



Oxford Policy Management

EVALUATION OF THE UGANDA SOCIAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS FOR EMPOWERMENT (SAGE) PROGRAMME

Technical Report on Regression Discontinuity Design

Dr Michele Binci, Fred Merttens, Sean O'Leary, Esmerelda Sindou

17 October 2014

Preface

This report complements the SAGE Programme Impact Evaluation by presenting the robustness checks and sensitivity tests that informed the decision to drop the Regression Discontinuity approach to estimating impact. For information on the study approach being implemented in the place of the Regressions Discontinuity Design see Evaluation of the Uganda Social Assistance Grants for Empowerment (SAGE) Programme: Impact after one year of programme operations 2012–2013 (October 2014).

This assessment is being carried out by Oxford Policy Management, Economic Policy Research Centre and Stella Neema of the Department of Anthropology and Sociology, University of Makerere, with additional assistance from The Uganda Bureau of Statistics. The project manager is Fred Merttens (fred.merttens@opml.co.uk).

The contact point for the client is Kurt Koomen (kkoomen@maxwellstamp.com).

Oxford Policy Management Limited

Registered in England: 3122495

6 St Aldates Courtyard
38 St Aldates
Oxford OX1 1BN
United Kingdom

Tel +44 (0) 1865 207 300
Fax +44 (0) 1865 207 301
Email admin@opml.co.uk
Website www.opml.co.uk

Table of Contents

Preface	i
List of Tables and Figures	iii
List of Abbreviations	iv
1 Preliminary Concerns	5
1.1 Theory and Implementation	5
1.2 Baseline Tests	6
2 Sensitivity Analysis	8
2.1 Different Models and Alternative Thresholds and Bandwidths	8
2.1.1 Robustness across models	8
2.1.2 Sensitivity to alternative eligibility thresholds and bandwidths	9
2.1.3 Tables with test results	10
2.1.4 Discussion of the test results	13
2.2 A further round of tests	13
3 Conclusions	23
References / Bibliography	24
Annex A Robustness checks across all indicators	25

List of Tables and Figures

Table 1 Consistency across models and sensitivity to alternate thresholds and bandwidths	11
Table 2 Consistency across models.....	15
Table 3 Sensitivity to alternate eligibility thresholds.....	17
Table 4 Sensitivity to alternate eligibility thresholds for quadratic with controls model.....	19
Table 5 Sensitivity to alternate eligibility thresholds for quadratic collapsed at the mean.....	21

List of Abbreviations

BDR	Birth and Death Registration
DID	Difference-in-differences
Diff-in-Dis	Difference-in-discontinuities
OPM	Oxford Policy Management
PRP	Peer Review Panel
PSM	Propensity Score Matching
RDD	Regression Discontinuity Design
SAGE	Social Assistance Grants for Empowerment
SCG	Senior Citizens Grant
UNHS	Uganda National Household Survey
VFSG	Vulnerable Families Support Grant

1 Preliminary Concerns

1.1 Theory and Implementation

This technical report explains the reasons behind the decision to drop the Regression Discontinuity Design (RDD) for estimating impact under the SAGE impact evaluation and replacing it with an alternative estimation method. The report details the issues that were encountered in using RDD estimation strategies and presents the various sensitivity tests and robustness checks that were employed to corroborate this decision. The conclusion reached by OPM was that the RDD was unable to provide credible and reliable results and should be replaced by an alternative approach. The case for dropping the RDD was particularly strong because the various issues encountered were not isolated incidences, which could have been justified by the extensive range of indicators involved in the analysis, but occurred multiple times across both targeting mechanisms and a large series of diverse indicators.

The alternative quasi-experimental approach chosen to replace the RD design is Propensity Score Matching (PSM). This is in line with the back-up strategy that was envisaged by the Evaluation Team during the inception phase of the project, when the decision to pursue an RDD approach was made by the Steering Committee. In fact, a number of potential risks associated with the use of the RDD methodology were already expressed by OPM at the inception stage, with respect to the defining parameters of the programme as well as its practical implementation.

A general point of concern was the lack of external validity of the RD design itself. Since this design requires that the sample of interviewed households is restricted to those within a narrow bandwidth of eligibility scores around the cut-off score representing the eligibility threshold of the programme, the estimated impact results cannot be generalised to all recipient households. This limitation of the RDD approach in terms of external validity was exacerbated in the context of this evaluation by the fact that districts selected for the programme were by no means typical of Uganda as a whole, having been specifically chosen on the basis of a bespoke vulnerability index. Moreover, villages (clusters) with low density around the eligibility threshold were screened out from the sample of villages covered by the evaluation, thus further undermining the external validity of the study.

Finally, as the control households for the RDD estimation strategy need to be drawn from the same clusters (villages) as the treatment households', the potential for spill-over effects represented another significant risk for the RDD approach. Given the close proximity between control and treatment households, it is highly likely the programme may have resulted in welfare improvements even for non-recipients household, due to economic linkages between households and support networks at the village level that involve sharing money and other resources. This can further undermine the reliability of the RDD approach, which would underestimate the impact of the programme if the welfare of control households increase due to spill-over effects. Spill-overs can be of concern to other evaluation designs but they represented a somewhat heightened risk in this context due to the location of treatment and control households in the same clusters.

In addition to these preliminary methodological concerns associated with the use of the RD approach, the existence of even more issues related to the implementation of the programme, which could themselves negatively affect the robustness of the RDD evaluation design, became apparent during discussions with the SAGE management team.

Two factors risked undermining the key assumptions underpinning the RDD approach:

1. The link between the births registration programme and enrolment to the SAGE programme became overt for households and communities.
 - This could have undermined the RDD assumption that the distribution of the outcome variable is independent from the eligibility criteria in the close neighbourhood of the threshold
2. A large number of households in the six pre-pilot sub-counties came into the programme on appeal.
 - This could have undermined the RDD assumption that the eligibility rules are strictly and uniformly implemented in the field.

There was therefore a strong risk of selection-bias, with better informed (more able and better connected) households potentially able to manipulate the eligibility criteria of the programme, by misreporting their age to obtain the SCG treatment for instance. At the same time, the fact that some control households subsequently entered the programme on appeal further undermined the robustness of the counterfactual. These implementation problems added to the methodological issues mentioned above, further called into question the suitability of the RDD approach for this impact evaluation.

1.2 Baseline Tests

The evaluation baseline report (BL) included a series of tests that were performed with the aim of assessing whether some of the assumptions underpinning the RDD approach were fulfilled (see Imbens and Lemieux 2008 and Lee and Lemieux 2010 for a detailed introduction to the RDD approach and its assumptions). However, not all assumptions could be tested at BL and an alternative method (PSM) was again touted as a potential replacement strategy in case the RDD failed. In other words, At BL the methodological concerns were still sufficient to consider the use of a different evaluation design.

Apart from the assumption referring to *the unobservable characteristics being a continuous function of the assignment variable at the cut-off*, which can never be tested directly, the other assumptions that could not be tested at baseline were that *the assignment variable has a monotonic effect on the probability of being treated* and that *there must be discontinuity in the probability of being treated by SAGE around cut-off*. In order for these assumptions to be fulfilled, the implementation phase of the programme needs to be consistently conducted, which was proven to be problematic in this case. The tests that could be performed revealed a mixed picture, with the majority of indicators and variables passing the tests, but serious reservations on the efficacy of the RDD still remaining. Specifically, the assumption stating that *the gains from treatment must be a function of the assignment variable at the cut-off* and the assumption stating that *the observables must be a continuous function of the assignment variable at the cut-off* were tested in the BL, with the following results:

- The first assumption that was tested is concerned with the potential ability of certain households to have an influence on the assignment variable, thus increasing their probability of receiving the treatment. By analysing the density of the normalised assignment variables for SCG and VFSG transfers, it was possible to identify a significant clumping of the assignment variables, particularly in the case of the age-related cut-off of the SCG, but also under the labour constrained score of the VFSG.

After performing the McCrary test (McCrary 2008) using the Uganda National Household Survey 2009/10 (UNHS), the lack of continuity in the assignment variable across the cut-off threshold was confirmed. This raised serious concerns that the assignment variable had been manipulated, especially in the case of the VFSG¹.

- The second assumption that was tested is meant to ensure that a discontinuity observed in the outcome variable at follow-up is a result of the impact of receiving the treatment and is not caused by a pre-existing discontinuity. Although the majority of the impact indicators, including poverty and consumption expenditure, did not show any sign of discontinuity at baseline, about a fifth of the outcome variables for both SCG and VFSG showed evidence of discontinuities. The inclusion of covariates into the estimation specification reduced the proportion of outcome variables showing pre-existent discontinuities to 19% for SCG households and 16% for VFSG households. Similar discontinuities were also found for a sizeable proportion of observable household characteristics. Given this variation in results across variables the tests were largely inconclusive, but the validity of this assumption could not be solidly verified.

The BL report also mentions the potential use of time series analysis to control for the discontinuities found at baseline, employing a difference-in-differences (DID) approach to control for systematic time invariant differences observed across treatment and control households. This approach was subsequently adopted in the sensitivity analysis presented in this report, which employed both DID and difference-in-discontinuities (Dif-in-Dis) as additional models for robustness checks.

The BL also discusses the anecdotal evidence collected in the field, which seemed to confirm the ability of certain households to manipulate the assignment variables. In particular, the connection between the collection of data carried out for the Birth and Death Registration (BDR) process and the targeting of the SAGE programme was well understood by potential beneficiaries in the communities that were visited during fieldwork for the baseline survey. Manipulation of the assignment variable was therefore possible and probably not random, as the households capable of manipulating were likely to be those more informed and better connected. As mentioned above, these operational problems related to the implementation of the two programmes exacerbated the fundamental weaknesses associated with the RDD that had been highlighted at the inception stage of the project. In fact, when further checks could be performed at the follow up stage, these and other concerns were largely confirmed, as the test results presented below demonstrate.

¹ Although it is highly improbable that households were aware of the precise calculation by which the VFSG score was constructed, and thus able to manipulate it, manipulation of sorts could still be likely if households understood the link between the BDR process and targeting of the SAGE programme. If the population were aware that 'vulnerable' households were being targeted, they might aim to game the system by reporting characteristics that are associated with 'vulnerability' in their communities, such as presence of aged household members, orphans and disabilities etc., all of which would influence the VFSG score (we know from the way that CBT is implemented in a number of settings, for instance, that communities do often associate certain categorical characteristics with poverty and vulnerability).

2 Sensitivity Analysis

2.1 Different Models and Alternative Thresholds and Bandwidths

The credibility of the RD estimation approach to assessing the impact of the two SAGE interventions was undermined by the initial findings emerging from the analysis of data collected at the follow up stage. Trends and impact estimates for a selection of indicators appeared to be contradictory and unfeasible based on the knowledge of the outcome measures under examination. In discussion with Patrick Nolen of the SAGE programme Evaluation Peer Review Panel (PRP), the OPM Evaluation Team decided to further investigate the significance of the findings and the reasons behind this apparent lack of robustness and reliability of the RDD results.

A sensitivity analysis was developed in order to achieve these aims. A series of technical notes exchanged between Patrick Nolen and the Evaluation Team informed the steps that were then followed to perform the sensitivity analysis:

- An estimation model was selected as a reference for the estimation of the impact
- Consistency was tested across alternative estimation models
- Sensitivity to alternative eligibility thresholds was tested
- Sensitivity to adjusting the bandwidth was tested

Below we discuss the findings from these analyses.

2.1.1 Robustness across models

A number of different models were employed to test the robustness of the results obtained. Each model was clustered on a discrete assignment score and specified according to different functional forms of the polynomial, either at the cross-sectional level or with a Dif-in-Dis approach. In order to ascertain which model could be considered as the primary measure of impact for each indicator the following logic was applied: where we found no discontinuity at baseline we took as our primary estimate of impact the quadratic cross-sectional model at follow-up. Where we did find a discontinuity at baseline we took the quadratic ‘Dif-in-Dis’ model. The latter combines RDD and DID, with which it shares the assumptions that the effect of the confounding discontinuity on the potential outcome in the case of no treatment is constant over time and the effect of the confounding discontinuity is the same in the case of treatment and no treatment (see Grembi et al. 2012 for a description of the Dif-in-Dis approach). The standard DID approach is also employed, with the aim of providing further insight into trends and thus assisting interpretation of the results. The quadratic polynomial was deemed as a good fit to be used as the reference estimation model for this sensitivity analysis, though other candidate models were previously tested.

Since for the VFSG group the probability of selection was almost fully determined by the assignment score, a sharp RD was applied to estimate impact. However, for the SCG group the probability of treatment was only partially determined by the assignment score. That is to say, some households with eligibility scores below the threshold were receiving the transfer and some with eligibility scores above the threshold were not receiving the transfer. Hence, a fuzzy RD was employed to estimate impact for the SCG group, in order to account for this ‘fuzziness’ or lack of sharpness of treatment status around the eligibility threshold.

The main models employed for this analysis are the following:

- **Quadratic cross-section baseline:** quadratic polynomial regression estimating the discontinuity at the eligibility threshold between treatment and control households at baseline only. *If this measure is not statistically significant, we assume there is no discontinuity at baseline.*
- **Quadratic cross-section follow-up:** quadratic polynomial regression estimating the discontinuity at the eligibility threshold between treatment and control households at the follow-up stage only.
- **Quadratic cross-section follow-up with controls:** as above but including a selection of covariates to control for a number of household and community-level characteristics.
- **Quartic cross-section follow-up:** as the quadratic cross-section specification but using a quartic polynomial model.
- **Quadratic Dif-in-Dis:** quadratic polynomial regression estimating the difference in discontinuity at follow-up minus the difference in discontinuity at baseline.
- **Quadratic Dif-in-Dis with controls:** as above but including a selection of covariates to control for a number of household and community-level characteristics.
- **Quartic Dif-in-Dis:** as the quadratic Dif-in-Dis but using a quartic polynomial.

The method to assess consistency with other functional forms of the polynomial is based on identifying whether each model is statistically significant or not in the same direction (+-) as the primary impact estimate, which is in this case the parametric polynomial quadratic model. Comparisons are based on the models appropriate to each targeting mechanism and on whether the primary model is a cross section or a Dif-in-Dis, in accordance with the criteria explained above.

2.1.2 Sensitivity to alternative eligibility thresholds and bandwidths

The sensitivity of the results obtained was also tested for discontinuities away from the original cut-off point and for discontinuities within different bandwidths around the threshold. Potential discontinuities away from the SAGE eligibility threshold were tested to assess the sensitivity of results to alternative eligibility thresholds. If there exists a discontinuity at an alternative threshold, some factor other than SAGE is likely to be driving the observed discontinuities. It is also possible that discontinuities away from the threshold arise from the fact that the assignment score is discrete, which is reflected in our findings of high standard errors around point estimates at each value of the assignment score.

At the same time, in order to assess the sensitivity of results to adjusting the bandwidth, the discontinuity on a reduced bandwidth of +10 (primary bandwidth is +15) was examined. The disparity between the DID estimate and the primary impact estimate was also considered, including whether this disparity decreases as the bandwidth is tightened from +15 to +10. If the disparity between DID and impact estimate is accounted for by the fact that points far away from the discontinuity are very different than those near the cut-off, the disparity should diminish the tighter the bandwidth becomes. This implies that if the disparity between DID and impact at bandwidth +15 is significant, the disparity between impact at bandwidth +15 and DID at +10 should be reduced.

2.1.3 Tables with test results

The table below presents the results of this sensitivity analysis for a selection of indicators across a range of different domains of impact, which were selected for their particular significance in terms of SAGE expected effects on beneficiaries. The table identifies the model used as the primary estimate of programme impact (quadratic) and assesses consistency of this estimate with other model specifications, sensitivity to adjusted bandwidth and sensitivity to alternative eligibility thresholds.

Statistically significant impact estimates are highlighted in bold, whilst inconsistent results in the sensitivity tests are highlighted in red. The asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator (***=99%; **=95%; *=90).

The source of the data used is the SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013.

Table 1 Consistency across models and sensitivity to alternate thresholds and bandwidths

Indicator / targeting mechanism		Selected model		Consistency across models		Sensitivity to alternate eligibility thresholds		Sensitivity to adjusted bandwidth		
		Type	Quadratic	Quadratic with controls	Quartic	+5	-5	Quadratic @ +-10	DID @ +-15	DID @ +-10
Per adult equivalent consumption (UGX)	SCG	Cross section	22,513	5,792	42,374	26,330	22,335	44,610***	14,620***	17,318***
	VFSG	Cross section	7,167	-6,009	17,660	6,560	27,992**	7,343	8,364**	8,575*
Change in consumption	SCG	Dif-in-dis	19,009***	15,652**	789.3	28,974***	13,510*	25,273***	14,620***	17,318***
	VFSG	Cross section	12,338**	8,749	19,647**	20,274	3,819	11,732*	8,364**	8,575*
Incidence of poverty (p0)	SCG	Cross section	-16.29**	-6.840	-19.48	-16.95	-12.03*	-26.53***	-2.417	-1.300
	VFSG	Cross section	-6.038	3.743	7.503	57.20	-17.45***	5.229	-7.500**	-8.541**
Poverty gap (p1)	SCG	Dif-in-dis	-2.120	-1.075	0.538	-14.20*	2.694	-4.831	-2.162**	-1.612
	VFSG	Cross section	-0.916	1.364	-0.619	9.651	-5.508***	-0.276	-1.948**	-1.931**
Severity of poverty (p2)	SCG	Cross section	-1.600	0.133	-4.442*	-1.311	-0.845	-5.505***	-1.261***	-1.049*
	VFSG	Cross section	-0.0247	0.640	-0.915	2.431	-2.042***	-0.315	-0.631**	-0.513
Proportion of households purchasing livestock in last 12 months	SCG	Cross section	12.90***	10.16**	12.10*	1.633	11.57**	7.975	16.77***	18.93***
	VFSG	Cross section	25.81***	21.65***	26.69	22.92	32.07***	28.33**	31.18***	31.06***
Mean total value of livestock purchased (UGX)	SCG	Cross section	25,636	60,380	-4,972	6,489	-21,672	-33,096	31,506*	50,175**

Indicator / targeting mechanism		Selected model		Consistency across models		Sensitivity to alternate eligibility thresholds		Sensitivity to adjusted bandwidth		
		Type	Quadratic	Quadratic with controls	Quartic	+5	-5	Quadratic @ +-10	DID @ +-15	DID @ +-10
	VFSG	Cross section	27,968*	19,203	9,004	140,200	2,705	46,820*	22,026**	7,777
Proportion of households owning land	SCG	Cross section	3.113	2.831	3.575	1.488	-2.207	2.740	-1.686	-1.480
	VFSG	Cross section	-4.312	-10.79	-0.638	-2.165	-0.390	-7.479	-0.250	-0.513
Proportion working-age adults engaged in subsidiary occupations	SCG	Cross section	-16.63***	-12.63*	-17.81*	-23.13*	-16.11**	-17.13*	-3.962	-4.172
	VFSG	Cross section	2.091	2.337	-13.27	-19.82	5.350	-1.420	0.776	2.088
Proportion of boys 6-17 currently attending formal education	SCG	Dif-in-dis	-0.251	-0.225	0.639	-1.177	-4.546	-3.453	-0.297	-1.410
	VFSG	Cross section	0.855	0.296	8.887	23.61	5.814*	3.577	-1.599	-0.608
Mean number of days missed in last 30 scheduled school days – boys	SCG	Cross section	-0.438	-0.890	-0.185	1.965	-0.366	2.216**	-0.366	-0.234
	VFSG	Cross section	-0.641	-0.863	2.956***	1.343	-0.0248	-0.409	-0.993**	-0.433
Class progression rate – girls	SCG	Dif-in-dis	11.42	11.57	31.79*	37.61	3.895	23.23*	-3.475	0.150
	VFSG	Cross section	8.967*	8.546*	9.479	-4.980	8.591	6.625*	-2.458	-1.301

2.1.4 Discussion of the test results

The results of the tests presented in the tables above highlighted the following issues:

- Inconsistency across different estimation models
- Sensitivity to alternative eligibility thresholds
- Sensitivity to adjusted bandwidth

Some indicators displayed either one of the issues above or a combination of them.

Six out of twelve indicators displayed significant estimates, but only two indicators were associated with significant impact estimates for both SCG and VFSG. Only two out of these six statistically significant impact estimates did not show any inconsistency across the models used as robustness checks, in both cases this was associated with the SCG indicator only. We found sensitivity to alternate eligibility thresholds in 11 cases for either SCG or VFSG treatments across eight different indicators. Five different indicators presented clear sensitivity to reducing the bandwidth in the case of the Quadratic model. The latter performed better as the selected model of estimation compared to previous estimations undertaken using different parametric polynomial models. However, there still was inconsistency with the quartic model in a considerable number of cases.

The interpretation of impacts associated with key indicators is severely undermined by the presence of inconsistencies and sensitivity. For instance, the reduction in the incidence of poverty and the simultaneous positive change in consumption estimated with the Quadratic model for SCG beneficiaries cannot be interpreted as a solid finding due to inconsistencies with the Quartic model estimates and sensitivity to alternate eligibility thresholds, which are clearly observable for both indicators. In fact, when significant discontinuities in outcome indicators are found at different thresholds along the assignment variable, the significant discontinuity found at the original cut-off point cannot be confidently attributed to the treatment under examination, as it may be the result of a general lumpiness in the relationship between the assignment and outcome variables.

2.2 A further round of tests

The set of test results presented in the previous section clearly pointed out fundamental weaknesses in the RD approach for the evaluation of the two programmes' impacts. Together with the initial methodological concerns and implementation issues described above, this serious lack of robustness emerging from the tests, the Evaluation Team at this point recommend changing the evaluation approach altogether, as the RDD could not be reasonably deemed a reliable design. Given the significance of this decision, further tests were performed with the aim of exhausting any possible option for double checking the robustness of the RDD approach.

This final round of tests was once again the product of discussions between OPM and Patrick Nolen, who suggested a further revision of the sensitivity analysis on the quadratic polynomial. In particular, two additional models were added as robustness checks to the quadratic and quadratic with controls: a linear model and a quadratic model that collapses to the mean at each discrete assignment score. The latter was intended to deal with issues related to variance and potential outliers within the discrete assignment scores.

Finally, further tests were performed on sensitivity to adjusting the eligibility threshold to varying degrees: +-1, +-2 and +-3. The use of alternative thresholds relatively far (+-5) from the original cut-off point in previous tests was in fact seen as a potentially problematic choice given the rapidly reducing size of the sample at the extremities of the distribution. The resulting small number of observations at the further alternate thresholds could have itself a confounding effect on the significance of the estimates. Hence, sensitivity tests closer to the original thresholds were deemed to be more reliable for identifying potential issues associated with lumpiness in the data. These sensitivity tests were performed for the primary quadratic model, the quadratic with controls and the quadratic collapsed at the mean.

As shown in the tables below, the linear model and especially the quadratic collapsed to the mean model display some crucial inconsistencies when compared to the significant estimates obtained with the primary quadratic model as well as the other models employed in the tests. Moreover, the results show considerable sensitivity to the additional alternate eligibility thresholds for all the different model specifications tested. This aspect was again of particular concern as it called into question the validity of any significant estimate found at the original programme threshold. If even restricting the range of alternate thresholds to a neighbourhood closer to the original cut-off point does not eliminate sensitivity, then the existence of severe lumpiness issues is likely to compromise the validity of the results.

