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**ON-LINE APPENDICES**

**On-line Appendix 1**

**Survey instrument (translated): All comments to the reader, which were not present to the participants are in square brackets.**

Welcome to this survey. We are a team of researchers from the Leibniz Institute of Agricultural Development in Transition Economies (IAMO) and the Chair of Production Economics at the University of Bonn.

We are interested in how land market regulations affect farmers and society. Your assessment is very important to us.

This questionnaire takes about 12 minutes and consists of 3 parts:

Part 1: Assessment of two land sale scenarios

Part 2: General assessments of land market regulations

Part 3: Your image of agriculture

There are no right or wrong answers. The survey is primarily aimed at farmers (private entrepreneur, owners or employees). Even if you are not a farmer, you are of course welcome to participate. The data are of course strictly confidential and anonymous and will only be used for scientific purposes. If you have any questions, please contact bodenmarkt@iamo.de. At the end of the survey, we will raffle off vouchers from the company Engelbert Strauss worth 50 Euros as a thank you to all participants. Per 100 participants 4 vouchers will be raffled.

Many thanks for your support.

Please answer first whether you are active in agriculture:

I am active in agriculture as owner/co-owner/leader/employee/lessor.

* Yes
* No
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In the following, we present two scenarios and ask you to assess them.

The scenarios represent reality in a simplified way, but your opinion is important to us.
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Land sale

**[vignette 1 observer]**

A piece of farmland (not expected to be developed) owned by the public sector is for sale. Mr. Meier, a **non-local farmer** wants to buy the piece of land. Mr. Huber, a local farmer, would also like to buy the land. At what price would it be justified to sell the land to Mr. Meier?

It seems justified to me that Mr. Meier, the **non-local farmer**, would receive the land at...

* .. the local price, if seller and buyer agree on it.
* ..10% above the local price.
* ..20% above the local price.
* ..30% above the local price.
* ..40% above the local price.
* ..50% above the local price..
* ..60% above the local price.
* ..70% above the local price.
* ..80% above the local price.
* ..90% above the local price.
* .. twice the usual local price.
* Mr. Meier, the non-local farmer, should not be able to buy the land under any circumstances.
* The highest bid should win the contract, regardless of who the buyer is.
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**[vignette 2 observer]**

A piece of farmland (not expected to be developed) owned by the public sector is for sale. Mr. Schmidt, a **local investor** **who has not yet been active in agriculture**, wants to buy the piece of land. Mr. Huber, a local farmer, would also like to buy the land. At what price would it be justified to sell the land to Mr. Schmidt?

It seems justified to me that Mr. Schmidt, the **local investor** **who has not yet been active in agriculture**, would receive the land at...

* .. the local price, if seller and buyer agree on it.
* ..10% above the local price.
* ..20% above the local price.
* ..30% above the local price.
* ..40% above the local price.
* ..50% above the local price..
* ..60% above the local price.
* ..70% above the local price.
* ..80% above the local price.
* ..90% above the local price.
* .. twice the usual local price.
* Mr. Schmidt, the local investor, should not be able to buy the land under any circumstances.
* The highest bid should win the contract, regardless of who the buyer is.
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**[vignette 3 observer]**

A piece of farmland (not expected to be developed) owned by the public sector is for sale. Mr. Fischer, a **non-local investor who has not yet been active in agriculture**, wants to buy the piece of land. Mr. Huber, a local farmer, would also like to buy the land. At what price would it be justified to sell the land to Mr. Fischer?

It seems justified to me that Mr. Fischer, the **non-local investor who has not yet been active in agriculture**, would receive the land at...

* .. the local price, if seller and buyer agree on it.
* ..10% above the local price.
* ..20% above the local price.
* ..30% above the local price.
* ..40% above the local price.
* ..50% above the local price..
* ..60% above the local price.
* ..70% above the local price.
* ..80% above the local price.
* ..90% above the local price.
* .. twice the usual local price.
* Mr. Fischer, the non-local investor, should not be able to buy the land under any circumstances.
* The highest bid should win the contract, regardless of who the buyer is.
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**[vignette 1 seller]**

You want to sell a piece of farmland (not expected to be developed). Mr. Meier, a **non-local farmer**, wants to buy the piece of land. Mr. Huber, a local farmer, would also like to buy the land. At what price would it be justified to sell the land to Mr. Meier?

