INTERNATIONAL FOOD
POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE
sustainable solutions for ending hunger and poverty
Supported by the CGIAR

IFPRI Discussion Paper 01328

February 2014

Improved Dairy Cows in Uganda

Pathways to Poverty Alleviation and Improved Child Nutrition

Nassul Kabunga

Development Strategy and Governance Division

INTERNATIONAL FOOD POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE

The International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), established in 1975, provides evidence-based policy solutions to sustainably end hunger and malnutrition and reduce poverty. The Institute conducts research, communicates results, optimizes partnerships, and builds capacity to ensure sustainable food production, promote healthy food systems, improve markets and trade, transform agriculture, build resilience, and strengthen institutions and governance. Gender is considered in all of the Institute's work. IFPRI collaborates with partners around the world, including development implementers, public institutions, the private sector, and farmers' organizations, to ensure that local, national, regional, and global food policies are based on evidence. IFPRI is a member of the CGIAR Consortium.

AUTHOR

Nassul Kabunga (N.Kabunga@cgiar.org) is an associate research fellow in the Development Strategy and Governance Division of the International Food Policy Research Institute, Kampala, Uganda.

Notices

IFPRI Discussion Papers contain preliminary material and research results and are circulated in order to stimulate discussion and critical comment. They have not been subject to a formal external review via IFPRI's Publications Review Committee. Any opinions expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the policies or opinions of IFPRI.

Copyright 2014 International Food Policy Research Institute. All rights reserved. Sections of this material may be reproduced for personal and not-for-profit use without the express written permission of but with acknowledgment to IFPRI. To reproduce the material contained herein for profit or commercial use requires express written permission. To obtain permission, contact the Communications Division at ifpri-copyright@cgiar.org.

Contents

Abstract	v
Acknowledgments	vi
1. Introduction	1
2. Background on Improved Dairy Cow Systems in Uganda	3
3. Data and Methodology	5
4. Results and Discussion	9
5. Conclusions	26
References	28

Tables

4.1 Number of sampled households surveyed and their adoption categories by region	9
4.2 Summary statistics for outcome indicators	10
4.3 Summary statistics: Farm and household characteristics	11
4.4 Differences in mean enterprise-level indicators for adopters and nonadopters	12
4.5 Differences in mean household-level welfare indicators for adopters and nonadopters	13
4.6 Differences in mean individual-level nutrition indicators for children younger than age five in adopter and nonadopter households	13
4.7 Differences in household characteristics of adopters and nonadopters	14
4.8 Probit estimation of the propensity score	16
4.9 Covariate balance tests	18
4.10 Propensity score matching quality indicators before and after matching	19
4.11 Nearest neighbor matching: Average treatment effects and results of sensitivity analysis	21
4.12 Kernel-based matching: Average treatment effects and results of sensitivity analysis	22
4.13 Heterogeneous effects by scale: Enterprise level	23
4.14 Heterogeneous effects by scale: Food and nonfood expenditures	24
4.15 Heterogeneous effects by scale: poverty and nutrition	24

Figures

4.1 Propensity score distribution and common support: Impact of improved dairy cows on milk yield	17
4.2 Propensity score distribution and common support: Impact of improved dairy cows on HAZ	17

ABSTRACT

There is limited empirical evidence on the linkages between agrotechnologies, poverty reduction and the pathways to better nutrition outcomes. The introduction and dissemination of improved dairy cow breeds in Uganda is arguably the most significant step taken to develop a modern and commercial dairy industry in the country over the last two decades. This study uses a nationally representative sample of Ugandan households to rigorously examine the impact of adoption of improved dairy cow breeds on enterprise-, household-, and individual child-level nutrition outcomes. We find that adopting improved dairy cows significantly increases milk productivity, milk commercialization, and food expenditure. Consequently, adoption substantially reduces household poverty and stunting for children younger than age five. These results are consistent with the perceived role of new agrotechnologies. Considering heterogeneity in farm size, we find that households with small farms will increase milk yield and food expenditure while also reducing poverty substantially due to adoption, and large farms increase not only own-milk consumption and commercialization but also nutrition outcomes of children younger than age five. This suggests that the nutritional benefits of adoption may not sufficiently help reduce child malnutrition for young children living on small farms. We argue that for holistic and sustainable improvements in broader welfare and nutrition outcomes, agricultural development programs should be accompanied with related programs on gender empowerment, nutrition education, and food safety and hygiene.

Keywords: technology adoption, productivity, child nutrition, poverty reduction, impact assessment, propensity score matching, Uganda

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study is supported by the Nutrition Innovation Laboratory Africa, a flagship collaboration managed by the School of Nutrition Science and Policy at Tufts University, and funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). This financial and technical support is acknowledged. The technical and editorial contributions of Todd Benson and the editorial assistance of Lucy Billings are appreciated. All remaining errors are my own.

1. INTRODUCTION

Income poverty, hunger, and malnutrition are challenges that dominate today's global development agenda. Agriculture, long viewed as a principal sector with potential to bring about desired developmental transformations, is once again under the lens. The question of interest is how to leverage agriculture to maximize reductions in malnutrition, particularly for women of child-bearing age and young children (Herforth 2012; IFPRI 2012). Food-based strategies that seek to increase the production and consumption of foods rich in specific micronutrients are believed to be more sustainable and culturally acceptable than supplementation or fortification (Ruel 2001).

The adoption and ownership of improved dairy cows by poor households in developing countries can potentially leverage pathways to poverty and hunger alleviation as well as reduce the prevalence of malnutrition in several ways. First, at the farm level, adoption of improved dairy cows could potentially improve dairy productivity, which translates into higher production per unit area or per cow. Increased milk production will stimulate rural milk markets and the integration of smallholders into improved value chains, thus improving producer incomes, which in turn can be used to purchase other foods to satisfy household nutritional needs (Staal, Delgado, and Nicholson 1997).

Second, milk consumption by the poor in developing countries is heavily constrained by insufficient supply and, consequently, high cost. In addition, other cultural factors may constrain consumption—for instance, intrahousehold food allocation patterns, may limit milk intake of the most vulnerable groups such as women and children (Gittelsohn and Vastine 2003). While food access issues at the household (or even community) level can generally be addressed through educational and awareness interventions, the sustainable solution to low milk availability and high cost lies in improving dairy productivity at the farm level. When consumed, milk is a good source of animal-based proteins, vitamins, and other micronutrients (such as calcium and zinc) to complement plant-based foods in local diets with significantly lower micronutrient bioavailability. Consequently, the consumption of even small amounts of milk can contribute significantly to improved dietary outcomes, especially for women and children (Henriksen et al. 2000; Black et al. 2002; Wiley 2009). Finally, beyond nutrition and income roles, livestock serves as a buffer resource for farmers to use in responding to emergencies, such as crop failure, as well as acts as a live bank, facilitating both income distribution and savings.

Relatively little evidence exists on the effectiveness of the adoption of improved agricultural technologies on improving the welfare of rural smallholder farmers in African countries south of the Sahara. Even less is known about the welfare effects of technology adoption in smallholder livestock systems compared with smallholder crop systems, including the adoption of improved dairy cow breeds. A few studies have documented the introduction of crossbred cows, complementary feeding of dairy animals, and good animal-health practices and have linked those practices to how poor farmers perceive the benefits (Nicholson, Thornton, and Muinga 2004; Dobson 2005). However, the effects of some or all of these interventions on household welfare and, more specifically, on nutrition outcomes are not known in a robust way. Understanding whether and how improved livestock systems improve household welfare and nutrition is essential for informed policymaking.

In this study, we contribute to the relatively limited literature on the impact of the adoption of improved agricultural technologies in developing countries. We specifically analyze the impact of adoption of improved dairy cows on household welfare in Uganda. Dairy production in Uganda is an interesting study. In the national context, the dairy sector is viewed not only as a potential source of much-needed micronutrients, especially for rural households, but also as the means through which smallholder farmers can participate in high-value domestic markets. At the regional level, dairy is becoming an important export product, although not yet at a large scale. Milk production has markedly increased during the past decade due to the introduction of improved dairy cow breeds and strengthening dairy-marketing channels. These developments have possibly improved the welfare of both consumers and producers.

Our core interest is to examine whether adoption of improved dairy cow breeds translates into better nutrition outcomes for children younger than age five who live in adopting households, by drawing pathway linkages between milk production, consumption, marketing, household expenditure, poverty, and ultimately nutrition outcomes. We do this by first separating households with improved dairy breeds from those with local (unimproved) breeds and then controlling for multiple confounding factors. Then we examine the effects of improved cow breeds on per-cow productivity (annual milk yield), the household's orientation to milk markets, and individual milk consumption. We then test whether the adoption of improved dairy cows translates into improved household expenditure on food and nonfood items, food availability, and broader alleviation of poverty. On nutrition outcomes, we sieve out households with children younger than age five and analyze the impact of improved dairy cows on the linear growth of these children.

Our analysis builds on a nationally representative data sample of 907 households with 715 children younger than age 5. The data include not only agricultural and household variables but also variables on livestock husbandry, household expenditure on food and nonfood items, and nutritional anthropometry indicators for children younger than age five.

To estimate the net effect of improved dairy cow adoption on these outcomes, we need to first isolate it from other confounding factors that potentially may have a simultaneous effect on the outcomes of interest, based on the assumption that improved dairy cow adoption behavior is not random. Failure to sufficiently correct for this self-selection to technology adoption could bias our results, a deficiency observed in existing studies (for a synopsis see Webb 2013). Our analysis employs a propensity score matching (PSM) approach that selects, matches, and compares dairy-producing households (or individuals) with and without improved dairy cow breeds with similar characteristics. Because technology adoption may have a differential impact on adopting households, we also assess heterogeneous impacts of adoption by scale, defined by herd size and land area. In so doing, we develop empirical evidence of how the adoption of improved dairy cattle contributes to improved welfare and nutritional status. Such evidence of what works to reduce poverty is increasingly demanded by governments and donors.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 gives a brief background on improved dairy cow systems in Uganda. Section 3 describes the data sources and the empirical strategies to isolate the impact of improved dairy cow adoption. Section 4 presents the results and discussion, and conclusions and policy recommendations are summarized in Section 5.

2. BACKGROUND ON IMPROVED DAIRY COW SYSTEMS IN UGANDA

The Livestock Sector in Uganda

The agricultural sector in Uganda employs 66 percent of the Ugandan population and is key to poverty reduction (Ssewanyana and Okidi 2007). The livestock census of 2008 reports the total cattle herd in Uganda to be in excess of 11 million, with 25 percent of all households owning cattle (MAAIF 2010). The livestock sector continues to grow annually at 3 percent, with dairy production contributing about half of the total livestock gross domestic product, which in turn contributes to nearly 20 percent of the total agricultural gross domestic product (BoU and PMA 2009 as cited in Mbowa, Shinyekwa, and Lwanga 2012). Dairy cows contribute to household food, are a major source of animal-based protein and minerals for the entire household, and are a dependable and stable source of cash income through the sale of mainly fluid milk and also milk byproducts to a very limited scale. Dairy cows also provide farmyard manure that is essential in the low-input smallholder integrated farming systems typical of East Africa. Moreover, dairy cows are considered some of the most important assets for Ugandan households (BoU and PMA 2009) with potential for high asset-to-cash convertibility. Dairy production is identified as a priority sector for promotion to meet local and regional milk export market demands, owing to the favorable soil and climatic conditions in most parts of Uganda (Elepu 2008; Wong and Kibirige 2009).

