



HAL
open science

The use of bootstrapped Malmquist indices to reassess productivity change findings: an application to a sample of Polish farms

Kelvin Balcombe, Sophia Davidova, Laure Latruffe

► To cite this version:

Kelvin Balcombe, Sophia Davidova, Laure Latruffe. The use of bootstrapped Malmquist indices to reassess productivity change findings: an application to a sample of Polish farms. *Applied Economics*, 2008, 40 (16), pp.2055-2061. 10.1080/00036840600949264 . hal-00582014

HAL Id: hal-00582014

<https://hal.science/hal-00582014>

Submitted on 1 Apr 2011

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



The use of bootstrapped Malmquist indices to reassess productivity change findings: an application to a sample of Polish farms

Journal:	<i>Applied Economics</i>
Manuscript ID:	APE-05-0640
Journal Selection:	Applied Economics
Date Submitted by the Author:	15-Nov-2005
JEL Code:	D24 - Production Capital and Total Factor Productivity Capacity < D2 - Production and Organizations < D - Microeconomics, Q12 - Micro Analysis of Farm Firms, Farm Households, and Farm Input Markets < Q1 - Agriculture < Q - Agricultural and Natural Resource Economics, C60 - General < C6 - Mathematical Methods and Programming < C - Mathematical and Quantitative Methods
Keywords:	productivity, Malmquist, bootstrapping, second-stage regression, Poland

1
2
3 **The use of bootstrapped Malmquist indices to reassess productivity change**
4
5 **findings: an application to a sample of Polish farms**
6
7
8
9

10 **Running title:** Bootstrapped Malmquist indices to reassess productivity change
11 findings
12
13
14
15

16
17 **Abstract**
18

19
20 The paper assesses the extent to which sampling variation affects findings about
21 Malmquist productivity change derived using Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA), in
22 the first stage calculating productivity indices and in the second stage investigating
23 the farm-specific change in productivity. Confidence intervals for Malmquist indices
24 are constructed using Simar and Wilson's (1999) bootstrapping procedure. The main
25 contribution of the paper is to account in the second stage for the information
26 provided by the first-stage bootstrap. The DEA standard errors of the Malmquist
27 indices given by bootstrapping are employed in an innovative heteroscedastic panel
28 regression, using a maximum likelihood procedure. The application is to a sample of
29 250 Polish farms over the period 1996-2000.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43
44 The confidence intervals' results suggest that the second half of 1990s for Polish
45 farms was characterised not so much by productivity regress but rather by stagnation.
46
47 As for the determinants of farm productivity change, we find that the integration of
48 the DEA standard errors in the second-stage regression is significant in explaining a
49 proportion of the variance in the error term. Although our heteroscedastic regression
50 results differ with those from the standard OLS, in terms of significance and sign,
51 they are consistent with theory and previous research.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **The use of bootstrapped Malmquist indices to reassess productivity change**
4
5 **findings: an application to a sample of Polish farms**
6
7
8
9

10 **1. Introduction**
11

12 The objective of the paper is to assess the extent to which findings about Malmquist
13 productivity change derived using Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) are affected
14 by sampling variation. Malmquist indices derived with the use of DEA have often
15 been employed for investigating changes in productivity either at farm or sectoral
16 level in agriculture (e.g. Coelli and Rao, 2003; Umetsu *et al.*, 2003). One of the main
17 drawbacks of DEA is that the results may be affected by sampling variation,
18 implying that distances to the frontier are likely to be underestimated.
19

20 The issue of sampling variation in DEA models is now receiving increasing
21 attention, following the method introduced by Simar and Wilson (1998, 2000)
22 allowing the construction of confidence intervals for DEA efficiency scores. Their
23 method, relying on resampling the efficiency scores with the help of bootstrapping,
24 has been adapted to the case of Malmquist DEA method (Simar and Wilson, 1999).
25 However, so far there have only been a few empirical applications of bootstrap to
26 Malmquist DEA indices (Tortosa-Ausina *et al.*, 2003; Chen, 2002), none of which
27 are to agriculture.
28