It seems justified to me that Mr. Meier, the **non-local farmer**, would receive the land at...

* .. the local price, if seller and buyer agree on it.
* ..10% above the local price.
* ..20% above the local price.
* ..30% above the local price.
* ..40% above the local price.
* ..50% above the local price..
* ..60% above the local price.
* ..70% above the local price.
* ..80% above the local price.
* ..90% above the local price.
* .. twice the usual local price.
* Mr. Meier, the **non-local farmer**, should not be able to buy the land under any circumstances.
* The highest bid should win the contract, regardless of who the buyer is.
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**[vignette 2 seller]**

You want to sell a piece of farmland (not expected to be developed). Mr. Schmidt, a **local investor who has not yet been active in agriculture**, wants to buy the piece of land. Mr. Huber, a local farmer, would also like to buy the land. At what price would it be justified to sell the land to Mr. Schmidt?

It seems justified to me that Mr. Schmidt, the **local investor who has not yet been active in agriculture**, would receive the land at...

* .. the local price, if seller and buyer agree on it.
* ..10% above the local price.
* ..20% above the local price.
* ..30% above the local price.
* ..40% above the local price.
* ..50% above the local price..
* ..60% above the local price.
* ..70% above the local price.
* ..80% above the local price.
* ..90% above the local price.
* .. twice the usual local price.
* Mr. Schmidt, the **local investor**, should not be able to buy the land under any circumstances.
* The highest bid should win the contract, regardless of who the buyer is.
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**[vignette 3 seller]**

You want to sell a piece of farmland (not expected to be developed). Mr. Fischer, a **non-local investor who has not yet been active in agriculture**, wants to buy the piece of land. Mr. Huber, a local farmer, would also like to buy the land. At what price would it be justified to sell the land to Mr. Fischer?

It seems justified to me that Mr. Fischer, the **non-local investor who has not yet been active in agriculture**, would receive the land at...

* .. the local price, if seller and buyer agree on it.
* ..10% above the local price.
* ..20% above the local price.
* ..30% above the local price.
* ..40% above the local price.
* ..50% above the local price..
* ..60% above the local price.
* ..70% above the local price.
* ..80% above the local price.
* ..90% above the local price.
* .. twice the usual local price.
* Mr. Fischer, the non-local investor, should not be able to buy the land under any circumstances.
* The highest bid should win the contract, regardless of who the buyer is.
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Regulations in the land market

In Germany, whether a prospective buyer is granted a contract for agricultural land that is available for sale depends on the granting of an official permit. We are interested in your personal opinion on the regulation of land sales. What is your general opinion on the regulation of the land market? You can agree or disagree with the following statements. The middle answer position means that you are undecided on this question.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | I fully agree | I agree | I rather agree | Un-decided | I rather not agree | I do not agree | I do not agree at all |
| The state has the task of protecting the interests of farmers by regulating the land market. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The state should not intervene in private transactions; purchase contracts can be freely negotiated. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The state should regulate the land market more strongly. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The state should regulate the land market less strongly. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The current land market regulations are generally satisfactory. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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We would now like to ask you how you assess certain reasons that speak against state intervention in the land market. Subsequently, we will present various objectives that can be pursued through regulation.

Reasons against land market regulations:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | I fully agree | I agree | I rather agree | Un-decided | I rather not agree | I do not agree | I do not agree at all |
| The seller should be adequately compensated for giving up the scarce resource of land. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Soil is a scarce resource. This must be reflected in the price, even if it means that farmers have to pay higher prices. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Farmers are land owners as well. High land prices mean an increase in the value of their property. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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Now we are looking at various objectives that the state can pursue to regulate the land market.

We would like to know from you which of these goals you think would make sense. Please put the following goals in order of importance. At the top is the most important goal.

The farm is to be given preference in the acquisition of land through regulations, which...

…operates organically

…is particularly hard hit by structural upheavals.

…is at risk from the competition of non-agricultural investors.

…needs to expand.