Dairy Production Systems, Markets, and Technology Adoption

The majority of dairy production in Uganda takes place on small mixed farms, with a significant share of this production done through intensive *zero-grazing units*, in which cows are kept in stalls and fed in-house with cut grass and a very limited amount of grain, with little or no grazing. A substantial number of zero-grazing units of one to three dairy cows are managed by women, who often have constraints to land access. A small share of milk is produced on commercial farms with relatively large herds of exotic dairy cows (Wong and Kibirige 2009). From a regional perspective, most dairy production activities take place in Western Uganda. Central Uganda, where Kampala City is located, provides the biggest market for raw liquid milk in the country. Dairy marketing remains largely informal, with nearly 80 percent of all milk sold as unprocessed fluid milk (Dobson 2005; Wong and Kibirige 2009). However, the formal dairy industry has substantially grown, especially in response to the demand of urban, educated consumers for hygienic and high-quality products.

Changes in consumer preferences notwithstanding, the growing dairy sector has major implications for income growth, poverty reduction, and nutrition outcomes for dairy-producing households, as well as for actors along the value chain. Over the last two decades, Uganda's dairy sector has steadily transformed from a solely government-controlled system to a more competitive industry with private actors as major players. The Dairy Development Authority, a government agency, regulates the industry and works to increase production and consumption of milk for economic development and improved nutrition. The Dairy Development Authority has created an enabling business environment that has spurred increased milk production (Kjær et al. 2012). Among private actors, milk traders and processors are the most significant agents. However, farmer groups and international nongovernmental organizations such as Send a Cow, Heifer International, and Land O'Lakes, in particular, have been active in the supply of essential inputs, crossbreeding, extension services, and enhancing efforts for improved dairy technology adoption (Mbowa, Shinyekwa, and Lwanga 2012).

Among all these efforts, the introduction and dissemination of exotic dairy breeds—particularly Holstein-Friesian, Guernsey, Jersey, and Ayrshire—and crossbreeds to increase milk production is regarded as the most significant step to develop a modern and commercial dairy industry in Uganda (Garcia et al. 2008). Reforms in the dairy sector that encouraged and expanded trade in milk are credited for a generic growth in the number of milk-producing households. With increased milk trade, households undertook to improve herd productivity by adopting improved dairy cattle breeds. Nongovernmental organizations have been instrumental in restocking and improving dairy cow productivity through

numerous donor-funded smallholder support programs. The targeting of specific groups, such as women, for adoption of improved dairy animals, as done by Send a Cow, Heifer International, and also National Agricultural Advisory Services—an ongoing government initiative for agricultural extension and technology development—has potentially improved household welfare, particularly for children in those households. Research has shown that the returns to technology adoption in terms of household welfare are higher if women have a substantial control of household resources, including new technologies introduced.

Indications for Impact

The hypothesis of this study is that the reforms in the dairy sector have provided general significant economic benefits and, more importantly, reduced poverty and malnutrition in Uganda. In spite of the higher initial investment costs for dairy cow systems, the higher milk yields obtained ensure increased on-farm per capita milk availability and consumption, increased surpluses of milk that can be marketed, and lower average milk prices for buying households. This postulation is not unusual. Observations in Uganda have shown substantial transformations in livestock husbandry practices, with dairy farms shifting away from free-range to paddocking, accompanied by reduced herd sizes of improved breeds (Dobson 2005; Mbowa, Shinyekwa, and Lwanga 2012). Raw milk production has shown growth since 2000, and the share of exotic crossbreeds to local cattle has increased by 7 percent between 2005 and 2009, with a remarkable 20 percent more households taking on dairy farming as a commercial venture between 2005 and 2009 (Mbowa, Shinyekwa, and Lwanga 2012). These increases in milk production seem to be the result of more farmers adopting high-yielding cow breeds than of increased herd sizes (Mbowa, Shinyekwa, and Lwanga 2012). This study investigates the impact of dairy cow adoption on milk productivity in terms of milk yield per cow after accounting for potential confounding factors.

Further, per capita milk consumption has grown from an average of about 28 liters per year in early 2000 to about 58 liters per year in 2010 (Dobson 2005; Mbowa, Shinyekwa, and Lwanga 2012). Although this is still much lower than the international recommended milk consumption level of 200 liters per capita per year, it is higher than the average in countries in Africa south of the Sahara, which is estimated at 30 liters per year (Gerosa and Skoet 2012). Higher milk production and improved consumer incomes among some sections of the population are considered as some of the major reasons for increased milk consumption (Dobson 2005; Gerosa and Skoet 2012). These potentially cause significant changes in the nutritional status of consuming households and in the income level of milk-producing households.

3. DATA AND METHODOLOGY

Data

To estimate the household- and individual-level impacts of improved dairy cow adoption, we use the Uganda National Panel Survey (UNPS) 2009/2010. This dataset was compiled by the Uganda Bureau of Statistics as part of a nationally representative household survey. The 2009/2010 round is the first wave of a panel of annual household surveys initiated by the Uganda Bureau of Statistics and its partners to track changes in the sampled households and individuals over time. The 2009/2010 round comprises 2,975 households that were selected from the sample of households surveyed in the 2005/2006 round of the Uganda National Household Surveys (UBoS, 2007).

A two-stage, stratified, random-sampling design was followed to generate the UNPS sample. In the first stage, enumeration areas were randomly selected from the four geographical regions based on probability proportional to size, except for Kampala, where all enumeration areas in the 2005/2006 Uganda National Household Surveys were selected for the 2009/2010 survey. Regional stratification is of interest in this study, as the Western region of Uganda represents the milk surplus region, while the Central region represents the biggest market for milk produced in the country (Mbowa, Shinyekwa, and Lwanga 2012). In the second stage of the sample selection for the 2009/2010 UNPS, 10 households that had been randomly selected in the 2005/2006 Uganda National Household Surveys were re-interviewed, except in cases where the respondent could not be traced. For the analysis here, the sample was further reduced to the 907 agricultural households in the sample that reported owning dairy cows, as these households are the principal focus of analysis in

The UNPS 2009/2010 was conducted between September 2009 and August 2010. The enumerators made two visits six months apart to all agricultural households in the sample to better capture agricultural outcomes associated with two major cropping seasons in Uganda. The survey questionnaire captured data on household demographics, assets, income, and expenditure, among others. The questionnaire also included an agricultural module that provided data on livestock production activities among other enterprises in which the household was involved. In the livestock section, we were able to isolate households that reared dairy cows as a focus of analysis for this paper. Moreover, the questionnaire required respondents to categorize different livestock owned as either local, crossbreeds, or exotic. Thus, we are able to categorize “improved dairy cow adopters” (referred to as *adopters*) as those households that mentioned owning at least one crossbred or exotic dairy cow; and households that reared only local indigenous dairy cows as *nonadopters*. The UNPS 2009/2010 also captured data on child anthropometry to derive linear growth. Height (in centimeters) and weight (in kilograms) measures of eligible children ages 0–59 months living in sampled households were obtained. We have observations on the height and weight of 745 children for analysis among the households in the UNPS sample that reared dairy cows.

Empirical Strategies

Our major objective is to estimate the impact of improved dairy cow adoption, measured by the average treatment effect on the treated (ATT), on several outcomes of interest. ATT computes the average difference in outcomes of adopters with and without a technology:

$$ATT = E(y_{1i} - y_{0i} | D_i = 1) = E(y_{1i} | D_i = 1) - E(y_{0i} | D_i = 1) \quad (1)$$

where $E(\cdot)$ denotes an expectation operator, y_{1i} is an outcome of interest for a household or an individual living in household with improved dairy cows (adopter), y_{0i} is the outcome of the same household or individual living in the same household without improved dairy cows (nonadopter), and D_i is a treatment indicator equal to 1 (adopter) if the household adopted improved dairy cows and 0 (nonadopter) otherwise. Since we cannot observe how the outcome levels would behave without adoption, the

fundamental problem we face is that of missing data on the counterfactual, that is, the outcome of adopters had they not adopted: $(y_{1i}|D_i = 0)$. Thus, with observational data, one may be inclined to simply compare outcomes between adopters and nonadopters. Yet, due to nonrandom self-selection into adoption or nonadoption, such an analysis may result in biased estimates.

The two potential sources of bias are, first, adopters may differ from nonadopters with respect to observed characteristics, such as education, age, landholding, and wealth; and second, adopters may differ with respect to unobserved characteristics, such as motivation, managerial skills, and risk preference, which may play an important role in technology adoption (Feder, Just, and Zilberman 1985; Sunding and Zilberman 2001; Bandiera and Rasul 2006; Matuschke and Qaim 2009; Foster and Rosenzweig 2010) as well as in heterogeneous information exposure to technology (Kabunga, Dubois, and Qaim 2012).

We use PSM, introduced by Rosenbaum and Rubin (1983), to control for observed characteristics. The idea of PSM is to construct a suitable control group with nonadopter individuals that are similar to improved dairy cow adopters in all relevant observed characteristics (Caliendo and Kopeinig 2008). Empirically, we modeled the impact of improved dairy cow adoption using PSM in two stages. In the first stage, we generated propensity scores $p(x_i)$ from a probit model, which simply indicate the probability of a household to adopt improved dairy cows given observed characteristics, x_i :

$$\Pr(D_i = 1|x_i) \equiv p(x_i) \quad (2)$$

We then constructed a control group by matching the adopters to nonadopters according to their propensity score. Adopters without an appropriate match from the nonadopter category (and vice versa) were dropped from further analysis.

In the second stage, we calculated the ATT of improved dairy cow adoption on outcome variables of interest, y_i , using matched observations of adopters and nonadopters as follows:

$$ATT^{psm} = E[y_{1i}|D_i = 1, p(x_i)] - E[y_{0i}|D_i = 0, p(x_i)] \quad (3)$$

where ATT^{psm} measures the mean difference of adopters matched with nonadopters who are balanced on their propensity scores and lie within the region of common support. It is important that the assumption of common support, which requires substantial overlap in covariates between adopters and nonadopters, is satisfied, so that households being compared have a common probability of both being adopter and nonadopter.

Several methods are proposed in the literature to match similar adopters and nonadopters (Caliendo and Kopeinig 2008). The most commonly used approaches are the nearest neighbor matching (NNM) and kernel-based matching (KBM) methods. NNM consists of matching each adopter with a nonadopter that has the closest propensity score. It is usually applied with replacement in the control units. The second step is to compute the differences of each pair of matched units, and finally the ATT is obtained as the average of all these differences. In KBM, all adopters are matched with a weighted average of all nonadopters, using weights that are inversely proportional to the distance between the propensity scores of adopters and nonadopters.

Furthermore, given that the analysis conditions not on all covariates but on the propensity score, the matching procedure needs to be checked for balance with the distribution of the relevant variables in the adopter and nonadopter categories. The basic idea is to compare the situation before and after matching and then check for any remaining differences after conditioning on the propensity score (Caliendo and Kopeinig 2008). Re-estimating the propensity score on the matched sample, on only adopters and matched nonadopters, and then comparing the pseudo- R^2 s before and after matching are recommended to check covariate balancing (Sianesi 2004). The pseudo- R^2 , which indicates how well the covariates x_i explain the adoption probability, should be fairly low after matching, since no systematic differences should appear in the distribution of covariates between both groups.

While PSM cannot control for bias due to unobservables, we test the robustness of the impact results by using different matching algorithms. Moreover, we test whether unobservables might affect our estimated results using the bounding sensitivity tests (Rosenbaum 2002).

Derivation of Outcome Indicators

Our analysis considers a broad set of outcome variables that are not only farm-household relevant but also individual specific in order to understand the impact of improved dairy cow adoption from a broader perspective.

Milk Yield and Commercialization

We use annual milk yield per cow to assess the impact on productivity and the share of milk sold to capture the effects on commercialization of production. Annual milk yield is estimated as the total milk produced in a year divided by the number of cows owned. The share of milk sold is calculated as the ratio of the quantity of milk sales to total production expressed as a percentage.