29 A few recent studies have investigated productivity change in Polish agriculture.
30 They all computed Malmquist indices, measuring changes in productivity and its
31 components - technical efficiency and technology change (Brümmer *et al.*, 2002;
32 Zawalinska, 2003; Latruffe, 2004; Piesse *et al.*, 2004). All of them suggest some
33 negative trends in productivity in the Polish farming sector. However, none of the
34 studies using DEA accounted for sampling variability by correcting for sample bias,
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 or constructing confidence intervals for the original Malmquist indices. Additionally,
4
5 they did not attempt to understand the factors behind this negative trend.
6
7

8
9 This paper, first, estimates Malmquist indices and, second, employs Simar and
10
11 Wilson's (1999) efficiency bootstrapping procedure adapted to the Malmquist index
12
13 case. As a result of the bootstrap application, a set of bootstrap Malmquist indices is
14
15 provided. This allows estimating the bias in the results. Confidence intervals are
16
17 constructed based on the bootstrap sample.
18
19

20
21 Second, a second-stage regression is performed to investigate factors determining
22
23 farm productivity change and answer the question why some farms performed better
24
25 than others. The main contribution of this analysis is that the information provided
26
27 by the bootstrap procedure is used in this second stage. A heteroscedastic panel
28
29 regression is employed which utilises the standard errors produced by the bootstrap.
30
31 Integrating these standard errors into the estimation process should lead to an
32
33 improvement in efficiency and to more accurate inference regarding the determinants
34
35 of productivity change.¹
36
37
38
39

40
41 The paper is structured as follows. The second section describes the methodology,
42
43 paying particular attention to the heteroscedastic panel regression. Section three
44
45 discusses the results and section four concludes.
46
47
48
49

50
51 ¹ The problem of sampling variability in the second-stage regression has also recently been addressed
52
53 by Simar and Wilson (2005) for efficiency scores. Their procedure, relying on a double
54
55 bootstrap, accounts for correlation among the DEA estimates but does not make use of the estimates
56
57 heterogeneity provided by the first-stage bootstrap. While in principle it may be possible to merge the
58
59 double bootstrap with the approach used herein, the computational requirements might make this
60
impractical.

2. Methodology and data

2.1. Malmquist indices and Data Envelopment Analysis

The Malmquist productivity index, pioneered by Caves *et al.* (1982) and developed further by Färe *et al.* (1992) relies on distance functions. The input-orientation Malmquist productivity indices are used in this study. Such orientation is adequate for the sample of Polish farms used here, as under the transition conditions farmers had more control over the reduction of their inputs than over the expansion of their outputs. For each farm, the input-orientation Malmquist productivity index is defined as follows (Färe *et al.*, 1992):

$$y_t = \left[\frac{d^t(F_{t+1}, Q_{t+1})}{d^t(F_t, Q_t)} \frac{d^{t+1}(F_{t+1}, Q_{t+1})}{d^{t+1}(F_t, Q_t)} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (1)$$

where

(F_t, Q_t) is the farm input-output vector in the t -th period;

$d^t(F_{t+1}, Q_{t+1}) = \max\{\delta : (F_{t+1} / \delta) \in P\}$ is the input distance from the observation in the $t+1$ period to the technology frontier of the t -th period, with $P(Q_{t+1})$ the input set and δ a scalar.

The indices are calculated with the non-parametric DEA method that uses linear programming to construct a piece-wise frontier that envelops all data points (Charnes *et al.*, 1978). DEA method avoids misspecification errors and allows investigating a multi-output multi-input case simultaneously. The empirical application is to a sample of 250 Polish farms over 5 years, 1996-2000. Farm level data have been collected by the Institute of Agricultural and Food Economics (IERiGZ) in Warsaw

1
2
3 which conducts an annual farm structures survey representative for the bookkeeping
4
5 farms.
6
7

8
9 In the model three outputs are included in value terms, crop, livestock and non-
10
11 agricultural output. Four inputs are used: land, labour, capital and intermediate
12
13 consumption. Land is defined as the utilised agricultural area (UAA) in hectares,
14
15 labour is calculated in annual work units (AWU)², capital is proxied by the value of
16
17 depreciation of fixed assets plus interest paid on loans, and the intermediate
18
19 consumption includes the aggregate value of seeds, fertilizers, chemicals, feed and
20
21 fuel. The monetary values for the period 1997-2000 have been deflated, using indices
22
23 based on 1996 published by the Polish Central Statistical Office (GUS, 2001).
24
25
26
27

