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Abstract: In the framework of Slovakia entering into the European Union, there was done a PHARE-ACE survey in years 1999–2000. The name of this survey was “Micro-economic analysis of farming households restructuring in pre-accession period to the EU”. The survey was finished in 2002. This survey was done in two regions of Slovakia, characterized by different natural conditions, production and economic conditions. This project was aiming not only at private farmers but also at other legal entities producing agricultural products. The monitored group consisted of 412 private farmers, farming in average 43.2 ha of agricultural land. Most of them are farming on 0–2 ha of agricultural land (20.8%) and on 25–100 ha of agricultural land (20.1%).
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Abstrakt: V rámci prípravy Slovenskej republiky na implementáciu štrukturalnej politiky EÚ a rozvoja vidieka bol v rokoch 1999–2001 realizovaný program PHARE ACE „Mikroekonomická analýza reštrukturalizácie vidiekých domácností v predvstupovom období do EÚ“. Výsledky sa uskutoční súbežne v dvoch územno-správnych regiónoch Slovenska, diferencovaných rozdielmi prirodzenými, produkčnými a ekonomickými podmienkami a z hľadiska organizačno-právnej formy podnikania na pôde. Výberový súbor tvorilo aj 412 súkromne hospodáriacich roľníkov podnikajúcich na priemernej výmere 43.2 ha poľnohospodárskej pôdy. Najpočetnejšiu skupinu tvorili farmári podnikajúci na výmere od 0–2 ha poľnohospodárskej pôdy (20,8 %) a v rozpätí od 25–100 ha poľnohospodárskej pôdy (20,1 %). Priemerná výmera súkromných faří v SR je pritom nižšia, len 10,4 ha poľnohospodárskej pôdy pri počte viac ako 21 tisíc registrovaných farmárov.
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SWOT analýza

RESTRUCTURING OF AGRICULTURE AND ITS INFLUENCE ON PRIVATE FARMS FORMATION

Slovak agriculture restructuring did not achieve success in putting pressure on private farmers. Most agricultural land is still cultivated by the transformed co-operative farms and even higher is their share in agricultural production. Agricultural production is capital intensive in Slovakia. The share of agriculture in total employment decreased (from 11% to 5.6%) and thus agriculture is no more a social net. Restructuring of agriculture led to increase of labour productivity, especially at larger enterprises. (Pokrivčák, Bielik 2002)

Land ownership became not only a formal legal relation but a relevant economic category. Problematic is the fact, that land ownership is extremely atomised. In 1997, there were 9.6 million plots of the average size 0.45 ha of agricultural land, owned by 12 up to 15 owners (OECD 1997). Land ownership was consolidated under the pressure of economies of scale in conditions of market economy, whereas in conditions of Slovakia it was not so.

Atomised land ownership slowed down the transition to private farming. High transactional costs were one of the reasons why this process was not successful. Transactional costs are mostly of the technical nature (lost and damaged cadastral maps and land registers, elimination of physical borders between plots during collectivisation) and legal nature (non-registering of possession changes in cadastr in the long-run). The result was the status quo in using land and also the decrease of long-run investments in agriculture (Swinnen 1976).

Additional obstacles with dividing the associated capital, underdevelopment of land market and shortcomings in money market connected with the lack of credit possibilities caused the increase of start-up costs related to the transition to private farming in agriculture.

Restructuring of agricultural produce and transformation of proprietary relations induced an increase of total productivity and a rapid increase of labour productivity in agriculture. The reason was improved managerial methods, budgetary restriction for enterprises after transformation and dismissal of redundant workers. These are
also the main reasons why private farmers are not the
dominant farming form within agriculture.

**Selected results of the survey**

Presumptive changes in our macro-economy after Slo-
vakia entering into the European Union create some op-
portunities and threats for competitiveness of agriculture
and exert pressure on different development of enterpr-
ises. Perhaps our entering into the EU in 2004 might solve
some problems concerning development of farming that
were not solved after the transformation in 1989. How did
respondents evaluate the impact of Slovakia entering
into the EU in terms of agriculture? They are of different
opinions regarding the fundamental question.

