**QUEEN'S
UNIVERSITY
BELFAST**

Modelling environmental technical efficiency and phosphorus pollution abatement cost in dairy farms

Henry Adenuga, A., Davis, J., Hutchinson, W. G., Patton, M., & Donellan, T. (2020). Modelling environmental technical efficiency and phosphorus pollution abatement cost in dairy farms. *Science of the Total Environment*, 714, [136690]. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.136690>

Published in:
Science of the Total Environment

Document Version:
Peer reviewed version

Queen's University Belfast - Research Portal:
[Link to publication record in Queen's University Belfast Research Portal](#)

Publisher rights

Copyright 2020 Elsevier.

This manuscript is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs License

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits distribution and reproduction for non-commercial purposes, provided the author and source are cited.

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Queen's University Belfast Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The Research Portal is Queen's institutional repository that provides access to Queen's research output. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact openaccess@qub.ac.uk.

Word count = 10413 words

Modelling environmental technical efficiency and phosphorus pollution abatement cost in dairy farms

Abstract

The dairy sector is an important sector in Northern Ireland being the single largest contributor to its agricultural economy. However, the sector contributes more to soil phosphorus (P) surplus compared to other agricultural sectors. Consequently, the goal of this research is to analyse the environmental technical efficiency of dairy farms making use of a novel parametric hyperbolic distance function approach. The model is able to internalise P surplus as undesirable output in the dairy production process by treating desirable and undesirable outputs asymmetrically. This allows for the maximum expansion of the desirable output and an equi-proportionate contraction of the undesirable output. The stochastic production frontier model is analysed simultaneously with an inefficiency model to explain variability in efficiency scores assuming the existence of heteroskedasticity in the idiosyncratic error term. Additionally, we estimated the shadow price and pollution cost ratio of P surplus in dairy farms. This paper contributes to the existing literature as it provides the first attempt to empirically estimate the pollution abatement cost of P surplus in dairy farms. Besides, the hyperbolic environmental technology distance function methodology employed to achieve the study objectives is less restrictive compared to the radial output/input distance function approach employed in previous studies. This allows for the estimation of a more robust environmental efficiency measure and shadow price of P surplus that is consistent with public policy goals that seek to simultaneously reduce pollution and increase production of desirable outputs. Our results showed that the average environmental technical efficiency estimates for dairy farms in Northern Ireland is 0.93. Intensification resulting in increased use of concentrates feed was found to be negatively related to environmental technical efficiency. We also found that age of the farmer and share of milk output have a positive relationship with environmental technical efficiency. The shadow price (marginal abatement cost) of P surplus evaluated at the mean is £12.29/Kg. The results of this research will be useful to policy makers and advisory staff in the design of regulatory environmental policies required to improve soil nutrients management in dairy farms.

Key words: Dairy farms; Environmental efficiency; Phosphorus surplus; Pollution abatement cost; Shadow price

1.0 Introduction

The dairy sector is an important sector in Northern Ireland being the single largest contributor to its agricultural economy, contributing about 32% of the total agricultural output (Playfair 2017). However, the sector contributes more to soil phosphorus (P) surplus compared to other agricultural sectors, putting pressure on the environment (Adenuga et al. 2018a). Already about 50% of farmed grassland have plant-available P (Olsen-P) values greater than the critical value of 25mg/kg (Bailey 2015, Kleinman et al. 2015, Cave and McKibbin 2016). Also, more than 50% of all rivers in the country are classified as “moderate/poor status” and about 70% of lakes are still classed as eutrophic under the “water framework directive” (Kleinman et al. 2015, Cave and McKibbin 2016). Soil P level unlike other nutrients is fixed in supply. The implication of this is that, excess P in soils is detrimental

not only from an economic point of view but also from an environmental sustainability point of view. Negative externality from agricultural production in the form of P surplus has detrimental effects on water quality and biodiversity. There is increasing pressure from the policy angle on the need to ensure that agricultural production is sustainable especially given the effect of agricultural pollution on the environment.

Given the foregoing, this paper sets out to achieve three specific objectives. The first is to estimate the environmental technical efficiency of dairy farms in Northern Ireland, incorporating P surplus as undesirable output in a parametric hyperbolic distance function modelling framework. Secondly, to analyse the determinants of environmental technical efficiency in dairy farms and lastly, by employing the duality between the parametric hyperbolic distance function and the maximisation of the profitability function, to estimate the shadow price (marginal abatement cost) and consequently pollution cost ratio of P surplus in dairy farms. The shadow price is defined as the opportunity cost of reducing one more unit of P in terms of reduction of the revenue from dairy production activities (Hailu and Veeman 2000, Fare, Grosskopf, and Weber 2006, Zhou, Zhou, and Fan 2014). The estimates of the marginal abatement cost can serve as an important parameter for the design of agri-environmental policy instruments required to optimize agricultural pollution abatement policies. For example, setting a nutrient surplus taxation policy or the derivation of the optimal subsidy to farmers per unit of the pollutant reduced. This will be relevant as empirical evidence in the implementation of government's policies to reward farmers for sustainable and environmentally friendly practices. It will also be useful in the development of a manure market which may be necessary in transferring nutrient surplus from areas of higher concentration to areas of lower concentration.

This study contributes to the existing literature in a number of ways. Firstly, the study provides the first attempt to empirically estimate the environmental technical efficiency and marginal abatement cost (shadow price) of P surplus in dairy farms employing the hyperbolic environmental technology distance function approach on farm level panel data. The measure reflects not only the level of environmental pressure but also the level of competitiveness and economic efficiency of the

dairy production systems. This analogy is in line with governments' policy that seek to reduce negative agricultural externalities and increase production of desirable outputs simultaneously (Hailu and Veeman 2000, Fare, Grosskopf, and Weber 2006). From a methodological perspective, the hyperbolic environmental technology distance function employed in this study is less restrictive compared to the radial output/input distance functions which assumes proportional expansion of all outputs (both desirable and undesirable outputs), or contraction of all inputs, in the same direction (Färe et al. 1993, Chung, Färe, and Grosskopf 1997, Hailu and Veeman 2000, Hadley 1998). Secondly, unlike previous studies that employed the farm gate approach, our estimation of the P surplus was based on the soil surface balance approach which involved the development of a novel nutrient requirement model employed to estimate P output from grazed grass. The soil surface balance approach gives a more meaningful assessment of risk to the aquatic environment (Eurostat 2013). The findings from this study will assist policy makers in understanding the factors that influence environmental technical efficiency and the trade-offs between revenue from dairy production and the negative impact of P surplus. This will be important in devising balanced policies required to enhance the sustainability of dairy production systems.

The remaining part of this paper is divided into six sections. In section two, we review relevant empirical literature. We present the theoretical framework for the hyperbolic distance function methodology in section three. The data and empirical specification of the model are presented in section four while the results are reported in section five. The paper ends with a summary of the main conclusions in section six.

2.0 Literature Review

Various approaches have been employed in the literature to estimate environmental technical efficiency and shadow price of undesirable outputs (pollutants) that accompany production activities. The process generally involve the internalisation of undesirable outputs in a multi-input, multi-output environmentally sensitive production framework making use of distance functions which are either parametric or non-parametric (Charnes, Cooper, and Rhodes 1978). Taking advantage of the duality

between the distance functions and the revenue or cost functions, the marginal [abatement costs](#) (shadow prices) of the pollutant can be derived.

Among the most widely used distance functions are the radial output/ input, hyperbolic and the directional distance functions (Shephard 1970, Cuesta, Lovell, and Zofio 2009, Zhou, Zhou, and Fan 2014). The radial output/input distance functions treat desirable and undesirable outputs symmetrically. That is, it assumes a proportional expansion of all outputs (both desirable and undesirable outputs) or contraction of all inputs without giving credit to the reduction of undesirable output or increase in desirable outputs (Chung, Färe, and Grosskopf 1997). In contrast, the directional and hyperbolic distance functions has the advantage of being able to treat desirable and undesirable outputs assymmetrically, enabling the expansion of desirable output and contraction of undesirable output simultaneously. In line with the pareto optimality condition, the methodologies seeks to provide a composite index that simultaneously captures economic and environmental balance in a production systems by modifying the direction in which to search for an efficient counterpart of each production unit towards the production frontier in line with the best production practices (Fare et al. 2005, Manello 2012, Adenuga et al. 2018b).

The directional distance function is thought to provide a useful and flexible method to evaluate the performance of environmentally sensitive production in the presence of undesirable outputs (Fare et al. 2005, Du, Hanley, and Wei 2015, Zhou, Poh, and Ang 2016). The method which normally employs mathematical programming techniques (Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA)) has the advantage of not requiring the specification of a mathematical formulation for the production function (Chung, Färe, and Grosskopf 1997, Macpherson, Principe, and Smith 2010, Picazo-Tadeo, Gómez-Limón, and Reig-Martínez 2011). However, it does not account for any stochastic variance from the frontier as it assumes that all observations in the sample belong to the potential production frontier (Vardanyan and Noh 2006). In addition, efficiency estimates are usually serially correlated and inference is possible only with bootstrapping (Simar and Wilson 2007).