Table 2 Consistency across models

Indicator / targeting mechanism		Selected model		Consistency across models				
		Type	Quadratic	Quadratic with controls	Quadratic collapsed at the mean	Quartic	Linear	DID
Per adult equivalent consumption (UGX)	SCG	Cross section	22,513	5,792	-13,273	42,374	23,792	14,620***
	VFSG	Cross section	7,167	-6,009	-15,017	17,660	17,397	8,364**
Change in consumption	SCG	Dif-in-dis	4,241	-1,191	0	-59,555**	-4,355	0
	VFSG	Cross section	12,338**	8,749	4,333	19,647**	6,860	0
Incidence of poverty (p0)	SCG	Cross section	-16.29**	-6.840	1.274	-19.48	-13.11	-2.417
	VFSG	Cross section	-6.038	3.743	-0.240	7.503	-11.89	-7.500**
Poverty gap (p1)	SCG	Dif-in-dis	-2.120	-1.075	-0.227	0.538	1.548	-2.162**
	VFSG	Cross section	-0.916	1.364	0.261	-0.619	-3.258	-1.948**
Severity of poverty (p2)	SCG	Cross section	-1.600	0.133	0.992	-4.442*	-2.002	-1.261***
	VFSG	Cross section	-0.0247	0.640	0.198	-0.915	-0.996	-0.631**

Indicator / targeting mechanism		Selected model		Consistency across models				
		Type	Quadratic	Quadratic with controls	Quadratic collapsed at the mean	Quartic	Linear	DID
Proportion of households purchasing livestock in last 12 months	SCG	Cross section	12.90***	10.16**	3.286	12.10*	16.04**	16.77***
	VFSG	Cross section	25.81***	21.65***	10.66*	26.69	24.69***	31.18***
Mean total value of livestock purchased (UGX)	SCG	Cross section	25,636	60,380	20,620	-4,972	-16,337	31,506*
	VFSG	Cross section	27,968*	19,203	41,501*	9,004	2,213	22,026**
Proportion of households owning land	SCG	Cross section	3.113	2.831	4.141	3.575	1.208	-1.686
	VFSG	Cross section	-4.312	-4.886	-2.056	-8.795	2.993	-0.250
Proportion working-age adults engaged in subsidiary occupations	SCG	Cross section	-16.63***	-12.63*	-2.805	-17.81*	-16.46*	-3.962
	VFSG	Cross section	2.091	2.337	-1.846	-13.27	7.079	0.776
Proportion of boys 6-17 currently attending formal education	SCG	Dif-in-dis	-0.251	-0.225	-5.188	0.639	-1.869	-0.297
	VFSG	Cross section	0.855	0.296	2.003	12.90*	4.354	-1.599
Mean number of days missed in last 30 scheduled school days – boys	SCG	Cross section	-0.438	-0.890	0.339	-0.185	-0.339	-0.366
	VFSG	Cross section	-0.641	-0.863	0.285	2.956***	-0.414	-0.993**
Class progression rate – girls	SCG	Dif-in-dis	11.42	11.57	0.338	31.79*	3.611	-3.475

Indicator / targeting mechanism		Selected model		Consistency across models					
		Type	Quadratic	Quadratic with controls	Quadratic collapsed at the mean	Quartic	Linear	DID	
	VFSG	Cross section	8.967*	8.546*	3.032	9.479	12.43***	-2.458	

Table 3 Sensitivity to alternate eligibility thresholds

Indicator / targeting mechanism			Selected model		Sensitivity to alternate eligibility thresholds					
			Type	Quadratic	+1	-1	+2	-2	+3	-3
Per adult equivalent consumption (UGX)	SCG	Cross section	22,513	24,181	24,732	25,435	25,136	26,127	33,730	
	VFSG	Cross section	7,167	2,219	10,700	-3,008	13,596	-8,513	14,537	
Change in consumption	SCG	Dif-in-dis	4,241	4,103	757.4	3,948	-5,921	3,687	3,597	
	VFSG	Cross section	12,338**	14,496*	9,977*	16,793*	7,889	19,228*	5,532	
Incidence of poverty (p0)	SCG	Cross section	-16.29**	-18.02***	-15.12**	-19.69***	-13.36*	-21.27***	-16.79***	
	VFSG	Cross section	-6.038	-3.242	-8.330	-0.250	-10.57	2.937	-12.39*	
Poverty gap (p1)	SCG	Dif-in-dis	-2.120	-2.336	-1.633	-2.645	0.650	-3.074	2.312	
	VFSG	Cross section	-0.916	0.189	-1.783	1.371	-3.002	2.628	-4.083**	
Severity of poverty (p2)	SCG	Cross section	-1.600	-1.889	-1.169	-2.077	-1.765	-2.111	-2.694*	
	VFSG	Cross section	-0.0247	0.454	-0.407	0.964	-0.976	1.505	-1.503**	

Indicator / targeting mechanism		Selected model		Sensitivity to alternate eligibility thresholds						
		Type	Quadratic	+1	-1	+2	-2	+3	-3	
Proportion of households purchasing livestock in last 12 months	SCG	Cross section	12.90***	13.12***	12.17***	13.26***	10.27**	13.15***	20.60***	
	VFSG	Cross section	25.81***	25.15**	26.77***	24.67*	29.37***	24.38	31.95***	
Mean total value of livestock purchased (UGX)	SCG	Cross section	25,636	38,913**	29,794*	31,184	4,701	34,851	2,130	
	VFSG	Cross section	27,968*	36,454	21,090**	46,011	15,183*	56,637	14,836	
Proportion of households owning land	SCG	Cross section	3.113	3.265	2.424	2.890	2.171	3.151	0.930	
	VFSG	Cross section	-4.312	-6.489	-2.580	-8.953	-1.056	-11.70*	0.367	
Proportion working-age adults engaged in subsidiary occupations	SCG	Cross section	-16.63***	-	17.50***	-	19.17***	-14.35**	-21.65**	-19.48***
	VFSG	Cross section	2.091	1.182	2.935	0.210	3.735	-0.826	3.927	
Proportion of boys 6-17 currently attending formal education	SCG	Dif-in-dis	-0.251	-0.728	-0.508	-1.161	-3.191	-1.470	-3.357	
	VFSG	Cross section	0.855	-0.505	2.064	-1.960	3.336	-3.509	4.518*	
Mean number of days missed in last 30 scheduled school days – boys	SCG	Cross section	-0.438	-0.384	-0.328	-0.345	-0.256	-0.380	-0.223	
	VFSG	Cross section	-0.641	-0.758	-0.544	-0.883	-0.429	-1.015	-0.333	

Indicator / targeting mechanism		Selected model		Sensitivity to alternate eligibility thresholds					
		Type	Quadratic	+1	-1	+2	-2	+3	-3
Class progression rate – girls	SCG	Dif-in-dis	11.42	13.19*	9.952	15.79*	9.291	19.91*	10.49
	VFSG	Cross section	8.967*	8.541	9.337**	7.954	9.309*	7.205	8.884*

Table 4 Sensitivity to alternate eligibility thresholds for quadratic with controls model

Indicator / targeting mechanism		Selected model		Sensitivity to alternate eligibility thresholds					
		Type	Quadratic	+1	-1	+2	-2	+3	-3
Per adult equivalent consumption (UGX)	SCG	Cross section	5,800	8,900	9,300	8,200	14,300	5,700	16,000
	VFSG	Cross section	-6,000	-12,200	-1,200	-18,700	3,200	-25,500	7,000
Change in consumption	SCG	Cross section	9,000	12,900	15,000	13,800	25,500	13,600	2,400
	VFSG	Dif-in-Dis	828.9	874.3	779.8	913.9	958.6	947.7	953.0
Incidence of poverty (p0)	SCG	Cross section	-6.8	-9.8**	-6.3	-10.5**	-8.9**	-9.7	-6.9
	VFSG	Cross section	3.7	6.9	1.2	10.4	-1.6	14.2	-4.4
Poverty gap (p1)	SCG	Dif-in-Dis	-1.1	-1.4	-0.6	-1.8	1.2	-2.3	2.5
	VFSG	Cross section	1.4	2.6	0.4	3.9	-0.8	5.3	-2.1*
Severity of poverty (p2)	SCG	Cross section	0.1	-0.4	0.6	-0.2	-2.2*	0.1	-1.0
	VFSG	Cross section	0.6	1.1	0.3	1.7	-0.3	2.3	-0.9*

Indicator / targeting mechanism		Selected model		Sensitivity to alternate eligibility thresholds						
		Type	Quadratic	+1	-1	+2	-2	+3	-3	
Proportion of households purchasing livestock in last 12 months	SCG	Cross section	10.2**	10.2*	8.5**	8.9*	6.1	9.8	18.5***	
	VFSG	Cross section	21.6***	19.9**	23.5***	18.2	26.2***	16.5	28.9***	
Mean total value of livestock purchased (UGX)	SCG	Cross section	60,400	64,800	60,400***	82,100***	13,900	82,000*	16,800	
	VFSG	Cross section	19,200	25,900	12,900	33,400	7,300	41,600	6,600	
Proportion of households owning land	SCG	Cross section	2.8	1.3	3.0	1.5	2.9	1.7	0.2	
	VFSG	Cross section	-4.9	-7.1	-3.0	-9.6	-1.6	-12.4	0.0	
Proportion working-age adults engaged in subsidiary occupations	SCG	Cross section	-12.6*	-14.5*	-14.4**	-18.3**	-9.4	-21.1*	-19.1**	
	VFSG	Cross section	2.3	1.2	3.4	0.0	4.2	-1.2	4.4	
Proportion of boys 6-17 currently attending formal education	SCG	Dif-in-Dis	-0.2	-0.5	-0.7	-0.8	-3.4	-1.0	-2.7	
	VFSG	Cross section	0.3	-1.2	1.7	-2.8	3.0	-4.6	4.1	
Mean number of days missed in last 30 scheduled school days – boys	SCG	Cross section	-0.9	-0.7	-0.8	-0.8	-0.6	-0.8	-0.3	
	VFSG	Cross section	-0.9	-1.0	-0.7	-1.2	-0.6	-1.4	-0.4	
Class progression rate – girls	SCG	Dif-in-Dis	11.6	13.3*	10.5	15.7*	10.0	19.5*	11.5	
	VFSG	Cross section	8.5*	8.1	8.8**	7.5	9.0**	6.8	8.3*	

Table 5 Sensitivity to alternate eligibility thresholds for quadratic collapsed at the mean

Indicator / targeting mechanism		Selected model		Sensitivity to alternate eligibility thresholds						
		Type	Quadratic	+1	-1	+2	-2	+3	-3	
Per adult equivalent consumption (UGX)	SCG	Cross section	-13,273	22,200	-10,800	19,800	-30,000**	36,600***	-12,600	
	VFSG	Cross section	-15,017	-13,000	-16,800	5,500	-13,200	16,300	7,800	
Change in consumption	SCG	Cross section	0	27,300*	28,200**	29,800*	15,200*	33,700**	4,900	
	VFSG	Dif-in-Dis	4,333	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Incidence of poverty (p0)	SCG	Cross section	1.274	-5.4	1.4	-3.3	15.0	-8.9*	0.0	
	VFSG	Cross section	-0.240	7.9	7.0	-5.0	-3.8	-7.7	-7.1	
Poverty gap (p1)	SCG	Dif-in-Dis	-0.227	1.0	-1.0	2.3*	-1.8	3.5**	1.0	
	VFSG	Cross section	0.261	3.1	1.6	-0.9	-2.7	-0.5	-0.7	
Severity of poverty (p2)	SCG	Cross section	0.992	-1.3	0.6	-0.5	2.8	-2.6**	0.8	
	VFSG	Cross section	0.198	1.2	0.4	-0.2	-1.0	0.2	0.3	
Proportion of households purchasing livestock in last 12 months	SCG	Cross section	3.286	-4.3	4.8	-6.5**	7.8	-8.6***	3.8	
	VFSG	Cross section	10.66*	10.4**	8.9	8.8**	-1.0	4.4	-12.8	
Mean total value of livestock purchased (UGX)	SCG	Cross section	20,620	8,500	10,400	-17,900	22,500	-17,900	-1,200	
	VFSG	Cross section	41,501*	41,600*	43,000**	34,500	23,900	-30,100	-4,100	
Proportion of households owning land	SCG	Cross section	4.141	-0.7	2.8	-0.7	-0.6	2.9	6.3	
	VFSG	Cross section	-2.056	-2.5	0.5	0.2	4.8	3.8	3.1	
Proportion working-age adults engaged in subsidiary occupations	SCG	Cross section	-2.805	0.1	-4.4	5.4	-0.4	-1.5	0.8	
	VFSG	Cross section	-1.846	3.7	-2.0	11.6***	-2.3	4.2	7.4**	
Proportion of boys 6-17 currently attending formal education	SCG	Dif-in-Dis	-5.188	-11.0**	-4.5	-5.6	12.1*	-6.4	13.9*	
	VFSG	Cross section	2.003	-2.5	-2.9	-0.8	-4.3	-3.3	-7.2	
Mean number of days missed in last 30 scheduled school days – boys	SCG	Cross section	0.339	0.3	0.2	-0.4	-0.5	-0.6	0.0	
	VFSG	Cross section	0.285	0.2	-0.5	0.1	-0.7	1.0*	0.7	

Indicator / targeting mechanism	Selected model		Sensitivity to alternate eligibility thresholds						
	Type	Quadratic	+1	-1	+2	-2	+3	-3	
Class progression rate – girls	SCG	Dif-in-Dis	0.338	-10.6	3.0	-11.2	10.6	-17.9***	10.5
	VFSG	Cross section	3.032	-8.1**	4.3	-6.8	4.7	-1.0	3.2

3 Conclusions

The impact estimates of the SAGE programme obtained at the follow up stage by employing the RDD showed clear anomalies, which undermined the reliability of the evaluation results. This added to serious methodological concerns that were highlighted in the inception and baseline stages of the evaluation. The tests presented in this report were undertaken with the aim of exploring why the results were not robust and deciding whether or not the RD approach needed to be dropped and replaced by a more suitable estimation design.

The resulting sensitivity analysis that was designed and developed focused on the following:

- Refining the logic for selecting the primary model for estimating impact;
- Testing for consistency across alternative estimation models;
- Testing for sensitivity to alternative eligibility thresholds; and
- Testing for sensitivity to adjusting the bandwidth

The main findings and indications emerging from these tests, which are presented and discussed in this technical report, can be summarised as follows:

- Some nonsensical and/or contradictory results across indicators;
- Statistically significant discontinuities at baseline across indicators and impact areas;
- Inconsistency across impact model specifications for a large number of indicators;
- Statistically significant discontinuities at alternative eligibility thresholds; and
- Sensitivity of impact estimates to adjusting the bandwidth

These results appear to be partially driven by low correlation between the assignment score and any given outcome variable of interest. With the assignment scores for both the SCG programme and the VFSG programme being discrete, this results in point estimates at each value of assignment score with high standard errors. This variation tends to render the results very sensitive to parameters such as model specification, bandwidth and threshold.

Given the failure on the part of the RDD regression model to pass this extensive series of robustness checks and sensitivity tests, the OPM Evaluation Team in discussion with Patrick Nolen of the PRP took the informed decision to drop the RD approach altogether and explore the adoption of Propensity Score Matching (PSM) as an alternative estimation approach to assessing the impact of the SAGE programme.

Finally, in the Annex attached to this report (Annex A – Robustness checks across all indicators) we present a comparison of impact estimates obtained using several specifications within three different RDD parametric estimation models (linear, quadratic and quartic). The specifications are: X-BL (cross-section at baseline); X-FU (cross-section at follow up); XC-FU (cross-section with controls at follow-up); D-FU (difference-in-discontinuities at follow-up) and DC-FU (difference-in-discontinuities with controls at follow-up). The inconsistency issues highlighted by the sensitivity analysis on the key indicators are observable for most indicators, which are presented in the Annex for sake of completeness.

References / Bibliography

- Grebbi, V., T. Nannicini, and U. Troiano (2012). Policy responses to fiscal restraints: A difference-in-discontinuities design. *IZA Discussion Paper no. 6952*.
- Imbens, G. W. and T. Lemieux (2008). Regression discontinuity designs: A guide to practice. *Journal of Econometrics* Vol(142), pp. 615-635
- Lee, D. S. and T. Lemieux (2010). Regression discontinuity designs in economics. *Journal of Economic Literature* Vol(48), pp. 281-355
- McCrary, J. (2008). Manipulation of the running variable in the regression discontinuity design: A density test. *Journal of Econometrics* Vol(142), pp. 698-714

Annex A Robustness checks across all indicators

Table A.1 Household consumption expenditure on education, food, clothes and shoes, and poverty rates – SCG

		SCG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
Mean household consumption expenditure per adult equivalent	Est.	-1,400	23,800	148.8	20,600	21,900	3,700	22,500	5,800	26,300**	20,800*	-13,000	42,400	29,400	49,500*	44,800*
	Se.	(26,227)	(32,117)	(25,732)	(29,438)	(22,144)	(14,156)	(18,730)	(16,979)	(11,474)	(11,379)	(21,428)	(26,766)	(22,361)	(27,295)	(23,910)
	N	1,944	1,944	1,915	1,944	1,917	1,944	1,944	1,915	1,944	1,917	1,944	1,944	1,915	1,944	1,917
Proportion of population below national poverty line (P0)	Est.	-7.0	-13.1	-2.3	-12.9	-8.6	-10.8	-16.3**	-6.8	-8.8	-5.6	-16.9	-19.5	-9.3	-3.5	0.8
	Se.	(15.24)	(15.08)	(11.82)	(17.81)	(12.12)	(7.34)	(6.73)	(4.81)	(6.65)	(6.23)	(12.27)	(12.11)	(7.92)	(15.13)	(11.23)
	N	1,944	1,944	1,915	1,944	1,917	1,944	1,944	1,915	1,944	1,917	1,944	1,944	1,915	1,944	1,917
Mean poverty gap (P1)	Est.	-8.2	-5.3	-1.2	1.5	1.7	-6.3*	-5.1*	-1.6	-2.1	-1.1	-9.9*	-8.8	-6.4*	0.5	1.6
	Se.	(7.73)	(6.55)	(5.34)	(9.19)	(6.14)	(3.68)	(2.99)	(2.47)	(3.61)	(3.04)	(5.86)	(5.41)	(3.72)	(8.31)	(6.08)
	N	1,944	1,944	1,915	1,944	1,917	1,944	1,944	1,915	1,944	1,917	1,944	1,944	1,915	1,944	1,917
Mean poverty severity (P2)	Est.	-4.8	-2.0	0.2	1.9	1.3	-3.2	-1.6	0.1	-1.0	-0.6	-5.7*	-4.4*	-3.6*	0.7	1.0
	Se.	(4.14)	(3.14)	(2.75)	(4.79)	(3.38)	(1.97)	(1.46)	(1.36)	(2.01)	(1.71)	(3.18)	(2.55)	(1.87)	(4.37)	(3.33)
	N	1,944	1,944	1,915	1,944	1,917	1,944	1,944	1,915	1,944	1,917	1,944	1,944	1,915	1,944	1,917
Mean expenditure on clothes and shoes (excluding school ware)	Est.	698.1	-3,100	-2,600	-0,500	-1,600	161.3	-1,300	-0,600	227.4	-0,600	-3,000	-2,100	293.9	5,600*	3,400
	Se.	(2,843)	(2,417)	(2,481)	(3,538)	(3,089)	(1,503)	(1,296)	(1,256)	(1,363)	(1,049)	(1,856)	(2,341)	(2,051)	(3,339)	(2,580)
	N	1,944	1,944	1,915	1,944	1,917	1,944	1,944	1,915	1,944	1,917	1,944	1,944	1,915	1,944	1,917
Mean food expenditure per adult equivalent	Est.	4,300	479.0	-9,800	2,400	1,200	5,100	3,100	-4,500	2,100	-16.6	-0,600	16,800**	12,700**	7,800	8,800
	Se.	(12,017)	(10,823)	(10,566)	(13,309)	(10,429)	(6,562)	(6,165)	(5,197)	(6,568)	(6,650)	(8,939)	(8,498)	(5,787)	(10,492)	(10,457)
	N	1,944	1,944	1,915	1,944	1,917	1,944	1,944	1,915	1,944	1,917	1,944	1,944	1,915	1,944	1,917
Mean share of food consumption in total household expenditure	Est.	-2.3	-3.0	-2.9	0.8	2.4	-0.9	-2.4	-1.6	-2.7*	-1.7	0.6	-2.7	-1.7	-4.5	-1.5
	Se.	(2.85)	(5.21)	(5.73)	(3.61)	(3.77)	(1.71)	(2.54)	(2.49)	(1.51)	(1.75)	(2.70)	(3.94)	(3.69)	(4.32)	(4.64)
	N	1,944	1,944	1,915	1,944	1,917	1,944	1,944	1,915	1,944	1,917	1,944	1,944	1,915	1,944	1,917
Mean monthly household education expenditure per child ² (UGX)	Est.	-7,800	-5,200	-18,000	6,300	12,800	4,000	565.9	-77.7	-2,300	-2,500	-12,600	5,900	-17.9	26,700	29,200
	Se.	(20,767)	(19,003)	(27,297)	(20,941)	(22,537)	(9,733)	(8,533)	(4,626)	(6,742)	(7,598)	(20,718)	(6,076)	(7,860)	(23,347)	(23,374)
	N	1,459	1,471	1,451	1,465	1,445	1,459	1,471	1,451	1,465	1,445	1,459	1,471	1,451	1,465	1,445
Mean monthly household health expenditure per capita (UGX)	Est.	-5,700	-4,000	-5,200	10,700**	8,500*	-2,500	-0,800	-3,800	5,600**	5,300**	-4,700	3,800	1,500	7,600	7,100
	Se.	(4,690)	(3,123)	(3,520)	(5,063)	(5,044)	(2,103)	(2,575)	(3,041)	(2,673)	(2,668)	(4,130)	(3,432)	(3,595)	(5,708)	(5,671)
	N	1,944	1,944	1,915	1,944	1,917	1,944	1,944	1,915	1,944	1,917	1,944	1,944	1,915	1,944	1,917

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90% (2) Households containing children of school-age (6-17) or other aged person currently attending school.

Table A.2 Household consumption expenditure on education, food, clothes and shoes, and poverty rates – VFSG

		VFSG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
Mean household consumption expenditure per adult equivalent	Est.	10,500	17,400	6,600	6,900	5,500	-5,200	7,200	-6,000	12,300**	8,600	-2,000	17,700	3,300	19,600**	13,800
	Se.	(8,572)	(10,978)	(6,993)	(5,383)	(5,690)	(8,878)	(12,461)	(9,543)	(6,015)	(8,091)	(12,494)	(16,742)	(13,963)	(8,227)	(9,296)
	N	1,865	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,848
Proportion of population below national poverty line (P0)	Est.	-10.1	-11.9	-3.6	-1.8	0.4	-4.1	-6.0	3.7	-1.9	2.2	-31.5**	7.5	16.1	39.0***	41.5***
	Se.	(6.02)	(7.66)	(5.52)	(5.96)	(6.32)	(9.72)	(10.46)	(7.71)	(9.08)	(9.50)	(13.80)	(20.35)	(14.35)	(12.72)	(14.02)
	N	1,865	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,848
Mean poverty gap (P1)	Est.	-2.1	-3.3	-1.4	-1.1	-0.4	-0.2	-0.9	1.4	-0.7	0.5	-4.4	-0.6	1.5	3.7	4.2*
	Se.	(1.81)	(1.95)	(1.64)	(1.15)	(1.20)	(2.98)	(2.98)	(2.36)	(1.85)	(1.89)	(5.10)	(4.91)	(3.82)	(2.41)	(2.37)
	N	1,865	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,848
Mean poverty severity (P2)	Est.	-0.7	-1.0	-0.5	-0.3	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.6	-0.1	0.3	-0.9	-0.9	-0.3	0.0	0.1
	Se.	(0.67)	(0.67)	(0.61)	(0.34)	(0.35)	(1.05)	(1.07)	(0.90)	(0.57)	(0.60)	(1.80)	(1.64)	(1.40)	(0.87)	(0.79)
	N	1,865	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,848
Mean expenditure on clothes and shoes (excluding school ware)	Est.	-0,600	1,500*	1,800***	2,100**	1,500	-0,400	903.1	1,100*	1,300	338.9	-2,600	1,100	477.4	3,800**	2,700
	Se.	(1,223)	(740.60)	(417.70)	(864.20)	(942.90)	(1,551)	(944.50)	(562.30)	(1,157)	(1,414)	(2,620)	(1,905)	(874.70)	(1,626)	(1,854)
	N	1,865	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,848
Mean food expenditure per adult equivalent	Est.	6,100	11,500*	5,100	5,500	4,400	-2,900	4,300	-3,400	7,200	4,900	-4,600	4,100	-3,400	8,700	5,900
	Se.	(5,619)	(6,737)	(4,272)	(4,361)	(4,276)	(5,912)	(7,042)	(5,232)	(4,829)	(5,380)	(7,774)	(8,826)	(8,704)	(8,251)	(8,087)
	N	1,865	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,848
Mean share of food consumption in total household expenditure	Est.	-2.1	-0.7	-1.1	1.4	1.1	-1.1	-1.7	-1.9	-0.7	-0.7	-11.9***	-3.0	-2.5	8.9**	9.2**
	Se.	(1.76)	(1.01)	(0.88)	(1.34)	(1.37)	(2.57)	(1.49)	(1.29)	(2.43)	(2.49)	(3.34)	(1.84)	(1.80)	(3.34)	(3.45)
	N	1,865	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,848
Mean monthly household education expenditure per child ² (UGX)	Est.	1,500	7,900***	6,800***	6,400**	5,800**	-0,200	9,900**	8,600**	10,200**	9,500**	9,800*	4,600	3,600	-5,200	-4,500
	Se.	(2,061)	(2,283)	(2,249)	(2,636)	(2,720)	(2,590)	(4,451)	(4,071)	(4,024)	(3,905)	(4,907)	(3,797)	(3,687)	(4,472)	(4,808)
	N	1,431	1,492	1,482	1,462	1,453	1,431	1,492	1,482	1,462	1,453	1,431	1,492	1,482	1,462	1,453
Mean monthly household health expenditure per capita (UGX)	Est.	780.7	-1,800	-2,100*	-2,500	-2,300	-1,900	-1,400	-1,800	516.3	602.2	-7,100***	497.0	-0,300	7,600	7,000
	Se.	(1,518)	(1,683)	(1,186)	(2,041)	(2,051)	(1,471)	(2,573)	(1,905)	(3,073)	(3,183)	(1,449)	(5,458)	(3,825)	(5,184)	(5,434)
	N	1,865	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,848

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90% (2) Households containing children of school-age (6-17) or other aged person currently attending school.