28 **2.2. Bootstrapping and second-stage regression**

29 **Bootstrapping**

30
31 Despite its advantages, the shortcoming of DEA is that the results may be affected by
32
33 sampling variation in the sense that distances to the frontier are underestimated if the
34
35 best performers in the population are not included in the sample. To account for this,
36
37 Simar and Wilson (1998, 2000) proposed a bootstrapping method, allowing the
38
39 construction of confidence intervals for DEA efficiency scores, which relies on
40
41 smoothing the empirical distribution. The rationale behind bootstrapping is to
42
43 simulate a true sampling distribution by mimicking a data generating process, here
44
45 the outputs from DEA. The procedure relies on constructing a pseudo-data set and
46
47 re-estimating the DEA model with this new data set. Repeating the process many
48
49 times allows to achieve a good approximation of the true distribution of the sampling
50
51 (Brümmer, 2001).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

² One AWU corresponds to 2,200 labour hours per year.

1
2
3 Simar and Wilson (1999) adapted the procedure to the case of Malmquist index
4 derived using DEA in order to account for possible temporal correlation arising from
5 the panel data characteristic. They proposed a consistent method using a bivariate
6 kernel density estimate that accounts for the temporal correlation via the covariance
7 matrix of data from adjacent years. The set of bootstrap Malmquist indices provided
8 by this procedure allows to account for the bias and to construct confidence intervals.
9
10 The final procedure for constructing confidence intervals consists of two main steps.
11 First, a set of bootstrap Malmquist indices is provided. This allows calculating the
12 bias in the results. Second, the confidence intervals are constructed based on the
13 bootstrap sample. In this study, 2000 bootstrap iterations were performed and the 95-
14 percent confidence intervals were constructed. The smoothing bandwidth parameter
15 (h) was determined by an appropriate rule for bivariate data given by Simar and
16 Wilson (1999):

$$h = \left(\frac{4}{5} n \right)^{\frac{1}{6}} \quad (2)$$

17 where n is the number of farms in the sample.

18 **Second-stage regression**

19 In order to investigate the determinants of farm-specific productivity change, the
20 standard method uses the Malmquist productivity indices as dependent variables in a
21 second-stage regression. This second stage, however, ignores the sampling
22 variability issue. In this study, we propose a heteroscedastic panel regression, using
23 the information provided by the bootstrapping procedure. This regression relies on
24 maximum likelihood and uses the DEA standard errors of the Malmquist indices.
25
26 The idea behind our panel estimation is to assume that Malmquist indices are
27 observed with noise:
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

$$y_{i,t} = y_{i,t}^* + u_{i,t} \quad (3)$$

with

$$y_{i,t}^* = \gamma_t \beta_0 + x_{i,t}' \beta_1 + e_{i,t} \quad (4)$$

where

$y_{i,t}$ is the Malmquist index for the i -th farm at the t -th period, calculated with DEA and used as the dependent variable in the regression;

$y_{i,t}^*$ is the true Malmquist index that is unobserved;

$u_{i,t}$ and $e_{i,t}$ are error terms;

γ_t is a fixed time effect;

$x_{i,t}$ is a vector of explanatory variables;

β_0 and β_1 are parameters to be estimated.

This delivers the following empirical specification:

$$y_{i,t} = z_{i,t}' \beta + v_{i,t} \quad (5)$$

with

$$z_{i,t}' = (\gamma_t, x_{i,t}') \quad (6)$$

$$v_{i,t} = e_{i,t} + u_{i,t} . \quad (7)$$

Both $u_{i,t}$ and $e_{i,t}$ are assumed to be normal, independent of the explanatory variables and independent of each other. We assume that $e_{i,t}$ is homoscedastic, but that with the bootstrapping results we have knowledge about the variance of the noise $u_{i,t}$ in the Malmquist indices:

$$Var(v_{i,t}) = \theta + \eta_{i,t} \lambda \quad (8)$$

where

$$Var(e_{i,t}) = \theta; \quad (9)$$

$$Var(u_{i,t}) = \eta_{i,t} \lambda; \quad (10)$$

$\eta_{i,t}$ is the variance of the i -th farm's DEA Malmquist, as given by the bootstrap distribution;

λ is a parameter reflecting the degree to which the bootstrap standard errors contribute to the variance of the errors in equation (5).

