IMPACT OF CONTRACT FARMING ON SMALLHOLDER POULTRY FARMERS' INCOME IN KENYA

Priscilla W. Wainaina, Julius J. Okello & Jonathan Nzuma

Department of Agricultural Economics

University of Nairobi

P.O. Box 29053, Nairobi, Kenya

Impact of Contract Farming on Smallholder Poultry Farmers' Income in Kenya

Abstract

Contract farming is a form of vertical coordination largely aimed at correcting the market failure associated with spot markets that arise due to imperfect information. However there is still no consensus in the literature on the impact of contract farming on the welfare of smallholder farmers. While some studies have argued that contact farming improves access to ready markets by smallholder farmers, other studies have suggested that contract farming lowers the incomes of smallholder farmers because the contractors wield greater market power over the farmers. Consequently, it is seen as a blessing by some and a necessary evil by others. This study uses a propensity score matching technique to shed light on the impact of contract farming on smallholder farmers. The study also examines the conditioners of participation in contract farming. It uses data collected from 180 smallholder poultry farmers stratified by participation in contract production. The study finds that, on average, contracted farmers earned more net revenue per bird compared to the independent farmers, by approximately 27 percent, and as such participating in contract farming could improve the welfare of these small holder poultry farmers. The study discusses the policy implications of the findings.

Key words: Contract farming, smallholder farmers, impact, propensity score matching, poultry production, Kenya.

1.0 Introduction

Contract farming is defined as an agreement between farmers and processing and/or marketing firms for the production and supply of agricultural products under forward agreements, frequently at predetermined prices (Eaton and Shepherd, 2001). The arrangement often involves the purchaser in providing a degree of production support through, for example, the supply of inputs and the provision of technical advice. For this arrangement to work the farmer commits himself to provide a specific commodity in quantities and at quality standards determined by the purchaser. The company on the other hand agrees to support the farmer's production and to purchase the commodity.

A fundamental feature of contract farming is the shifting of risk from producers to processors since it is a form of futures market. Production and price risks are important features of poultry farming. Risk sharing is one of the widely cited reasons for contracting. Numerous studies of contract farming emphasize risk reduction as a principal incentive for producers to enter in to contracts (Covey and Stennis, 1985). Much of the price risk is reduced, in contract farming, by the use of a predetermined price rather than the market price (Martinetz, 2005).

Strohm and Hoeffler (2006) argue that contract farming has been gaining popularity in developing countries. Some of the enterprises where contact farming is widely used are French beans and other horticultural crops (Kenya and Ethiopia), fruits such as pineapples mangoes and passion fruits (Ghana), cotton (Zimbambwe) and poultry (Kenya). Indeed, much of the success in the 20 horticulture industry in Kenya, Zambia and Ethiopia has for instance been attributed to contract 21 farming with producer organization (Narrod et al, 2009; Okello and Swinton, 2007)

There are four models of contract farming arrangements namely centralized model, multipartite model, intermediary model and the informal model (Eaton and Shepherd, 2001). The centralized model involves a centralized processor and/or buyer procuring from a large number of small-scale farmers. The cooperation is vertically integrated and in most cases involves the provision of several services such as pre-financing of inputs, extension and transportation of produce from the farmer(s) to the buyers' processing plant. Multipartite contract farming model arises when a combination of two or more organizations (state, private agribusiness firms, international aid agencies or non-governmental organizations - NGOs) work together to coordinate and manage the cooperation between buyers and farmers.

An intermediary model shows many characteristics of a centralized model with the difference that they act as an intermediary on behalf of another firm. Normally, the intermediaries organize everything on behalf of the final buyer starting with input supply, extension service, payment of the farmers and final product transport. Indeed, handling several thousands of out growers involves significant management effort and therefore it might be economically attractive for a buyer to outsource this task to an intermediary. Lastly Informal arrangements involve casual oral

agreements between contracting parties and regularly repeated marketing transactions, but are characterized by the absence of written contracts or equally binding and specifying documents

While contract farming is widespread in Africa and many other developing countries, there are conflicting views on its impact on the welfare of smallholder farmers. Some authors argue that contract farming is beneficial to the small holder farmers since it enables farmers to access ready markets and also to access global markets (Key and Rusten, 1999; Warnings and Key, 2002; Gulati *et al,* 2005; Minot, 1986; Minot and Roy, 2006; Minot *et al*, 2009). Such authors also argue that contract farming enhances the income of farmers which they attribute to the economies of scale enjoyed in contract farming. On the other hand other authors argue that contract farming is a means of exploiting farmers by the large agribusiness firms due to the unequal bargaining power (Little and Watts, 1994; Singh, 2002). They criticize contract farming on the basis that most of the contractual terms are too costly for smallholder farmers to comply with and that most large firms break the contractual terms at the expense of the smallholder due to unequal market power. Some other critics of contract farming (e.g. Guo et.al, 2005) argue that contract farming is only beneficial for large scale farmers and that it only serves to push smallholder farmers out of the market and could even lead to rural inequality and entrench poverty among the rural smallholder farmers.

The two contradicting views make contract farming appear as a necessary evil in the production and marketing of certain agricultural commodities. It is necessary because it is often a solution to the problem of endemic market failures in developing countries. Yet, it is evil because it may be an avenue for some large agribusiness firms to exploit the small scale farmers. However the question still remains as to whether contract farming indeed improves the welfare of the farming communities. It specifically addresses two objectives. First, it examines the factors affecting participation in commercial poultry contract production, after controlling for risk. Second, the study uses Propensity Score Matching (PSM) technique to examine the impact of contract farming on the incomes of smallholder poultry farmers.

This study uses data from a survey of 180 Kenyan smallholder poultry farmers in Nakuru County. Kenya has one of the most well-developed commercial poultry industries in Africa (Nyaga,

2007) making it a suitable case to study. The study specifically focuses on smallholder farmers producing poultry for Kims Poultry Care Center (KPCC), a large poultry firm located Nakuru – Kenya, under contract and those that are not under any contractual arrangement. KPCC is the only large poultry farm that works with smallholder farmers in Kenya in a production scheme that encompasses provision of inputs under interlinked credit arrangement. Markets for both poultry inputs and outputs tend to be thin, fragmented and hence generally fail for majority of these smallholder poultry farmers making contracting an attractive venture (Key and Runsten, 1999; Narrod et al, 2009).

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides a brief review of commercial poultry production in Kenya to provide context for the study. This is followed by a presentation of the study approach in Section 3. Section 4 presents the results of the PSM model. Finally, Section 5 concludes and discusses policy implications.