Table A.3 Subjective welfare and household perception of control of their own lives - SCG

		SCG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
Proportion of hhs doing very well	Est.	-2.6*	1.3	1.3	2.9*	2.7	-2.1*	0.3	-0.1	2.6**	2.4**	-1.6	2.3**	2.4**	0.8	0.8
	Se.	(1.56)	(1.28)	(1.60)	(1.76)	(2.07)	(1.07)	(0.88)	(1.02)	(1.01)	(1.05)	(1.18)	(1.04)	(1.12)	(1.34)	(1.36)
	N	1,947	1,946	1,917	1,947	1,919	1,947	1,946	1,917	1,947	1,919	1,947	1,946	1,917	1,947	1,919
Proportion of hhs doing well	Est.	-4.4	3.4	3.9	5.8	5.1	-1.3	3.3	4.0	3.1	2.7	-1.7	2.4	2.8	1.8	1.3
	Se.	(4.61)	(4.60)	(6.31)	(5.36)	(4.83)	(2.39)	(2.26)	(2.69)	(2.69)	(2.33)	(3.97)	(2.52)	(3.02)	(5.66)	(5.13)
	N	1,947	1,946	1,917	1,947	1,919	1,947	1,946	1,917	1,947	1,919	1,947	1,946	1,917	1,947	1,919
Proportion of hhs doing ok	Est.	-18.7*	-0.1	4.6	24.0**	20.3*	-10.6**	0.7	2.5	10.6*	9.3	-6.1	-10.4	-9.8	10.0	6.2
	Se.	(9.70)	(12.54)	(16.84)	(11.13)	(11.50)	(4.71)	(5.35)	(7.14)	(5.95)	(6.16)	(9.00)	(6.37)	(7.67)	(13.86)	(13.84)
	N	1,947	1,946	1,917	1,947	1,919	1,947	1,946	1,917	1,947	1,919	1,947	1,946	1,917	1,947	1,919
Proportion of hhs struggling	Est.	5.2	-7.4	-15.2	-13.3	-4.7	3.4	-7.0	-8.8	-6.0	-4.3	0.0	3.6	3.7	-0.3	4.3
	Se.	(9.00)	(13.83)	(17.75)	(10.86)	(10.43)	(5.16)	(5.97)	(7.32)	(6.42)	(6.61)	(8.56)	(7.22)	(8.68)	(10.40)	(9.92)
	N	1,947	1,946	1,917	1,947	1,919	1,947	1,946	1,917	1,947	1,919	1,947	1,946	1,917	1,947	1,919
Proportion of hhs unable to cope	Est.	20.9***	2.8	5.4	-19.8**	-23.5***	11.6**	2.7	2.4	-11.3**	-11.1**	8.6	2.1	0.8	-11.5	-11.6
	Se.	(7.51)	(4.86)	(6.44)	(8.53)	(7.84)	(4.69)	(2.66)	(3.55)	(4.91)	(4.56)	(6.85)	(3.25)	(4.04)	(9.16)	(9.43)
	N	1,947	1,946	1,917	1,947	1,919	1,947	1,946	1,917	1,947	1,919	1,947	1,946	1,917	1,947	1,919
Proportion of hhs can't say	Est.	-0.5	-0.5	-0.5	0.4	0.1	-1.1	-1.1	-1.1	1.1	1.0	0.8	0.8	0.8	-0.8	-1.0
	Se.	(1.31)	(1.31)	(1.31)	(1.34)	(1.28)	(1.33)	(1.33)	(1.33)	(1.43)	(1.49)	(2.25)	(2.25)	(2.25)	(2.25)	(2.28)
	N	1,947	1,947	1,947	1,947	1,919	1,947	1,947	1,947	1,947	1,919	1,947	1,947	1,947	1,947	1,919
Average step	Est.	-0.5	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.7	-0.6**	0.6	0.3	1.1***	1.0***	0.2	0.9***	0.2	0.3	0.1
	Se.	(0.43)	(0.83)	(0.87)	(0.55)	(0.56)	(0.26)	(0.45)	(0.29)	(0.28)	(0.33)	(0.40)	(0.34)	(0.31)	(0.54)	(0.48)
	N	1,946	1,946	1,917	1,946	1,919	1,946	1,946	1,917	1,946	1,919	1,946	1,946	1,917	1,946	1,919

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A.4 Subjective welfare and household perception of control of their own lives - VFSG

		VFSG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
Proportion of hhs doing very well	Est.	0.5*	0.4	0.4	-0.2	-0.1	-0.6**	0.4	0.4	1.0*	1.0*	0.7	0.6	0.7	-0.1	0.0
	Se.	(0.30)	(0.41)	(0.38)	(0.53)	(0.55)	(0.26)	(0.41)	(0.42)	(0.50)	(0.55)	(0.89)	(0.67)	(0.75)	(1.17)	(1.20)
	N	1,867	1,866	1,849	1,867	1,849	1,867	1,866	1,849	1,867	1,849	1,867	1,866	1,849	1,867	1,849
Proportion of hhs doing well	Est.	0.1	3.4**	3.1**	3.3	2.8	2.8	2.7	2.0	-0.1	-0.7	11.2***	6.3**	4.9**	-4.9	-5.6
	Se.	(1.57)	(1.23)	(1.28)	(2.08)	(2.06)	(1.65)	(1.91)	(2.22)	(2.15)	(2.24)	(3.80)	(2.46)	(2.15)	(3.96)	(4.08)
	N	1,867	1,866	1,849	1,867	1,849	1,867	1,866	1,849	1,867	1,849	1,867	1,866	1,849	1,867	1,849
Proportion of hhs doing ok	Est.	-5.1	9.2	11.1**	14.3**	13.3**	-4.9	16.8**	18.1***	21.6***	20.3***	-0.8	28.1**	26.9***	28.9**	27.5**
	Se.	(3.60)	(6.65)	(4.66)	(6.34)	(6.36)	(5.49)	(6.76)	(5.57)	(6.52)	(6.23)	(10.39)	(10.35)	(7.51)	(11.07)	(10.00)
	N	1,867	1,866	1,849	1,867	1,849	1,867	1,866	1,849	1,867	1,849	1,867	1,866	1,849	1,867	1,849
Proportion of hhs struggling	Est.	-6.1	-12.4***	-10.9**	-6.3	-5.3	-4.3	-18.8***	-16.7***	-14.5*	-13.3*	-17.1	-27.1***	-23.8***	-9.9	-7.4
	Se.	(6.46)	(4.22)	(3.98)	(7.75)	(7.99)	(8.81)	(5.29)	(5.37)	(7.46)	(7.62)	(11.54)	(8.02)	(7.40)	(9.49)	(9.48)
	N	1,867	1,866	1,849	1,867	1,849	1,867	1,866	1,849	1,867	1,849	1,867	1,866	1,849	1,867	1,849
Proportion of hhs unable to cope	Est.	9.9	-0.5	-3.5**	-10.4**	-9.9**	7.4	-1.1	-3.8**	-8.4*	-7.8*	5.9	-7.9	-8.6**	-13.8	-14.4*
	Se.	(6.32)	(3.53)	(1.35)	(3.93)	(3.81)	(6.26)	(3.77)	(1.63)	(4.27)	(4.33)	(7.40)	(7.37)	(4.17)	(8.37)	(7.39)
	N	1,867	1,866	1,849	1,867	1,849	1,867	1,866	1,849	1,867	1,849	1,867	1,866	1,849	1,867	1,849
Proportion of hhs can't say	Est.	0.7	0.0	0.0	-0.7	-0.7	-0.4	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.4	0.1	0.0	0.0	-0.1	-0.2
	Se.	(0.75)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.75)	(0.73)	(0.93)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.93)	(0.91)	(1.58)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(1.58)	(1.58)
	N	1,867	1,866	1,849	1,867	1,849	1,867	1,866	1,849	1,867	1,849	1,867	1,866	1,849	1,867	1,849
Average step	Est.	-0.1	-0.3	-0.1	-0.2	-0.3	0.3	-1.0***	-0.8***	-1.2***	-1.3***	-0.4	-2.3***	-2.1***	-1.9**	-1.9*
	Se.	(0.24)	(0.33)	(0.28)	(0.35)	(0.35)	(0.37)	(0.31)	(0.27)	(0.36)	(0.41)	(0.63)	(0.53)	(0.61)	(0.86)	(0.96)
	N	1,865	1,867	1,850	1,866	1,849	1,865	1,867	1,850	1,866	1,849	1,865	1,867	1,850	1,866	1,849

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A.5 Shocks and coping strategies – SCG

		SCG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC- FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC- FU	D-FU	DC- FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC- FU	D-FU	DC-FU
Proportion of households reporting suffering a problem in last 12 months that they could not cope with using normal household resources	Est.	-5.4	5.1	6.8	5.0	3.9	-4.7	2.4	-0.1	6.5	5.5	-6.3	10.3	-4.4	12.8	10.4
	Se.	(10.26)	(8.65)	(8.27)	(11.58)	(13.27)	(6.89)	(5.24)	(5.27)	(7.55)	(8.02)	(7.84)	(7.64)	(5.28)	(9.96)	(10.33)
	N	1,947	1,946	1,917	1,947	1,919	1,947	1,946	1,917	1,947	1,919	1,947	1,946	1,917	1,947	1,919

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A.6 Shocks and coping strategies – VFSG

		VFSG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC- FU	D-FU	DC- FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC- FU	D-FU	DC- FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
Proportion of households reporting suffering a problem in last 12 months that they could not cope with using normal household resources	Est.	-12.5**	-3.3	-2.3	9.2**	9.1**	-19.9**	-5.9	-4.2	14.0**	12.4**	-26.6	5.0	7.1	31.6**	26.7**
	Se.	(5.30)	(5.16)	(4.51)	(4.43)	(4.40)	(7.58)	(6.03)	(5.39)	(5.94)	(5.48)	(16.77)	(10.96)	(10.21)	(13.46)	(11.01)
	N	1,867	1,863	1,846	1,865	1,848	1,867	1,863	1,846	1,865	1,848	1,867	1,863	1,846	1,865	1,848

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A.7 Average number of meals and ownership of blankets and mosquito nets – SCG

		SCG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
Proportion of individuals owning blanket to sleep under	Est.	7.7	14.5	19.1**	-2.9	-12.4	11.8*	13.6	13.9*	-5.0	-9.2	14.0	13.6	17.5	-4.7	-12.9
	Se.	(14.50)	(14.27)	(9.53)	(16.63)	(13.19)	(6.95)	(9.51)	(8.07)	(7.36)	(6.83)	(12.18)	(8.42)	(11.94)	(19.42)	(17.15)
	N	10,583	10,667	10,549	10,625	10,497	10,583	10,667	10,549	10,625	10,497	10,583	10,667	10,549	10,625	10,497
Proportion of individuals sleeping under a mosquito net	Est.	10.3	-4.6	-4.0	-11.4	-10.0	11.6*	0.1	1.3	-9.0	-9.8	3.0	1.7	-3.3	-1.0	4.6
	Se.	(13.05)	(11.32)	(12.48)	(15.60)	(13.00)	(6.80)	(5.43)	(3.45)	(6.69)	(6.03)	(10.31)	(7.65)	(8.32)	(15.42)	(14.31)
	N	10,442	10,248	10,131	10,345	10,219	10,442	10,248	10,131	10,345	10,219	10,442	10,248	10,131	10,345	10,219
Treated	Est.	-23.2**	-13.1	-9.7	17.5	19.9	-4.9	-10.6	-4.9	-3.8	-1.2	-23.8*	-6.3	-17.4	23.1	34.1
	Se.	(10.36)	(22.71)	(32.52)	(12.70)	(13.93)	(7.70)	(11.42)	(11.85)	(10.07)	(10.22)	(13.48)	(8.68)	(25.40)	(30.38)	(33.35)
	N	3,286	4,050	4,004	3,668	3,624	3,286	4,050	4,004	3,668	3,624	3,286	4,050	4,004	3,668	3,624
Not treated	Est.	22.0*	1.3	-6.9	-12.9	-15.8	6.8	8.1	6.8	2.6	0.1	27.5*	8.0	14.8	-26.9	-36.4
	Se.	(11.42)	(21.45)	(28.98)	(12.88)	(13.79)	(8.96)	(10.77)	(9.32)	(10.29)	(10.64)	(15.60)	(6.44)	(23.18)	(31.75)	(34.74)
	N	3,286	4,050	4,004	3,668	3,624	3,286	4,050	4,004	3,668	3,624	3,286	4,050	4,004	3,668	3,624
Mean number of meals consumed in the last day																
Per child (aged 17 and under)	Est.	0.1	0.1	0.2	-0.1	-0.2	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	-0.1
	Se.	(0.20)	(0.21)	(0.22)	(0.26)	(0.22)	(0.11)	(0.09)	(0.14)	(0.13)	(0.12)	(0.15)	(0.13)	(0.23)	(0.32)	(0.27)
	N	5,124	4,976	4,922	5,050	4,989	5,124	4,976	4,922	5,050	4,989	5,124	4,976	4,922	5,050	4,989
Per Adult (18-64)	Est.	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.1*	0.1	0.1	0.0
	Se.	(0.20)	(0.12)	(0.16)	(0.21)	(0.18)	(0.12)	(0.08)	(0.07)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.17)	(0.08)	(0.13)	(0.19)	(0.17)
	N	4,063	3,819	3,778	3,941	3,897	4,063	3,819	3,778	3,941	3,897	4,063	3,819	3,778	3,941	3,897
Per old person (65+)	Est.	0.4	-0.1	0.0	-0.4	-0.4	0.2	0.0	0.0	-0.1	-0.1	0.4	0.3	0.2	-0.4	-0.6
	Se.	(0.40)	(0.34)	(0.38)	(0.54)	(0.38)	(0.23)	(0.18)	(0.22)	(0.28)	(0.24)	(0.32)	(0.19)	(0.43)	(0.57)	(0.63)
	N	1,171	1,249	1,230	1,210	1,192	1,171	1,249	1,230	1,210	1,192	1,171	1,249	1,230	1,210	1,192
All persons	Est.	0.1	0.1	0.2	-0.1	-0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	-0.1
	Se.	(0.18)	(0.15)	(0.17)	(0.22)	(0.19)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.13)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.24)	(0.20)
	N	10,358	10,044	9,930	10,201	10,078	10,358	10,044	9,930	10,201	10,078	10,358	10,044	9,930	10,201	10,078

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A.8 Average number of meals and ownership of blankets and mosquito nets – VFSG

		VFSG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
Proportion of individuals owning blanket to sleep under	Est.	-0.3	4.4	0.3	4.7	4.1	2.2	4.0	-1.3	1.9	-2.1	11.5	4.6	6.2	-6.9	-7.9
	Se.	(4.45)	(5.44)	(4.67)	(3.31)	(3.63)	(5.02)	(5.84)	(4.98)	(3.30)	(3.62)	(8.20)	(11.44)	(9.10)	(6.07)	(7.70)
	N	9,760	10,416	10,342	10,088	10,017	9,760	10,416	10,342	10,088	10,017	9,760	10,416	10,342	10,088	10,017
Proportion of individuals sleeping under a mosquito net	Est.	3.1	4.7	4.2	1.6	0.2	5.0	2.5	1.1	-2.6	-5.1	-17.1***	-6.5	-5.7	10.5	8.7
	Se.	(3.42)	(3.41)	(3.26)	(4.26)	(4.22)	(5.55)	(5.60)	(5.65)	(5.16)	(5.32)	(5.26)	(7.92)	(7.17)	(9.00)	(9.11)
	N	9,620	10,085	10,014	9,853	9,783	9,620	10,085	10,014	9,853	9,783	9,620	10,085	10,014	9,853	9,783
Treated	Est.	-7.6*	18.3***	18.8***	25.9***	26.2***	-2.4	25.2***	25.4***	27.6**	28.6**	-21.4**	20.0**	22.1**	41.4**	45.7***
	Se.	(3.71)	(5.73)	(6.21)	(7.50)	(7.43)	(5.15)	(7.79)	(8.70)	(11.17)	(10.92)	(8.19)	(9.51)	(9.52)	(15.69)	(15.27)
	N	4,212	3,862	3,831	4,037	4,013	4,212	3,862	3,831	4,037	4,013	4,212	3,862	3,831	4,037	4,013
Not treated	Est.	9.9***	-16.5**	-16.2**	-26.3***	-26.3***	7.1	-23.0**	-22.5**	-30.0***	-30.7***	33.1***	-10.4	-11.1	-43.5**	-46.4**
	Se.	(3.11)	(6.18)	(6.78)	(7.00)	(7.21)	(5.10)	(8.61)	(9.35)	(10.00)	(9.97)	(11.44)	(10.55)	(10.62)	(18.15)	(18.29)
	N	4,212	3,862	3,831	4,037	4,013	4,212	3,862	3,831	4,037	4,013	4,212	3,862	3,831	4,037	4,013
Mean number of meals consumed in the last day																
Per child (aged 17 and under)	Est.	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.6***	0.5***	0.5***	0.5***
	Se.	(0.10)	(0.09)	(0.08)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.12)	(0.14)	(0.15)	(0.22)	(0.14)	(0.13)	(0.14)	(0.14)
	N	5,942	6,195	6,153	6,069	6,030	5,942	6,195	6,153	6,069	6,030	5,942	6,195	6,153	6,069	6,030
Per Adult (18-64)	Est.	0.0	0.1*	0.1	0.2**	0.1	0.0	0.2**	0.1	0.2**	0.1	0.1	0.6***	0.6***	0.5***	0.5***
	Se.	(0.08)	(0.07)	(0.06)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.09)	(0.08)	(0.09)	(0.18)	(0.13)	(0.10)	(0.14)	(0.13)
	N	2,807	2,970	2,954	2,889	2,872	2,807	2,970	2,954	2,889	2,872	2,807	2,970	2,954	2,889	2,872
Per old person (65+)	Est.	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	-0.3**	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.4*	0.5	0.7	0.8	0.3	0.3
	Se.	(0.14)	(0.16)	(0.14)	(0.15)	(0.15)	(0.12)	(0.26)	(0.23)	(0.19)	(0.19)	(0.28)	(0.54)	(0.48)	(0.41)	(0.42)
	N	713	693	683	703	692	713	693	683	703	692	713	693	683	703	692
All persons	Est.	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1*	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.6***	0.6***	0.5***	0.5***
	Se.	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.07)	(0.08)	(0.09)	(0.10)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.12)	(0.20)	(0.12)	(0.11)	(0.13)	(0.13)
	N	9,462	9,858	9,790	9,660	9,593	9,462	9,858	9,790	9,660	9,593	9,462	9,858	9,790	9,660	9,593

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A.9 Child malnutrition rates (0-59 months) – SCG

		SCG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
Stunted	Est.	-1.5	25.1	36.0**	1.9	-9.7	-10.6	-0.6	-5.5	2.3	3.8	-1.3	-29.5*	-19.0**	10.7	12.0
	Se.	(12.62)	(17.53)	(18.25)	(19.47)	(14.93)	(7.05)	(10.34)	(10.57)	(8.53)	(7.86)	(12.75)	(15.74)	(8.26)	(23.59)	(25.95)
	N	906	1,008	997	957	945	906	1,008	997	957	945	906	1,008	997	957	945
Moderate ²	Est.	-11.6	18.7	27.6*	13.1	-4.3	-11.3	2.7	1.6	9.4	8.4	-5.5	-27.5**	-10.7	25.2	19.9
	Se.	(12.00)	(14.84)	(16.63)	(16.24)	(13.10)	(7.26)	(7.48)	(5.60)	(7.85)	(7.28)	(11.57)	(10.71)	(7.25)	(19.70)	(20.49)
	N	906	1,008	997	957	945	906	1,008	997	957	945	906	1,008	997	957	945
Severe ³	Est.	10.1	6.3	8.4	-11.2	-5.3	0.7	-3.3	-7.1	-7.1	-4.5	4.2	-1.9	-8.3	-14.6	-7.9
	Se.	(9.00)	(8.18)	(9.08)	(8.87)	(7.44)	(4.39)	(5.50)	(6.97)	(4.49)	(4.54)	(7.12)	(9.83)	(5.40)	(10.87)	(13.28)
	N	906	1,008	997	957	945	906	1,008	997	957	945	906	1,008	997	957	945
Wasted	Est.	9.4	7.2	5.3	-11.2	-6.6	3.0	-3.6	-10.9*	-3.1	-0.2	2.5	-6.1	-9.3**	2.7	7.9
	Se.	(8.58)	(4.86)	(4.46)	(10.69)	(9.77)	(3.97)	(4.68)	(6.06)	(4.24)	(4.33)	(6.65)	(8.22)	(4.33)	(11.58)	(12.30)
	N	906	1,008	997	957	945	906	1,008	997	957	945	906	1,008	997	957	945
Moderate ²	Est.	8.9	6.2	5.3	-10.2	-8.2	3.4	-5.3	-12.2**	-4.1	-2.0	-0.3	-8.7	-9.0**	7.4	10.7
	Se.	(7.31)	(5.09)	(4.79)	(9.00)	(8.48)	(3.16)	(4.40)	(5.90)	(3.41)	(3.27)	(5.95)	(7.66)	(4.30)	(11.02)	(11.66)
	N	906	1,008	997	957	945	906	1,008	997	957	945	906	1,008	997	957	945
Severe ³	Est.	0.6	1.0	-0.1	-1.0	1.6	-0.5	1.7	1.3	0.9	1.8	2.8	2.6	-0.3	-4.6	-2.8
	Se.	(2.96)	(1.74)	(1.95)	(3.63)	(2.90)	(1.72)	(1.63)	(1.15)	(1.73)	(1.74)	(2.29)	(2.89)	(1.42)	(3.37)	(3.61)
	N	906	1,008	997	957	945	906	1,008	997	957	945	906	1,008	997	957	945
Underweight	Est.	14.8	6.6	5.2	-25.1	-12.4	0.2	-10.5	-15.3***	-8.3	-3.2	0.6	-12.4	-15.7***	-6.7	4.3
	Se.	(15.80)	(13.95)	(12.74)	(19.54)	(17.02)	(6.08)	(7.02)	(4.64)	(6.25)	(6.34)	(8.98)	(12.44)	(5.64)	(17.14)	(19.05)
	N	906	1,008	997	957	945	906	1,008	997	957	945	906	1,008	997	957	945
Moderate ²	Est.	20.7	5.5	4.1	-35.2*	-26.2	4.4	-8.7	-16.5***	-10.5*	-7.9	-3.2	-2.8	-9.3	-5.2	-1.1
	Se.	(15.50)	(11.73)	(11.43)	(19.53)	(16.71)	(5.72)	(5.75)	(5.70)	(6.27)	(6.60)	(9.92)	(10.67)	(6.12)	(18.05)	(20.13)
	N	906	1,008	997	957	945	906	1,008	997	957	945	906	1,008	997	957	945
Severe ³	Est.	-5.9	1.1	1.1	10.1	13.8*	-4.2	-1.8	1.2	2.2	4.7	3.8	-9.6	-6.4	-1.5	5.5
	Se.	(5.56)	(4.69)	(4.92)	(8.20)	(8.15)	(3.24)	(2.97)	(3.30)	(3.77)	(4.25)	(3.60)	(6.45)	(4.01)	(8.11)	(9.06)
	N	906	1,008	997	957	945	906	1,008	997	957	945	906	1,008	997	957	945

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (2) Measures of moderate include all children below -2SD. (3) Measures of severe include all children below -3SD (4) Technical annex on the calculation and definition of each measure is found in **Error! Reference source not found.**

Table A.10 Child malnutrition rates (0-59 months) – VFSG

		VFSG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
Stunted	Est.	-4.3	-2.7	-3.3	1.6	1.6	-7.1	2.2	1.6	9.3	8.4	-32.3**	-2.7	0.0	29.6*	29.2*
	Se.	(6.00)	(3.91)	(3.80)	(5.54)	(5.30)	(8.73)	(4.10)	(4.37)	(9.99)	(9.89)	(13.86)	(10.12)	(9.96)	(16.48)	(15.82)
	N	1,521	1,494	1,481	1,508	1,500	1,521	1,494	1,481	1,508	1,500	1,521	1,494	1,481	1,508	1,500
Moderate ²	Est.	-5.5	-0.6	-1.4	4.8	4.4	-5.9	1.4	1.0	7.2	5.7	-34.4***	6.0	9.9	40.3***	40.1***
	Se.	(4.77)	(2.46)	(2.68)	(4.63)	(4.55)	(7.60)	(2.53)	(3.09)	(8.11)	(8.31)	(8.99)	(7.62)	(8.15)	(7.72)	(8.05)
	N	1,521	1,494	1,481	1,508	1,500	1,521	1,494	1,481	1,508	1,500	1,521	1,494	1,481	1,508	1,500
Severe ³	Est.	1.2	-2.0	-2.0	-3.2	-2.8	-1.2	0.8	0.6	2.0	2.7	2.0	-8.7	-9.9	-10.7	-11.0
	Se.	(2.36)	(2.60)	(2.62)	(3.17)	(3.23)	(2.84)	(3.09)	(3.19)	(4.46)	(4.40)	(6.05)	(7.39)	(8.11)	(11.68)	(11.35)
	N	1,521	1,494	1,481	1,508	1,500	1,521	1,494	1,481	1,508	1,500	1,521	1,494	1,481	1,508	1,500
Wasted	Est.	-1.7	-2.6	-2.4	-0.9	-1.0	-0.5	-7.3***	-7.3***	-6.8*	-6.8*	-10.3***	-7.1	-7.1	3.2	2.9
	Se.	(1.72)	(2.08)	(1.89)	(2.05)	(2.02)	(2.61)	(2.60)	(2.32)	(3.37)	(3.37)	(3.33)	(3.51)	(5.14)	(5.03)	(4.57)
	N	1,521	1,494	1,481	1,508	1,500	1,521	1,494	1,481	1,508	1,500	1,521	1,494	1,481	1,508	1,500
Moderate ²	Est.	-1.5	-1.4	-1.3	0.0	-0.1	-1.2	-4.6*	-4.7**	-3.4	-3.5	-9.4**	-3.0	-3.1	6.4	5.9
	Se.	(1.61)	(1.63)	(1.47)	(1.74)	(1.69)	(2.48)	(2.37)	(2.17)	(3.39)	(3.30)	(3.50)	(4.18)	(4.04)	(4.33)	(4.35)
	N	1,521	1,494	1,481	1,508	1,500	1,521	1,494	1,481	1,508	1,500	1,521	1,494	1,481	1,508	1,500
Severe ³	Est.	-0.2	-1.1	-1.1*	-0.9	-0.9	0.7	-2.7***	-2.6***	-3.4***	-3.3***	-0.9	-4.2***	-4.0***	-3.2**	-3.0**
	Se.	(0.41)	(0.66)	(0.61)	(0.78)	(0.79)	(0.55)	(0.63)	(0.58)	(0.66)	(0.67)	(0.97)	(1.14)	(1.21)	(1.23)	(1.32)
	N	1,521	1,494	1,481	1,508	1,500	1,521	1,494	1,481	1,508	1,500	1,521	1,494	1,481	1,508	1,500
Underweight	Est.	-1.1	-2.2	-2.5	-1.1	-1.0	-1.9	-1.4	-1.2	0.5	0.7	-9.1*	3.1	3.2	12.2**	11.6**
	Se.	(2.01)	(2.69)	(2.62)	(3.52)	(3.70)	(2.88)	(3.33)	(3.42)	(4.44)	(4.46)	(5.09)	(5.79)	(5.53)	(5.77)	(5.58)
	N	1,521	1,494	1,481	1,508	1,500	1,521	1,494	1,481	1,508	1,500	1,521	1,494	1,481	1,508	1,500
Moderate ²	Est.	-1.7	-2.4	-2.5	-0.7	-0.5	-2.7	-1.4	-1.0	1.2	1.6	-8.9*	-0.4	-1.3	8.5	8.0
	Se.	(1.89)	(2.60)	(2.58)	(3.31)	(3.44)	(2.98)	(3.40)	(3.61)	(4.39)	(4.44)	(4.76)	(6.05)	(5.98)	(5.90)	(5.83)
	N	1,521	1,494	1,481	1,508	1,500	1,521	1,494	1,481	1,508	1,500	1,521	1,494	1,481	1,508	1,500
Severe ³	Est.	0.6	0.2	0.0	-0.4	-0.4	0.8	0.1	-0.1	-0.8	-0.9	-0.2	3.5**	4.5**	3.7**	3.6**
	Se.	(0.94)	(0.82)	(0.86)	(1.11)	(1.13)	(1.05)	(1.19)	(1.38)	(1.47)	(1.47)	(1.57)	(1.64)	(1.76)	(1.60)	(1.66)
	N	1,521	1,494	1,481	1,508	1,500	1,521	1,494	1,481	1,508	1,500	1,521	1,494	1,481	1,508	1,500