In addition, we allow for potential serial correlation between the productivity indices.

It is assumed that the i -th farm may systematically be above or below its expected growth rate, even after accounting for the impact of the explanatory variables ($x_{i,t}$).

This is parsimoniously captured by assuming that

$$Cov(e_{i,t}, e_{i,t-s}) = \rho^s \theta \quad (11)$$

where ρ is the parameter which captures potential serial correlation.

The likelihood function to maximise is therefore:

$$L = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \right)^{nT} \det(\Omega_v)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{v' \Omega_v^{-1} v}{2} \right) \quad (12)$$

where n is the number of farms and T is the number of periods;

$$\Omega_v = \theta J(\rho) + \lambda N = \theta [J(\rho) + \tau N]; \quad (13)$$

$$J(\rho) = \begin{pmatrix} I & \rho I & \dots & \rho^T I \\ \rho I & I & \dots & \rho^{T-1} I \\ \dots & \dots & I & \dots \\ \rho^T I & \dots & \rho I & I \end{pmatrix}; \quad (14)$$

I the identity matrix;

$$N = \text{diag}(\eta_1', \eta_2', \dots, \eta_T'); \quad (15)$$

$$\tau = \frac{\lambda}{\theta}. \quad (16)$$

The reparameterisation of the likelihood, to be expressed in terms of τ and θ rather than λ and θ , facilitates the estimation. This model nests standard sub-models, such as the case where $\tau=0$ and $\rho=0$ that is to say the model reduces to a standard linear regression.

The results of this heteroscedastic panel regression are compared to a standard Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression that is usually employed in studies investigating the determinants of productivity change. In addition, the significance of τ may be examined to determine if the heteroscedastic model is supported by the data.

Seven explanatory variables are used in both second-stage regressions. Land area is included as a farm size indicator. The capital to labour ratio is used as a proxy of farm technology. The share of hired labour represents the farm integration into the labour market.³ The availability of financial resources is proxied by the share of marketed output in total output.⁴ The degree of reliance upon and concentration on farming is proxied by the share of other income in total income. Finally, two farmers' characteristics are included, the farmers' age and their agricultural education. The latter is a dummy variable. Four year dummies are incorporated to represent the fixed time effect γ_t .

³ Polish farms are rather small and rely mostly on family labour. They are not well integrated into the factor markets.

⁴ The mass of Polish farms are semi-subsistence, produce mainly for household consumption and market the surplus. The use of external credit is low and the marketed output is often the single source of cash. For this reason it can be treated as a proxy for liquidity.

3. Results

3.1. Productivity change

The point estimates of Malmquist indices indicate that over the period 1996-2000 the total factor productivity in Polish agriculture decreased by 2 percent (Table 1). This result is consistent with the results from previous studies. The bias corrected estimates indicate the same direction of change but emphasise stronger the negative trend. In comparison with the point estimates, the regress in productivity appears to be deeper, 4 percent.

The confidence intervals are large, 48 percent on average. This indicates that it is not possible to unambiguously identify farms that have experienced significant progress or regress, namely whose productivity change is significantly different from 0. Based on the point estimates of Malmquist indices, farms that have experienced productivity progress (that is to say whose Malmquist index is strictly greater than 1) were 128 in 1996/97 (51 percent of the sample), 82 in 1997/98 (33 percent), 76 in 1998/99 (30 percent) and 176 in 1999/2000 (70 percent). Only between 0 and 3 farms in different years recorded a lack of change in productivity (index equal to 1). The remaining farms recorded productivity regress. The picture is not different if the bias corrected point estimates are considered. By contrast, if farms are analysed based on their interval bounds, out of the total sample of 250, 205 farms in 1996/97 (82 percent), 158 in 1997/98 (63 percent), 169 in 1998/99 (68 percent) and 206 in 1999/2000 (82 percent) might have experienced no change in productivity.⁵

Therefore, these results suggest that contrary to what was reported by some previous

⁵ A farm is said to have experienced significant progress if its confidence interval lower bound is greater than 1, significant regress if its upper bound is less than 1, and no significant change if 1 is included in its confidence interval.