2.0 Study context

Commercial poultry production is concentrated in the urban centers of Nairobi, Mombasa, Nakuru, Kisumu and Nyeri where ready urban markets are available. This has led to the growth of commercial hatcheries located in the peri-urban areas, which sell hybrid broiler and layer chicks to commercial farmers (Nyaga, 2007). Kenya has one of the most well-developed commercial poultry industries in Africa (Nyaga, 2007). Among the commercial poultry producing areas in Kenya, only Kiambu and Nakuru counties have some form of contractual arrangement. The poultry contracting firm in Kiambu is Kenchic Limited that deals exclusively with medium and large scale farmers. On the other hand the contracting firm in Nakuru County, Kims Poultry Care Centre, works with smallholder farmers. This study focuses on commercial poultry production by smallholder farmers in Nakuru County, Kenya. Nakuru County was chosen because it had smallholder contracted farmers.

Kims Poultry Care Centre started contracting farmers in 1996 and has since then grown steadily. It works with farmers within a radius of 60km around Nakuru town to ease logistical costs. Strohm and Hoeffler (2006) indicate that the deals with three categories of farmers namely, small-scale keeping an average of 100 to 500 birds, medium scale with an average of 500 to

1000 birds and large scale farmers with over 1000 birds on average. Kims Poultry Care Centre gets its parent stock of 6000 birds every 2 to 3 months from Kenchic Ltd and hatches approximately 20,000 to 30,000 day-old chicks per week. It sells 60 percent of its day old chicks to contract out growers and 40 percent to contracted agents who distribute to poultry farmers. It therefore does not deal directly with farmers.

Nakuru County is a cosmopolitan region in the Rift Valley province with a population of 471, 514 people. The major drivers of the economy in the County are agriculture and tourism. According to Republic of Kenya (RoK) (2005) and Nyaga (2007) the County has high poverty levels (ranging from 41 percent in the urban areas to 45 percent in the rural areas) and high unemployment levels (approximately 15 percent). Poultry is production is one of the leading agricultural enterprises in the County. The processed chicken and eggs produced in the county feed into the tourist hotels with the rest being sold to other cities in Kenya and in the East Africa region (Okello *et al*, 2010).

3.0 Study Approach

3.1 Theoretical framework

Impact assessment establishes with as much certainty as possible, whether or not an intervention produces its intended effects (African Impact Evaluation Initiative (AIEI), 2010*)*. There are two approaches to study the impact of a given project. These are the 'before and after' and the 'with and without' approaches. 'Before and after' analysis compares the performance of key variables during and after the program, with those prior to the implementation of the program. This approach uses statistical methods to evaluate whether there is a significant change in some essential variables over time. The approach often gives biased results because it does not take in to account the effect of the confounding factors on the change. With and without comparisons compares the behavior in the key variables in a sample of program beneficiaries, with their behavior in non-program group (a comparison group). This is an approach uses the experiences of the comparison group as a proxy for what would otherwise have happened in the program beneficiaries.

Impact evaluations typically rely on econometric and statistical models. There are three main kinds of impact evaluation designs. These are experimental, quasi-experimental and non-experimental which are respectively associated with control groups, comparison groups, and non-participants. Impact Evaluation (IE) rigorously measures the impact that a project has on beneficiaries. It typically does this by comparing outcomes between beneficiaries and a control group (African Impact Evaluation Initiative (AIEI), 2010*).*

In Experimental or Randomized Control Design method selection into the treatment and control groups is random within some well-defined set of people. In this case there should be no difference (in expectation) between the two groups besides the fact that the treatment group had access to the program. Non-experimental or Quasi-Experimental Design methods are used to carry out an evaluation when it is not possible to construct treatment and comparison/control groups through experimental design. These techniques generate comparison groups that resemble the treatment group, at least in observed characteristics, through econometric methodologies, which include difference in difference methods, reflexive comparisons, instrumental variables methods and matching methods (Baker, 2000).

More recently matching techniques has gained prominence in impact evaluations (Ali and Abdulai, 2010). In matching methods (also known sometimes as constructed controls), an individual from comparison is matched with one from the treatment group and difference in outcome variable of interest in the intervention computed (Caliendo and Kopeinig, 2005). The most widely used type of matching is propensity score matching, in which the comparison group is matched to the treatment group on the basis of a set of observed characteristics in the form of a "propensity score". The propensity score is the predicted probability of participation in an intervention given observable characteristics. Under this approach the closer the propensity scores for the treatment and the control are the better the match. A good comparison group comes from the same economic environment and was administered the same questionnaire by similarly trained interviewers as the treatment group (Baker, 2000).

Propensity-score matching is by definition a non-experimental method for estimating the average effect of social programs (Rosenbaum and Rubin, 1983; Heckman *et al*., 1998). The method

compares average outcomes of participants and non-participants, conditional on the propensity score value. Thus the closer the propensity scores for the treatment and the control, the better the match. A good control group should come from the same economic environment and should have been administered the same questionnaire by similarly trained interviewers as the treatment group (Baker, 2000).

Propensity score matching has become an extremely popular evaluation method. Both in the academic and applied literature the amount of research based on matching methods has been steadily growing. Its application in the evaluation of agricultural interventions has grown tremendously in last few years (Ali and Abdulai, 2010; Becceril and Abdulai, 2010). It has also been widely applied in evaluating labor market policies and other diverse fields of study (see e.g. Dehejia and Wahba (1999) or Heckman *et al*. (1997)). Its popularity stem from the fact that it can be applied in any situation where one has a group of treated individuals and a group of untreated individuals. The nature of treatment may be very diverse .Some authors have therefore argued that matching is the best available method for selecting a matched (or re-weighted) comparison group which 'looks like' the (treatment) group of interest (Barbara, 2009; Ali and Abdulai, 2010; Becerril and Abdulai, 2010).

Heckman (1979) suggest that the impact of an intervention is essentially an estimation of a treatment effect in policy analysis. However, change in an outcome of a treatment is often a function of multiple endogenous and exogenous factors. Often, the problem arises in identifying part of the change in the outcome variable for the target population due to treatment. This problem arises due to the difficulty of observing the counterfactual corresponding to any change induced by a treatment. Yet it is necessary to observe the counterfactual if the impact is to be assessed. Given that the decision of households to participate or not to participate in the treatment may be associated with the net benefits from participation, the issue of self-selection becomes extremely crucial.