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (2) Measures of moderate include all children below -2SD. (3) Measures of severe include all children below -3SD (4) Technical annex on the calculation and definition of each measure is found in **Error! Reference source not found.**

Table A.11 Food consumption score and hunger scale – SCG

		SCG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
Mean FANTA hunger scale	Est.	0.0	-0.1	0.0	-0.4	-0.3	-0.1	-0.2	-0.2	-0.2	-0.1	-0.3	-0.2	-0.2*	0.1	0.2
	Se.	(0.35)	(0.20)	(0.23)	(0.39)	(0.29)	(0.17)	(0.15)	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.15)	(0.23)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.32)	(0.30)
	N	1,931	1,938	1,909	1,935	1,907	1,931	1,938	1,909	1,935	1,907	1,931	1,938	1,909	1,935	1,907
% households by FANTA hunger scale categories																
Little or no hunger in the household	Est.	-10.2	9.3	8.6	20.2	15.6	3.5	10.9	11.4	4.1	1.6	4.9	13.8**	13.5*	3.4	0.3
	Se.	(13.06)	(10.13)	(10.92)	(16.03)	(12.65)	(6.81)	(7.00)	(7.25)	(6.99)	(6.59)	(8.86)	(6.10)	(7.57)	(14.08)	(13.14)
	N	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920
Moderate hunger in the household	Est.	14.9	-5.2	-4.3	-24.5	-19.7	-2.1	-8.8	-9.1	-3.7	-1.7	-2.5	-11.3**	-9.8	-5.6	-3.3
	Se.	(13.28)	(9.93)	(10.89)	(16.25)	(13.77)	(7.41)	(6.88)	(7.22)	(7.73)	(7.35)	(9.43)	(5.55)	(6.96)	(14.50)	(13.84)
	N	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920
Severe hunger in the household	Est.	-3.8	-2.1	-1.3	3.2	2.6	-1.1	-0.8	-0.6	-0.3	0.0	-2.0	-0.1	-0.6	-0.6	-0.3
	Se.	(2.37)	(2.00)	(3.30)	(2.82)	(2.98)	(1.27)	(1.07)	(1.62)	(1.68)	(1.85)	(2.07)	(1.45)	(1.53)	(2.24)	(2.63)
	N	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920
Mean food consumption score	Est.	-1.9	3.0	3.3	4.7	2.4	1.3	2.6	1.6	1.4	0.3	2.4	6.6***	5.9***	3.5	1.7
	Se.	(5.81)	(3.81)	(4.05)	(6.79)	(5.35)	(3.09)	(2.21)	(2.25)	(2.95)	(2.74)	(4.04)	(2.18)	(2.09)	(5.09)	(4.66)
	N	1,946	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,919	1,946	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,919	1,946	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,919
% of households with																
Poor food consumption	Est.	6.4	-2.2	-3.8	-12.5	-11.9	1.3	-1.0	-0.4	-5.7	-5.3	-4.4	0.1	0.5	-8.6	-9.5
	Se.	(10.77)	(7.05)	(7.95)	(11.59)	(9.54)	(5.16)	(3.91)	(3.96)	(4.35)	(4.21)	(8.49)	(5.00)	(4.91)	(8.30)	(7.70)
	N	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920
Borderline food consumption	Est.	0.6	-5.4	-9.5	-6.2	0.5	-2.7	-4.2	-4.4	-2.8	0.0	-6.7	-23.4***	-23.8***	6.9	12.1
	Se.	(10.63)	(13.36)	(15.81)	(13.11)	(11.73)	(5.94)	(7.32)	(7.81)	(6.01)	(6.34)	(8.55)	(5.55)	(5.89)	(11.85)	(11.92)
	N	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920
Acceptable food consumption	Est.	-7.0	7.6	13.2	18.6	11.4	1.4	5.2	4.8	8.5	5.3	11.1	23.3***	23.3***	1.6	-2.5
	Se.	(17.25)	(15.17)	(17.53)	(21.66)	(17.81)	(8.83)	(8.08)	(8.46)	(8.22)	(7.84)	(11.41)	(8.21)	(8.51)	(15.79)	(14.65)
	N	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A.12 Food consumption score and hunger scale – VFSG

		VFSG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
Mean FANTA hunger scale	Est.	-0.2	-0.5**	-0.4**	-0.3**	-0.2	-0.4	-0.8**	-0.6*	-0.4*	-0.2	-0.9*	-1.3**	-1.0**	-0.4	-0.4
	Se.	(0.19)	(0.21)	(0.18)	(0.11)	(0.12)	(0.24)	(0.31)	(0.30)	(0.21)	(0.25)	(0.51)	(0.57)	(0.49)	(0.35)	(0.38)
	N	1,855	1,861	1,844	1,858	1,841	1,855	1,861	1,844	1,858	1,841	1,855	1,861	1,844	1,858	1,841
% households by FANTA hunger scale categories																
Little or no hunger in the household	Est.	7.9	17.5**	14.4**	9.6*	7.1	12.1	28.8**	22.7**	16.7*	12.9	31.0*	55.1**	45.3**	24.0	23.6
	Se.	(6.41)	(7.84)	(6.49)	(5.25)	(5.51)	(7.53)	(10.95)	(10.81)	(9.29)	(10.62)	(15.80)	(20.50)	(17.87)	(14.61)	(15.49)
	N	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850
Moderate hunger in the household	Est.	-7.1	-16.5**	-14.3**	-9.4	-7.6	-10.0	-27.7***	-23.1**	-17.7	-15.5	-35.3**	-52.8***	-44.6**	-17.5	-17.0
	Se.	(7.19)	(6.95)	(5.79)	(7.32)	(7.41)	(8.80)	(10.00)	(10.07)	(12.40)	(13.23)	(16.80)	(18.00)	(16.44)	(19.73)	(20.16)
	N	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850
Severe hunger in the household	Est.	-1.3	-1.4	-0.5	-0.2	0.6	-2.8	-2.0	-0.6	0.7	2.2	0.3	-2.3	-0.8	-2.6	-2.8
	Se.	(2.40)	(1.64)	(1.60)	(2.58)	(2.52)	(3.59)	(2.46)	(2.30)	(3.95)	(3.73)	(4.53)	(5.29)	(4.73)	(6.31)	(6.02)
	N	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850
Mean food consumption score	Est.	0.1	2.3	2.0	2.2	1.0	0.7	1.4	0.6	0.7	-0.9	5.7	4.8	2.6	-1.0	-1.5
	Se.	(1.95)	(1.75)	(1.51)	(1.67)	(1.70)	(1.79)	(2.33)	(2.02)	(1.89)	(1.78)	(4.06)	(4.00)	(3.25)	(3.20)	(2.97)
	N	1,865	1,867	1,850	1,866	1,849	1,865	1,867	1,850	1,866	1,849	1,865	1,867	1,850	1,866	1,849
% of households with																
Poor food consumption	Est.	-1.6	-6.1**	-6.5**	-4.4	-3.2	0.4	-3.7	-4.0	-4.1	-2.8	9.0	-11.2*	-10.1	-20.2**	-20.2**
	Se.	(2.80)	(2.26)	(2.43)	(3.05)	(2.97)	(4.40)	(3.25)	(3.48)	(4.92)	(4.69)	(11.06)	(5.82)	(6.82)	(9.10)	(8.31)
	N	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850
Borderline food consumption	Est.	9.2	3.7	5.9	-5.4	-2.2	10.5	2.9	6.9	-7.6	-3.2	-13.7	3.1	9.1	16.8	18.6
	Se.	(5.43)	(5.02)	(4.68)	(6.74)	(7.80)	(7.87)	(6.39)	(5.99)	(11.10)	(12.88)	(17.72)	(11.12)	(10.34)	(22.96)	(25.34)
	N	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850
Acceptable food consumption	Est.	-7.5	2.3	0.6	9.8	5.4	-10.8**	0.8	-2.9	11.7	6.0	4.6	8.1	0.9	3.4	1.6
	Se.	(5.28)	(5.21)	(4.83)	(6.19)	(7.11)	(4.97)	(6.62)	(6.50)	(7.96)	(9.85)	(10.90)	(13.35)	(13.19)	(16.34)	(18.95)
	N	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A.13 Labour participation rates and time use in productive activities – SCG

		SCG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
Proportion of working-age adults (18-64) engaged in economically productive activities ²	Est.	-19.0***	-26.9***	-22.8***	19.9**	15.0**	-12.2***	-11.9***	-8.6*	4.1	1.9	-10.8***	-23.5***	-18.9***	14.3	13.6
	Se.	(4.81)	(5.81)	(7.40)	(8.00)	(7.55)	(2.68)	(3.87)	(4.58)	(3.21)	(3.15)	(4.15)	(5.06)	(5.98)	(9.32)	(8.67)
	N	9,218	9,432	9,327	9,325	9,215	9,218	9,432	9,327	9,325	9,215	9,218	9,432	9,327	9,325	9,215
Mean number of hours spent working per week ³	Est.	-0.8	-4.2	-5.8	-0.9	-0.5	-0.4	-4.4***	-4.1**	-1.6	-1.7	-0.1	-4.1	-4.4	-0.5	0.7
	Se.	(1.77)	(2.90)	(3.54)	(2.19)	(2.36)	(0.95)	(0.90)	(1.95)	(1.38)	(1.42)	(1.52)	(2.84)	(3.52)	(3.12)	(2.87)
	N	9,218	9,432	9,327	9,325	9,215	9,218	9,432	9,327	9,325	9,215	9,218	9,432	9,327	9,325	9,215
Mean number of months spent working in main occupation in last year	Est.	-1.1	-1.7***	-1.0*	1.3	0.2	-0.7	-1.0**	-0.3	0.7	0.4	0.2	-0.5	0.4	0.0	-0.7
	Se.	(1.13)	(0.58)	(0.57)	(1.29)	(0.97)	(0.60)	(0.39)	(0.41)	(0.59)	(0.51)	(0.89)	(0.37)	(0.55)	(1.27)	(1.00)
	N	2,808	3,152	3,120	2,980	2,949	2,808	3,152	3,120	2,980	2,949	2,808	3,152	3,120	2,980	2,949
Proportion of working-age adults engaged in subsidiary occupations in addition to their main occupation	Est.	-3.7	-16.5*	-17.8	3.2	1.9	-1.1	-16.6***	-12.6*	-2.4	-3.2	8.6	-17.8*	-21.0**	-3.1	-1.3
	Se.	(6.47)	(9.96)	(11.60)	(7.94)	(7.66)	(4.18)	(6.40)	(6.98)	(5.30)	(5.47)	(6.27)	(9.96)	(9.75)	(10.26)	(10.28)
	N	3,026	3,244	3,208	3,135	3,101	3,026	3,244	3,208	3,135	3,101	3,026	3,244	3,208	3,135	3,101

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (2) An adult is classified as engaged in economically productive activities if during the last 7 days they have: worked for payment in cash/in-kind outside the household; worked on household owned land or with household owned livestock or fished; worked in his/her own business or business owned by another member of the household; or even if not worked in last 7 days does have a permanent job or enterprise such as a retail shop, a factory, farm or service establishment that they will return to. (3) In all occupations.

Table A.14 Labour participation rates and time use in productive activities – VFSG

		VFSG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC- FU	D-FU	DC- FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC- FU	D-FU	DC- FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
Proportion of working-age adults (18-64) engaged in economically productive activities ²	Est.	0.5	0.8	0.7	0.3	0.3	-1.0	0.1	-0.3	1.0	0.6	2.7	4.1	5.1	1.4	0.1
	Se.	(1.68)	(1.44)	(1.63)	(1.56)	(1.61)	(2.72)	(2.36)	(2.65)	(2.32)	(2.34)	(4.01)	(3.54)	(3.95)	(3.53)	(3.64)
	N	7,870	8,634	8,577	8,252	8,195	7,870	8,634	8,577	8,252	8,195	7,870	8,634	8,577	8,252	8,195
Mean number of hours spent working per week ³	Est.	0.5	0.5	0.1	0.1	-0.2	0.1	0.0	-0.9	-0.1	-0.7	3.6*	2.9	1.5	-0.6	-0.6
	Se.	(0.70)	(0.68)	(0.56)	(0.45)	(0.40)	(1.45)	(1.09)	(1.02)	(0.70)	(0.57)	(2.04)	(1.73)	(1.27)	(1.28)	(1.14)
	N	7,870	8,634	8,577	8,252	8,195	7,870	8,634	8,577	8,252	8,195	7,870	8,634	8,577	8,252	8,195
Mean number of months spent working in main occupation in last year	Est.	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.9**	1.0**	0.9	0.7	1.6**	1.0	0.9	-0.7	-0.9**
	Se.	(0.39)	(0.38)	(0.38)	(0.38)	(0.39)	(0.56)	(0.41)	(0.47)	(0.51)	(0.51)	(0.74)	(0.77)	(0.83)	(0.48)	(0.38)
	N	2,228	2,509	2,496	2,369	2,355	2,228	2,509	2,496	2,369	2,355	2,228	2,509	2,496	2,369	2,355
Proportion of working-age adults engaged in subsidiary occupations in addition to their main occupation	Est.	2.5	7.1	7.7	4.6	3.9	-2.6	2.1	2.3	4.7	4.5	0.8	-13.3	-16.0	-14.1	-15.7
	Se.	(3.08)	(5.78)	(5.89)	(4.50)	(4.44)	(4.12)	(5.59)	(5.90)	(5.13)	(5.47)	(5.68)	(10.42)	(12.33)	(9.18)	(10.64)
	N	2,313	2,558	2,545	2,436	2,420	2,313	2,558	2,545	2,436	2,420	2,313	2,558	2,545	2,436	2,420

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (2) An adult is classified as engaged in economically productive activities if during the last 7 days they have: worked for payment in cash/in-kind outside the household; worked on household owned land or with household owned livestock or fished; worked in his/her own business or business owned by another member of the household; or even if not worked in last 7 days does have a permanent job or enterprise such as a retail shop, a factory, farm or service establishment that they will return to. (3) In all occupations.

Table A.15 Land ownership – SCG

		SCG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC- FU	D-FU	DC- FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC- FU	D-FU	DC- FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC- FU	D-FU	DC- FU
Proportion of households owning land	Est.	5.9	1.2	-1.7	0.2	-0.1	4.9	3.1	2.8	-1.6	-1.2	12.7***	3.6	2.9	-14.6*	-12.5*
	Se.	(6.49)	(4.03)	(4.87)	(8.24)	(7.70)	(3.54)	(2.07)	(2.58)	(4.12)	(3.81)	(4.68)	(2.83)	(3.25)	(7.52)	(7.16)
	N	1,944	1,946	1,917	1,945	1,918	1,944	1,946	1,917	1,945	1,918	1,944	1,946	1,917	1,945	1,918
Mean acres owned	Est.	1.0	0.0	-1.3	0.0	0.1	1.6	1.2	0.7	-1.1	-1.4	1.1	1.2	-1.2	0.0	-0.1
	Se.	(3.45)	(2.38)	(2.81)	(3.53)	(2.81)	(2.34)	(0.99)	(1.21)	(1.94)	(1.90)	(3.25)	(1.10)	(2.20)	(3.83)	(3.59)
	N	1,786	1,844	1,822	1,815	1,796	1,786	1,844	1,822	1,815	1,796	1,786	1,844	1,822	1,815	1,796
Mean acres cultivated	Est.	1.9	-0.2	-0.5	-1.4	-1.3	1.7	0.4	0.6	-1.4	-1.5*	1.6	0.7	0.5	-1.2	-1.2
	Se.	(1.84)	(1.24)	(1.24)	(1.86)	(1.33)	(1.26)	(0.80)	(0.94)	(0.94)	(0.89)	(1.74)	(0.96)	(0.82)	(1.91)	(1.72)
	N	1,785	1,842	1,820	1,814	1,794	1,785	1,842	1,820	1,814	1,794	1,785	1,842	1,820	1,814	1,794
Proportion of households renting out land owned	Est.	-6.1	0.5	0.3	7.5	6.6	-3.6	1.2	1.2	3.5	3.5	-4.3	-0.9	-3.7	2.6	3.9
	Se.	(4.81)	(4.00)	(5.80)	(4.75)	(4.71)	(2.49)	(1.52)	(2.18)	(2.18)	(2.19)	(4.47)	(2.14)	(3.89)	(4.70)	(4.75)
	N	1,944	1,946	1,917	1,945	1,918	1,944	1,946	1,917	1,945	1,918	1,944	1,946	1,917	1,945	1,918
Proportion of households cultivating on land not owned	Est.	-11.8**	4.9	10.4	6.7	7.2	-10.6***	-6.9**	-8.0*	9.9***	9.9**	-11.1**	-3.2	-2.2	17.3***	16.4**
	Se.	(6.02)	(6.79)	(9.51)	(6.85)	(7.18)	(3.66)	(3.00)	(4.72)	(3.80)	(4.00)	(5.37)	(4.62)	(6.07)	(6.73)	(6.95)
	N	1,944	1,946	1,917	1,945	1,918	1,944	1,946	1,917	1,945	1,918	1,944	1,946	1,917	1,945	1,918
Mean acres rented	Est.	0.1	-0.3	-0.3	0.0	0.0	0.1	-0.1*	-0.1*	-0.2	-0.2	-0.1	-0.2*	-0.1	0.0	0.1
	Se.	(0.26)	(0.16)	(0.23)	(0.22)	(0.21)	(0.14)	(0.08)	(0.06)	(0.12)	(0.13)	(0.23)	(0.13)	(0.08)	(0.21)	(0.23)
	N	1,785	1,843	1,821	1,814	1,795	1,785	1,843	1,821	1,814	1,795	1,785	1,843	1,821	1,814	1,795
Mean acres cultivated on land not owned	Est.	-0.4	2.0***	2.6**	0.7	0.5	0.7	1.1**	0.8**	0.1	-0.1	2.9	0.6**	0.6*	-4.1	-3.8
	Se.	(1.88)	(0.73)	(1.19)	(1.70)	(1.25)	(1.18)	(0.43)	(0.36)	(1.09)	(1.08)	(2.16)	(0.29)	(0.32)	(2.61)	(2.59)
	N	313	344	337	329	323	313	344	337	329	323	313	344	337	329	323

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A.16 Land ownership – VFSG

		VFSG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC- FU	D-FU	DC- FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC- FU	D-FU	DC- FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC- FU
Proportion of households owning land	Est.	4.3	3.0	2.4	-1.3	-1.6	0.4	-4.3	-4.9	-4.7	-5.6	-8.2	-8.8	-10.8	-0.6	-2.3
	Se.	(2.74)	(3.39)	(3.53)	(3.19)	(3.44)	(2.64)	(3.52)	(4.18)	(3.33)	(3.83)	(5.99)	(7.86)	(7.39)	(7.55)	(7.86)
	N	1,866	1,866	1,850	1,866	1,849	1,866	1,866	1,850	1,866	1,849	1,866	1,866	1,850	1,866	1,849
Mean acres owned	Est.	-0.4	-0.4	-0.5	0.0	-0.1	-0.5	-0.2	-0.5	0.3	0.1	2.9***	1.9**	1.2**	-0.9	-1.2
	Se.	(0.44)	(0.48)	(0.39)	(0.43)	(0.39)	(0.66)	(0.74)	(0.61)	(0.57)	(0.47)	(0.67)	(0.89)	(0.58)	(1.07)	(1.03)
	N	1,624	1,697	1,682	1,661	1,646	1,624	1,697	1,682	1,661	1,646	1,624	1,697	1,682	1,661	1,646
Mean acres cultivated	Est.	-0.1	-0.2	-0.2	-0.1	-0.1	-0.2	-0.2	-0.3	0.0	-0.1	0.7*	0.7	0.3	-0.1	-0.2
	Se.	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.18)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.29)	(0.34)	(0.32)	(0.27)	(0.26)	(0.42)	(0.54)	(0.54)	(0.60)	(0.61)
	N	1,621	1,690	1,675	1,656	1,641	1,621	1,690	1,675	1,656	1,641	1,621	1,690	1,675	1,656	1,641
Proportion of households renting out land owned	Est.	2.1	3.2	3.0	1.2	0.7	3.8	1.0	0.2	-2.8	-3.3	-1.4	1.5	-0.5	2.9	2.4
	Se.	(1.66)	(2.35)	(2.03)	(2.35)	(2.31)	(2.27)	(2.79)	(2.29)	(3.30)	(3.21)	(3.01)	(4.57)	(3.66)	(3.81)	(3.76)
	N	1,866	1,866	1,850	1,866	1,849	1,866	1,866	1,850	1,866	1,849	1,866	1,866	1,850	1,866	1,849
Proportion of households cultivating on land not owned	Est.	-12.6*	-5.7	-2.1	6.9	4.5	-19.5**	-7.3	-5.6	12.2*	8.9	-14.3	-14.1	-13.5	0.2	0.3
	Se.	(7.40)	(6.20)	(5.10)	(5.17)	(5.16)	(9.08)	(7.72)	(5.67)	(6.59)	(6.35)	(13.56)	(12.36)	(11.67)	(9.74)	(9.72)
	N	1,866	1,866	1,850	1,866	1,849	1,866	1,866	1,850	1,866	1,849	1,866	1,866	1,850	1,866	1,849
Mean acres rented	Est.	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	-0.1	-0.1	0.1	0.0	0.2*	0.2*
	Se.	(0.09)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.13)	(0.08)	(0.07)	(0.13)	(0.12)	(0.10)	(0.09)	(0.08)	(0.12)	(0.11)
	N	1,623	1,690	1,675	1,657	1,642	1,623	1,690	1,675	1,657	1,642	1,623	1,690	1,675	1,657	1,642
Mean acres cultivated on land not owned	Est.	-0.2	0.0	-0.1	0.3	-0.1	-0.4	0.3	0.1	0.7**	0.1	0.5	0.7	0.6	0.2	0.6
	Se.	(0.22)	(0.26)	(0.22)	(0.31)	(0.27)	(0.32)	(0.27)	(0.25)	(0.34)	(0.30)	(0.41)	(0.58)	(0.53)	(0.50)	(0.40)
	N	582	653	647	618	612	582	653	647	618	612	582	653	647	618	612

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A.17 Livestock ownership and sales – SCG

		SCG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
Proportion of households owning livestock	Est.	8.4	14.5***	14.0**	-7.0	-8.9	4.5	9.0**	8.4*	1.2	-1.1	12.1	3.7	3.5	-8.7	-9.7
	Se.	(15.31)	(5.09)	(6.90)	(13.63)	(11.21)	(7.64)	(4.04)	(4.42)	(5.44)	(4.98)	(10.97)	(6.28)	(8.25)	(10.04)	(9.39)
	N	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920
Proportion of households purchasing livestock in last 12 months	Est.	-1.6	16.0**	13.5	9.9	10.1	-2.2	12.9***	10.2**	15.7**	14.7**	-6.1	12.1*	6.9	27.2**	26.8**
	Se.	(11.85)	(8.00)	(9.06)	(12.94)	(10.52)	(6.46)	(4.32)	(5.05)	(6.73)	(6.28)	(10.80)	(6.89)	(7.12)	(12.88)	(11.78)
	N	1,930	1,947	1,918	1,939	1,913	1,930	1,947	1,918	1,939	1,913	1,930	1,947	1,918	1,939	1,913
Mean total value of livestock purchased	Est.	-80,800	-16,300	45,100	118,500*	92,300	-45,200	25,600	60,400	48,000	38,000	-21,800	-5,000	12,600	5,100	-15,300
	Se.	(54,938)	(46,937)	(87,326)	(66,495)	(57,943)	(29,715)	(24,705)	(39,927)	(29,189)	(28,172)	(34,739)	(24,246)	(37,456)	(56,101)	(61,228)
	N	1,930	1,947	1,918	1,939	1,913	1,930	1,947	1,918	1,939	1,913	1,930	1,947	1,918	1,939	1,913
Proportion of households selling livestock in last 12 months	Est.	-8.6	-2.3	-5.9	11.7	12.1	-5.2	1.6	0.6	6.5	4.4	-1.6	0.3	-0.9	3.8	2.0
	Se.	(9.44)	(8.98)	(9.64)	(10.95)	(10.59)	(4.65)	(5.44)	(5.85)	(6.57)	(6.56)	(7.68)	(4.09)	(4.91)	(14.87)	(15.01)
	N	1,938	1,947	1,918	1,943	1,916	1,938	1,947	1,918	1,943	1,916	1,938	1,947	1,918	1,943	1,916
Mean total value of livestock sold	Est.	-162,800	-135,400	-187,700	182,800	138,100	-52,100	-39,000	-18,500	42,900	14,700	-96,800	-35,600	-12,600	177,600	122,300
	Se.	(119,838)	(99,923)	(133,316)	(135,298)	(145,482)	(77,878)	(58,830)	(69,672)	(83,534)	(90,630)	(114,846)	(49,937)	(55,600)	(158,204)	(154,601)
	N	1,938	1,947	1,918	1,943	1,916	1,938	1,947	1,918	1,943	1,916	1,938	1,947	1,918	1,943	1,916

