



Food and Agriculture Organization  
of the United Nations

# **Productive impact of Malawi's Social Cash Transfer Programme – midterm report**

A From Protection to Production (PtoP)  
report



# **Productive impact of Malawi's Social Cash Transfer Programme – midterm report**

## **A From Protection to Production (PtoP) report**

Solomon Asfaw, Robert Pickmans and Benjamin Davis  
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)

**The From Protection to Production (PtoP) programme, jointly with the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), is exploring the linkages and strengthening coordination between social protection, agriculture and rural development.**

**PtoP programme is funded principally by the United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the European Union.**

**The programme is also part of a larger effort, the Transfer Project, together with UNICEF, Save the Children and the University of North Carolina, to support the implementation of impact evaluations of cash transfer programmes in sub-Saharan Africa.**

For more information, please visit the PtoP website: [www.fao.org/economic/ptop](http://www.fao.org/economic/ptop)

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

© FAO, 2016

FAO encourages the use, reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product. Except where otherwise indicated, material may be copied, downloaded and printed for private study, research and teaching purposes, or for use in non-commercial products or services, provided that appropriate acknowledgement of FAO as the source and copyright holder is given and that FAO’s endorsement of users’ views, products or services is not implied in any way.

All requests for translation and adaptation rights, and for resale and other commercial use rights should be made via [www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request](http://www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request) or addressed to [copyright@fao.org](mailto:copyright@fao.org).

FAO information products are available on the FAO website (<http://www.fao.org/publications/en/>) and can be purchased through [publications-sales@fao.org](mailto:publications-sales@fao.org)

## Contents

Abstract .....	iv
Acknowledgments .....	v
<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Programme evaluation design and data.....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1 Impact evaluation design and targeting procedure .....	3
2.2 Evaluation sample, survey instruments and attrition .....	4
2.3 Summary statistics.....	4
<b>3. Analytical methods.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>4. Results and discussion.....</b>	<b>8</b>
4.1 Impact on crop production and productivity .....	8
4.2 Impact on crop input use and land .....	9
4.3 Impact on agricultural assets.....	10
4.4 Impact on livestock .....	10
4.5 Impact on on-farm labour activities .....	10
4.6 Impact on non-farm enterprises.....	11
4.7 Impact on formal wage labour and <i>ganyu</i> labour.....	12
4.8 Impact on household activities .....	12
4.9 Impact on time spent on household chores .....	13
4.10 Impact on child labour.....	13
4.11 Impact on hired labour .....	15
4.12 Impact on credit and other income .....	16
4.13 Impact on private transfers received and given.....	16
4.14 Impact on food security and food caloric intake .....	17
<b>5. Conclusions .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>References .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Appendix 1: Tables.....</b>	<b>22</b>

## Abstract

This report uses data collected from a randomized experimental design impact evaluation to analyse the impact of the Malawi Social Cash Transfer Programme (SCTP) on household decision-making over agricultural production, labour supply, the accumulation of private assets and other income generating activities. The general framework for empirical analysis is based on a comparison of programme beneficiaries with a group of controls interviewed in 2013 and again in 2014, using difference-in-difference estimators. The overall positive impacts of the SCTP across a broad spectrum of livelihood indicators show that the programme is achieving many of its intended objectives. The programme led to shifts in crop production and productivity that in turn led to increased total value of crop production for some households. The SCTP increased the number of productive assets owned in terms of both livestock and agricultural tools. Not only did the SCTP reduce household debt but it also reduced income from asset selling, a notable risk-coping strategy. Adult and elderly household members shifted away from *ganyu* labour and towards participation in livestock work; impacts on wage labour and non-farm enterprises were mixed, the latter particularly with regard to the type of enterprise. Children moved away noticeably from *ganyu* labour, but there were also shifts in other forms of labour. We also found increases in food security and daily caloric intake per capita. The analysis reveals important heterogeneity in programme impacts, with estimated magnitudes varying over gender of household head, household land size, household labour constraint status and poverty status.

## **Acknowledgments**

This research forms a part of the Protection to Production (PtoP) project and analyses data collected for the impact evaluation of the Malawi Social Cash Transfer Programme, which is implemented by the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and the Centre for Social Research of the University of Malawi under contract to UNICEF-Malawi. The evaluation is commissioned by the Government of Malawi's Ministry of Gender, Children, Disability and Social Welfare, with support from the European Union, the German Government through KfW, Irish Aid, and UNICEF-Malawi. The authors recognise the contributions of several parties, without which this study would not have been possible. We would also like to acknowledge the support of UNICEF colleagues and all the people that peer-reviewed the report.

## Executive Summary

**The Malawi Social Cash Transfer Programme (SCTP) is the Government of Malawi's social cash transfer managed at the national level.** By March 2015 the SCTP had covered 100 000 beneficiary households and had gone to full scale in ten districts. In 2013, one-adult beneficiary households received 1000 Malawian Kwacha (MWK; about US\$3) a month plus additional amounts based on household size and the number of children enrolled in primary or secondary school. The government of Malawi expects to have enrolled over 175 000 households by the end of 2015.

**This study uses data collected from a seventeen-month evaluation (2013 and 2014), itself a part of a longer evaluation, to analyse the impact of the Malawi SCTP** on productive activities and investment, agricultural production, labour allocation, risk-coping behaviour and food security. This study complements the Malawi Social Cash Transfer Programme Midline Impact Evaluation Report, led by the Carolina Population Centre at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC-CH) and the Centre for Social Research of the University of Malawi (CSR UNIMA), with technical support and guidance from UNICEF Malawi and which covers a broader set of outcomes. Although the programme is designed to reduce poverty and hunger in vulnerable households and increase school enrolment, there are good reasons to expect impacts on the economic choices of beneficiaries, whose livelihoods are based primarily on agriculture. Impact results are systematically presented for households overall, as well as by gender of household head, household land size (small, medium and large) and household labour-constraint status (severely constrained, moderately constrained and unconstrained). Impacts by poverty status and by participation in the Farm Input Subsidy Programme (FISP) also feature in the report depending on the outcome under review.

**First, the programme led to shifts in crop production, ultimately leading to an increase in the overall value of production for some categories of households.** The SCTP led to an increase in groundnut production and productivity, while male-headed households and medium farm households had higher yields of maize. As a result of shifts in crop production spurred by the SCTP, the value of crop production in MWK also increased for both male-headed households and medium farm households by 19 percent and 10 percent respectively. Households were also more likely to sell harvested crops on the market.

**Second, the SCTP had a significant impact on the accumulation of productive assets.** With respect to livestock, large and significant impacts were found on both the share of households owning animals and on the number of animals owned, particularly in chickens and goats/sheep. In terms of agricultural implements, the SCTP led to an increase in expenditure on hand hoes and sickles, as well as in the number of those tools owned.

**Third, some categories of SCTP households reduced debt from previous loans, and were less likely to purchase on credit and to receive income from selling assets.** Households overall, and female-headed households and large farm households in particular, reduced levels of debt from previous loans. Male-headed households and large farm households were less likely to still owe money on previously contracted loans. Households purchased on credit less often, with the impact being stronger for large farm households. The SCTP reduced income from selling assets, and male-headed households and large farm households sold assets less often, indicating a reduction in distress sales.



**Fourth, in terms of labour supply, while we found households shifting away from *ganyu* labour, we found muted and mixed impacts elsewhere.** There was no clear impact on household on-farm labour and formal wage work. In the former category, adult males were more likely to work on-farm in some tasks while the opposite was true for adult females. We noted a similar increase and decrease in participation among household members between female-headed households and male-headed households respectively in on-farm labour as well. Results on non-farm enterprise labour were mixed, with beneficiary households being less likely to engage in charcoal/firewood enterprises but more likely to engage in petty trade enterprises. Household members were also more likely to be involved in livestock activities, which makes sense given greater livestock ownership.

**Fifth, while children experienced mixed shifts in labour supply according to particular activity and household category, decreased engagement in *ganyu* labour is clear for older children.** The SCTP led to a decrease in *ganyu* labour in both intensity and engagement for children aged between 10 and 17. There was a strong reduction in participation in on-farm crop activities in male-headed households for older children. However we also found shifts for younger children; for instance, younger girls aged six to nine participated more often in on-farm activities in severely constrained households, but the opposite was true for younger girls in less labour-constrained households. Older children worked more days in formal wage labour in female-headed households, but fewer days in male-headed households. Children increased their engagement in water collection, but turned away from collecting firewood, mirroring the shifts in chores for adults. All of these results point to the need for more detailed investigation.

**Sixth, the SCTP decreased the receipt of private transfers as well as the depth of food transfers received in particular, but it also increased the amount received in cash for some groups.** Beneficiary households overall were less likely to receive private transfers from family, friends, or neighbours in the last 12 months. The amount in food or other consumables decreased for different groups of beneficiary households, but for two of these groups (male-headed households and large farm households), the amount received in private cash increased.

**Finally, we find robust evidence of increases in food security and in daily per capita caloric intake.** Because of the SCTP beneficiary households overall worried less often about not having enough food and also consumed more meals per day. For medium farm households we observed an increase in the number of months that maize from last year's harvest lasted. The programme also led to a significant increase in daily per capita caloric intake, with larger impacts found among female-headed households and medium farm households. This increase in calories consumed came exclusively from food purchases, and not from own production.

**Overall, the study provides direct evidence that the SCTP influenced the livelihood strategies of the poor, with differential intensity across gender of the household head, land size, labour constraint of the household and poverty status.** The programme has helped families to reduce hunger and food security, which were stated objectives of the programme.

## 1. Introduction

The Malawi Social Cash Transfer Programme (SCTP) was initiated in 2006 in the pilot district of Mchinji, providing cash grants to ultra-poor households without any able-bodied adult household members ('labour-constrained' households). The objectives of the programme include reducing poverty and hunger in vulnerable households and increasing school enrolment. A rigorous impact evaluation of the pilot in Mchinji district was designed and implemented during the pilot phase in 2007/08. Results from this initial evaluation indicated strong positive impacts of the pilot on household food security, children's schooling, health and household possession of productive assets (Miller *et al.*, 2010; Covarrubias *et al.*, 2012). The SCTP is currently operational in 18 districts (ten at full scale) and, as of April 2015, reached over 100000 beneficiary households. The Government of Malawi (GoM) expects to have enrolled over 175 000 households by the end of 2015. The current expansion of the SCTP presents an important opportunity to evaluate the adjusted programme with a larger sample size across several districts.

The programme is fully executed by the GoM through Social Welfare Officers from the District Councils. At the national level, management of the SCTP falls under the Ministry of Gender, Children, Disability & Social Welfare (MoGCDSW), with policy and design oversight under the Ministry of Finance, Economic Development and Planning (MoFEDP). The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) country office in Malawi, jointly with other development partners, is supporting the GoM in implementing the SCTP in coordination with the regional and district offices. The programme fits under the broader prioritization of social protection in national development strategies, including the second theme of the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (2006-2010) and in the third theme of the draft Malawi Growth and Development Strategy II (2011-2016).

The Malawi SCTP impact evaluation is led by the Carolina Population Centre at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC-CH) and the Centre for Social Research of the University of Malawi (CSR UNIMA) with technical support and guidance from UNICEF. The objective of the impact evaluation is to analyse key questions concerning the programme's welfare impact on children and their caretakers, household behavioural changes, access to and linkages with other social services and on the familial environment affecting children. FAO's From Protection to Production (PtoP) project contributed with technical support, including carrying out qualitative fieldwork (OPM, 2014) and the construction of the Local Economy Wide Impact Evaluation (LEWIE) model to estimate the income multiplier associated with the SCTP (Thorne *et al.*, 2015).

