



# Expanding the evidence base on the impact of rural advisory services

David J. Spielman and Simrin Makhija International Food Policy Research Institute

## Motivation

66 Evaluation of public extension services reveal inefficiency and lack of impact; unclear objectives, extension agents without a clear sense of what they are expected to accomplish, poorly motivated workers and management, no incentives to produce results, top-down approaches, no accountability to farmers, inappropriate messages, no funds for running costs, lack of supervision, no in-service training, lack of linkage with research etc.

~R. Haug (1999), J Agricultural Education & Extension, p. 271

## Why is evaluation important?

- Learning: building evidence about what works and why
- Accountability
- Transparency
- Feedback to management
- Policy design

## Why do we evaluate extension?

- To measure the impact of advisory services on technology adoption .... And the impact of adoption on productivity, sustainability, and welfare
- What have we learned? Adoption is constrained by
  - Biophysical characteristics: Land, soil, water, biology
  - Individual, household attributes: credit, tenure, education, social capital
  - Behavior: Preferences, aversions
- Where do we go from here?
  - Pursue the social and psychological dimensions of adult learning
  - Evaluate with better designs and greater rigor

## Why do we need better designs, more rigor?

- Sample selection bias
  - Those who learn/adopt may be fundamentally different from those who don't
  - Bias limits our ability to make wider inferences
- Endogeneity
  - Reverse Causation:  $A \rightarrow B \text{ or } B \rightarrow A$ ?
  - Simultaneity: the "Reflection Problem"
- Heterogeneity
  - Beyond average effects: Measuring outcomes for specific groups within a population

### With a better toolkit, we can do a lot more...

- Understanding context
  Understanding impact pathways and theories of change
- Internal validity: good identification strategies
  - Experimental Methods: RCTs

Quantitative

• Qualitative

- Non-experimental methods: PSM, RDD, Ivs, D-in-D 2.
- External validity: generalizability

Mixed Methods

#### ...to ask the right questions...

How do different extension approaches to adult education affect learning outcomes?

## ...with a better conceptual grounding

- Combine economics, education, and social psychology
   → behavior dimensions of learning and technology adoption in agriculture
- Evaluate type and intensity of training
- Study the step-by-step process of learning
- Evaluate changes in aspirations and locus of control
- Evaluate learning failures
- Evaluate peer effects

## New ideas for future research...

For a single technology or practice...

- 1. Evaluate which extension approach better facilitates learning/adoption
- 2. Compare different extension approaches
  - Training & Visit vs. Farmer Field Schools vs. Mother-Baby Trials vs. Chalk-and-Talk
- 3. Measure the cost-effectiveness of each extension approach
- 4. Open the door to evaluation of learning approaches, not just technologies

## ...to affect policy change



Source: Authors, adapted from IFPRI (2011)





# Thank you

## References



Bernard, T., S. Dercon, K. Orkin, & A.S. Taffesse. 2014. "The Future in Mind: Aspirations and Forward-Looking Behaviour in Rural Ethiopia." Centre for the Study of African Economies Working Paper Series no. 2014-16. Oxford, UK: University of Oxford.

Davis, K., Nkonya, E., Kato, E., Mekonnen, D. A., Odendo, M., Miiro, R., & Nkuba, J. 2012. "Impact of Farmer Field Schools on Agricultural Productivity and Poverty in East Africa." *World Development* 40(2): 402-413.

Feder, G., R.E. Just, & D. Zilberman. 1985. "Adoption of Agricultural Innovations in Developing Countries: A Survey." *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 33(2): 255-298.

Hanna, R., S. Mullainathan, & J. Schwartzstein. 2012. "Learning through Noticing: Theory and Experimental Evidence in Farming." Working Paper no. 18401. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Haug, R. 1999. "Some Leading Issues in International Agricultural Extension, a Literature Review." *Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension* 5(4): 263-274.

IPPRI (International Food Policy Research Institute). 2011. Policies, Institutions, and Markets to Strengthen Food Security and Incomes for the Rural Poor. A revised proposal submitted to the CGIAR Consortium Board. Washington, DC: IFPRI.

Jack, B.K. 2011. "Market Inefficiencies and the Adoption of Agricultural Technologies in Developing Countries." White paper prepared for the Agricultural Technology Adoption Initiative: Cambridge, MA/Berkeley, CA: Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab (MIT)/Center for Effective Global Action.

Kondylis, F., & Mueller, V. 2010. "Seeing is Believing? Evidence from a Demonstration Plot Experiment in Mozambique." Mozambique Strategy Support Program working paper no. 1. Washington, DC: IFPRI.

Lambrecht, I., Vanlauwe, B., Merckx, R., & Maertens, M. 2014. "Understanding the Process of Agricultural Technology Adoption: Mineral Fertilizer in Eastern DR Congo." *World Development* 59: 132-146.

Manski, C.F. 1993. "Identification of Endogenous Social Effects: The Reflection Problem." Review of Economic Studies 60(3): 531-542.