The parametric hyperbolic environmental technology distance functions have recently been proposed in the literature (Cuesta and Zofío 2005, Cuesta, Lovell, and Zofío 2009, Duman and Kasman 2018, Adenuga et al. 2019). Although the directional and hyperbolic distance functions are aimed at achieving similar goals, they are nevertheless differentiated based on their homogeneity property. While the hyperbolic distance function is based on the multiplicative homogeneity property of the Shephard (1970) distance function, the directional distance function makes use of the translation property which is an additive analogue of the multiplicative homogeneity property of the hyperbolic distance function (Färe et al. 2005, Cuesta, Lovell, and Zofío 2009, Cuesta and Zofío 2005, Du, Hanley, and Wei 2015, Hailu and Veeman 2000, Chambers, Chung, and Färe 1998). The parametric hyperbolic distance function accounts for statistical noise, it is differentiable and is able to conduct statistical inference without bootstrapping (Färe et al. 2005, Wei, Löschel, and Liu 2013). The results obtained using the methodology are also less sensitive to outliers which may negatively affect the accuracy of results (Boyd, Tolley, and Pang 2002, Simar and Wilson 2007, Wei, Löschel, and Liu 2013, Pérez Urdiales, Lansink, and Wall 2016, Skevas et al. 2018). Examples of studies that have employed the parametric hyperbolic environmental technology distance function in the literature include: Cuesta and Zofío (2005) who employed the translog hyperbolic distance function to estimate the efficiency of Spanish savings banks, while Cuesta, Lovell, and Zofío (2009) used the hyperbolic and the enhanced hyperbolic distance function approach to estimate the efficiency scores for a set of U.S. electric industries and consequently estimated the shadow price of SO₂ emissions which was considered as undesirable output. Suta, Bailey, and Davidova (2010) using the hyperbolic distance function approach, calculated the environmental technical efficiency scores of selected EU farms. Glass et al. (2014) employed the enhanced hyperbolic distance function to measure the relative performance of Japanese cooperative banks, modelling non-performing loans as an undesirable output. Mamardashvili, Emvalomatis, and Jan (2016) applied the hyperbolic distance function to analyse the environmental performance and estimated the shadow price of nitrogen surplus for conventional and organic Swiss dairy farms using cross sectional data. Rosano Peña et al. (2018)

employed the parametric hyperbolic distance function approach to show the possibility of producing more with less environmental impact and less use of resources in the agriculture of the municipalities comprising the Brazilian Amazon biome. Duman and Kasman (2018) considering CO₂ emissions as undesirable output estimated the environmental technical efficiency for a panel of European Union (EU) member and candidate countries for the period 1990–2011. Vu and Turnell (2012) employed the hyperbolic distance function approach to measure the scale efficiency and productivity change of the Vietnamese banking sector during the 2000–2006 period while Skevas et al. (2018) examines the impact of policies and intensification on the environmental performance of Dutch dairy farms in the period 2001–2010. As far as it is known, there has not been any study that simultaneously estimated the environmental technical efficiency and shadow price of P surplus in dairy farms using the parametric hyperbolic distance function approach. This study therefore seek to fill this gap in the literature.

3.0 Theoretical framework for the hyperbolic environmental technology distance function

In this section, we present the theoretical model used to estimate the environmental technical efficiency of dairy farms incorporating P surplus as undesirable output into a parametric hyperbolic distance function framework. Suppose there are N ($i=1,2,\dots,N$) decision making units, i.e. dairy farms in this case, employing multiple inputs denoted by vector $x_n = (x_{1n}, x_{2n}, \dots, x_{Jn}) \in R_+^J$ to produce a vector of desirable outputs $y_n = (y_{1n}, y_{2n}, \dots, y_{Mn}) \in R_+^M$ and a vector of undesirable outputs $s_n = (s_{1n}, s_{2n}, \dots, s_{Kn}) \in R_+^K$. Then, the environmental production technology can be represented by the output possibility set $T(x)$ given in equation (1) (Chung, Färe, and Grosskopf 1997, Cuesta, Lovell, and Zofío 2009, Zhou, Poh, and Ang 2016, Duman and Kasman 2018)

$$T(x) = \{(x, y, s): x \in R_+^J \text{ can produce } (y, s); y \in R_+^M, s \in R_+^K\} \quad (1)$$

The hyperbolic environmental technology distance function (D_H) represents the maximum expansion of the desirable output vector (y) and the equi-proportionate contraction of the undesirable output vector (s) that places a producer on the boundary of the technology (Faere et al. 1989, Cuesta, Lovell, and Zofío 2009). It is formally defined in equation (2).

$$D_H(x, y, s) = \inf \left\{ \eta > 0: (x, \frac{y}{\eta}, s\eta) \in T \right\} \quad (2)$$

As indicated by η in equation (2), the desirable and undesirable output changes in the same proportion but in opposite direction. The range of the hyperbolic environmental technology distance function is $0 < D_H(x, y, s) \leq 1$. Farms are said to be fully efficient if $D_H = 1$ implying that the estimated observation is on the boundary of the production frontier and it will not be possible to reduce P surplus or increase dairy output at the same time. If the value of the distance functions is less than 1 ($D_H < 1$), then the farm is inefficient which leaves room for enhancing efficiency of the dairy farms by increasing dairy output and reducing P surplus.

Following Cuesta, Lovell, and Zofio (2009) and Mamardashvili, Emvalomatis, and Jan (2016), the almost homogeneity property can be employed to derive the hyperbolic environmental technology distance function. Given a set of inputs data, desirable output and undesirable output, the function can be expressed as given in equation (3)

$$D_H(x, \phi y, \phi^{-1} s) = \phi D_H(x, y, s), \phi > 0 \quad (3)$$

Given that ϕ in equation (3) is greater than 0, then imposing the almost homogeneity condition by setting $\phi = \frac{1}{y_m}$ (where y_m is, without loss of generality, the Mth output), the hyperbolic environmental technology distance function can be expressed as presented in equation (4):

$$D_H\left(x_i, \frac{y_i}{y_m}, s_i y_m\right) = \frac{1}{y_m} D_H(x_i, y_i, s_i) \quad (4)$$

The model can be specified based on the translog functional form given that it provides a flexible approximation to the production technology. It is differentiable and quite amenable to the imposition of almost homogeneity conditions (Cuesta and Zofio 2005, Cuesta, Lovell, and Zofio 2009). It is also linear in parameters, easy to compute and has been extensively used in the empirical literature (Faere et al. 1989, Coelli et al. 2005, Cuesta and Zofio 2005, Mamardashvili, Emvalomatis, and Jan 2016, Rosano Peña et al. 2018).

The hyperbolic distance function is specified in a stochastic frontier analysis (SFA) framework. The SFA provides room for the estimation of the frontier of best production practices that

envelop the data while assuming the existence of an idiosyncratic error term. The function $D_H(x_i, y_i, s_i)$ is almost homogenous of degrees r_1, r_2, r_3 and r_4 if,

$$D_H(\phi^{r_1}x, \phi^{r_2}y, \phi^{r_3}s) = \phi^{r_4}D_H(x, y, s), \forall \phi > 0 \quad (5)$$

From this definition the environmental hyperbolic distance function D_H is homogenous of degrees 0, 1, -1, 1. It is non-decreasing in desirable outputs, $D_H(x, \eta y, s) \leq D_H(x, y, s)$, $\eta \in [0, 1]$; non-increasing in undesirable output $D_H(x, y, \eta s) \leq D_H(x, y, s)$, $\eta \geq 1$ and non-increasing in inputs $D_H(\eta x, y, s) \leq D_H(x, y, s)$, $\eta \geq 1$ (Cuesta, Lovell, and Zofio 2009, Cuesta and Zofio 2005) Assuming that our distance function $D_H(x, y, s)$ is continuously differentiable, to be almost homogeneous it must satisfy the following expression in equation (6).

$$r_1 \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{\partial D_H}{\partial x_j} x_j + r_2 \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{\partial D_H}{\partial y_m} y_m + r_3 \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\partial D_H}{\partial s_k} s_k = r_4 D_H \quad (6)$$

Departing from equation (6) and given that the hyperbolic distance function satisfy the homogeneity degrees of 0, 1, -1, 1 corresponding to r_1, r_2, r_3 and r_4 respectively we have

$$\sum_{m=1}^M \frac{\partial \ln D_H}{\partial \ln y_m} y_m - \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\partial \ln D_H}{\partial \ln s_k} s_k = 1 \quad (7)$$

The Translog specification of the hyperbolic environmental technology distance function $D_H(x, y, s)$ following (4) takes the form;

$$\begin{aligned} \ln D_H(x, y, s) = & \alpha_0 + \sum_{j=1}^J \alpha_j \ln x_{ji} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{j'=1}^J \alpha_{jj'} \ln x_{ji} \ln x_{j'i} + \sum_{m=1}^M \beta_m \ln y_{mi} \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{m'=1}^M \beta_{mm'} \ln y_{mi} \ln y_{m'i} + \sum_{k=1}^K \gamma_k \ln s_{ki} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{k'=1}^K \gamma_{kk'} \ln s_{ki} \ln s_{k'i} \\ & + \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{m=1}^M \delta_{jm} \ln x_{ji} \ln y_{mi} + \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{k=1}^K \psi_{jk} \ln x_{ji} \ln s_{ki} \\ & + \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{k=1}^K \mu_{mk} \ln y_{mi} \ln s_{ki} \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