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A.18 Livestock ownership and sales – VFSG

		VFSG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
Proportion of households owning livestock	Est.	-3.0	9.8**	8.9**	12.8**	8.7	2.4	14.8**	10.7*	12.3**	6.7	13.7	12.8	4.7	-1.0	-2.1
	Se.	(5.42)	(4.70)	(4.27)	(4.89)	(5.26)	(5.61)	(6.30)	(5.92)	(5.98)	(6.55)	(12.68)	(12.63)	(11.06)	(11.18)	(12.90)
	N	1,865	1,867	1,850	1,866	1,849	1,865	1,867	1,850	1,866	1,849	1,865	1,867	1,850	1,866	1,849
Proportion of households purchasing livestock in last 12 months	Est.	-9.0*	24.7***	24.0***	33.7***	32.1***	-7.3	25.8***	21.7***	33.2**	29.7**	23.1**	26.7	19.2	3.6	2.5
	Se.	(5.22)	(5.65)	(4.69)	(7.93)	(7.28)	(7.30)	(8.91)	(7.61)	(13.52)	(12.28)	(10.69)	(17.83)	(15.43)	(18.20)	(16.82)
	N	1,857	1,867	1,850	1,862	1,845	1,857	1,867	1,850	1,862	1,845	1,857	1,867	1,850	1,862	1,845
Mean total value of livestock purchased	Est.	14,600	2,200	123.6	-12,400	-15,200	32,100	28,000*	19,200	-4,100	-10,700	17,100	9,000	-78.3	-8,100	-7,400
	Se.	(23,539)	(14,035)	(14,703)	(22,278)	(22,563)	(27,623)	(15,664)	(15,220)	(27,695)	(28,340)	(48,614)	(34,476)	(34,881)	(51,774)	(51,639)
	N	1,857	1,867	1,850	1,862	1,845	1,857	1,867	1,850	1,862	1,845	1,857	1,867	1,850	1,862	1,845
Proportion of households selling livestock in last 12 months	Est.	-2.2	1.0	0.2	3.3	-0.6	8.2	4.3	2.2	-4.0	-8.7	1.6	2.5	-1.1	0.9	0.8
	Se.	(5.46)	(5.59)	(4.68)	(4.55)	(4.58)	(6.71)	(6.26)	(5.44)	(5.28)	(6.08)	(12.93)	(10.50)	(8.51)	(9.47)	(10.74)
	N	1,860	1,867	1,850	1,864	1,846	1,860	1,867	1,850	1,864	1,846	1,860	1,867	1,850	1,864	1,846
Mean total value of livestock sold	Est.	3,900	-1,300	-2,800	-5,200	-14,900	-16,700	14,500	13,500	31,200	23,900	117,600	41,900	34,300	-75,700	-79,600
	Se.	(35,377)	(14,561)	(12,348)	(34,275)	(35,477)	(35,163)	(18,524)	(18,703)	(38,897)	(41,120)	(71,995)	(35,783)	(35,872)	(91,077)	(94,900)
	N	1,860	1,867	1,850	1,864	1,846	1,860	1,867	1,850	1,864	1,846	1,860	1,867	1,850	1,864	1,846

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A.19 Purchase and sale of productive assets² and asset index score – SCG

		SCG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
Proportion of households purchasing productive assets in last 12 months	Est.	10.4	6.3	5.2	-18.5*	-15.5	6.9	0.6	0.4	-9.4	-10.5	-3.2	-7.6	-9.6	14.6	11.9
	Se.	(9.09)	(8.59)	(12.61)	(10.40)	(10.89)	(5.66)	(4.91)	(5.48)	(6.85)	(6.83)	(7.10)	(9.15)	(9.02)	(10.30)	(9.18)
	N	1,944	1,947	1,918	1,946	1,918	1,944	1,947	1,918	1,946	1,918	1,944	1,947	1,918	1,946	1,918
Mean total value of productive assets purchased	Est.	-1,900	214.9	-3,300	-0,400	794.6	856.2	-0,400	-2,100	-1,400	-1,700	4,200	90.9	-1,300	-2,100	-2,400
	Se.	(4,726)	(4,626)	(7,253)	(4,705)	(4,716)	(2,730)	(2,575)	(3,265)	(2,783)	(2,877)	(4,380)	(2,246)	(2,667)	(6,156)	(6,500)
	N	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920
Proportion of households selling productive assets in last 12 months	Est.	-0.8	-0.9	-1.6	1.2	1.7	-0.5	-0.2	-0.5	0.8	1.0	-1.5	-1.7*	-2.0*	3.0	2.4
	Se.	(1.99)	(1.17)	(1.84)	(2.38)	(2.29)	(1.00)	(0.57)	(0.76)	(1.17)	(1.14)	(1.80)	(0.91)	(1.14)	(2.49)	(2.46)
	N	1,942	1,946	1,917	1,944	1,917	1,942	1,946	1,917	1,944	1,917	1,942	1,946	1,917	1,944	1,917
Mean total value of productive assets sold	Est.	-1,400	-0,400	-0,600	1,400	1,400	-0,500	-0,200	-0,200	453.7	459.6	-0,800	-0,200	-0,200	1,100	1,100
	Se.	(1,156)	(324.50)	(475.70)	(1,179)	(1,211)	(531.30)	(151.00)	(170.40)	(531.50)	(533.60)	(1,455)	(130.50)	(154.10)	(1,580)	(1,630)
	N	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920
Asset score	Est.	-0.2	-0.2	-0.2	0.4	0.2	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.1
	Se.	(0.28)	(0.24)	(0.20)	(0.32)	(0.23)	(0.16)	(0.14)	(0.11)	(0.13)	(0.10)	(0.21)	(0.11)	(0.12)	(0.29)	(0.22)
	N	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (2) Productive assets are assets used for any economic activity.

Table A.20 Purchase and sale of productive assets² and asset index score – VFSG

		VFSG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
Proportion of households purchasing productive assets in last 12 months	Est.	-6.9	8.7	10.3**	15.6***	13.5***	-8.7	-2.4	-1.9	6.3	3.7	-23.0*	-4.2	-5.9	18.8	16.1
	Se.	(4.86)	(5.85)	(4.71)	(4.83)	(4.71)	(6.92)	(7.26)	(5.41)	(7.48)	(6.95)	(11.71)	(11.04)	(9.50)	(14.01)	(12.81)
	N	1,866	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,849	1,866	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,849	1,866	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,849
Mean total value of productive assets purchased	Est.	-2,600	3,000**	3,100***	5,500***	5,500***	-4,100	2,400	2,200*	6,500**	6,000**	-5,800	3,200	2,300	9,000*	9,100*
	Se.	(1,738)	(1,181)	(875.10)	(1,626)	(1,689)	(2,717)	(1,554)	(1,093)	(2,426)	(2,458)	(5,900)	(2,478)	(2,482)	(5,131)	(5,308)
	N	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850
Proportion of households selling productive assets in last 12 months	Est.	-0.4	-1.2**	-1.2*	-0.8	-0.8	-0.3	-0.8	-0.7	-0.5	-0.5	0.6	2.6**	2.6**	2.0	2.0
	Se.	(0.48)	(0.58)	(0.59)	(0.58)	(0.58)	(0.73)	(0.79)	(0.84)	(0.69)	(0.68)	(1.10)	(1.24)	(1.17)	(1.73)	(1.72)
	N	1,863	1,867	1,850	1,865	1,848	1,863	1,867	1,850	1,865	1,848	1,863	1,867	1,850	1,865	1,848
Mean total value of productive assets sold	Est.	-1,000	-0,700	-0,600	279.4	353.6	-1,000	-53.0	-24.0	917.5	1,100	1,400	2,800	2,700	1,300	1,300
	Se.	(1,190)	(766.70)	(705.10)	(1,410)	(1,444)	(1,219)	(910.60)	(836.90)	(1,552)	(1,598)	(1,060)	(2,445)	(2,396)	(2,680)	(2,613)
	N	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850
Asset score	Est.	-0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2**	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.5*	0.6*	0.4*	0.1	0.0
	Se.	(0.17)	(0.15)	(0.08)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.19)	(0.18)	(0.14)	(0.10)	(0.06)	(0.30)	(0.33)	(0.21)	(0.22)	(0.15)
	N	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (2) Productive assets are assets used for any economic activity.

Table A.21 Migration and remittances – SCG

		SCG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
Proportion of households with migrant	Est.	-4.3	-2.5	1.5	4.7	2.2	-4.5	-2.2	-3.3	5.0	3.8	-3.4	-2.6	-3.9	4.9	-0.2
	Se.	(5.06)	(8.00)	(14.07)	(7.88)	(9.52)	(2.84)	(5.34)	(7.35)	(3.77)	(4.07)	(4.36)	(9.58)	(9.59)	(11.10)	(13.28)
	N	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920
Proportion of households with migrant (reliable)	Est.	-10.8	-2.5	1.5	8.1	2.1	-7.2	-2.2	-3.3	6.4	3.9	-8.7	-2.6	-3.9	10.2	3.2
	Se.	(9.85)	(8.00)	(14.07)	(12.51)	(13.12)	(5.35)	(5.34)	(7.35)	(6.70)	(6.51)	(8.87)	(9.58)	(9.59)	(15.42)	(17.21)
	N	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920
Age	Est.	0.8	0.1	2.5	-2.0	-2.3	0.3	-1.9	-1.0	-2.9	-2.5	1.4	6.0**	8.0**	-27.9***	-22.5**
	Se.	(3.41)	(4.09)	(3.67)	(3.36)	(3.39)	(2.71)	(2.11)	(2.24)	(2.75)	(2.76)	(4.38)	(2.48)	(3.33)	(10.41)	(9.86)
	N	318	1,454	1,407	886	861	318	1,454	1,407	886	861	318	1,454	1,407	886	861
Proportion female	Est.	-3.9	24.7	22.8	-5.1	-7.7	-1.2	6.0	6.6	1.8	1.5	4.7	9.6	28.6**	-85.7**	-98.3**
	Se.	(17.37)	(16.36)	(21.16)	(21.61)	(20.06)	(12.99)	(5.85)	(8.01)	(13.09)	(12.69)	(17.89)	(7.16)	(12.23)	(43.13)	(41.03)
	N	318	1,464	1,417	891	866	318	1,464	1,417	891	866	318	1,464	1,417	891	866
Proportion sending remittances	Est.	1.4	-3.7	1.4	-0.4	-7.8	-0.4	6.5	10.5	-2.7	-8.0	3.0	-8.0	-7.7	-10.1	-13.2
	Se.	(7.15)	(18.03)	(16.82)	(13.57)	(13.12)	(6.39)	(6.62)	(7.68)	(9.92)	(9.27)	(7.73)	(19.20)	(9.37)	(62.60)	(43.56)
	N	317	1,460	1,413	889	863	317	1,460	1,413	889	863	317	1,460	1,413	889	863

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A.22 Migration and remittances – VFSG

		VFSG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC- FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC- FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
Proportion of households with migrant	Est.	-0.5	-5.6	-5.2	-5.2	-6.0*	-0.1	-4.0	-3.7	-3.9	-4.6	-0.5	19.4	19.6	19.8*	21.0**
	Se.	(2.18)	(4.22)	(3.43)	(3.17)	(3.13)	(3.32)	(5.32)	(4.27)	(4.07)	(3.99)	(7.27)	(12.62)	(11.61)	(10.03)	(9.89)
	N	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850
Proportion of households with migrant (reliable)	Est.	-0.1	-5.6	-5.2	-5.6	-6.6*	2.8	-4.0	-3.7	-6.8	-8.0	18.5*	19.4	19.6	0.8	1.0
	Se.	(4.99)	(4.22)	(3.43)	(3.67)	(3.55)	(6.37)	(5.32)	(4.27)	(5.65)	(5.10)	(10.21)	(12.62)	(11.61)	(11.55)	(11.18)
	N	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850
Age	Est.	-8.4**	-0.8	-1.3	7.6	7.3	-11.3**	-2.4	-3.6	9.0	8.4	1.5	-0.3	-1.1	-1.7	0.3
	Se.	(3.89)	(2.23)	(2.22)	(4.90)	(5.23)	(5.12)	(3.41)	(3.17)	(6.99)	(7.21)	(5.22)	(6.48)	(5.44)	(9.89)	(7.66)
	N	265	933	913	599	588	265	933	913	599	588	265	933	913	599	588
Proportion female	Est.	-5.7	0.2	-2.5	5.9	-1.4	-11.6	10.2	11.0	21.9	17.6	-37.8**	19.4*	21.1*	57.2***	55.7***
	Se.	(11.19)	(6.58)	(7.08)	(12.54)	(13.69)	(14.22)	(6.80)	(6.60)	(16.69)	(17.22)	(14.38)	(10.41)	(11.98)	(18.07)	(18.09)
	N	267	941	921	604	593	267	941	921	604	593	267	941	921	604	593
Proportion sending remittances	Est.	-8.9**	8.2**	6.6*	17.2***	13.8***	-13.2***	5.7	6.7*	18.9***	18.0***	-16.5**	17.1***	18.6***	33.6***	29.0***
	Se.	(3.68)	(3.00)	(3.26)	(3.94)	(4.01)	(4.69)	(4.08)	(3.78)	(5.62)	(5.20)	(6.18)	(5.60)	(6.04)	(7.72)	(9.15)
	N	267	947	927	607	596	267	947	927	607	596	267	947	927	607	596

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A.23 Child labour participation rates – SCG

		SCG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
Proportion of children aged 5-17 engaged in child labour ²																
Boys	Est.	0.9	-2.0	-6.9	-3.5	-3.6	-1.0	-2.4	-1.9	-1.1	-0.1	-0.4	-2.0	-2.9	0.9	5.5
	Se.	(7.34)	(8.98)	(9.51)	(8.23)	(9.12)	(4.54)	(6.06)	(6.89)	(5.25)	(5.26)	(6.29)	(6.93)	(5.94)	(11.55)	(11.37)
	N	1,995	2,077	2,049	2,036	2,008	1,995	2,077	2,049	2,036	2,008	1,995	2,077	2,049	2,036	2,008
Girls	Est.	6.9	-3.8	-12.1	-7.1	-10.4	3.8	-1.9	-6.0	-4.2	-5.8	-0.6	1.2	3.5	-6.2	-3.5
	Se.	(13.47)	(11.77)	(18.20)	(14.85)	(17.41)	(7.24)	(7.70)	(9.83)	(7.58)	(6.81)	(9.38)	(7.43)	(7.08)	(11.43)	(8.86)
	N	1,950	2,073	2,058	2,012	1,993	1,950	2,073	2,058	2,012	1,993	1,950	2,073	2,058	2,012	1,993

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (2) UBOS definition of child labour.

Table A.24 Child labour participation rates – VFSG

		VFSG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
Proportion of children aged 5-17 engaged in child labour ²																
Boys	Est.	-5.5	-1.4	-2.5	4.1	3.2	2.1	-5.4	-8.5	-7.4	-8.8	31.4*	4.3	-3.5	-27.1	-27.3
	Se.	(6.36)	(3.51)	(3.49)	(7.12)	(7.11)	(7.23)	(6.15)	(5.54)	(8.07)	(8.23)	(15.52)	(9.41)	(9.20)	(20.43)	(20.65)
	N	2,180	2,449	2,439	2,315	2,300	2,180	2,449	2,439	2,315	2,300	2,180	2,449	2,439	2,315	2,300
Girls	Est.	-2.2	1.9	0.4	4.1	3.2	-7.6	5.9	3.7	13.5**	14.3***	-12.7	8.3	5.8	21.0**	21.0***
	Se.	(5.31)	(3.56)	(3.02)	(5.13)	(5.08)	(7.47)	(5.37)	(4.45)	(5.75)	(4.95)	(9.16)	(9.52)	(8.00)	(7.63)	(7.03)
	N	2,139	2,409	2,388	2,274	2,261	2,139	2,409	2,388	2,274	2,261	2,139	2,409	2,388	2,274	2,261

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (2) UBOS definition of child labour.

Table A.25 Dwelling characteristics, fuel, water and sanitation – SCG

		SCG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X-FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X-FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X-FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
Proportion of households owning their own dwelling	Est.	-3.4	0.3	0.3	5.0	5.0	-2.5	-0.1	0.6	2.7	3.3**	2.5	3.1	4.8**	-4.0	-0.1
	Se.	(2.80)	(4.45)	(4.87)	(4.10)	(3.20)	(1.66)	(2.20)	(2.13)	(1.81)	(1.52)	(2.30)	(4.37)	(2.37)	(5.13)	(4.04)
	N	1,943	1,945	1,916	1,944	1,917	1,943	1,945	1,916	1,944	1,917	1,943	1,945	1,916	1,944	1,917
Mean number of rooms ²	Est.	0.2	0.7	0.6	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.6**	0.5**	0.2	0.1	0.5*	0.7***	0.6***	0.0	-0.3
	Se.	(0.46)	(0.42)	(0.38)	(0.53)	(0.34)	(0.26)	(0.26)	(0.23)	(0.20)	(0.16)	(0.33)	(0.23)	(0.20)	(0.41)	(0.33)
	N	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920
Proportion of households whose main source of lighting is electricity ³	Est.	2.6	1.4	1.2	-6.0	-5.4	1.3	0.4	0.3	-1.3	-1.9	-3.1	-0.3	-1.0	6.4	6.3
	Se.	(6.16)	(4.15)	(5.47)	(6.95)	(6.52)	(3.06)	(2.17)	(2.46)	(2.39)	(2.39)	(4.96)	(2.00)	(2.06)	(6.35)	(5.95)
	N	1,479	1,947	1,918	1,713	1,688	1,479	1,947	1,918	1,713	1,688	1,479	1,947	1,918	1,713	1,688
Proportion of households whose main source of cooking fuel is charcoal or firewood	Est.	-0.6	-0.6	0.3	-1.9	-0.6	-0.1	-1.1	-0.8	-1.5	-0.8	-0.6	-0.1	0.2	-0.7	1.0
	Se.	(2.16)	(1.64)	(1.77)	(1.98)	(1.70)	(1.10)	(0.96)	(0.99)	(1.08)	(1.07)	(2.11)	(0.74)	(0.79)	(2.09)	(1.95)
	N	1,943	1,947	1,918	1,945	1,918	1,943	1,947	1,918	1,945	1,918	1,943	1,947	1,918	1,945	1,918
Proportion of households with safe water source ⁴	Est.	10.3	-17.3*	-19.7*	-11.6	-8.5	1.2	-14.4**	-18.1***	-0.3	1.3	5.5	-4.8	-6.3	0.7	10.3
	Se.	(11.04)	(9.01)	(10.85)	(13.20)	(12.51)	(6.19)	(5.72)	(6.89)	(5.79)	(5.70)	(9.05)	(5.22)	(4.55)	(12.77)	(12.76)
	N	1,944	1,946	1,917	1,945	1,918	1,944	1,946	1,917	1,945	1,918	1,944	1,946	1,917	1,945	1,918
Proportion of households with good quality toilet ⁵	Est.	6.9	-3.7	-3.1	-3.6	-11.1	7.4	-2.0	-2.3	-4.0	-7.7	15.9	-1.5	-2.7	-7.0	-13.5
	Se.	(13.38)	(7.28)	(8.31)	(13.64)	(9.32)	(7.24)	(3.98)	(3.97)	(6.79)	(5.54)	(10.66)	(3.08)	(3.21)	(11.58)	(8.41)
	N	1,939	1,945	1,916	1,942	1,915	1,939	1,945	1,916	1,942	1,915	1,939	1,945	1,916	1,942	1,915
Proportion of households with good quality toilet ⁵ (incl. shared)	Est.	7.7	7.4	12.1	-12.6	-19.1	12.3	3.0	2.6	-11.0	-14.5	10.4	4.4	2.1	-5.5	-13.6
	Se.	(18.38)	(10.28)	(12.60)	(20.62)	(16.56)	(10.15)	(5.37)	(5.42)	(10.76)	(9.76)	(13.59)	(4.35)	(4.94)	(15.87)	(12.96)
	N	1,939	1,945	1,916	1,942	1,915	1,939	1,945	1,916	1,942	1,915	1,939	1,945	1,916	1,942	1,915
Paraffin is main source of lighting	Est.	-12.0	-6.7	-13.3**	16.6*	19.5**	-5.1	-3.2	-6.2***	6.0	7.1**	-8.6	-2.6	-5.3*	17.9**	19.1***
	Se.	(8.78)	(4.33)	(5.44)	(9.75)	(9.37)	(4.34)	(2.37)	(2.33)	(3.82)	(3.46)	(6.41)	(2.96)	(2.94)	(7.96)	(6.86)
	N	1,479	1,947	1,918	1,713	1,688	1,479	1,947	1,918	1,713	1,688	1,479	1,947	1,918	1,713	1,688
Battery torch/lantern is main source of lighting	Est.	6.9	4.9	3.9	0.9	1.9	4.1	7.3	8.9	-0.3	0.2	9.6	4.0	2.8	-7.7	-6.1
	Se.	(9.79)	(9.74)	(10.35)	(12.50)	(9.36)	(4.11)	(5.40)	(5.63)	(3.96)	(4.12)	(6.70)	(6.00)	(6.22)	(10.67)	(10.01)
	N	1,479	1,947	1,918	1,713	1,688	1,479	1,947	1,918	1,713	1,688	1,479	1,947	1,918	1,713	1,688
Candle/tadooba is main source of lighting	Est.	27.4*	22.9	26.3*	-19.2	-16.0	24.3***	18.3**	15.0**	-9.2	-7.3	27.7**	26.1***	20.8***	-15.4	-24.9
	Se.	(15.70)	(15.19)	(15.74)	(20.64)	(15.74)	(8.58)	(8.06)	(7.38)	(8.88)	(8.08)	(13.30)	(7.37)	(6.16)	(22.78)	(17.17)
	N	1,479	1,947	1,918	1,713	1,688	1,479	1,947	1,918	1,713	1,688	1,479	1,947	1,918	1,713	1,688
Firewood is main source of lighting	Est.	-28.3	-20.1	-13.3	9.1	0.4	-27.4**	-22.5*	-16.8	6.6	3.5	-25.4	-26.6**	-15.2**	-4.5	0.6
	Se.	(26.58)	(24.79)	(22.32)	(34.74)	(21.02)	(13.78)	(12.87)	(10.74)	(11.70)	(8.36)	(19.48)	(11.00)	(6.81)	(32.43)	(19.90)
	N	1,479	1,947	1,918	1,713	1,688	1,479	1,947	1,918	1,713	1,688	1,479	1,947	1,918	1,713	1,688

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (2) Includes bedrooms and living rooms; does not include storage rooms, bath rooms, toilets or rooms used solely for business; includes kitchen only if used for living room or sleeping as well. (3) Includes grid, generator or solar electricity supply. (4) Improved water sources include piped water, public taps, boreholes, protected well/springs, rain water and gravity-fed schemes. Note that the definition used for improved water sources is consistent with UNHS definition and it differs from the one used internationally which excludes rain water. (5) Includes covered pit latrine, ventilation improved pit latrine and flush toilet – Following international convention, sanitation facilities cannot be considered good quality if shared.