More than 70% of them expect mostly positive effects.
Those should be connected especially with the foreign
capital inflow, foreign investments to new technologies
and increase of labour productivity. This ought to de-
crease possible threats and dangers concerning the unit-
ited market and its competitiveness. Another strong
motive for private farmers to support our entering into
the EU is the system of subsidising agricultural produc-
ers by direct payments. Entering into the EU is connect-
ed with using four basic forms of the free flow of
products, services, capital and people, that can present
also a possible threat, because of the related increase of
all forms of costs and competition for home producers.
Possible threats are quotation of some agricultural pro-
ducts, high proportion of farmers farming on 0–2 ha of
agricultural land (20.8%), low average size of farm 10.4 ha
of agricultural land, outflow of qualified labour force for
better living and working conditions to the present mem-
ber countries of the EU and so forth.

What do respondents think about competitive advan-
tage and disadvantage in comparison with the EU? Strong points of our enterprises are cheap labour force and
its high expertise, diverse agricultural production on
bigger farms, geographical position of Slovakia and spe-
cialised agricultural production. These strong points can
change in practice into possible threats.

The structure of farmers’ education reveals the level
of education as well as the level of expertise of private
farmers (Table 1). Almost 80% of the analysed group of
respondents have secondary or higher education, but
30.5% of them have non-agricultural education. It means
that 46% of farmers gained their present level of ex-
pertise, ability to work and manage farm of their parents, by
working with parents or from their own experiences with
farming in the past. 13% of private farmers have com-
pleted tertiary education in such fields of study as agrono-
ymy, livestock specialisation, mechanisation or econo-
metrics. Although their education was interdisciplinary, it
was directed at agricultural production. The share of farm-
ers who gained their expertise by working in co-oper-
atives or state farms is very low. Stated differently, a great
amount of the current farmers did not farm before the year
1989 in the socialistic agricultural production. Their mo-
tive to start farming was land restitution, loss of their
previous job in industrial enterprises, return to former
family traditions (Table 2).

Among the underbellies typical for farming, there be-
long low productivity and utility of labour, low profitability
and income parity of farmers and rural households,
unfavourable capital structure, problems to obtain cred-
it, weak marketing strategy, insufficient research and
development, poor language knowledge etc. Approxi-
ately 60% of private farmers spend their working time
by working on farm. The rest work on farm from 0 to 99%
of their working time (Table 3).

An equivalent for prosperity is success in economics
of enterprise, it means profitable farming. To prove that
prosperity is connected with economic results of farm,
we use in economics the term “economic prosperity”
measured by income, profit and cost-effectiveness.

Low profit, or high loss typical for great number of
farms became one of the most important negative mo-

**Table 1. Education and expertise of private farmers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion (%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of farmers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 – no schooling, 2 – completed primary, 3 – some high-school, 4 – completed gymnasium, general, 5 – completed agricultural high
school, 6 – completed other vocational school, 7 – agricultural university, 8 – non-agricultural university, 9 – postgraduate study

**Table 2. Where did you learn to manage farm**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion (%)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of farmers</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 – from parents, work on own farm, 2 – previous job in cooperative or state farm, 3 – I learned it in the school, 4 – other farm-
ers, 5 – own experiences, 6 – other, 7 – not applicable
Table 3. Time spent in farming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time spent in farming</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1–30%</th>
<th>31–50%</th>
<th>51–99%</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion (%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of farmers</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N – not applicable

Table 4. Most important reasons why people are not interested in farming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion (%)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of farmers</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 – private farming is not profitable, 2 – we are too old, 3 – no descendant interested to take over the farm, 4 – we can earn more money doing other things, 5 – we do not need money, 6 – our land is located in a nature reserve, 7 – other reasons, 8 – no reasons, X – does not know

Table 5. Main job in terms of incomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion (%)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of farmers</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 6. Appraisal of the present incomes in the household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion (%)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of farmers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 – incomes are not sufficient for the bare necessities of life, 2 – incomes are sufficient only for the bare necessities of life, 3 – incomes are sufficient for a decent living, but we cannot afford buying more expensive things, 4 – we manage to have everything we need, without any restrictions, N – not applicable

Incentives in the development of farming. High average age and so-called “over-aged” farmers are the restrictive factors of farm stagnation (Table 4). Table 5 reveals that only 48% of farmers have incomes resulting solely from own farming. Low income parity, when incomes in agriculture represent approximately 70% of incomes in the national economy, force farmers to find other sources of money in the non-agricultural sector. 22% of farmers are interested in working abroad (for instance job in non-agricultural sector out of season, working on farms in the EU etc.).