1
2
3 studies, the second half of 1990s was characterised not so much by productivity
4 regress but rather by stagnation. This is intuitively more appealing as it is difficult to
5 think about factors that would have been responsible for productivity regress even
6 during transition. The Polish farming was not subject to such extensive land reforms
7 and farm restructuring as the other countries in transition, and therefore the
8 transitional disruption was not so strong.

9
10 From a methodological point of view, this result shows that there is a large
11 uncertainty about the extent of productivity change in Polish farming and strongly
12 supports Simar and Wilson's (1999: 471) argument that "it is not enough to know
13 whether the Malmquist index estimator indicates increases or decreases in
14 productivity, but whether the indicated changes are significant in a statistical sense;
15 i.e., whether the result indicates a real change in productivity, or is an artifact of
16 sampling noise".

3.2. Determinants of productivity change

17
18 Following the methodology explained above, first, the standard OLS regression was
19 run. The results are presented in Table 2. They indicate that capital to labour ratio,
20 liquidity (the share of marketed output) and other income are significant
21 determinants of productivity change, with the parameter of the capital to labour ratio
22 being negative and the parameter of the other two variables being positive. As for
23 the time trend, year dummies show that the first year of the period recorded the
24 largest increase in productivity. Productivity then dropped, but started recovering
25 again in the last periods.

26
27 The results of the heteroscedastic regression are displayed in Table 3. The serial
28 correlation parameter (ρ) is negative, suggesting that farms that increase their
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 productivity in one year tend to move backward in the following year. As for the
4
5 explanatory variables, two differences with the standard regression results in Table 2
6
7 can be noted. First, there is a change in the significance of some parameters. Except
8
9 for the share of hired labour and year dummies, the parameters present a lower
10
11 significance. The share of marketed output and the capital to labour ratio are not
12
13 significant anymore. However, the share of hired labour became significant. It affects
14
15 negatively the productivity progress. The second difference relates to the sign of the
16
17 share of other income, namely a switch from a positive sign in the standard OLS
18
19 regression to a negative in the new heteroscedastic regression. The heteroscedasticity
20
21 parameter τ is very large (43.6) and its confidence interval does not include 0,
22
23 indicating that the heteroscedastic model is supported by the data.
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 **4. Conclusions**

31
32
33 The analysis of productivity change in Polish agriculture between 1996 and 2000
34
35 based on Malmquist DEA point estimates has revealed a gloomy picture. The use of
36
37 bias corrected indices confirmed this finding as it indicated an average productivity
38
39 regress of 4 percent. However, the confidence intervals suggest that productivity
40
41 might have been static rather than decreasing. Therefore, this study underlines the
42
43 uncertainty surrounding the findings regarding productivity change measured
44
45 through Malmquist DEA method using point estimates only.
46
47
48
49

50
51 The lack of productivity change in Poland in the second half of 1990's could be
52
53 attributed to various factors. OECD report on Poland (2004) emphasises the link
54
55 between land ownership and eligibility for the strongly subsidised farmers social
56
57 insurance system (the requirement is to keep 1 ha agricultural land to be eligible for
58
59 the system but to have less than 2 ha to qualify for unemployment benefits) as a
60

1
2
3 critical barrier to productivity growth. The structural inefficiencies are also rooted in
4
5 the high costs for land registration. In addition, the same report argues that the
6
7 relative agricultural labour productivity in Poland (measured as agricultural value
8
9 added per agricultural worker divided by the whole economy value added per one
10
11 employed) decreased in 1990s. Concerning farm equipment, Zawalinska (2003)
12
13 reports that between 1995 and 1999 the sales of new farm machineries and
14
15 implements decreased considerably and physical capital became obsolete. All these
16
17 factors might have contributed to the stagnation of productivity in Polish agriculture
18
19 during the period studied.
20
21
22
23
24

