018) Remittance inflow and smallholder farming practices: The case of Moldova. *Land Use Policy* 70, 654-665.

You can download the published version at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2017.10.050>

©<2018>. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Abstract

In the Republic of Moldova, a large number of households that received land shares after the break-down of the collective farm structure currently focus on semi-subsistence agriculture. Often, one or more members of these households have migrated abroad. This paper aims at assessing the impact of remittances on their agricultural production practices and investments. The authors rely on the rotating panel dataset of the Household Budget Survey for the period 2007–2013, and on an original survey carried out on a sample of 126 households in 2015. To test if remittance recipients replace family labour and self-produced inputs with mechanisation services and purchased inputs, a shadow agricultural wage is estimated. Logistic regressions are used to assess whether the occurrence of investments (land, machinery, or dairy cattle) is more probable in the case of remittance inflow. The results show that recipient households reduce their drudgery by substituting family labour and self-produced seeds and feed with mechanisation services and purchased inputs, without necessarily increasing production efficiency. The relationship between remittances and agricultural investments is very weak or negative. However, qualitative insights demonstrate that many investments (greenhouses, rototillers, walnut orchards, etc.) were possible thanks to remittances. Although most recipients do not invest in agriculture, the minority that does invest has access to remittances.

Keywords: smallholders; remittances; investment decisions; farming practices; Republic of Moldova.

1. Introduction

In a number of formerly centrally-planned economies, the decollectivisation of agriculture and privatisation of land resulted in agricultural structures dominated by small farms. Romania, Latvia, Lithuania and Moldova, in particular, experienced an increase in the share of agriculture in employment, combined with a growing number of individual farms (Macours and Swinnen, 2005; Swinnen et al., 2005). Many of these smallholders focus on semi-subsistence farming. Indeed, apart from the small size of their plots, which is not enough to provide decent revenue, the shortage of agricultural credit and the unreliability of output markets obstruct the development of viable commercial farms. Furthermore, the lack of non-farm jobs on the rural labour market represents a constraint in pursuing alternative livelihood choices locally. International migration has thus become a widespread strategy, illustrated by the high inflow of remittances. The Republic of Moldova is a prime example of this development pattern. Here, the break-down of collective agriculture generated around 900,000 small family farms within a population of 3.55 million inhabitants (NBS, 2011), while, due to high rates of emigration, in the last decade remittances have accounted for 20–30% of the GDP (World Bank, 2017). But whether households use this income for consumptive purposes or to invest in and develop their farming businesses remains an open question.

53 The literature on migration and agricultural change focuses either on developing countries
54 in Latin America (Aguilar-Støen et al., 2016; Davis and Lopez-Carr, 2014; Gray, 2009; Gray and
55 Bilsborrow, 2014; Jacoby, 1993; Taylor et al., 2016), Asia (Adams Jr., 1998; Sunam and McCar-
56 thy, 2016) and Africa (Adams Jr., 1991), or on emerging countries, primarily China (de Brauw
57 and Rozelle, 2008; Liu et al., 2016; Qin and Liao, 2016; Rozelle et al., 1999). As for Eastern
58 Europe, both the impact of remittances on the overall economy (León-Ledesma and Piracha,
59 2004), and the relationship between migration and agricultural labour (Macours and Swinnen,
60 2005), or land use (Baumann et al., 2011) have been investigated. Due to the huge proportions
61 assumed by international migration in Moldova, the impact of remittances on its economy has
62 been assessed in specific studies (Lücke et al., 2009; Pinger, 2010). The relationship between
63 remittances and land use has been looked at by Bolganschi (2011). Based on the results of a
64 qualitative survey and on secondary data, she argues that migration causes farming households to
65 switch towards less labour-demanding production activities, and fosters farm exit, although most
66 emigrants maintain the property of their land. She does not, however, provide an in-depth analysis
67 at to whether remittance inflow generates any change in the agricultural practices of the house-
68 holds who do not exit farming.

69 Economic theory offers several channels for explaining how migration could affect labour-
70 sending rural households. First, abstracting from hidden unemployment, migration of labour force
71 should lead to an increase in the opportunity cost of labour (Singh et al., 1986). Second, remit-
72 tances can enable households to overcome credit constraints (Stark, 1991). Conditional upon the
73 possibility to hire labour as a compensation for migrated household members, remittances will be
74 invested in productive or non-productive durable assets. The empirical evidence from a range of
75 developing and transition economies is rather mixed. On the one hand, Taylor and Lopez-Feld-
76 man (2010) find for Mexicans migrating to the US that the incomes of sending households and
77 their agricultural productivity increase due to remittances. Similarly, using Mexican data, Böhme
78 (2015) finds that accumulated agricultural assets are greater in households receiving international
79 remittances, but cannot find evidence of investment in riskier activities, like livestock husbandry.
80 Furthermore, he shows that investments are subject to a life-cycle, that households with older
81 heads invest less, and that migrant households even disinvest more at later stages of their life
82 cycle than non-migrant households. Differentiating between productive and non-productive as-
83 sets, and controlling for asset accumulation effect, Chiodi et al. (2012) find evidence that rural
84 Mexican households tend to use remittances to invest in productive assets. On the other hand,
85 using farm household data from Albania, Kilic et al. (2009) find that non-farm income is used to
86 move out of crop production and, for commercial farms, to invest in livestock production. Also,
87 the intensity of arable land use follows an inverted N-shaped curve as rural out-migration in-
88 creases, due to the concurrent impact of labour shortage and intensified use of fertiliser and pes-
89 ticide inputs (Liu et al., 2016). Qin and Liao (2016) analyse the relationship between migration,
90 agricultural change and general regional development by qualitatively reviewing twenty case
91 studies from rural China. They find that agricultural production declines in regions with high out-
92 migration and general low economic development, while in more economically developed regions
93 out-migration and agricultural production seem to be positively related. Thus, whether remit-
94 tances are used for achieving agricultural modernisation depends on the context and, probably,
95 on household-specific characteristics.

96 This paper aims at assessing the impact of remittances on the production practices of Mol-
97 dovan smallholders. More specifically, it analyses whether households receiving remittances
98 change their on-farm labour use, and whether they invest at least part of their remittances into
99 agriculture. Differently from previous studies on this country, econometric analyses drawing from
100 a rich database—the database of the Household Budget Survey (HBS) of the National Bureau of

101 Statistics of the Republic of Moldova (NBS) for the period 2007–2013—were carried out, apply-
102 ing (and building on) the methodology developed by Skoufias (1994). A further contribution of
103 this paper relates to the combination of quantitative analyses and qualitative insights from an
104 original survey carried out by one of the authors in spring 2015 (hereafter, “2015-smallholder-
105 survey”). To avoid endogeneity issues due to common characteristics driving households’ deci-
106 sions related to migration, production, and consumption, here panel data allow for a more con-
107 sistent modelling of the relationship between remittance inflow, and smallholders’ investment
108 decisions. To our knowledge, this is the first study analysing the effect of remittances on agricul-
109 tural investments in a transition country context. The case of Moldova is particularly relevant due
110 to the paramount role played by family farming in the national economy and society, and to the
111 signing of an Association Agreement between this country and the European Union (EU) in 2014,
112 which is expected to generate interesting opportunities for commercial farmers.

113 The rest of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 provides a short background on
114 smallholder agriculture and international migration in Moldova. Section 3 introduces the data and
115 the methodology. Section 4 presents and discusses the results of the econometric analysis, putting
116 them in perspective using the insights from the 2015-smallholder-survey. Section 5 concludes and
117 provides some policy implications.

118

119 **2. Smallholder agriculture and international migration in Moldova**

120 Moldova is a small landlocked country in which agriculture has long been an important economic
121 activity¹. While a member of the USSR, the country was a net exporter of agro-food products to
122 the rest of the Union (primarily wine, spirits, and fresh products, like fruits and vegetables)² (Gor-
123 ton and White, 2003). Its agro-industrial complex was dominated by huge collective and State
124 farms: the only form of family agriculture was the small plots allocated to the members of rural
125 households and to urban workers, which accounted for 7% of the agricultural land. Households
126 were also engaged in animal breeding, producing a large share of the national output of meat,
127 milk, eggs, and sheep wool. Smallholders emerged as a result of the insider privatisation of col-
128 lective and State farms. Although foreseen in the Land code of 1991, the process of land distri-
129 bution didn’t begin until 1998, when the Parliament passed the National Land Program, and was
130 carried out in the form of “shares”³.

131 The portion of privately-owned land grew from around nil to 67% in 2003. In 2001, over
132 500,000 individuals had received land shares, and over 200,000 had registered their household as
133 a peasant farm, with an average size of 1.8 hectares. However, the reform overlooked the role of
134 collective and State farms as providers of social services and managers of rural infrastructure
135 (including irrigation systems), which fell into disrepair. Furthermore, in many cases the privati-
136 sation process turned into a “grab what you can” at local level (Ibidem: 321). Reformers expected
137 a structure of middle-sized commercial family farms to emerge gradually through market-based

¹ All studies on the Republic of Moldova, including this one, focus on the western region of the country (Bessarabia), since eastern Moldova (Transnistria) is not controlled by the national government. The surface of Bessarabia is 30,355 square kilometres and, as of 2017, its population is 3.55 million inhabitants, of whom 57% live in rural areas (NBS, 2017c). The share of territory covered by arable land and permanent crops (64% in 2014) is one of the largest in the world (World Bank, 2017).

² Until 2005, agri-food products and drinks accounted for over 50% of Moldovan exports, and were still accounting for 33% in 2016 (NBS, 2017c).

³ Home gardens and household plots were assigned to the households farming them as “small shares”. The land farmed collectively (arable land, orchards and vineyards) was divided into “big shares”, whose size and composition were set at the level of municipality based on the local land endowment. Furthermore, “shares of values” of the assets of collective and State farms were created. All workers of these State farms, including pensioners and former workers as of 1 January 1992, were entitled to a share. Furthermore, up to 50% of the local land was distributed to local residents belonging to certain categories, if none of their family members were eligible (Möllers et al., 2016).

138 land transactions and investments, thus triggering the economic development of rural areas. In-
139 stead, the land market evolved slowly: in ten years, only 2% of the land changed ownership, the
140 average transaction involving 0.1 hectares (Cimpoieş, 2010). As in other post-Soviet countries,
141 commercial agriculture continues to be dominated by the large corporate farms that succeeded
142 their socialist counterparts (Lerman and Sutton, 2008; Small, 2007).