This report complements the Malawi SCTP Midline Evaluation Report prepared by UNC-CH and CSR UNIMA (Handa *et al.*, 2015). Along with information on the conceptual framework and design of the impact evaluation, the report analyses the impact along different dimensions of household welfare, including consumption, food security, health, nutrition, schooling, child labour and transition to adulthood. In this report we primarily focus on the impact of the programme on crop input use, crop production and composition, ownership of agricultural assets and other assets including livestock, the labour supply of household members, credit, private transfers and food security. The impact evaluation strategy was based on a longitudinal experimental design, and the framework for empirical analysis is based on a comparison of programme beneficiaries with a group of non-beneficiaries serving as controls.

Our hypothesis is that regular and predictable cash transfers can have impacts on household decision-making over labour supply, the accumulation of productive assets and productive activities and risk-coping behaviour. Most beneficiaries of cash transfer programmes live in rural areas, depend on subsistence agriculture and live in places where markets for financial services (such as credit and insurance), labour, goods and inputs are lacking or do not function well. Cash transfers often represent a significant share of household income, and when provided in a regular and predictable fashion, may help households in overcoming the obstacles that block their access to credit or cash. There is robust evidence from numerous countries, in both Latin America and sub-Saharan Africa, that cash transfers have brought about sizeable gains in access to health and education services, as measured by increases in school enrolment (particularly for girls) and use of health services (particularly preventative health, and health monitoring for children and pregnant women) (e.g. Fiszbein and Schady, 2009; Davis *et al.*, 2012). Recent evidence in sub-Saharan Africa also shows that social cash transfer programmes can have impacts on household decision-making, including labour supply, accumulation of productive assets and productive activities (e.g. Todd *et al.*, 2010; Davis *et al.*, 2010; Covarrubias *et al.*, 2012; Gilligan *et al.*, 2009; Gertler *et al.*, 2012; Asfaw *et al.*, 2014; Daidone *et al.*, 2014a and 2014b; Asfaw *et al.*, 2015).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section two provides the evaluation design, data collection methods, and descriptive statistics for the sample. Section three describes the analytical methods employed in the report. The fourth section presents and discusses the analytical results, and section five follows with conclusions.

## 2. Programme evaluation design and data

### 2.1 Impact evaluation design and targeting procedure

The evaluation team led by the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill took advantage of an expansion in the SCTP to build an experimental ‘delayed-entry’ control group implemented in two stages referred to as random selection and random assignment. In the first stage, all Traditional Authorities (TAs) in Salima and Mangochi districts were listed, and consequently two TAs per district were selected by lottery. The selected TAs were Ndidi and Maganga in Salima district and Mbwana Nyambi and Jalasi in Mangochi district. Subsequently, the MoGCDSW prioritized these four TAs for targeting in order to identify the eligible list of households and their corresponding Village Clusters (VCs). Overall there were about 100 beneficiaries per VC, and for a sample size of about 3500 households the evaluation team considered including about 35-40 VCs in the study. Where more than 35-40 VCs existed in these TAs, VCs were randomly sorted to participate in the study. In the second stage, following completion of the baseline survey, half of the VCs in the study sample were randomly assigned to treatment status and entered the programme immediately, while the other half would enter the programme when the study is finished. The ethical rationale for the design was that the programme could not expand to all eligible locations at the same time, so locations which would enter the programme later in the expansion cycle were used as control sites to measure the impact (see Handa *et al.*, 2014 for details). Targeting of households was carried out in both treatment and control locations according to standard programme operation guidelines.

The original design called for a follow-up survey 12 months after baseline (July/August 2013), when beneficiary households would have received ten or perhaps eight months of transfers, depending on how quickly households could be enrolled and paid after the baseline survey. However, due to the delay in the start of the payment (May 2014), the follow-up survey was postponed until November 2014, at which time beneficiary households would have received five payments (ten months’ worth). The experience to date suggests that some indicators do move very quickly even after only a few payments, such as diet diversity, and food and total consumption. On the other hand, indicators such as schooling may require at least one schooling cycle to be completed before impacts can be detected, and child nutritional status (particularly height-for-age) will require a longer period to show any effects as would other indicators such as investment activity or input use. UNC-CH, CSR UNIMA and UNICEF have secured funding through the International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie) to conduct a 24-month follow-up survey on approximately 2300 households. This would provide an excellent opportunity to observe the medium-term impacts of the SCTP on areas such as child nutritional status, asset accumulation and economic activity.

The size of the transfer to each household depended on the number of household members and their characteristics. For one-adult households, beneficiaries received 1000 MWK (about US\$3) prior to May 2015 (1700 MWK after May 2015), plus additional amounts for the number of children enrolled in primary or secondary school (Table 1).

## 2.2 Evaluation sample, survey instruments and attrition

The evaluation sample includes three groups of households: treatment households, control households and ineligible households. The last group was included in order to assess the programme's targeting effectiveness as well as its local economy impact, but data on ineligible households were not collected at the midline survey.

Table 2 reports the baseline sample size for eligible treated and control households as well as ineligible households, disaggregated by location. The Malawi baseline survey data contain observations on 4352 households, corresponding to 20177 individuals. The longitudinal impact evaluation includes 3531 eligible households and 821 ineligible households. The sample is divided between two districts, Salima and Mangochi, with 2192 and 2160 households respectively. Of these households, 1775 in Salima and 1756 in Mangochi meet the eligibility criteria. Around half belong to treated communities and the other half to control communities.

In order to evaluate the impact of the SCTP, this report uses baseline and 17-month follow-up data. The main survey instrument is the household survey, a multi-topic questionnaire administered to the main caregiver or household head. The survey instrument is essentially a small version of the Malawi Third Integrated Household Survey (IHS3) and covers demographic and household composition, food and total expenditure, work, education, health, housing characteristics, possession of assets and durable goods, recent mortality, chronic illness and other shocks, savings and use of social services. Only some components of the income-generation and economic activity modules of the IHS3 were incorporated (due to their length) to capture economic activity, including on- and off-farm activity, input use and sales. However, the entire consumption module of the IHS3 was incorporated in order to be able to generate a measure of total household consumption identical to that reported in the IHS3 and used for the computation of national poverty rates. This will allow a clean comparison of poverty rates between SCTP households and the nation to be made.

The baseline report (Handa *et al.*, 2014) demonstrates the successfulness of the randomization of households into control and treatment groups, given that both groups were similar across indicators ranging from food security to health and adolescent behaviour. The PtoP baseline report largely echoes that conclusion, noting a similar picture of the differences between control and treated households when focusing on the key demographic, productive and economic indicators in the household (Table 3). The vast majority of indicators are not statistically different across the treatment and control categories, which presents a good opportunity for analytical work concerning productive impacts. As reported in Table 2, the attrition rate is generally low (4.7 percent). Handa *et al.* (2015) show that attrition is random and not systematic across the two survey rounds.

## 2.3 Summary statistics

Tables 4 to 8 present baseline summary statistics for SCTP-eligible households in areas ranging from crop production to labour supply. Summary statistics are weighted with a sampling weight for eligible households (for a more thorough explanation of weighting, refer to Handa *et al.* (2014)).

Table 4 presents the share of eligible households producing common crops and the quantity of those crops harvested by eligible households. The vast majority of eligible households produce maize, while a fifth or less of eligible households grow groundnut or pigeon pea. *Nkhwani*

(pumpkin leaves), rice, cotton and sorghum are also produced but are rarer, with less than 10 percent of eligible households producing those crops in the eligible sample. Maize dominates for eligible households; the average quantity harvested is over 15 times that of groundnuts. In terms of balance, treatment and control households do not differ significantly from one another on crop outcomes.

Livestock ownership was generally low overall. Less than a fifth of eligible households in the sample own chickens and about a tenth of eligible households in the sample own a sheep or goat (Table 5). Very few eligible households own larger livestock such as cows, bulls, and oxen. Again there are no statistical significant differences between treated and control households in these outcome variables at baseline.

Households use a variety of inputs in crop production. Two thirds of SCTP-eligible households use chemical fertilizer for crop production (Table 6). Rates of chemical fertilizer usage are around three times that of organic fertilizer, and pesticide use among eligible households is much lower. The wide diffusion of chemical fertilizer is uncommon among cash transfer recipients in other sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) countries, but is more common in Malawi due to access to the Farm Input Subsidy Programme (FISP). As reported in Asfaw *et al.* (2015), 53 percent of treatment and 54 percent of control households receive the FISP; the difference between the two is not statistically significant at the 10 percent level. Less than half of eligible households use improved or hybrid seeds for crops. In contrast to the general widespread use of crop inputs, livestock input use is almost non-existent in the eligible sample. In terms of significant differences, treatment households are more likely to use pesticides and spend around 67 MWK less on organic fertilizers compared to control households.

Table 7 shows the share of eligible households receiving and giving private transfers, as well as the associated amounts. Eligible households are much more likely to receive transfers than to give transfers, whether considering any transfer overall or a specific type of transfer. When converted to MWK, the amount of private transfers received also exceeds those given out. Eligible households are most likely to receive food or other consumables, and then to receive private cash. While eligible households are most likely to give food and other consumables, the next most common transfer is labour or time. At baseline, treatment households were significantly less likely to receive labour or time, and also received less in terms of food and other consumables compared to control households.

At baseline, a vast majority of both eligible adult females and males aged 18 to 59 in the sample work in farming activities. More than a third of both females and males in the eligible sample perform *ganyu* labour, while participation in non-farm enterprises is 12 percent for eligible adult females and 9 percent for eligible adult males (Table 8). Formal wage labour is not common in the sample of eligible adults, even though participation of adult males in treatment areas is 2 percentage points (pp) less likely compared to households in the control group. Furthermore, adult females in treatment areas are 4 pp less likely to do *ganyu* labour compared to adult females in the control group.

### 3. Analytical methods

In this paper we seek to answer the question, “How would cash transfer beneficiaries have fared in absence of the programme?” As it is impossible to observe a household both participating and not participating in the programme, the goal is to compare participants with non-participants who are as similar as possible except for the fact that they are not beneficiaries. The identification of the counterfactual is the organizing principle of an impact evaluation; that is, it tells us what would have happened to the beneficiaries if they had not received the intervention. The “with” data are observed in a household survey that records outcomes for recipients of the intervention. The “without” data, however, are fundamentally unobserved since a household cannot be both a participant and a non-participant of the same programme.

When panel data are available with pre- and post-intervention information, which is the case with the SCTP, the statistical approach we take to derive average treatment effects of the programme is the difference-in-differences (DiD) estimator. This entails estimating the change in an outcome indicator ( $Y$ ), such as input use, maize production, or asset ownership, between the baseline and follow-up periods for beneficiary ( $T$ ) and non-beneficiary ( $C$ ) households, and then comparing the magnitude of these changes.

Two key features of this design are particularly attractive for deriving unbiased programme impacts. First, the use of pre- and post-treatment measures allows us to net out unmeasured fixed time-invariant family or individual characteristics (such as entrepreneurial drive) that may affect outcomes. Second, using the change in a control group as a comparison allows us to account for general trends in the value of the outcome. For example, if there is a general increase in maize production because of higher rainfalls, deriving treatment effects based only on the treatment group will confound programme impacts on production with the general improvement in weather conditions.

The key assumption underpinning the DiD estimator is that there is no systematic unobserved time-varying difference between the treatment and control groups. For example, if plot quality for the  $T$  group remains constant over time but the  $C$  group experiences on average deterioration and erosion, then we would attribute a greater increase in agricultural production in  $T$  to the programme rather than to this unobserved time-varying change in soil characteristic. In practice, the random assignment to  $T$  and  $C$ , the geographical proximity of the samples and the rather short duration between pre- and post-intervention measurements make this assumption reasonable.

