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Objective

- Measure food choice decisions of men and women among small-scale farming households as:
  - Income varies (what if)
  - Nutritional information is provided (treatment effect)
Introduction to choice experiments

- Choice experiments analyze how people make decisions when faced with various alternatives
  - The influences leading to a decision can be identified and measured. For example:
    - What aspects of a product do consumers value?
    - How much are they willing to pay for certain characteristics?
- Traditional application in food industry, consumer goods, financial products and healthcare plans.
Rationale

• Why consider individual food choices?
  • Preferences/food choices important input in nutritional outcomes of the household
  • Understand the determinants of these choices for policy intervention

• Why food choice experiment?
  • Difficult to assess individual food choices in the household by simply considering consumption data
### Data

- 250 small-scale farming households with couples randomly selected across 2 study sites in Guatemala
- WEAI module
- Household-level production and consumption data
- Food choice experiments with all the participants (N=500)
- Labor preference experiment with all the participants (N=500)
Scoring food choices - healthy and unhealthy food items

- Define healthy and unhealthy food choices using:
  - WHO nutrient profile classification for food groups
    - Certain food groups like chocolate and sugar confectionery, energy drinks etc. are straightforward *unhealthy* choices
    - For other food items like cereal, cheese etc., categorization accounts for sugar, sodium and fat contents in a standard portion size of 100 grams
Scoring food choices - members’ nutritional status & per capita standardization

- Categorize all household members’ nutritional status using body mass index (BMI) - undernourished, normal, overweight and obese.
- Using participant’s age & BMI type to calculate adult female equivalent (AFE):
  - E.g. a man in the age group of 30-39 years with normal BMI is 1.25 AFE, while an obese man in the same age group is 1.42 AFE.
- Household-level AFE - Sum of AFE’s of the all the HH members
Scoring food choices

- For each food item and its quantity selected in the experiment - calculate the total quantity in grams to grams per capita (total QTY/HH AFE)
- Standardize grams per capita of food choice to a 100 gram portion size → final score of healthy and unhealthy food choices
### Descriptives of food choice score

**Table:** *Food choice scores of men and women by treatment effect (received or not nutritional information)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income level</th>
<th>Treat=1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Treat=0</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>t-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food choice score for healthy items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.63</td>
<td>9.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>13.44</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.02</td>
<td>12.78</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>16.64</td>
<td>17.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>17.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food choice score for unhealthy items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food choice score for healthy and unhealthy items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>10.88</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.44</td>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>13.47</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.59</td>
<td>13.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Correlates of food choice scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>income=75Q</td>
<td>2.86***</td>
<td>3.64***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income=100Q</td>
<td>6.46***</td>
<td>5.74***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment=1 (HH received nutritional information)</td>
<td>2.76***</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WEAI indicators**
- Ag decisions disempowerment | 0.82 | -8.03*** |
- Asset ownership disempowerment | 2.3* | 3.36* |
- Credit access disempowerment | -0.87 | 2.72 |
- Income use disempowerment | 0.32 | -1.17 |
- Group membership disempowerment | 1.06 | -3.09** |
- Workload disempowerment | 2.19 | -1.45 |

**Individual-level controls**
- Age | -0.07** | -0.75*** |
- Literacy | 1.08** | 0.14 |
- Participation in nutritional workshop | 1.68** | -0.9 |

**Household-level controls**
- HH size | -1.4*** | -1.33*** |
- HH food insecurity | -1.6** | -2.03*** |
- Expenses in non-food items | -0.004*** | -0.006* |
- Frequency of market visits(less than weekly) | -1.98** | -1.32* |
- Region dummy | -0.85 | -.21 |
Summary of results

- In this experiment, choices are not discrete.
- Participants selected several food items from the choice set and different quantities of each item.
- Food choice scores help to standardize the choices in one unit while taking into account nutrient content of food items.
- We find strong treatment effect for women’s food choices.
- Income is strongly and positively correlated with healthier choices.
- WEAI domain indicators are not highly significant for women’s food choices.
- For men adequate empowerment in agricultural decision-making and group membership is correlated with higher food choice scores.
- The scores are also correlated with several socio-economic aspects of the individual and the household.
Next steps

- Consider the experiment rounds with a mix of food and non-food items
- Analyze individual choices in conjunction with joint choices conducted
- Explore random utility model (RUM) to analyze food choices by converting scores (continuous numbers) in discrete options
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