The relevant partial derivatives for the translog hyperbolic distance function presented in equation (8) yields the elasticities presented in equations (9) (10) and (11)

$$\frac{\partial \ln D_H}{\partial \ln x_j} = \alpha_j + \sum_{j'=1}^J \alpha_{jj'} \ln x_{j'i} + \sum_{m=1}^M \delta_{jm} \ln y_{mi} + \sum_{k=1}^K \psi_{jk} \ln s_{ki} \quad (j = 1, 2, \dots, J) \quad (9)$$

$$\frac{\partial \ln D_H}{\partial \ln y_m} = \beta_m + \sum_{m'=1}^M \beta_{mm'} \ln y_{m'i} + \sum_{j=1}^J \delta_{jm} \ln x_{ji} + \sum_{k=1}^K \mu_{mk} \ln s_{ki} \quad (m = 1, 2, \dots, M) \quad (10)$$

$$\frac{\partial \ln D_H}{\partial \ln s_k} = \gamma_k + \sum_{k'=1}^K \gamma_{kk'} \ln s_{k'i} + \sum_{j=1}^J \psi_{jk} \ln x_{ji} + \sum_{m=1}^M \mu_{mk} \ln y_{mi} \quad (k = 1, 2, \dots, K) \quad (11)$$

Taking y_{o-th} output as the normalising variable to satisfy the almost homogeneity condition, and appending a random error term, $v_{it} \sim N(0, \sigma_v^2)$ to equation (8), the stochastic translog hyperbolic environmental technology distance function can be specified as presented in equation (12). The model is enhanced by allowing for a multi-period framework making use of panel data, hence, all variables are indexed with a year subscript t

$$\begin{aligned} \ln \left(\frac{D_H(x_i, y_i, s_i)}{y_{mo,it}} \right) = & \alpha_0 + \sum_{j=1}^J \alpha_j \ln x_{jit} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{j'=1}^J \alpha_{jj'} \ln x_{jit} \ln x_{j'it} + \sum_{m=1}^{M-1} \beta_m \ln y_{mit}^* \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{M-1} \sum_{m'=1}^{M-1} \beta_{mm'} \ln y_{mit}^* \ln y_{m'it}^* + \sum_{k=1}^K \gamma_k \ln s_{kit}^* + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{k'=1}^K \gamma_{kk'} \ln s_{kit}^* \ln s_{k'it}^* \\ & + \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{m=1}^{M-1} \delta_{jm} \ln x_{jit} \ln y_{mit}^* + \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{k=1}^K \psi_{jk} \ln x_{jit} \ln s_{kit}^* + \sum_{m=1}^{M-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \mu_{mk} \ln y_{mit}^* \ln s_{kit}^* \\ & + v_{it} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Where $y_{m,it}^* = \frac{y_{m,it}}{y_{mo,it}}$; $s_{k,it}^* = s_{k,it} \times y_{mo,it}$. $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \psi$ and μ are the parameters to be estimated. Equation (12) cannot be directly estimated given that $\ln D_H(x_i, y_i, s_i)$ is not directly observed. This problem can be solved by making use of the logarithmic properties and denoting $\ln D_H(x_i, y_i, s_i) = u_{it}$ (this can be interpreted as a one-sided error term which is assumed to account for farm-specific effects following (Aigner, Lovell, and Schmidt 1977)). Moving it to the right-hand

side of the equation, an estimable form of the model can be obtained as presented in equation (13). Terms involving the normalising output $y_{mo,it}$ are null. This is because the ratio $y_{m,it}^*$ is equal to one. The distance function elasticity with respect to the desirable output can however be recovered by making use of the almost homogeneity condition (Cuesta, Lovell, and Zofio 2009)

$$\begin{aligned}
-\ln y_{mo,it} = & \alpha_0 + \sum_{j=1}^J \alpha_j \ln x_{j,it} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{j'=1}^J \alpha_{jj'} \ln x_{j,it} \ln x_{j',it} + \sum_{m=1}^{M-1} \beta_m \ln y_{m,it}^* \\
& + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{M-1} \sum_{m'=1}^{M-1} \beta_{mm'} \ln y_{m,it}^* \ln y_{m',it}^* + \sum_{k=1}^K \gamma_k \ln s_{k,it}^* + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{k'=1}^K \gamma_{kk'} \ln s_{k,it}^* \ln s_{k',it}^* \\
& + \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{m=1}^{M-1} \delta_{jm} \ln x_{j,it} \ln y_{m,it}^* + \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{k=1}^K \psi_{jk} \ln x_{j,it} \ln s_{k,it}^* \\
& + \sum_{m=1}^{M-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \mu_{mk} \ln y_{m,it}^* \ln s_{k,it}^* + (v_{it} - u_{it})
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

The composed error term $\varepsilon_{it} = (v_{it} - u_{it})$ includes u_i , the one-sided error term that captures environmental technical inefficiency, that is, the distance that separates a farm from the production frontier. It is assumed to be independently and identically distributed across observations. v_{it} is the standard random term which captures the statistical noise and is assumed to be symmetrically distributed around zero, $v_{it} \sim N(0, \sigma_v^2)$. To obtain unbiased estimates of the frontier function's parameters as well as the estimates of inefficiency the stochastic production frontier model is analysed simultaneously with the inefficiency model to explain the variability in efficiency scores assuming the existence of heteroskedasticity in the inefficiency term u_{it} and in the parameter of the Idiosyncratic error term v_{it} as presented in equations (14) and (15) (Caudill, Ford, and Gropper 1995, Hadri 1999, Kumbhakar and Lovell 2000, Wang and Schmidt 2002, Belotti et al. 2013).

$$\sigma_{ui}^2 = \exp(z_i' \varphi) \tag{14}$$

$$\sigma_{vi}^2 = \exp(h_i' \xi) \tag{15}$$

Where z_i' and h_i' are vectors of variables that affect the variance of the two error terms and φ and ξ are vectors of parameters to be estimated. **3.1 Shadow price estimation**

To obtain the shadow price of P surplus, we employed the Shephard duality lemma between the stochastic hyperbolic distance function and the maximisation of the profitability function (Shephard 1970, Färe, Grosskopf, and Zaim 2002).

Given y_m as the vector of desirable outputs and p_m as its corresponding prices, the shadow price of P surplus can be derived from the profitability maximising function presented in equation (16) (Cuesta, Lovell, and Zofío 2009, Mamardashvili, Emvalomatis, and Jan 2016, Van Ha, Kant, and Maclaren 2008).

$$\rho(x, y, s) = \max_{y, s} \{p_m y_m / p_s s : D_H(x, y, s) \leq 1\} \quad (16)$$

Differentiating with respect to y_m and s respectively by taking the first order condition, where p_s is the (unknown) price of the undesirable output and λ is the Lagrange multiplier we have:

$$\frac{p_m}{p_s s} = \lambda \frac{\partial D_H(x, y, s)}{\partial y_m}, m = 1, 2, \dots, M \quad (17)$$

$$-\frac{\sum_{m=1}^M p_m y_m}{p_s s^2} = \lambda \frac{\partial D_H(x, y, s)}{\partial s} \quad (18)$$

Taking the ratio of the last condition to any first-order condition in the first set, we have

$$\frac{\sum_{m=1}^M p_m y_m}{s} = -p_m \frac{\frac{\partial D_H(x, y, s)}{\partial s}}{\frac{\partial D_H(x, y, s)}{\partial y_1}} \quad (19)$$

Given that the frontier of the production possibility set is a representation of the locus of points for which the distance function is equal to unity, the ratio of partial derivatives on the right-hand side of equation (19) can be expressed as the slope of the relationship between y_m and s at the frontier. That is, by applying the implicit function theorem on the distance function, the equation becomes;

$$p_m \frac{\frac{\partial D_H(x, y, s)}{\partial s}}{\frac{\partial D_H(x, y, s)}{\partial y_m}} = p_m \left. \frac{\partial y_m}{\partial s} \right|_{D_H(x, y, s)=1} \quad (20)$$

This can be interpreted as the shadow price of s in terms of y_m . That is, the extent to which the revenue from desirable outputs y_m is reduced if the undesirable output s is reduced by one unit when the point (x, y, s) is on the production frontier. Given that the shadow price is estimated on the

frontier, the values refers to the marginal abatement cost for the most efficient farms since farms operating below the frontier are able to reduce undesirable output without reducing the desirable output.

4.0 Data and empirical specification of the model

4.1 Study Area

The study was carried out in Northern Ireland (Latitude: 54°38'N. Longitude: 6°13'W). Northern Ireland is located in the north-east of the island of Ireland with six administrative counties. It is also the smallest region of the United Kingdom with a population of 1.87 million people which make up about 28% of the island of Ireland's total population (NISRA 2019). The Northern Ireland landscape is dominated by two large lakes (Lough Neagh and Erne), which together drain approximately 6000 square kilometres or 40 per cent of the land area of Northern Ireland plus a further 2500 square kilometre of the Republic of Ireland (Dairyman 2011). Figure 1 shows the map of the study area

Fig. 1 Map of the study area: inset is the map of United Kingdom and the island of Ireland.
Source: Author's compilation.