In large-scale social experiments like the SCTP it is typical to estimate the DiD in a multivariate framework, controlling for potential intervening factors that might not be perfectly balanced across  $T$  and  $C$  units and/or are strong predictors of the outcome ( $Y$ ). Not only does this allow us to control for possible confounders, but it also increases the efficiency of our estimates by reducing the residual variance in the model. The basic setup of the estimation model is shown in equation (1):

$$Y_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 D_{it} + \beta_2 R_t + \beta_3 (R_t * D_{it}) + \sum \beta_i Z_i + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (1)$$

where  $Y_{it}$  is the outcome indicator of interest;  $D_{it}$  is a dummy equal to 1 if household  $i$  received the treatment and 0 otherwise;  $R_t$  is a time dummy equal to 0 for the baseline and to 1 for the follow-up round;  $R_t * D_{it}$  is the interaction between the intervention and time dummies, and  $\varepsilon_{it}$  is the statistical error term. To control for household and community characteristics that may

influence the outcome of interest beyond the treatment effect alone, we add in  $Z_i$ , a vector of household and community characteristics to control for observable differences across households at the baseline which could have an effect on  $Y_{it}$ . These factors are not only those for which some differences may be observed across treatment and control at baseline, but also ones which could have some explanatory role in the estimation of  $Y_{it}$ . In order to be consistent with the findings of Handa *et al.* (2015), this report uses the same covariates, weighting, and estimation technique as found in the Midline Evaluation Report.

All estimators presented above assume the impact of the SCTP to be constant, irrespective of who receives it. The mean impact of a programme or policy based on this assumption is a concise and convenient way of evaluating impacts. But in addition to examining the overall mean impact, it is important to understand how the SCTP affects different types of individuals and households. Indeed, even if the mean programme effect was significant, whether the programme had a significant beneficial or detrimental effect might vary across the distribution of targeted households (Khandker *et al.*, 2010). Therefore, we also estimated the heterogeneity of impact by gender of household head, farm size and degree of household labour constraint.

We define a household as severely labour constrained if there is no able-bodied member or member who is fit-to-work (FTW), i.e. no adult member (18 to 59 years of age) without chronic illnesses and disabilities. A household is moderately labour constrained if there is at least one able-bodied member and the ratio of members not fit-to-work (NF) to FTW is greater than or equal to three. A household is labour unconstrained if there is at least one able-bodied member and the dependency ratio (NF/FTW) is less than three. Results are also presented by farm size, which we constructed from terciles of total household plot area at baseline. Two caveats must be made explicit. The first is that the terms used to designate these household plot areas (small, medium and large) do not necessarily correlate to what people may consider small, medium and large farms in Malawi in reality. The terms are used in this impact evaluation report to facilitate communication of the results. The second caveat is that 'small' farm households also include those households with no plots (4 percent of households at baseline, per Table 4), in order to discuss impacts over all eligible households.



## 4. Results and discussion

In this section we discuss the average treatment effects of the Malawi SCTP on the treated households over several groups of outcome variables. The groups include areas such as crop input use and land characteristics, crop production, agricultural assets, livestock and labour supply. We also investigate impacts on credit, private transfers given and received, food security and caloric intake.

Within this section, we make references to three other reports. The first is that by Handa *et al.* (2015) which investigates the effect of the SCTP on a broad range of indicators, while focusing on those indicators pertaining to agricultural production, labour allocation and risk coping behaviour. The second report, by Covarrubias *et al.* (2012), is the Malawi Mchinji pilot impact evaluation report and is based on data collected from March 2007 to April 2008. The third is the OPM (2014) SCTP qualitative report which documents findings in communities from focus groups, household case studies and semi-structured interviews with key informants.

### 4.1 Impact on crop production and productivity

Overall, the SCTP led to significant changes in crop production. We first note the increase in production and productivity for groundnuts, which was the third most popular crop (for crop enterprise) at baseline. Large farm households are 13 pp more likely to grow groundnuts (over a baseline of 25 pp) (Table 9). As noted by Handa *et al.* (2015), households overall harvested more groundnuts, but they also did so at disaggregated levels as seen in the aforementioned table. Crop productivity, as measured by kilogram per acre, generally followed the pattern of crop production in Table 9; there were increases in groundnut yields with scattered impacts on other crops (Table 10).<sup>1</sup> Maize, grown by 91 percent of households at baseline, was harvested in greater quantities by medium farm households and male-headed households, with both also experiencing an increase in terms of kilograms of maize per acre. Households turned away from growing pigeon pea as a result of the SCTP but it did not seem to decrease the production or productivity of pigeon pea. The SCTP usually led to decreases in productivity and production for sorghum and rice as well as some increases for cotton, but only around 5 percent of households grew each crop at baseline. Ultimately, it appears that the shifts in crop production and productivity associated with the SCTP led to an increase in total value of crop production for male-headed households and medium farm households.<sup>2</sup> On average male-headed households and medium farm beneficiary households have increased their total value of crop production by over 2 726 and 1 433 MKW, respectively.

To understand the role of the FISP in conjunction with the SCTP, we also analyse the impact on crop productivity by household receipt of the FISP. Both the FISP and non-FISP households had higher groundnut productivity but only FISP households enjoyed higher maize productivity (Table 11). FISP households on the other hand had lower yields for cotton and sorghum, while non-FISP households had higher yields for cotton. In terms of total value of production, the

---

<sup>1</sup> Overall, households harvested more maize in Handa *et al.* (2015), but that effect is only statistically significant in our analysis for medium farm households, perhaps due to differing treatment of outliers.

<sup>2</sup> There are two measures for the total value of crop productivity in this report. For the first measure, baseline quantities are linked to baseline prices, and follow-up quantities linked to follow-up prices. For the second measure, follow-up prices are linked to both baseline and follow-up quantities. We used both measures to assess the robustness of our results to potential changes in prices and to be assured that the SCTP (rather than difference in prices in a certain time period) leads to changes in value of production.

SCTP combined with the FISP had a large and significant positive impact (2 465 MWK), which might indicate the complementarity role that the FISP plays in boosting crop productivity.<sup>3</sup>

What happened with the harvested crops? Households overall, and female-headed households and small farm households in particular, were more likely to sell any crop (Table 12). Focusing on specific crops, households overall increased the amount of groundnuts sold in the market, but so too did male-headed households and small farm households. Medium farm households, which had higher maize harvest and productivity, also sold more maize. These results make sense given that households with increased production and productivity could sell more of those crops. In terms of total value of crop sales<sup>4</sup>, female-headed households, small farm households and medium farm households increased their sales. However, we observed a decrease in total value of sales for large households.

## 4.2 Impact on crop input use and land

The SCTP has led to a greater use of organic fertilizer. While the programme had no impact on the share of households using organic fertilizer, with the exception of large farm households (who are 7 pp more likely to use organic fertilizer), the programme increased total household expenditure on organic fertilizer by 158 MWK (from a baseline of 245 MWK), and per acre expenditure by 100 MWK (from a baseline of 225 MWK) (Table 13). The large impact of the SCTP on organic fertilizer use was also significant for each of the subgroups, aside from medium farm households. On the other hand, the programme had no significant impact on the already high levels of chemical fertilizer use, with the exception of households with medium-sized landholdings.

In terms of other inputs, the programme encouraged medium farm households to increase pesticide use by 3 pp over a baseline of 3 percent. The SCTP led to a significant decrease in the use of improved or hybrid seeds among male-headed households and medium farm households. Yet, the story behind this impact is not clear. In terms of differentiated crop input use impact across FISP receipt, both FISP and non-FISP households report an increase in depth of organic fertilizer use (Table 14), a pattern previously observed for households in Table 13.

We also looked at land tenure arrangement and land management practices at the household level. Adoption of these technologies often requires upfront investment costs while the benefits accrue at latter stages and, as a result, the adoption rates are quite low. The presence of the SCTP may thus serve as an incentive in helping farmers to address credit constraints towards the use of some types of land management practices. Medium farm households were 4 pp more likely to irrigate plots (over a baseline of 6 pp) (Table 15). Male-headed households were 3 pp less likely to rent in a plot (over a baseline of 5 pp), and female-headed households were 1 pp more likely to rent in a plot (over a baseline of 6 pp). Households overall engaged more often in minimum tillage as a result of the SCTP (3 pp over a baseline of 4 percent), but so too did female-headed households and large farm households. As a result of the programme beneficiary male-headed households and large farm households use ploughing techniques less often to prepare the land. Small farm households were 10 pp more likely to use crop residue in their plot (over a baseline of 21 pp), all pointing to the positive role of the SCTP in encouraging households to engage in some sustainable land management practices, despite low initial values.

---

<sup>3</sup> It is important however to point out that the FISP is endogenous in our model and the difference in crop productivity might be as a result of some unobservable factors associated with FISP receipt.

<sup>4</sup> The two measures for crop sales follow the designs of the two measures for value of crop production, but the quantities used are the quantities sold.

### 4.3 Impact on agricultural assets

Overall, the SCTP led to a significant increase in farm tool ownership. The programme led to increased expenditure (including purchase, maintenance, and transport) on hand hoes, panga knives, axes, and sickles, two to three times over baseline values (Table 16). Households were 6 pp more likely to own sickles as a result of the programme, over a baseline of 18 percent, as well as a greater number of hand hoes and sickles (as also found in Handa *et al.*, 2015). Increases in the number owned of those two items also occurred across different segments of the sample households; female-headed households and large farm households owned more hand hoes, while small farm households and medium farm households owned more sickles (male-headed households owned more of both). OPM (2014) noted hand hoes and sickles among the farm tools being purchased by SCTP households. Medium farm households also increased the number of panga knives they owned as the result of the programme. These increases in various dimensions of agricultural assets mirror those found in the Malawi Mchinji pilot programme, which found increases in household ownership of hoes, axes and sickles (Covarrubias *et al.*, 2011).

### 4.4 Impact on livestock

First, we looked at aggregate figures over all households, on livestock ownership, expenditure and sales, including overall livestock holdings measured in tropical livestock units (TLU). The SCTP led to significant increases in overall livestock ownership; the share of households owning any livestock increased by 14 pp, over a baseline of 29 percent (Table 17). The programme led to a 1 153 MWK increase in spending on livestock, as well as an increase in livestock holdings as measured in TLU. However, the programme led to a decrease in total livestock sales for households overall and for large farm households; this may reflect the mitigating role of the SCTP against distress sales of livestock. OPM (2014) noted that households purchased livestock both to build up a stock of assets and for sustainable sources of income after the programme's closure. Yet they also found households had to sell off livestock, especially as a result of the long payment delay in 2013.

The increase in livestock ownership was focused primarily on chickens and goats/sheep (Table 18), both in terms of the share of households owning, as well as total numbers of, these smaller animals. The impacts were similar across most subgroups. Similarly, the SCTP had a positive impact on expenditure on chickens and goats/sheep, as well as the number purchased (Table 19). The programme also led to an increase in expenditure on pigeons, ducks and doves by female-headed households and small and medium farm households, and a decrease on cows, bulls and oxen for households overall, as well as for female-headed households and large farm households. Finally, a significant share of the purchases of chickens and goats/sheep were made by beneficiary households (Table 20). Investment in small livestock like poultry or small ruminants is an expected outcome of such programmes, one that has in fact occurred in other programmes in the region and in other parts of the world.

### 4.5 Impact on on-farm labour activities

One of the main areas of interest is whether the cash transfer influenced households' decisions to allocate time to farming activities. This report looked at farming activity by specific activity (land preparation and planting, non-harvest work and harvest-work) as well as overall at the household level. We looked at both participation and total days worked over the past rainy season, focusing on households overall in Table 21 and by age and sex groups: individuals aged

six and above, adults aged 18 to 59 and elderly aged 60 and above in both Table 22 and Table 23.