Milk Consumption and Number of Meals

We use per capita annual milk consumption to measure the impact that dairy cows have on the nutritional security of households. Milk consumption as applied here refers only to own-produced milk that is consumed by a producing household and is calculated as the annual volume of milk reported consumed, divided by the number of resident household members. As a measure of gross household food security, we use the average reported number of meals consumed daily per household.

Income and Poverty Indicators

As our outcome measure for income, we use per capita monthly expenditures on food and nonfood items. We follow the same approach as Ssewanyana and Kasirye (2007) to aggregate household expenditures item by item. Given the different recall periods used in the survey to collect household expenditure data, conversion factors are applied to generate an indicator of household consumption on the basis of a 30-day month. Note that home-produced food consumption is valued at local market prices for those food items.

For poverty indicators, we employ per capita expenditure (PCE) in our analysis rather than household income.¹ The PCE was calculated by aggregating different subcomponents of expenditures but excluding nonconsumption expenditure (Ssewanyana and Kasirye 2012). This aggregation of expenditure was normalized on an adult equivalent basis by taking into account the demographic profile of each sample household² (Appleton 2001). Using the national consumer price index, we accounted for intertemporal variations by converting all monetary values into 2005/2006 prices. Thereafter, per adult equivalent consumption expenditure (expressed in 2005/2006 prices) was compared to the poverty lines following a cost of basic needs approach (Ravallion and Bidani 1994).

We follow the standard Foster-Greer-Thorbecke poverty indexes that incorporate the three most common poverty measures—poverty headcount (P_0), poverty gap (P_1), and squared poverty gap (P_2) (Foster, Greer, and Thorbecke 1984), specified as

$$P_\alpha = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^m \left[\frac{z - y_i}{z} \right]^\alpha \quad (4)$$

¹ *Per capita expenditure* reflects effective consumption of households and thus provides information on the food security status of households. The degree of measurement error is lower for consumption expenditure than income, especially in developing countries.

² The adult male aged 18–30 years is used as the reference person for the calculation of per adult equivalents.

where N is the number of people in the sample, z is the poverty line, y_i is PCE for the i th person, and α is the poverty aversion parameter. When $\alpha = 0$, P_α is simply the headcount index (P_0), or the proportion of households that are poor. When $\alpha = 1$, P_α is the poverty gap index (P_1), a measure of the depth of poverty defined by the mean distance to the poverty line, where the mean is formed over the entire population with the nonpoor counted as having a zero poverty gap. When $\alpha = 2$, P_α is a measure of severity of poverty (P_2) and reflects the degree of inequality among the poor.

The poverty line (z in Equation 4) in Uganda was developed in Appleton (1999) and follows the cost of basic needs approach. The poverty line consists of a food and a nonfood component. The food poverty line—termed as the *lower bound* poverty by Ravallion (1998)—is constructed from the Ugandan food basket, comprising the most frequently consumed food items by households with less than median income. On the other hand, the nonfood poverty line—termed the *upper bound*—is constructed by estimating the nonfood expenditure of households whose total expenditure is greater than the poverty line. In all estimations, variations in prices of nonfood items are allowed. For this reason, Uganda has nine poverty lines, depending on whether a household is located in a rural or an urban setting, plus regional variations (Levine 2012). In our estimations, we use the different poverty lines to estimate the respective poverty indexes noted above, as appropriate.

Nutrition and Health Indicators

In the last part of the analysis, efforts are made to identify the extent of malnutrition among children ages 0–5 years in both adopter and nonadopter households based on linear growth metrics. Anthropometric z-scores, standardized for age and sex, are used: stunting, or insufficient height for age; being underweight, or insufficient weight for age; and wasting, or having insufficient weight for height, indicating acute malnutrition (Aslam and Kingdon 2012). We compute and use z-scores for the conventional measures—height for age (HAZ), weight for age (WAZ), and weight for height (WHZ)—using a STATA add-on command ZSCORE06 to convert observed height, weight, and age of a given child into a z-score relative to the 2006 World Health Organization (WHO) growth standards (Leroy 2011). The z-scores generated are used in further analysis as dependent variable indicators to examine children’s health outcomes and to compute prevalence differentials of stunting, wasting, and underweight in adopter and nonadopter households. A child is considered to be malnourished if her relevant z-score is less than -2.0 .

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive Statistics

As explained earlier, adopters are classified as households that own at least one crossbred or exotic dairy cow in the year preceding the survey, while nonadopters are those households that reared only indigenous dairy cows. The number of sampled households and their adoption status by region are reported in Table 4.1. Twenty-one percent of all sampled households are adopters: The highest adoption rates are observed in Western Uganda (38.1 percent) followed by Central Uganda (25.8 percent), with the smallest share in Northern Uganda (2.2 percent). These observations are in line with what is reported elsewhere (Mbowa, Shinyekwa, and Lwanga 2012).

Table 4.1 Number of sampled households surveyed and their adoption categories by region

Category	Central	Eastern	Northern	Western
Adopters	49	48	6	56
Nonadopters	141	246	270	91
Total	190	294	276	147

Source: Author's calculations based on UNPS 2009/2010 dataset.

Tables 4.2 and 4.3 report summary statistics for the sample households of selected outcome indicators and key observed farm and household characteristics, respectively. Appropriate sampling weights are applied so that the statistics reflect the characteristics in aggregate of all households in Uganda that are engaged in dairy production. The average annual milk yield of dairy cow systems in Uganda is estimated at 65 liters per cow, which is much lower than in neighboring Kenya, in Africa as a whole, and in Europe (Wambugu, Kiriimi, and Opiyo 2011). The level of farm commercialization also is low: An average of 12 percent of milk produced is sold. Although the biggest share of milk is retained for household consumption, annual per capita consumption of own produced milk is far much lower than the international standard. Ugandan milk-producing households consume about 31 liters per person per year, only a quarter of that consumed by neighboring Kenyans (Wambugu, Kiriimi, and Opiyo 2011).

Table 4.2 further reports that Ugandan dairy-farming households consume about 2.5 meals per day, compared with the median standard of 4 meals per day, including breakfast. Further, these households spend a monthly average of 27,507 Ugandan shillings (UGX) on food items per capita, which is slightly higher than the average national food poverty line (UGX 26,232). Although the number of daily meals a household consumes is a poor metric for food security because it does not explicitly inform us of the food quality or quantity, observing this number alongside monthly food expenditure points to the fact that an average household in our study lies on the poverty line. Their chances of falling even further, below the poverty line, are high. Additionally, dairy-producing households spend a monthly average of close to UGX 19,000 on nonfood items such as education, health, clothes, and others, which is slightly more than half the amount spent on food.

Based on the three Foster-Greer-Thorbecke measures of poverty, Table 4.2 shows that 29 percent of dairy cattle households are extremely (food) poor, with their monthly real gross expenditures below the food poverty line, and 46 percent of sampled households are nonfood poor. These results are comparable to other studies (Levine 2012; Ssewanyana and Kasirye 2012). The analysis of expenditure and the poverty indexes generally indicate a high prevalence of poverty among dairy cattle households.

Table 4.2 Summary statistics for outcome indicators

Variable	Description	N	Mean ^a	S.E.
Milk yield	Annual milk production per cow (liters/cow)	906	64.71	17.60
Milk sales	Share of annual milk sales (%)	907	12.30	0.87
Milk consumption	Annual per capita milk consumption (liters/person)	907	31.33	3.09
Meals	Number of meals consumed by household the previous day	902	2.52	0.02
Food expenditure	Per capita monthly expenditure on food items (UGX)	906	27,507	693.98
Nonfood expenditure	Per capita monthly expenditure on nonfood items (UGX)	863	18,927	777.50
Food poverty headcount	Share of extremely poor households (per adult equivalent monthly expenditure is below the food poverty line)	906	0.29	0.02
Food poverty gap	Measures the depth of poverty in relation to the food poverty line	906	0.13	0.01
Food poverty severity	Measures the severity of poverty; reflects the degree of inequality among the food-poor households	906	0.07	0.00
Nonfood poverty headcount	Share of poor households (per adult equivalent monthly expenditure is below the nonfood poverty line)	906	0.46	0.02
Nonfood poverty gap	Measures the depth of poverty in relation to the nonfood poverty line	906	0.24	0.01
Nonfood poverty severity	Measures the severity of poverty; reflects the degree of inequality among the non-food-poor households	906	0.14	0.01
HAZ	Stunting—Height-for-age z-scores	745	−1.44	0.07
WAZ	Underweight—Weight-for-age z-scores	742	−0.83	0.05
WHZ	Wasting—Weight-for-height z-scores	735	−0.05	0.04

Source: Author's calculations based on UNPS 2009/2010 dataset.

Notes: N = number of observations; S.E. = standard errors; UGX = Ugandan shillings. ^a Population-weighted statistics are reported.

At the bottom of Table 4.2, we show nutrition indicators for children ages 0–5 years. It is important to note at this point that the number of observation we base our analysis on for child nutrition outcomes is substantially lower than the number of household observations. This is due to two reasons: first, household sampling was random as also was the child selection for anthropometric measurements, implying that if a sampled household had no child aged 0–5 years, the section for anthropometry would be skipped. Second, during data processing, a few other observations were voluntarily omitted from the sample due to measurement error. Nonetheless, our estimations conform to what is also reported elsewhere (UDHS 2011) and we are confident that the omissions do not introduce any bias.

On average, most children living in Uganda's dairy cattle households are below the WHO reference population mean height and weight. The average HAZ is -1.44 , suggesting that sampled children are almost one-and-a-half standard deviations shorter on average than the reference population, suggesting stunting and chronic undernutrition. The average WAZ is -0.83 , implying that the weight of sampled children is on average below that of the reference population. Unlike HAZ and WAZ, which are indicators of long-term deprivation, the deviation from mean of WHZ, indicative of more recent short-term deprivation, is not as bad, although still below the WHO population reference mean.

Table 4.3 provides information on the characteristics of Ugandan dairy cattle households. An average household head in such households has attained some education, but less than the statutory seven years of primary education, and is about 48 years of age. A majority of the households are male headed, although half of household members are female. Households are relatively large, with an average of 8 members but with some households having as many as 29 members. The dependency ratio is high, with the share of working-age household members almost half of the non-working-age members. Sample households have relatively large farm areas compared with those in other studies (Kassie, Shiferaw, and Muricho 2011). This is not surprising because cattle-herding systems are known to thrive on relatively large land expanses compared with field crop systems. However, half of the sampled households are small, with farms of less than 2 acres. Another way to look at scale effects for dairy cattle households is in terms of herd size. Sampled households have an average of seven heads of dairy cattle, although the majority of households (56 percent) are smallholders with one to three heads of cattle.

Table 4.3 Summary statistics: Farm and household characteristics

Variable	Description	N	Mean ^a	S.E.
Education	Number of completed years of schooling for household head	899	5.46	0.14
Age	Age of household head (years)	906	48.38	0.50
Sex	Sex of the household head (male = 1)	907	0.77	0.01
Household size	Number of people residing in household	907	7.52	0.13
Male share	Share of males residing in household (%)	907	49.95	0.59
Dependency ratio	Share of dependents to working-age household members (%)	892	142.25	3.82
Farm size	Total landholding (acres)	876	9.82	1.00
<i>Small</i>	Below median	438	1.78	0.05
<i>Large</i>	Above median	438	16.93	1.97
Herd size	Number of cattle heads owned	907	7.00	0.71
<i>Small</i>	Below median	507	1.58	0.04
<i>Large</i>	Above median	400	13.2	1.55
Assets	Value of capital assets owned (million UGX)	907	1.13	0.12
Off-farm income	Share of households with off-farm income	907	0.98	0.01
Central	If household is located in Central region (yes = 1)	907	0.22	0.14
West	If household located in Western region (yes = 1)	907	0.18	0.01
Urban	If household is urban (yes = 1)	907	0.09	0.01

Source: Author's calculations based on UNPS 2009/2010 dataset.