This study uses PSM to evaluate the impact of contract farming on net income of poultry farmers with participation in contract poultry production as the treatment. Following Heckman (1979) the

impact of participation in contract farming on household income (Y) can be expressed as a function of explanatory variables (X_i) and a participation dummy variable (R) specified as;

$$Y = \beta X_i + A R_i + \mu_i$$ ……………………………………………………………. (1)

Where R_i =1 for contracted farmers and 0 for independent farmers.

μ_i is the error term, β and A are coefficients.

Whether farmers participate in contract farming or not is dependent on the characteristics of farmers and farms, hence the decision of a farmer to participate is based on each farmer's self-selection instead of random assignment.

Assuming a risk-neutral farmer, the index function to estimate participation in contract farming can be expressed as:

$$R_i^* = \gamma X_i + e_i$$ …………………………………………………………………….. (2)

Where R_i^* is a latent variable denoting the difference between utility from participating in contract farming U_{iA} and the utility from not participating (U_{iN}). The farmer will participate in contract farming if $R_i^* = U_{iA} - U_{iN} > 0$. The term γX_i provides an estimate of the difference in utility from participating in contract farming ($U_{iA} - U_{iN}$), using the household and farm-level characteristics,X_i as explanatory variables, while e_i is an error term. In estimating equations (1) and (2), it should be noted that the relationship between participating in contract farming and the outcome (such as income) could be interdependent. Thus, participating in contract farming can increase output and as such richer households may be better disposed toward participating in contract farming. Thus, treatment assignment is not random, with the group of farmers being systematically different. Specifically, selection bias occurs if unobservable factors influence both the error terms of the income equation, μ_i, and that of the participation choice equation,e_i thus resulting in correlation of the error terms of the outcome and participation choice specifications (Green, 2003). In that case, estimating equation (1) with ordinary least squares will lead to biased estimates.

Several strategies have been employed in addressing the problem of selection bias above. Some studies have employed the Heckman two-step method to address selection bias, when the correlation between the two error terms is greater than zero. However, the approach depends on the restrictive assumption of normally distributed errors. Another way of controlling for selection

bias is to employ instrumental variable approach (IV). However, the instrumental variable approach suffers from a major limitation relating to the difficulty in finding and identifying instruments in the estimation. In addition both OLS and IV procedures tend to impose a linear functional form assumption implying that the coefficients on the control variables are similar for adopters and non-adopters (Ali and Abdulai, 2010). They further add that this assumption may not hold, since the coefficients could differ. Unlike the parametric methods mentioned above, propensity score-matching requires no assumption about the functional form in specifying the relationship between outcomes and predictors of outcome. Due to the shortcomings of the two methods discussed above, propensity score matching which is a non-parametric method, first proposed by Rosenbaum and Rubin (1983) is used as a treatment effect correction model to reduce self selection bias.

To evaluate the impact of participation in poultry contract farming on income, all observable characteristics have to be the same between the contract farmers which in this case is the treatment and the non-contract farmers which in this case will be the control. The expected treatment effect of contract participation or Average Treatment effect on Treatment (ATT) is the difference between the actual income and the income if they did not participate in contract farming. This is given as;

$$ATT = E(Y_{1i} - Y_{0i} \, / \, P_i = 1)$$ ………………………………………………… (3)

where Y_{1i} denotes income when the *i-th* farmer participates in contract, Y_{0i} is the income of *i-th* farmer when he does not participate in contract, and P_i denotes the contract participation, 1=participate, 0=otherwise. ATT is also called conditional mean impact. The mean difference between observable and control is written as;

$$D = E(Y_1 / P_i = 1) - E(Y_0 \, / \, P_i = 0) = ATT + \varepsilon$$ …………………………………… (4)

where ε is the bias, also given by:

$$\varepsilon = E(Y_0 \, / \, P_i = 1) - E(Y_0 \, / \, P_i = 0)$$ …………………………………….. (5)

9

The true parameter of ATT is only identified if the outcome of treatment and control under the absence of contract are the same. This is written as:

$$E(Y_0 \, / \, P_i = 1) = E(Y_0/P_i = 0) \quad \text{..} \quad (6)$$

3.2 Empirical methods

The dependent variable in the model estimated to assess the determinants of participating in contract farming is binary taking the value of 1 if a farmer participated and 0 otherwise. Consequently, a Logit regression model was used. Other authors have used Probit regression model to estimate such binary dependent variable regression models. Both the Logit and Probit models estimate parameters using maximum likelihood. However, while Probit assumes normally distributed error term, the Logit model assumes a logistic distribution of the error term. The Logit model is often preferred due to the consistency of parameter estimates associated with the assumption that error term in the equation has a logistic distribution (Ravallion 2001; Baker 2000). Therefore the Logit regression model was used to estimate the probability of contract participation assigned to socio- economic characteristics in this study.

To address the second objective which is to assess the impact of contract participation on income propensity score matching will be was used. Baker (2000) gives the steps involved in applying propensity score matching. First the propensity score is estimated using a discrete choice model. To estimate the participation probability, Logit model with maximum likelihood method is often preferred due to the consistency of parameter estimation associated with the assumption that error term in the equation has a logistic distribution (Baker 2000, Ravallion 2001). Caliendo and Kopeinig (2005) also note that the Logit model which has more density mass in the bounds could be used to estimate the propensity score $p(X)$.

In the second step matching algorithm is selected based on the data at hand after undertaking matching quality test. Matching is a common technique used to select control subjects who are matched with the treated subjects on background covariates that the investigator believes need to be controlled. In this study nearest neighbor matching (NNM), radius matching (RM) and kernel based matching (KBM) methods were used. Basically, these methods numerically search for

"neighbours" that have a propensity score for non-treated individuals that is very close to the propensity score of treated individuals. NNM method is the most straight forward matching method. It involves finding, for each individual in the treatment sample, the observation in the non-participant sample that has the closest propensity score, as measured by the absolute difference in scores (Baker, 2000; Caliendo and Kopeinig 2005).

The KBM method is also a non-parametric matching method that uses the weighted average of the outcome variable for all individuals in the group of non-participants to construct the counterfactual outcome, giving more importance to those observations that provide a better match. This weighted average is then compared with the outcome for the group of participants. The difference between the two terms provides an estimate of the treatment effect for the treated case. Radius matching (RM) is a variant of caliper matching suggested by Dehejia and Wahba (2002). Applying caliper matching means that an individual from the comparison group is chosen as a matching partner for a treated individual that lies within the caliper ('propensity range') and is closest in terms of propensity score (Caliendo and Kopeinig 2005). The basic idea of RM as a variant of caliper matching is to use not only the nearest neighbour within each caliper but all of the comparison members within the caliper. A benefit of this approach is that it uses only as many comparison units as are available within the caliper and therefore allows for usage of extra (fewer) units when good matches are (not) available.