For the most part, the SCTP did not have a significant impact on household participation in, or the number of days of, on-farm adult labour supply, either by farming activities in general or by specific activity (Table 21). Several additional patterns do emerge in terms of household adult age-sex group participation (Table 22), however. First, adult males appear more likely to work on their own farms. Although the programme has no impact when all farming activities are grouped together, the programme led to an increase in participation for adult males in land preparation and planting (7 pp increase over a baseline of 82 percent in all sample households considered together), as well as an increase in non-harvest participation in severely constrained households. Adult males are also more likely to do harvest work in severely and moderately constrained households. Second, adult females are less likely to work on farm as a result of the SCTP, at least in male-headed households and labour-unconstrained households, in all farming activities, including non-harvest work, and harvest work. Third, the SCTP led to an increase in participation among the elderly (both males and females), among households overall, as well as in female-headed households and small farm households. Fourth, severely and moderately constrained households only faced increases in the likelihood of participation, while unconstrained households only experienced decreases. Fifth, gender of the household head seemed to influence the impact of the programme – among female-headed households the programme increased the likelihood of participation for the most part. The programme decreased the likelihood of participation among male-headed households for adult females, but adults aged 18 and above were more likely to participate in non-harvest and harvest work.

It is difficult to interpret what all of this means: a cash transfer may induce adult males to enter agricultural work (to work with the increase in agricultural assets), while adult females may face different pressures, moving away from farm work. The cash transfer may be giving more constrained households flexibility to enter farm work. It is not clear why unconstrained households of various adult age and sex groups may be leaving farm work. We would also expect the elderly to be less likely to work on family farms with a cash transfer. The Mchinji impact evaluation also found an increase in on-farm work as a result of the cash transfer, suggesting that households devoted more labour to their own household farm activities, with less time devoted to out-of-household labour. Meanwhile, there do not appear to be any discernible patterns when it comes to total days worked in the household in Table 23 by specific age-sex groups.

#### **4.6 Impact on non-farm enterprises**

The SCTP did not lead to an increase in non-farm enterprise (NFE) activity. Severely constrained households were actually less likely (7 pp decrease from a baseline of 18 percent) to operate a NFE in the last 12 months (Table 24). Furthermore, households overall, female-headed households and severely constrained households operated significantly fewer enterprises in that time span. Beneficiaries also reduced the number of months of business operation in the last 12 months.

We disaggregated impacts by three of the most prominent types of NFEs: petty trading, charcoal or firewood and crafts. Here, differences emerge among the types of activities. While beneficiary households were less likely to operate charcoal or firewood enterprises, they were more likely to operate petty trader enterprises, which are less physically intensive than the former enterprises. These two patterns are mirrored in the total months that these household

businesses operated in the last year. Households also operated fewer months in crafts businesses in the last year.

Among unconstrained households the programme led to an increase in spending in the last month on all inputs and goods for NFEs. Given that households have experienced mixed effects depending on the level of disaggregation and business, we are also interested in whether shifts may have reflected moves towards more profitable enterprises. However, only severely constrained households changed in terms of sales and profits, with decreases faced in both categories.

This quantitative report did not find the widespread investment in small businesses that the OPM (2014) qualitative study found, although OPM only found those impacts in well-connected areas. These areas were also where OPM found a tradition of enterprise, where inputs for the businesses were readily available and where there was a large and accessible customer base.

#### 4.7 Impact on formal wage labour and *ganyu* labour

Households that receive cash transfers may decide to use that money to help enter into more formal work or rely on the cash as a substitute for less desirable casual agricultural wage labour on others' farms. With this motivation, we investigate the impact of the SCTP on formal wage labour and *ganyu* labour for individuals aged 18 and above. Both sets of indicators were measured over the last 12 months in the labour module.

It does not seem that the SCTP encouraged beneficiaries to enter or leave wage work, given the lack of impact found in the top half of Table 25. In severely constrained households elderly males worked 8.48 fewer days (over a baseline of 8.98 days) while adult males worked about 14 more days (over a baseline of 6.41 days) – both large and significant impacts.

On the other hand, the SCTP led to large and consistent reductions in both participation and total days (16 days from base of 59 days in the overall sample) in adult *ganyu* labour in the last 12 months (**Error! Reference source not found.**). These patterns are particularly evident among adult males. Elderly males are also less likely to do *ganyu* work in households overall, as well as in male-headed households and severely constrained households. The programme reduced the intensity of adult females in *ganyu* labour across subgroups, and also reduced the participation of adult females in severely and moderately constrained households. These decreases make sense given that *ganyu* labour is agricultural work performed on others' farms; as some household members have increased participation in own farm work, they may have also decreased their *ganyu* work. *Ganyu* labour also serves as the work of last resort for many individuals, so decreases may be expected with the receipt of a cash transfer. OPM (2014) found many beneficiaries to reduce their *ganyu* work, and particularly so for the elderly. Covarrubias et al. (2011) also reported a decrease in the number of days in *ganyu* labour worked by the household head in the Mchinji impact evaluation.

#### 4.8 Impact on household activities

The survey also gathered information on household participation in household non-farm enterprises, livestock activities, collection of nuts or other products, *ganyu* labour and formal wage labour over the last seven days. For *ganyu* labour and formal wage labour, these figures complement those presented previously, which were measured over the last 12 months.



The most obvious pattern is the decrease in *ganyu* labour, in both participation and total hours (Table 27), reflecting the consistent decreases found in Table 26. However, the SCTP also led to an increase in livestock activity participation across different groups of households, a probable result of the increase in livestock ownership. Households overall, for example, are 4 pp more likely to participate in a livestock activity, over a baseline of 5 percent. Households overall work more hours in formal wage work, although this seems to be driven by female-headed households. The SCTP did not affect participation in the most common activity, fruit collecting.

As with previous figures, we are also interested in participation of, and total hours worked by, adult age-sex groups within the household; these are featured in Table 28 and Table 29, respectively. Aside from *ganyu* labour, adult males are mostly participating more in household activities measured at different levels. In contrast, adult females are both participating less and working fewer hours in these household activities. These two trends match those found in participation of adult males and females in on-farm labour activities.

Again, the household activity featuring the largest impact is *ganyu* labour. Figures on non-farm enterprises feature a few increases but more decreases, which fits with the mixed picture provided by Table 24; in this context, the lack of impact in Table 27 also makes sense. On participation in formal wage labour, we again observe increases with adult males (Table 28), with one of those increases being in severely constrained households. However, adult males in moderately constrained households decrease their participation in formal wage labour in the last week.

#### **4.9 Impact on time spent on household chores**

Household chores comprise another important part of time allocation among household members that may be influenced by a cash transfer. In the context of this report, chores include 1) collecting water; 2) collecting firewood; and 3) taking care of children, cooking, or cleaning.

When looking at participation in chores (Table 30) and total hours spent yesterday on chores (Table 31), the SCTP had mixed impacts depending on the chore. The SCTP led to an increase in participation and time intensity in collecting water, across all demographic categories included, and particularly in female headed households. On the other hand, the programme generally reduced both participation and time spent for adults and the elderly in firewood collection. Finally, adult males and elderly males in male-headed households reduced their participation in taking care of children, cooking, or cleaning, with increases in other subgroups.

#### **4.10 Impact on child labour**

The impact of the cash transfer may differ for children compared to older household members, so we analyse the impact of the SCTP on children's participation and extent of involvement in on-farm labour activities, formal wage labour, *ganyu* labour, household activities and household chores. To be consistent with other variables featured in this report we remained at the household level, observing impacts on child labour in households with children.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> In order to be more consistent with the indicators for children in Handa *et al.* (2015), we grouped households with children aged 10 to 17 (referred to henceforth as older children), but also focused on households with children aged 6 to 9 (referred to henceforth as younger children). We also split these two groupings by sex, as females may face different pressures than males with a cash transfer.

Six trends within the data on child labour stand out in particular. First, within on-farm labour activities, older children within male-headed households decreased their participation, regardless of gender. Older children are 12 pp less likely to engage in farm activities generally (Table 32). These decreases seem to be driven by decreases in both land preparation as well as in harvest work.<sup>6</sup>

Second, younger children in moderately constrained households and unconstrained households largely decreased both their participation (Table 32) and total days (Table 33) in on-farm work. For example, younger boys in unconstrained households are 13 pp less likely to work in any farming activity, while younger girls in moderately constrained households are 14 pp less likely to work in any farming activity. Meanwhile, younger girls in severely constrained households are more likely to work in land preparation and in non-harvest work. Younger children in severely constrained households also worked fewer total days in harvest work, although the change was not captured for each sex separately.

Third, the SCTP led to an increase in wage labour days for older children in female-headed households, while the opposite is the case in male-headed households (Table 34).<sup>7</sup> Within female-headed households these increases appear to be driven by the increases among older boys, but in male-headed households older girls also work fewer days in the last 12 months. Older boys are also more likely to work wage labour in female-headed households but are less likely to do so in male-headed households. However, older boys in male-headed households are more likely to work in wage labour measured over the last week (Table 36).

Fourth, older and younger children of both genders were more likely to be engaged in livestock activities, reflecting the increase in livestock ownership. These increases in livestock activity engagement typically represent a doubling (or more) over baseline values of participation (Table 36). Unconstrained households faced increases for younger children and boys as well as for older girls, and younger girls in severely constrained households worked more hours in livestock activity too (Table 37).<sup>8</sup>

Fifth, as was the case for adults, increases in water collection were generally met with decreases in firewood collection. Participation in water collection, the most common activity for children, increased particularly for younger girls and older boys (Table 38). Younger boys were less likely to collect firewood, as well as older children in unconstrained households. In moderately constrained households, younger children devoted more time to collecting water (Table 39). Meanwhile, older girls in male-headed households and unconstrained households spent less time collecting firewood, driving the impact for older children.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> The measure for on-farm labour activity in Handa *et al.* (2015) for child labour in “unpaid household work” includes land preparation or planting, weeding, fertilizing, and other non-harvest work and harvesting for children aged 10 to 17. However, it is at the individual level. Handa *et al.* (2015) found no impact from the SCTP on hours spent doing unpaid household work, which matches with the lack of impact found in total days for children aged 10-17 found in **Error! Reference source not found.**

<sup>7</sup> The labour module providing the data for these tables was only administered to individuals 10 years of age or above, and so impacts could not be estimated for children aged 6 to 9.

<sup>8</sup> The measure in Handa *et al.* (2015) for household activities, “unpaid productive labour”, includes NFEs, livestock activities, and collecting nuts or other tree fruits, honey, or other products. On this measure, Handa *et al.* (2015) found no impact on hours spent in unpaid productive labour for children aged 10 to 17.

<sup>9</sup> Older girls also spend less time collecting firewood in male-headed households and in unconstrained households. Handa *et al.* (2015) estimate the separate impacts of the SCTP on hours spent yesterday collecting water, collecting firewood, and in childcare, cooking, or cleaning at the individual level for children aged 10 to 17 and found no impact, reflecting the mixed impacts occurring on chores depending on the chore.

Finally, similar to its impact on adults, the SCTP decreases participation in, and intensity of, *ganyu* labour for older children. Measured over the last 12 months, older children (particularly older boys) are less likely to participate in *ganyu* labour, and both genders work fewer *ganyu* labour days because of the SCTP (Table 35).<sup>10</sup> Measured over the last week, *ganyu* participation halved for older children overall (Table 36) and older and younger children worked fewer hours in *ganyu* labour, as expected (Table 37).

These changes in child labour occur in the context of the findings of the SCTP on education explored by Handa *et al.* (2015), who observe that school net enrolment increased by 12 pp for children aged 6 to 17. The authors find net enrolment to be stronger for children aged 14 to 17 compared to those aged 6 to 13 (although both are significant). Although the ages are not perfectly aligned, the latter result makes sense as older children (as defined in this report) were the ones more likely to have decreased engagement in *ganyu* labour as a result of the SCTP. Primary school dropout rates also fall (secondary dropout rates do not), and temporary withdrawal rates<sup>11</sup> decline as well (Handa *et al.*, 2015). Thus, it seems that the decrease in child labour overall may be partially attributed to the increase in time devoted to school. However, more research needs to be carried out as to the role of the SCTP with regard to child labour, especially as household categories seem to influence the cash transfer's impact in some activities.