Notes: N = number of observations; S.E. = standard errors; UGX = Ugandan shillings. ^a Population-weighted statistics are reported.

Another important characteristic is the asset holdings of the study households. Average asset holdings are in excess of UGX 1 million. The assets exclude housing units and livestock. Ninety-eight percent of all households are involved in off-farm income activities, perhaps as a risk diversification strategy away from farming. Other literature has shown that off-farm income helps offset farm and household cash needs (Babatunde and Qaim 2010). Twenty-two percent and 18 percent of households are resident in Central and Western Uganda, respectively. Irrespective of regional placement, cattle herding, as many other agricultural activities, is a rural phenomenon, with 91 percent of all sampled households located in rural settings. These locational variables will be included later in multivariate analyses to control for potential influences of factors related to markets and agroecological production characteristics.

To examine differences in observed characteristics between adopters and nonadopters, we performed significance tests on the equality of means (and equality of proportions for binary variables). Table 4.4 shows significant differences between all enterprise-level outcome indicators for adopters and nonadopters. With improved dairy cow breeds, adopters on average obtain more than fourfold the amount of milk per cow as nonadopters. This has also been reported elsewhere: Dobson (2005) asserts that indigenous cows can on average yield 1–2 liters of milk, while crossbreds and Friesians yield in the range of 5–20 liters per day. Members of adopting households consume more than twice as much of own-produced milk per year as nonadopters. Moreover, adopters are more likely to be involved in milk markets than nonadopters, with adopters selling one-third of all their production, a figure that is more than thrice that of nonadopters.

Table 4.4 Differences in mean enterprise-level indicators for adopters and nonadopters

Indicator	Adopter (N = 159)	Nonadopter (N = 748)	Difference	t-value
Milk yield	198.07 (513.48)	45.48 (150.67)	152.60***	6.86
Milk consumption	70.73 (190.43)	23.01 (65.29)	47.71***	5.51
Milk commercialization	30.00 (35.38)	8.74 (22.22)	21.24***	9.72

Source: Author's calculations based on UNPS 2009/2010 dataset.

Notes: N = Number of observations. *** indicates statistical significance at the 1% level. Figures in parentheses are standard deviations.

Household-level comparisons for welfare indicators are presented in Table 4.5. Adopters of improved dairy cows are seemingly better off than nonadopters in many aspects. Adopters have a significantly higher number of meals as well as higher monthly per capita food expenditure. These two indicators point to the fact that adopters are likely more food secure than nonadopters. Adopters also have higher monthly per capita nonfood expenditures, implying that adopters can access more nonfood items such as healthcare, education, and clothes, which can impact quality of life. These facts are further emphasized by the observed poverty levels. Poverty incidence in the nonadopter category is relatively higher: Extreme poverty based on the food poverty line reference point shows that only 13 percent of adopters are extremely poor, compared with 32 percent in the nonadopter category; nonfood poverty incidence is comparatively much higher in nonadopters, with a difference of 24 percent between adopters and nonadopters.

Table 4.5 Differences in mean household-level welfare indicators for adopters and nonadopters

Indicator	Adopters (N = 159)	Nonadopters (N = 747)	Difference	t-value
Meals	2.76 (0.57)	2.46 (0.64)	0.30***	5.33
Food expenditure	29,768 (17,066)	25,265 (19,163)	4,503***	2.74
Nonfood expenditure	27,956 (32,016)	15,839 (17,418)	12,117***	6.57
Food poverty headcount	0.13 (0.34)	0.32 (0.49)	-0.19***	-4.87
Food poverty gap	0.06 (0.17)	0.16 (0.25)	-0.10***	-4.73
Food poverty severity gap	0.03 (0.10)	0.09 (0.16)	-0.06***	-4.20
Nonfood poverty headcount	0.27 (0.45)	0.51 (0.50)	-0.24***	-5.52
Nonfood poverty gap	0.14 (0.24)	0.28 (0.30)	-0.14***	-5.57
Nonfood poverty severity	0.08 (0.15)	0.16 (0.21)	-0.09***	-5.19

Source: Author's calculations based on UNPS 2009/2010 dataset.

Notes: N = Number of observations. *** indicates statistical significance at the 1% level. Figures in parentheses are standard deviations.

The poverty gap and poverty severity indexes are both significantly higher among nonadopters, implying that relatively more effort would be required to improve the welfare levels of nonadopters above the respective poverty lines than would be required for adopters. Moreover, significantly higher inequalities are prevalent in nonadopters than in adopters. These results indicate that improved dairy cows may be instrumental in reducing poverty, income gaps, and inequality among the poor.

Table 4.6 shows mean value comparisons of nutrition and health outcome indicators for individual children ages 0–5 years living in adopter and nonadopter households. Children living in adopter households are shown to be significantly healthier than children living in nonadopter households when assessed based on HAZ (stunting) and WAZ (underweight). However, WHZ is not significantly different, meaning that both adopting and nonadopting households had suffered equally from a more recent deprivation, if any. Again, these z-scores imply that increased milk production as a result of adopting improved dairy cows, and certainly consumption of own-produced milk, may have important effects on improving nutrition outcomes of children living in adopting households.

Table 4.6 Differences in mean individual-level nutrition indicators for children younger than age five in adopter and nonadopter households

Indicator	Adopters (N = 120)	Nonadopters (N = 625)	Difference	t-value
HAZ	-0.93 (1.82)	-1.48 (1.86)	0.55***	2.96
WAZ	-0.51 (1.14)	-0.83 (1.26)	0.32***	2.61
WHZ	0.04 (1.36)	-0.03 (1.17)	0.07	0.58

Source: Author's calculations based on UNPS 2009/2010 dataset.

Notes: HAZ = height-for-age z-scores; WAZ = weight-for-age z-scores; WHZ = weight-for-height z-scores. *** indicates statistical significance at the 1% level. Figures in parentheses are standard deviations.

Tables 4.4 to 4.6 have presented mean value comparisons of outcome indicators between adopters and nonadopters. Yet other potentially confounding factors to the observed outcomes beyond adoption are possible. Table 4.7 presents differences in the characteristics of adopting and nonadopting dairy households alongside their t-values. Comparisons show that education level, household size, dependency ratio, and the share of male household members are significantly different between adopters and nonadopters. Specifically, adopters have more years of education and significantly more household members. Household size is a proxy for labor, as most rural households in Uganda depend heavily on household labor rather than hired labor. Adopters also have a bigger share of male members and a lower dependency ratio than nonadopters. Since indications show that improved dairy cows are more labor intensive (Nicholson, Thornton, and Muinga 2004), requiring adopters to spend more time and effort grazing besides complementary feeding, vaccination, and protection against pests, adopters should have not merely labor but rather skilled labor available. It is thus logical that an average adopter has attained seven years of statutory primary education. Also, traditional Ugandan societies consider cattle rearing and management a male-domain chore. Unsurprisingly, households with more males are more likely to be adopters.

Table 4.7 Differences in household characteristics of adopters and nonadopters

Characteristic	Adopters (N = 159)	Nonadopters (N = 747)	Difference	t-value
Education	7.31 (4.34)	5.24 (4.17)	2.07***	5.62
Age	50.09 (15.08)	48.04 (14.34)	2.06	1.63
Sex	0.79 (0.41)	0.77 (0.42)	0.02	0.51
Household size	8.42 (3.96)	7.58 (3.48)	0.84***	2.69
Male share	52.74 (16.68)	49.20 (16.79)	3.54**	2.42
Dependency ratio	118.43 (95.17)	154.75 (116.35)	-36.32***	-3.67
Farm size	20.33 (73.86)	8.47 (16.90)	11.86***	3.87
Assets ('000 UGX)	2,744 (6,085)	902 (2,947)	1,842***	5.71
Off-farm income	0.96 (0.19)	0.99 (0.11)	-0.03**	-2.31
Central	0.30 (0.46)	0.18 (0.39)	0.11***	3.26
West	0.35 (0.48)	0.12 (0.33)	0.23***	7.37
Urban	0.16 (0.37)	0.10 (0.30)	0.07**	2.49

Source: Author's calculations based on UNPS 2009/2010 dataset.

Notes: N = Number of observations; UGX = Ugandan shillings. *** and ** indicate statistical significance at the 1% and 5% levels, respectively. Figures in parentheses are standard deviations.

Further, Table 4.7 reports significant differences in farm size holdings: Adopters have more than twice as much land as their nonadopting counterparts. Significant differences are also observed with respect to value of assets owned, excluding housing and livestock. Considering land and assets as proxies for wealth, we conclude that adopters are wealthier than nonadopters. Adopters are also less likely to be involved in off-farm activities, suggesting that households that decide to adopt improved dairy cows commit substantial labor to the enterprise, possibly at the expense of off-farm economic activities. We

also observe that most adopters are located in the Western and Central regions of Uganda. As earlier mentioned, the Western region represents the milk production hub for Uganda, while the Central region is the biggest milk market. Irrespective of regional placement, significantly more adopters are located in urban settings than rural. This further underscores the role of ready milk markets, potentially offered by urban dwellers, in influencing adoption of improved dairy cows.

Propensity Score Matching Estimation of Impact of Improved Dairy Cow Adoption

Summary statistics and tests analyzed in the previous subsection indicate that adopters of improved dairy cows are better off than nonadopters. However, a critical look at possible covariates in Table 4.7 hints at a positive selection bias in adoption behavior, with better-off farmers more likely to adopt improved dairy cows. Moreover, the substantial variation observed in the listed covariates may also confound the impact of adoption on the outcomes of interest. To investigate and separate the net technological effect, we employ multivariate approaches that account for self-selection that may arise as a result of the observed systematic differences between adopters and nonadopters. As explained earlier, we use PSM methods to match variables that influence both treatment assignment and outcomes but are not affected by the treatment (Smith and Todd 2005).

Based on previous studies on adoption of improved agricultural technologies in developing countries (Feder, Just, and Zilberman 1985; Matuschke and Qaim 2009; Foster and Rosenzweig 2010; Kabunga, Dubois, and Qaim 2012), we carefully select variables from the available dataset that are exogenous to treatment, but likely to influence both treatment assignment and outcomes of interest. We exclude covariates that are either unrelated to the outcome or are not proper covariates (Rubin and Thomas 1996). As a first step, we generate propensity scores for improved dairy cow adoption by employing a probit model, with a binary dependent variable equal to 1 for adopters and 0 otherwise (Equation 2). Results of the propensity score are reported in Table 4.8. The subjects of analysis are households and individual children living in adopter and nonadopter households, respectively. This model is specified as a first step in assessing impact for all outcomes.

Table 4.8 shows the result of the probit model specified for milk yield and height-for-age outcomes. We do not observe notable changes in coefficients of the selected covariates across all outcomes at the enterprise-, household-, or individual-level analysis. For this reason and for brevity, we use results for the height-for-age and milk yield models to represent all other outcomes.