…is a family business.

…has a sustainable concept for the future.

…is local
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View of the agriculture

We now ask you to evaluate the following statements.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | I fully agree | I agree | I rather agree | Un-decided | I rather not agree | I do not agree | I do not agree at all |
| German agriculture should not be supported by regulations and subsidies if food can be produced abroad at lower cost. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The special status of agriculture in society should also be reflected in subsidies and privileges. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The special status of agriculture in society results from the fact that farmers consciously operate in and with nature. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The special status of agriculture in society results from the need for a secure supply of food. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agriculture has a special status in society. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agriculture is an industrial sector like any other. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| When market forces can operate freely, the farmer is helped the most. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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Farmers

Structural data

1. In which state is the company you own or work at?
* Baden-Württemberg Bayern
* Berlin
* Brandenburg
* Bremen
* Hamburg
* Hessen
* Mecklenburg-Vorpommern
* Niedersachsen
* Nordrhein-Westfalen
* Rheinland-Pfalz
* Saarland
* Sachsen
* Sachsen-Anhalt
* Schleswig-Holstein
* Thüringen
1. In which county is the company you own or work at?

(complete designation)

1. How large is the area your farm cultivates?
* Less than 25 hectares
* 25 to 50 hectares
* 50 to 100 hectares
* 100 to 250 hectares
* 250 to 500 hectares
* 500 to 1000 hectares
* 1000 to 2000 hectares
* More than 2000 hectares
1. What part of the cultivated area is owned by your farm? Please give an approximate percentage
2. Which type of farming best describes your agricultural company? (multiple answers possible)
* Sideline business
* Family business as main occupation
* Partnership
* Former LPG
* Genossenschaftlicher Betrieb
* GmbH

1. Which position best describes your role in the company?

(multiple answers possible)

* Owner
* Co-owner
* Manager
* Employee
* Leaseholder
1. How long has your company existed?

Year of foundation:

1. How do you see the economic future of your company?

* very confident
* quite confident
* rather confident
* rather not confident
* quite unmanageable
* not at all confident
1. How many livestock units does your farm keep per hectare?

 Around Livestock units

1. What is the proportion of grassland on your farm?

Please enter an approximate percentage value

About %

1. In which year were you born?

If you do not want to indicate this, please put an X.

Year of birth:

1. What gender are you?
* Male
* Female
* Other
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non Farmers

Structural data

1. In which state is the company you own or work at?
* Baden-Württemberg
* Bayern
* Berlin
* Brandenburg
* Bremen
* Hamburg
* Hessen
* Mecklenburg-Vorpommern
* Niedersachsen
* Nordrhein-Westfalen
* Rheinland-Pfalz
* Saarland
* Sachsen
* Sachsen-Anhalt
* Schleswig-Holstein
* Thüringen
1. In which county is the company you own or work at?

(complete designation)

1. Are farmers among your friends or acquaintances?
* Yes
* No
1. Do you belong to an agricultural family but are not a farmer yourself?
* Yes
* No
1. In which year were you born?

If you do not want to indicate this, please put an X.

Year of birth:

1. What gender are you?
* Male
* Female
* Other
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You can now participate in the raffle. We raffle 4 vouchers from the workwear company Engelbert Strauss at 50 Euro each per 100 participants.

If you want to take part in the raffle, please tick the box and enter your e-mail address.

This will only be used for the raffle. No connection will be made to the data collected. Your e-mail address will not be saved after the raffle.

I want to take part in the raffle. I agree that my e-mail address will be stored until the winners are drawn. My details in this survey will remain anonymous and my e-mail address will not be passed on to third parties.

***Last Page***

Thanks for your participation!