4.2 Data and Analytical Techniques

The empirical specification of the stochastic hyperbolic environmental technology distance function following (Aigner, Lovell, and Schmidt 1977) is presented in equation (21). Where $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ represents the observed dairy farms in time $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$ time periods. The study employed unbalanced panel dataset (2009-2014) obtained from the Northern Ireland Farm Business Survey (FBS, Northern Ireland) as part of the EU Farm Accountancy Data Network (FADN) requirements. The data consist of 498 observations from 83 specialist dairy farms. To impose the almost homogeneity condition, the milk output (y_{1t}) was chosen for normalising. A time variable to capture the presence of neutral technical change as well as other temporal effects is also incorporated

in the production frontier model. The equation was analysed assuming heteroskedasticity of the inefficiency as well as in the parameter of the idiosyncratic error term (Wang and Schmidt 2002, Cuesta, Lovell, and Zofio 2009, Battese and Coelli 1995).

$$\begin{aligned}
-\ln y_{1,it} = & \alpha_0 + \sum_{j=1}^5 \alpha_j \ln x_{j,it} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^5 \sum_{j'=1}^5 \alpha_{jj'} \ln x_{j,it} \ln x_{j',it} + \beta_2 \ln \frac{y_{2,it}}{y_{1,it}} + \frac{1}{2} \beta_{22} \left(\ln \frac{y_{2,it}}{y_{1,it}} \right)^2 \\
& + \gamma_o \ln(s_{it} y_{1,it}) + \frac{1}{2} \gamma_{oo} (\ln(s_{it} y_{1,it}))^2 + \sum_{j=1}^5 \delta_{j2} \ln x_{j,it} \ln \frac{y_{2,it}}{y_{1,it}} \\
& + \sum_{j=1}^5 \psi_{jo} \ln x_{j,it} \ln(s_{it} y_{1,it}) + \mu_{2o} \ln \frac{y_{2,it}}{y_{1,it}} \ln(s_{it} y_{1,it}) + \sum_{\tau=1}^T \rho_{\tau} d_{\tau}^t \\
& + (v_{it} - u_{it})
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

The equation is estimated based on the Greene (2005) time varying fixed effect model which allows one to disentangle time varying inefficiency from unit-specific time-invariant unobserved heterogeneity (Greene 2005, Belotti et al. 2013). The conditional distribution of the inefficiency component was obtained following a truncated normal distribution. In addition, as a robustness check, we also, ran the model assuming a half-normal distribution for the inefficiency component of the model. The results are presented in Appendix A. We found considerable differences in the results of the two specifications, especially regarding expected sign and significances of the parameter estimates of the distance function. The truncated normal distribution model produced the most consistent signs and statistically significant parameter estimates. The inefficiency component, was specified as a function of explanatory variables, including farm-specific characteristics and policy variables. The parameters of the stochastic frontier and the determinants of inefficiency were simultaneously analysed in a single step procedure. This has been noted to be a better approach than the two-step procedure which has been shown to result in biased results (Greene 2012, Wang and Schmidt 2002, Belotti et al. 2013).

Following standard practice in the literature, all variables apart from the time variable were scaled by their geometric mean to avoid convergence issues in the maximum likelihood algorithm

and allow for the interpretation of the estimated first order parameters as elasticities at the sample mean of the data (Fare et al. 2005, Cuesta, Lovell, and Zofío 2009 Kumbhakar, Wang, and Horncastle 2015). The variables measured in monetary units were corrected for inflation using the appropriate annual producer price indices published by Department of Agriculture, Environment and Rural Affairs (Department of Agriculture 2018).

The time invariant efficiency estimates EE was calculated for each farm by using the point estimator proposed by Battese and Coelli (1988) given in equation (22):

$$EE = E(e^{-ui} | \varepsilon_i) \quad (22)$$

Where E is the mathematical expectation operator. The analysis was done using STATA statistical software (Belotti et al. 2013). The variables considered in the analysis are based upon the production process of specialised dairy farms. The five inputs included in the specification of hyperbolic environmental technology distance function include:

- i. total utilized agricultural area measured in hectares;
- ii. the number of livestock units on the farm measured in standardized livestock units (LU);
- iii. capital measured in terms of depreciation values for building and machinery;
- iv. variable inputs which consist of costs of livestock feed, fertilizers, seed and others measured in monetary units and
- v. labour measured in standardized labour units.

The desirable outputs are:

- i. revenue from the sales of milk and
- ii. revenue from the sales of other outputs (sales of crops and other livestock).

The undesirable output

- i. P surplus estimated based on the methodology presented in section 4.3 and measured in Kg.

To analyse the determinants of environmental technical efficiency, a number of farm characteristics obtained from the empirical literature were included in the model. The following variables were

hypothesized to influence environmental technical efficiency. They include: age of the farmer (Z_1), stocking density (Z_2), milk sales as a share of total revenue (Z_3), the cost of concentrates (Z_4), farm size (Z_5), land type (Z_6), and access to environmental subsidy. (Z_7). The hypothesized explanatory variables were tested for multicollinearity and the results show that it ranges between 0.0 and 0.7 and hence, there was no multicollinearity problem among all the hypothesized variables included in the model. It was hypothesized that the age of the farmer should have a negative relationship with environmental technical efficiency. This is on the basis that younger farmers are usually more amenable to adoption of sustainable dairy production practices (Mbehoma and Mutasa 2013). We expect stocking density to have a negative effect on environmental technical efficiency as a high stocking density is likely to result in increased manure input to the soil per hectare of utilised agricultural area. The share of revenues from milk production was included in the model to capture the effect of degree of specialisation in milk production on environmental technical efficiency. We hypothesized a positive effect of the share of revenue from milk on environmental technical efficiency as the more specialised farms are expected to be more amenable to adoption of improved environmental technology adoption. Increasing the amount of concentrates fed per dairy cow could result in increased amount of P going to the soil from manure. As a result, we hypothesized that it will have a negative relationship with environmental technical efficiency. We expect higher efficiency for farmers with larger farm size (z_5), which may indicate having more land to spread excess manure. Farm land is categorised into two types in the study, namely farms in less favoured areas (severely disadvantaged (SDA) and disadvantaged (DA) areas) and farms on lowland. The land type variable was measured as a dummy variable in the model. It is hypothesized that farms on lowland should have a positive relationship with environmental technical efficiency. Finally, we hypothesize a positive effect of access to environmental subsidy on environmental technical efficiency as the subsidy should provide farmers with more fund to comply with environmental regulations aimed at maintaining the environment. It should be noted that the hypothesised influence of the identified explanatory variables on environmental technical efficiency may vary depending on the dairy

production system of a particular study area. We were unable to include more variables in the model due to unavailability of data. Nevertheless, their effects will be controlled for in the fixed effect specification adopted for this study. The following variables were included in the model to account for heteroscedasticity of v_{it} . They include: age of the farmer (h_1); milk yield (h_2); amount of concentrates (h_3); and land type (h_4). A summary statistic of the variables included in the model is given in Table 1

Table 1: Structural and socioeconomic variables (averages across 6 years period)

Variables	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.
Desirable outputs				
Dairy gross output (£)	218762.0	238145.1	12160.8	1593409.0
Other outputs (£)	57859.8	40749.3	270.4	264675.2
Inputs				
Utilised agricultural area (ha)	81.2	51.9	20.0	262.8
Variable Input (£)	147667.5	183408.6	10912.9	1381661.0
Capital Overhead costs (£)	81889.9	73508.8	15374.24	466659.9
livestock Units(LU/ha)	163.5	125.6	24.9	647.4
Herd size (Cow)	106.6	84.0	13.0	451.8
Labour units	1.7	0.8	0.34	5.1
Undesirable output				
Gross phosphorus balance (Kg/ha)	13.6	11.0	0.0	69.7
Socioeconomic and Structural variables				
Milk yield (litres/cow)	6513.2	1175.3	3992.4	11071.6
Age(years)	59.6	13.0	28.0	90.0
Stocking density(LU/ha)	2.1	0.54	1.0	4.8
Concentrates fed (£)	81994.3	103217.0	3358.0	787335.4

4.3 Nutrient budget methodology

In estimating P surplus, we used the OECD/Eurostat soil surface budget methodology. A detailed description of the methodology is given in (Adenuga et al. 2018b) and is therefore described only briefly in this paper. It is estimated as the difference between total P input into the soil from chemical fertiliser, livestock manure and seeds and total P output from the soil in the form of grazed grass, crop production, hays and silages. A complex part of this methodology is in the estimation of nutrient output from grazed grass. Previous studies have employed expert judgement, and assuming a fixed amount of nutrient output per hectare (Humphreys, O’Connell, and Casey 2008, Brewin et al. 2013). However, such an assumption does not take into consideration the differences in the production management systems across the dairy farms. To overcome this deficiency, we developed a nutrient requirement model based on the difference between the net energy (NE) provided by feed purchased from off the farm (dry matter of concentrates and forages) and the total NE requirements of livestock on the farm for, maintenance, milk production, pregnancy and other activities. This was used to estimate nutrient output from grazed grass. It can be described as a back-calculation approach based on the number of grazing animals on the farm, the area under consideration and milk production data. The NE supplied by grass can be obtained by subtracting the total NE from feed (concentrates and supplements), from the total NE requirement for all grazing livestock on the farm (McCarthy, Shalloo, and Geary 2011). The total NE requirements, converted to units of feed for lactation (UFL) and adapted to local farm conditions, are computed based on relevant equations published in the National Research Council (NRC) publication on “nutrient requirement for dairy cattle” (Council 2001). It was assumed that 1 kg dry matter of grass equals 1 unit of feed for lactation (UFL)(McCarthy, Shalloo, and Geary 2011). Stocking rate was expressed in terms of livestock units (LU) per hectare. The amount of nutrient output from grass was subsequently obtained by multiplying the quantity of grazed grass by the P coefficients in grass (Eurostat 2013).