Table 4.8 Probit estimation of the propensity score

<i>Dependent variable is adoption 1/0</i>	Enterprise and household-level indicators, for example, milk yield			Individual child-level indicators, for example, HAZ		
	Coefficient	S.E.	z-value	Coefficient	S.E.	z-value
Education	0.06***	0.01	4.00	0.08***	0.02	4.17
Age	2.16E-03	4.13E-03	0.52	2.62E-03	5.36E-03	0.49
Sex	-0.30**	0.14	-2.13	-0.37*	0.20	-1.90
Household size	0.01	0.02	0.63	0.00	0.02	-0.09
Male share	4.80E-03	3.42E-03	1.40	4.49E-03	4.30E-03	1.04
Dependency ratio	-1.00E-03*	5.47E-04	-1.83	-2.15E-03***	6.79E-04	-3.16
Farm size	4.60E-03**	2.14E-03	2.15	3.76E-03***	1.36E-03	2.76
Assets (million UGX)	0.04**	0.02	2.37	0.02	0.02	0.73
Off-farm income	-1.01***	0.37	-2.77	-0.78**	0.40	-1.95
Central	0.63***	0.14	4.54	0.77***	0.15	5.12
West	0.97***	0.14	7.02	0.95***	0.17	5.56
Urban	0.02	0.18	0.11	0.13	0.22	0.61
Constant	-0.79*	0.47	-1.69	-0.76	0.53	-1.42
<i>N</i>	853			690		
<i>LR</i> χ^2 ($p > \chi^2$)	134.09(0.00)			107.39(0.00)		
<i>Pseudo-R</i> ²	0.17			0.17		
<i>Log likelihood</i>	-334.24			-261.97		

Source: Author's calculations based on UNPS 2009/2010 dataset.

Notes: HAZ = height-for-age z-scores; SE = Standard error; UGX = Ugandan shillings; *N* = Number of observations; ***, **, and * indicate statistical significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% levels, respectively. Figures in parentheses are standard errors.

The main objective of the propensity score modeling is to balance the observed distribution of covariates across the treated and nontreated groups and not necessarily to perfectly predict selection (Caliendo and Kopeinig 2008; Lee 2013). Nonetheless, it is worthwhile to mention a few things. First, the pseudo- R^2 for all the models is above 0.17, indicating a reasonably good model fit. Second, most variables included in the specification show the expected signs: Education is positive and highly significant, implying that household heads with more years of formal education are more likely to adopt improved dairy cows. Female-headed households are more likely to adopt improved dairy cows, and there is no association between adoption and the share of male household members. This has gender implications but also demonstrates the effect of recent efforts to promote zero-grazing dairy units, largely managed by women, for improved nutrition. There is a positive association between farm size and adoption, implying that the likelihood of adoption is higher for farmers with more land. Off-farm income is negatively associated with adoption, suggesting that improved dairy cow adoption requires more labor commitment. Finally, households located in Western and Central Uganda are more likely to adopt improved dairy cows than those living elsewhere. As mentioned earlier, these results are consistent with first-stage probit regressions for other outcome indicators and are also consistent with the literature on improved agricultural technology adoption in developing countries.

To consistently estimate the impact of improved dairy cow adoption, we impose the common support condition by matching adopters and nonadopters in the region of common support (Sianesi 2004). As explained earlier, the analysis in this paper employs the most common matching algorithms: NNM and KBM methods (Caliendo and Kopeinig 2008). Matching was performed with replacement to increase the quality of matches and reduce the chances of bad matches (Smith and Todd 2005). Observations from adopters and nonadopters whose propensity scores are higher than the maximum or less than the

minimum propensity score are dropped from further analysis. Figures 4.1 and 4.2 show the distribution of the propensity scores and the region of common support for adopters and nonadopters across enterprise- and household-level and individual child-level outcome indicators, respectively. As with the first-stage estimates, we use milk yield and height for age as representatives of the respective outcome levels. The figures show that there is satisfactory overlap, which shows proper matching and that the common support condition is met.

Figure 4.1 Propensity score distribution and common support: Impact of improved dairy cows on milk yield

Source: Author's illustrations based on UNPS 2009/2010 dataset.

Figure 4.2 Propensity score distribution and common support: Impact of improved dairy cows on HAZ

Source: Author's illustrations based on UNPS 2009/2010 dataset.

Notes: HAZ = height-for-age z-scores;

Additionally, we should remember that PSM matches adopter and nonadopter observations on a single dimension—the propensity score—that is a function of all covariates included in the model. It is therefore important that similar propensity scores emerge from similar characteristics. For this reason, we performed balancing tests after matching. Table 4.9 presents the means of all covariates for the treated and nontreated before and after matching for each level of assessment. As in Table 4.8, we choose milk yield and HAZ to represent other outcomes at the enterprise and household level and individual child

level, respectively.³ Average education of household heads, farm size, and value of assets are reduced for treated households and increased for untreated households after matching and after dropping unmatched households from either side. In contrast, the dependency ratio increased for adopting households and reduced for nonadopting households after matching. As expected, we do not have any significant differences after matching. Moreover, estimations are regarded as balanced when there is substantial reduction in the mean absolute standardized bias between the matched and unmatched models (Caliendo and Kopeinig 2008).

Table 4.9 Covariate balance tests

Variable		Milk yield				HAZ			
		Mean		% bias		Mean		% bias	
		Treated	Control	reduction	p-value	Treated	Control	reduction	p-value
Education	Unmatched	7.27	5.28	80.5	0.00	7.10	5.75	93.6	0.00
	Matched	6.95	7.34		0.46	7.13	7.04		0.84
Age	Unmatched	49.52	47.86	-2.4	0.18	46.35	44.12	35.6	0.10
	Matched	48.28	49.98		0.32	45.29	46.74		0.47
Sex	Unmatched	0.78	0.78	-985.0	0.96	0.85	0.88	-70.8	0.40
	Matched	0.79	0.77		0.66	0.86	0.91		0.27
Household size	Unmatched	8.55	7.75	91.6	0.01	10.09	9.09	77.8	0.01
	Matched	8.37	8.30		0.89	9.94	10.17		0.74
Male share	Unmatched	52.83	49.74	63.4	0.03	50.71	49.26	4.7	0.34
	Matched	52.63	51.50		0.59	50.32	51.70		0.45
Dependency ratio	Unmatched	116.97	156.84	96.9	0.00	149.67	193.32	88.8	0.00
	Matched	126.44	125.21		0.92	159.96	165.19		0.63
Farm size	Unmatched	20.67	8.56	71.9	0.00	29.36	8.40	98.4	0.00
	Matched	11.23	7.83		0.11	7.72	7.39		0.90
Assets (million UGX)	Unmatched	2.72	0.81	80.7	0.00	1.65	0.70	89.3	0.00
	Matched	1.69	1.33		0.33	1.08	1.18		0.73
Off-farm income	Unmatched	0.96	0.99	48.9	0.01	0.95	0.99	51.9	0.00
	Matched	0.97	0.99		0.41	0.99	0.97		0.32
Central	Unmatched	0.29	0.17	55.6	0.00	0.37	0.20	44.1	0.00
	Matched	0.29	0.24		0.33	0.37	0.27		0.14
West	Unmatched	0.35	0.12	77.7	0.00	0.27	0.09	51.1	0.00
	Matched	0.31	0.36		0.37	0.25	0.34		0.17
Urban	Unmatched	0.16	0.08	81.1	0.00	0.14	0.06	88.5	0.00
	Matched	0.14	0.13		0.72	0.10	0.11		0.82

Source: Author's calculations based on UNPS 2009/2010 dataset.

Note: HAZ = height-for-age z-scores; UGX = Ugandan shillings.

Table 4.10 presents the overall matching quality before and after propensity score estimation. The relatively low pseudo- R^2 and the p -values of the likelihood ratio test of joint significance of regressors imply no systematic difference in the distribution of covariates between adopters and nonadopters after matching. Moreover, standardized mean bias before matching—in the range of 25–28 percent—is heavily reduced to the range of 2–11 percent after matching.

³ The balancing tests (based on NNM and KBM matching algorithms) for other outcomes behave in the same fashion, but we only report these two for brevity.

Table 4.10 Propensity score matching quality indicators before and after matching

Outcome	Method	Pseudo-R ² before matching	Pseudo-R ² after matching	p>χ ² before matching	p>χ ² after matching	Mean bias before matching	Mean bias after matching	Mean bias reduction (%)
Milk yield	NNM	0.17	0.03	0.00	0.68	27.50	7.50	72.72
	KBM	0.17	0.01	0.00	1.00	27.50	3.40	87.60
Milk consumption	NNM	0.17	0.03	0.00	0.68	27.50	7.50	72.72
	KBM	0.17	0.01	0.00	1.00	27.50	3.40	87.63
Milk sales	NNM	0.17	0.03	0.00	0.68	27.50	7.50	72.72
	KBM	0.17	0.01	0.00	1.00	27.50	3.40	87.63
Meals	NNM	0.17	0.02	0.00	0.95	25.50	6.60	74.12
	KBM	0.17	0.01	0.00	1.00	25.50	2.90	88.63
Food expenditure (log)	NNM	0.17	0.04	0.00	0.39	25.40	8.10	68.50
	KBM	0.17	0.01	0.00	1.00	25.40	2.90	88.58
Nonfood expenditure (log)	NNM	0.18	0.03	0.00	0.81	26.10	6.10	76.63
	KBM	0.18	0.01	0.00	1.00	26.10	2.90	88.89
Food poverty headcount	NNM	0.17	0.04	0.00	0.51	25.40	8.10	68.11
	KBM	0.17	0.01	0.00	1.00	25.40	2.90	88.58
Food poverty gap	NNM	0.17	0.04	0.00	0.51	25.40	8.10	68.11
	KBM	0.17	0.01	0.00	1.00	25.40	2.90	88.58
Food poverty severity	NNM	0.17	0.04	0.00	0.51	25.40	8.10	68.11
	KBM	0.17	0.01	0.00	1.00	25.40	2.90	88.58
Nonfood poverty headcount	NNM	0.17	0.04	0.00	0.51	25.40	8.10	68.11
	KBM	0.17	0.01	0.00	1.00	25.40	2.90	88.58
Nonfood poverty gap	NNM	0.17	0.04	0.00	0.51	25.40	8.10	68.11
	KBM	0.17	0.01	0.00	1.00	25.40	2.90	88.58
Nonfood poverty severity	NNM	0.17	0.04	0.00	0.51	25.40	8.10	68.11
	KBM	0.17	0.01	0.00	1.00	25.40	2.90	88.58
HAZ	NNM	0.18	0.06	0.00	0.31	26.10	10.90	58.24
	KBM	0.18	0.01	0.00	1.00	26.10	4.10	84.29
WAZ	NNM	0.18	0.04	0.00	0.60	26.70	9.00	66.29
	KBM	0.18	0.01	0.00	1.00	26.70	4.20	84.27
WHZ	NNM	0.18	0.03	0.00	0.74	26.60	7.30	72.56
	KBM	0.18	0.01	0.00	1.00	26.60	4.00	84.96

Source: Author's calculations based on UNPS 2009/2010 dataset.

Notes: NNM = Nearest Neighbor Matching; KBM = Kernel Based Matching; HAZ = height-for-age z-scores; WAZ = weight-for-age z-scores; WHZ = weight-for-height z-scores.

After successful matching, empirical results for the net impact (ATT) of improved dairy cow adoption on the outcome indicators of interest can be calculated according to Equation 3. Tables 4.11 and 4.12 present the results based on the NNM and KBM algorithms, respectively.