25 The novelty of this study is mainly in the second stage where we used a
26
27 heteroscedastic panel regression estimated by maximum likelihood, that makes use
28
29 of the bootstrapping information and in particular of the Malmquist indices' standard
30
31 errors. The heteroscedastic model was supported by the data. Additionally, although
32
33 the inclusion of the information provided by the first-stage bootstrap changed the
34
35 significance and the sign of some parameters in the second-stage regression, the
36
37 findings of this regression better meet the *a priori* expectations based on theory and
38
39 previous research than the standard ones. The negative influence of the share of hired
40
41 labour on productivity growth is consistent with the theory, in particular the
42
43 transaction costs approach. Family labourers are in full control of the resources and
44
45 technology and, as the only residual claimants, have more incentives than hired
46
47 labour to act efficiently. Although moving to hired labour involves gains from task
48
49 specialisation, it may also result in shirking (Allen and Lueck, 1998). Beckmann
50
51 (1996) argues that due to the high bonding within the family farm, it compares
52
53 favourably to other forms of capitalist labour organisation of production as it
54
55 minimises transaction costs.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Concerning the negative impact of the share of other income, most often in transition
4 economies farmers have been pushed to diversify due to declining farm incomes in
5 relative terms. In these circumstances 'push' may be considered as a survival strategy
6 (Chaplin, 2003). However, as it might imply poor management practices and
7 therefore low technical efficiency, such strategy can hardly be favourable to
8 productivity growth.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 **Acknowledgements**

23
24 The authors wish to thank Lech Goraj from IERiGZ in Warsaw for providing access
25 to the data.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

Allen, D., Lueck, D. (1998) The nature of the farm, *Journal of Law and Economics*, XLI (October 1998), 343-386.

Beckmann, V. (1996) *Transaction costs and institutional choice in agriculture: The example of family vs. hired labour*, paper presented at the VIIIth EAAE Congress, Edinburgh, Scotland, 3-7 September.

Brümmer, B. (2001) Estimating confidence intervals for technical efficiency: The case of private farms in Slovenia, *European Review of Agricultural Economics*, 28(3), 285-306.

Brümmer, B, Glauhen, T., Thijssen, G. (2002) Decomposition of productivity growth using distance functions: The case of dairy farms in three European countries, *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 84(3), 628-644.

Caves, D., Christensen, L., Diewert, E. (1982) The economic theory of index numbers and the measurement of input, output, and productivity, *Econometrica*, 50(6), 1393-1414.

Chaplin, H. (2003) *Non-Agricultural Diversification of Corporate Farms and Farm Households in Central Europe*, PhD Thesis, Imperial College, University of London, unpublished.

Charnes, A., Cooper, W., Rhodes, E. (1978) Measuring the efficiency of decision making units, *European Journal of Operational Research*, 2, 429-444.

Chen, S.-N. (2002) *Productivity changes in hospitals in Taiwan: A quality incorporated Malmquist index bootstrap approach*, paper presented at the Asia Conference on Productivity Growth, Taiwan, 19-20 July.

1
2
3 Coelli, T., Rao, P. (2003) *Total factor productivity growth in agriculture: A*
4
5
6 *Malmquist index analysis of 93 countries, 1980-2000*, Working Paper No. 02/2003,
7
8 CEPA, University of Queensland.

9
10
11 Färe, R., Grosskopf, S., Lindgren, B., Roos, P. (1992) Productivity changes in
12
13 Swedish pharmacies 1980-1989: A non-parametric approach, *Journal of Productivity*
14
15 *Analysis*, 3(1-2), 85-101.

16
17
18 GUS. (2001) *Agriculture, Hunting and Fishery – Yearbook 2001*, Central
19
20 Statistical Office, Warsaw.

21
22
23 Latruffe, L. (2004) *Farm Technical Efficiency, Credit and Investment in a*
24
25 *Transition Country: A Microeconomic Analysis in Poland*, PhD Thesis, University of
26
27 Paris 10, unpublished.

28
29
30
31 OECD. (2004) *Economic survey – Poland 2004*, Paris, OECD.

32
33
34 Piesse, J., Thirtle, C., Hadley, D. (2004) Current and Historic Relative Agricultural
35
36 Productivity and Performance: Sector and Farm Level, Chapter 1 in *Impact on UK of*
37
38 *Increasing Agricultural Productivity in New Member States*, Report for DEFRA,
39
40 Project No. EPES 0203/4, unpublished.