143 In the same year that land began to be privatised (1998), Moldova was severely hit by the
144 Russian financial crisis, which led to the beginning of mass migration. Estimates of the stock of
145 international migrants vary: in 2014, Moldovan diplomatic missions gave a figure of 984,000, up
146 from 505,000 in 2011, while State border authorities gave a figure of 762,000 (IOM, 2016). Since
147 the country is located at the border between the Community of Independent States and the EU,
148 Moldovans migrate in either direction. The common Soviet past reduces the transaction costs of
149 moving to Russia, which has constantly attracted an absolute majority of migrants (550,000 in
150 2014), followed by Italy (150,000) (Ibidem). Migration to Russia tends to be short-term, so that
151 numbers fluctuate more (Lücke et al., 2009). In 2014, limited to temporary migrants (342,000),
152 72% came from rural areas, 64% were male, and the largest age group (35%) was represented by
153 25 to 34-year-olds (IOM, 2016). These figures, which had not changed significantly since 2009,
154 give an idea of the impressive outflow of labour force, accounting for between 25 and 50% of the
155 active population (Pinger, 2010: 145). Simultaneously, migration resulted in a sizeable inflow of
156 remittances, which peaked at 35% of the GDP in 2006, and declined to 22% in 2016, when Mol-
157 dova was ranked the seventh country in the world by remittances as a share of GDP (World Bank,
158 2017). During the period studied here, this figure ranged from 34% in 2007, to 27% in 2013
159 (Ibidem). Of special relevance for the analysis at hand is that remittances have always accounted
160 for around twice the share of family income in rural areas than in cities (23% vs. 12% in 2016)
161 (NBS, 2017c).

162 Despite migration, 94% of the almost 900,000 family farms (not necessarily registered)
163 detected by the most recent Agricultural Census in 2011 were active (NBS, 2011). This corre-
164 sponds to one active family farm for every 4.2 inhabitants: the highest incidence among European
165 and Central Asian countries⁴. These family farms were found to have an average size of 1.1 hec-
166 tares, and make up 43% of the total agricultural land (NBS, 2011): a much larger share than in
167 Russia or Ukraine, where, in 2008, corporate farms accounted for around 80% of the total land
168 (Lerman and Sutton, 2008). In 2016, agriculture and related activities produced 12% of the GDP,
169 while agricultural employment stood at 34% (NBS, 2017c). Considering that most land recipients
170 did not register their households as farms, and many pensioners cultivate their land, the real num-
171 bers are probably much higher. The prevalence of informal agricultural labour can also explain
172 why the share of active population in rural areas was as low as 41% in 2016 (Ibidem).

173 Based on the Agricultural Census of 2011, a large majority of Moldovan family farms
174 (86%) focus on subsistence production. Less than 9% sell over half of their output. Farms are
175 small (71% have a surface area below one hectare, and 99.7% below ten hectares) and operate
176 with rather old machinery, if at all (e.g., one tractor for every 54 farms, of which 83% are older
177 than 10 years). Only 0.7% of the land farmed by family farms is irrigated. Furthermore, family
178 farms rely almost exclusively on family labour (81% of 1.6 million working persons), or on rela-
179 tives (17%). Finally, only 0.1% of them keep books⁵. Nevertheless, they are more efficient and
180 productive than corporate farms (Lerman and Sutton, 2008: 100): since 1999, their total yearly
181 production at national level has continued to surpass that of the latter (which farm more land) by
182 1.5 to 2.3 times (NBS, 2017c). Despite this efficiency, family farms face tight credit constraints,

⁴ Authors' elaboration on data from FAO (2014), and the Moldovan Agricultural Census (NBS, 2011).

⁵ Authors' elaboration on data from the Moldovan Agricultural Census (NBS, 2011).

183 which prevent them from modernising and turning into viable businesses to support future gener-
184 ations. This situation is due to three main reasons: they lack collateral apart from their land, as
185 banks tend to formulate excessive requests (or undervalue their assets); the supply is limited al-
186 most exclusively to short-term loans; and there is a lack of instruments facilitating access to credit,
187 such as guarantee funds (Moroz et al., 2015). In 2011, only 0.1% of these farms received a bank
188 loan, 7% obtained State subsidies, and less than 1% had access to other types of financing⁶.

189 The agricultural sector is a cornerstone of the government’s *National Development Strategy*
190 *Moldova 2020*, approved in 2012. The general goal of the strategy is to ensure sustainable growth,
191 and improve living conditions in rural areas by increasing “competitiveness and productivity”
192 (FAO, 2012: 22). In the meanwhile, in 2014, the international framework within which Moldova
193 elaborates its rural development policy underwent relevant changes, as its government and the
194 EU signed an Association Agreement (which also includes a Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade
195 Agreement). Much like in other sectors, agricultural policies were also linked to the general goal
196 of EU integration. This is expected to translate into new opportunities and constraints for small-
197 holders, as the EU—like many other international and State-based development agencies active
198 in the country—foresees financial assistance for the producers interested in farm modernisation
199 (e.g., for conforming to food quality and safety standards) (EU, 2014). Understanding the rela-
200 tionship between remittances and agriculture among smallholders can thus contribute to the suc-
201 cess of the ongoing rural development measures.

202

203 **3. Data and methods**

204 **3.1. Data**

205 Two types of data were used: the results of the 2015-smallholder-survey and the database of the
206 Moldovan HBS for the period 2007–2013.

207 The database of the 2015-smallholder-survey provides an explanatory framework, and
208 makes it possible to identify smallholders’ motivations, as well as relationships that are not de-
209 tectable by means of purely quantitative data. This survey was implemented by a two-person team
210 (a man and a woman) using a structured questionnaire, which was read to an adult member of the
211 households (or to a married couple) in face-to-face interviews. The population of reference con-
212 sisted of farming households, defined as households cultivating some land and obtaining a non-
213 zero farm income. Participation was voluntary: respondents were identified using snowball sam-
214 pling, while interviewers controlled for the distribution of two stratifying variables (farm size and
215 age of the household head), which were kept in line with the Agricultural Census (NBS, 2011).
216 The final sample size was 126⁷. The period of reference for the answers was either the 12 months
217 before the interview, or the previous agricultural year (November 2013 to October 2014). All
218 monetary values were registered in current (2015) Moldovan *Lei* (singular: *Leu*, MDL), and were
219 then converted to EUR, using the 2015 exchange rate, for the purpose of presenting them in this
220 paper⁸.

221 Within the sample, farm sizes range from 0.04 to 38.50 hectares. Excluding three farms of
222 more than ten hectares, which would not be classified as “small” by the NBS (2017a) and repre-
223 sent clear outliers, the average size is 1.60 hectares, compared to 1.07 in the Agricultural Census.
224 The average age of the household head is 56.5 years, compared to 53.1 in the Agricultural Census.

⁶ See previous footnote.

⁷ A simple random sample of 126 households from a population of 898,768 returns a confidence interval of $\pm 8.7\%$ at a confidence level of 95%, or of $\pm 11.5\%$ at a confidence level of 99%. Due to stratification, the actual error margin is likely to be narrower.

⁸ In 2015, the average official exchange rate was 20.8980 MDL/EUR (0.0479 EUR/MDL).

225 An absolute majority of interviews was conducted in the districts of Orhei and Telenești, along
226 the Răut River Valley or in the surrounding hills. These districts occupy a midway position be-
227 tween the capital and the periphery of the country; therefore, their agricultural sector is affected
228 neither by excessive closeness to the former, nor by extreme isolation. To improve sample repre-
229 sentativeness, 20 interviews were taken in three districts which present specific conditions:
230 Briceni, the northernmost of the country; Găgăuzia, a remote southern region inhabited by a Turk-
231 ish-speaking minority; and Chișinău city-district, affected by the spill-overs of the large market
232 of the capital.

233 Furthermore, semi-structured qualitative interviews were carried out with a rural develop-
234 ment manager of the EU Delegation in Chișinău, with the accountant of a village-based associa-
235 tion granting short-term loans to smallholders, and with two village-based land registry officers.

236 The second database is the rotating panel database of the HBS. The HBS aims at determin-
237 ing people's life levels by registering household incomes, expenditures, consumption, living con-
238 ditions, and related variables (NBS, 2017b). The sampling unit is the household, and the popula-
239 tion of reference is all people residing in Moldova outside Transnistria. Sampling follows a two-
240 stage procedure: after dividing the country into primary sampling units representing big cities,
241 small towns, or villages, a group of households from each unit is selected. Weights are included
242 to weigh every household according to the size of its unit. Every month, the NBS selects 814
243 households which must register their incomes and expenditures along a given period (the month
244 of the interview and the last 12 months for remittances and farm income, the last two weeks for
245 expenditures and self-consumed farm products). Monthly data aim at obtaining representative
246 samples on a quarterly or yearly basis. In 2007–2013, yearly sample sizes ranged from a maxi-
247 mum of 6,133 units in 2008 to a minimum of 5,082 in 2013, for a total of 39,414 over the entire
248 period.

249 Around half of the households taking part in the HBS (from 3,012 in 2007, to 2,437 in
250 2013, for a total of 18,804 single observations) are included in a panel study based on a rotation
251 scheme. They are interviewed up to four times, once every 12 months. For most panel households,
252 less than four observations are available in the period 2007–2013, since they entered the study
253 either before 2007, or after 2010. This time span is not long enough to model phenomena like
254 farm exit, but allows for changes in other key variables to be observed.

255 The HBS does not focus exclusively on farming households. Therefore, only households
256 earning farm income (either in kind or in money) were selected. Choosing an appropriate defini-
257 tion of “farming household” was not trivial and this one was selected for its inclusiveness, allow-
258 ing for the detection of a larger spectrum of situations and diverse dynamics. Indeed, while the
259 households obtaining over half of their income from farming are few, agriculture represents an
260 important income source and life activity for many more. The sample size resulting from this
261 definition is 30,119. The number of households decreases gradually, from 4,627 in 2007, to 3,995
262 in 2013. Of these, 14,503 are panel observations but, for 2,158 households, only one observation
263 is available.

264 Remittance-recipient households were defined as households receiving money from
265 abroad, regardless of the amount or the sending person (a member of the family, a relative, or a
266 friend). Indeed, the latter information is not available in the database, and the variable indicating
267 whether a specific household member was missing is almost empty. No household in any year
268 reported receiving in-kind remittances, so the sum is made up of monetary transfers only. Internal
269 remittances from non-household members are included within a residual income aggregate, and
270 could not be extracted; furthermore, this aggregate is much smaller than international remittances

271 (88 EUR vs. 364 EUR on average for the entire population), and is rarely worth over 600 EUR
272 (10,000 MDL). Hence, it can barely have a relevant impact on agricultural practices and invest-
273 ments. Based on this definition, 7,871 farming households (26%) are recipients, while 22,248
274 (74%) are not. Among panel households for whom more than one observation is available, 3,251
275 are recipients, while 9,094 are not.

276 Within the HBS database, monetary values are expressed in current MDL. Before carrying
277 out the econometric analysis, they were deflated to obtain constant 2007 prices. For the purpose
278 of presenting them in this paper, they were converted into EUR using the 2007 exchange rate⁹. The
279 2015-smallholder-survey and the HBS will be analysed in parallel. Indeed, the two samples are
280 easily comparable: first, the definition of the farming household is the same; second, as already
281 mentioned, the districts covered by the 2015-smallholder-survey represent the country well.