At the enterprise level, results show that adoption of improved dairy cows causes a significant increase in milk yield as per the two matching algorithms. Specifically, the NNM estimates in Table 4.11 suggest that adoption of improved dairy cows increases annual milk yields by about 170 liters per cow, while the KBM approach suggests that it could increase by about 163 liters per cow (Table 4.12). This is the average difference in milk yield per cow between similar pairs of households that own different cow breeds and consequently belong to different adoption status. These estimates imply that improved dairy cow adoption increases milk yield by more than 200 percent. These results are not different from other observations in Uganda and the East African region: Wong and Kibirige (2009) assert that improved breeds can produce as much as 990 liters per head per year, compared with 400 liters for local breeds—a 147 percent increase in milk for improved breeds. In Kenya, a local zebu cow yields between 100 and 200 liters per year, while improved dairy cows yield in the range of 1,400 to 1,700 liters per year (Wambugu, Kirimi, and Opiyo 2011). Although the figures observed here are relatively lower and lag behind the genetic potential of known improved breeds, the potential to enhance milk productivity for poor African farmers through improved dairy cow adoption is irrefutable.

We also find significant effects of improved dairy cow adoption on own-milk consumption based on both the NNM and KBM algorithms. We further find positive, consistent, and highly significant ATT estimates for the share of milk sales—an indicator of commercialization of production—demonstrating the potential of improved technologies in integrating smallholders into modern markets. Unlike earlier studies, where ambiguity in the relationship between commercialization and own-food consumption has been reported (Alderman 1994; von Braun 1995), this study shows that the benefits of adopting improved dairy cows help in enhancing both outcomes.

At the household level, we find that adoption of improved dairy cows significantly and robustly (across both matching algorithms) increases the number of meals consumed and monthly per capita food expenditure, but not monthly nonfood PCE. The causal effect of adoption on monthly food expenditure ranges between 0.14 and 0.18, which is the average difference between monthly food expenditures of similar households, but belonging to different adoption status. Since expenditure is expressed in our model as a natural logarithm, further computations show that adopters spend 15 to 21 percent more on food than matched nonadopters do. These estimates imply that adopters are relatively better off especially in terms of food access, although not better off in terms of nonfood items such as education, health, and clothing.

The effects on expenditures consequently have a positive bearing on poverty reduction. As shown in Tables 4.11 and 4.12, the NNM and KBM algorithms yield significant and negative ATTs for all poverty measures. Particularly, adoption can reduce chances of households falling below the food poverty line by 10–12 percent and the nonfood poverty line by 14–15 percent. Adoption also reduces the depth and severity of poverty: Based on the food poverty line, the net effect of adoption on poverty depth is 7 percent, while the effect based on the nonfood poverty line is in the range of 8–10 percent. Moreover, adoption of improved dairy cows decreases food and nonfood poverty inequality as measured by the poverty severity indexes by 4–7 percent. These are very strong results with wider implications on poverty reduction at the national level. These results suggest that improved dairy cows should further be promoted for better poverty outcomes.

Table 4.11 Nearest neighbor matching: Average treatment effects and results of sensitivity analysis

	Mean		ATT	t-value	Observations		Critical level of hidden bias (Γ)
Outcome	Treated	Control			Treated	Control	
<i>Enterprise-level indicators</i>							
Milk yield	231.34	61.02	170.32*** (62.16)	2.74	134	700	1.40–1.50
Milk consumption	51.56	29.05	22.51* (11.99)	1.88	134	700	1.20–1.30
Milk sales	26.44	14.54	11.89*** (4.19)	2.84	134	700	1.50–1.60
<i>Household-level indicators</i>							
Meals	2.75	2.54	0.22** (0.09)	2.54	134	698	1.50–1.60
Food expenditure (log)	10.18	9.99	0.18** (0.08)	2.13	134	700	1.10–1.20
Nonfood expenditure (log)	9.60	9.47	0.14 (0.12)	1.11	131	668	—
Food poverty headcount	0.15	0.25	−0.10* (0.06)	−1.68	134	700	1.20–1.30
Food poverty gap	0.07	0.14	−0.07** (0.03)	−2.23	134	700	1.20–1.30
Food poverty severity	0.03	0.08	−0.05** (0.02)	−2.44	134	700	1.20–1.30
Nonfood poverty headcount	0.30	0.44	−0.14** (0.06)	−2.46	134	700	1.50–1.60
Nonfood poverty gap	0.15	0.23	−0.08** (0.04)	−2.00	134	700	1.20–1.30
Nonfood poverty severity	0.08	0.15	−0.07** (0.03)	−2.47	134	700	1.30–1.40
<i>Individual-child indicators</i>							
HAZ	−0.95	−1.39	0.43* (0.26)	1.70	103	572	1.25–1.30
WAZ	−0.54	−0.69	0.15 (0.16)	0.95	101	569	—
WHZ	0.02	0.04	−0.02 (0.18)	−0.08	102	564	—

Source: Author's calculations based on UNPS 2009/2010 dataset.

Notes: ATT = Average treatment effects; HAZ = height-for-age z-scores; WAZ = weight-for-age z-scores; WHZ = weight-for-height z-scores. ** and * indicate statistical significance at the 5% and 10% levels, respectively. Figures in parentheses are standard errors.

Table 4.12 Kernel-based matching: Average treatment effects and results of sensitivity analysis

	Mean				Observation		
Outcome	Treated	Control	ATT	t-value	Treated	Control	Critical level of hidden bias (Γ)
<i>Enterprise-level indicators</i>							
Milk yield	232.32	68.51	163.81*** (56.28)	2.91	149	700	1.20–1.30
Milk consumption	66.20	27.73	38.47** (15.82)	2.43	149	700	1.20–1.30
Milk sales	28.65	10.20	18.45*** (3.13)	5.90	149	700	1.60–1.70
<i>Household-level indicators</i>							
Meals	2.77	2.55	0.22*** (0.06)	3.67	147	698	1.80–1.90
Food expenditure (log)	10.17	10.03	0.14** (0.06)	2.55	149	700	1.40–1.50
Nonfood expenditure (log)	9.71	9.58	0.13 (0.09)	1.34	145	668	—
Food poverty headcount	0.14	0.26	−0.12*** (0.04)	−3.04	149	700	1.7–1.80
Food poverty gap	0.06	0.13	−0.07*** (0.02)	−3.39	149	700	2.70–2.80
Food poverty severity	0.03	0.08	−0.04*** (0.01)	−3.22	149	700	2.70–2.80
Nonfood poverty headcount	0.28	0.43	−0.15*** (0.05)	−3.23	149	700	1.10–1.20
Nonfood poverty gap	0.14	0.24	−0.10*** (0.03)	−3.73	149	700	1.90–2.00
Nonfood poverty severity	0.08	0.15	−0.07*** (0.02)	−3.79	149	700	2.50–2.60
<i>Individual child indicators</i>							
HAZ	−0.95	−1.44	0.49** (0.21)	2.34	108	572	1.40–1.50
WAZ	−0.55	−0.70	0.15 (0.13)	1.14	109	569	—
WHZ	0.01	0.08	−0.07 (0.14)	−0.52	107	564	—

Source: Author's calculations based on UNPS 2009/2010 dataset.

Notes: ATT = average treatment effects; HAZ = height-for-age z-scores; WAZ = weight-for-age z-scores; WHZ = weight-for-height z-scores. ***, **, and * indicate statistical significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% levels, respectively. Figures in parentheses are standard errors.

Finally, we discuss the net effects of improved dairy cow adoption on individual child nutrition indicators. The bottom sections of Tables 4.11 and 4.12 show positive and consistently significant ATT estimates for HAZ but not for WAZ or WHZ, implying that improved dairy adoption reduces stunting but not underweight or wasting of children younger than age five. Our estimates show that children living in adopting households are on average taller than those living in nonadopting households for the same age and gender. Although we still observe stunted children in matched adopting and nonadopting households, the adoption of improved dairy cows reduces stunting of children in the household by an average of 0.43 to 0.49 standard deviations. These are quite large effects by any standards but are not surprising, given that milk is a nutrient-dense food. Children who consume cow's milk have been shown elsewhere to attain augmented height and bone mass gain than children who avoid it (Henriksen et al. 2000; Black et al. 2002; Wiley 2009).

The last columns of Tables 4.11 and 4.12 present results of the sensitivity analysis on hidden bias for significant adoption effects. The critical levels of gamma, Γ , at which point the causal inference of significant adoption effects may be questioned, are found within sufficient range. For instance, the value of 1.40–1.50 for milk yield (Table 4.11) implies that if households that have the same covariates differ in their odds of adoption by a factor of 40–50 percent, the significance of the adoption effect on output may be questioned (Rosenbaum 2002). This shows that the level of hidden bias has been substantially reduced by identifying the most important variables that affect both adoption and outcome indicators.

Heterogeneous Effects

In this section, we seek further understanding of the impact of adoption by scale, measured by herd and farm acreage. Accordingly, we stratify the sample into two groups: small and large farmers, as explained in Table 4.3. For heterogeneous effects, the stratified samples are based on matched samples obtained using the NNM algorithm, and all the balancing properties are satisfied.

Table 4.13 shows heterogeneous effects at the enterprise level. We find that adoption of improved dairy cows significantly increases milk yield for households with both large and small farms. From the herd size perspective, however, the effect of adoption is 70 percent more on small farms, implying that productivity is higher with small herds as compared with large herds. On the other hand, farm acreage has a stronger leverage on milk yield than herd size, which makes sense—it would be difficult to hold large herds without large farm areas. On household's own-milk consumption and commercialization, we find that households with large farms observe the biggest benefits from adoption. With specific reference to herd size, the effect on commercialization is twice as much for households with large farms, while we also find significant effects of adoption on commercialization among households with large farm acreage. These results suggest that farm acreage is influential to adoption but may also stimulate the household's ability to achieve substantial gains from adoption.

Table 4.13 Heterogeneous effects by scale: Enterprise level

Variable		Scale by herd size			Scale by farm acreage		
		ATT	S.E.	t-value	ATT	S.E.	t-value
Milk yield							
	Large	114.65**	44.90	2.55	287.57**	123.21	2.33
	Small	195.19*	111.35	1.75	48.64*	26.70	1.82
Milk consumption							
	Large	69.37**	31.14	2.23	98.01***	33.33	2.94
	Small	7.49	6.348	1.18	3.45	7.44	0.46
Milk sales							
	Large	14.03**	6.85	2.05	27.94***	5.86	4.76
	Small	8.64**	4.14	2.09	3.32	4.84	0.69

Source: Author's calculations based on UNPS 2009/2010 dataset.

Notes: ATT = average treatment effects; S.E. = standard error. ***, **, and * indicate statistical significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% levels, respectively.

Table 4.14 presents the heterogeneous effects of dairy cow adoption on the number of meals consumed by the household as well as the household's expenditures on food and nonfood items. For both scale categorizations, we find large and stronger effects on meals for households with smaller farms. We also find that households with small farm acreage increase their food expenditure but not necessarily nonfood expenditures. These results demonstrate that the biggest benefits of improved dairy cow adoption on consumption (or generally household food security) accrue to small farmers.

Table 4.14 Heterogeneous effects by scale: Food and nonfood expenditures

		Scale by herd size			Scale by farm acreage		
Variable		ATT	S.E.	t-value	ATT	S.E.	t-value
Meals							
	Large	0.16	0.10	1.61	0.13	0.09	1.40
	Small	0.29***	0.09	3.07	0.34***	0.09	3.61
Food expenditure							
	Large	0.11	0.09	1.15	0.08	0.10	0.85
	Small	0.18**	0.08	2.23	0.28***	0.09	3.24
Nonfood expenditure							
	Large	0.10	0.15	0.63	0.12	0.16	0.77
	Small	0.09	0.13	0.66	0.12	0.12	0.99

Source: Author's calculations based on UNPS 2009/2010 dataset.

Notes: ATT = average treatment effects; S.E. = standard error. *** and ** indicate statistical significance at the 1% and 5% levels, respectively.