**On-line Appendix 2**

**Composition of Sample**

**On-line Appendix 2** “Composition of Sample”: Composition of sample and balance in % (italics) across the vignette conditions\*

| socio-economic variables | Vignette conditions | Total # by characteristics group |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Observer, non-local farmer | Seller, non-local farmer | Observer, local non-farmer | Seller, local non-farmer |
| Farm location (Federal State) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | North Rhine-Westphalia | 101 | 112 | 99 | 132 | 444 (84.9%) |
|  |  | *22.8* | *25.2* | *22.3* | *29.7* | *100.0* |
|  | Other Western federal states | 5 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 21 (4.0%) |
|  |  | *23.8* | *28.6* | *33.3* | *14.3* | *100.0* |
|  | Brandenburg | 14 | 10 | 17 | 5 | 46 (8.8 %) |
|  |  | *30.4* | *21.7* | *37.0* | *10.9* | *100.0* |
|  | Other Eastern federal states | 1 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 12 (2.3 %) |
|  |  | *8.3* | *16.7* | *58.3* | *16.7* | *100.0* |
|  | **Total**  | **121** | **130** | **130** | **142** | **523 (100 %)** |
|  |  | ***23.1*** | ***24.9*** | ***24.9*** | ***27.2*** | ***100*** |
| Agricultural land area |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Less than 25ha  | 28 | 24 | 26 | 25 | 103 (19.7 %) |
|  |  | *27.2* | *23.3* | *25.2* | *24.3* | *100* |
|  | 25 - 50ha  | 20 | 23 | 29 | 37 | 109 (20.9 %) |
|  |  | *18.4* | *21.1* | *26.6* | *33.9* | *100* |
|  | 50 - 100ha  | 26 | 37 | 33 | 36 | 132 (25.3 %) |
|  |  | *19.7* | *28.0* | *25.0* | *27.3* | *100* |
|  | 100 - 250ha  | 31 | 29 | 25 | 29 | 114 (21.8 %) |
|  |  | *27.2* | *25.4* | *21.9* | *25.4* | *100* |
|  | 250 - 500ha  | 1 | 5 | 9 | 8 | 23 (4.4 %) |
|  |  | *4.4* | *21.7* | *39.1* | *34.8* | *100* |
|  | 500 - 1000ha  | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 17 (3.3 %) |
|  |  | *29.4* | *29.4* | *23.5* | *17.7* | *100* |
|  | 1000 - 2000ha  | 7 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 14 (2.7 %) |
|  |  | *50.0* | *21.4* | *14.3* | *14.3* | *100* |
|  | More than 2000ha  | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 10 (1.9 %) |
|  |  | *20.0* | *40.0* | *20.0* | *20.0* | *100* |
|  | **Total**  | **120** | **130** | **130** | **142** | **522 (100 %)** |
|  |  | ***23.0*** | ***24.9*** | ***24.9*** | ***27.2*** | ***100*** |
| Share of owned land on utilized agricultural area |
|  | 0% | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 (1.4 %) |
|  |  | *0.0* | *28.6* | *28.6* | *42.9* | *100* |
|  | 0-5%  | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 11 (2.1 %) |
|  |  | *18.2* | *36.4* | *18.2* | *27.3* | *100* |
|  | 5-10%  | 3 | 8 | 9 | 11 | 31 (6.0 %) |
|  |  | *9.7* | *25.8* | *29.0* | *35.5* | *100* |
|  | 10-40%  | 43 | 40 | 44 | 44 | 171 (33.0 %) |