In the third stage overlap condition or common support condition is identified. The common support or the overlap condition is an important condition while applying PSM. The common support is the area where the balancing score has positive density for both treatment and comparison units. No matches can be made to estimate the average treatment effects on the ATT parameter when there is no overlap between the treatment and non-treatment groups. In the fourth stage the treatment effect is estimated based on the matching estimator selected on the common support region.

Finally, sensitivity analysis is undertaken to check the strength of the conditional independence assumption. Sensitivity analysis can also be undertaken to check if the influence of an unmeasured variable on the selection process is so strong to undermine the matching procedure

(Ali and Abdulai, 2010). The sensitivity analysis was done by applying the Rosenbaum bound sensitivity test (r-bounds test). In addition to these, a major objective of propensity score estimation is to balance the observed distribution of covariates across the groups of participants and non-participants. The balancing test is normally required after matching to ascertain whether the differences in the covariates in the two groups in the matched sample have been eliminated, in which case the matched comparison group can be considered as credible counterfactual (Caliendo and Kopeinig, 2008).

3.3 Estimating net revenues

Total revenues earned by farmers were estimated in this study by revenue from sale of full grown birds (which is equal to the total number of chicks kept by the farmer less the approximate number of chicks which died during the cycle multiplied by the selling price per bird) and revenue from sale of manure and empty feed bags. Costs incurred during the cycle were categorized in to production and transaction costs. Production costs were categorized in to; feed costs (broiler starter, broiler finisher and pellets), cost of vaccines and medication (new castle, gumboro, fowl typhoid, vitamin supplements, deworming drugs and any other medication that the farmer may have used), labor costs and other costs which includes electricity, charcoal, litter (wood shavings) , water and any other cost the farmer may have incurred. Labor costs were estimated from the number of hours put in to poultry production (including both family and hired labor). Labor costs were estimated from the number of hours spent on poultry production and included both family and hired labor converted into monetary terms using the wage rate applicable in the area. In addition, the transaction costs of production and marketing of poultry was included as a cost item. Transaction cost considered included phone call costs and transport cost incurred in search of markets as well as the costs negotiating and enforcing the contracts (i.e., following up on the terms of contract in cases of delayed or defaulted payment agreements). However in this study, most of the transaction costs incurred by the farmers were in search of markets and in enforcement of contracts. The net income value obtained therefore equals total revenue net of all production and transaction costs.

3.4 Data and sampling

To analyze the impact of contract farming on the income of small holder commercial poultry farmers, primary data was collected using pre tested questionnaires in Nakuru County. Nakuru County was chosen because it had smallholder contracted farmers. Primary data was collected from poultry farmers in Nakuru County stratified by participation in contract farming. The list of farmers and their location was obtained from the day old chick suppliers in Nakuru which include Kenchic, Muguku and Sigma. A list of the contracted farmers was also obtained from KPCC. Based on these lists the farmers were placed into various administrative divisions and six divisions with a considerable number of both contract and independent poultry farmers were purposively selected. The selected divisions were Bahati, Njoro, Dundori, Nakuru Municipality, Nakuru North and Elburgon. A complete list of all the villages in the divisions was then drawn and 39 villages randomly selected. Again, a complete list of poultry farmers in the 39 villages were drawn out of which a random sample of 180 households stratified by participation in contract production was randomly selected. Of the 180 households 111 are independent (non-contracted) growers and 69 were contracted farmers.

The survey was conducted on May 2011. However the data on production was for the period November 2010 to February 2011 and was based on the farmer's latest production cycle. Information collected included demographic characteristics of the household, land and asset endowments, access to infrastructure (roads, electricity, water, and telephone), information on revenue earned and cost incurred in poultry production, transaction costs and information on the household farm and nonfarm income. Information on the nature of contract was also collected from contracted farmers.

To obtain Information on the risk perception of the farmer a proxy for risk tolerance based on individual's response to hypothetical risky choices was applied, following Kimball *et.al* (2007). The questions were addressed as a hypothetical gamble. In particular, farmers were asked to choose between a crop/livestock with a certain lifetime income and a crop/livestock with uncertain but higher income. The uncertain income was made to change from a higher amount to a lower amount and the farmer's choice (depending on how much risk he/she was willing to take) based on the expected changes in income. After obtaining the farmers responses farmers'

risk attitude was categorized into risk-averse, risk neutral and risk-loving. This study unlike some studies on risk did not intend to go ahead and translate the ordinal responses to cardinal proxies of risk. The dependent variable in model estimated to examine the drivers of participation in poultry production contract is *Kims* which a dummy variable equal to 1 if a farmer is in a contract with Kims, 0 otherwise.

The independent variables were: Family Size = number of household members Experience = experience of the farmer in contract farming in years; Education = number of formal years of education of the farmer; Gender = dummy variable equal 1is farmer is male, 0 otherwise; Age Composition = number of household members aged 15 years and above; Occupation = Dummy for main occupation of the farmer: 1 if farming, 0 otherwise; Risk Altitude = farmer's risk perception: 0 if risk-loving, 1 if risk neutral, and 2 if risk-averse; Farm Size = size of the farm land in acres; Total Assets = Natural log of total asset value of the farm in Kenya Shillings; Brooder Capacity = full brooder capacity of the farm.(number of chicks that the farm's brooders can hold when completely full; Credit = Dummy equal 1 if the farmer received credit for poultry production, 0 otherwise; Group Membership = dummy equal 1 if farmer is a member of a farmers' association, 0 otherwise; Farm Income = natural log of household farm income during 2010; Non-farm Income = natural log of non-farm income earned by the household in 2010; Distance = distance to the main road in kilometers; Extension = Dummy equal 1 if farmer received technical advice during last cycle, 0 otherwise.

4.0 Results

4.1. Characteristics of Poultry Farmers in Nakuru County

Table 1 presents summary statistics for the key variables in the data collected. It shows the means of these variables and also the t-tests of differences in mean. As shown by the t- test of mean differences contract farmers have, on average, significantly higher levels of farm and non-farm incomes compared to the independent growers. They also have, on average, significantly shorter production cycles. The t tests also show that the contract farmers and independent farmers differ significantly with respect to distance to the main road, asset value and also the average weight of full grown birds.

