

Ghana - Commercial Training 2008-2011

The Institute for Statistical, Social and Economic Research (ISSER)

Report generated on: November 3, 2020

Visit our data catalog at: <https://microdata.fao.org/index.php>

Overview

Identification

ID NUMBER

GHA_2008_CT_v01_EN_M_v01_A_OCS

Overview

ABSTRACT

The evaluation had the primary objective of measuring the impact of the FBO training program on farmers' farm productivity and crop income. It was based on a randomized phase-in approach, taking advantage of the fact that not all FBOs that were to be part of the program could be trained at the same time, and so implicit in the program design itself was some degree of phasing. At the core of the impact evaluation was a difference-in-difference approach designed to measure the difference in agricultural output between the treatment group (a collection of FBO members who received commercial trainings in 2008 and 2009) and the control group (a collection of FBO members who received commercial trainings a year later). The Farmer-Based Organization (FBO) Survey series is a collection of data designed to evaluate the impact of these trainings on farmers in Ghana. To aid the survey and enable the implementation of the difference-in-difference approach, the FBOs were divided into two batches and each farmer was to be interviewed twice: once at baseline and again after one year. Batch 1 treatment and control farmers were surveyed in November-December 2008 and again in February-April 2010. Batch 2 treatment and control farmers were surveyed in February-April 2010 and again in November 2010-January 2011. In total, approximately 6,000 farmers -- 3,000 in the treatment group and 3,000 in control group -- were surveyed.

KIND OF DATA

Sample survey data [ssd]

UNITS OF ANALYSIS

Households

Scope

NOTES

- Household members
- General education
- Health
- Activity and occupation
- Migration
- Transfers
- Information seeking
- Savings, credit & assets
- Housing characteristics
- Agriculture
- Non-farm enterprises

TOPICS

Topic	Vocabulary	URI
Agriculture & Rural Development	FAO	
Access to Finance	FAO	
Migration & Remittances	FAO	

KEYWORDS

Randomized Roll-out, Farmer Training, Impact evaluation

Coverage

GEOGRAPHIC COVERAGE

Regional

Producers and Sponsors

PRIMARY INVESTIGATOR(S)

Name	Affiliation
The Institute for Statistical, Social and Economic Research (ISSER)	

FUNDING

Name	Abbreviation	Role
Millennium Challenge Corporation	MCC	Funded the study

Metadata Production

METADATA PRODUCED BY

Name	Abbreviation	Affiliation	Role
Office of Chief Statistician	OCS	Food and Agriculture Organization	Adoption of metadata for FAM
Millennium Challenge Corporation	MCC		Metadata entry

DDI DOCUMENT VERSION

GHA_2008_CT_v01_EN_M_v01_A_OCS_v01

DDI DOCUMENT ID

DDI_GHA_2008_CT_v01_EN_M_v01_A_OCS_FAO

Sampling

Sampling Procedure

The Farmer-Based Organization (FBO) Survey covered farmers in three (3) Millennium Development Authority (MiDA) operational zones and the sample was selected in two (2) stages. In the first stage, FBOs were selected within each zone. MiDA made 600 FBOs available to the survey group, all of which were used in the sample. FBOs were randomly assigned to either receive the early trainings (Batch I) or the late trainings (Batch II). In the second stage, five (5) farmers were selected from each of the 600 FBOs. Each batch contained approximately 3,000 farmers and 6,000 farmers in all were interviewed.

Deviations from Sample Design

Researchers noted that there seemed to have been some level of contamination of the control group -- a problem that the farmers in the southern zone raised. There were two sources of this contamination. One was from the control farmers attending training sessions meant for the treatment group. The other source was engendered by the situation where farmers who got the training went around to their colleagues in the control group (who may have been part of some "original" groupings) and taught them what they had learned. Whereas the first was an implementation challenge, researchers noted, the second reflects positive spill overs of the training.

Response Rate

Approximately 82 percent

Weighting

Refer to study dataset.

Questionnaires

No content available

Data Collection

Data Collection Dates

Start	End	Cycle
2008-11-01	2008-12-30	Batch I (Round 1)
2010-02-01	2010-04-30	Batch I (Round 2)
2010-02-01	2010-04-30	Batch II (Round 1)
2010-11-01	2011-01-31	Batch II (Round 2)

Data Collection Mode

Face-to-face paper [f2f]

Data Processing

No content available

Data Appraisal

No content available