|  |  | *25.2* | *23.4* | *25.7* | *25.7* | *100* |
|  | 40-70%  | 26 | 40 | 32 | 40 | 138 (26.6 %) |
|  |  | *18.8* | *29.0* | *23.2* | *29.0* | *100* |
|  | 70-100%  | 45 | 36 | 39 | 41 | 161 (31.0 %) |
|  |  | *28.0* | *22.4* | *24.2* | *25.5* | *100* |
|  | **Total** | **119** | **130** | **128** | **142** | **519 (100 %)** |
|  |  | ***22.9*** | ***25.1*** | ***24.7*** | ***27.4*** | ***100*** |
| Legal form |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Family farm  | 65 | 83 | 77 | 91 | 316 (78.6 %) |
|  |  | *20.6* | *26.3* | *24.4* | *28.8* | *100* |
|  | Partnership (personal) | 13 | 9 | 16 | 15 | 53 (13.2 %) |
|  |  | *24.5* | *17.0* | *30.2* | *28.3* | *100* |
|  | Cooperative  | 6 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 15 (3.7 %) |
|  |  | *40.0* | *26.7* | *20.0* | *13.3* | *100* |
|  | Limited liability  | 8 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 18 (4.5 %) |
|  |  | *44.4* | *22.2* | *16.7* | *16.7* | *100* |
|  | **Total**  | **92** | **100** | **99** | **111** | **402 (100 %)** |
|  |  | ***22.9*** | ***24.9*** | ***24.6*** | ***27.6*** | ***100*** |
| Part-time farming |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Non part time | 91 | 96 | 95 | 109 | 391 (74.5 %) |
|  |  | *23.3* | *24.6* | *24.3* | *27.9* | *100.0* |
|  | Part time  | 31 | 35 | 35 | 33 | 134 (25.5 %) |
|  |  | *23.1* | *26.1* | *26.1* | *24.6* | *100.0* |
|  | **Total**  | **122** | **131** | **130** | **142** | **525 (100 %)** |
|  |  | ***23.2*** | ***25.0*** | ***24.8*** | ***27.1*** | ***100*** |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | <=25 years  | 5 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 27 (6.3 %) |
|  |  | *18.5* | *22.2* | *29.6* | *29.6* | *100.0* |
|  | 26-35 years  | 16 | 13 | 24 | 14 | 67 (15.5 %) |
|  |  | *23.9* | *19.4* | *35.8* | *20.9* | *100.0* |
|  | 36-50 years  | 29 | 23 | 30 | 24 | 106 (24.5 %) |
|  |  | *27.4* | *21.7* | *28.3* | *22.6* | *100.0* |
|  | 51-65 years  | 41 | 54 | 36 | 68 | 199 (46.1 %) |
|  |  | *20.6* | *27.1* | *18.1* | *34.2* | *100.0* |
|  | >65 years  | 6 | 9 | 6 | 12 | 33 (7.6 %) |
|  |  | *18.2* | *27.3* | *18.2* | *36.4* | *100.0* |
|  | **Total**  | **97** | **105** | **104** | **126** | **432 (100 %)** |
|  |  | ***22.5*** | ***24.3*** | ***24.1*** | ***29.2*** | ***100.0*** |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Male  | 107 | 117 | 105 | 125 | 454 (87.1 %) |
|  |  | *23.6* | *25.8* | *23.1* | *27.5* | *100.0* |
|  | Female  | 13 | 12 | 23 | 15 | 63 (12.1 %) |
|  |  | *20.6* | *19.1* | *36.5* | *23.8* | *100.0* |
|  | Other  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 (0.8 %) |
|  |  | *0.0* | *0.0* | *50.0* | *50.0* | *100.0* |
|  | **Total**  | **120** | **129** | **130** | **142** | **521 (100 %)** |
|  |  | ***23.0*** | ***24.8*** | ***25.0*** | ***27.3*** | ***100.0*** |