Table1 Summary statistics of contracted and independent poultry farmers in Nakuru

Variable	Independent farmers (N=111)		Contract farmers (N=69)		P value
	Mean	std dev	Mean	std dev	
Distance to the main road	2.98	2.75	2.02	1.54	0.08*
Distance to town (Nakuru)	14.35	7.21	15.84	8.64	0.212
Distance to the vet clinic	5.16	2.35	4.62	3.33	0.207
Distance to the credit society	7.08	3.35	7.68	4.65	0.315
Distance to nearest animal feed	2.30	2.19	2.07	1.66	0.468
Distance to nearest processor	2.62	1.46	2.29	1.10	0.106
Household size	4.21	1.51	4.33	1.35	0.571
Farmers' age	46.69	10.45	46.83	9.44	0.918
Years of farmers' education	12.23	3.08	12.64	2.75	0.365
Land size in acres	1.11	1.00	1.27	1.18	0.349
Full brooder capacity	624.77	550.99	684.2	627.36	0.506
Natural log of total asset value	11.22	1.49	11.62	1.55	0.084*
Average weight per bird (Kg)	1.45	0.1	1.38	0.06	0.000***
No of birds kept by farmers	362.16	112.66	389.9	122.97	0.127
Natural log of farm income	3.56	5.51	5.21	6.08	0.05**
Natural log of non farm income	6.02	6.34	8.41	6.22	0.014**
Length of production cycle (week)	6.01	0.46	5.88	0.4	0.049
Number of feeders	14.45	7.46	15.51	5.89	0.319
Number of drinkers	12.14	6.8	12.91	5.35	0.426
Household member >15 years	3.56	1.48	3.58	1.54	0.896

4.2 Factors influencing farmers' participation in contract farming among the commercial poultry farmers

Table 2 presents the maximum likelihood estimates and the marginal effects from the Logit regression. Among all the exogenous variables considered, age, education, farm income, off-farm income, gender, distance to the main road, risk altitude and education significantly influenced the probability of participation in poultry contract farming at least at the 10 percent

15

level (Table 2). The model diagnostics indicate that it fits the data well (p value= 0.000). A good fit as measured by Hosmer and Lemeshow's test will yield a large p-value, therefore the Hosmer and Lemeshow's goodness-of-fit test also indicates that the model fits the data well since (P value=0.99).

Table 2 Logit regression results of factors affecting participation in production contract

	Maximum likelihood estimates			Marginal effects	
Variable	**Coefficient**	**S.E**	**p-value**	**Coefficient**	**p-value**
Distance to the main road	-0.229**	0.089	0.011	-0.049***	0.009
Education	-0.135*	0.079	0.088	-0.029*	0.082
Experience	-0.489	0.052	0.348	-0.010	0.346
Occupation	0.215	0.534	0.688	0.045	0.684
Gender	1.096***	0.428	0.010	0.221***	0.010
Age composition	-0.068	0.121	0.574	-0.014	0.575
Land size	-0.19	0.185	0.283	-0.042	0.290
Risk attitude	1.67***	0.377	0.000	0.355***	0.000
Credit	0.476	0.633	0.452	0.107	0.474
Extension	-1.056*	0.569	0.063	-0.190**	0.027
Asset value	0.071	0.15	0.636	0.015	0.632
Farm income	0.113***	0.04	0.005	0.024***	0.007
Non-farm income	0.135***	0.041	0.001	0.029***	0.001
CONS	-3.03	2.02	0.134		

*significant at 10% **significant at 5% and *** significant at 1%
Overall P-value = 0.000; Pseudo R^2 = 0.299; Hosmer-Lemeshow's test (p-value) =   0.9929

As expected, the risk attitude positively and significantly influenced the likelihood of participating in contract production at 1 percent level of significance. This means that risk-averse farmers are more likely to participate in contract farming than their counterparts. In theory contract farming is viewed as a means of hedging against risks. Hence risk-averse farmers will tend to participate in marketing arrangements that diversify (reduce) risks such as futures markets. The computed marginal effects indicate that farmers who have higher risk-rating also have higher likelihood of participating in contract farming.   Hence our finding is line with

theory. Indeed risk reduction is usually a major objective of contract farming (Martin, 1995).

Results also indicated that distance to the main road negatively influenced farmers' participation and was significant at the 5 percent level. This implies that the further away the farm is from the main road, the less likely the farmer will participate in contract production. A 10 percentage increase in the distance from the main road will reduce the probability of participating in contract farming by 0.5, other things constant. This finding is perhaps due to the fact that the contracting firm (KPCC) prefers to work with farmers who are near the main roads due to ease of reaching such farms.

The levels of farm and non-farm incomes also positively and significantly influence the decision to participate in poultry contract faming. A percentage increase in the farm income and also in non-farm incomes of a farmer will increase the likelihood of the farmer to participate in contract farming by 2 and 3 percent, respectively, other things constant. These findings suggest that farmer's financial endowment increases the probability of participating in contract farming. The finding that households with higher levels financial endowments are more likely to participate in contract farming than their counterparts suggests that contract farming can exclude poor farmers.

Results further indicate that gender of the respondent is also positively affects the likelihood of participation in contract production. In particular, the results show that male farmers have a higher probability of participating in contract farming than their female counterparts. The computed marginal effects indicate that for male farmers the probability of participating in contract farming is higher than for the female farmers by 0.22. The finding may be due to the disproportionate ownership of productive assets by males in general in Kenya.

Contrary to our expectation, households which received technical advice from extension agents were less likely to participate in contract farming. Results indicate that the probability of participating in contract farming for those farmers who have access to technical advice is lower by 0.19 compared to those farmers who have no access to these services. This finding suggests that farmers who obtain technical advice from government extension agents are likely to be more aware and informed of alternative marketing channels and also production methods.

The level of education of the farmer, however, has a negative effect on the farmer's likelihood to participate in contract farming but was significant at the 10 percent level. Results show that an increase in years of education by 1 year will reduce the likelihood to participate in contract farming by 0.14, other things constant. This is probably due to the fact that more educated farmers are more likely to seek information on other marketing channels in the region including hotels and rural assemblers.

4.2 Impact of contract farming on the net income per bird.

To assess the impact propensity score matching (PSM) was applied. The results of the initial step in PSM used in estimating the propensity scores (which employs a Logit regression) are shown in the Table 3.