#### 4.11 Impact on hired labour

Agricultural households receiving cash transfers may put them to use by hiring labour into their farms. For hired labour, we investigated all farming activities grouped together, as well by separate activities. We also split those activities by numbers hired, total days and demographic structure.

Immediately visible from Table 40 is the low percentage of households that hire labour – only 4 percent of households overall hired labour for some activity at baseline. Still, female-headed households and moderately constrained households are 3 pp more likely to hire someone for an activity (over baselines of 4 and 3 percent respectively). On all farming activities, the SCTP led female-headed households to hire men for 0.25 total days more (over a baseline of 0.36 days), while unconstrained households hire both men and children for more days. However, severely constrained households hire men and women for fewer days as a result of the SCTP – a counter-intuitive result.

The impacts vary depending on the hired in labour category, but do not follow clear patterns. In land preparation and planting, the SCTP led unconstrained households to hire more men and women and for more total days. For land preparation and planting, total days for men and the number of children hired also increased for households overall and female-headed households, as well as severely constrained households for number of children hired. However, the total days women were hired decreased in severely constrained households. For non-harvest activities, male-headed households hire fewer men and instead hire women and children. Meanwhile, moderately constrained households hired more women and for more days, and

---

<sup>10</sup> Looking at individual level labour for children aged 10 to 17, Handa *et al.* (2015) found no impact on the likelihood of wage employment as well as a decrease in the likelihood of *ganyu* labour (at the 10 percent significance level), matching the household level results in this report.

<sup>11</sup> These rates are defined by Handa *et al.* (2015) as missing more than two consecutive weeks of instruction at any time in the past 12 months.



hired fewer children. For non-agricultural enterprises, households at all levels hired more men, although these increases are very small and occur on baseline values close to zero. Indeed, one must keep in mind that these impacts are occurring over baseline values for numbers hired and total days hired that are very low. OPM (2014) reported some increases in hired labour, finding the trend to represent “a significant change in the typical livelihood activities of the ultra-poor.”

#### **4.12 Impact on credit and other income**

The receipt of cash transfers can represent an opportunity for households to pay off loans and/or reduce the need for credit or, conversely, to improve the perceived creditworthiness of the households and increase the access to and use of credit. Instead of households taking on more credit, the SCTP led households to reduce the level of household debt and the use of new credit. Beneficiary households overall paid off more of previous loans compared to control households; so too did female-headed households and large farm households (Table 41). Large farm households were also less likely to still owe money on previous loans (8 pp decrease from a baseline of 8 percent), as were male-headed households (a 5 pp decrease from a baseline of 7 percent). Households overall paid interest on loans less often, (as did female-headed households and large farm households too), and female-headed households owed 119 MWK less on loans (from a baseline of 593 MWK). Finally, households were significantly less likely to purchase food and other goods on credit. Handa *et al.* (2015) also note that households overall are less likely to purchase on credit and to borrow in the last 12 months (the latter at 10 percent significance).

Households were also asked about income received from various sources, with asset sales as a particular source of interest as it can represent a negative risk-coping strategy. Male-headed households and large farm households were less likely to receive income from selling assets, and households overall, male-headed households, and large farm households received a lower amount from selling off assets, as compared to control households (Table 42). These results suggest that SCTP beneficiary households are retaining their assets, which is in line with other results suggesting increased investment activity.

#### **4.13 Impact on private transfers received and given**

Receipt of the SCTP can affect the private exchange of cash and in-kind goods by programme recipients with their family and neighbours – either substituting for private exchanges or allowing households to contribute to exchanges. Because of the SCTP, overall households are less likely to receive any kind of private transfer, as are small farm households and large farm households (Table 43). This decrease amounts to 4 pp – much lower than the 32 pp decrease found in the Mchinji pilot. OPM (2014) found a gradual weakening of informal networks in both treatment and control communities, and noted that people still widely cited neighbours as easily approachable and that they could also rely on friends, anticipating little to no effect on private transfers received. Looking at specific types of transfers, we find no impacts for households overall, as is the case in Handa *et al.* (2015). In terms of amount received, the SCTP led to a large and significant decrease in the value of food transfers, overall and for most subcategories of households. However, the amount received of private cash transfers for male-headed households and large farm households actually increased significantly.

Households were asked a hypothetical question regarding if they would be able to ask someone for a private transfer if they had not received one. Households overall, female-headed households, and small farm households were less likely to be able to ask someone for any kind

of transfer. Yet breaking down transfers by type reveals a more complex story. These same groups of households were more likely to be able to ask someone for private cash transfers (although there is a decrease in likelihood for medium farm households). Beneficiary households across different categories were less likely to ask for labour or time from someone compared to control households even if they have not received any transfer. Female-headed households that have not received a transfer were less likely to be able to ask for food or other consumables, whereas male-headed households and medium farm households were more likely to ask someone for those goods.

The SCTP had little impact on the likelihood of a beneficiary household providing support to another household, which is similar to the conclusion reached by Handa *et al.* (2015). However, small farm households were more likely to give private cash to someone, while both female-headed households and large farm households were less likely to give agricultural implements or inputs – though baseline values are very low in these cases. The SCTP also had no impact on amounts given, with the exception of small farm households who gave 56 MWK more cash (from a baseline of 40 MWK) compared to the control households.

#### **4.14 Impact on food security and food caloric intake**

The SCTP increased self-reported food security. Beneficiary households were 11 pp less likely to worry whether they would have enough food in the past week (from a baseline of 83 percent) (Table 44), results similar to those found in Handa *et al.*, measured at the 10 percent significance level (2015). This decrease matched similar decreases for female-headed households, small farm households, and medium farm households. The SCTP also allowed households to eat more meals per day, with effects observed for households at all levels (minus large farm households). Medium farm households also increased the number of months that last year's maize harvest lasted.

We also analysed the impact of the SCTP on daily per capita caloric intake. Daily per capita caloric intake was calculated using kilocalories per gram of edible portions of specific foods, multiplied by the quantity (in grams) of specific foods eaten. These kilocalorie figures were summed up within the household, and then divided by the number of household members and the days per week to receive daily per capita figures. The SCTP had positive impacts on daily per capita caloric intake, over all households (361 calories from a baseline of 1 926 calories) and by subgroups, with the exception of male headed households. This increase was the result of purchases and not own production. OPM (2014) found a short-term increase in the variety of food purchased, as well as an increase in quantity of usual foods purchased, which helps explain the increases in food security and food consumption (coming from food purchases in particular) found in this report.

We also looked into the daily per capita intake among extremely poor and non-extremely poor households, using the baseline poverty lines and per capita expenditure aggregates in Handa *et al.* (2015). We find a similar pattern as in the previous table for the extreme poor and non-extreme poor: increases in calories consumed that are coming from purchases rather than own production (Table 45). These impacts do not disappear over extreme poverty status. However, Handa *et al.* (2015) find an increase on food expenditures only for ultra-poor households at baseline, but not for all eligible households considered together.

## 5. Conclusions

This report uses data collected from a randomized experimental design impact evaluation (2013 and 2014) to assess the impact of the Malawi SCTP on household decision-making over agricultural production and livelihood options.

The SCTP encouraged households to invest more in agricultural activities. Beneficiary households increased the number of agricultural assets owned as well as the number of chickens and goats/sheep owned. The SCTP led to an increase in the use of organic fertilizer which, combined with changes in labour supply, led to shifts in crop production and productivity, particularly in groundnuts as well as in maize for some households. These shifts brought about an increase in the value of crop production for both male-headed and medium farm households. Beneficiary households paid off more on previous loans, were less likely to purchase food or other goods on credit, decreased total livestock sales, and received fewer MWK from selling off assets compared to control households.

In terms of labour supply, the SCTP clearly allowed households to move away from *ganyu* labour performed on others' lands in both involvement and intensity. In turn, the programme led to shifts in some types of on-farm work as well as increases in participation in livestock activities (the former measured over the last 12 months, the latter measured in the last week). These increases make sense in light of the abovementioned investments found in crop inputs and in the number of livestock and agricultural assets owned. The SCTP had minor impacts on participation in, and intensity of, wage work. While beneficiary households increased degree of engagement and number of months of operation for petty trader enterprises, they decreased months of operation for firewood/charcoal businesses and craft businesses, as well as engagement with the former. Overall, total months of business operations fell, although no impact was registered for NFE operation in the last 12 months for households overall. Household members increased their participation and intensity in collecting water, but the opposite is true for collecting firewood. For child labour, there were clear decreases in *ganyu* labour, and children engaged more with livestock activities. Younger children participated more often in on-farm activities in severely constrained households but less often in moderately constrained and unconstrained households. Older children worked more days in wage labour in female-headed households, while the opposite was true in male-headed households. Engagement with household chores by children typically mirrors that of adults, with decreases in firewood collection and increases in water collection.

The cash transfer also played a protective role in the household: food security increased for beneficiary households, as measured by various self-reported measures. Gains made in daily per capita caloric intake also support this conclusion. With calories coming from food purchases, it seems that households used the cash transfers to directly purchase food rather than to grow food for the household. As previously mentioned, households are less engaged in *ganyu* work and some households receive less income from selling off assets, which are signs that SCTP beneficiary households have a less frequent need to engage in negative risk-coping strategies.

These results also match those found in the Zambia Child Grant Programme impact evaluation, which used a randomized experimental design to study similar themes of household decision-making (Daidone *et al.*, 2014). An increase on food consumption was found to come particularly from purchased foods, as in the case with daily per capita caloric intake in Malawi. Livestock ownership and number of livestock owned also increased, alongside gains made in

agricultural asset ownership and number of agricultural assets owned. Households repaid loans and increased the use of inputs, including hired labour and fertilizers. These increases in inputs translated into higher production for beneficiaries. Although households were found in Zambia to move into off-farm family enterprises, both settings featured agricultural wage labour (similar to *ganyu*) decreasing, and adult males were more likely to work in non-agricultural wage labour and in on-farm labour in both Zambia and Malawi. These results are encouraging given that they stem from rigorous randomized designs and from programmes not intending to affect productive activities.