282

283 **3.2. Methodology**

284 The econometric analysis presented here relies on HBS data for the years 2007 to 2013. All equa-
285 tions were estimated using pooled time-series and cross-section data (like in Skoufias, 1994),
286 ignoring sample weights to avoid mixing them (as suggested by Signoret, 2003).

287 Before assessing if remittances have an impact on production and investment behaviours,
288 the differences between recipient and non-recipient farming households in terms of demographics
289 and other variables were tested by means of a logit regression (where the dependent variable was
290 a dummy turning one if the family received remittances, zero otherwise), and through quantile
291 regressions estimated among recipients only (using the median, the third quartile, and the 90th
292 percentile, respectively). Based on these estimates, variables for matching recipient and non-re-
293 cipient households were identified.

294 To assess whether recipient households tend to replace family labour and self-produced
295 inputs with services and purchased inputs, the shadow value of family labour was calculated. The
296 first step consisted in estimating agricultural production functions.

297 Four Cobb-Douglas-shaped production functions were estimated: two with male, female
298 and child labour separately (like in Skoufias, 1994; Le, 2009), and two with total family labour.
299 For each setup, an equation was estimated using generalised two-stage least square random-ef-
300 fects¹⁰, and another using the single-equation generalised method of moments (Jacoby, 1993; Le,
301 2009), both with instrumental variables (IV). All variables referring to agricultural family labour
302 and variable farm inputs were instrumented. Due to the difficulty in finding appropriate instru-
303 ments (the HBS database reports only the expenditure for inputs, without prices), dummy varia-
304 bles for macro-regions were included to account for price variations¹¹. In contrast to developing

⁹ In 2007, the average official exchange rate was 16.5986 MDL/EUR (0.0602 EUR/MDL). In 2013, the two-stage sampling adopted in the HBS resulted in a standard error of ± 1.35 EUR for individual income estimates, and ± 1.28 EUR for consumption estimates, at a confidence level of 95% (NBS, 2017b).

¹⁰ In line with Skoufias (1994), a fixed-effect model was also estimated, and the Hausman test of the random-effects versus fixed-effects specification calculated. The test favoured the latter if both covariance matrices were based on disturbance variance estimates from the efficient estimator, but the difference matrix was not positive definite, putting this result in doubt. The random-effect model was finally retained for several reasons. First, the average number of observations per household is limited (1.3), so that fixed-effects could barely be calculated; second, the R-squared index is significantly higher for the random-effects estimate (0.3899 vs. 0.0758); third, the results of the random-effects estimate were in line with those obtained with the generalised method of moments. The follow-up of the analysis was also performed with the shadow wage and incomes calculated from the fixed-effect model, and the results in terms of labour use did not change.

¹¹ The lists of the variables instrumented and of the instruments are provided in the Tables.

305 countries in Latin America or Southeast Asia, male and female labour is almost perfectly substi-
 306 tutable in Moldova, while child labour is secondary. Therefore, only the production functions
 307 with total family labour are retained in the Results Section. Production functions take the form:

$$\ln(Y_{h,t}) = \beta_0 + \sum_i \beta_i \ln(L_i)_{h,t} + \sum_j \gamma_j \ln(C_j)_{h,t} + \sum_k \alpha_k N_{k,h,t} + \sum_l \delta_l \ln(G_l)_{h,t} + \sum_m \theta_m A_{m,h,t} + \sum_n \varepsilon_n D_{n,h,t} + v_{h,t} \quad (1)$$

308 where $Y_{h,t}$ is the value of the total agricultural production of farming household h in year t , β_0 is a
 309 constant term, β_i 's, γ_j 's, α_k 's, δ_l 's, θ_m 's and ε_n 's are parameters, L_i are the hours of i types of labour
 310 (either female, male and child separately, or total family labour), C_j are the cost of j inputs (includ-
 311 ing mechanisation services and hired labour), N_k are the number of k types of animals, G_l are the
 312 surfaces (in ares¹²) of l types of land¹³, A_m are m household characteristics, D_n are location and
 313 other variables, and v is an error term for the effect of omitted variables.

314 Using the coefficients from the production functions, agricultural shadow wages and
 315 shadow incomes were calculated. Unlike in previous analyses (Skoufias, 1994; Le, 2009), home
 316 labour and self-produced goods were not included in income due to the lack of data. The shadow
 317 cost of family labour was obtained by multiplying the shadow wages by the number of hours spent
 318 working on the family farm; then, its incidence on total farm costs (including shadow costs) was
 319 calculated. The share of internalised inputs was obtained by summing up the costs of self-produced
 320 feed and seeds (available in the database) with the shadow cost of family labour¹⁴. The formulas
 321 to calculate shadow wages $\hat{w}_{i,h,t}^*$ (2), shadow incomes $\hat{V}_{h,t}^*$ (3), and labour costs C_l (4) are, respec-
 322 tively:

$$\hat{w}_{i,h,t}^* = \beta_i * (\hat{Y}_{h,t} / L_{i,h,t}) \quad (2)$$

$$\hat{V}_{h,t}^* = \hat{Y}_{h,t} - \sum_i \hat{w}_{i,h,t}^* W_{i,h,t} - \sum_j C_{j,h,t} + \sum_p I_{p,h,t} \quad (3)$$

$$C_l = \sum_i \hat{w}_{i,h,t}^* L_{i,h,t} \quad (4)$$

323 where, for each household h in year t , \hat{Y} is the fitted value of farm output, W_i is the labour supplied
 324 (both on-farm and off-farm) by each type i of family members (males, females and children), and
 325 I_p are off-farm incomes, including eventual incomes from renting land, and from providing mech-
 326 anisation services. The incidence of labour (5), and of internalised inputs (6) are, respectively:

$$\pi_{l,h,t} = C_{l,h,t} / \left(C_{l,h,t} + \sum_j C_{j,h,t} \right) \quad (5)$$

$$\pi_{i,h,t} = (C_{l,h,t} + C_{f,h,t} + C_{s,h,t}) / \left(C_{l,h,t} + \sum_{j \neq f,s} C_{j,h,t} \right) \quad (6)$$

327 where C indicates a cost, and s and f (here, as well as in the formulas below) refer to self-produced
 328 seeds (and seedlings) and feed, respectively.

329 Labour supply functions were estimated using two-stage least squares regressions with IV,
 330 considering all households with non-zero farm labour (as in Skoufias, 1994)¹⁵. Then, they were
 331 estimated for remittance-recipients and for non-recipient households separately, thus obtaining
 332 the elasticity of the labour supply with respect to shadow wages and incomes for both household

¹² Due to the small farm sizes, hectares were converted into ares (1 are = 0.01 hectares) to avoid too small coefficients.

¹³ Either "small shares", generally used for self-consumption crops, and "big shares", used for orchards or for the extensive cultivation of cereals.

¹⁴ The shadow agricultural wage, the shadow income, and the shares of family labour and internalized inputs were calculated from each of the four production functions. The results with total family labour are retained in the Results Section, while those with male, female and child labour separately are presented within the Supplementary material.

¹⁵ Labour supply functions were estimated also for males and females separately (as in Le, 2009); estimates are presented within the Supplementary material.

333 types. The labour supply functions for total family labour (7), male labour (8), and female labour
 334 (9) take the following forms, respectively:

$$\ln(W_{tot_{h,t}}) = \rho_0 + \rho_1 \ln(\widehat{w}_{tot_{h,t}}^*) + \rho_3 \ln(\widehat{V}_{h,t}^*) + \sum_m \theta_m B_{m,h,t} + \sum_n \varepsilon_n H_{n,h,t} + \eta_{h,t} \quad (7)$$

$$\ln(W_{M_{h,t}}) = \rho_0^M + \rho_1^M \ln(\widehat{w}_{M_{h,t}}^*) + \rho_2^M \ln(\widehat{w}_{F_{h,t}}^*) + \rho_3^M \ln(\widehat{V}_{h,t}^*) + \sum_m \theta_m^M B_{m,h,t} + \sum_n \varepsilon_n^M H_{n,h,t} + \eta_{h,t} \quad (8)$$

$$\ln(W_{F_{h,t}}) = \rho_0^F + \rho_1^F \ln(\widehat{w}_{F_{h,t}}^*) + \rho_2^F \ln(\widehat{w}_{M_{h,t}}^*) + \rho_3^F \ln(\widehat{V}_{h,t}^*) + \sum_m \theta_m^F B_{m,h,t} + \sum_n \varepsilon_n^F H_{n,h,t} + \eta_{h,t} \quad (9)$$

335 where, for each household h in year t , W_{tot} and \widehat{w}_{tot}^* indicate, respectively, the labour supply and
 336 the shadow wage calculated for all family members, W_M and \widehat{w}_M^* indicate those for male members,
 337 and W_F and \widehat{w}_F^* those for female members. B is a vector of household characteristics (different in
 338 every equation), D is a vector of location and other variables, η is an error term for the effect of
 339 omitted variables, and ρ_s 's are the parameters to be estimated.

340 Before testing whether recipient and non-recipient households adopt significantly different
 341 production strategies, the two groups were matched using propensity score matching. The prop-
 342 ensity score was calculated with a logit regression where the dependent variable was a dummy
 343 turning one for remittance recipients, zero otherwise. T-tests of difference of means between re-
 344 mittance recipients and their matched non-recipient peers were implemented for the shares of
 345 labour costs and of internalised inputs. A bootstrapped value of the differences was also calculated
 346 to test whether it was significantly different from zero.

347 Nine more production indicators were calculated, and the difference between recipient and
 348 non-recipient household tested after propensity score matching; for this analysis, input and output
 349 variables were expressed in thousand MDL, family labour in hours, and land in ares:

- 350 1. the intensity of purchased inputs on farmed land: $(\sum_{j \neq \{f,s\}} C_{j_{h,t}}) / (\sum_l G_{l_{h,t}})$;
- 351 2. the intensity of family labour on farmed land: $(\sum_i L_{i_{h,t}}) / (\sum_l G_{l_{h,t}})$;
- 352 3. the ratio of family labour to purchased inputs: $(\sum_i L_{i_{h,t}}) / (\sum_{j \neq \{f,s\}} C_{j_{h,t}})$;
- 353 4. the ratio of purchased inputs to farm output: $(\sum_{j \neq \{f,s\}} C_{j_{h,t}}) / Y_{h,t}$;
- 354 5. the productivity of family labour (farm output unit per unit of family labour): $Y_{h,t} / (\sum_i L_{i_{h,t}})$;
- 355 6. the productivity of land (unit of farm output per unit of land farmed): $Y_{h,t} / (\sum_l G_{l_{h,t}})$;
- 356 7. the productivity of purchased inputs (unit of farm output per input unit): $Y_{h,t} / (\sum_{j \neq \{f,s\}} C_{j_{h,t}})$;
- 357 8. the share of animal production in total farm output: $Y_{h,t}^A / Y_{h,t}$;
- 358 9. the incidence of farm sales (i.e., of monetary farm income) on total output (in kind and in
 359 money): $Y_{h,t}^M / Y_{h,t}$.