5.0 Results and discussions

The parameter estimates and associated standard errors of the parametric hyperbolic distance function model are presented in Table 2. Many parameters are statistically significant at the 1% level. Considering the negative sign of the left side variable “ $\ln y_{1,it}$ ” in equation (21), the parameter estimates (distance elasticities) of inputs, other outputs and undesirable outputs variables in the model all possess the expected sign at the mean of the data. For example, the positive sign of the other output parameter implies that for a given input vector x and undesirable output vector s , an increase in outputs will bring the observation closer to the production frontier. On the other hand, the negative sign of the undesirable output parameter implies that for a given output vector y and input vector x , an increase in undesirable output will move the observation to the right, and further away from the production frontier (farms become less efficient). Likewise and all things being equal, the negative sign of the inputs parameters implies that increase in inputs moves the boundary of production possibilities set upward such that the observation become further away from the production frontier. On the basis of these results, the monotonicity conditions are fully satisfied at the sample mean for the estimated hyperbolic environmental technology distance function (Skevas et al. 2018, Cuesta and Zofio 2005).

Table 2: Parameter estimates of the hyperbolic environmental technology distance function

Parameter	Estimate	Std. Err
α_1 (labour)	-0.051	.047
α_2 (land)	-0.031	0.071
α_3 (capital)	-0.817***	0.044
α_4 (livestock units)	-0.354***	0.089
α_5 (variable inputs)	-0.381***	0.048
α_{11}	-0.119	0.111
α_{22}	0.057	0.176
α_{33}	-0.252	0.502
α_{44}	0.077	0.216
α_{55}	0.114	0.349
α_{12}	0.042	0.112
α_{13}	0.232	0.207
α_{14}	0.031	0.115
α_{15}	-0.411***	0.157
α_{23}	.066	.194
α_{24}	-0.069	0.141
α_{25}	-0.169	0.159
α_{34}	0.078	0.246
α_{35}	0.209	0.345
α_{45}	-0.105	0.174
β_2 (other output)	0.349***	0.022
β_{22}	0.103***	0.014
γ_s (phosphorus surplus)	-0.045***	0.009
γ_{ss}	-0.013*	0.007
δ_{12}	0.059	0.065
δ_{22}	-0.077	0.069
δ_{32}	0.279***	0.099
δ_{42}	-0.198***	0.074
δ_{52}	-0.145*	0.082
ψ_{1s}	0.040*	0.021
ψ_{2s}	0.002	0.029
ψ_{3s}	-0.017	0.052
ψ_{4s}	-0.039	0.035
ψ_{5s}	0.061**	0.028
μ_{2s}	0.017*	0.010
ρ_τ	-0.028***	0.005
α_0 (constant)	-0.010	0.015
Heteroskedasticity in σ_u		
ϕ_1 (age)	-0.031**	0.015
ϕ_2 (stocking density)	0.315	0.392
ϕ_3 (milk share)	-5.677***	0.810
ϕ_4 (concentrates value)	0.00001***	4.19e-06
ϕ_5 (farm size)	-0.0014	0.0059
ϕ_6 (land type)	-0.2562	0.4495
ϕ_7 (environmental subsidy)	0.5877	0.5289
ϕ_0 (constant)	3.3406**	1.3596
Heteroskedasticity in σ_v		
ϕ_1 (age)	0.0381***	0.0126
ϕ_2 (milk yield)	-0.00006	0.00015
ϕ_3 (concentrates value)	-9.55e-07	1.78e-06
ϕ_4 (land type)	0.0659	0.3541
ϕ_0 (constant)	-7.4323***	1.1469
Log-Likelihood	468.88	
Mean EE	0.93	
SD	0.06	
Min.	0.70	
Max	1	

Notes: Single, double, and triple asterisks (*, **, ***) indicate significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1%

The results of the analysis showed that the average environmental technical efficiency estimates of dairy farms in Northern Ireland is 0.93. The standard deviation of 0.06 reflects a low level of heterogeneity in environmental technical efficiency across the dairy farms. Similar results was obtained by (Adenuga et al. 2018b) in which they employed the directional distance function approach to analyse the environmental technical efficiency for dairy farms on the island of Ireland. This estimate gives an indication of how far the inefficient dairy farms are from the production frontier. It implies that on the average, dairy farmers in the country can improve their productive performance by increasing desirable output from dairy production by 7.53% ($1/0.93 = 1.075$) and simultaneously contract P surplus by 7% ($1 - 0.93 = 0.07$) using current technology. The histogram of the hyperbolic efficiency estimates exhibits a left-skewed pattern with a minimum efficiency of 70.3% indicating that the least efficient farm can increase revenue from milk production by as much as 42% while simultaneously reducing P surplus by 29.7% (Figure 2).

The results imply that a reasonable percentage of the dairy farms are highly efficient. The relatively high level of efficiency may have resulted from the fact that milk quota wasn't binding in Northern Ireland during the milk quota years such that they were able to increase revenue from milk production by increasing cow numbers and milk yield per dairy cow. The parameter estimates of the year variable (ρ_τ), which is intended to capture the neutral technical change has the expected negative sign and was statistically significant providing evidence of technical progress in Northern Ireland's dairy farms over the years considered. The result implies that the efficient farms are able to increase dairy production output while making use of more environmentally friendly technologies.

Figure 2: Distribution of environmental technical efficiency in dairy farms

5.1 Determinants of environmental technical efficiency

The set of parameters (ϕ_1 - ϕ_7) presented in Table 2 explains the determinants of environmental technical efficiency. A negative parameter sign implies that the variable has a negative relationship with environmental technical inefficiency and consequently increases efficiency when the variable is increased by one more unit and vice versa. Our results showed that the age of the farmer has a significant negative influence on environmental technical inefficiency. This implies that the older farmers are more efficient compared to the younger farmers. This does not conform to our a priori expectation. The reason may be that the older farmers are more experienced and conservative such that they ensure better management of nutrients. Besides, with an average age of 59 years, a good number of the farmers are still active, hence could make good use of their experiences to improve environmental technical efficiency. Reinhard, Lovell, and Thijssen (1999) and Weersink, Turvey, and Godah (1990) obtained contrasting results in measuring the relationship between age and technical efficiency where they found younger farmers to be more efficient than the older farmers.

We find a positive and significant relationship between amount of concentrates fed per dairy cow and environmental technical inefficiency. This implies that an increase in the use of concentrates

has a negative impact on environmental technical efficiency. This result is in contrast to that obtained by studies which estimated technical efficiency of dairy farms without incorporating undesirable output such as P surplus in the modelling framework. For example Bajrami et al. (2017) Ma, Bicknell, and Renwick (2019) Cabrera, Solís, and del Corral (2010) found significant, positive relationship between feed use intensification and technical efficiency. The result of this study has shown that the reverse occurs in the case of environmental technical efficiency. Our result is in line with that obtained by Reinhard, Lovell, and Thijssen (2002) in which they found feed use intensification to be negatively related to environmental efficiency. The implication of this result is that excess use of concentrates in dairy farms especially considering the P content of the concentrates can have detrimental effect on the environment. This result also confirms the suggestion by Ma, Bicknell, and Renwick (2019), that intensification of dairy farms might be associated with negative environmental effects. The negative relationship may have resulted from the fact that during the milk quota years, quota was not a constraint in Northern Ireland such that dairy farms increased milk output by increasing the use of concentrates and reducing feed intake from grazed grass. This results in more nutrient going into the soil from manure than it is taken out from it in form grazed grass.

The share of revenue from milk production was also found to have a statistically significant effect on environmental technical efficiency. This is in line with our *a priori* expectation implying that farms with greater share of revenue from milk are more efficient. This may have resulted from the notion that the more specialised dairy farms generates more revenue from the desirable outputs such that the ratio of desirable to undesirable output is higher resulting in higher level of environmental technical efficiency. Similar results were obtained by Skevas et al. (2018)

Although the sign of the land type variable implies that land quality has a positive relationship with environmental technical efficiency, it is not statistically significant. This implies that there is no statistically significant difference in environmental technical efficient between lowland and less favoured area dairy farms. This may have resulted from the fact that majority of dairy farms in

Northern Ireland are located on good land. Stocking density and farm size although with the expected sign were also not statistically significant.