On the broader outcome indicators of household poverty and child nutritional status, Table 4.15 presents effects of improved dairy cow adoption among households with small and large farms. We find substantial food and nonfood poverty reduction effects of adoption on households with small farms. Poverty reduction effects for large farmers are not very precisely measured, being significant only at the 10 percent level or insignificant altogether. Conversely, however, we find bigger and significant effects of adoption on nutrition outcomes (HAZ) only among households with large farms (based on both herd size and acreage) but not those with small farms. This implies that adopting improved dairy cows may not adequately improve nutrition outcomes for children younger than age five in Ugandan households with less than median farm size.

Table 4.15 Heterogeneous effects by scale: poverty and nutrition

		Scale by herd size			Scale by farm acreage		
Variable		ATT	S.E.	t-value	ATT	S.E.	t-value
Food poverty	Large	−0.11*	0.06	−1.89	−0.06	0.06	−1.00
	Small	−0.12*	0.07	−1.83	−0.19***	0.06	−3.06
Nonfood poverty	Large	−0.11	0.08	1.47	−0.09	0.08	1.09
	Small	−0.13*	0.07	−1.69	−0.22***	0.07	−3.04
HAZ	Large	0.97***	0.35	2.77	0.90**	0.38	2.34
	Small	0.33	0.37	0.89	0.28	0.36	0.79

Source: Author's calculations based on UNPS 2009/2010 dataset.

Notes: ATT = average treatment effects; HAZ = height-for-age z-scores; S.E. = standard error. ***, ** and * indicate statistical significance at the 1%, 10% and 5% levels, respectively.

This result is puzzling, as we would expect that significant increases observed for milk productivity, food expenditures, and poverty reduction, particularly among small farmers, are also reflected in improvements of child nutrition outcomes. Yet, this result is not unusual: A recent review of 26 Indian studies found that enhancing agricultural productivity typically improves output, income, and consumption, but does not automatically translate into better nutrition outcomes (Gillespie, Harris, and Kadiyala 2012).

In the context of this study, some possible reasons for this lack of improvement in child nutritional outcomes are as follows: First, small farmers may be observing benefits of adoption as portrayed above, but certainly below a minimal threshold to leverage nutritional outcomes of young children resident in these households. In fact, as observed in Table 4.14, adoption stimulates commercialization to some level but does not increase own-milk consumption for households with small farms. Additional income derived from the technological change, from product marketing, or from both may not sufficiently cause significant changes in nutrition. In fact it matters how large and how strong the linkages are between observed income changes derived from improved agrosystems and the dimension of health being considered (Hoddinott 2012). If households do not use the additional derived income on more foods or foods of improved quality but rather on other goods that do not have a direct effect on health and nutrition, then the benefits of improved production will be minimal. In this case, it is possible that additional income derived from adoption for small farmers is used to achieve broader household food security objectives that focus on having more high-calorie foods without paying particular attention to quality feeding needs of young children. This could be a factor of insufficient nutritional knowledge, resources, or both.

Second, in improved smallholder production systems with commercialization as a major goal, it is important to understand gender and intrahousehold allocation of benefits for nutrition (von Braun 1995). In this case study, it is possible that women have less control of profitable enterprises, including dairy cows, to the detriment of child nutrition as also reported to occur in Kenyan milk-producing households (Meinzen-Dick et al. 2012). Third, it is also possible that the adoption of improved production systems may not be accompanied by improved food safety systems at the household level such that gains in productivity, increased nutrient density intakes, or both are canceled out by ingested toxins in the product, plus zoonotic pathogens (Spears 2013).

Thus, while the literature links agricultural development to improved nutrition outcomes, this study shows that the underlying causes of undernutrition may go beyond direct nutrition-specific interventions to possibly include other factors such as gender and intrahousehold dynamics, education, and awareness of the contribution of high-quality foodstuffs in the health of children, as well as improvement in food safety and hygiene at the household level. For holistic and sustainable improvements in poverty and health outcomes, agricultural innovation programs should be complemented with related programs on gender empowerment, nutritional education and awareness, and food safety and hygiene.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The introduction and dissemination of improved dairy cow breeds in Uganda is arguably the most significant step taken to develop a modern and commercial dairy industry over the last two decades. In this study, we draw and evaluate empirical links between farm productivity, commercialization, poverty alleviation, and nutrition outcomes of children younger than age five. We analyze the impact of adoption of improved dairy cow breeds on three levels of outcomes: enterprise level (milk yield, own-milk consumption, and commercialization), household level (the number of meals; food and nonfood expenditure; poverty incidence, depth, and severity), and child health (child stunting and wasting). Our analysis is based on a nationally representative primary household dataset recently collected in Uganda. We employ rigorous impact assessment techniques using PSM to account for selection bias and achieve consistent estimates. We further test the robustness and sensitivity of our results using various matching algorithms as well as the consideration of heterogeneous effects of adoption based on farm acreage and herd size.

In the probit estimation of the first stage of the PSM, we find that the probability of adoption of improved cow breeds increases with education of the household head, farm size, and the sex of the household head being female. The latter is an interesting finding, as it demonstrates the effect of recent governmental and nongovernmental efforts to promote zero-grazing units, which are largely managed by women.

Controlling for heterogeneity in household- and contextual-level observables, we find a consistent increase in milk yield by more than 147 percent due to adoption of improved cow breeds. These are substantial increases in milk yield, although still lower than the genetic potential of known improved breeds. We also find significant positive effects of adoption on own-milk consumption and milk commercialization using the share of milk sales indicator, suggesting that improved dairy cows may help farmers to increase milk intakes and to integrate into modern milk markets. At the household level, we find that adoption of improved dairy cows increases the number of meals consumed and monthly food expenditure in a significant and robust way, but not nonfood expenditure. Adopters spend 15–21 percent more on food than nonadopters, implying that adopters are relatively more food secure than nonadopters. Consequently, increased expenditures have positive impacts on poverty reduction: Adopters reduce chances of falling below the food and the nonfood poverty lines by 10–12 percent and 14–15 percent, respectively. Moreover, adopters also reduce the depth and severity of poverty in the range of 7–10 percent and 4–7 percent, respectively. These results suggest that improved dairy cows are instrumental for poverty alleviation.

Further, the study finds no significant effects of dairy cow adoption on weight-for-age but finds substantial positive effects on height-for-age indexes. Individual children younger than age five living in households that adopted improved dairy cows are on average much taller than those living in nonadopting households for the same age and gender, implying that adoption of improved dairy cows is influential in reducing stunting.

The impact findings are further differentiated by scale effects in terms of herd size and acreage. We find that adoption of improved dairy cows significantly increases milk yield for households with both large and small farms. From the herd size perspective, however, the milk yield effect of adoption is 70 percent more on small farms, implying that productivity is higher with small herds than with large herds. Yet the productivity effect is conversely bigger and stronger among households with larger acreage. Moreover, households with large farms, especially those with larger acreage, achieve higher benefits of adoption in terms own-milk consumption and commercialization.

The study further shows that households with generally small farms will likely consume more meals per day and significantly increase their food expenditure, an indication of improved household food security, due to adoption of improved dairy cows. Consequently, adoption helps small farmers to substantially reduce both food and nonfood poverty. The puzzle, however, is that improved welfare

conditions (in terms of food security and poverty reduction) due to adoption do not translate into improved child nutrition outcomes for households with small farms. Rather, we find bigger and positive significant effects of adoption on stunting only in households with large farms that have also shown significant increases in milk consumption and commercialization due to adoption.

The empirical findings of this study suggest that promoting improved dairy cow breeds is likely to benefit farmers, especially smallholder farmers, to improve productivity, output, commercialization, food security, and poverty. However, large farmers, instead of the smallholders, will more likely achieve higher child nutritional benefits from improved dairy cow adoption despite their modest improvements in productivity, output, and poverty levels due to adoption. While existing literature links agricultural development to improved nutrition outcomes, we argue that the underlying causes of undernutrition may go beyond direct nutrition-specific interventions to possibly include other factors such as gender and intrahousehold dynamics, education, and awareness of the contribution of high-quality foodstuffs such as milk in the health of children, as well as improvement in food safety and hygiene at the household level. For holistic and sustainable improvements in nutrition outcomes, we recommend that agricultural development programs should be accompanied with related programs on gender empowerment, nutrition education, as well as food safety, sanitation, and hygiene.

REFERENCES

- Alderman, H. 1994. "Why Should It Matter What Commodity Is the Source of Agricultural Profits? Dairy Development in India." In *Agricultural Commercialization, Economic Development, and Nutrition*, edited by J. V. Braun and E. Kennedy, 239–251. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University.
- Appleton, S. 2001. *Education, Incomes, and Poverty in Uganda in the 1990s. CREDIT Research Paper No. 01/22*. Nottingham: University of Nottingham.
- Appleton, S. M., T. Emwanu, J. Kagugube, and J. Muwonge. 1999. *Changes in Poverty in Uganda, 1992–1997*. Working Paper 99-22. Centre for the Study of African Economies, University of Oxford.
- Aslam, M., and G. G. Kingdon. 2012. "Parental Education and Child Health—Understanding the Pathways of Impact in Pakistan." *World Development* 40 (10): 2014–2032.
- Babatunde, R. O., and M. Qaim. 2010. "Impact of Off-Farm Income on Food Security and Nutrition in Nigeria." *Food Policy* 35 (4): 303–311.
- Bandiera, O., and I. Rasul. 2006. "Social Networks and Technology Adoption in Northern Mozambique." *The Economic Journal* 116 (514): 869–902.
- Black, R. E., S. M. Williams, I. E. Jones and A. Goulding. 2002. "Children Who Avoid Drinking Cow Milk Have Low Dietary Calcium Intakes and Poor Bone Health." *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition* 76 (3): 675–680.
- BoU (Bank of Uganda) and PMA (Plan for the Modernization of Agriculture). 2009. *Agricultural Finance Yearbook, Investment-Led Productivity Building in Agricultural Value Chains*. Kampala, Uganda: German Technical Cooperation Republic of Uganda, Federal Republic of Germany, BoU, and PMA.
- Caliendo, M., and S. Kopeinig. 2008. "Some Practical Guidance for the Implementation of Propensity Score Matching." *Journal of Economic Surveys* 22 (1): 31–72.
- Dobson, W. D. 2005. *Dairy Industry of Uganda. Dairy Updates No. 106*. Babcock Institute, University of Wisconsin.
- Elepu, G. 2008. "Assessment of Impacts of Changes in Dairy in East Africa: The Case of Uganda." Final draft submitted to the International Livestock Research Institute. Nairobi, Kenya: ILRI.
- Feder, G., R. Just, and D. Zilberman. 1985. "Adoption of Agricultural Innovations in Developing Countries: A Survey." *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 33 (2): 255–298.
- Foster, A., and M. Rosenzweig. 2010. "Microeconomics of Technology Adoption." *Annual Review of Economics* 2 (1): 395–424.
- Foster, J., J. Greer, and E. Thorbecke. 1984. "A Class of Decomposable Poverty Measures." *Econometrica* 52:761–766.
- Garcia, O., D. Balikowa, D. Kiconco, A. Ndambi, and T. Hemme. 2008. *Milk Production in Uganda: Dairy Farming Economics and Development Policy Impacts*. Working Paper 09-08. Addis Ababa: Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) Livestock Policy Initiative.
- Gerosa, S. and J. Skoet. 2012. *Milk Availability: Trends in Production and Demand and Medium-Term Outlook*. Agricultural Development Economics Working Paper No.12-01. Rome: FAO.
- Gillespie, S., J. Harris, and S. Kadiyala. 2012. *The Agriculture-Nutrition Disconnect in India: What Do We Know?* Discussion Paper No. 01187. Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Gittelsohn, J., and A. E. Vastine. 2003. "Sociocultural and Household Factors Impacting on the Selection, Allocation and Consumption of Animal Source Foods: Current Knowledge and Application." *The Journal of Nutrition* 133 (11): 4036s–4041s.
- Henriksen, C., M. Eggesbø, R. Halvorsen, and G. Botten. 2000. "Nutrient Intake among Two-Year-Old Children on Cows' Milk-Restricted Diets." *Acta Paediatrica* 89 (3): 272–278.