360 To evaluate whether remittance recipients are more likely to invest in agriculture than non-
 361 recipient households, both qualitative insights from the 2015-smallholder-survey, and economet-
 362 ric analyses were used. First, examples of investments, not necessarily of remittances (e.g. roto-
 363 tillers, greenhouses, walnut orchards, etc.), were identified through the 2015-smallholder-survey,
 364 and are provided in the Results Section. In addition to providing information on actual invest-
 365 ments, respondent households were asked how they would spend non-repayable sums of 50,000
 366 EUR and 1,000 EUR, respectively. Three investment options that could be detected from the HBS
 367 database were selected for further analysis: dairy cattle, agricultural machinery, and arable land
 368 (either purchased or rented, since land rental represents a very common instrument for land con-
 369 solidation, Möllers et al., 2016). Although the literature on remittance investment patterns reveals
 370 that receiving households rarely opt for traditional agriculture as a livelihood strategy, these spe-
 371 cific investments were chosen to test three findings of the 2015-smallholder-survey. First, small-

372 scale milk and cheese production emerged as a viable strategy for providing a constant side in-
373 come to rural dwellers. Second, apart from traditional farming, agricultural machinery was used
374 either to provide mechanisation services to other smallholders, thus ensuring a discreet income,
375 or to reduce the drudgery of part-time farming (e.g., rototillers). Finally, respondents highlighted
376 the importance of land ownership for achieving self-fulfilment, and some examples of land pur-
377 chase for performing low-input agriculture were observed.

378 Only panel households were included in the study of farm investments. An investment
379 (disinvestment) was registered if the variables indicating the asset showed a positive (negative)
380 difference across years. For dairy cattle, the number of heads owned (2008–2013) was considered.
381 For farm machinery, when one of the dummies indicating ownership of tractors, plugs, trailers,
382 combines, or seeders turned from zero to one, an investment was registered, otherwise a disin-
383 vestment. For land, if the surface available to a household grew, an investment was registered,
384 otherwise a disinvestment. Categorical variables (investment, no change, and disinvestment)
385 were, thus, created.

386 The relationship between remittances and farm investments was assessed by means of mul-
387 tinomial logistic regressions of the abovementioned categorical variables on income variables,
388 household characteristics (head age and sex, and family size), and location dummies (for urban
389 areas, and regions). Three income typologies were considered: (1) remittances; (2) earned in-
390 comes (salaries and self-employment income); and (3) non-earned incomes (pensions and other
391 welfare payments). For each of the three investments, four models were estimated. In the first
392 model, income variables corresponded to the amount (in thousand MDL) in the current year. In
393 the second one, variables for the amount in the previous year were also included. In the third
394 model, incomes were represented, instead, by dummies for the availability of each type of income
395 in the current year. In the fourth one, dummies for their availability in the previous year were also
396 included¹⁶. Only the results of the estimate of the second model (with the current and lagged
397 amount of the three income typologies as independent variables) are displayed in the Results
398 Section¹⁷.

399 Finally, t-tests were implemented to assess whether the shares of households making one
400 of the three investments differed significantly between remittance recipients and non-recipients.
401 First, the two groups were matched by means of propensity score matching. Bootstrapped values
402 of the differences were also calculated to test whether they were significantly different from zero.

403

404 **4. Results**

405 Throughout the entire period 2007–2013, 80% of the households included in the HBS database
406 owned some land. The average property was 1.49 hectares but, due to leases (mostly to corporate
407 farms, as reported by Möllers et al., 2016), only 0.74 hectares were available on average. The
408 households farming some land were 78%, the average size being 0.30 hectares. Since rural house-
409 holds are overrepresented in the database, more reliable estimates can be obtained for 2013 using
410 sample weights: 72% of the households owned land (1.32 hectares on average), the same percent-
411 age had access to some of it (although only to 0.64 hectares), and 69% were farming some (0.29

¹⁶ Since the HBS panel rotates, cumulated incomes along many years could not be calculated. The Variance Inflation Factor was used to check for multicollinearity between current and lagged values, but no multicollinearity was observed.

¹⁷ The results of the estimates of the other models are provided within the Supplementary material.

412 hectares). Among farming households, the average yearly farm output (including in kind) at con-
 413 stant 2007 prices was 416 EUR over the entire period, and 348 EUR in 2013 (using weights). By
 414 comparison, family income accounted for 1,821 EUR and 1,862 EUR, respectively.

415 In 2013, farm income was the most widespread means of income (70% of the households),
 416 followed by pensions and other welfare payments (60%), waged income (49%), remittances
 417 (23%), and earnings from off-farm businesses (less than 1%). On average, remittances represented
 418 the highest sum after waged incomes (460 EUR vs. 858 EUR), being slightly above welfare pay-
 419 ments (409 EUR), more than twice farm revenues (187 EUR), and almost three times the earnings
 420 from off-farm businesses (142 EUR). Property income was negligible (4 EUR). For most house-
 421 holds, land ownership provided a simple supplement to wages or welfare: those earning over half
 422 of their income from farming were only 6%; on average, farming accounted for 13% of the income
 423 (18% among farming households).

424
 425 Table 1. Differences between recipient and non-recipient households, and among recipients.

Explanatory variables	Logit for remittances (dummy)		Quantile regression (median)		Quantile regression (75 th)		Quantile regres- sion (90 th)	
	Odd ratios	Std. err.	Coeff.	Std. err.	Coeff.	Std. err.	Coeff.	Std. err.
Household size	1.253	0.016	2.684	0.167	5.005	0.326	7.185	0.682
Household head age	1.008	0.007	-0.430	0.091	-0.571	0.178	-1.100	0.372
Household head age (squared)	1.000	0.000	0.003	0.001	0.003	0.002	0.006	0.004
Male household head (dummy)	0.540	0.017	-1.349	0.441	-1.547	0.862	-0.571	1.806
Urban location (dummy)	1.279	0.059	0.729	0.672	-0.969	1.312	-5.249	2.749
North (dummy)	0.855	0.029	3.088	0.509	2.875	0.994	1.786	2.084
South (dummy)	1.448	0.053	-1.472	0.511	-3.846	0.998	-8.579	2.092
Chişinău (dummy)	0.938	0.095	0.295	1.577	-0.194	3.079	-2.897	6.451
Earned income (1,000 MDL ¹)	0.958	0.002	-0.084	0.016	-0.092	0.032	-0.140	0.067
Non-earned income (1,000 MDL ¹)	0.954	0.003	-0.214	0.037	-0.323	0.073	-0.505	0.153
Farm income (1,000 MDL ¹)	0.966	0.003	-0.010	0.036	-0.075	0.070	-0.361	0.146
Land farmed (ares)	1.008	0.001	0.003	0.011	-0.026	0.022	0.006	0.045
Low education (dummy)	0.636	0.022	-2.937	0.525	-4.855	1.025	-8.856	2.148
High education (dummy)	1.012	0.063	2.625	0.935	6.647	1.826	14.531	3.827
Constant term	1.191	0.202	25.469	2.256	41.444	4.405	79.830	9.230
Number of observations	30,119		7,871		7,871		7,871	

Notes: ¹ 1,000 MDL correspond to 60 EUR.

Source: Authors' elaboration on data from the Moldovan HBS.

426
 427 The 2015-smallholder-survey showed that, due to the important role of homemade food
 428 and agricultural activities for self-reward and social appraisal, many smallholders choose to farm
 429 even if it results in financial loss (Piras, 2016). Rather than selling their land, or leaving it fallow,
 430 they use their waged income and remittances to cover farm costs. Thirty-five respondents (30%)
 431 had received remittances in the last 12 months, although the frequency was not regular. Based on
 432 HBS data for 2013, farming households receiving waged income or remittances were 41% and
 433 25%, respectively. On average, these represented the largest types of earnings but, unlike for the
 434 overall population, among farming households waged income was only slightly above remittances
 435 (558 EUR vs. 449 EUR). Furthermore, due to a strongly right-skewed distribution, the average
 436 amount of waged income for farming households with off-farm workers was lower than the av-
 437 erage remittances for recipient farming households (1,358 EUR vs. 1,551 EUR).

438 Table 1 shows the results of the logit and quartile regressions identifying the differences
 439 between remittance recipients (coded one) and other households (coded zero), and among the
 440 former. Recipient households are larger, are more often female-led (probably due to the absence
 441 of the husband), more often urban-based or from the south (more rarely from the north or from
 442 Chişinău), earn lower "internal" incomes (including from farming, despite using a larger area of
 443 land), and are less likely to be poorly educated. Furthermore, younger households, as well as those
 444 from rural areas, from the north, and with a higher education tend to receive more remittances.
 445 These findings suggest a need to implement propensity score matching.

446

447 **4.1. Remittances and production practices**

448 Table 2 presents two different estimates of the agricultural production functions for the house-
 449 holds using non-zero family labour¹⁸. Regardless of the estimation method, the direction of the
 450 coefficients does not change, meaning that the results are robust. Farm production is positively
 451 correlated with family labour, expenditure on seeds, mechanisation services and other inputs, an-
 452 imals (particularly cows) and male household heads. In contrast, hiring labour, larger land areas
 453 (both “small shares” and “big shares”), and older ages of the family head have a negative impact.
 454 Even the respondents to the 2015-smallholder-survey indicated the low productivity of hired ag-
 455 ricultural workers (Piras, 2016).
 456

457 Table 2. Estimates of the Cobb-Douglas production functions.

Farm output (1,000 MDL ¹) (log)	Random-effects IV regression (Model 1)		GMM IV regression (Model 2)	
	Coeff.	Std. err.	Coeff.	Std. err.
Household labour (hours) (log) ¹	0.2550	0.0195	0.2686	0.0264
Hired labour costs (1,000 MDL ²) (log) ¹	-2.4967	0.3800	-3.9053	0.6018
Seed costs (1,000 MDL ²) (log) ¹	1.2333	0.1182	1.2566	0.1455
Feed costs (1,000 MDL ²) (log) ¹	-0.1683	0.1602	-0.2165	0.1856
Other costs (1,000 MDL ²) (log) ¹	1.1224	0.1103	1.2104	0.1295
Mechanisation services costs (1,000 MDL ²) (log) ¹	0.7051	0.1851	0.5300	0.2129
Number of cows	0.1579	0.0226	0.1579	0.0275
Number of sheep	0.0118	0.0020	0.0107	0.0028
Number of goats	0.0130	0.0060	0.0227	0.0179
Number of pigs	0.0099	0.0108	0.0713	0.0227
Number of poultry	0.0003	0.0005	0.0004	0.0007
Number of other animals	0.0092	0.0013	0.0106	0.0025
Size of the “small share” (ares) (log)	-0.0371	0.0205	-0.0353	0.0249
Size of the “big share” (ares) (log)	-0.2874	0.0716	-0.1603	0.0879
Land quality (%)	-0.0031	0.0009	-0.0026	0.0011
Household head age	-0.0040	0.0026	-0.0054	0.0028
Household head age squared	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Male household head (dummy)	0.0880	0.0129	0.0992	0.0143
Education low (dummy)	0.0166	0.0133	0.0097	0.0146
Education high (dummy)	0.0195	0.0274	0.0491	0.0402
R-squared	0.3899		0.2926	
Number of observations	16,426		16,426	

Notes: ¹ Endogenous variables. ² 1,000 MDL correspond to 60 EUR.