5.2 Shadow price and pollution cost of P surplus in dairy farms.

The results of the shadow price analysis based on equation (19) is presented in Table 3. The values represent a measure of the amount that has to be given up by a farm in order to reduce P surplus by one additional unit. The frontier shadow price was inflated by multiplying the ratio of the average value of output by the average value of P surplus because all input and output variables have been normalized to estimate the unknown parameters (Fare et al. 2005, Tang, Gong, and Wang 2016). The price of the desirable outputs in the model are also implicitly normalised to 1 given that they are measured in monetary units (Mamardashvili, Emvalomatis, and Jan 2016, Tang, Gong, and Wang 2016).

Table 3: Shadow price and pollution cost ratio of P surplus in dairy farms

Year	Shadow price((£/kg))	Pollution cost ratio
2009	5.26 (10.12)	0.02 (0.10)
2010	9.47 (11.41)	0.05(0.07)
2011	10.85 (10.91)	0.04(0.05)
2012	13.60 (10.42)	0.05(0.06)
2013	17.28(12.67)	0.09(0.12)
2014	15.93(10.69)	0.07(0.07)
Average	12.29(11.74)	0.05(0.08)

Standard deviations are in brackets

The marginal abatement cost (shadow price) evaluated at the mean of the data was £12.29/Kg. This implies that on the average, £12.29 of revenue from milk production has to be given up to reduce P surplus by 1Kg. It must be emphasized that for farms bellow the frontier, their shadow price will be zero because this group of farms can still reduce P surplus without reducing revenue. The distribution of the shadow price estimate shows that a good number of the dairy farms have their shadow price around the average. However, a good number of the farms also have values above the average shadow price with reasonable degree of variation in the spectrum of shadow prices across the dairy farms. For example, the 25th percentile is 5.08 £/kg, while the 75th percentile is 19.79 £/kg and the maximum value is 56.41 £/kg (Figure 3). About 10% of the observations had negative shadow

values. Mamardashvili, Emvalomatis, and Jan (2016) and Bokusheva and Kumbhakar (2014) also obtained negative values in their estimation of shadow value of N surplus in dairy farms. It is argued that a negative shadow price is feasible if pollution abatement is implemented in compliance with the regulations because there is a resource-use for abatement (Van Ha, Kant, and Maclaren 2008, Mamardashvili, Emvalomatis, and Jan 2016).

Figure 3: Distribution of shadow price of P in dairy farms

We estimated the P pollution abatement cost per farm by multiplying the derived average shadow price of P surplus by the average estimated volume of P surplus per farm for each year. With a threshold of 5Kg/ha, the value beyond which P surplus becomes a problem (Bailey 2016), the results of our estimation showed that for an efficient farm (i.e. farms at the hyperbolic production frontier) it will cost about £20,624 per farm to abate P surplus to the 5Kg/ha threshold. These values constitute about 7.5% of revenue from dairy production output over the stipulated time period.

Also, to be able to relate pollution costs to dairy production output, we computed the pollution costs ratio for each farm. An average pollution cost ratio is obtained by dividing the aggregated pollution cost by the aggregated value of output from dairy production. The results are also presented in Table 3. It can be observed from the results that there has been a relative increase in the shadow

price of P surplus and pollution cost ratio over the years considered. This implies that it has become increasingly costly to reduce P surplus in the dairy farms. This upward trend in shadow price of P surplus is consistent with those of previous studies for example, Hailu and Veeman (2000), Shaik, Helmers, and Langemeier (2002) and Bokusheva and Kumbhakar (2014) in which they found increasing shadow prices for nutrient surplus over time. In the interpretation of our results, it should be noted that the estimated shadow price is a measure of opportunity costs based on the assumption of full efficiency of the dairy farms. That is, farms located on the production possibility frontier. The implication of this is that the average shadow price of farms located within the production frontier may not be as high as what we have estimated (Murty, Kumar, and Dhavala 2007)

6.0 Conclusion

This study analysed the environmental technical efficiency and shadow price of P surplus in dairy farms employing the hyperbolic environmental technology distance function in a stochastic frontier analysis framework. The methodology allows for the internalisation of negative externalities (P surplus) in the specification of the production function. The model simultaneously account for the expansion of desirable outputs (milk and other outputs) and reduction in undesirable outputs (P surplus) thereby providing a standardized environmental technical efficiency index for each decision making unit. The empirical analysis was based on unbalanced panel data set of 83 dairy farms observed over the period of 2009-2014. The results of the study show that the environmental technical efficiency of dairy farms in the study area is relatively high but there exist more room for improvement. The results of the study also shows that intensification resulting in increased use of concentrates feed is negatively related to environmental technical efficiency while the age of the farmer and share of milk output in total production both have a positive relationship with efficiency. Although intensification resulting from increasing use of feed concentrates in the dairy diet might results in higher animal productivity and higher desirable output production at the farm level, this study shows that it can also have a detrimental effect on the environment if not properly managed. It therefore

means that appropriate strategies must be put in place by the government to ensure improved concentrates use efficiency in dairy farms for example by reducing the P content of dairy concentrates and improving the genetic potentials of the dairy cows. The results of the study also provide a possibility for the internalisation of negative externalities in dairy production in Northern Ireland as it gives an indication of how much has to be given up in order to abate one more unit of P surplus in each farm.

Some important policy implications can be drawn from the study results. First, our estimates of environmental technical efficiency indicate that on the average, there is scope for further abatement of P pollution and simultaneous expansion of dairy output. Specifically, dairy farms operating below the production frontier have the potential to improve their productive performance by simultaneously increasing desirable output and reducing P surplus in the production process. This signifies the existence of opportunities for a win-win situation provided farmers employ the best production practices. Secondly, the estimated P abatement cost provides empirical evidence that can be used as a yardstick by the government to incentivise farmers for reducing P pollution on their farms or penalise farmers for excess P surplus to the environment. The measurement of the level of environmental technical efficiency of the dairy sector would improve the knowledge of efficient dairy production systems and aid in the understanding of livestock sector impacts. The derived results will also help policy makers in understanding the trade-offs between the desirable and undesirable outputs when farm-level inefficiencies are eradicated, assisting them in devising balanced policies to improve current operations and enhance sustainability. It is worth noting that the estimation of the shadow price is based on the assumption that farms are operating on the frontier such that, they cannot reduce P surplus without reducing desirable outputs. However, as shown by the environmental technical efficiency estimates, farms operating below the frontier can reduce P surplus without reducing desirable output.

One important limitation of this study is the relatively small sample size, which could affect the accuracy of efficient frontier estimation. However, the data used for the study is the only data available and the sample size can reasonably be considered to be representative of dairy farms in the region given the relatively small size of the region. It should also be noted that the estimated P surplus gives only an indication of the potential risk to the environment and does not constitute actual losses

to water bodies which apart from economic and management practices is influenced by other factors such as soil type. In this study we used the standard amount of P output in manures peculiar to the feeding system in Northern Ireland in our estimation of P surplus. However, any change in this in the future due to change in feeding system could affect the amount of P surplus which could consequently affect the estimate of the environmental technical efficiency. It should also be emphasized that this study has only included P surplus as the environmental variable from the dairy farms. However, dairy cows also contribute significantly to greenhouse gas emissions. Future studies can therefore be extended to include [greenhouse gas emissions](#) (GHG) to give a wider perspective on environmental technical efficiency in dairy farms. **Acknowledgements**

This study is funded by Teagasc under the Walsh fellowship programme. The authors thank Agri-Food and Biosciences Institute, Northern Ireland for providing technical supports. We also thank the Department of Agriculture, Environment and Rural Affairs (DAERA), Policy and Economics Division, Northern Ireland and Teagasc for providing access to data. The authors are also grateful to the Editor and anonymous reviewers of this journal for very insightful comments and suggestions of great benefit to the paper.

References

- Adenuga, Adewale Henry, John Davis, George Hutchinson, Trevor Donnellan, and Myles Patton. 2018a. "Estimation and determinants of phosphorus balance and use efficiency of dairy farms in Northern Ireland: A within and between farm random effects analysis." *Agricultural Systems* 164:11-19. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2018.03.003>.
- Adenuga, Adewale Henry, John Davis, George Hutchinson, Trevor Donnellan, and Myles Patton. 2018b. "Modelling regional environmental efficiency differentials of dairy farms on the island of Ireland." *Ecological Indicators* 95:851-861. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2018.08.040>.
- Adenuga, Adewale Henry, John Davis, George Hutchinson, Trevor Donnellan, and Myles Patton. 2019. "Environmental Efficiency and Pollution Costs of Nitrogen Surplus in Dairy Farms: A Parametric Hyperbolic Technology Distance Function Approach." *Environmental and Resource Economics* 74 (3):1273-1298. doi: 10.1007/s10640-019-00367-2.
- Aigner, Dennis, C. A. Knox Lovell, and Peter Schmidt. 1977. "Formulation and estimation of stochastic frontier production function models." *Journal of Econometrics* 6 (1):21-37. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-4076\(77\)90052-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-4076(77)90052-5).
- Bailey, J. S. 2016. "Phosphorus management for sustainable dairy production." Step to Sustainable Livestock International Conference, Bristol, United Kingdom 20th Sep 2017.
- Bailey, J.S. 2015. "Assessing the environmental risks associated with newly revised P application limits for farmland in NI." Proceedings of the Agricultural Research Forum, Ireland.
- Bajrami, Egzon, Eric Wailes, Bruce Dixon, Arben Musliu, and Alvaro Durand-Morat. 2017. "Factors affecting the technical efficiency of dairy farms in Kosovo." *Journal of Central European Agriculture* 18:823-840. doi: 10.5513/JCEA01/18.4.1964.
- Battese, G. E., and T. J. Coelli. 1995. "A model for technical inefficiency effects in a stochastic frontier production function for panel data." *Empirical Economics* 20 (2):325-332. doi: 10.1007/BF01205442.