Table A.27 Dwelling characteristics, fuel, water and sanitation – VFSG

		VFSG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC- FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC- FU	D-FU	DC- FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
Proportion of households owning their own dwelling	Est.	-0.7	2.2	2.1	2.8	3.2	-8.0**	-1.8	-1.8	6.1	6.7	-20.3***	7.7	7.6	28.0***	27.2***
	Se.	(2.64)	(3.27)	(2.87)	(3.02)	(3.02)	(2.92)	(5.55)	(5.64)	(5.98)	(5.84)	(5.42)	(10.12)	(9.39)	(6.37)	(7.00)
	N	1,867	1,866	1,849	1,867	1,849	1,867	1,866	1,849	1,867	1,849	1,867	1,866	1,849	1,867	1,849
Mean number of rooms ²	Est.	-0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2*	0.2	-0.2	0.2	0.2	0.4***	0.3**	0.3	1.2***	1.1***	0.9**	0.8**
	Se.	(0.25)	(0.24)	(0.14)	(0.11)	(0.12)	(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.20)	(0.13)	(0.15)	(0.34)	(0.41)	(0.25)	(0.37)	(0.36)
	N	1,867	1,864	1,847	1,866	1,848	1,867	1,864	1,847	1,866	1,848	1,867	1,864	1,847	1,866	1,848
Proportion of households whose main source of lighting is electricity ³	Est.	1.2	-0.1	-0.1	-1.3	-1.4	-0.5	-3.3	-3.4	-2.8	-3.3	2.1	3.2	2.5	1.2	-1.5
	Se.	(3.68)	(2.27)	(2.24)	(3.12)	(3.10)	(4.85)	(2.70)	(2.90)	(5.40)	(5.13)	(13.91)	(3.85)	(3.29)	(12.85)	(12.32)
	N	886	1,866	1,849	1,376	1,361	886	1,866	1,849	1,376	1,361	886	1,866	1,849	1,376	1,361
Proportion of households whose main source of cooking fuel is charcoal or firewood	Est.	0.3	0.0	0.1	-0.3	-0.4	0.0	-0.8	-0.8	-0.8	-1.0	0.3	0.2	-0.2	-0.1	0.0
	Se.	(0.96)	(0.47)	(0.47)	(1.11)	(1.13)	(1.23)	(0.50)	(0.46)	(1.46)	(1.48)	(2.03)	(0.88)	(0.96)	(1.98)	(2.06)
	N	1,864	1,866	1,849	1,865	1,848	1,864	1,866	1,849	1,865	1,848	1,864	1,866	1,849	1,865	1,848
Proportion of households with safe water source ⁴	Est.	9.5	6.3	3.7	-3.2	-2.7	14.4**	8.5	3.0	-5.9	-5.2	17.8**	-2.0	-9.6	-19.8**	-18.7**
	Se.	(5.85)	(6.89)	(4.63)	(3.27)	(3.14)	(6.72)	(7.64)	(6.19)	(4.10)	(4.30)	(7.45)	(9.45)	(6.88)	(7.65)	(7.69)
	N	1,867	1,865	1,848	1,866	1,849	1,867	1,865	1,848	1,866	1,849	1,867	1,865	1,848	1,866	1,849
Proportion of households with good quality toilet ⁵	Est.	-8.6*	-1.6	-1.4	7.1	6.2	-10.0*	-0.5	-0.4	9.5*	7.6	-2.6	8.2*	7.1	10.9	10.1
	Se.	(4.86)	(2.07)	(2.24)	(5.59)	(5.48)	(5.25)	(2.30)	(2.33)	(5.39)	(5.23)	(10.41)	(4.63)	(4.68)	(12.19)	(12.25)
	N	1,863	1,861	1,844	1,862	1,845	1,863	1,861	1,844	1,862	1,845	1,863	1,861	1,844	1,862	1,845
Proportion of households with good quality toilet ⁵ (incl. shared)	Est.	-3.8	1.9	1.9	5.7	5.0	-7.1*	1.2	0.9	8.3	6.6	-2.3	11.5*	10.5	13.8	15.0
	Se.	(4.10)	(3.12)	(3.26)	(5.87)	(5.64)	(4.04)	(3.57)	(3.61)	(5.57)	(5.51)	(8.26)	(6.24)	(6.98)	(10.28)	(10.61)
	N	1,863	1,861	1,844	1,862	1,845	1,863	1,861	1,844	1,862	1,845	1,863	1,861	1,844	1,862	1,845
Paraffin is main source of lighting	Est.	5.5	2.0	1.3	-3.5	-4.0	5.7	4.5***	4.4***	-1.2	-0.3	19.8**	6.6**	6.6**	-13.1	-12.1
	Se.	(4.10)	(1.48)	(1.58)	(4.37)	(4.39)	(7.20)	(1.37)	(1.49)	(7.69)	(8.02)	(9.62)	(2.61)	(2.77)	(10.38)	(10.68)
	N	886	1,866	1,849	1,376	1,361	886	1,866	1,849	1,376	1,361	886	1,866	1,849	1,376	1,361
Battery torch/lantern is main source of lighting	Est.	-16.1**	0.9	-0.1	17.1***	15.6***	-3.3	10.9	7.0	14.2*	13.1*	20.1	27.1*	21.0	6.9	9.9
	Se.	(7.16)	(6.86)	(5.83)	(4.45)	(4.08)	(11.74)	(6.68)	(6.38)	(8.25)	(6.68)	(20.92)	(14.89)	(13.40)	(14.85)	(11.65)
	N	886	1,866	1,849	1,376	1,361	886	1,866	1,849	1,376	1,361	886	1,866	1,849	1,376	1,361
Candle/tadooba is main source of lighting	Est.	1.8	-2.9	0.2	-4.7	-2.5	-7.5	-14.8	-9.4	-7.3	-4.9	-37.0	-34.0**	-27.0*	3.0	-0.3
	Se.	(9.75)	(8.28)	(7.15)	(5.37)	(5.33)	(11.64)	(8.91)	(7.94)	(7.00)	(7.07)	(23.98)	(15.90)	(14.59)	(13.09)	(13.28)
	N	886	1,866	1,849	1,376	1,361	886	1,866	1,849	1,376	1,361	886	1,866	1,849	1,376	1,361
Firewood is main source of lighting	Est.	3.4	0.2	-0.9	-3.3*	-2.8	2.4	0.0	-0.7	-2.4	-2.4	-20.4***	-4.0	-2.6	16.4***	17.8***
	Se.	(2.60)	(2.13)	(1.29)	(1.91)	(2.08)	(3.50)	(2.47)	(1.46)	(3.67)	(3.40)	(4.87)	(3.12)	(2.43)	(5.30)	(5.36)
	N	886	1,866	1,849	1,376	1,361	886	1,866	1,849	1,376	1,361	886	1,866	1,849	1,376	1,361

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (2) Includes bedrooms and living rooms; does not include storage rooms, bath rooms, toilets or rooms used solely for business; includes kitchen only if used for living room or sleeping as well. (3) Includes grid, generator or solar electricity supply. (4) Improved water sources include piped water, public taps, boreholes, protected well/springs, rain water and gravity-fed schemes. Note that the definition used for improved water sources is consistent with UNHS definition and it differs from the one used internationally which excludes rain water. (5) Includes covered pit latrine, ventilation improved pit latrine and flush toilet – Following international convention, sanitation facilities cannot be considered good quality if shared.

Table A.29 Child education attendance, attainment and literacy – SCG

		SCG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
Proportion of children 6-17 currently attending formal education	Est.	19.4	4.4	-1.8	-1.8	1.2	20.0***	13.4***	7.3	-3.3	-3.8	22.5*	10.4	2.7	7.8	4.1
	Se.	(15.26)	(14.27)	(13.85)	(18.89)	(12.31)	(7.41)	(4.48)	(7.64)	(6.87)	(5.43)	(11.52)	(8.32)	(8.05)	(19.04)	(14.31)
	N	3,775	3,899	3,857	3,837	3,792	3,775	3,899	3,857	3,837	3,792	3,775	3,899	3,857	3,837	3,792
Boys	Est.	20.9	2.5	-0.7	-1.9	1.5	19.4***	9.5	9.1	-0.3	-0.2	28.3***	11.0	0.9	0.6	-6.6
	Se.	(13.44)	(11.63)	(12.54)	(15.97)	(12.79)	(6.89)	(6.75)	(5.84)	(5.68)	(5.24)	(9.57)	(7.85)	(11.29)	(13.13)	(11.50)
	N	1,897	1,957	1,929	1,927	1,900	1,897	1,957	1,929	1,927	1,900	1,897	1,957	1,929	1,927	1,900
Girls	Est.	19.1	7.0	-5.9	-4.9	-0.1	21.5*	11.9	4.7	-7.5	-8.6	13.8	-9.6	-21.5	20.1	24.2
	Se.	(22.01)	(17.95)	(18.85)	(28.01)	(19.43)	(11.11)	(9.52)	(9.60)	(11.53)	(9.36)	(17.66)	(15.64)	(15.05)	(31.36)	(23.08)
	N	1,878	1,942	1,928	1,910	1,892	1,878	1,942	1,928	1,910	1,892	1,878	1,942	1,928	1,910	1,892
Mean number of days missed in last 30 scheduled school days	Est.	0.6	-1.6	-2.8**	-1.1	-0.6	-0.2	-0.5	-1.8***	-0.3	0.0	-0.2	-0.4	0.9	-0.5	0.3
	Se.	(0.86)	(1.13)	(1.15)	(0.91)	(0.93)	(0.45)	(0.56)	(0.67)	(0.51)	(0.56)	(0.79)	(0.56)	(0.62)	(0.83)	(0.77)
	N	2,691	2,818	2,792	2,755	2,728	2,691	2,818	2,792	2,755	2,728	2,691	2,818	2,792	2,755	2,728
Boys	Est.	1.0	-0.3	-0.4	-2.1	-1.9	-0.1	-0.4	-0.9	-0.4	-0.3	-1.1	-0.2	1.0*	-0.4	0.6
	Se.	(1.29)	(1.19)	(1.34)	(1.44)	(1.67)	(0.70)	(0.84)	(0.79)	(0.76)	(0.86)	(1.09)	(0.73)	(0.57)	(1.54)	(1.52)
	N	1,388	1,433	1,416	1,411	1,394	1,388	1,433	1,416	1,411	1,394	1,388	1,433	1,416	1,411	1,394
Girls	Est.	0.2	-3.3**	-5.9***	-0.2	0.7	-0.4	-1.7**	-2.9***	0.0	0.3	1.0	0.6	-1.4	-0.8	-0.1
	Se.	(0.77)	(1.45)	(1.63)	(0.85)	(0.94)	(0.51)	(0.85)	(0.84)	(0.63)	(0.67)	(1.01)	(0.85)	(1.13)	(1.20)	(1.40)
	N	1,303	1,385	1,376	1,344	1,334	1,303	1,385	1,376	1,344	1,334	1,303	1,385	1,376	1,344	1,334
Class progression rate ²	Est.	-5.8	-1.1	4.5	3.2	2.9	-7.8	-4.3	-3.4	7.0	7.4	-0.7	-1.4	0.4	7.1	8.3
	Se.	(8.45)	(8.07)	(10.03)	(7.93)	(7.84)	(5.00)	(4.98)	(6.65)	(5.21)	(5.26)	(9.81)	(6.75)	(7.14)	(10.65)	(10.46)
	N	2,771	2,884	2,853	2,828	2,798	2,771	2,884	2,853	2,828	2,798	2,771	2,884	2,853	2,828	2,798
Boys	Est.	-8.8	-0.9	-0.9	5.0	8.0	-6.9	-0.3	1.7	3.2	3.4	3.3	1.6	5.1	-13.5	-11.5
	Se.	(9.18)	(9.52)	(11.40)	(10.70)	(10.95)	(6.20)	(6.30)	(8.08)	(7.65)	(7.76)	(10.69)	(9.66)	(8.65)	(8.83)	(8.79)
	N	1,428	1,460	1,440	1,444	1,426	1,428	1,460	1,440	1,444	1,426	1,428	1,460	1,440	1,444	1,426
Girls	Est.	-6.4	-2.0	13.2	3.6	0.0	-10.3*	-10.7*	-8.4	11.4	11.6	-9.3	-7.4	-3.9	31.8*	32.1*
	Se.	(11.20)	(12.81)	(16.45)	(11.34)	(12.28)	(5.46)	(6.00)	(9.78)	(7.09)	(7.35)	(13.06)	(7.02)	(11.74)	(18.32)	(18.04)
	N	1,343	1,424	1,413	1,384	1,372	1,343	1,424	1,413	1,384	1,372	1,343	1,424	1,413	1,384	1,372
Cohort primary completion rate (aged 15-20)	Est.	-1.0	-3.4	-4.5	1.8	1.1	-0.5	0.9	0.9	1.5	1.0	-5.3	-4.1	-1.5	6.6	8.0
	Se.	(3.87)	(3.51)	(5.56)	(4.24)	(3.99)	(3.56)	(1.62)	(5.31)	(2.65)	(2.59)	(4.39)	(2.97)	(4.10)	(4.75)	(6.36)
	N	267	346	342	307	304	267	346	342	307	304	267	346	342	307	304
Boys	Est.	-3.5	-9.3	-11.0	3.5	2.7	-4.4	-1.4	-4.1	3.4	2.9	-6.4	-2.4	-3.2	5.4	7.4
	Se.	(6.12)	(6.07)	(7.12)	(5.26)	(5.63)	(6.41)	(3.71)	(7.62)	(4.24)	(5.18)	(7.07)	(3.03)	(7.51)	(5.68)	(10.79)
	N	134	179	177	157	155	134	179	177	157	155	134	179	177	157	155
Girls	Est.	4.7	1.9	4.7	-4.8	-4.9	2.4**	1.7	6.8	-0.7	1.6	-1.9***	-4.3*	-2.7	-19.7	-5.7

		SCG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
	Se.	(2.90)	(2.71)	(3.86)	(4.37)	(3.70)	(1.20)	(1.30)	(4.31)	(2.68)	(2.51)	(0.69)	(2.25)	(3.74)	(21.80)	(20.15)
	N	133	167	165	150	149	133	167	165	150	149	133	167	165	150	149

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (2) Proportion of children graduating to next appropriate grade since last academic year.

Table A.31 Child education attendance, attainment and literacy – VFSG

		VFSG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
Proportion of children 6-17 currently attending formal education	Est.	3.6	3.6*	3.5*	0.0	-0.5	2.6	2.1	1.4	-0.5	-1.3	20.4***	7.1	3.3	-13.3	-12.8
	Se.	(3.01)	(2.14)	(2.04)	(3.63)	(3.58)	(5.34)	(2.99)	(2.88)	(6.56)	(6.25)	(6.79)	(5.83)	(4.88)	(10.32)	(10.19)
	N	3,978	4,467	4,437	4,223	4,195	3,978	4,467	4,437	4,223	4,195	3,978	4,467	4,437	4,223	4,195
Boys	Est.	5.3	4.4	4.5*	-1.0	-1.6	6.3	0.9	0.3	-5.5	-6.5	27.9***	12.9*	8.9	-15.0*	-15.3*
	Se.	(3.57)	(2.61)	(2.50)	(3.62)	(3.59)	(6.11)	(3.18)	(3.05)	(6.15)	(6.00)	(6.03)	(7.09)	(6.67)	(8.64)	(8.37)
	N	2,019	2,276	2,265	2,148	2,133	2,019	2,276	2,265	2,148	2,133	2,019	2,276	2,265	2,148	2,133
Girls	Est.	1.7	2.9	2.7	1.2	0.9	-1.2	3.4	3.1	4.6	4.0	12.0	1.5	-0.3	-10.6	-9.1
	Se.	(3.70)	(3.24)	(2.92)	(4.19)	(4.27)	(5.78)	(4.47)	(4.20)	(7.21)	(6.95)	(8.93)	(6.57)	(5.28)	(11.99)	(11.75)
	N	1,959	2,191	2,172	2,075	2,062	1,959	2,191	2,172	2,075	2,062	1,959	2,191	2,172	2,075	2,062
Mean number of days missed in last 30 scheduled school days	Est.	-0.2	-0.5	-0.5	-0.3	-0.3	0.4	-0.7	-0.9	-1.1	-1.1	1.3	1.3	1.0	0.0	-0.1
	Se.	(0.43)	(0.49)	(0.49)	(0.59)	(0.58)	(0.42)	(0.68)	(0.68)	(0.81)	(0.80)	(0.80)	(0.82)	(0.85)	(1.01)	(0.99)
	N	3,147	3,685	3,663	3,416	3,394	3,147	3,685	3,663	3,416	3,394	3,147	3,685	3,663	3,416	3,394
Boys	Est.	-0.2	-0.4	-0.5	-0.2	-0.2	0.9	-0.6	-0.9	-1.5	-1.5	2.0	3.0***	2.6**	0.9	0.7
	Se.	(0.69)	(0.55)	(0.56)	(0.86)	(0.86)	(0.70)	(0.87)	(0.86)	(1.02)	(1.03)	(1.30)	(0.86)	(0.96)	(1.21)	(1.23)
	N	1,612	1,894	1,885	1,753	1,740	1,612	1,894	1,885	1,753	1,740	1,612	1,894	1,885	1,753	1,740
Girls	Est.	-0.2	-0.6	-0.6	-0.4	-0.3	-0.1	-0.9	-0.9	-0.8	-0.7	0.5	-0.4	-0.6	-0.9	-0.9
	Se.	(0.53)	(0.58)	(0.53)	(0.59)	(0.58)	(0.67)	(0.68)	(0.69)	(0.81)	(0.79)	(1.39)	(1.07)	(1.01)	(1.51)	(1.55)
	N	1,535	1,791	1,778	1,663	1,654	1,535	1,791	1,778	1,663	1,654	1,535	1,791	1,778	1,663	1,654
Class progression rate ²	Est.	7.3**	8.0**	7.9**	0.7	1.7	3.0	4.3	5.2	1.3	2.3	-1.8	12.3*	13.2*	14.1	12.0
	Se.	(2.75)	(3.08)	(3.05)	(4.05)	(4.16)	(3.75)	(3.94)	(3.75)	(5.77)	(5.66)	(7.41)	(7.25)	(6.48)	(8.89)	(8.61)
	N	3,214	3,759	3,736	3,487	3,464	3,214	3,759	3,736	3,487	3,464	3,214	3,759	3,736	3,487	3,464
Boys	Est.	1.8	3.8	3.1	2.0	2.6	1.3	0.2	1.1	-1.2	0.5	13.2	15.8	16.6*	2.5	2.5
	Se.	(3.34)	(3.96)	(4.44)	(3.60)	(3.58)	(4.79)	(5.79)	(6.01)	(5.07)	(5.02)	(11.64)	(9.45)	(9.52)	(8.32)	(8.01)
	N	1,654	1,937	1,927	1,796	1,782	1,654	1,937	1,927	1,796	1,782	1,654	1,937	1,927	1,796	1,782
Girls	Est.	13.5***	12.4***	12.3***	-1.1	0.3	5.2	9.0*	8.5*	3.8	3.9	-16.9**	9.5	9.4	26.4**	22.4*
	Se.	(4.80)	(3.94)	(3.33)	(6.14)	(6.11)	(6.22)	(4.83)	(4.34)	(8.04)	(7.86)	(7.46)	(6.87)	(5.64)	(11.47)	(11.03)
	N	1,560	1,822	1,809	1,691	1,682	1,560	1,822	1,809	1,691	1,682	1,560	1,822	1,809	1,691	1,682
Cohort primary completion rate (aged 15-20)	Est.	2.7	0.7	0.9	-1.9	-1.9	0.4	1.6	2.4	1.2	2.2	3.5	-1.3	-2.9	-4.8	-5.1
	Se.	(3.75)	(1.25)	(1.36)	(4.02)	(3.72)	(5.43)	(1.27)	(1.68)	(5.72)	(5.31)	(6.31)	(1.77)	(2.31)	(6.05)	(5.73)
	N	336	425	423	381	378	336	425	423	381	378	336	425	423	381	378
Boys	Est.	6.5	1.8	1.8	-4.7	-5.3	4.4	1.3	1.6	-3.1	-2.9	5.9	2.5	0.9	-3.4	-6.3
	Se.	(4.80)	(1.96)	(2.07)	(5.05)	(5.29)	(4.17)	(2.00)	(2.76)	(4.34)	(4.63)	(4.38)	(2.45)	(3.23)	(4.74)	(5.52)
	N	152	202	202	177	177	152	202	202	177	177	152	202	202	177	177
Girls	Est.	0.2	-0.3	0.0	-0.5	-0.7	-2.9	1.9	2.7	4.8	6.7	4.8	-5.0*	-8.9*	-9.7	-11.0

		VFSG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
	Se.	(4.72)	(1.56)	(2.07)	(5.03)	(4.71)	(7.53)	(1.78)	(2.63)	(8.02)	(8.18)	(10.05)	(2.88)	(4.82)	(9.67)	(10.36)
	N	184	223	221	204	201	184	223	221	204	201	184	223	221	204	201

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (2) Proportion of children graduating to next appropriate grade since last academic year.

Table A.33 Incidence of ill health, health seeking behaviour and expenditure on health – SCG

		SCG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
Proportion of individuals ill or injured in the past 3 months	Est.	5.9	-0.4	-1.9	-2.3	-2.4	1.6	2.5	0.2	1.0	0.7	-1.6	0.9	-1.1	4.8	5.2
	Se.	(5.16)	(5.64)	(7.05)	(5.78)	(5.60)	(2.57)	(2.76)	(3.44)	(3.62)	(3.76)	(4.85)	(4.75)	(4.04)	(8.82)	(8.78)
	N	10,554	10,692	10,574	10,623	10,495	10,554	10,692	10,574	10,623	10,495	10,554	10,692	10,574	10,623	10,495
Proportion of those ill or injured in past 3 months seeking formal healthcare ²	Est.	11.9	-5.2	-6.8	-22.7	-18.9	5.8	-5.4	-10.7**	-11.5	-11.0	-1.6	-17.1***	-10.3*	7.0	8.1
	Se.	(13.21)	(6.38)	(6.58)	(14.47)	(14.58)	(7.18)	(4.64)	(4.79)	(7.36)	(7.78)	(11.93)	(6.50)	(5.33)	(13.95)	(12.40)
	N	2,218	2,200	2,173	2,209	2,179	2,218	2,200	2,173	2,209	2,179	2,218	2,200	2,173	2,209	2,179
Mean total cost of consultation (per individual) ³	Est.	-13,400	-16,900	-22,400	35,400*	28,700	-1,100	-0,200	-7,800	16,800	16,600	-5,600	2,900	-4,200	23,400	19,300
	Se.	(14,686)	(12,764)	(19,895)	(21,258)	(19,006)	(8,317)	(8,278)	(10,891)	(12,160)	(11,397)	(11,456)	(7,929)	(13,570)	(17,209)	(16,813)
	N	1,685	1,524	1,511	1,605	1,586	1,685	1,524	1,511	1,605	1,586	1,685	1,524	1,511	1,605	1,586

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (2) Includes community health workers, private or government hospitals, health centres or clinics. (3) Includes cost of transportation and accommodation incurred as a result of seeking consultation, cost of consultation, and cost of any medicines prescribed.

Table A.34 Incidence of ill health, health seeking behaviour and expenditure on health – VFSG

		VFSG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
Proportion of individuals ill or injured in the past 3 months	Est.	-0.8	1.0	1.2	1.7	2.6	-2.3	2.3	1.9	4.6	5.3**	-7.3	-6.7	-5.4	0.6	0.5
	Se.	(2.13)	(2.42)	(1.76)	(2.44)	(2.40)	(2.67)	(3.37)	(2.81)	(2.71)	(2.57)	(5.53)	(5.85)	(4.46)	(6.42)	(5.35)
	N	9,685	10,419	10,345	10,052	9,981	9,685	10,419	10,345	10,052	9,981	9,685	10,419	10,345	10,052	9,981
Proportion of those ill or injured in past 3 months seeking formal healthcare ²	Est.	1.4	9.7***	10.1**	8.3	7.4	0.7	9.2**	9.8*	8.6	8.1	14.3	-2.7	-4.4	-16.9*	-15.9
	Se.	(4.13)	(3.16)	(3.68)	(5.71)	(5.75)	(5.09)	(4.24)	(4.88)	(6.94)	(7.09)	(8.41)	(5.67)	(5.87)	(9.17)	(9.90)
	N	2,008	2,665	2,646	2,337	2,319	2,008	2,665	2,646	2,337	2,319	2,008	2,665	2,646	2,337	2,319
Mean total cost of consultation (per individual) ³	Est.	-8,400*	-15,600**	-15,100**	-7,200	-5,600	-17,800***	-12,200	-11,600	5,600	6,600	-6,100	18,600	16,700	24,700	21,700
	Se.	(4,374)	(7,443)	(7,233)	(9,318)	(9,628)	(5,895)	(11,879)	(11,181)	(14,129)	(15,101)	(9,256)	(20,107)	(18,159)	(25,150)	(25,867)
	N	1,422	1,707	1,695	1,565	1,554	1,422	1,707	1,695	1,565	1,554	1,422	1,707	1,695	1,565	1,554

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (2) Includes community health workers, private or government hospitals, health centres or clinics. (3) Includes cost of transportation and accommodation incurred as a result of seeking consultation, cost of consultation, and cost of any medicines prescribed.

Table A.35 Household saving, borrowing and access to credit – SCG

		SCG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
Saving	Est.															
Proportion of households reporting current cash savings	Est.	4.4	19.5	0.0***	-5.7	0.0***	3.7	10.5	0.0***	0.9	0.0**	12.8	13.0**	0.0***	-11.8	0.0***
	Se.	(10.29)	(12.47)	(0.00)	(14.69)	(0.00)	(5.27)	(6.93)	(0.00)	(5.68)	(0.00)	(7.92)	(6.39)	(0.00)	(12.48)	(0.00)
	N	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920
Of which, Proportion of households with savings in a formal financial institution	Est.	7.0	-0.3	0.5	-7.9	-11.1	-1.0	1.3	2.5	2.7	0.0	-16.5	5.0	4.9	17.9	14.3
	Se.	(10.67)	(5.46)	(4.98)	(11.72)	(10.79)	(7.06)	(3.60)	(3.52)	(6.95)	(7.27)	(14.08)	(3.51)	(4.48)	(17.54)	(17.96)
	N	532	764	753	648	641	532	764	753	648	641	532	764	753	648	641
Of which Proportion of households with savings in an informal savings institution ²	Est.	6.5	-2.1	-3.8	-12.6	-11.0	5.8	-4.6	-6.3	-11.1	-9.2	12.9	1.0	1.7	-28.4	-24.9
	Se.	(7.71)	(5.16)	(5.93)	(8.55)	(7.78)	(6.66)	(3.22)	(4.30)	(7.06)	(6.67)	(14.76)	(3.49)	(4.63)	(19.29)	(18.68)
	N	532	764	753	648	641	532	764	753	648	641	532	764	753	648	641
Mean total value of current savings, for those with any savings	Est.	-61,500	153,500	206,900*	94,700	12,400	-51,600	78,200	107,300	94,100	33,300	114,300	41,700	135,800	-164,400	-262,300
	Se.	(113,282)	(111,088)	(111,257)	(125,524)	(124,357)	(74,235)	(71,195)	(85,048)	(78,546)	(80,607)	(108,100)	(92,939)	(110,897)	(141,048)	(163,591)
	N	494	739	730	617	611	494	739	730	617	611	494	739	730	617	611
Borrowing																
Proportion of households reporting borrowing money in last 12 months	Est.	3.5	-9.1	0.0	-1.6	0.0***	-4.2	1.1	0.0	5.5	0.0***	-3.8	1.1	0.0***	6.9	0.0***
	Se.	(9.47)	(10.05)	(0.00)	(12.06)	(0.00)	(5.99)	(4.03)	(0.00)	(7.44)	(0.00)	(7.69)	(6.42)	(0.00)	(12.10)	(0.00)
	N	1,947	1,946	1,917	1,947	1,919	1,947	1,946	1,917	1,947	1,919	1,947	1,946	1,917	1,947	1,919
Mean total value of borrowing in last 12 months (UGX)	Est.	66,900	169,800	211,500	-150,900	-273,100	66,800	59,500	121,900	-54,700	-99,300	-181,600	120,600	219,100	32,200	-0,700
	Se.	(255,981)	(156,617)	(182,987)	(286,508)	(247,406)	(114,930)	(83,358)	(105,101)	(100,820)	(103,128)	(182,114)	(140,050)	(172,700)	(264,391)	(254,302)
	N	824	891	885	858	850	824	891	885	858	850	824	891	885	858	850
Mean total value of current outstanding debt, for those with outstanding debt (UGX)	Est.	38,600	134,000	156,400*	-17,300	-96,200	22,400	73,000	104,600*	28,600	253.8	-27,600	104,200	141,200	-107,700	-122,400
	Se.	(139,260)	(90,801)	(93,979)	(165,249)	(145,280)	(64,156)	(56,497)	(61,787)	(72,298)	(70,758)	(104,533)	(109,855)	(136,045)	(150,082)	(139,742)
	N	638	860	854	749	742	638	860	854	749	742	638	860	854	749	742
Credit																
Proportion of households reporting purchasing on credit last 3 months	Est.	12.4	5.5	3.9	-12.0	-10.2	3.4	2.2	-2.6	4.2	3.5	1.9	4.9	0.2	14.5	10.3
	Se.	(9.56)	(12.93)	(14.10)	(10.77)	(10.72)	(5.76)	(4.64)	(6.98)	(6.56)	(6.75)	(10.25)	(6.63)	(5.85)	(10.73)	(9.12)
	N	1,947	1,944	1,915	1,946	1,918	1,947	1,944	1,915	1,946	1,918	1,947	1,944	1,915	1,946	1,918
Mean total value of credit in last 3 months, for those who purchased on credit (UGX)	Est.	-22,200	7,500	33,900	16,200	13,600	-2,300	14,600	30,200*	3,000	5,000	-38,800	5,500	-5,800	17,500	9,800
	Se.	(25,318)	(32,189)	(36,721)	(22,400)	(20,013)	(14,453)	(17,930)	(17,131)	(13,947)	(15,036)	(26,663)	(6,646)	(19,957)	(25,277)	(25,553)
	N	641	753	746	697	691	641	753	746	697	691	641	753	746	697	691
Mean total value of outstanding credit	Est.	-21,000	2,300	4,100	29,900	32,600	-12,000	6,200	11,600	11,700	15,400	-21,100*	-27,500***	-12,900	7,400	8,200
	Se.	(15,332)	(20,584)	(23,113)	(18,934)	(20,246)	(9,175)	(9,441)	(9,288)	(12,839)	(14,071)	(11,844)	(8,420)	(9,312)	(15,053)	(15,316)

		SCG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
debt, for those with outstanding credit debt (UGX)	N	626	712	707	669	664	626	712	707	669	664	626	712	707	669	664

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (2) Includes ROSCA / SACCO / MFI / VSLA.