**Table 3 Maximum likelihood estimates of the logit regression used in estimating the propensity scores**

Variable	Coefficient	Std Error	P-value
Distance to the main road	0.208**	0.09	0.021
Experience	-0.052	0.055	0.339
Education	-0.148*	0.089	0.096
Occupation	0.384	0.516	0.456
Gender	0.906**	0.415	0.029
Age composition	-0.072	0.13	0.581
Land size	-0.165	0.178	0.354
Risk attitude	1.65***	0.365	0.000
Credit	0.120	0.601	0.485
Extension	-0.968*	0.549	0.078
Capacity	0.001	0.001	0.795
Asset value	0.072	0.157	0.644
Farm income	0.114***	0.040	0.004
Nonfarm income	0.121***	0.38	0.001
CONS	-3.92***	1.135	0.001

*significant at 10% **significant at 5% and *** significant at 1%;
Pseudo $R^2 = 0.292$; P value $= 0.000$

The likelihood ratio test of goodness of fit indicates that the model fits the data well (p value =0.000). Furthermore results of the maximum likelihood estimation of the Logit show that distance of the farm to the main road, gender of the farmer, risk perception of the farmer, receiving advice from extension agent, farm income and non-farm income are significant factors in explaining the farmers' participation in contract farming. Hence individuals participating in contract farming differ significantly from the non-participants with respect to observable characteristics suggesting that there is self-selection. Therefore comparing the two groups as they are would have resulted in biased estimates and thus the need to correct for selection bias through the use of propensity score matching.

Propensity scores were estimated for all the 180 farmers including 111 independent growers (control) and 69 contracted farmers (treatment). Among participants, the predicted propensity score ranges from 0.0347 to 0.9311, with a mean of 0.5809. While the predicted propensity score ranges from 0.0068 to 0.8450, with a mean of 0.2543 among non-adopters. The density distribution of the propensity scores for participants and non-participants is shown in (Figure 1) below. The bottom half of each graph shows the propensity score distribution for the non-treated, while the upper-half refers to the treated individuals. The y-axis indicates the frequency of the propensity score distribution. Visual analysis of the density distribution of the propensity scores suggests that there is a high chance of getting good matches and large number of matched sample as the propensity score distribution is skewed to the left for participants and to the right for the non-participants.

Figure1: Propensity score histogram

The graph shows that no treated individuals were off support indicating that all the individuals that participated in contract farming (treated) found a suitable match among those who did not participate (control

Table 4 presents the results of the covariate balancing test to test the hypothesis that that both groups have the same distribution in covariates x after matching. It presents the covariates' means, their t-test of differences in means as well as the percentage bias before and after matching. For all the 13 covariates, the matched sample means are almost similar for both the treatment and the control which was not the case prior to matching

Table 4 Propensity Score and Covariate Balancing

Variable	Sample	Mean		% bias reduction		T test differences in means	
		Treated	untreated	% bias	|bias|	T stat	p- value
Pscore	Matched	0.5909	0.2543	145.5		9.42	**0.000**
	unmatched	0.5909	0.5685	9.7	93.4	0.61	0.540
Distance to the main road	Matched	2.0232	2.9856	-43.3		-2.66	**0.008**
	unmatched	2.0232	2.198	-7.9	81.8	-0.63	0.529
Education	Matched	12.638	12.225	14.1		0.91	0.365
	unmatched	12.638	12.937	-10.3	27.4	-0.64	0.525
Experience	Matched	5.7391	6.2973	-12.4		-0.81	0.421
	unmatched	5.7391	6.1638	-9.4	23.9	-0.57	0.572
Occupation	Matched	0.5507	0.6396	-18.1		-1.18	0.238
	unmatched	0.5507	0.5391	2.4	87.0	0.14	0.892
Gender	Matched	0.6957	0.5225	35.8		2.32	**0.022**
	unmatched	0.6957	0.7232	-5.7	84.1	-0.35	0.724
Age composition	Matched	3.6522	3.6216	2.0		0.13	0.896
	unmatched	3.6522	3.7406	-5.8	-189.4	-0.34	0.733
Land size	Matched	1.2652	1.1108	14.1		0.94	0.349
	unmatched	1.2652	1.3334	12.1	14.6	0.74	0.460
Brooder capacity	Matched	684.2	624.77	10.1		0.67	0.506
	unmatched	684.2	793.91	-18.6	-84.6	-1.00	0.321
Risk attitude	Matched	1.8261	1.1802	95.7		5.92	**0.000**
	unmatched	1.8261	1.8116	2.1	97.8	0.18	0.856
Credit	Matched	0.1594	0.1171	12.2		0.81	0.420
	unmatched	0.1594	0.1551	1.3	89.0	0.07	0.945
Extension	Matched	0.1015	0.2172	-29.4		-1.86	**0.065**
	unmatched	0.1015	0.1015	0.0	100.0	0.00	1.000
Asset value	Matched	11.623	11.217	26.6		1.74	**0.083**
	unmatched	11.623	11.449	11.4	57.2	0.67	0.506
Farm income	Matched	5.2842	3.5614	29.7		1.96	**0.051**
	unmatched	5.2842	5.0663	3.8	87.4	0.21	0.833
Non farm income	Matched	8.411	6.0179	38.1		2.48	**0.014**
	unmatched	8.411	7.6693	11.8	69.0	0.70	0.485
(Figures in bold shows significant covariates)							

Attainment of covariate balancing for this study is also indicated by the tests of differences in means shown in Table 5 below in the last column. Table 5 shows that with matching those covariates whose differences were statistically significant prior to matching have been balanced

such that after matching there are no longer statistically significant. These are those variables whose *p* values are in bold and they include distance to the main road, risk attitude, gender, farm income, non farm income, total asset value and extension, (all were balanced such after matching none was significantly different). Matching makes the covariates comparable by balancing them for the two groups and by doing this reduces the selection bias.

Table 5 Other Covariate Balances Indicators Before and After Matching

Test indicator	
Before matching	
Pseudo R^2	0.292
LR χ2 (P value)	69.93(0.000)
After matching using nearest neighbor matching (NNM)	
Pseudo R^2	0.028
LR χ2 (P value)	5.35(0.967)
After matching using kernel based matching (KBM)	
Pseudo R^2	0.04
LR χ2 (P value)	7.67(0.864)
After matching using radius matching (RM)	
Pseudo R^2	0.051
LR χ2 (P value)	9.74 (0.715)

Low pseudo-R2 and the insignificant likelihood ratio tests further support the hypothesis that both groups have the same distribution in covariates *x* after matching. These results clearly show that the matching procedure is able to balance the characteristics in the treated and the matched comparison groups. Therefore these results were used to evaluate the impact of contract farming on the bird's net income among groups of households having similar observed characteristics. Together, the results of these tests indicate absence of hidden bias which implies that the computed ATT estimates are valid given the sample.