41
42
43
44 Simar, L., Wilson, P. (1998) Sensitivity analysis of efficiency scores: How to
45
46 bootstrap in nonparametric frontier models, *Management Science*, 44(1), 49-61.

47
48
49 Simar, L., Wilson, P. (1999) Estimating and bootstrapping Malmquist indices,
50
51 *European Journal of Operational Research*, 115, 459-471.

52
53
54 Simar, L., Wilson, P. (2000) Statistical inference in nonparametric frontier models:
55
56 The state of the art, *Journal of Productivity Analysis*, 13(1), 49-78.

1
2
3 Simar, L., Wilson, P. (2005) Estimation and inference in two-stage, semi-
4 parametric models of production processes, *Journal of Econometrics*, in press.
5
6

7
8 Tortosa-Ausina, E., Grifell-Tatje, E., Armero, C., Conesa, D. (2003) *Sensitivity*
9 *Analysis of Efficiency and Malmquist Productivity Indices: An Application to*
10 *Spanish Savings Banks*, Centre for Applied Economic Research Working Paper
11 2003/02, University of New South Wales.
12
13
14
15
16

17
18 Umetsu, C., Lekprichakul, T., Chakravorty, U. (2003) Efficiency and technical
19 change in the Philippine rice sector: A Malmquist total factor productivity analysis,
20 *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 85(4), 943-963.
21
22
23
24
25

26 Zawalinska, K. (2003) *The Competitiveness of Polish Agriculture in the Context of*
27 *Integration with the European Union*, PhD Thesis, University of Warsaw,
28 unpublished.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: Inference results for Malmquist productivity indices; 1996-2000 average

Malmquist index average	-2%
Bias corrected Malmquist index average	-4%
Confidence intervals	
Upper bound average	+18%
Lower bound average	-31%
Width average	48%

Table 2: Regression of Malmquist productivity indices (standard OLS)

	Parameter estimates	Standard errors	<i>t</i> -test
Land area	1.36 10 ⁻⁴	1.78 10 ⁻⁴	0.76
Capital to labour ratio	-6.20 10 ⁻⁶	1.78 10 ⁻⁶	-3.49 ***
Share of hired labour	-2.78 10 ⁻⁴	6.48 10 ⁻⁴	-0.43
Share of commercialised output	3.73 10 ⁻³	0.31 10 ⁻³	12.0 ***
Share of other income	1.76 10 ⁻³	0.38 10 ⁻³	4.64 ***
Age	9.31 10 ⁻⁵	20.4 10 ⁻⁴	0.45
Agricultural education dummy	1.47 10 ⁻²	1.45 10 ⁻²	1.01
Year 96-97 dummy	1.06	0.017	62.9 ***
Year 97-98 dummy	0.88	0.016	53.6 ***
Year 98-99 dummy	0.98	0.016	61.3 ***
Year 99-00 dummy	0.99	0.016	61.6 ***

Table 3: Regression of Malmquist productivity indices accounting for sampling variability and serial correlation

	Parameter estimates	Standard errors	<i>t</i> -test	
Land area	4.97 10 ⁻⁵	16.3 10 ⁻⁵	0.31	
Capital to labour ratio	-8.81 10 ⁻⁷	15.3 10 ⁻⁷	-0.58	
Share of hired labour	-1.20 10 ⁻³	0.54 10 ⁻³	-2.22	**
Share of commercialised output	-4.95 10 ⁻⁴	3.92 10 ⁻⁴	-1.26	
Share of other income	-6.60 10 ⁻⁴	3.07 10 ⁻⁴	-2.15	**
Age	7.54 10 ⁻⁵	16.4 10 ⁻⁵	0.46	
Agricultural education dummy	5.35 10 ⁻³	10.4 10 ⁻³	0.52	
Year 96-97 dummy	1.02	0.014	70.8	***
Year 97-98 dummy	0.88	0.014	65.4	***
Year 98-99 dummy	0.97	0.013	75.9	***
Year 99-00 dummy	0.98	0.014	71.5	***

Serial correlation parameter: $\rho = -0.42$

Heteroscedasticity parameter: $\tau = 43.6$; confidence interval = [26.0 ; 61.2]