Table A.36 Household saving, borrowing and access to credit – VFSG

		VFSG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
Saving	Est.															
Proportion of households reporting current cash savings	Est.	-1.2	17.3***	0.0**	18.5**	0.0**	-4.7	24.0***	0.0***	28.7**	0.0*	14.6	36.4**	0.0*	21.8	0.0*
	Se.	(5.80)	(5.47)	(0.00)	(6.90)	(0.00)	(8.77)	(6.87)	(0.00)	(11.90)	(0.00)	(14.96)	(13.51)	(0.00)	(18.06)	(0.00)
	N	1,867	1,865	1,848	1,866	1,849	1,867	1,865	1,848	1,866	1,849	1,867	1,865	1,848	1,866	1,849
Of which, Proportion of households with savings in a formal financial institution	Est.	0.6	0.8	0.7	0.2	-0.1	3.4	2.5*	1.8	-1.0	-1.4	-0.6	4.6	3.4	5.2	3.7
	Se.	(2.74)	(1.34)	(1.13)	(2.91)	(2.96)	(2.52)	(1.34)	(1.12)	(2.83)	(3.05)	(7.03)	(3.80)	(4.07)	(9.59)	(10.07)
	N	711	779	776	745	741	711	779	776	745	741	711	779	776	745	741
Of which Proportion of households with savings in an informal savings institution ²	Est.	0.8	-2.6	-3.0	-3.3	-3.6	-5.3	-6.4***	-6.6***	-1.1	-1.7	-21.4***	-9.8*	-10.3*	11.6	10.6
	Se.	(3.18)	(2.19)	(2.08)	(3.82)	(3.87)	(3.26)	(1.72)	(1.67)	(3.86)	(3.95)	(7.47)	(5.42)	(6.01)	(9.72)	(10.31)
	N	711	779	776	745	741	711	779	776	745	741	711	779	776	745	741
Mean total value of current savings, for those with any savings	Est.	11,200	35,300	48,200	24,000	25,000	-32,500	-28,600	-25,800	3,900	6,700	55,900	65,400	16,300	9,600	-49,400
	Se.	(95,097)	(37,627)	(35,921)	(96,713)	(95,930)	(76,461)	(68,551)	(61,308)	(66,119)	(64,922)	(156,959)	(120,986)	(114,516)	(159,636)	(174,348)
	N	663	763	760	713	710	663	763	760	713	710	663	763	760	713	710
Borrowing																
Proportion of households reporting borrowing money in last 12 months	Est.	-10.7	-6.5	0.0	4.2	0.0	-12.8	-4.3	0.0**	8.4	0.0**	-1.0	11.9	0.0*	12.9	0.0*
	Se.	(7.16)	(7.05)	(0.00)	(4.11)	(0.00)	(8.48)	(7.56)	(0.00)	(6.01)	(0.00)	(12.76)	(13.55)	(0.00)	(15.92)	(0.00)
	N	1,867	1,866	1,849	1,867	1,849	1,867	1,866	1,849	1,867	1,849	1,867	1,866	1,849	1,867	1,849
Mean total value of borrowing in last 12 months (UGX)	Est.	-21,100	-39,600	-50,400	-18,500	-26,800	-24,600	-72,100	-95,600*	-47,600	-62,200	34,300	-15,200	-63,000	-49,500	-48,700
	Se.	(58,692)	(49,550)	(45,346)	(64,061)	(60,231)	(92,546)	(60,856)	(52,885)	(108,882)	(96,737)	(177,581)	(94,106)	(77,720)	(186,923)	(163,436)
	N	954	1,087	1,079	1,021	1,012	954	1,087	1,079	1,021	1,012	954	1,087	1,079	1,021	1,012
Mean total value of current outstanding debt, for those with outstanding debt (UGX)	Est.	-56,200	-5,900	-13,800	50,300	46,300	-56,300	-32,900	-53,400	23,400	3,400	-102,900	-72,300	-111,300	30,600	9,000
	Se.	(56,008)	(37,705)	(35,720)	(66,469)	(61,482)	(104,805)	(60,187)	(54,185)	(127,429)	(119,972)	(227,619)	(98,882)	(85,155)	(283,109)	(264,985)
	N	787	1,072	1,065	930	922	787	1,072	1,065	930	922	787	1,072	1,065	930	922
Credit																
Proportion of households reporting purchasing on credit last 3 months	Est.	-3.9	-4.1	0.8	-0.1	-1.3	1.8	0.1	4.5	-1.7	-2.6	6.3	16.6	17.9	10.3	8.3
	Se.	(7.30)	(7.86)	(4.85)	(5.92)	(5.75)	(8.32)	(8.62)	(5.34)	(7.50)	(7.09)	(14.29)	(20.79)	(14.69)	(16.42)	(16.34)
	N	1,867	1,865	1,848	1,866	1,849	1,867	1,865	1,848	1,866	1,849	1,867	1,865	1,848	1,866	1,849
Mean total value of credit in last 3 months, for those who purchased on credit (UGX)	Est.	53,200	31,900	35,300	-21,300	-19,900	43,700	15,500	25,000	-28,300	-20,000	-25,600	29,100	24,400	54,600	50,900
	Se.	(52,504)	(25,811)	(28,982)	(29,374)	(28,271)	(42,626)	(21,592)	(31,270)	(23,748)	(16,931)	(27,115)	(37,096)	(43,481)	(40,912)	(42,129)
	N	840	1,053	1,048	947	941	840	1,053	1,048	947	941	840	1,053	1,048	947	941
Mean total value of outstanding credit	Est.	1,200	2,300	3,000	1,100	1,800	-0,500	-2,000	-0,500	-1,500	663.2	4,400	-6,200	-7,500	-10,600*	-12,200*
	Se.	(3,092)	(4,898)	(5,571)	(6,461)	(7,132)	(4,477)	(3,883)	(5,244)	(4,715)	(5,318)	(7,009)	(5,385)	(6,220)	(5,939)	(6,990)

		VFSG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
debt, for those with outstanding credit debt (UGX)	N	830	1,028	1,023	929	924	830	1,028	1,023	929	924	830	1,028	1,023	929	924

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (2) Includes ROSCA / SACCO / MFI / VSLA.

Table A.38 Formal and informal transfers – SCG

		SCG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
Proportion of households receiving any informal help from other households in last 3 months	Est.	6.2	5.0	-6.2	-4.2	-3.1	-1.0	2.9	-0.8	3.3	2.8	-2.0	8.4	6.2	-6.7	-3.9
	Se.	(9.80)	(10.22)	(13.38)	(11.48)	(11.93)	(5.51)	(5.47)	(5.85)	(6.98)	(7.02)	(9.89)	(5.60)	(6.42)	(15.10)	(15.89)
	N	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920
Proportion of households receiving cash help from other households in last 3 months	Est.	-2.1	-8.2	-11.9	10.4	7.4	-0.4	-3.3	-3.9	2.3	0.7	-4.4	-4.2	-3.6	10.3	7.8
	Se.	(9.66)	(8.31)	(12.81)	(7.36)	(7.21)	(4.79)	(4.45)	(5.92)	(4.68)	(4.75)	(9.10)	(5.92)	(7.04)	(10.06)	(10.26)
	N	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920
Proportion of households receiving in-kind help from other households in last 3 months	Est.	11.1	15.8	10.9	-19.2*	-17.2	0.5	6.5	3.2	-2.4	-1.3	-2.7	9.7	6.8	-14.5	-7.4
	Se.	(7.23)	(10.80)	(15.13)	(9.93)	(10.92)	(4.26)	(6.22)	(7.50)	(6.11)	(6.51)	(6.91)	(6.26)	(7.37)	(15.16)	(16.64)
	N	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920
Mean total value of informal help received in last 3 months (UGX)	Est.	-52,200	-27,200	-49,800	66,000	63,000*	-29,000	-6,600	-9,200	27,300	24,900	-42,600	4,700	3,900	45,300	40,700
	Se.	(40,575)	(32,837)	(32,487)	(40,837)	(37,770)	(18,746)	(17,543)	(15,060)	(16,611)	(16,090)	(27,893)	(17,660)	(15,474)	(31,685)	(29,935)
	N	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920
Proportion of households giving any informal help from other households in last 3 months	Est.	0.7	22.7***	27.1***	-2.4	-6.6	-3.4	14.4***	15.7***	8.6	5.1	-2.9	10.0	5.8	3.5	-3.9
	Se.	(7.19)	(7.93)	(10.29)	(7.91)	(5.67)	(4.50)	(4.38)	(5.70)	(5.66)	(5.20)	(7.79)	(6.09)	(7.59)	(11.83)	(11.57)
	N	1,947	1,946	1,917	1,947	1,919	1,947	1,946	1,917	1,947	1,919	1,947	1,946	1,917	1,947	1,919
Proportion of households giving cash help from other households in last 3 months	Est.	4.7	5.9	8.5	1.3	-1.8	0.8	4.8	4.0	6.8*	4.9	-4.7	4.5	4.2	14.3**	11.2**
	Se.	(4.92)	(6.09)	(7.94)	(4.95)	(4.23)	(3.40)	(3.78)	(4.83)	(3.80)	(3.23)	(4.53)	(3.85)	(4.70)	(5.95)	(5.55)
	N	1,947	1,946	1,917	1,947	1,919	1,947	1,946	1,917	1,947	1,919	1,947	1,946	1,917	1,947	1,919
Proportion of households giving in-kind help from other households in last 3 months	Est.	2.3	18.4*	22.7*	-7.3	-10.1*	-1.6	10.3**	11.6*	2.8	0.2	3.7	6.9	2.6	-8.7	-13.7
	Se.	(6.74)	(9.41)	(13.00)	(8.17)	(6.07)	(4.39)	(4.92)	(6.47)	(5.52)	(5.60)	(6.88)	(5.99)	(7.44)	(9.65)	(10.03)
	N	1,947	1,946	1,917	1,947	1,919	1,947	1,946	1,917	1,947	1,919	1,947	1,946	1,917	1,947	1,919
Mean total value of informal help given in last 3 months	Est.	5,800	14,200	23,200	9,700	7,800	5,500	16,700	22,900	4,000	2,100	-8,400	9,900	14,200	4,600	322.2
	Se.	(14,320)	(26,582)	(36,447)	(15,751)	(16,326)	(6,997)	(13,258)	(14,521)	(7,020)	(7,835)	(11,705)	(10,189)	(11,129)	(12,969)	(13,118)
	N	1,945	1,947	1,918	1,946	1,919	1,945	1,947	1,918	1,946	1,919	1,945	1,947	1,918	1,946	1,919
Proportion of households either giving or receiving any informal help	Est.	3.6	16.4**	14.4	-0.6	-3.4	-2.0	9.3**	5.9	9.2	6.7	-6.1	14.3**	11.7*	5.4	3.6
	Se.	(10.12)	(8.03)	(11.29)	(11.67)	(11.37)	(6.06)	(4.49)	(5.64)	(7.55)	(7.42)	(9.48)	(5.83)	(6.13)	(12.81)	(13.31)
	N	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920

		SCG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
from other households in last 3 months																
Proportion of households reporting being able to borrow a large amount of cash in an emergency	Est.	-23.9***	7.7	7.8	27.8***	29.8***	-17.7***	6.4	9.2	22.8***	20.6***	-20.2***	1.3	3.3	23.3***	20.1**
	Se.	(7.00)	(10.47)	(10.81)	(7.76)	(8.02)	(3.52)	(7.69)	(8.31)	(3.88)	(4.39)	(6.61)	(8.22)	(7.34)	(8.56)	(8.02)
	N	1,906	1,931	1,902	1,919	1,891	1,906	1,931	1,902	1,919	1,891	1,906	1,931	1,902	1,919	1,891

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A.40 Formal and informal transfers - VFSG

		VFSG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
Proportion of households receiving any informal help from other households in last 3 months	Est.	-1.7	6.4	3.3	8.1*	7.7	4.2	7.1	2.3	2.9	0.6	2.8	20.6	17.8	17.8	17.9
	Se.	(5.83)	(7.08)	(4.59)	(4.72)	(5.30)	(6.12)	(7.30)	(6.00)	(5.54)	(6.33)	(7.73)	(15.40)	(17.52)	(16.05)	(16.61)
	N	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850
Proportion of households receiving cash help from other households in last 3 months	Est.	2.1	8.6*	6.8*	6.6	5.8	3.9	14.5***	11.8***	10.7**	9.3*	3.6	14.0	12.1	10.4	10.3
	Se.	(3.82)	(4.50)	(3.43)	(4.29)	(4.34)	(4.44)	(4.69)	(4.22)	(4.44)	(4.83)	(8.23)	(9.18)	(10.08)	(14.14)	(14.06)
	N	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850
Proportion of households receiving in-kind help from other households in last 3 months	Est.	-0.2	5.8	3.1	6.0	6.5	1.2	5.0	0.5	3.8	1.9	7.6	10.6	7.8	3.0	3.8
	Se.	(6.93)	(7.41)	(4.13)	(4.56)	(5.19)	(7.93)	(7.08)	(4.85)	(5.61)	(6.55)	(9.29)	(10.76)	(11.85)	(8.08)	(8.92)
	N	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850
Mean total value of informal help received in last 3 months (UGX)	Est.	3,400	-1,400	-5,800	-4,900	-6,200	10,700	-18,600	-24,900	-29,300	-33,500*	6,600	-64,700***	-71,800***	-71,300***	-75,900***
	Se.	(6,543)	(10,094)	(10,329)	(13,296)	(13,514)	(6,480)	(15,790)	(16,544)	(17,294)	(17,075)	(10,856)	(19,936)	(19,757)	(23,592)	(22,132)
	N	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850
Proportion of households giving any informal help from other households in last 3 months	Est.	-4.0	4.2	3.0	8.2	3.9	-5.0	3.0	1.6	8.1	3.4	2.0	13.0	9.6	11.0	8.2
	Se.	(5.55)	(5.57)	(4.53)	(7.62)	(7.49)	(6.19)	(7.63)	(6.15)	(7.88)	(7.07)	(13.44)	(12.75)	(10.39)	(10.84)	(10.07)
	N	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850
Proportion of households giving cash help from other households in last 3 months	Est.	-6.1*	5.3*	3.2	11.3***	7.9**	-12.9***	7.2*	4.0	20.1***	16.0***	-7.4	10.7	6.1	18.1***	15.3***
	Se.	(3.46)	(2.82)	(2.79)	(3.77)	(3.74)	(3.31)	(4.09)	(3.96)	(3.87)	(3.98)	(6.44)	(6.73)	(5.62)	(6.15)	(5.54)
	N	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850
Proportion of households giving in-kind help from other	Est.	-2.6	3.5	3.9	6.2	3.0	-2.7	2.5	3.1	5.3	1.8	2.6	4.8	3.1	2.2	-0.1
	Se.	(5.79)	(4.74)	(3.86)	(7.00)	(6.97)	(6.38)	(5.98)	(4.53)	(7.03)	(6.54)	(12.82)	(9.84)	(9.68)	(11.72)	(12.05)
	N	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850

		VFSG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
households in last 3 months																
Mean total value of informal help given in last 3 months	Est.	1,600	6,200	6,200	4,600	2,300	1,600	-2,400	-2,800	-3,900	-7,300	2,900	-6,100	-7,800	-9,000	-11,800
	Se.	(6,820)	(3,861)	(4,048)	(6,027)	(6,207)	(7,379)	(4,035)	(3,879)	(6,611)	(7,214)	(14,856)	(7,822)	(7,736)	(11,241)	(11,323)
	N	1,865	1,867	1,850	1,866	1,849	1,865	1,867	1,850	1,866	1,849	1,865	1,867	1,850	1,866	1,849
Proportion of households either giving or receiving any informal help from other households in last 3 months	Est.	-2.9	8.6*	5.6	11.6**	9.7*	-0.4	9.4	5.0	9.8*	6.0	11.1	35.3**	30.9**	24.2***	22.9***
	Se.	(5.56)	(5.01)	(3.75)	(5.38)	(5.68)	(6.30)	(6.48)	(5.46)	(4.81)	(5.69)	(12.05)	(14.06)	(14.16)	(7.74)	(7.31)
	N	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850
Proportion of households reporting being able to borrow a large amount of cash in an emergency	Est.	-15.9**	-3.6	0.6	12.3**	8.8*	-12.6*	-3.7	-0.2	8.9	4.4	8.5	7.7	5.2	-0.8	-0.8
	Se.	(6.67)	(6.07)	(2.26)	(5.08)	(5.15)	(6.84)	(6.58)	(2.88)	(6.70)	(5.68)	(14.51)	(11.06)	(5.48)	(14.12)	(13.08)
	N	1,838	1,853	1,836	1,846	1,828	1,838	1,853	1,836	1,846	1,828	1,838	1,853	1,836	1,846	1,828

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A.41 Decision making within households – SCG

		SCG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
Proportion of households a female is the main person to make decisions on...																
Children's education	Est.	23.9**	-9.5	-21.5*	-18.5	-1.9	13.9**	2.3	-7.0	-7.2	-2.4	19.3*	4.3	10.1**	-14.9	-5.5
	Se.	(11.56)	(10.94)	(11.64)	(15.46)	(7.35)	(6.37)	(5.33)	(5.32)	(7.29)	(4.49)	(9.99)	(5.15)	(4.78)	(20.20)	(9.36)
	N	1,328	1,340	1,326	1,334	1,318	1,328	1,340	1,326	1,334	1,318	1,328	1,340	1,326	1,334	1,318
What to do about a serious health problem	Est.	31.9***	3.7	-12.1	-23.6	1.0	15.1**	4.4	-7.8	-7.9	2.8	26.6***	10.3	4.3	-27.6*	-12.2
	Se.	(11.83)	(11.68)	(9.62)	(15.47)	(8.34)	(6.32)	(7.12)	(5.35)	(6.91)	(5.41)	(8.72)	(8.28)	(5.21)	(16.06)	(8.86)
	N	1,799	1,806	1,785	1,803	1,780	1,799	1,806	1,785	1,803	1,780	1,799	1,806	1,785	1,803	1,780
How to invest money	Est.	10.7	6.7	-10.6	-4.0	18.3**	5.7	8.1	-3.9	1.5	11.9**	10.0	6.7	5.9	-11.6	2.9
	Se.	(11.91)	(12.92)	(9.94)	(16.14)	(9.08)	(6.95)	(7.03)	(5.34)	(7.55)	(4.69)	(8.56)	(6.65)	(7.03)	(16.68)	(8.49)
	N	1,782	1,849	1,827	1,816	1,792	1,782	1,849	1,827	1,816	1,792	1,782	1,849	1,827	1,816	1,792
Proportion of households where at least two people share decisions on...																
Children's education	Est.	5.4	-10.4	-10.3	-9.6	-11.2	1.9	-7.2	-5.0	-6.5	-6.1	1.6	-16.3	-16.4**	5.7	8.5
	Se.	(9.69)	(13.65)	(15.57)	(13.60)	(11.74)	(5.40)	(7.65)	(6.46)	(7.22)	(6.38)	(9.95)	(11.56)	(8.03)	(20.17)	(16.95)
	N	1,327	1,451	1,434	1,389	1,371	1,327	1,451	1,434	1,389	1,371	1,327	1,451	1,434	1,389	1,371
What to do about a serious health problem	Est.	-20.1*	-27.1***	-32.2***	18.1	16.9	-11.8*	-16.9***	-17.9***	3.4	4.1	-10.6	-19.3**	-17.2*	8.0	9.4
	Se.	(10.48)	(8.82)	(12.42)	(12.79)	(11.16)	(6.23)	(4.55)	(6.42)	(6.51)	(6.06)	(10.18)	(8.12)	(10.10)	(15.55)	(14.59)
	N	1,799	1,942	1,913	1,871	1,844	1,799	1,942	1,913	1,871	1,844	1,799	1,942	1,913	1,871	1,844
How to invest money	Est.	-14.7*	-29.6***	-36.4***	12.5	11.4	-9.1	-18.9***	-10.7**	0.3	0.6	-7.8	-18.2**	-15.7*	4.7	3.6
	Se.	(8.89)	(8.71)	(11.73)	(12.19)	(10.27)	(5.69)	(4.85)	(5.24)	(6.59)	(6.16)	(8.28)	(7.77)	(9.08)	(14.30)	(12.09)
	N	1,777	1,943	1,915	1,860	1,834	1,777	1,943	1,915	1,860	1,834	1,777	1,943	1,915	1,860	1,834
Proportion of households a female is the main person to make decisions on... (excl. female-headed hhs)																
Children's education	Est.	24.4***	-25.8***	-27.5*	-6.3	-2.3	17.1***	-5.5	-20.0***	-7.7	-7.3	17.4*	-5.9	-4.1	-3.9	-9.9
	Se.	(8.98)	(9.72)	(14.28)	(9.47)	(10.02)	(5.17)	(5.47)	(6.14)	(5.29)	(5.76)	(9.30)	(8.56)	(9.76)	(14.70)	(13.94)
	N	913	906	894	910	895	913	906	894	910	895	913	906	894	910	895
What to do about a serious health problem	Est.	13.8*	-9.4	-10.2	0.5	6.0	4.1	-1.3	-9.6	2.2	3.7	18.4**	-1.7	-0.6	-13.8	-16.1
	Se.	(8.29)	(8.44)	(11.31)	(9.29)	(9.23)	(4.69)	(4.57)	(6.54)	(5.81)	(6.16)	(8.05)	(4.89)	(6.63)	(11.68)	(11.72)
	N	1,165	1,150	1,132	1,158	1,138	1,165	1,150	1,132	1,158	1,138	1,165	1,150	1,132	1,158	1,138
How to invest money	Est.	-5.0	-2.7	-6.3	15.1	24.3*	-6.0	0.6	-3.4	10.1	14.4*	-3.3	4.2	4.1	2.4	3.2
	Se.	(14.15)	(7.42)	(10.73)	(17.05)	(14.64)	(7.43)	(4.35)	(6.10)	(8.34)	(7.64)	(8.62)	(6.74)	(8.50)	(11.03)	(10.56)
	N	1,150	1,170	1,151	1,160	1,141	1,150	1,170	1,151	1,160	1,141	1,150	1,170	1,151	1,160	1,141

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A.43 Decision making within households – VFSG