Instruments: number of family members working on the farm, number of adult family members (aged 18 to 64), number of children (aged 4 to 17), number of elderly people (aged over 64), dummy for ownership of a tractor, dummy for urban locations, and regional dummies to account for price variations. Dummies for the year and the month of the interview and for inputs with zero value, and intercepts included in the regressions but not shown in the table. Constant of one added to all inputs before taking the logarithm.

Source: Authors’ elaboration on data from the Moldovan HBS.

458
 459 Table 3 gives the estimates of the labour supply functions. The elasticity of the labour sup-
 460 ply with respect to the shadow agricultural wage is clearly positive¹⁹, while its elasticity with
 461 respect to the shadow income is negative, as expected. The coefficients maintain the same signs
 462 when the functions are estimated separately for remittance recipients and non-recipients. How-
 463 ever, the elasticities with respect to the shadow wages (either negative or positive) and incomes
 464 (negative) are higher among recipients, meaning that the latter are more reactive to changes in
 465 these variables. Furthermore, the amount of labour supplied by Moldovan families is positively
 466 associated with the number of adult members, being married—as also detected by Skoufias (1994)
 467 using Indian data—and with higher ages of the family head (although it decreases for very old
 468 ages). In comparison, it is negatively associated with high education levels, probably due to the
 469 higher productivity of labour in this case.
 470

¹⁸ The test for endogeneity indicates that the variables instrumented are, indeed, endogenous.

¹⁹ When the labour supply functions for male and female members are estimated separately, the elasticity with respect to their own shadow wage is negative, suggesting that the labour supply curve is S-shaped for wages close to the subsistence level (Dessing, 2002). Furthermore, the opposite signs of the coefficients associated with the wages of family members of different sex provides evidence of a substitution effect between male and female labour. Tables with the results of the estimates are provided in the Supplementary material.

471 Table 3. IV two-stage least squares estimates of the labour supply functions with shadow wages
 472 and incomes calculated respectively from Model 1 and Model 2 of Table 2.

Shadow wage and income from Model 1		All households		Remittance recipients		Non-recipient families	
		Coeff.	Std. err.	Coeff.	Std. err.	Coeff.	Std. err.
Household labour supply (hours) (log)							
Household shadow wage (1,000 MDL ²) (log) ¹		189.5492	14.2934	188.0882	26.5480	166.8521	15.1744
Shadow income (1,000 MDL ²) (log) ¹		-0.2421	0.0260	-0.1579	0.0292	-0.1499	0.0485
Household head age		0.0126	0.0052	0.0110	0.0069	0.0121	0.0065
Household head age squared		-0.0001	0.0000	-0.0001	0.0001	-0.0001	0.0001
Married (dummy)		0.3199	0.0286	0.1164	0.0431	0.3666	0.0348
Education low (dummy)		0.0184	0.0250	0.0527	0.0364	0.0009	0.0285
Education high (dummy)		-0.1651	0.0542	-0.1561	0.0834	-0.1948	0.0614
Number of adults		0.3543	0.0127	0.3813	0.0169	0.3215	0.0162
Number of children		0.0750	0.0136	0.0575	0.0163	0.0771	0.0172
Number of infants		0.0319	0.0300	-0.0137	0.0370	0.0367	0.0379
Over-identification (p-value)		0.0294		0.0000		0.0000	
Number of observations		16,426		4,748		11,678	
Shadow wage and income from Model 2		All households		Remittance recipients		Non-recipient families	
		Coeff.	Std. err.	Coeff.	Std. err.	Coeff.	Std. err.
Household labour supply (hours) (log)							
Household shadow wage (1,000 MDL ²) (log) ¹		146.6000	11.8192	179.5616	25.5652	122.8072	11.8895
Shadow income (1,000 MDL ²) (log) ¹		-0.2292	0.0280	-0.1551	0.0318	-0.1396	0.0518
Household head age		0.0137	0.0055	0.0119	0.0075	0.0119	0.0068
Household head age squared		-0.0001	0.0001	-0.0001	0.0001	-0.0001	0.0001
Married (dummy)		0.3179	0.0306	0.1062	0.0474	0.3613	0.0366
Education low (dummy)		0.0225	0.0267	0.0667	0.0402	0.0041	0.0298
Education high (dummy)		-0.1738	0.0582	-0.1540	0.0911	-0.1983	0.0645
Number of adults		0.3442	0.0139	0.3726	0.0186	0.3153	0.0172
Number of children		0.0729	0.0146	0.0529	0.0180	0.0753	0.0181
Number of infants		0.0304	0.0321	-0.0121	0.0404	0.0277	0.0395
Over-identification (p-value)		0.0382		0.0000		0.0001	
Number of observations		16,426		4,748		11,678	

Notes: ¹ Endogenous variables. ² 1,000 MDL correspond to 60 EUR.

Instruments: exogenous income of the household (1,000 MDL – 60 EUR) (log), area of land farmed (ares) (log), number of family members working on the farm (aged 18 to 64), and dummy for urban locations. Dummies for the year and the month of the interview, for the region and for zero or negative shadow incomes, and intercepts included in the regressions but not shown in the table. Constant of one added to all inputs before taking the logarithms.

Source: Authors' elaboration on data from the Moldovan HBS.

473
 474 The results of the tests of difference in the mean incidence of family labour and of inter-
 475 nalised input costs between recipient and non-recipient households are shown in Table 4. The
 476 difference in the shadow wages was also tested, but it was found to be non-significant. The inci-
 477 dence of family labour and of internalised inputs on total farm costs differs significantly regard-
 478 less of the estimation method. Family labour accounts for 50–52% of farm costs among recipients,
 479 compared to 53–55% among non-recipients. Internalised inputs account for 58–59% and 62–63%,
 480 respectively. These results suggest that recipients tend to substitute family labour and self-pro-
 481 duced inputs with mechanisation services provided by contractors (as also observed during the
 482 2015-smallholder-survey), and with purchased inputs.

483
 484 Table 4. Incidence of family labour (calculated from Model 1 and Model 2 of Table 2) and of in-
 485 ternalised inputs on total farm expenditures among recipient and non-recipient households.

Variable		Recipients	Others	Diff.	Std. err.	Bootstr. diff.	Std. err.
Share of labour costs (from Model 1)	Unmatched	0.5019	0.5272	-0.0253	0.0026		
	Matched	0.5011	0.5326	-0.0316	0.0044	-0.0409	0.0026
Share of internalised inputs (from Model 1)	Unmatched	0.5782	0.6188	-0.0406	0.0028		
	Matched	0.5779	0.6173	-0.0394	0.0047	-0.0494	0.0027
Share of labour costs (from Model 2)	Unmatched	0.5158	0.5435	-0.0277	0.0028		
	Matched	0.5151	0.5481	-0.0331	0.0046	-0.0429	0.0029
Share of internalised inputs (from Model 2)	Unmatched	0.5896	0.6317	-0.0421	0.0029		
	Matched	0.5893	0.6297	-0.0403	0.0049	-0.0509	0.0030

Notes: Households matched on the number of adult members, their average age (and its squared value), the gender of the household head, location dummies (urban settlement, north, centre and south; Chişinău omitted), earned income (1,000 MDL – 60 EUR), non-earned income (1,000 MDL – 60 EUR), farm income (1,000 MDL – 60 EUR), available land (ares), and year dummies. Values calculated on 16,324 households (2008–2013) producing a non-zero farm output and using a non-zero amount of family labour for which the propensity score could be estimated (11,677 untreated, 4,647 treated).

Source: Authors' elaboration on data from the Moldovan HBS.

486
 487 All production indicators assume values that are significantly different between remittance
 488 recipient and non-recipient households, as shown in Table 5. On average, recipient households

489 spend 523 EUR on purchased inputs, and employ 7,100 hours of family labour per hectare farmed,
 490 compared to 489 EUR and 7,830 hours among non-recipients. Hence, remittance recipients show
 491 higher labour productivity (0.36 vs. 0.33 EUR per hour), and lower land productivity (1,018 EUR
 492 vs. 1,100 EUR per hectare). Due to the lower labour to inputs ratio (15.4 vs. 17.2 hours per EUR
 493 spent), the incidence of monetary costs on farm production is higher among them (39% vs. 32%),
 494 and the productivity of purchase input lower (4.12 vs. 4.36 units per unit spent). Finally, recipients
 495 obtain a higher share of their farm output from animal breeding (39% vs. 37%), and sell a smaller
 496 share of their production (11% vs. 15%)²⁰. The latter figure seems to confirm the qualitative find-
 497 ing of the 2015-smallholder-survey, reported by Piras (2016), that many smallholders who earn a
 498 good income off-farm (including remittances from household members) continue to engage in
 499 agriculture (eventually part-time) for non-financial reasons. Indeed, this survey showed that
 500 working one's land and producing one's own food yields self-fulfilment and social appraisal,
 501 especially in the villages. These smallholders are not interested in systematic commercialisation
 502 of farm output.

504 Table 5. Difference in the values of production indexes among recipients and non-recipients.

Variable		Recipients	Others	Diff.	Std. err.	Bootstr. diff.	Std. err.
Intensity of purchased inputs on land (1,000 MDL/are ¹)	Unmatched	0.0877	0.0753	0.0124	0.0026		
	Matched	0.0868	0.0812	0.0056	0.0044	0.0101	0.0030
Intensity of labour on land (hours/are)	Unmatched	71.3463	76.3946	-5.0483	1.7752		
	Matched	71.0343	78.2994	-7.2651	3.0176	-5.1070	2.1189
Labour to input ratio (hours/1,000 MDL ¹)	Unmatched	920.6582	1045.7013	-125.0432	14.7387		
	Matched	926.1547	1038.0795	-111.9248	23.9181	-134.9787	17.1630
Purchased input cost on farm output	Unmatched	0.3932	0.2983	0.0949	0.0110		
	Matched	0.3871	0.3187	0.0684	0.0148	0.0495	0.0086
Labour productivity (1,000 MDL/hour ¹)	Unmatched	0.0060	0.0059	0.0000	0.0001		
	Matched	0.0060	0.0055	0.0005	0.0002	0.0008	0.0001
Land productivity (1,000 MDL/are ¹)	Unmatched	0.1689	0.1924	-0.0234	0.0051		
	Matched	0.1689	0.1826	-0.0137	0.0082	-0.0124	0.0044
Productivity of purchased inputs	Unmatched	4.0950	4.6440	-0.5489	0.0614		
	Matched	4.1181	4.3632	-0.2452	0.0967	-0.1529	0.0778
Animal production on total farm production	Unmatched	0.3940	0.3761	0.0180	0.0038		
	Matched	0.3949	0.3722	0.0227	0.0063	0.0252	0.0043
Farm sale on total farm production	Unmatched	0.1123	0.1454	-0.0331	0.0033		
	Matched	0.1133	0.1518	-0.0385	0.0055	-0.0233	0.0045

Notes: ¹ 1,000 MDL correspond to 60 EUR. Households matched on the same variables as in Table 4. Values calculated on 18,831 households (2007–2013) producing a non-zero farm output and using non-zero family labour for which the propensity score could be estimated, and the index calculated (18,682 for input intensity, labour intensity and land productivity; 15,257 for labour to inputs ratio and input productivity; 18,723 for farm sales, animal output, input costs on farm production, and labour productivity). Source: Authors' elaboration on data from the Moldovan HBS.