- Battese, George E., and Tim J. Coelli. 1988. "Prediction of firm-level technical efficiencies with a generalized frontier production function and panel data." *Journal of Econometrics* 38 (3):387-399. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-4076\(88\)90053-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-4076(88)90053-X).
- Belotti, F., S. Daidone, G. Ilardi, and V. Atella. 2013. "Stochastic frontier analysis using Stata." *Stata Journal* 13 (4):719-758.
- Bokusheva, R., and S. C. Kumbhakar. 2014. "A Distance Function Model with Good and Bad Outputs." European Association of Agricultural Economists, Ljubljana, Slovenia, August 26-29.
- Boyd, Gale A., George Tolley, and Joseph Pang. 2002. "Plant Level Productivity, Efficiency, and Environmental Performance of the Container Glass Industry." *Environmental and Resource Economics* 23 (1):29-43. doi: 10.1023/A:1020236517937.
- Brewin, Derek, Petra Loro, Mehdi Arzandeh, Wole Akinremi, Collin Gyles, and Dupe Ige. 2013. *Estimating Soil Phosphorus Budgets for Rural Municipalities in Manitoba*.
- Cabrera, V. E., D. Solís, and J. del Corral. 2010. "Determinants of technical efficiency among dairy farms in Wisconsin." *Journal of Dairy Science* 93 (1):387-393. doi: <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2009-2307>.
- Caudill, Steven B., Jon M. Ford, and Daniel M. Gropper. 1995. "Frontier Estimation and Firm-Specific Inefficiency Measures in the Presence of Heteroscedasticity." *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 13 (1):105-111. doi: 10.2307/1392525.
- Cave, S., and D. McKibbin. 2016. *River Pollution in Northern Ireland: An Overview of Causes and Monitoring Systems, with Examples of Preventative Measures*. Belfast.
- Chambers, R. G., Y. Chung, and R. Färe. 1998. "Profit, Directional Distance Functions, and Nerlovian Efficiency." *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications* 98 (2):351-364. doi: 10.1023/A:1022637501082.
- Charnes, A., W. W. Cooper, and E. Rhodes. 1978. "Measuring the efficiency of decision making units." *European Journal of Operational Research* 2 (6):429-444. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-2217\(78\)90138-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0377-2217(78)90138-8).
- Chung, Y. H., R. Färe, and S. Grosskopf. 1997. "Productivity and Undesirable Outputs: A Directional Distance Function Approach." *Journal of Environmental Management* 51 (3):229-240. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1006/jema.1997.0146>.
- Coelli, T. J., D. S. Prasada Rao, C. J. O'Donnell, and G. E. Battese. 2005. *An Introduction to Efficiency and Productivity Analysis*. 2 ed. USA: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Council, National Research. 2001. *Nutrient Requirements of Dairy Cattle: Seventh Revised Edition, 2001*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Cuesta, Rafael A., C. A. Knox Lovell, and José L. Zofío. 2009. "Environmental efficiency measurement with translog distance functions: A parametric approach." *Ecological Economics* 68 (8):2232-2242. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2009.02.001>.
- Cuesta, Rafael A., and José L. Zofío. 2005. "Hyperbolic Efficiency and Parametric Distance Functions: With Application to Spanish Savings Banks." *Journal of Productivity Analysis* 24 (1):31-48. doi: 10.1007/s11123-005-3039-3.
- Dairyman. 2011. *An Assessment of Regional Sustainability of Dairy Farming in Northern Ireland*. Belfast.
- Department of Agriculture, Environment and Rural Affairs DAERA 2018. "Indices of producer prices 1981 onwards."
- Du, Limin, Aoife Hanley, and Chu Wei. 2015. "Marginal Abatement Costs of Carbon Dioxide Emissions in China: A Parametric Analysis." *Environmental and Resource Economics* 61 (2):191-216. doi: 10.1007/s10640-014-9789-5.
- Duman, Yavuz Selman, and Adnan Kasman. 2018. "Environmental technical efficiency in EU member and candidate countries: A parametric hyperbolic distance function approach." *Energy* 147:297-307. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2018.01.037>.
- Eurostat. 2013. *Nutrient Budgets – Methodology and Handbook, Version 1.02*. Luxembourg: OECD.

- Faere, Rolf, Shawna Grosskopf, C. A. K. Lovell, and Carl Pasurka. 1989. "Multilateral Productivity Comparisons When Some Outputs are Undesirable: A Nonparametric Approach." *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 71 (1):90-98. doi: 10.2307/1928055.
- Färe, Rolf, and Shawna Grosskopf. 2004. "Modeling undesirable factors in efficiency evaluation: Comment." *European Journal of Operational Research* 157 (1):242-245. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-2217\(03\)00191-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-2217(03)00191-7).
- Färe, Rolf, Shawna Grosskopf, C. A. Knox Lovell, and Suthathip Yaisawarng. 1993. "Derivation of Shadow Prices for Undesirable Outputs: A Distance Function Approach." *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 75 (2):374-380. doi: 10.2307/2109448.
- Fare, Rolf, Shawna Grosskopf, Dong-Woon Noh, and William Weber. 2005. "Characteristics of a polluting technology: theory and practice." *Journal of Econometrics* 126 (2):469-492.
- Fare, Rolf, Shawna Grosskopf, and William Weber. 2006. "Shadow prices and pollution costs in U.S. agriculture." *Ecological Economics* 56:89-103. doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2004.12.022.
- Färe, Rolf, Shawna Grosskopf, and Osman Zaim. 2002. "Hyperbolic efficiency and return to the dollar." *European Journal of Operational Research* 136 (3):671-679. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-2217\(01\)00022-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-2217(01)00022-4).
- Glass, J. Colin, Donal G. McKillop, Barry Quinn, and John Wilson. 2014. "Cooperative bank efficiency in Japan: a parametric distance function analysis." *The European Journal of Finance* 20 (3):291-317. doi: 10.1080/1351847X.2012.698993.
- Greene, W. 2012 *Econometric Analysis*. 7th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Greene, William. 2005. "Reconsidering Heterogeneity in Panel Data Estimators of the Stochastic Frontier Model." *Journal of Econometrics* 126:269-303. doi: 10.1016/j.jeconom.2004.05.003.
- Hadley, David. 1998. "ESTIMATION OF SHADOW PRICES OF UNDESIRABLE OUTPUTS: AN APPLICATION TO UK DAIRY FARMS."
- Hadri, Kaddour. 1999. "Estimation of a Doubly Heteroscedastic Stochastic Frontier Cost Function." *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 17 (3):359-363. doi: 10.2307/1392293.
- Hailu, Atakelty, and Terrence S. Veeman. 2000. "Environmentally Sensitive Productivity Analysis of the Canadian Pulp and Paper Industry, 1959-1994: An Input Distance Function Approach." *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 40 (3):251-274. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1006/jeem.2000.1124>.
- Humphreys, James, K. O'Connell, and I. A. Casey. 2008. "Nitrogen flows and balances in four grassland-based systems of dairy production on a clay-loam soil in a moist temperate climate." *Grass and Forage Science* 63:467-480. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2494.2008.00660.x.
- Kleinman, Peter, Andrew Sharpley, Paul Withers, Lars Bergström, Laura Johnson, and Donnacha Doody. 2015. "Implementing agricultural phosphorus science and management to combat eutrophication." *Ambio* 44:297-310. doi: 10.1007/s13280-015-0631-2.
- Kumbhakar, Subal C., and C. A. Knox Lovell. 2000. *Stochastic Frontier Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kumbhakar, Subal C., Hung-Jen Wang, and Alan P. Horncastle. 2015. *A Practitioner's Guide to Stochastic Frontier Analysis Using Stata*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ma, Wanglin, Kathryn Bicknell, and Alan Renwick. 2019. "Feed Use Intensification and Technical Efficiency of Dairy Farms in New Zealand." *Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics* 63:20-38. doi: 10.1111/1467-8489.12283.
- Macpherson, Alexander J., Peter P. Principe, and Elizabeth R. Smith. 2010. "A directional distance function approach to regional environmental-economic assessments." *Ecological Economics* 69 (10):1918-1925. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2010.04.012>.
- Mamardashvili, P., G. Emvalomatis, and P. Jan. 2016. "Environmental Performance and Shadow Value of Polluting on Swiss Dairy Farms." *Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics* 41 (2):225-246.
- Manello, A. 2012. "Efficiency and productivity in presence of undesirable outputs." PhD, University of Bergamo.

