1. Characteristics of farmers likely to seek info from other farmers  
   Regressand = info\_source\_other\_farmer

Regressor = in degree centrality, social capital[[1]](#footnote-1), network characteristics (dummy for each region?) – alternatively coop present[[2]](#footnote-2) dummy, social network characteristics[[3]](#footnote-3) -, hh characts, income, previous exposure

* 1. What are the differences in info sources amongst the two?
  2. Amongst those who would seek info from other farmers, are there differences in reliance on other farmers? What are the characteristics of these farmers more dependent on other farmers?  
     histogram of number of sources excluding other farmers   
     if big split, t tests
     1. Would expect reliance to be greater amongst those will less exposure, but are there clear cut offs?

Simple t-tests instead?

1. Characteristics of farmers likely to be sought out by other farmers for info. Are they different from those likely to seek out info?[[4]](#footnote-4) How does this vary by network?[[5]](#footnote-5)
   1. Do farmers of different reliance (if present) seek out different types of farmers?[[6]](#footnote-6)

Regressand = in degree centrality

Regressor = social capital[[7]](#footnote-7), network characteristics (dummy for each region?) – alternatively coop present[[8]](#footnote-8) dummy, social network characteristics - , hh characts, income,

Control for same cluster

Should this be a tobit?

Scatterplot showing how traits vary with (predicted) soughtoutedness

Venn diagram to show overlap of seek/non seek and saughter

1. Where do the two groups (or three if splitting those who get info from other farmers into reliant and less reliant) get their info from? Does source vary? Does reliance vary?
   1. Is the difference in tech source by status greater than the difference by region?[[9]](#footnote-9)

Averages

Discussion

Because its that they want, does it mean it makes economic sense.

Challenge top down model – how can f2f be used to promote bottom up

Inherently, results particular to west kenya if not finer level.

1. Composed as a combination of out degree and indicators (village rel, group membership, group rel), possibly as a percentage with 100 being max (assuming 1 group, can have more if more than one group) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Corroborate from answers of people – those networks without coop should have prices for coop or sales to coop; *alternatively could be based on individual, whether they report a coop pri*ce [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Corroborate from answers of people – those networks without coop should have prices for coop or sales to coop; *alternatively could be based on individual, whether they report a coop pri*ce [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. If yes, top down. If no, circular. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Likely to see more circular in more bubbly region, top down on case of cooperative/ones with big guys. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Would need to create two in degrees; in degree from high reliance and in degree from low reliance, and run regression on each [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Composed as a combination of out degree and indicators (village rel, group membership, group rel), possibly as a percentage with 100 being max (assuming 1 group, can have more if more than one group) [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Corroborate from answers of people – those networks without coop should have prices for coop or sales to coop; *alternatively could be based on individual, whether they report a coop pri*ce [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. If yes, justified having private and public sources in same space [↑](#footnote-ref-9)