505

506 4.2. Remittances and agricultural investments

507 The 2015-smallholder-survey confirmed smallholders' difficulties in obtaining a bank loan, and
 508 highlighted that interest rates are high (over 20% in 2015). The only options for those lacking
 509 collateral, or a means of transport to cities (where banks are located) are formal loans from village-
 510 based credit agencies, or informal private loans. These are usually small, short-term loans, and
 511 are thus used for current expenditures. For example, the credit agency whose accountant was
 512 interviewed was supplying one- or two-year loans of 500 EUR (2015) on average, at an interest
 513 rate of 31% (the crisis of the Russian rouble had caused interest rates to raise). Furthermore, the
 514 smallholders whose loan requests were approved had to give their land as collateral. Private loans
 515 imply no administrative burdens, and low or even no interest, but generate an uncomfortable
 516 moral obligation to maintain good relationships with the moneylender. Indeed, the latter is often

²⁰ Any difference between the figures presented in the paragraph and those shown in Table 5 is due to the use of different units, and to the subsequent conversion of MDL into EUR. Indeed, to avoid obtaining too small coefficients, land variables in the database were converted into ares (1 are = 0.01 hectares), and monetary values into 1,000 MDL, which correspond to 60 EUR.

517 a large farmer renting the “big share” of the creditor. Smallholders usually ask for such loans at
518 the beginning of the agricultural year, and pay them back after harvesting.

519 Only 14 respondents (12%), with farms generally larger than the average (ten of them were
520 above two hectares, five above five hectares), had received a loan in the 12 months before the
521 2015-smallholder-survey. Seven had received a formal loan averaging 3,364 EUR (2015) and
522 seven an informal one averaging 507 EUR (2015). One respondent with a farm size of 7.2 hectares
523 had obtained 6,460 EUR (2015) within the framework of a development project funded by the
524 Japan International Cooperation Agency, but this was the only such case detected. Although in-
525 ternational grants for farm modernisation are becoming increasingly available thanks to the As-
526 sociation Agreement with the EU, no *ad hoc* program for assisting smallholders is currently in
527 place as the government presumes that, as a first step, smallholders should gather in producers’
528 groups in order to overcome the small size constraint and gain access to investment funds²¹.
529 Unlike loans or grants, remittances are available to many smallholders, and pose a much lower
530 administrative burden.

531 To assess the propensity of survey respondents to invest in agriculture, they were asked
532 how they would spend a non-repayable sum of 50,000 EUR²². A relative majority (31%) stated
533 that they would invest in housing, 27% in farming and related activities (including food pro-
534 cessing), 12% would give this sum to a younger relative (a child or a grandchild), 11% would
535 open a non-farm business, and 18% mentioned a different option. As for those interested in agri-
536 culture, given the low levels of mechanisation, many would purchase farm machinery (tractors or
537 combines); the second largest group would build storage facilities (including cold storage houses);
538 and others would invest in permanent crops, mostly walnuts or vineyards. Some mentioned ani-
539 mal farming (cattle, rabbits, beekeeping), or related activities (slaughterhouses). Only three would
540 purchase more land, while two spoke about rural tourism.

541 Respondents were also asked how they would spend a non-repayable sum of 1,000 EUR
542 usable only in agriculture, to see if they preferred to cover their current expenditures, or to make
543 a small investment²³. Thirty-six percent opted for the former option: most of them mentioned
544 seeds, followed by mechanisation services; some named irrigation services, fertilisers, and young
545 animals. Sixty-four percent opted, however, to invest: in seedlings, usually walnut trees (21%),
546 small greenhouses (11%), farm equipment, large part rototillers (10%), arable land (9%), vine-
547 yards (6%), dairy cattle (6%), and drop irrigation facilities (4%). Such answers point to a certain
548 interest in the small-scale intensification of farm production.

549 Finally, respondents were asked whether they had used remittances to cover farm expend-
550 itures: out of 35 recipient households, 22 answered positively. The sum received was often enough
551 to make small investments. One respondent used remittances from Ireland to buy ten “big shares”
552 for planting walnut trees: this operation required much time due to the difficulty in convincing
553 other smallholders to sell their land, and in finding contiguous plots. Using money earned in Rus-
554 sia, a young family started a small pig farm, and purchased a large tractor that they were using to
555 provide mechanisation services to fellow farmers. After having received a rototiller from his child
556 working in Italy, an old agronomist began growing strawberries and gooseberries in his large
557 home garden, and was earning a decent income by selling them²⁴. With remittances from Spain,

²¹ Partially based on the interview with the rural development officer of the EU Delegation.

²² This was not a closed-ended question: respondents were allowed to express their ideas, and their answers were then classified according to pre-set categories. The total sums up to over 100% since respondents were allowed to mention more than one option.

²³ Also in this case, respondents were allowed to express their ideas, then their answers were assigned to a category.

²⁴ Berries emerged as a profitable production for smallholders, although the lack of irrigation represented a strong constraint.

558 a household renovated some greenhouses dating back to Soviet times to produce vegetables for
559 sale. After coming back from Russia, another dug a lake where people could fish for a fee, and
560 created a small ethnographic museum by gathering traditional objects. These remittances origi-
561 nated from many countries, primarily Russia and Italy. However, it is not always easy to detect
562 the impact of remittances, as they are often earned by a relative, and enter the budget of the fam-
563 ilies as donations, including in-kind.

564 Previous findings point to the relationship between migration and diversification, either on-
565 farm or off-farm. This issue has been extensively researched in the literature. Focusing on North-
566 ern China, Démurger et al. (2010) find that the decision to diversify on-farm is driven by the
567 availability of land, while the main determinants of off-farm diversification are a family's wealth
568 (especially for self-employment), higher levels of education, and access to social networks. The
569 answers from Moldovan smallholders confirm that to pursue non-farm self-employment, a sizea-
570 ble investment is required. Instead, diversification of farm activities could be achieved at a limited
571 cost and, unlike in Northern China, with limited land endowment. This is confirmed by what was
572 observed in Romania, a culturally-similar and geographically proximate country, where 37% of
573 the farming households (compared to 30% of corporate farms) engage in farm-related activities,
574 such as food processing (Albiou et al., 2011). Off-farm diversification in Romania consists mainly
575 in taking up waged jobs, to the extent that the largest share of family income is often earned off-
576 farm (Davidova and Thomson, 2013).
577

578 Table 6. Relationship between farm investments or disinvestments, and the values (current, and
579 first lag) of different types of income.

Out-put	Explanatory variables	Dairy cattle		Farm equipment		Farmland	
		R.R.R.	Std. err.	R.R.R.	Std. err.	R.R.R.	Std. err.
Disinvestment	Remittances (1,000 MDL ¹) (t)	1.002	0.004	0.995	0.005	0.996	0.003
	Non-earned income (1,000 MDL ¹) (t)	0.993	0.012	0.986	0.018	0.979	0.009
	Earned income (1,000 MDL ¹) (t)	0.991	0.006	0.983	0.011	0.989	0.005
	Remittances (1,000 MDL ¹) (t-1)	0.997	0.005	1.006	0.003	1.000	0.004
	Non-earned income (1,000 MDL) (t-1)	1.008	0.012	0.992	0.017	1.006	0.007
	Earned income (1,000 MDL ¹) (t-1)	1.001	0.005	0.994	0.010	0.999	0.005
	Mean adult age	1.082	0.030	1.122	0.050	0.998	0.017
	Mean adult age (squared)	0.999	0.000	0.999	0.000	1.000	0.000
	Male household head (dummy)	1.389	0.188	1.720	0.376	1.025	0.088
Household size	1.368	0.064	1.243	0.099	1.060	0.038	
No variation (base outcome)							
Investment	Remittances (1,000 MDL ¹) (t)	1.003	0.004	1.002	0.006	1.003	0.003
	Non-earned income (1,000 MDL) (t)	0.987	0.015	0.971	0.022	1.025	0.006
	Earned income (1,000 MDL ¹) (t)	0.988	0.006	1.002	0.007	1.008	0.003
	Remittances (1,000 MDL ¹) (t-1)	0.981	0.006	0.982	0.011	0.995	0.003
	Non-earned income (1,000 MDL ¹) (t-1)	0.995	0.014	0.984	0.026	0.972	0.009
	Earned income (1,000 MDL ¹) (t-1)	0.987	0.006	0.982	0.007	0.992	0.004
	Mean adult age	1.102	0.036	1.172	0.060	1.013	0.018
	Mean adult age (squared)	0.999	0.000	0.998	0.001	1.000	0.000
	Male household head (dummy)	1.676	0.270	2.083	0.492	0.966	0.080
Household size	1.427	0.065	1.416	0.077	1.113	0.035	
Number of observations		6,522		8,190		8,190	

Notes: ¹ 1,000 MDL correspond to 60 EUR. Dummies for urban location, north, south and Chişinău, and intercepts included in the regressions but not shown in the table. R.R.R.: Relative-Risk Ratio, i.e. risk of the outcome, relative to the base outcome, for a one-unit change of the independent variable. Significant coefficients marked in bold.

Source: Authors' elaboration on data from the Moldovan HBS.