The treatment effect (impact)

The impact of participating in contract farming on poultry income computed using the three matching algorithms namely, nearest neighbor matching (NNM), kernel based matching (KBM) and radius matching (RM) are shown below in Table 6. The outcome variable was the net income per bird (net of all production costs and transaction costs) in Kshs. The impact of participation is shown by the difference in ATT shown in bold in the table 6 below.

Table 6 Impact of participation in contract production of poultry

Matching algorithm	Sample	Treated	Control	Difference	T –stat
	unmatched	33.65	27.76	5.90	2.21
Nearest neighbour matching	ATT**	33.65	25.74	**7.91**	2.19
	ATU	27.76	32.90	5.14	
	ATE			6.20	
Kernel based matching	ATT**	33.65	26.87	**6.78**	2.04
	ATU	27.76	32.58	4.38	
	ATE			5.58	
Radius Matching	ATT**	33.65	26.73	**6.93**	2.19
	ATU	27.76	33.41	5.66	
	ATE			6.14	

*significant at10% **significant at 5% ***significant at 1%

The results indicate that, participating in contract farming has a positive and significant impact on the incomes of the farmers at the 5 percent level (Table 6). This is achieved through the increment in the net revenues from bird sale. The impact for these farmers is an increment in net revenue per bird of Kshs 7.91, Kshs 6.78 and Kshs 6.93 using NNM, KBM and RM matching algorithms respectively which are significant at 5 percent. It can therefore be concluded that the impact of participating in contract farming is an increment of net revenue per bird of

approximately 27 percent on average. This finding suggests that getting smallholder commercial poultry farmers to participate in contract farming can help improve their welfare through increasing the net revenues from these birds and thereof incomes.

Sensitivity analysis for hidden bias

The propensity score matching model applied above assumes that the differences between the participants and the non-participants is just because they differ in observable variables in the data set that is the conditional independence or the unconfoundedness assumption. However if the two comparison groups differ in unobservable characteristics the conclusion of the positive effect of participation in contract farming on the net income from birds may be questionable. The purpose of the sensitivity analysis is to ask whether inferences about participation effects may be altered by factors not observed in the data set (unobserved variables).

Since it is not possible to estimate the magnitude of selection bias while using PSM (non-experimental model) Aakvix (2001) suggests the use of Rosenbaum bounds (rbounds) test which tests the null hypothesis that there is no change on the treatment effect for different values of unobserved selection bias. This study therefore conducted the sensitivity analysis for the presence of hidden bias using the Rosenbaum bounds (rbounds test) in STATA 11. This sensitivity test shows how hidden biases might alter inferences about treatment effects but does not indicate whether biases are present or what magnitudes are plausible

The level of gamma is defined as the odds ratio of differential treatment assignment due to an unobserved covariate. Table 7 below shows the level of gamma for the three matching algorithms. Both the KBM and the RM approach reported a level of gamma of [2.15, 2.2] while the level of gamma in NNM is [2.3, 2.35]. In all the three matching algorithms the lowest gamma level is 2.15 and the highest level is 2.35. For a gamma level of 2.15 it implies that if individuals who have the same characteristics (χ vector) differs in their odds ratio of participation by a factor of 115 percent then the significance of the estimated participation effect on net income may be questionable

Table 7 Results of the sensitivity analysis for the hidden bias

Matching method	ATT	T statistic	Gamma (γ) level
Nearest neighbour	7.90	2.19	2.3-2.35
Kernel Based	6.78	2.04	2.15- 2.2
Radius Matching	6.93	2.19	2.15- 2.2

(The gamma level is reported at the point where 10% level on (sig +) is exceeded)

Generally, the gamma levels reported for sensitivity analysis compare favourably with those reported in other studies (e.g. Faltermeier and Abdulai, 2009, Ali and Abdulai, 2010). It can therefore be concluded that even large amounts of unobserved covariates would not alter the conclusion about the estimated effects and that the positive treatment effects reported in table 6 above can be attributed to participation in contract farming and not due to unobserved variables

5.0 Summary, conclusion and policy recommendation

This study examined the factors influencing farmers' participation in contract farming and evaluated the impact of contract farming on the net revenue from broiler production in Nakuru County of Kenya among the smallholder farmers. Comparison was made between two groups of farmers namely independent farmers and contracted farmers by an agribusiness firm called Kims Poultry Care Centre. A sample of 180 farmers selected using the multi-stage sampling procedures were interviewed using semi-structured questionnaires and the data analyzed in Stata.

The findings indicate that risk–averse farmers were more likely to participate in poultry contract farming. Farm and non-farm income also have positive influence on the likelihood of participating in contract farming while male farmers have a higher likelihood of participating in contract compared to the female farmers. The study further finds that distance of the farm from the main road as well as the farmer's level of education were found to negatively influence farmers' likelihood to participate in contract production. Farmers who receives advice from the extension agents are however less likely to participate in contract farming. Results of impact

assessment, as given by average treatment effect on the treated (ATT), show that participating in contract farming has a positive and a significant effect on the net revenue per bird. The increment in revenue was found to be approximately 27 percent of the net revenue that these farmers would have received if they had not participated in contract farming. Furthermore results from the sensitivity (rbounds) test of hidden bias showed that even large amounts of unobserved covariates would not alter the conclusion about the estimated effects and that the treatment effects estimated are purely as a result of participation in contract farming.

The study concludes that participation in contract production indeed improves the welfare of participating farmers. The implication of these findings is that contract farming can reduce rather than entrench rural poverty as some studies have suggested. Policies which will make it easier for smallholder farmers to participate in contract farming should be pursued. These include policies that target improvement of rural infrastructure especially roads. The finding that poor farmers are less likely to participate in farming due to risks involved calls for policies and strategies that target the inclusion of such farmers in contract production. One such strategy is to help such farmers form producer organizations that will allow then overcome financial barriers and idiosyncratic market failures.

6.0 References

Aakvix. A. 2001. Bounding a matching estimator; the case of a Norwegian training program.
    Working paper, University of Bergen

AIEI (African impact evaluation initiative). 2010. Impact evaluation methods
        http://go.worldbank.org/J35S3J8B60

Ali, A. and Abdulai, A. 2010. The adoption of genetically modified cotton and poverty
        reduction in Pakistan. *Journal of agricultural economics vol.61, No1,2010, 175-192.*

 Baker. J. 2000. Evaluating the Impact of Development Projects on Poverty A Handbook for
        Practitioners. The World Bank Washington, D.C.

Barbara, S. 2009. Propensity score matching. Institute for Fiscal Studies,
        UCL.http://www.esrc.ac.uk/

Barrett, B.C.2008. Smallholder participation: Concepts and evidence from Eastern and S. Africa.
        Food policy 33(4) pp 299-317.