Approximately 50% of the analysed private farmers evaluate their incomes as sufficient only for the bare necessities of life. 7% of farmers state that their incomes are under this level, thus their incomes are not sufficient for the bare necessities of life. Other farmers say that their incomes are sufficient for a decent living, but they cannot afford buying more expensive things (37%) and a small group of farmers consider their level of incomes enough high to buy everything they need, without any restrictions (4%). These data are shown in the Table 6.

Table 7 illustrates the total amount of money normally spent in the household each month. Expenditures of most households range from 5 000 to 20 000 SKK per month.

When we compared the economic situation of households in the year 1999 with the previous years, we came to the conclusion that about half of respondents (51%) judge their situation as worse than in the year 1995 and 5% of them think that their situation is much worse than
Table 7. Total amount of money normally spent in the household each month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories according to expenditures</th>
<th>Less than 5 000 SKK</th>
<th>5 001–10 000 SKK</th>
<th>10 001–15 000 SKK</th>
<th>15 001–20 000 SKK</th>
<th>20 001–25 000 SKK</th>
<th>25 001–30 000 SKK and more SKK</th>
<th>Does not know</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total monthly expenditures (proportion %)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures on food, beverages and cigarettes (proportion %)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total monthly expenditures (number)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures on food, beverages and cigarettes (number)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Opportunities to increase incomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Together</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion (%)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of farmers</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>412</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 – production on own farm (crops), 2 – production on own farm (livestock), 3 – production in a non-farm company, 4 – wage employment in state sector, 5 – wage employment in co-operative or agricultural company, 6 – wage employment in private sector, 7 – wage employment in other part of the country, 8 – wage employment abroad, 9 – start a non-agricultural business, 10 – other, X – does not know, N – not applicable

Table 9. Problems or constraints to increase the household activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion (%)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of farmers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 – cannot obtain more land, 2 – cannot obtain loans, credits, 3 – cannot find labour, 4 – cannot sell products, 5 – cannot hire workers, 6 – cannot find workers in own family, 7 – prices of products are too low, 8 – delayed payments from buyers, 9 – prices of inputs are too high, 10. cannot find suppliers of inputs, 11 – cannot obtain my land from co-operative, 12 – land is located in nature reserve, 13 – difficulties of dealing with state, 14 – difficulties in dealing with co-operative, 15 – agricultural production is less profitable than other household activities, 16 – other constraints, 17 – no constraints, X – does not know

Table 10. Main sources of money to cover investments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion (%)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of farmers</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 – own funds, 2 – relatives, 5 – bank or other credit institution, 9 – subsidies, 10 – hire purchase

it was in 1995. 42% of rural households state, that their financial situation is worse in the year 1999 in comparison to the year 1989.

Opportunities resulting from the entry to the EU are connected with exploiting free population movement within the EU, interconnection with multinational capital and receiving direct payments and subsidies directed to agricultural production, conservancy of environment and countryside. These opportunities are attainable only for farmers who know about their existence and who are prepared to use it. On the other side, there are also some constraints obstructing the development of private farms. It is for example the shortage of own finance, present price policy, price disharmony to farmer’s disadvantage and the lower rate of subsidising agricultural activities in comparison to agricultural producers in the
EU. Problematic is also to obtain credits because of their costliness as well as required guaranties.

Private farmers have to be acquainted intimately with the rules of competition in the European markets, to learn how to evaluate realistically their position in these markets, to be able to identify signals about future development of given market and to use high expertise to gain competitive advantage before their rivals.

CONCLUSION

Micro-economic analysis of farming households restructuring in the conditions of the Slovak Republic in the pre-accession period points at fact that the situation and farmer’s opinion level is differentiated. It is influenced by supposed both opportunities and threats that could be connected with the EU’s Common Agricultural Policy. We evaluate positively that majority of respondents supposes the positive effects following from foreign capital and investment inflows that would influence expressively the growth of farmer’s performance and production factors productivity. Apprehension are connected with competitiveness and allocation of domestic production at the EU’s market. SWOT analysis points both at future opportunities and threats that deal with the apprehension from free sale of land, present low farmer’s profit and income level, low marketing strategy, etc. Education level we consider for comparative advantage of our farmers.
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