580
581 Table 6 contains the results of the multinomial logistic regressions for agricultural invest-
582 ments, or disinvestments. In most cases, the relative-risk ratios are not significant, meaning that
583 no correlation could be detected between the amount of remittances, earned incomes and/or non-
584 earned incomes received in the current or previous year, and a family's propensity to purchase or
585 sell farm assets. In most cases, when the ratios are significant, they are below 1, meaning that the
586 probability of either selling or purchasing farm assets is lower than the probability of staying in
587 the same situation if the smallholder has access to higher off-farm sums. This seems in line with
588 the finding of the 2015-smallholder-survey, that farming households whose members have a well-

589 paid non-agricultural job prefer to pursue off-farm-centred livelihoods, while keeping the farm
 590 for lifestyle or reputational reasons. A partial exception is investments in land: the relative-risk
 591 ratio of selling decreases by 2.1% for each additional 60 EUR (1,000 MDL) of non-earned in-
 592 come, and by 1.1% for earned income, while the relative-risk ratio of purchasing increases by
 593 2.5% and 0.8%, respectively. The opposite is true for dairy cattle (the relative-risk ratio of pur-
 594 chasing always decreases for increasing incomes). During the 2015-smallholder-survey, dairy
 595 cattle emerged as a successful investment for families wanting to earn a limited income by selling
 596 cheese and sour cream. Finally, larger households, those headed by a male, and those with an
 597 older head (although not too old) appear more dynamic in terms of both sales and purchases, as
 598 the relative-risk ratios associated with these variables are above 1 for all outcomes.

599 Table 7 shows that the share of recipient households investing in farming is not signifi-
 600 cantly different from that of non-recipient households. Around 4% of the families of either group
 601 purchased dairy cattle, 9% increased their land endowment, and less than 2% of remittance recip-
 602 ients purchased farm machinery, compared to almost 3% among non-recipient households.
 603

604 Table 7. Incidence of investors among recipient and non-recipient households.

Variable		Recipients	Others	Difference	Std. err.	Bootstr. diff.	Std. err.
Purchasers of dairy cattle	Unmatched	0.0406	0.0409	-0.0003	0.0056	-0.0027	0.0081
	Matched	0.0422	0.0404	0.0018	0.0092		
Purchasers of farm equipment	Unmatched	0.0165	0.0183	-0.0017	0.0033	-0.0018	0.0040
	Matched	0.0166	0.0270	-0.0104	0.0058		
Purchasers of farmland	Unmatched	0.0942	0.0959	-0.0017	0.0074	-0.0029	0.0108
	Matched	0.0932	0.0890	0.0043	0.0116		

Notes: Households matched on the number of adult members, their average age (and its squared value), the gender of the household head, location dummies (urban settlement, north, centre and south; Chişinău omitted), earned income (1,000 MDL – 60 EUR), non-earned income (1,000 MDL – 60 EUR), farm income (1,000 MDL – 60 EUR), land owned the previous year (ares), and year dummies. Source: Authors' elaboration on data from the Moldovan HBS.

605

606 5. Conclusions

607 Using data from the Moldovan HBS for the period 2007–2013, and the findings of an original
 608 mixed-methods survey of Moldovan smallholders carried out in 2015, this paper assessed the
 609 impact of remittances on the production practices and investments of farming households in Mol-
 610 dova.

611 The households whose members receive remittances are usually larger, younger, and better
 612 educated, thus representing the most dynamic part of the society. The HBS estimates of the labour
 613 supply functions showed that remittance recipients are also more likely to respond to economic
 614 incentives, such as higher agricultural shadow wages. Furthermore, it emerged that they tend to
 615 replace family labour and self-produced inputs (seeds, seedlings, and animal feed) with services
 616 provided by contractors and purchased inputs, respectively. Both results (non-negative shadow
 617 wages and the substitution of family labour with purchased inputs and services) indicate that hid-
 618 den unemployment does not play an important role, and that the time constraints of migrant house-
 619 holds are binding. Remittance-receiving households display higher labour productivity at the ex-
 620 pense of lower land and input productivity; however, production or commercialisation levels do
 621 not necessarily increase. These findings, together with what was observed during the 2015-small-
 622 holder-survey, suggest that remittance recipients engage in agriculture mostly to achieve lifestyle
 623 and social rewards, and are thus willing to reduce their drudgery.

624 As for investments, three options were considered: dairy cattle, machinery, and farmland.
 625 The analysis of the HBS data showed that farming households that receive a larger amount of

626 remittances are not significantly more likely to either sell or purchase farm assets²⁵. On the one
627 hand, this may confirm the previous observation that they engage in farming for non-financial
628 reasons, and as such do not need to increase the economic size of their farm. On the other hand,
629 this may suggest that they are caught in a “poverty trap”, where the money earned abroad is not
630 enough to invest in farm growth, but they cannot quit farming because it provides a necessary
631 supplement to ensure family survival. This hypothesis needs to be further researched.

632 The results of the 2015-smallholder-survey show a partially different situation. Indeed,
633 most of the small improvements observed among respondents were possible thanks to the availa-
634 bility of remittances. A widespread interest for small investments aimed at intensifying farm pro-
635 duction to ensure a constant income supplement also emerged among respondent families. While
636 the econometric analysis confirmed the finding of Bolganschi (2011) that few migrant households
637 invest in agriculture, qualitative insights suggest that most farming households who invest in ag-
638 riculture are remittance recipients, as few alternative financing opportunities exist for them.

639 Agricultural Census data show that most Moldovan land recipients maintain the property
640 of their plots, and engage in agriculture at least as a side activity. While, on the one hand, this
641 may limit access to land for potential investors, obstructing a more efficient use of it, on the other
642 hand, this means that many households have a base from which to build a middle-sized commer-
643 cial farm. The results of this analysis suggest that, due to their widespread availability, remittances
644 could provide an effective starting point for policy makers. Co-funding of remittance-financed
645 projects could be one way to stimulate investments, and improve the efficiency of grants (Vargas-
646 Lundius et al., 2002). The 2015-smallholder-survey indicated a preference for small intensifica-
647 tion projects (greenhouses, recovery of orchards, purchase of rototillers, etc.), rather than farm
648 growth. Giving priority to such projects in funding programs would allow the land to flow into
649 middle-sized family businesses instead of large corporate farms, thus achieving a farm structure
650 more similar to market economies (Lerman and Sutton, 2008), and a fairer distribution of rural
651 incomes²⁶.

652 However, investments need a supportive business environment. Therefore, policy makers
653 should pay attention to removing any obstacles which prevent recipient farming households from
654 investing in agriculture. One of the main challenges is “systematic corruption”, as also recognised
655 by the European Council (2016). Corruption not only obstructs the implementation of the Asso-
656 ciation Agreement with the EU, but also feeds parasitic rent-seekers while choking small inves-
657 tors, and thus needs to be addressed. Furthermore, “systemic risks like draught and frosts”, which
658 hit smallholders particularly hard, endangering their investments, require the design of a viable
659 system of farm insurance, which is currently missing (World Bank, 2015: 5). Finally, the unreli-
660 ability of markets (Moroz et al., 2015) could be reduced, e.g., by negotiating preferential access
661 to the EU market for agro-food products made by smallholders.

662 One limit of this study consists in the fact that the HBS was conceived for a different pur-
663 pose and, as such, some relevant variables are missing. Furthermore, the role of informal channels
664 and of personal relationships in the circulation of remittances may prevent quantitative surveys
665 from effectively detecting their actual uses. As for the 2015-smallholder-survey, the small sample
666 size could cast doubts on its representativeness. Nevertheless, while rare phenomena were prob-

²⁵ However, the same is true for all households who have access to larger off-farm incomes. These households are slightly more likely to purchase farmland, and slightly less likely to purchase dairy cattle.

²⁶ Lerman and Sutton (2008: 101) state that, instead, the Moldovan government “biases its policies in favour of large farms”. The persistence of this bias may be proved by the lack of *ad hoc* programs for smallholders, highlighted during the interview with the rural development officer of the EU Delegation.

667 ably missed, the overall dynamics detected remain reliable, and the narration of individual expe-
668 riences holds an important added value. With a view to maximising the impact of the EU rural
669 development programs targeting Moldova, *ad hoc* qualitative surveys are thus needed to look at
670 the role of remittances in agricultural change and to identify the obstacles preventing the invest-
671 ment of these sums.

672

673 **Acknowledgments and funding**

674 - Omitted for review –

675

676 **References**

677 Adams Jr., R.H. 1991. The Economic Uses and Impact of International Remittances in Rural
678 Egypt. *Econ. Dev. Cult. Change* 39, 695-722.

679 Adams Jr., R.H. 1998. Remittances, Investment, and Rural Asset Accumulation in Pakistan. *Econ.*
680 *Dev. Cult. Change* 47, 155-173.

681 Aguilar-Støen, M., Taylor, M., Castellanos, E. 2016. Agriculture, Land Tenure and International
682 Migration in Rural Guatemala. *J. Agrar. Change* 16, 123-144.

683 Alboiu, C., Kuliesis, G., Salengaite, D. 2011. The impact of Rural Development Program on Ag-
684 riculture and Business/Rural Development in Lithuania and Romania: A Mirror Situation.
685 *Agricultural Economics and Rural Development, New Series VIII(1)*, 77-90.

686 Baumann, M., Kuemmerle, T., Elbakidze, M., Ozdugan, M., Radeloff, V.C., Keuler, N.S., Pri-
687 shchepov, A.V., Kruhlov, I., Hostert, P. 2011. Patterns and Drivers of Post-Socialist Farm-
688 land Abandonment in Western Ukraine. *Land Use Policy* 28, 552-562.

689 Böhme, M.H. 2015. Does Migration Raise Agricultural Investment? An Empirical Analysis for
690 Rural Mexico. *Agr. Econ.* 46, 211-225.

691 Bolganschi, D. 2011. Rural Out Migration and Land Use in Moldova. [http://pdc.ceu.hu/ar-](http://pdc.ceu.hu/archive/00006465/01/cps-research-report-rural-out-migration-moldova-2011.pdf)
692 [chive/00006465/01/cps-research-report-rural-out-migration-moldova-2011.pdf](http://pdc.ceu.hu/archive/00006465/01/cps-research-report-rural-out-migration-moldova-2011.pdf) [Accessed
693 on 15 August 2017].

694 Chiodi, V., Jaimovich, E., Montes-Rojas, G. 2012. Migration, Remittances and Capital Accumu-
695 lation: Evidence from Rural Mexico. *J. Dev. Stud.* 48, 1139-1155.

696 Cimpoieș, D. 2010. The economics of land fragmentation in the individual farm sector of Mol-
697 dova. *Știința Agricolă* 2, 101-108.

698 Davidova, S., Thomson, K. 2013. Family farming: A Europe and Central Asia perspective. Draft
699 background report for ‘Regional dialogue on family farming: Working towards a strategic
700 approach to promote food security and nutrition.’ FAO, Brussels. [http://www.fao.org/filead-](http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Europe/documents/Events_2013/FF_EUCAP_en.pdf)
701 [min/user_upload/Europe/documents/Events_2013/FF_EUCAP_en.pdf](http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Europe/documents/Events_2013/FF_EUCAP_en.pdf) [Accessed on 14
702 September 2015].

703 Davis, J., Lopez-Carr, D. 2014. Migration, Remittances and Smallholder Decision-making: Im-
704 plications for Land Use and Livelihood Change in Central America. *Land Use Policy* 36,
705 319-329.

706 de Brauw, A., Rozelle, S. 2008. Migration and Household Investment in Rural China. *China Econ.*
707 *Rev.* 19, 320-335.