- March, M. D., L. Toma, A. W. Stott, and D. J. Roberts. 2016. "Modelling phosphorus efficiency within diverse dairy farming systems – pollutant and non-renewable resource?" *Ecological Indicators* 69:667-676. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2016.05.022>.
- Matsushita, Kyohei, and Fumihiro Yamane. 2012. "Pollution from the electric power sector in Japan and efficient pollution reduction." *Energy Economics* 34 (4):1124-1130. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2011.09.011>.
- Mbehoma, Petermus M., and Felician Mutasa. 2013. "Determinants of Technical Efficiency of Smallholders Dairy Farmers in Njombe District, Tanzania." *African Journal of Economic Review* 01 (2):264-288.
- McCarthy, B., L. Shalloo, and U. Geary. 2011. The grass calculator. edited by Moorepark Animal and Grassland Research and Innovation centre. Ireland: Teagasc.
- Murty, M. N., Surender Kumar, and Kishore K. Dhavala. 2007. "Measuring environmental efficiency of industry: a case study of thermal power generation in India." *Environmental and Resource Economics* 38 (1):31-50. doi: 10.1007/s10640-006-9055-6.
- NISRA, Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency. 2019. 2018 Mid-year Population Estimates for Northern Ireland. edited by NISRA. Belfast.
- Pérez Urdiales, María, Alfons Oude Lansink, and Alan Wall. 2016. "Eco-efficiency Among Dairy Farmers: The Importance of Socio-economic Characteristics and Farmer Attitudes." *Environmental and Resource Economics* 64 (4):559-574. doi: 10.1007/s10640-015-9885-1.
- Picazo-Tadeo, Andrés J., José A. Gómez-Limón, and Ernest Reig-Martínez. 2011. "Assessing farming eco-efficiency: A Data Envelopment Analysis approach." *Journal of Environmental Management* 92 (4):1154-1164. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2010.11.025>.
- Playfair, David. 2017. Northern Ireland Agri-food Sector Key Statistics 2017. edited by Economics and Statistics Division CAP Policy. Belfast: Department of Agriculture, Environment and Rural Affairs (DAERA).
- Reinhard, Stijn, C. A. Knox Lovell, and Geert Thijssen. 1999. "Econometric Estimation of Technical and Environmental Efficiency: An Application to Dutch Dairy Farms." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 81 (1):44-60. doi: 10.2307/1244449.
- Reinhard, Stijn, C. A. Knox Lovell, and Geert Thijssen. 2002. "Analysis of Environmental Efficiency Variation." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 84 (4):1054-1065.
- Rosano Peña, Carlos, André Luiz Marques Serrano, Paulo Augusto Pettenuzzo de Britto, Víthor Rosa Franco, Patrícia Guarnieri, and Karim Marini Thomé. 2018. "Environmental preservation costs and eco-efficiency in Amazonian agriculture: Application of hyperbolic distance functions." *Journal of Cleaner Production* 197:699-707. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.06.227>.
- Shaik, Saleem, Glenn A. Helmers, and Michael R. Langemeier. 2002. "Direct and Indirect Shadow Price and Cost Estimates of Nitrogen Pollution Abatement." *Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics* 27 (2):420-432.
- Shephard, Ronald W. 1970. *Theory of Cost and Production Functions*: Princeton University Press.
- Simar, Léopold, and Paul W. Wilson. 2007. "Estimation and inference in two-stage, semi-parametric models of production processes." *Journal of Econometrics* 136 (1):31-64. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2005.07.009>.
- Skevas, Ioannis, Xueqin Zhu, Victoria Shestalova, and Grigorios Emvalomatis. 2018. The Impact of Agri-Environmental Policies and Production Intensification on the Environmental Performance of Dutch Dairy Farms. *Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics* 43 (3): 423-440. Accessed 2018-09. doi:10.22004/ag.econ.276503
- doi.
- Suta, Cornelia Madalina, Alastair Bailey, and Sophia Davidova. 2010. "Environmental efficiency of small farms in selected EU NMS." 2010-08.

- Tang, Kai, Chengzhu Gong, and Dong Wang. 2016. "Reduction potential, shadow prices, and pollution costs of agricultural pollutants in China." *Science of The Total Environment* 541:42-50. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2015.09.013>.
- Toma, L., M. March, A. W. Stott, and D. J. Roberts. 2013. "Environmental efficiency of alternative dairy systems: A productive efficiency approach." *Journal of Dairy Science* 96 (11):7014-7031. doi: <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2013-6911>.
- Tyteca, Daniel. 1996. "On the Measurement of the Environmental Performance of Firms— A Literature Review and a Productive Efficiency Perspective." *Journal of Environmental Management* 46 (3):281-308. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1006/jema.1996.0022>.
- Van Ha, Nguyen, Shashi Kant, and Virginia Maclaren. 2008. "Shadow prices of environmental outputs and production efficiency of household-level paper recycling units in Vietnam." *Ecological Economics* 65 (1):98-110. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2007.06.003>.
- Vardanyan, Michael, and Dong-Woon Noh. 2006. "Approximating pollution abatement costs via alternative specifications of a multi-output production technology: A case of the US electric utility industry." *Journal of environmental management* 80:177-90. doi: 10.1016/j.jenvman.2005.09.005.
- Vu, Ha, and S. Turnell. 2012. "A parametric measure of productivity change from hyperbolic distance function : application to the Vietnamese banking industry." 2 (5):63-96.
- Wang, Hung-jen, and Peter Schmidt. 2002. "One-Step and Two-Step Estimation of the Effects of Exogenous Variables on Technical Efficiency Levels." *Journal of Productivity Analysis* 18 (2):129-144. doi: 10.1023/A:1016565719882.
- Weersink, Alfons, Calum Turvey, and A. Godah. 1990. "Decomposition Measures of Technical Efficiency for Ontario Dairy Farms." 38:1023-1023. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-7976.1990.tb03538.x.
- Wei, Chu, Andreas Löschel, and Bing Liu. 2013. "An empirical analysis of the CO2 shadow price in Chinese thermal power enterprises." *Energy Economics* 40:22-31. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2013.05.018>.
- Zhou, P., X. Zhou, and L. W. Fan. 2014. "On estimating shadow prices of undesirable outputs with efficiency models: A literature review." *Applied Energy* 130:799-806. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2014.02.049>.
- Zhou, Peng, Kim Leng Poh, and Beng Wah Ang. 2016. "Data Envelopment Analysis for Measuring Environmental Performance." In *Handbook of Operations Analytics Using Data Envelopment Analysis*, edited by Shih-Nan Hwang, Hsuan-Shih Lee and Joe Zhu, 31-49. Boston, MA: Springer US.

Appendix A: **Parameter estimates of the hyperbolic environmental technology distance function assuming a half-normal distribution assumptions for the inefficiency component of the model**

Table A1 : Parameter estimates of the hyperbolic environmental technology distance function

Parameter	Estimate	Std. Err
α_1 (labour)	-0.090*	0.052
α_2 (land)	-0.152	0.147

α_3 (capital)	-0.187*	0.106
α_4 (livestock units)	0.194	0.186
α_5 (variable inputs)	-0.543***	0.061
α_{11}	-0.115	0.115
α_{22}	0.433	0.390
α_{33}	2.165***	0.502
α_{44}	0.246	0.253
α_{55}	0.762	
α_{12}	0.129	0.252
α_{13}	-0.256	0.376
α_{14}	0.105	0.246
α_{15}	-0.012	0.265
α_{23}	-0.122	0.223
α_{24}	-0.070	0.280
α_{25}	-0.305	0.329
α_{34}	-0.712**	0.330
α_{35}	-0.745***	0.256
α_{45}	0.183	0.266
β_2 (other output)	0.298***	0.035
β_{22}	0.112***	0.029
γ_5 (phosphorus surplus)	-0.032***	0.010
γ_{ss}	-0.007	0.010
δ_{12}	0.128	0.095
δ_{22}	-0.203*	0.112
δ_{32}	0.163	0.337
δ_{42}	-0.076	0.103
δ_{52}	-0.128	0.237
ψ_{1s}	0.044*	0.026
ψ_{2s}	-0.068	0.069
ψ_{3s}	-0.035	0.113
ψ_{4s}	0.062	0.051
ψ_{5s}	0.037	0.041
μ_{2s}	0.033**	0.016
ρ_τ	-0.022***	0.005
Heteroskedasticity in σ_u		
ϕ_1 (age)	-0.007	0.013
ϕ_2 (stocking density)	0.806	0.551
ϕ_3 (milk share)	-4.185***	0.877
ϕ_4 (concentrates value)	9.79e-06	6.35e-06
ϕ_5 (farm size)	0.002	0.009
ϕ_6 (land type)	-0.017	1.443
ϕ_7 (environmental subsidy)	0.518	0.877
ϕ_0 (constant)	0.663	1.534
Heteroskedasticity in σ_v		
ϕ_1 (age)	0.014	0.012
ϕ_2 (milk yield)	-2.2e-04	2.1e-04
ϕ_3 (concentrates value)	-4.47e-06	3.1e-05
ϕ_4 (land type)	-0.687	2.350
ϕ_0 (constant)	-5.23	7.475
Log-Likelihood	429.25	
Mean EE	0.92	
SD	0.064	
Min.	0.68	
Max	1	

Notes: Single, double, and triple asterisks (*, **, ***) indicate significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1%