		VFSG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC- FU	D-FU	DC- FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC- FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
Proportion of households a female is the main person to make decisions on...																
Children's education	Est.	1.9	0.4	-2.4	-1.5	-1.6	0.0	2.0	-0.1	2.0	-2.5	-12.7	-14.2	-7.0	-1.5	1.1
	Se.	(8.32)	(7.24)	(3.11)	(3.24)	(2.26)	(12.12)	(11.05)	(5.35)	(4.15)	(3.30)	(25.37)	(20.15)	(10.15)	(7.85)	(5.42)
	N	1,290	1,396	1,391	1,343	1,337	1,290	1,396	1,391	1,343	1,337	1,290	1,396	1,391	1,343	1,337
What to do about a serious health problem	Est.	9.8	5.7	-0.9	-4.0	-1.3	8.7	6.5	-0.9	-2.2	-4.2	7.6	-11.1	-11.0	-18.7***	-5.3
	Se.	(7.42)	(7.46)	(3.25)	(3.56)	(2.77)	(8.93)	(10.48)	(6.17)	(5.62)	(4.33)	(21.16)	(20.82)	(12.48)	(5.60)	(8.60)
	N	1,695	1,699	1,690	1,697	1,686	1,695	1,699	1,690	1,697	1,686	1,695	1,699	1,690	1,697	1,686
How to invest money	Est.	10.3	8.0	0.0	-2.3	-0.5	9.5	7.4	0.2	-2.1	-2.7	3.9	-8.9	-9.4	-12.7*	-2.3
	Se.	(8.17)	(7.88)	(2.66)	(3.87)	(3.08)	(10.16)	(10.87)	(5.08)	(5.41)	(4.53)	(22.01)	(20.69)	(9.63)	(6.70)	(7.13)
	N	1,696	1,743	1,733	1,720	1,708	1,696	1,743	1,733	1,720	1,708	1,696	1,743	1,733	1,720	1,708
Proportion of households where at least two people share decisions on...																
Children's education	Est.	-8.9	4.2	5.5	13.1	13.1	-22.4***	2.5	2.9	25.0*	25.5*	1.4	-12.4	-17.3	-13.8	-13.1
	Se.	(5.99)	(5.90)	(5.09)	(8.09)	(7.81)	(7.66)	(9.63)	(9.74)	(14.20)	(13.53)	(12.47)	(13.35)	(12.85)	(15.52)	(14.19)
	N	1,290	1,508	1,497	1,399	1,390	1,290	1,508	1,497	1,399	1,390	1,290	1,508	1,497	1,399	1,390
What to do about a serious health problem	Est.	-3.6	-1.8	1.3	1.8	1.9	-13.5***	-5.1	-1.8	8.3	9.0	-3.0	-8.8	-7.7	-5.8	-7.6
	Se.	(4.34)	(4.24)	(2.99)	(4.20)	(4.31)	(4.60)	(6.71)	(5.54)	(5.92)	(6.16)	(10.54)	(10.24)	(8.97)	(10.74)	(10.09)
	N	1,695	1,862	1,845	1,779	1,764	1,695	1,862	1,845	1,779	1,764	1,695	1,862	1,845	1,779	1,764
How to invest money	Est.	-10.3**	-0.9	4.3	9.4*	11.0**	-17.5***	-2.6	2.5	14.8**	16.5**	-11.7	-13.3	-12.1**	-1.6	-6.1
	Se.	(3.76)	(4.67)	(2.67)	(4.74)	(4.82)	(4.28)	(6.53)	(4.34)	(6.45)	(6.35)	(9.91)	(9.77)	(5.07)	(11.20)	(11.26)
	N	1,698	1,859	1,842	1,779	1,764	1,698	1,859	1,842	1,779	1,764	1,698	1,859	1,842	1,779	1,764
Proportion of households a female is the main person to make decisions on... (excl. female-headed hhs)																
Children's education	Est.	-2.0	-1.6	-3.0	0.4	-1.1	0.2	-3.2	-2.2	-3.4	-4.7	-5.1	-21.2*	-17.2	-16.1	-4.8
	Se.	(3.06)	(4.53)	(4.27)	(4.70)	(3.70)	(4.78)	(6.40)	(6.70)	(5.85)	(4.79)	(10.21)	(11.00)	(12.38)	(9.74)	(8.95)
	N	860	930	925	895	889	860	930	925	895	889	860	930	925	895	889
What to do about a serious health problem	Est.	-3.6	-1.3	-2.0	2.2	0.6	-0.7	-2.3	-3.0	-1.6	-4.8	-1.8	-21.0	-22.1	-19.3	-12.2
	Se.	(3.98)	(4.52)	(4.37)	(5.07)	(4.42)	(5.50)	(8.08)	(8.27)	(8.46)	(7.10)	(8.84)	(16.48)	(17.16)	(15.48)	(14.94)
	N	1,056	1,069	1,060	1,063	1,053	1,056	1,069	1,060	1,063	1,053	1,056	1,069	1,060	1,063	1,053
How to invest money	Est.	-1.7	0.0	-0.7	1.8	0.8	1.9	-0.1	-1.4	-2.0	-4.4	-7.0	-21.9*	-20.6*	-14.9	-8.6
	Se.	(3.29)	(3.73)	(3.50)	(4.87)	(4.55)	(5.04)	(6.83)	(6.62)	(7.24)	(6.54)	(8.02)	(10.85)	(11.90)	(11.52)	(11.96)
	N	1,058	1,073	1,064	1,066	1,056	1,058	1,073	1,064	1,066	1,056	1,058	1,073	1,064	1,066	1,056

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A.44 Capacity to voice opinions, collective action and influence – SCG

		SCG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X-FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X-FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X-FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
Proportion of households reporting they had raised an issue a community meeting in the last 12 months	Est.	-13.1	-6.9	1.6	6.6	-2.1	-2.8	-6.8	-5.2	-0.5	-3.9	-17.1**	-1.8	-0.7	17.5*	14.5*
	Se.	(9.46)	(7.23)	(7.75)	(12.15)	(11.44)	(6.80)	(4.84)	(5.34)	(7.70)	(7.61)	(8.22)	(3.68)	(3.75)	(10.38)	(8.53)
	N	1,939	1,938	1,909	1,939	1,911	1,939	1,938	1,909	1,939	1,911	1,939	1,938	1,909	1,939	1,911
Proportion of households reporting it likely that together with others they could make their local elected councillor listen to their concerns	Est.	-7.9	-14.7**	-15.2	8.8	4.9	-0.8	-8.0***	-11.4**	-2.0	-3.9	-5.8	-4.1	-4.3	9.0	6.8
	Se.	(8.79)	(7.27)	(12.02)	(8.57)	(9.17)	(5.07)	(3.07)	(5.51)	(5.70)	(5.90)	(8.49)	(4.06)	(4.82)	(11.76)	(12.28)
	N	1,947	1,943	1,914	1,945	1,918	1,947	1,943	1,914	1,945	1,918	1,947	1,943	1,914	1,945	1,918
Proportion of respondents reporting that people from outside of their family come to them for advice	Est.	5.1	-12.6	-6.5	4.0	-4.6	7.6	-4.3	-3.8	-1.6	-5.1	4.4	-1.8	-2.5	6.9	-1.0
	Se.	(8.05)	(9.69)	(13.12)	(10.38)	(8.33)	(5.17)	(5.24)	(6.95)	(6.13)	(5.60)	(6.74)	(6.07)	(6.74)	(14.51)	(13.20)
	N	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A.46 Capacity to voice opinions, collective action and influence – VFSG

		VFSG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
Proportion of households reporting they had raised an issue a community meeting in the last 12 months	Est.	-3.0	9.0**	11.5***	12.0**	9.1	-12.0	5.6	6.9	17.6**	14.9**	-1.9	11.1	8.0	13.1	10.6
	Se.	(5.72)	(3.63)	(3.20)	(5.75)	(5.40)	(7.28)	(4.93)	(4.47)	(7.86)	(6.94)	(12.27)	(8.09)	(8.59)	(15.49)	(13.67)
	N	1,859	1,850	1,833	1,855	1,837	1,859	1,850	1,833	1,855	1,837	1,859	1,850	1,833	1,855	1,837
Proportion of households reporting it likely that together with others they could make their local elected councillor listen to their concerns	Est.	-5.4	3.0	5.1	8.4	5.6	-2.6	4.0	6.8	6.6	4.6	15.8	10.3	11.8	-5.5	-3.9
	Se.	(4.09)	(4.55)	(3.02)	(6.22)	(5.92)	(5.44)	(5.20)	(4.41)	(6.70)	(6.73)	(10.70)	(7.74)	(7.35)	(12.56)	(13.13)
	N	1,865	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,865	1,848	1,865	1,848
Proportion of respondents reporting that people from outside of their family come to them for advice	Est.	-7.1	2.0	3.5	9.1***	7.2***	-12.6*	0.1	2.4	12.7***	10.2***	17.4**	9.7	12.0	-7.7**	-6.6
	Se.	(4.28)	(4.10)	(3.15)	(2.76)	(2.39)	(7.11)	(5.05)	(4.59)	(3.81)	(3.17)	(7.76)	(8.24)	(8.02)	(3.36)	(4.34)
	N	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A.48 Household demographics characteristics – SCG

		SCG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
household size	Est.	-0.7	-0.4	0.0**	0.0	0.0***	-0.7*	-0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0***	-1.0*	-1.1***	0.0***	0.5	0.0***
	Se.	(0.71)	(0.67)	(0.00)	(0.75)	(0.00)	(0.34)	(0.27)	(0.00)	(0.35)	(0.00)	(0.57)	(0.36)	(0.00)	(0.82)	(0.00)
	N	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920
% of male in the household	Est.	-10.7*	-6.8	0.5	9.9	0.4	-5.1	-2.8	2.1	2.1	-1.1	-12.7***	-7.3**	-5.8	17.4**	12.2*
	Se.	(6.49)	(5.24)	(5.21)	(8.08)	(6.77)	(3.74)	(3.19)	(3.07)	(3.40)	(3.25)	(4.88)	(3.64)	(4.29)	(7.07)	(6.39)
	N	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920
% of under 18 and 65+ in the household	Est.	34.6***	37.7***	17.1***	-32.5***	-15.4***	23.0***	23.2***	4.0	-10.9***	-4.6*	22.3***	22.8***	8.9**	-24.4***	-15.6***
	Se.	(6.03)	(4.15)	(4.71)	(6.88)	(4.64)	(2.82)	(2.68)	(2.81)	(3.30)	(2.57)	(4.21)	(4.39)	(3.70)	(6.78)	(6.07)
	N	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920
proportion of households with orphans (father and/or mother not alive)	Est.	-9.0	-16.0**	-21.2***	13.5	17.4**	0.8	-5.2	-6.4	-3.8	-2.3	-5.8	-8.2**	-5.8	16.1	16.7
	Se.	(9.15)	(7.64)	(8.18)	(10.12)	(8.60)	(5.27)	(4.53)	(4.62)	(5.00)	(5.05)	(7.49)	(3.63)	(3.81)	(12.38)	(10.41)
	N	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920
proportion of households with eligible elderly (65+ all districts/ 60+ karamoja)	Est.	80.8***	86.1***	23.5***	-31.8***	4.2	72.0***	76.9***	24.4***	-16.9***	-3.1	69.5***	63.9***	18.0***	-31.2**	-10.2
	Se.	(8.77)	(9.27)	(6.26)	(11.40)	(5.89)	(5.47)	(5.71)	(3.97)	(5.46)	(2.92)	(7.17)	(7.99)	(3.82)	(12.57)	(7.08)
	N	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920
(max) disabled_hh	Est.	21.2**	12.6*	23.8**	-10.3	-10.0	13.6***	13.8***	13.8***	-5.2	-0.8	10.5	4.8	4.7	-11.0	-8.2
	Se.	(9.32)	(6.74)	(9.79)	(11.44)	(10.83)	(5.06)	(4.08)	(4.67)	(5.50)	(5.06)	(7.72)	(4.09)	(4.81)	(10.73)	(10.58)
	N	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920
prop of hh with no-able adults	Est.	42.8***	35.9***	16.5***	-29.8***	-20.2***	30.6***	26.8***	7.8**	-11.3**	-6.9*	29.2***	30.8***	13.4***	-26.4***	-20.3***
	Se.	(6.32)	(6.37)	(5.93)	(8.29)	(5.74)	(3.90)	(2.82)	(3.92)	(4.85)	(4.12)	(5.49)	(3.67)	(4.47)	(8.73)	(6.89)
	N	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920
proportion of households with 1 member only	Est.	15.4**	14.7**	15.6**	-11.4	-12.9**	9.8***	10.6***	8.3***	-3.2	-3.6	11.4**	14.5***	9.0***	-12.7**	-11.3**
	Se.	(6.63)	(6.15)	(6.54)	(7.25)	(5.48)	(3.12)	(2.97)	(2.95)	(2.61)	(2.69)	(5.65)	(3.13)	(3.04)	(6.36)	(5.42)
	N	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920
age of one person household	Est.	5.7	4.2	0.0	3.8	0.0***	5.3**	6.8***	0.0***	0.6	0.0***	13.0***	9.8***	0.0	-6.1	0.0***
	Se.	(4.94)	(4.15)	(0.00)	(4.43)	(0.00)	(2.59)	(1.86)	(0.00)	(2.37)	(0.00)	(4.82)	(2.74)	(0.00)	(5.30)	(0.00)
	N	210	202	199	206	204	210	202	199	206	204	210	202	199	206	204
proportion aged under 5 in the household	Est.	1.6	1.3	-3.1	-6.8***	-0.8	-1.5	-1.8*	-3.1**	-1.7	-0.1	-1.8	-0.7	0.4	-3.7	-1.9
	Se.	(2.07)	(1.67)	(2.80)	(2.34)	(2.90)	(1.07)	(1.02)	(1.21)	(1.52)	(1.68)	(1.49)	(2.36)	(2.24)	(2.93)	(3.33)
	N	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920
proportion aged 6-17 in the household	Est.	-5.1	-4.1	-1.3	-5.3	-3.0	-6.8**	-7.6**	-5.4**	-1.1	-0.5	-5.2	-8.9**	-3.2	-1.1	-2.0
	Se.	(5.32)	(5.67)	(5.18)	(5.53)	(4.11)	(2.67)	(3.10)	(2.66)	(1.84)	(1.79)	(4.61)	(4.03)	(3.61)	(5.95)	(3.81)
	N	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920
	Est.	-34.7***	-37.6***	-17.1***	32.6***	15.4***	-23.2***	-23.2***	-4.0	11.1***	4.6*	-22.1***	-22.6***	-9.0**	24.0***	15.5**

		SCG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
proportion aged 18-64 in the household	Se.	(6.06)	(4.12)	(4.73)	(6.91)	(4.64)	(2.76)	(2.68)	(2.82)	(3.18)	(2.56)	(4.18)	(4.39)	(3.70)	(6.72)	(6.06)
	N	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920
proportion aged 65+ in the household	Est.	38.1***	40.4***	21.5***	-20.4***	-11.6**	31.3***	32.5***	12.4***	-8.1**	-4.0*	29.3***	32.4***	11.7***	-19.6***	-11.8***
	Se.	(6.84)	(5.00)	(5.19)	(6.88)	(4.73)	(3.59)	(2.59)	(2.35)	(3.36)	(2.41)	(5.06)	(3.77)	(2.71)	(5.72)	(4.16)
	N	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920	1,947	1,947	1,918	1,947	1,920

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A.49 Household demographics characteristics – VFSG

		VFSG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC- FU	D-FU	DC- FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC- FU	D-FU	DC- FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
household size	Est.	-1.0	-0.9	0.0**	0.2	0.0**	-1.1	-0.9	0.0**	0.2	0.0**	-0.4	-0.3	0.0	0.1	0.0
	Se.	(0.77)	(0.78)	(0.00)	(0.11)	(0.00)	(0.88)	(0.93)	(0.00)	(0.18)	(0.00)	(1.50)	(1.63)	(0.00)	(0.29)	(0.00)
	N	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850
% of male in the household	Est.	-5.7	-3.1	0.2	2.6	2.3	-9.3**	-8.0**	-4.7**	1.3	1.5	-14.9*	-11.1*	-9.7**	3.9	3.0
	Se.	(3.66)	(3.73)	(2.09)	(1.62)	(1.72)	(3.41)	(3.17)	(1.87)	(2.69)	(2.88)	(8.04)	(6.24)	(4.09)	(4.33)	(3.83)
	N	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850
% of under 18 and 65+ in the household	Est.	3.0	0.8	1.3	-2.1	-2.0	4.7	4.1*	3.4	-0.6	-0.5	1.0	2.5	-1.6	1.5	4.2
	Se.	(2.79)	(2.29)	(2.10)	(1.74)	(1.50)	(3.49)	(2.33)	(2.91)	(2.76)	(2.33)	(5.27)	(4.10)	(5.02)	(4.01)	(3.83)
	N	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850
proportion of households with orphans (father and/or mother not alive)	Est.	0.5	1.0	1.2	0.5	-0.9	-0.6	0.4	1.6	0.9	0.0	-22.6	-20.3	-21.8***	2.2	4.0
	Se.	(6.51)	(5.57)	(3.45)	(2.05)	(2.30)	(10.10)	(9.44)	(6.26)	(2.32)	(2.77)	(14.76)	(13.70)	(7.08)	(3.95)	(4.74)
	N	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850
proportion of households with eligible elderly (65+ all districts/ 60+ karamoja)	Est.	8.9	7.8	-0.4	-1.1	1.4	11.4	12.0	2.7	0.6	4.2***	10.6	17.4	0.3	6.7**	10.1***
	Se.	(10.40)	(10.54)	(1.40)	(1.77)	(1.34)	(11.97)	(12.45)	(1.84)	(2.03)	(1.31)	(21.94)	(21.68)	(3.91)	(2.85)	(2.18)
	N	1,860	1,864	1,850	1,862	1,850	1,860	1,864	1,850	1,862	1,850	1,860	1,864	1,850	1,862	1,850
(max) disabled_hh	Est.	-4.9	-3.6	-3.7	1.3	1.3	-11.1	-2.1	-5.6	9.0	1.1	-46.2***	-13.4	-22.2*	32.8**	11.0
	Se.	(5.61)	(5.40)	(4.23)	(5.97)	(2.63)	(9.93)	(7.92)	(6.93)	(8.09)	(3.43)	(9.12)	(13.31)	(11.25)	(12.20)	(8.95)
	N	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850
prop of hh with no-able adults	Est.	17.2*	13.3	5.4	-3.9	-2.6	11.6	12.2	3.4	0.6	1.1	-10.5	-1.1	-9.4	9.4**	8.0**
	Se.	(9.99)	(9.10)	(3.48)	(2.74)	(1.99)	(10.35)	(9.06)	(5.24)	(3.24)	(2.10)	(11.00)	(11.06)	(7.52)	(4.25)	(3.03)
	N	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850
proportion of households with 1 member only	Est.	22.9*	15.9	10.2**	-7.1***	-5.0**	20.0	12.4	6.7	-7.6***	-5.4**	13.7	13.3	9.3	-0.4	-2.0
	Se.	(11.27)	(9.94)	(4.96)	(2.29)	(1.93)	(12.00)	(10.77)	(4.87)	(2.42)	(2.11)	(15.52)	(14.12)	(6.19)	(3.39)	(3.54)
	N	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850
age of one person household	Est.	5.4	2.6	0.0	-2.8	0.0	-6.6	7.6	0.0	14.1**	0.0	23.3	-6.7	0.0*	-30.0	0.0
	Se.	(5.10)	(4.85)	(0.00)	(5.56)	(0.00)	(5.08)	(5.37)	(0.00)	(5.06)	(0.00)	(43.15)	(43.26)	(0.00)	(63.21)	(0.00)
	N	244	201	201	223	223	244	201	201	223	223	244	201	201	223	223
proportion aged under 5 in the household	Est.	-4.2	-5.2*	-2.4**	-1.0	-1.2	-2.2	-3.5	-1.3	-1.3	-1.4	0.9	-3.2	-1.9	-4.1**	-3.7*
	Se.	(2.93)	(2.55)	(1.08)	(0.80)	(0.75)	(3.16)	(2.81)	(1.07)	(1.22)	(1.23)	(5.34)	(4.65)	(2.07)	(1.94)	(1.95)
	N	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850
proportion aged 6-17 in the household	Est.	-6.2	-4.5	-0.4	1.7	0.0	-5.8	-3.8	0.4	2.0	0.3	-13.0	-9.5	-6.6	3.5	4.9*
	Se.	(6.74)	(6.55)	(2.41)	(1.14)	(1.36)	(8.78)	(8.56)	(3.54)	(1.60)	(2.04)	(13.75)	(13.75)	(4.33)	(2.44)	(2.61)
	N	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850
proportion aged 18-64 in the household	Est.	-3.6	-1.7	-1.4	1.9	2.0	-5.6	-4.9*	-3.4	0.6	0.4	-0.8	-2.4	1.6	-1.6	-4.2

		VFSG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC- FU	D-FU	DC- FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC- FU	D-FU	DC- FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
	Se.	(3.06)	(2.39)	(2.09)	(1.80)	(1.50)	(3.67)	(2.61)	(2.91)	(2.79)	(2.32)	(5.30)	(4.16)	(5.03)	(4.12)	(3.82)
	N	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850
proportion aged 65+ in the household	Est.	13.4	10.6	4.1	-2.8*	-0.9	12.7	11.4	4.3	-1.3	0.6	13.1	15.1	6.9*	2.0	2.9
	Se.	(10.08)	(9.66)	(2.97)	(1.40)	(1.12)	(11.33)	(10.64)	(2.87)	(1.64)	(1.39)	(16.47)	(15.59)	(3.56)	(2.28)	(2.88)
	N	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,867	1,850	1,867	1,850

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A.50 Civil Status – SCG

		SCG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC- FU	D-FU	DC- FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC- FU	D-FU	DC- FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC-FU	D-FU	DC-FU
Proportion of people aged over 18 that are married	Est.	-23.0***	-13.6	-4.5	14.9	4.3	-18.6***	-14.2***	-8.8*	7.9	3.7	-14.9*	-15.4*	-12.3	7.0	2.3
	Se.	(8.44)	(10.14)	(8.88)	(13.27)	(9.89)	(4.10)	(5.26)	(4.60)	(5.41)	(4.75)	(7.93)	(8.68)	(8.65)	(18.46)	(14.64)
	N	5,316	5,329	5,268	5,323	5,260	5,316	5,329	5,268	5,323	5,260	5,316	5,329	5,268	5,323	5,260
Proportion of people aged over 18 that are divorced/separated	Est.	3.0	-1.1	-5.9	1.6	4.6	2.2	2.0	0.9	0.0	1.2	4.2	0.5	-3.5	3.5	3.3
	Se.	(4.56)	(6.29)	(6.61)	(6.03)	(5.62)	(2.73)	(3.40)	(2.13)	(2.55)	(2.44)	(4.54)	(3.87)	(5.18)	(7.07)	(6.29)
	N	5,316	5,329	5,268	5,323	5,260	5,316	5,329	5,268	5,323	5,260	5,316	5,329	5,268	5,323	5,260
Proportion of people aged over 18 that are widowed	Est.	12.2***	11.3***	8.7**	-5.7	2.3	11.1***	9.6***	8.7***	-3.8	-0.2	12.7***	16.1***	16.3***	-14.3	-6.0
	Se.	(4.66)	(3.19)	(4.09)	(6.73)	(5.57)	(2.42)	(2.00)	(2.88)	(3.62)	(3.30)	(4.46)	(4.46)	(4.56)	(9.72)	(8.32)
	N	5,316	5,329	5,268	5,323	5,260	5,316	5,329	5,268	5,323	5,260	5,316	5,329	5,268	5,323	5,260
Proportion of people aged over 18 that are never married	Est.	8.7*	3.4	1.7	-12.1	-12.4**	6.2*	2.6	-0.8	-5.2	-5.8*	-2.7	-1.2	-0.5	4.5	0.9
	Se.	(4.97)	(5.85)	(6.16)	(7.47)	(5.61)	(3.41)	(3.38)	(3.16)	(4.24)	(3.21)	(4.30)	(4.07)	(4.42)	(9.86)	(7.20)
	N	5,316	5,329	5,268	5,323	5,260	5,316	5,329	5,268	5,323	5,260	5,316	5,329	5,268	5,323	5,260

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A.51 Civil Status – VFSG

		VFSG														
		Linear RDD					Quadratic RDD					Quartic RDD				
		X-BL	X- FU	XC- FU	D-FU	DC- FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC- FU	D-FU	DC- FU	X-BL	X- FU	XC- FU	D-FU	DC- FU
Proportion of people aged over 18 that are married	Est.	-11.4	-10.6*	-2.6	0.8	0.8	-12.1*	-12.4**	-7.8***	-0.2	-2.6	-8.4	-12.9	-11.7*	-4.5	-5.6
	Se.	(7.09)	(5.71)	(2.56)	(2.49)	(2.42)	(6.98)	(5.81)	(2.08)	(2.71)	(2.72)	(11.74)	(10.37)	(5.92)	(6.08)	(5.19)
	N	3,571	3,807	3,781	3,689	3,661	3,571	3,807	3,781	3,689	3,661	3,571	3,807	3,781	3,689	3,661
Proportion of people aged over 18 that are divorced/separated	Est.	2.0	1.5	0.4	-0.6	-1.1	3.3	2.6	1.7	-0.7	-0.9	0.7	3.0	3.2	2.3	4.3
	Se.	(2.21)	(2.32)	(2.06)	(1.77)	(1.80)	(2.03)	(2.38)	(2.06)	(1.98)	(1.93)	(4.85)	(5.13)	(3.93)	(4.10)	(4.04)
	N	3,571	3,807	3,781	3,689	3,661	3,571	3,807	3,781	3,689	3,661	3,571	3,807	3,781	3,689	3,661
Proportion of people aged over 18 that are widowed	Est.	8.6	7.0	1.1	-1.6	-1.2	11.2*	12.3**	7.3***	1.1	2.4*	2.0	6.3	7.1	4.3	4.6*
	Se.	(6.85)	(5.82)	(2.44)	(1.94)	(1.35)	(6.41)	(5.81)	(2.04)	(2.28)	(1.37)	(7.70)	(8.33)	(4.29)	(3.72)	(2.37)
	N	3,571	3,807	3,781	3,689	3,661	3,571	3,807	3,781	3,689	3,661	3,571	3,807	3,781	3,689	3,661
Proportion of people aged over 18 that are never married	Est.	0.1	2.1	1.1	2.0	1.8	-3.0	-2.5	-1.2	0.4	1.3	4.0	3.6	1.4	-0.3	-1.9
	Se.	(1.89)	(2.17)	(2.03)	(1.66)	(1.97)	(2.52)	(2.33)	(2.07)	(2.44)	(2.97)	(6.62)	(6.86)	(5.10)	(3.33)	(4.25)
	N	3,571	3,807	3,781	3,689	3,661	3,571	3,807	3,781	3,689	3,661	3,571	3,807	3,781	3,689	3,661

Source: SAGE Impact Evaluation Survey Sep 2012-Oct 2013. Notes: (1) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant treatment comparator: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.