- 708 Démurger, S., Fournier, M., Yang, W. 2010. Rural households' decisions towards income diver-
709 sification: Evidence from a township in northern China. *China Econ. Rev.* 21(1), S32-S44.
- 710 Dessing, M. 2002. Labor Supply, the Family and Poverty: The S-shaped Labor Supply Curve. *J.*
711 *Econ. Behav. Organ.* 49, 433-458.
- 712 European Council (EC). 2016. Council conclusions on the Republic of Moldova. [http://www.con-](http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2016/02/15-fac-moldova-conclusions/)
713 [silium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2016/02/15-fac-moldova-conclusions/](http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2016/02/15-fac-moldova-conclusions/) [Accessed
714 on 15 September 2017].
- 715 European Union (EU). 2014. Association agenda between the European Union and the Republic
716 of Moldova. [http://eeas.europa.eu/archives/docs/moldova/pdf/eu-moldova-association-](http://eeas.europa.eu/archives/docs/moldova/pdf/eu-moldova-association-agenda-26_06_en.pdf)
717 [agenda-26_06_en.pdf](http://eeas.europa.eu/archives/docs/moldova/pdf/eu-moldova-association-agenda-26_06_en.pdf) [Accessed on 17 September 2017].
- 718 Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). 2012. Assessment of the Agri-
719 culture and Rural Development Sectors in the Eastern Partnership Countries. The Republic
720 of Moldova. <http://www.fao.org/docrep/field/009/aq675e/aq675e.pdf> [Accessed on 10 June
721 2017].
- 722 Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). 2014. The state of food and
723 agriculture. Innovation in family farming. FAO, Rome, pp. xviii + 139.
- 724 Gorton, M., White, J. 2003. The politics of agrarian collapse: Decollectivisation in Moldova. *E.*
725 *Eur. Polit. Soc.* 17(2), 305-331.
- 726 Gray, C.L. 2009. Rural Out-migration and Smallholder Agriculture in Southern Ecuadorian An-
727 des. *Popul. Environ.* 30, 193-217.
- 728 Gray, C.L., Bilsborrow, R.E. 2014. Consequences of Out-migration for Land Use in Rural Ecua-
729 dor. *Land Use Policy* 36, 182-191.
- 730 International Organization for Migration (IOM). 2016. Extended Migration Profile of the Repub-
731 lic of Moldova 2009–2014. Analytical report. [http://www.iom.md/sites/default/files/publi-](http://www.iom.md/sites/default/files/publications/docs/EMP%202009-2014%20ENG.pdf)
732 [cations/docs/EMP%202009-2014%20ENG.pdf](http://www.iom.md/sites/default/files/publications/docs/EMP%202009-2014%20ENG.pdf) [Accessed on 27 September 2017].
- 733 Jacoby, H.G. 1993. Shadow wages and peasant family labour supply: an econometric application
734 to the Peruvian Sierra. *Rev. Econ. Stud.* 60, 903-921.
- 735 Kilic, T., Carletto, C., Miluka, J., Savastano, S. 2009. Rural Nonfarm Income and its Impact on
736 Agriculture: Evidence from Albania. *Agr. Econ.* 40, 139-160.
- 737 Le, K.T. 2009. Shadow Wages and Shadow Income in Farmers' Labor Supply Functions. *Am. J.*
738 *Agr. Econ.* 91, 685-696.
- 739 León-Ledesma, M., Piracha, M. 2004. International Migration and the Role of Remittances in
740 Eastern Europe. *Int. Migr.* 42, 65-83.
- 741 Lerman, Z., Sutton, W.R. 2008. Productivity and efficiency of small and large farms in transition:
742 Evidence from Moldova. *Post-Sov. Aff.* 24(2), 97-120.
- 743 Liu, G., Wang, H., Cheng, Y., Zheng, B., Lu, Z. 2016. The impact of rural out-migration on arable
744 land use intensity: Evidence from mountain areas in Guangdong, China. *Land Use Policy*
745 59, 569-579.
- 746 Lücke, M., Omar Mahmoud, T., Steinmayr, A. 2009. Labour migration and remittances in Mol-
747 dova: Is the boom over? Trends and preliminary findings from the IOM-CBSAXA panel

- 748 household survey 2006-2008. <https://www.econbiz.de/Record/labour-migration-remittances-moldova-boom-trends-preliminary-findings-iom-cbsaxa-panel-household-survey-2006-2008-luecke-matthias/10008495216> [Accessed on 15 August 2017].
- 751 Macours, K., Swinnen, J.F.M. 2005. Agricultural Labor Adjustments in Transition Countries: The
752 Role of Migration and Impact of Poverty. *Rev. Agr. Econ.* 27, 405-411.
- 753 Möllers, J., Herzfeld, T., Piras, S., Wolz, A. 2016. Structural Transformation of Moldovan Small-
754 holder Agriculture: Implications for Poverty Reduction and Shared Prosperity. World Bank
755 Group, Washington DC. [http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2016/06/23/090224b0843f61cc/1_0/Rendered/PDF/Struc-](http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2016/06/23/090224b0843f61cc/1_0/Rendered/PDF/StructuralOtra0nd0shared0prosperity.pdf)
756 [turalOtra0nd0shared0prosperity.pdf](http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2016/06/23/090224b0843f61cc/1_0/Rendered/PDF/StructuralOtra0nd0shared0prosperity.pdf) [Accessed on 15 August 2017].
- 758 Moroz, V., Stratan, A., Ignat, A., Lucasenco, E. 2015. Country Report: Republic of Moldova.
759 http://www.agricistrade.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/Agricistrade_Moldova.pdf [Ac-
760 cessed on 10 June 2017].
- 761 National Bureau of Statistics of the Republic of Moldova (NBS). 2011. General Agricultural Cen-
762 sus 2011. National results, 1 Volume. [http://www.statistica.md/public/files/publicatii_elec-](http://www.statistica.md/public/files/publicatii_electronice/Recensamint_agricol/RGA_2011_date_definitive.pdf)
763 [tronice/Recensamint_agricol/RGA_2011_date_definitive.pdf](http://www.statistica.md/public/files/publicatii_electronice/Recensamint_agricol/RGA_2011_date_definitive.pdf) [Accessed on 15 August
764 2017].
- 765 National Bureau of Statistics of the Republic of Moldova (NBS). 2017a. Agricultural Activity of
766 Small Agricultural Producers in the Republic of Moldova in 2014. http://www.statistica.md/public/files/Metadate/en/Mici_Producatori_Agricoli_en.pdf [Accessed on 15 Au-
767 gust 2017].
- 769 National Bureau of Statistics of the Republic of Moldova (NBS). 2017b. Population Incomes and
770 Expenditures (Household Budget Survey). [http://www.statistica.md/public/files/Meta-](http://www.statistica.md/public/files/Metadate/en/CBGC_en.pdf)
771 [date/en/CBGC_en.pdf](http://www.statistica.md/public/files/Metadate/en/CBGC_en.pdf) [Accessed on 15 August 2017].
- 772 National Bureau of Statistics of the Republic of Moldova (NBS). 2017c. Statistical Databank.
773 [http://statbank.statistica.md/pxweb/pxweb/en/?rxid=e4bd48c3-1a85-4f04-a278-](http://statbank.statistica.md/pxweb/pxweb/en/?rxid=e4bd48c3-1a85-4f04-a278-9d3960686388)
774 [9d3960686388](http://statbank.statistica.md/pxweb/pxweb/en/?rxid=e4bd48c3-1a85-4f04-a278-9d3960686388) [Accessed on 14 September 2017].
- 775 Pinger, P. 2010. Come Back or Stay? Spend Here or There? Return and Remittances: The Case
776 of Moldova. *Int. Migr.* 48, 142-173.
- 777 Piras, S. 2016. Moldovan family farms: Social buffer or economic driver? A survey-based assess-
778 ment. Doctoral dissertation, Università di Bologna.
- 779 Qin, H., Liao, T.F. 2016. Labor out-migration and agricultural change in rural China: A systematic
780 review and meta-analysis. *J. Rural Stud.* 47, 533-541.
- 781 Rozelle, S. D., Taylor, J. E., de Brauw, A. 1999. Migration, Remittances, and Agricultural Produc-
782 tivity in China. *Am. Econ. Rev.* 89, 287-291.
- 783 Signoret, J.E. 2003. The Moldova HBS: A note on the panel sample. Unpublished internal docu-
784 ment. World Bank Group, Washington DC.
- 785 Singh, I., Squire, L., Strauss, J. 1986. A Survey of Agricultural Household Models: Recent Find-
786 ings and Policy Implications, *World Bank Econ. Rev.* 1, 149-179.
- 787 Skoufias, E. 1994. Using shadow wages to estimate labor supply of agricultural households. *Am.*
788 *J. Agr. Econ.* 76, 215-227.

- 789 Small, L.A. 2007. East Meets West: Utilising Western Literature to Conceptualise Post-Soviet
790 Agrarian Change. *J. Peasant Stud.* 34(1), 29-50.
- 791 Stark, O. 1991. *The Migration of Labor*. Blackwell, Cambridge, MA, pp. x + 406.
- 792 Sunam, R.K., McCarthy, J.F. 2016. Reconsidering the Links between Poverty, International La-
793 bour Migration, and Agrarian Change: Critical Insights from Nepal. *J. Peasant Stud.* 43,
794 39-63.
- 795 Swinnen, J.F.M., Dries, L., Macours, K. 2005. Transition and Agricultural Labor. *Agr. Econ.* 32,
796 15-34.
- 797 Taylor, J.E., Lopez-Feldman, A. 2010. Does Migration Make Rural Households More Produc-
798 tive? Evidence from Mexico. *J. Dev. Stud.* 46, 68-90.
- 799 Taylor, M.J., Aguilar-Støen, M., Castellanos, E., Moran-Taylor, M.J., Gerkin, K. 2016. Interna-
800 tional Migration, Land Use Change and the Environment in Ixcán, Guatemala. *Land Use*
801 *Policy* 54, 290-301.
- 802 Vargas-Lundius, R., Lanly, G., Villarreal, M., Osorio, M. 2002. International Migration, Remit-
803 tances and Rural Development: Enabling Poor Rural People to Overcome Poverty.
804 [http://www.msu.ac.zw/elearning/material/1330864645Reading%204%20Interna-](http://www.msu.ac.zw/elearning/material/1330864645Reading%204%20International%20migration.docx)
805 [tional%20migration.docx](http://www.msu.ac.zw/elearning/material/1330864645Reading%204%20International%20migration.docx) [Accessed on 15 August 2017].
- 806 World Bank (WB). 2015. *Moldova Public Expenditure Review: Agriculture*. World Bank Group,
807 Washington DC. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/28331> [Accessed on
808 15 September 2017].
- 809 World Bank (WB). 2017. *World Bank Open Data*. <http://data.worldbank.org/> [Accessed on 15
810 August 2017].