Baumann, P. (2000). Equity and efficiency in contract farming schemes: The experience of agricultural tree crops. *Working Paper 139, ODI, London, UK*.

Becerril, J. and Abdulai, A. 2010. The impact of improved maize varieties on poverty in Mexico: A Propensity Score Matching Approach. World development Vol. 38, No.7 pp.1024-1035, 2010.

Caleindo, M. and Kopeinig, S. 2005. Some Practical Guidance for the Implementation of Propensity Score Matching. IZA Discussion Paper, no. 1588. Bonn, Germany: IZA.

Caliendo, M. and Kopeinig, S. 2008 . Some practical guidance for the implementation of propensity score matching. *Journal of Economic Surveys, Vol. 22, (2008),31–72*.

Covey, T. and Stennis, E. 1985. Analysis of the rough rice futures contract. Agricultural Economics Research Report 156, Mississippi State University, USA.

Dehejia, R.H. and Wahba, S. 2002 Propensity score matching methods for non-experimental causal studies. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 84(1): 151–161.

Eaton, C. and Shepherd, A.W. (2001). Contract farming: Partnership for Growth. *FAO Agricultural Services Bulletin 145, Rome, Italy.*

Faltermeier, L. and Abdulai, A. 2009. The impact of water conservation and intensification technologies ; Empirical evidence for rice farmers in Ghana', *Agricultural Economics, Vol. 40, (2009) pp. 365–379.*

Gulati, A., Birthal, P.S.and P.K. Joshi, 2005. Vertical Coordination in High Value Commodities: Implications for the Smallholders. Markets, Trade, and Institutions. Division Discussion. *Paper No. 85. Washington, D.C.: IFPRI*

Guo, H., Jolly, R.W. and Zhu, J. 2005. Contract Farming in China: Supply Chain or Ball and Chain? Paper presented at the 15th Annual World Food & Agribusiness Symposium, IAMA, Chicago.

Greene, W.H. (2003) *Econometric Analysis*. New York: New York University.

Heckman, J.J. (1979) Sample selection bias as a specification error. *Econometrica 47: 153-167*

Heckman, J., Lochner, L., Taber, C., 1998. Explaining rising wage inequality: explorations with a dynamic general equilibrium model of labor earnings with heterogeneous agents. *Review of Economic Dynamics* 1 (1), 1–58.

Heckman, J, Ichimura, H, and Todd P, 1997. Matching as an Econometric Evaluation Estimator: Eveidence from Evaluating a job training program, *Review of Economic studies* 64:4, 605-654

Keskin, E., Steglich, M., Dijkman, J. and Hall, A. 2008. Private Capacity and Public Failure: Contours of Livestock innovation Response Capacity in Kenya

Key, N., and Runsten, D. 1999. Contract Farming, Smallholders, and Rural Development in Latin America: The Organization of Agro processing Firms and the Scale of Outgrower Production. *World Development 27 (2): 381–401*

Kimball, S.M , Sahm, R.C and Shapiro, D. 2007. Imputing risk tolerance from survey responses. *National Bureau of Economic research.*

Leuven, E. and Sianesi, B. 2003. PSMATCH2: Stata module to perform full Mahalanobis and propensity score matching, common support graphing, and covariate imbalance testing.

Little, P. and Watts, M.1994. Living Under Contract: Contract Farming and Agrarian Transformation in Sub-Saharan Africa. Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press

Martinetz, S. 2005. Vertical coordination of marketing systems: Lessons learned from the poultry, egg and pork industries. United States Department of Agriculture. ERS Agricultural Economic Report No. 708.

Minot, N. 1986. Contract Farming and Its Effect on Small Farmers in Less Developed Countries. *Working Paper No. 31, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.*

Minot, N., & Roy, D. (2006). Impact of high-value agriculture and modern marketing channels on poverty: An analytical framework. Mimeo. Washington, DC: Markets, Trade, and Institutions Division, *International Food Policy Research Institute. April*.

Minot, N., Miyata, S and Dinghuan, H. 2007. Impact of contract farming on income. Linking small farmers, packers and supermarkets in China. IFPRI.

Narrod, C., Devesh, R., Okello, J.J., Avendano, B., Rich, K., and Thorat, A. 2009. Role of 17 public-private partnerships in ensuring smallholder participation in high valued fruit and vegetable supply chains. *Food Policy.* 34: 8-15

Nyaga, 2007; poultry sector country review, FAO

Okello, J.J and S.M. Swinton (2007) "Compliance with international food safety standards in Kenya's green bean industry: a paired case study of small and large family farms." *Review of Agricultural Economics*. 29:269-285.

Okello, J., Gitonga, Z., Mutune, J., Okello ,R..M., Afande, M. and Rich, M.K. 2010. Value chain analysis of the Kenyan poultry industry; The case of Kiambu, Kilifi, Vihiga and Nakuru Districts.

Pindyck, R.S, and Rubinfeld, D.C, 1981. Econometric models and Econometric factors 2nd
      edition McGraw/Hill book Co.New York

Ramaswani,.B, Singh,B. and Joshi, P.K 2006. Efficiency and distribution in contract farming; the
      case of Indian poultry growers. IFPRI.

Ravallion. M. 2001. "The Mystery of the Vanishing Benefits: An Introduction to Impact
      Evaluation." The World Bank Economic Review **15**(1): 115-140.

Rehber, E. 1998.Vertical integration in agriculture and contract farming. Department of
      Agricultural Economics, Uludag University, Turkey, Working Paper #46.

Republic of Kenya (RoK) (2005).District Strategic Plan 2005-2010 for implementation of
      National Population Policy for sustainable Development.

Rosenbaum, P.R. and Rubin, D.B. 1983. The Central Role of the Propensity Score in
      Observational Studies for Causal effects, *Biometrika*, Vol.70, No.1, pp. 41–55.

Simmons, P., P. Winters, and I. Patrick. 2005. "An Analysis of Contract Farming in East Java,
      Bali, and Lombok, Indonesia." *Agricultural Economics* 33 (2005).

Singh, S. 2002. Contracting Out Solutions: Political Economy of Contract Farming in the Indian
      Punjab. World Development 30 (9): 1621–1638.

Strohm, K. and Hoeffler. H. 2006. Contract farming in Kenya: Theory, evidence from selected
      value chains & implications for Development Cooperation.

Warning, M., and Key, N. 2002. The Social Performance and Distributional Consequences of
      Contract Farming: An Equilibrium Analysis of the Arachide de Bouche Program in
      Senegal. *World Development 30 (2): 255–263.*