## References

- Asfaw, S., Carraro, A., Pickmans, R., Daidone, S. & Davis, B. 2015. Productive impacts of the Malawi Social Cash Transfer Programme – Baseline Evaluation Report. FAO-PtoP Baseline Report. Rome, FAO.
- Asfaw S., Davis, B., Josh Dewbre, J., Handa, S. & Winters, P. 2014. Cash transfer programme, productive activities and labour supply: Evidence from randomized experiment in Kenya. *Journal of Development Studies*, 50(8): 1172–1196.
- Boone, R, Covarrubias. K., Davis. B. & Winters, P. 2013. Cash Transfer Programmes and agricultural production: The case of Malawi. *Agricultural Economics*, 44:365–378.
- Covarrubias. K., Davis. B. & Winters, P. 2012. From Protection to Production: Productive impacts of the Malawi Social Cash Transfer Scheme. *Journal of Development Effectiveness*, 4(1):50–77.
- Daidone, S., Davis, B., Dewbre, J. & Covarrubias, K. 2014a. Lesotho’s Child Grant Programme: 24-month impact report on productive activities and labour allocation. FAO-PtoP country Report. Rome, FAO.
- Daidone, S., Davis, B., Dewbre, J., González-Flores, M., Handa, S., Seidenfeld, D. & Tembo, G. 2014b. Zambia’s Child Grant Programme: 24-month impact report on productive activities and labour allocation. FAO-PtoP country Report. Rome, FAO.
- Davis, B., Carletto, G. & Winters, P. 2010. Migration, transfers and economic decision-making among agricultural households. Introduction to Special Issue, *Journal of Development Studies*, 46(1):1–13.
- Davis, B., Gaarder, M., Handa S. & Yablonski, J. 2012. Evaluating the impact of cash transfer programmes in sub-Saharan Africa: an introduction to the special issue. *Journal of Development Effectiveness*, 4(1):1–8.
- Fiszbein, A. & Schady, N., with Ferreira, F.H.G., Grosh, M., Kelleher, N., Olinto, P., & Skoufias, E., 2009. Conditional Cash Transfers for Attacking Present and Future Poverty. A World Bank Policy Research Report. Washington, DC, World Bank.
- Gertler, P., Martinez, S. & Rubio-Codina, M. 2012. Investing cash transfers to raise long-term living standards. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 4(1):164–92.
- Gilligan, D., Hoddinott J. & Taffesse, A. 2009. The impact of Ethiopia’s productive safety net programme and its linkages. *Journal of Development Studies* 45(10):1684– 1706.
- Handa, H., Angeles, G., Abdoulayi, S., Brugh, K., Hill, M.J., Kilburn, K., Mvula, P., Natali, L., Otchere, F., Tsoka, M. & Zuskov, D. 2014. Malawi Social Cash Transfer Programme; Baseline Evaluation Report. Commissioned by UNICEF Malawi, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina.
- Handa, S., Angeles, G., Abdoulayi, S., Mvula, P., Tsoka, M., Palermo, T., Peterman, A., Barrington, C., Brugh, K., Kilburn, K., Otchere F. & Rock, A. 2015. Malawi Social Cash

- Transfer Programme: Midline Impact Evaluation Report. Commissioned by UNICEF Malawi, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina.
- Handa, S., Kilburn, K., Barrington, C., Angeles, G., Mvula, P. & Tsoka, M. 2013. Impact Evaluation of the Malawi SCTP. Inception report. Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina.
- Khandker, S. R., Koolwal, G. B., & Samad, H. A. 2010. Handbook on impact evaluation: quantitative methods and practices, World Bank Publications, number 2693, June. Washington, DC, World Bank.
- Miller, C., Tsoka, M., & Reichert, K. 2010. Impacts on children of cash transfers in Malawi. *In* S. Handa, S. Devereux & Webb, D., Social protection for Africa's children. London, Routledge Press.
- Oxford Policy Management (OPM). 2014. Qualitative research and analyses of the economic impacts of cash transfer programmes in sub-Saharan Africa: Malawi country case study report, Oxford, OPM.
- Thorne, K., Taylor, J. E., Tsoka, M., Mvula, P., Davis, B. & Handa, S. 2015. Local Economy-wide Impact Evaluation (LEWIE) of Malawi. Paper prepared for the From Protection to Production project. Rome, FAO.
- Todd, J., Winters, P. & Hertz, T. 2010. Conditional cash transfers and agricultural production: lessons from the Oportunidades experience in Mexico. *Journal of Development Studies*, 46(1):39–67.

## Appendix 1: Tables

**Table 1 Household transfers (MWK)**

	Prior to May 2015	After May 2015
1 member	1 000	1 700
2 members	1 500	2 200
3 members	1 950	2 900
4 + members	2 400	3 700
Each primary school child	300	500
Each secondary school member	600	1 000

**Note:** Source is the Malawi SCTP Midline Report (2015). Primary school benefit provided for household residents age 21 or below in primary school. Secondary school benefit provided for household residents age 30 or below in secondary school.

**Table 2 Baseline household and individual sample sizes by district and treatment status**

district	Treatment status			total
	control	treatment	ineligible	
Salima	975	800	417	2192
	<i>4 758</i>	<i>3 821</i>	<i>2 069</i>	<i>10 648</i>
Mangochi	878	878	404	2 160
	<i>3 733</i>	<i>3 766</i>	<i>2 030</i>	<i>9 529</i>
Total	1 853	1 678	821	4 352
	<i>8 491</i>	<i>7 587</i>	<i>4 099</i>	<i>20 177</i>
Attrition HH level (%)	5.0	4.3		4.7

**Note:** Sample of individuals in italic.

**Table 3** Baseline demographic variables of eligible households

	treatment	control	diff	total
Household size	4.46	4.51	-0.05	4.49
Household size (adult equivalents)	3.59	3.62	-0.03	3.61
Head is male, proportion	0.17	0.16	0.01	0.17
Head is female, proportion	0.83	0.84	-0.01	0.83
Head is married, proportion	0.30	0.29	0.01	0.29
Head is single, proportion	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.02
Head is separated/divorced	0.23	0.26	<b>-0.03*</b>	0.25
Head is widow, proportion	0.45	0.42	0.03	0.44
Head is elderly, proportion	0.49	0.43	<b>0.06**</b>	0.46
Age of head (years)	59.23	57.26	<b>1.97*</b>	58.23
Sex ratio in HH (males/females)	0.88	0.90	-0.02	0.89
Dependency ratio	2.68	2.71	-0.03	2.70
Age 0-14 #	2.35	2.45	-0.10	2.40
Age 15-19 # individuals	0.49	0.48	0.01	0.49
Age 15-19 # males	0.27	0.25	0.02	0.26
Age 15-19 # females	0.22	0.23	-0.01	0.23



Age 20-34 # individuals	0.36	0.36	0.00	0.36
Age 20-34 # males	0.14	0.13	0.01	0.13
Age 20-34 # females	0.22	0.23	-0.01	0.23
Age 35-59 # individuals	0.47	0.51	-0.04	0.49
Age 35-59 # males	0.13	0.14	-0.01	0.14
Age 35-59 # females	0.34	0.37	-0.03	0.35
Age >=60 # individuals	0.79	0.72	<b>0.07**</b>	0.75
Age >=60 # males	0.20	0.19	0.01	0.20
Age >=60 # females	0.59	0.53	<b>0.06***</b>	0.56
# Adults (>17) with no education	1.07	1.05	0.02	1.07
# Males with no education	0.61	0.67	-0.06	0.64
# Females with no education	1.28	1.28	0.00	1.28
Head with no education, proportion	0.71	0.72	-0.01	0.72
# Adults (>17) with primary education	0.64	0.61	0.03	0.63
# Males with primary education	1.10	1.08	0.02	1.09
# Females with primary education	1.10	1.12	-0.02	1.11
Head with primary education, proportion	0.27	0.27	0.00	0.27
# Adults (>17) with secondary education	0.06	0.06	0.00	0.06
# Males with secondary education	0.05	0.04	0.01	0.04
# Females with secondary education	0.03	0.03	0.00	0.03
Head with primary secondary, proportion	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01

**Note:** Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*), 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels. For this and all tables, the asterisks in the diff column refer to statistical differences between treatment and control groups in the eligible sample.

**Table 4 Share of eligible households producing given crop and quantity harvested (by treatment status, baseline)**

	treatment	control	diff	total
<b>HH owns or cultivates land</b>	0.95	0.96	-0.01	0.96
<b><u>HH producing</u></b>				
maize	0.92	0.93	-0.01	0.92
groundnut	0.19	0.17	0.02	0.18
pigeon pea ( <i>nandolo</i> )	0.19	0.22	-0.03	0.20
<i>nkhwani</i>	0.07	0.04	0.03	0.06
rice	0.04	0.06	-0.02	0.05
cotton	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.02
sorghum	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.03
<b><u>Quantity harvested (kg)</u></b>				
maize	219.59	224.38	-4.79	222.02
groundnut	14.05	14.79	-0.74	14.43
pigeon pea ( <i>nandolo</i> )	7.78	12.48	-4.70	10.17
<i>nkhwani</i>	2.26	0.42	1.84	1.33
rice	1.82	1.91	-0.09	1.87
cotton	2.10	1.58	0.52	1.84
sorghum	3.29	1.06	2.23	2.16
N	1 678	1 853		3 531

**Note:** Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*), 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels.

**Table 5** Share of eligible households owning livestock, number owned, and value of livestock (by treatment status, baseline)

	treatment	control	diff	total
<b><u>Proportion HH</u></b>				
chickens	0.16	0.15	0.01	0.15
goats/sheep	0.10	0.10	0.00	0.10
cows/bulls/oxen	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
birds	0.03	0.03	0.00	0.03
pigs	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01
<b><u># Livestock</u></b>				
chickens	0.64	0.56	0.08	0.60
goats/sheep	0.27	0.28	-0.01	0.28
cows/bulls/oxen	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
birds	0.25	0.22	0.03	0.23
pigs	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01
<b><u>Value livestock (MWK)</u></b>				
purchases	180.50	144.71	35.79	162.32
sales	686.36	509.92	176.44	596.53
N	1 678	1 853		3 531

**Note:** Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*), 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels.

**Table 6** Share of eligible households using crop and livestock inputs, and amount spent or used (by treatment status, baseline)

	treatment	control	diff	total
<b><u>HH using</u></b>				
<i>Crop input</i>				
chemical fertilizer	0.66	0.65	-0.01	0.66
organic fertilizer	0.23	0.26	-0.03	0.24
pesticide	0.03	0.02	<b>-0.01**</b>	0.02
improved or hybrid seed	0.39	0.41	-0.02	0.40
<i>Livestock input</i>				
fodder	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
manufactured feeds, salt	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
vet services, drugs, or medicines	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b><u>Amount</u></b>				
chemical fertilizer (kg)	27.04	27.62	-0.58	27.34
organic fertilizer (MWK)	210.01	276.78	<b>-66.77***</b>	243.93
N	1 678	1 853		3 531

**Note:** Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*) , 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels.

**Table 7 Share of eligible households receiving/giving private transfers and associated amounts (by treatment status, baseline)**

	treatment	control	diff	total
<b><u>HH receiving</u></b>				
any transfer	0.80	0.85	-0.05	0.82
cash transfer	0.41	0.46	-0.05	0.43
food, other cons	0.71	0.79	-0.08	0.75
labour or time	0.33	0.37	<b>-0.04**</b>	0.35
ag tools or inputs	0.20	0.22	-0.02	0.21
<b><u>Amount received</u></b>				
all	10 804.06	13 242.03	-2 437.97	12 042.44
cash transfer	2 678.78	2 749.26	-70.48	2 714.57
food, other cons	6 036.36	8 217.79	<b>-2 181.43*</b>	7 144.06
labour or time	2 086.07	2 274.98	-188.91	2 182.03
<b><u>HH giving</u></b>				
any transfer	0.28	0.33	-0.05	0.31
cash transfer	0.05	0.05	0.00	0.05
food, other cons	0.21	0.25	-0.04	0.23
labour or time	0.12	0.13	-0.01	0.12
ag tools or inputs	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.03
<b><u>Amount given</u></b>				
all	995.00	947.73	47.27	970.99
cash transfer	140.94	110.39	30.55	125.42
food, other cons	402.95	451.53	-48.58	427.63
labour or time	451.11	385.82	65.29	417.95
N	1 678	1 853		3 531

**Note:** Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*), 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels.

**Table 8** Eligible adult (aged 18-59) labour participation (by treatment status, baseline), individual level

	treatment	control	diff	total
<b><u>Female</u></b>				
<i>Past season</i>				
farming activity	0.91	0.92	-0.01	0.91
<i>Last seven days</i>				
<i>ganyu</i>	0.36	0.40	<b>-0.04*</b>	0.38
wage labour	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.02
self-enterprise	0.12	0.11	0.01	0.12
<b>Observations</b>	1 074	1 264		2 338
<b><u>Male</u></b>				
<i>Past season</i>				
farming activity	0.85	0.83	0.02	0.84
<i>Last seven days</i>				
<i>ganyu</i>	0.36	0.35	0.01	0.35
wage labour	0.01	0.03	<b>-0.02**</b>	0.02
self-enterprise	0.08	0.10	-0.02	0.09
<b>N</b>	613	663		1 276

**Note:** Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*) , 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels.