- Herforth, A. 2012. *Guiding Principles for Linking Agriculture and Nutrition: Synthesis from 10 Development Institutions*. Report for the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Rome: FAO.
- Hoddinott, J. 2012. "Agriculture, Health, and Nutrition: Toward Conceptualizing the Linkages." In *Reshaping Agriculture for Nutrition and Health*, edited by S. Fan and R. Pandya-Lorch, 13-20. Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- IFPRI (International Food Policy Research Institute). 2012. *Global Food Policy Report 2011*. Washington, DC: IFPRI.
- Kabunga, N. S., T. Dubois, and M. Qaim. 2012. "Heterogeneous Information Exposure and Technology Adoption: The Case of Tissue Culture Bananas in Kenya." *Agricultural Economics* 43 (5): 473–486.
- Kassie, M., B. Shiferaw, et al. 2011. "Agricultural Technology, Crop Income, and Poverty Alleviation in Uganda." *World Development* 39 (10): 1784–1795.
- Kjær, A. M., F. Muhumuza, T. Mwebaze and M. Katusiimeh. 2012. Coalition-Driven Initiatives in the Ugandan Dairy Sector: Elites, Conflict and Bargaining. DIIS Working Paper 2012:02. Copenhagen: Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS).
- Lee, W.-S. 2013. "Propensity Score Matching and Variations on the Balancing Test." *Empirical Economics* 44 (1): 47–80.
- Leroy, J. 2011. "Zscore06: Stata Module to Calculate Anthropometric Z-Scores Using the 2006 Who Child Growth Standards." *Statistical Software Components*.
- Levine, S. 2012. "Exploring Differences in National and International Poverty Estimates: Is Uganda on Track to Halve Poverty by 2015?" *Social Indicators Research* 107 (2): 331–349.
- MAAIF (Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries). 2010. *Statistical Abstract*. Entebbe, Uganda: Agricultural Planning Department.
- Matuschke, I., and M. Qaim. 2009. "The Impact of Social Networks on Hybrid Seed Adoption in India." *Agricultural Economics* 40 (5): 493–505.
- Mbowa, S., I. Shinyekwa, and M. M. Lwanga. 2012. *Dairy Sector Reform and Transformation in Uganda since the 1990s*. EPRC Research Report. Kampala, Uganda: Economic Policy Research Center.
- Meinzen-Dick, R., J. Behrman, P. Menon, and A. Quisumbing. 2012. "Gender: A Key Dimension Linking Agricultural Programs to Improved Nutrition and Health." In *Reshaping Agriculture for Nutrition and Health*, edited by S. Fan and R. Pandya-Lorch, 135-144. Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Nicholson, C. F., P. K. Thornton, et al. 2004. "Household-Level Impacts of Dairy Cow Ownership in Coastal Kenya." *Journal of Agricultural Economics* 55 (2): 175–195.
- Ravallion, M. 1998. *Poverty Lines in Theory and Practice*. Living Standards Measurement Study Working Paper. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Ravallion, M., and B. Bidani. 1994. "How Robust Is a Poverty Profile?" *The World Bank Economic Review* 8 (1): 75–102.
- Rosenbaum, P. R. 2002. *Observational Studies*. New York: Springer.
- Rosenbaum, P., and D. Rubin. 1983. "The Central Role of the Propensity Score in Observational Studies for Causal Effects." *Biometrika* 70 (1): 41–55.
- Rubin, D. B., and N. Thomas. 1996. "Matching Using Estimated Propensity Scores: Relating Theory to Practice." *Biometrics* 52 (1): 249-264.
- Ruel, M. T. 2001. *Can Food-Based Strategies Help Reduce Vitamin A and Iron Deficiencies?: A Review of Recent Evidence*. Food Policy Review. Washington DC: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Sianesi, B. 2004. "An Evaluation of the Swedish System of Active Labor Market Programs in the 1990s." *Review of Economics and Statistics* 86 (1): 133–155.

- Smith, J., and P. Todd. 2005. "Does Matching Overcome Lalonde's Critique of Nonexperimental Estimators?" *Journal of Econometrics* 125 (1): 305–353.
- Spears, D. 2013. *How Much International Variation in Child Height Can Sanitation Explain?* Policy Research Working Paper, WPS 6351. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Ssewanyana, S. N., and I. Kasirye. 2012. *Poverty and Inequality Dynamics in Uganda: Insights from the National Panel Surveys 2005/2006 and 2009/2010*. EPRC Research Paper. Kampala, Uganda: Economic Policy Research Center.
- Ssewanyana, S. N., and J. A. Okidi. 2007. *Poverty Estimates from Uganda National Household Survey III 2005/2006*. Kampala, Uganda: Economic Policy Research Center.
- Staal, S., C. Delgado, and C. Nicholson. 1997. "Smallholder Dairying under Transactions Costs in East Africa." *World Development* 25 (5): 779–794.
- Sunding, D., and D. Zilberman. 2001. "The Agricultural Innovation Process: Research and Technology Adoption in a Changing Agricultural Sector." *Handbook of Agricultural Economics* 1: 207–261.
- UBoS (Uganda Bureau of Statistics). 2007. *Uganda National Household Survey 2005-2006: Social Economic Report*. Kampala: Uganda Bureau of Statistics.
- von Braun, J. 1995. "Agricultural Commercialization: Impacts on Income and Nutrition and Implications for Policy." *Food Policy* 20 (3): 187–202.
- Wambugu, S., L. Kiriimi, and J. Opiyo. 2011. *Productivity Trends and Performance of Dairy Farming in Kenya*. Nairobi, Kenya: Tegemeo Institute of Agricultural Policy and Development.
- Webb, P. 2013. *Impact Pathways from Agricultural Research to Improved Nutrition and Health: Literature Analysis and Research Priorities*. Rome: Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and World Health Organization (WHO).
- Wiley, A. S. 2009. "Consumption of Milk, but Not Other Dairy Products, Is Associated with Height among US Preschool Children in Nhanes 1999–2002." *Annals of Human Biology* 36(2): 125–138.
- Wong, M., and M. Kibirige. 2009. *South-South Exchange: Sharing of Knowledge and Innovations, the Case of the Dairy Sector in India, Uganda, and Tanzania*. Working Paper 52074. Washington, DC: World Bank.

RECENT IFPRI DISCUSSION PAPERS

For earlier discussion papers, please go to www.ifpri.org/pubs/pubs.htm#dp.
All discussion papers can be downloaded free of charge.

1327. *A comparative analysis of global cropping systems models and maps*. Weston Anderson, Liangzhi You, Stanley Wood, Ulrike Wood-Sichra, and Wenbin Wu, 2014.
1326. *Population pressure and livelihood dynamics: Panel evidence from Bangladesh*. Shahidur Rashid, Nigussie Tefera, Solomon Lemma, and Mohammed Yunus, 2014.
1325. *Changing sources of growth in Indian Agriculture: Implications for regional priorities for accelerating agricultural growth*. Pratap S. Borthal, Pramod K. Joshi, Digvijay S. Negi, and Shaily Agarwal, 2014.
1324. *Risk and Ambiguity Preferences and the Adoption of New Agricultural Technologies: Evidence from Field Experiments in Rural India*. Patrick S. Ward and Vartika Singh, 2014.
1323. *Land, Assets, and Livelihoods: Gendered Analysis of Evidence from Odisha State in India*. Vivien Savath, Diana Fletschner, Amber Peterman, and Florence Santos, 2014.
1322. *Exploring local perceptions of climate change impact and adaptation in rural Bangladesh*. Peter Davis and Snigdha Ali, 2014.
1321. *Closing the gender asset gap: Learning from value chain development in Africa and Asia*. Agnes R. Quisumbing, Deborah Rubin, Cristina Manfre, Elizabeth Waithanji, Mara van den Bold, Deanna Olney, and Ruth Meinzen-Dick, 2014.
1320. *The political economy of Zambia's recovery: Structural change without transformation?* Danielle Resnick and James Thurlow, 2014.
1319. *The impact of Bolsa Família on schooling: Girls' advantage increases and older children gain*. Alan de Brauw, Daniel O. Gilligan, John Hoddinott, and Shalini Roy, 2014.
1318. *Exploring strategic priorities for regional agricultural research and development investments in Southern Africa*. Michael Johnson, Samuel Benin, Liangzhi You, Xinshen Diao, Pius Chilonda, and Adam Kennedy, 2014.
1317. *How do intrahousehold dynamics change when assets are transferred to women?: Evidence from BRAC's Challenging the Frontiers of Poverty Reduction—Targeting the Ultra Poor Program in Bangladesh*. Narayan Das, Rabeya Yasmin, Jinnat Ara, Md. Kamruzzaman, Peter Davis, Julia A. Behrman, Shalini Roy, and Agnes R. Quisumbing, 2013.
1316. *Is there an app for that?: The impact of community knowledge workers in Uganda*. Bjorn Van Campenhout, 2013.
1315. *Can integrated agriculture-nutrition programs change gender norms on land and asset ownership: Evidence from Burkina Faso*. Mara van den Bold, Abdoulaye Pedehombga, Marcellin Ouedraogo, Agnes R. Quisumbing, and Deanna Olney, 2013.
1314. *Moving in the right direction?: Maize productivity and fertilizer use and use intensity in Ghana*. Antony Chapoto and Catherine Ragasa, 2013.
1313. *Women's empowerment in agriculture, production diversity, and nutrition: Evidence from Nepal*. Hazel Jean L. Malapit, Suneetha Kadiyala, Agnes R. Quisumbing, Kenda Cunningham, and Parul Tyagi, 2013.
1312. *Don't tell on me: Experimental evidence of asymmetric information in transnational households*. Kate Ambler, 2013.
1311. *Can dairy value-chain projects change gender norms in rural Bangladesh?: Impacts on assets, gender norms, and time use*. Agnes R. Quisumbing, Shalini D. Roy, Jemimah Njuki, Kakuly Tanvin, and Elizabeth Waithanji, 2013.
1310. *Can government-allocated land contribute to food security?: Intrahousehold analysis of West Bengal's microplot allocation program*. Florence Santos, Diana Fletschner, Vivien Savath, and Amber Peterman, 2013.
1309. *The National Health Insurance Scheme in Ghana: Implementation challenges and proposed solutions*. Gissele Gajate-Garrido and Rebecca Owusu, 2013.
1308. *Gender inequalities in ownership and control of land in Africa: Myths versus reality*. Cheryl Doss, Chiara Kovarik, Amber Peterman, Agnes R. Quisumbing, Mara van den Bold, 2013.
1307. *Farmer preferences for drought tolerance in hybrid versus inbred rice: Evidence from Bihar, India*. Patrick S. Ward, David L. Ortega, David J. Spielman, Vartika Singh, 2013.

**INTERNATIONAL FOOD POLICY
RESEARCH INSTITUTE**

www.ifpri.org

IFPRI HEADQUARTERS

2033 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-1002 USA
Tel.: +1-202-862-5600
Fax: +1-202-467-4439
Email: ifpri@cgiar.org

IFPRI KAMPALA

15 East Naguru Road
Kampala
Uganda
Tel.: +256-41-285-060/4; +256-312-226-613
Fax: +256-41-285-079
Email: ifpri-Kampala@cgiar.org