A mixed-methods approach to construct program-impact pathways (PIP) and highlight the role of an agricultural and market development program in supporting household food security and dietary diversity among smallholder farmers in Guatemala
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INTRODUCTION

Agriculture systems have a crucial role in provision of food, livelihoods, and income. Agriculture is the main occupation of 80% of poor populations in rural areas, including women and the primary source of livelihood for the majority of the world’s poor. The sector contributes to livelihoods and food security through direct production of food and by generating income that can be spent on food, education, and health care that benefit nutrition. Evidence of the effectiveness of targeted agricultural programs on nutrition, with the exception of vitamin A, is limited. Strengthening of nutrition goals and actions and rigorous effectiveness assessments are needed. Evaluation of agricultural development programs that directly or indirectly promote nutrition and health is still an area of critical need. Focusing on mechanisms and pathways is important for demonstrating the connections between activities and program outcomes. Also, understanding program logic that focuses on the mechanisms and pathways may help identify whether impact was achieved despite failure to implement the program as conceptualized and designed. Strengthening the policy and programmatic links between agriculture and health and nutrition requires means of seeing how their numerous links fit together. Emerging evidence from well-conducted agriculture interventions shows its effect on increasing productivity and food availability. However, there is also growing consensus that a better understanding is needed of the different cultural, economic and social conditioning factors that affect the dynamic nature of this association.

OBJECTIVE

To integrate evidence underpinning program-impact pathways on food security and dietary diversity promoted by the Purchase for Progress (P4P) program in Guatemala

METHODS


- Levels of Evidence Set and Defined
  1. Content Analysis
  2. Common Patterns
  3. Contextual Settings

- Key Findings: From Each Data Source:
  - Improved agricultural productivity is a critical factor promoted by P4P that had direct impact on household food security and dietary diversity.
  - Household food security and dietary diversity in the context of the P4P initiative in Guatemala was primarily impacted by increased productivity and income, changes in crops and production practices, improved market access and price, and empowerment strategies.

RESULTS

Program-impact Pathway #1: Changes in crops and production practices promote food security and dietary diversity through the increased productivity.

- Improved Price
- Market Access
- Productivity

Program-impact Pathway #2: Improved price, market access and productivity promote food security and dietary diversity through investments in basic needs and agricultural production practices and increased income.

- Basic Needs
- Investment
- Food Security

Program-impact Pathway #3: Improved market access and price results in increased income that promotes food security and dietary diversity through investments in basic needs and agricultural production practices.

- Improved Access to Information
- Inclusion and Participation
- Empowerment
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