**Table 9 Impact of SCTP on crop production, last rainy season**

	all		fhh		mhh		small or no farm		medium farm		large farm	
<i>Crop enterprise (prop)</i>												
maize	-0.01	0.91	-0.02	0.90	0.02	0.94	-0.02	0.88	-0.01	0.98	0.01	0.94
	[-0.45]		[-0.67]		[1.05]		[0.84]		[-0.37]		[0.59]	
groundnut	0.08	0.17	0.07	0.17	0.11	0.19	0.06	0.12	0.06	0.23	<b>0.13**</b>	0.25
	[1.62]		[1.62]		[1.61]		[1.32]		[0.68]		[2.54]	
pigeon pea	<b>-0.07*</b>	0.19	<b>-0.09*</b>	0.19	-0.01	0.15	-0.05	0.18	<b>-0.14***</b>	0.23	<b>-0.08*</b>	0.18
	[-1.94]		[-1.70]		[-0.32]		[1.48]		[-2.58]		[-1.65]	
<i>nkhwani</i>	-0.04	0.05	-0.04	0.05	-0.03	0.03	-0.06	0.04	0.00	0.06	<b>-0.02*</b>	0.05
	[-1.07]		[-1.03]		[-0.72]		[-1.15]		[0.04]		[-1.95]	
rice	-0.011	0.03	-0.01	0.03	<b>-0.02**</b>	0.03	<b>-0.03***</b>	0.01	-0.02	0.05	-0.04	0.07
	[-1.01]		[-0.45]		[-2.38]		[-5.06]		[-0.87]		[-1.62]	
cotton	0.02	0.05	0.02	0.04	0.05	0.12	0.02	0.02	<b>0.08***</b>	0.08	-0.02	0.14
	[1.51]		[1.38]		[1.36]		[1.48]		[3.34]		[-0.64]	
sorghum	<b>-0.02**</b>	0.03	-0.02	0.03	<b>-0.04***</b>	0.04	-0.01	0.03	<b>-0.05***</b>	0.04	<b>-0.04***</b>	0.04
	[-1.99]		[-1.06]		[-3.67]		[-0.65]		[-2.69]		[-2.67]	
<i>Crop harvested (kg)</i>												

maize	15.55	161.79	13.94	158.33	<b>24.99*</b>	179.82	10.19	141.37	<b>36.56**</b>	190.68	22.510	190.89
	[0.83]		[0.70]		[1.69]		[0.52]		[2.25]		[1.53]	
groundnut	<b>6.82**</b>	9.64	<b>6.61**</b>	9.58	<b>8.81*</b>	9.95	<b>7.55***</b>	6.25	4.78	12.70	<b>7.985*</b>	15.69
	[2.42]		[2.21]		[1.82]		[3.04]		[0.68]		[1.83]	
pigeon pea	0.19	5.75	0.06	5.83	0.88	5.34	1.08	5.20	-2.41	7.27	<b>3.466*</b>	6.02
	[0.10]		[0.03]		[0.20]		[0.62]		[-0.95]		[1.77]	
<i>nhkwani</i>	-0.73	0.45	-0.60	0.47	-1.39	0.37	-0.72	0.37	-1.13	0.66	0.594	0.52
	[-0.83]		[-0.71]		[-1.52]		[-0.72]		[-1.02]		[0.54]	
rice	-2.17	0.91	-2.01	0.96	-2.49	0.69	-1.47	0.31	-1.65	1.61	-3.550	1.89
	[-0.76]		[-0.70]		[-1.05]		[-0.50]		[-0.38]		[-1.39]	
cotton	0.41	0.89	-0.32	0.54	<b>5.43*</b>	2.70	0.25	0.19	0.52	0.96	0.901	2.52
	[0.64]		[-0.86]		[1.77]		[0.76]		[0.38]		[0.54]	
sorghum	-0.67	0.93	-0.44	0.89	<b>-1.89*</b>	1.09	-0.39	0.84	-1.17	1.04	-0.830	1.06
	[-1.42]		[-1.13]		[-1.91]		[-0.89]		[-1.48]		[-1.01]	
<b><i>Crop area (acres)</i></b>												
maize	-0.10	0.94	-0.03	0.92	<b>0.10***</b>	1.03	0.01	0.65	-0.01	1.20	<b>-0.06**</b>	1.46
	[-0.31]		[-0.70]		[2.87]		[0.32]		[-0.31]		[-2.39]	
groundnut	<b>0.08***</b>	0.13	<b>0.08***</b>	0.12	<b>0.10**</b>	0.14	<b>0.07***</b>	0.07	0.07	0.19	<b>0.10***</b>	0.22



	[3.92]		[3.91]		[2.02]		[3.58]		[1.01]		[2.97]		
pigeon pea	-0.08	0.18	-0.08	0.18	-0.04	0.18	-0.05	0.13	-0.01	0.25	-0.16	0.28	
	[-1.39]		[-1.46]		[-1.06]		[-1.18]		[-1.11]		[-1.33]		
<i>nkhwani</i>	-0.02	0.03	-0.02	0.03	-0.020	0.02	-0.03	0.02	-0.02	0.05	-0.01	0.04	
	[-1.11]		[-1.13]		[-1.10]		[-1.19]		[-0.74]		[-0.57]		
rice	-0.00	0.03	-0.00	0.03	-0.00	0.03	<b>-0.03***</b>	0.01	0.03	0.05	-0.04	0.08	
	[-0.32]		[-0.01]		[-0.31]		[-4.80]		[0.86]		[-0.16]		
cotton	<b>-0.01**</b>	0.02	<b>-0.01**</b>	0.01	0.01	0.04	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.02	<b>-0.02**</b>	0.05	
	[-2.03]		[-2.14]		[0.54]		[-0.23]		[-0.45]		[-1.98]		
sorghum	-0.01	0.02	-0.01	0.02	<b>-0.04*</b>	0.03	-0.01	0.01	-0.00	0.03	<b>-0.04***</b>	0.03	
	[-1.64]		[-1.31]		[-1.82]		[-0.91]		[-0.22]		[-2.97]		
<b>N</b>	6 733		5 623		1 110		3 965		1 126		1 642		

Note: Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*), 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels. Robust standard errors presented in parentheses. Bold indicates that they are significant at  $p < .10$ . Directly above the standard errors is the treatment effect for the indicator, and in the following column is the baseline value. † refers to an instance where the estimation could not converge, a lack of observations across strata, or where there were no observations. Estimates for binary outcomes are reported using marginal effects.

**Table 10 Impact of SCTP on hh crop productivity (kg per acre) and value of production (MWK), last rainy season**

	all		fhh		mhh		small or no farm		medium farm		large farm	
<i>Crop productivity</i>												
maize	16.73	179.24	13.63	177.40	<b>26.88*</b>	188.83	3.57	188.21	<b>49.12***</b>	184.98	23.42	153.48
	[1.06]		[0.84]		[1.79]		[0.17]		[4.08]		[1.40]	
groundnut	<b>9.93**</b>	17.23	<b>9.22*</b>	17.04	<b>15.01**</b>	18.19	<b>7.92*</b>	13.41	14.34	23.01	<b>13.94***</b>	22.39
	[2.00]		[1.80]		[2.32]		[1.71]		[1.55]		[2.84]	
pigeon pea	-0.39	7.34	-1.02	7.38	2.19	7.12	-0.46	7.19	-2.55	9.38	0.95	6.27
	[-0.17]		[-0.40]		[0.44]		[-0.18]		[-0.88]		[0.30]	
nkhwani	-1.95	1.03	-1.68	1.05	-3.00	0.95	-2.06	1.09	-2.46	0.87	-1.05	1.01
	[-1.23]		[-1.18]		[-1.16]		[-1.17]		[-1.16]		[-0.72]	
rice	-4.93	1.43	-4.08	1.56	-8.12	0.75	-3.82	0.58	-2.73	3.03	<b>-9.42***</b>	2.35
	[-0.97]		[-0.83]		[-1.58]		[-0.72]		[-0.36]		[-4.06]	
cotton	-0.06	1.23	<b>-0.89*</b>	0.80	<b>5.43***</b>	3.48	0.350	0.34	-0.79	1.73	0.99	3.03
	[-0.10]		[-1.66]		[2.60]		[0.71]		[-0.59]		[0.84]	
sorghum	-0.89	1.49	-0.67	1.38	<b>-2.03***</b>	2.09	-0.16	1.47	-4.56	2.02	-0.36	1.18
	[-1.19]		[-0.83]		[-2.79]		[-0.22]		[-1.81]		[-1.04]	
<i>Value of production</i>												
Val of production 1	1 512.56	1 3465	1 250.32	1 3139	<b>2 906.89**</b>	15163	1 825.17	11 262	<b>1 702.44**</b>	16 184	930.78	16 879
	[1.28]		[1.11]		[1.99]		[1.29]		[2.18]		[0.63]	
Val of production 2	1 302.03	13 585	1 038.95	13 309	<b>2 726.90***</b>	15 028	1 573.48	11 404	<b>1 433.47*</b>	16 411	845.17	16 875
	[1.03]		[0.86]		[3.84]		[1.12]		[1.90]		[0.51]	
N	6 733		5 623		1 110		3 965		1 126		1 642	

Note: Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*), 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels. Robust standard errors presented in parentheses. Bold indicates that they are significant at  $p < .10$ . Directly above the standard errors is the treatment effect for the indicator, and in the following column is the baseline value. † refers to an instance where the estimation could not converge, a lack of observations across strata, or where there were no observations. Estimates for binary outcomes are reported using marginal effects. Value of production 1 uses baseline quantities using baseline prices, follow-up quantities using follow-up prices, and regressions using prices. Value of production 2 uses baseline and follow-up quantities using follow-up prices.

**Table 11 Impact of SCTP on hh crop productivity (kg per acre) and value of production (MWK), last rainy season**

	all		FISP		non-FISP	
<b>Crop productivity</b>						
maize	16.73	179.24	<b>32.67***</b>	207.34	2.89	146.28
	[1.06]		[5.14]		[0.10]	
groundnut	<b>9.93**</b>	17.23	<b>7.95*</b>	23.19	<b>11.47***</b>	10.21
	[2.00]		[1.73]		[2.65]	
pigeon pea	-0.39	7.34	-1.49	9.93	0.49	4.30
	[-0.17]		[-0.61]		[0.28]	
<i>nkhwani</i>	-1.95	1.03	-1.27	0.991	-3.05	1.08
	[-1.23]		[-1.01]		[-1.29]	
rice	-4.93	1.43	-4.02	1.58	-5.91	1.25
	[-0.97]		[-1.02]		[-0.99]	
cotton	-0.06	1.23	<b>-1.77***</b>	1.50	<b>2.31**</b>	0.91
	[-0.10]		[-3.36]		[2.37]	
sorghum	-0.89	1.49	<b>-1.38*</b>	1.73	-0.368	1.21
	[-1.19]		[-1.67]		[-0.54]	
<b>Value of production</b>						
Val of production 1	1 512.56	13 465	<b>2 622.08***</b>	16 401.45	1 059.95	10 013.89
	[1.28]		[3.20]		[0.63]	
Val of production 2	1 302.03	13 585	<b>2 465.35**</b>	16 637.46	824.61	9 999.01
	[1.03]		[2.54]		[0.46]	
N	6 733		3 517		3 216	

Note: Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*), 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels. Robust standard errors presented in parentheses. Bold indicates that they are significant at  $p < .10$ . Directly above the standard errors is the treatment effect for the indicator, and in the following column is the baseline value. † refers to an instance where the estimation could not converge, a lack of observations across strata, or where there were no observations. Estimates for binary outcomes are reported using marginal effects. Value of production 1 uses baseline quantities using baseline prices, follow-up quantities using follow-up prices, and regressions using prices. Value of production 2 uses baseline and follow-up quantities using follow-up prices.