Notes: The last column (“Total by characteristics group”) indicates characteristic variables’ class frequencies in the sample. The (bold typed) totals indicate the number of non-missing values of the characteristic (among 673 cases with non-missing experiment data). Figures in italics indicate relative frequencies (in percent) of the experimental arms (vignettes) for the respective characteristics class. In a perfectly balanced experiment the percentages in each of these rows would be equal to the percentages of the respective (bold typed) total.

**On-line Appendix 3**

**Estimation results ordered logit model with socio-economic variables**

***On-line Appendix 3:*** *Estimation results ordered logit model with socio-economic variables*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Coef. | Std. Err. | 95% confidence interval | z- value | p-value | Exp. Coef. |
| (Intercept):1 | -1.9768 | (0.6738) | -3.30 … -0.66 | -2.934 | 0.0033 |  |
| (Intercept):2 | -1.3924 | (0.6722) | -2.71 … -0.07 | -2.071 | 0.0383 |  |
| (Intercept):3 | -0.5306 | (0.6707) | -1.85 … 0.78 | -0.791 | 0.4289 |  |
| RoleSeller | 0.5563 | (0.1427) | 0.28 … 0.84 | 3.897 | 0.0001 | 1.7442 |
| Buyernon\_loc\_farmer | 1.6084 | (0.1717) | 1.27 … 1.95 | 9.370 | 0.0000 | 4.9949 |
| Buyerlocal\_nonfarmer | 0.3756 | (0.1623) | 0.06 … 0.69 | 2.315 | 0.0206 | 1.4559 |
| EastWestNewFedStates | 0.4828 | (0.4100) | -0.32 … 1.29 | 1.178 | 0.2390 | 1.6206 |
| UAA25 t 50 ha t 50ha | 0.3492 | (0.2413) | -0.12 … 0.82 | 1.447 | 0.1479 | 1.4179 |
| UAA50 to 100ha | 0.5449 | (0.2519) | 0.051 … 1.04 | 2.163 | 0.0305 | 1.7244 |
| UAA100 to 250ha | 0.9003 | (0.2711) | 0.37 … 1.43 | 3.321 | 0.0009 | 2.4604 |
| UAA250 to 500ha | 1.0888 | (0.4044) | 0.30 … 1.88 | 2.692 | 0.0071 | 2.9706 |
| UAA500 to 1000ha | 0.9543 | (0.5305) | -0.09 … 1.99 | 1.799 | 0.0721 | 2.5968 |
| UAA1000 to 2000ha | -0.6888 | (0.7287) | -2.12 … 0.74 | -0.945 | 0.3445 | 0.5022 |
| UAAMore than 2000ha | -0.1757 | (0.8291) | -1.80 … 1.45  | -0.212 | 0.8321 | 0.8388 |
| OwnedShare0<X<=5% | -1.3961 | (0.7340) | -2.83 … 0.04 | -1.902 | 0.0572 | 0.2476 |
| OwnedShare5<X<=10% | -1.0676 | (0.6462) | -2.33 … 0.20 | -1.652 | 0.0985 | 0.3438 |
| OwnedShare10<X<=40% | -1.3563 | (0.5916) | -2.52 … -0.20 | -2.293 | 0.0219 | 0.2576 |
| OwnedShare40-70% | -1.0225 | (0.5941) | -2.19 … 0.15 | -1.721 | 0.0852 | 0.3597 |
| OwnedShare70-100% | -0.5398 | (0.5902) | -1.70 … 0.62  | -0.915 | 0.3604 | 0.5829 |
| PartTimePart TimeF | 0.5604 | (0.1947) | 0.18 … 0.94 | 2.879 | 0.0040 | 1.7514 |
| LegalFormPersPartnership | -0.1862 | (0.2292) | -0.64 … 0.26 | -0.812 | 0.4166 | 0.8301 |
| LegalFormCoOp | 0.1197 | (0.6721) | -1.20 … 1.44 | 0.178 | 0.8587 | 1.1272 |
| LegalFormLLC | 0.5204 | (0.5353) | -0.53 … 1.57 | 0.972 | 0.3310 | 1.6827 |
| Livestock<=1LU | -0.4895 | (0.2139) | -0.91 … -0.07 | -2.288 | 0.0221 | 0.6129 |
| Livestock1-10 LU | -0.1524 | (0.1631) | -0.47 … 0.17 | -0.934 | 0.3502 | 0.8587 |
| Livestock>10LU | -0.8458 | (0.2501) | -1.34 … -0.36 | -3.382 | 0.0007 | 0.4292 |
| AgeGrp26-35yrs | -0.1740 | (0.3418) | -0.85 … 0.50 | -0.509 | 0.6108 | 0.8403 |
| AgeGrp36-50yrs | 0.4986 | (0.3183) | -0.13 … 1.12 | 1.566 | 0.1173 | 1.6464 |
| AgeGrp51-65yrs | 0.7154 | (0.306) | 0.12… 1.32 | 2.338 | 0.0194 | 2.0450 |
| AgeGrp>65yrs | 0.9040 | (0.3809) | 0.16 … 1.65 | 2.373 | 0.0176 | 2.4693 |
| Genderfemale | -0.4706 | (0.2436) | -0.95 … 0.01 | -1.932 | 0.0534 | 0.6246 |
| Residual Deviance | 1907.891 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Log-likelihood | -953.946 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of obs. | 850 |  |  |  |  |  |
| DF | 2519 |  |  |  |  |  |