# Demand and supply factors constraining the emergence and sustainability of an efficient seed system: A pre-registered report

Bjorn Van Campenhout\*, Proscovia Renzaho Ntakyo<sup>†</sup>, Robert Sparrow<sup>‡</sup>, David J Spielman<sup>§</sup>, Caroline Miehe<sup>¶</sup>

April 29, 2021

### Abstract

Agricultural technology remains under-adopted among smallholder farmers in Sub-Saharan Africa. We investigate how the quality of an agricultural technology – improved maize seed – affects its adoption. The research entails three hypotheses that will be tested in a series of randomized controlled trials among agro-input dealers and smallholder farmers in Uganda. In a first hypothesis, quality concerns that constrain uptake are caused by information inefficiencies at the level of the agro-input dealer, who is assumed to lack knowledge about proper storage and handling. An intensive training program is expected to increase improved maize seed quality and subsequent adoption by farmers. A second hypothesis conjectures that information asymmetry between seller and buyer with respect to the quality of seed

<sup>\*</sup>Development Strategy and Governance Division, International Food Policy Research Institute, Leuven, Belgium - corresponding author: b.vancampenhout@cgiar.org

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup>National Agricultural Research Organisation (NARO), Uganda

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>‡</sup>Development Economics Group, Wageningen University and Research, Wageningen, The Netherlands

<sup>§</sup>Development Strategy and Governance Division, International Food Policy Research Institute, Kigali, Rwanda

 $<sup>\</sup>P LICOS$  Centre for Institutions and Economic Performance, KULeuven, Leuven, Belgium

– a classic lemons technology – leads to under-adoption. We implement a crowd-sourced information clearinghouse similar to yelp.com to test this hypothesis. This hypothesis targets the interaction between farmers and input dealers. A third hypothesis targets farmers directly, as sub-optimal adoption is assumed to be caused by learning failures: Farmers might attribute disappointing outcomes to poor input quality, while in reality many input dimensions like the time of planting, weeding and fertilizer application co-determine outcomes. An ICT-mediated information campaign that stresses the importance of paying attention to all input dimensions is implemented to test this hypothesis.

keywords: seed systems, information clearing house, learning failures, information, input quality, agricultural technology adoption

JEL codes: O13; Q12; Q16; D82; D83

## 1 Balance tables

### 1.1 Orthogonality test for input dealers

Standard orthogonality tables will be included in the report. At each outcome level (farmer or input dealer), we pre-register 10 variables. Half of these are characteristics that are less likely to be affected by the intervention, while the other 5 picked from the primary and secondary outcomes listed in the next section.

# References

Table 1: Orthogonality tests - agro-input dealer level

	mean	dealer	clearing	farmer
age of the person interviewed - years	32.427	2.024	-0.039	-2.662
gender of the person interviewed - 1 is male	0.595	(0.057) $(0.132)$	0.054 $(0.121)$	0.080 $0.080$
education level of the interviewed - 1 if finished primary	0.897 $0.305$	(0.051)	(0.054)	(0.066) -0.069 (0.066)
number of years the business has been in operation (years)	(6.299)	(0.362)	0.208 $(1.482)$	-0.124 (1.380)
distance of agro-input dealer to nearest tarmac road - km	6.523 $(10.410)$	(2.0644) $(3.433)$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1.152 \\ 0.917 \\ (3.153) \end{pmatrix}$	(1.324) $(2.292)$
daily number of customers	41.486 $(46.489)$	8.954 (11.451)	-3.565 (8.219)	-4.755 $(10.085)$
quantity of seed sold during the last season - kg	910.885	562.086	131.991 $(370.090)$	-24.944 (585 445)
quantity of seed that was lost/wasted during the last season - $\ensuremath{\mathrm{kg}}$	(2003:239) 3.504 (18.651)	(3.232)	(3.387)	(3.394 - 3.053)
Ever received training? (1=yes)	0.526 $(0.500)$	(0.052) $(0.115)$	0.006 $0.126$	-0.011 $(0.108)$
Knows best seed packaging practice (1=yes)	(0.270) $(0.445)$	0.048 $(0.120)$	(0.120)	(0.120)
Number of observations	348	348	348	348

Note: First column reports sample means (and standard deviations below); \*\*, \* and + denote significance at the 1, 5 and 10 percent levels. Reported standard errors are clustered at the level of randomization (catchement area).

Table 2: Orthogonality tests - farmer level  $\,$ 

	mean	dealer	clearing	farmer
age of household head in years	48.617 (13.385)	1.744 (1.120)	0.202	0.181
household head finished primary education	0.503 $(0.500)$	(0.073) $(0.050)$	0.003 $(0.042)$	(0.036) $(0.039)$
gender of household head (1 is male)	0.777 $(0.416)$	(0.044)	$\stackrel{.}{-}0.013$ $(0.046)$	-0.047 $(0.042)$
household size - number of individuals eating in house regularly	(8.695)	-0.123 $(0.401)$	0.035 $(0.310)$	0.401 $(0.322)$
distance of homestead to nearest dealer selling maize seed in km	(4.789)	-0.80 <i>7</i> (0.706)	$\stackrel{)}{0.294}$ $(0.969)$	0.045 $(0.712)$
roof made of iron sheets	0.923 $(0.266)$	-0.007 $(0.034)$	$\begin{array}{c} -0.005 \\ (0.037) \end{array}$	0.003 $(0.027)$
used quality maize seed on any plot in last season	0.492 (0.500)	-0.020 $(0.046)$	-0.032 $(0.037)$	-0.041 (0.038)
thinks that maize seed at agro-input dealers is adulterated	0.685 $(0.465)$	0.021 $(0.062)$	-0.044 $(0.073)$	-0.023 $(0.056)$
bought quality maize seed from dealer in last season	0.320 $(0.467)$	0.000 $(0.044)$	$\begin{array}{c} -0.004 \\ (0.041) \end{array}$	0.000 $(0.035)$
maize yields on randomly chosen plot in last season (kg per acre)	864.249 (2785.970)	-148.190* (72.572)	-108.483 (79.294)	-29.801 (79.294)
Number of observations	3470	3470	3470	3470

Note: First column reports sample means (and standard deviations below); \*\*, \* and + denote significance at the 1, 5 and 10 percent levels. Reported standard errors are clustered at the level of randomization (catchement area).