**Table 12 Impact of SCTP on hh selling crop (proportion) and amount of crop sold (kg), last rainy season**

	all		fhh		mhh		small or no farm		medium farm		large farm	
<i>HH selling crop</i>												
any crop	<b>0.06*</b>	0.21	<b>0.06*</b>	0.21	0.08	0.22	<b>0.12***</b>	0.15	0.07	0.26	-0.05	0.31
	[1.71]		[1.68]		[1.17]		[4.16]		[1.45]		[-1.29]	
maize	0.01	0.04	0.00	0.04	-0.01	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.04	-0.03	0.07
	[0.62]		[0.38]		[-0.44]		[1.63]		[0.88]		[-1.19]	
groundnut	0.02	0.06	<b>0.02**</b>	0.06	0.00	0.06	<b>0.04***</b>	0.04	-0.01	0.07	0.01	0.10
	[1.17]		[2.14]		[0.33]		[2.98]		[-0.21]		[0.53]	
pigeon pea	<b>0.05**</b>	0.12	<b>0.04*</b>	0.13	<b>0.09***</b>	0.08	<b>0.10***</b>	0.11	0.06	0.15	<b>-0.13***</b>	0.13
	[2.01]		[1.67]		[3.21]		[4.14]		[1.60]		[-3.19]	
<i>nkhwani</i>	<b>-0.02***</b>	0.00	<b>-0.02***</b>	0.00	+	0.00	+	0.00	+	0.00	+	0.00
	[-12.85]		[-9.68]									
rice	<b>-0.02***</b>	0.00	<b>-0.02**</b>	0.00	+	0.00	<b>-0.02***</b>	0.00	<b>-0.05**</b>	0.04	<b>-0.04***</b>	0.00
	[-3.51]		[-2.39]				[-4.60]		[-2.53]		[-2.63]	
cotton	0.01	0.05	0.01	0.03	0.05	0.11	0.01	0.01	<b>0.09***</b>	0.07	-0.04	0.12
	[0.80]		[1.06]		[1.22]		[0.57]		[3.48]		[-1.55]	
sorghum	<b>-0.01***</b>	0.00	+	0.00	+	0.00	+	0.00	+	0.00	+	0.00
	[12.92]											
<i>Amount of crop sold</i>												
maize	-0.36	2.16	0.58	2.03	-6.54	2.84	0.76	1.31	<b>3.16*</b>	2.37	-4.47	4.08
	[-0.13]		[0.23]		[-1.42]		[0.36]		[1.68]		[-0.86]	
groundnut	<b>2.95*</b>	3.36	2.94	3.44	<b>3.38***</b>	2.95	<b>3.64***</b>	1.78	2.74	4.88	1.65	6.11
	[1.74]		[1.55]		[3.49]		[3.11]		[0.85]		[0.63]	
pigeon pea	0.76	1.36	0.61	1.41	1.29	1.09	1.24	1.07	-0.75	2.17	0.56	1.49
	[0.85]		[0.93]		[0.54]		[1.46]		[-1.18]		[0.45]	
<i>nkhwani</i>	0.03	0.04	0.01	0.05	<b>0.15*</b>	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.01	0.03	0.08	0.14
	[0.34]		[0.11]		[1.89]		[1.06]		[0.08]		[0.27]	
rice	-1.84	0.61	-2.05	0.68	-1.14	0.27	-0.32	0.10	-1.21	0.55	-6.41	1.91



**Table 13 Impact of SCTP on use of crop inputs, last rainy season**

	all		fhh		mhh		small or no farm		medium farm		large farm	
hh applies chemical fertilizer	-0.02	0.66	-0.03	0.65	-0.00	0.72	-0.04	0.60	0.06	0.74	-0.04	0.74
	[-0.42]		[-0.46]		[-0.15]		[-0.71]		[1.03]		[-0.55]	
amount of chemical fertilizer by hh, in kg	1.68	27.57	1.26	26.22	3.54	34.60	0.92	22.05	<b>5.56**</b>	35.59	0.50	35.29
	[0.59]		[0.40]		[1.44]		[0.35]		[2.51]		[0.12]	
total chemical fertilizer, kg per acre	0.76	25.65	1.74	25.00	-5.64	29.04	-0.96	30.69	<b>5.91***</b>	24.37	1.15	14.35
	[0.27]		[0.53]		[-1.00]		[-0.34]		[3.36]		[0.33]	
hh applies organic fertilizer	0.02	0.25	0.00	0.24	0.07	0.28	0.01	0.22	-0.05	0.29	<b>0.07***</b>	0.28
	[1.03]		[0.35]		[1.24]		[0.30]		[-1.01]		[2.60]	
total exp of organic fertilizer by hh, in MWK	<b>158***</b>	244.76	<b>139***</b>	227.79	<b>276.3**</b>	333.27	<b>150***</b>	192.32	106.23	286.98	<b>221***</b>	341.98
	[4.85]		[4.80]		[2.27]		[5.60]		[1.13]		[4.03]	
total organic fertilizer MWK, per acre	<b>99.5***</b>	225.19	<b>88.1***</b>	219.23	<b>154.93*</b>	256.23	<b>81***</b>	268.17	78.94	197.91	<b>165***</b>	140.37
	[3.69]		[3.49]		[1.81]		[2.87]		[1.25]		[3.65]	
hh applies pesticide	0.00	0.02	-0.00	0.02	0.03	0.05	-0.00	0.01	<b>0.03*</b>	0.03	0.02	0.05
	[0.43]		[-0.24]		[0.89]		[-1.33]		[1.89]		[0.49]	
hh uses improved or hybrid seed	-0.01	0.40	-0.00	0.38	<b>-0.11***</b>	0.49	0.01	0.36	<b>-0.12***</b>	0.43	-0.02	0.49
	[-0.21]		[-0.15]		[-2.61]		[0.52]		[-3.46]		[-0.43]	
N	6 733		5 623		1 110		3 965		1 126		1 642	

Note: Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*), 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels. Robust standard errors presented in parentheses. Bold indicates that they are significant at  $p < .10$ . Directly above the standard errors is the treatment effect for the indicator, and in the following column is the baseline value. † refers to an instance where the estimation could not converge, a lack of observations across strata, or where there were no observations. Estimates for binary outcomes are reported using marginal effects.

**Table 14 Impact of SCTP on use of crop inputs, last rainy season**

	all		FISP		non-FISP	
hh applies chemical fertilizer	-0.02	0.66	0.02	0.95	-0.03	0.32
	[-0.40]		[0.61]		[-0.33]	
amount of chemical fertilizer by hh, in kg	1.68	27.57	2.20	42.59	3.01	9.92
	[0.59]		[0.79]		[1.08]	
total chemical fertilizer kg, per <b>acre</b>	0.76	25.65	0.82	38.99	1.94	9.98
	[0.27]		[0.25]		[0.77]	
hh applies organic fertilizer	0.02	0.25	0.02	0.23	-0.00	0.27
	[1.03]		[0.80]		[-0.02]	
total exp of organic fertilizer by hh, in MWK	<b>157.58***</b>	244.76	<b>140.82***</b>	218.34	<b>165.86***</b>	275.60
	[4.85]		[3.33]		[4.98]	
total organic fertilizer MWK, per <b>acre</b>	<b>99.51***</b>	225.19	<b>111.36**</b>	179.68	<b>72.13*</b>	278.45
	[3.69]		[2.36]		[1.81]	
hh applies pesticide	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.03	0.01	0.02
	[0.43]		[0.08]		[0.80]	
hh uses improved or hybrid seed	-0.01	0.40	-0.01	0.51	0.02	0.27
	[-0.21]		[-0.20]		[0.67]	
N	6 733		3 517		3 216	

Note: Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*), 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels. Robust standard errors presented in parentheses. Bold indicates that they are significant at  $p < .10$ . Directly above the standard errors is the treatment effect for the indicator, and in the following column is the baseline value. † refers to an instance where the estimation could not converge, a lack of observations across strata, or where there were no observations. Estimates for binary outcomes are reported using marginal effects.

**Table 15 Impact of SCTP on land tenure arrangement and land management practices, last rainy season**

	all		fhh		mhh		small or no farm		medium farm		large farm	
hh has plot that is irrigated	0.01	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.02	0.06	-0.01	0.03	<b>0.04**</b>	0.06	-0.00	0.09
	[1.18]		[0.82]		[0.72]		[-0.72]		[2.29]		[-0.01]	
hh plot area devoted that is irrigated	0.01	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.03	0.06	-0.01	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.04	0.14
	[1.30]		[0.37]		[1.00]		[-1.43]		[0.63]		[1.34]	
hh used cover crop before cultivation of rainy season	0.06	0.12	0.06	0.12	0.06	0.11	0.06	0.12	0.10	0.14	0.05	0.11
	[1.03]		[1.01]		[1.22]		[1.01]		[1.44]		[0.78]	
<b><i>Tenure arrangement, prop</i></b>												
rented-in plot	0.01	0.05	<b>0.01**</b>	0.06	<b>-0.03**</b>	0.05	-0.01	0.05	0.04	0.06	0.01	0.06
	[1.39]		[1.97]		[-2.23]		[-0.53]		[1.19]		[0.89]	
used plot	-0.02	0.94	-0.02	0.93	0.01	0.96	-0.03	0.91	0.01	0.99	0.00	0.96
	[-0.78]		[-0.92]		[0.72]		[-1.04]		[0.74]		[0.06]	
rented-out plot	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.02	-0.01	0.02	0.00	0.01	-0.03	0.02	0.01	0.05
	[0.75]		[0.33]		[-0.43]		[0.49]		[-1.21]		[0.24]	
<b><i>Land preparation, prop</i></b>												
traditional ridging	-0.01	0.87	0.00	0.86	-0.05	0.90	-0.00	0.84	0.03	0.93	-0.05	0.90
	[-0.15]		[0.05]		[-1.29]		[-0.05]		[0.50]		[-0.95]	
tied or box ridging	-0.00	0.03	-0.01	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.02	-0.02	0.05
	[-0.32]		[-0.79]		[1.24]		[0.65]		[0.53]		[-0.89]	
planting pits	-0.01	0.03	-0.01	0.03	0.01	0.02	-0.02	0.02	0.02	0.04	-0.01	0.04
	[-0.78]		[-0.94]		[0.97]		[-1.46]		[1.34]		[0.55]	
minimum tillage	<b>0.03*</b>	0.04	<b>0.03*</b>	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.10	0.07	<b>0.04*</b>	0.07
	[1.70]		[1.73]		[1.53]		[1.31]		[1.45]		[1.66]	
ploughing	-0.01	0.02	-0.01	0.02	<b>-0.03***</b>	0.01	-0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.02	<b>-0.03**</b>	0.04
	[-1.07]		[-0.63]		[-2.98]		[-0.86]		[-1.50]		[-1.97]	



crop residue use	0.06	0.26	0.06	0.25	0.08	0.30	<b>0.10**</b>	0.21	-0.01	0.30	0.02	0.34
	[1.46]		[1.46]		[1.03]		[2.51]		[-0.10]		[0.36]	
N	6 733		5 623		1 110		3 965		1 126		1 642	

Note: Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*), 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels. Robust standard errors presented in parentheses. Bold indicates that they are significant at  $p < .10$ . Directly above the standard errors is the treatment effect for the indicator, and in the following column is the baseline value. † refers to an instance where the estimation could not converge, a lack of observations across strata, or where there were no observations. Estimates for binary outcomes are reported using marginal effects.

**Table 16 Impact of SCTP on expenditure on, and ownership of, agricultural assets, last rainy season**

	all		fhh		mhh		small or no farm		medium farm		large farm	
<i>HH expenditure (MKW)</i>												
hand hoe	<b>132.00***</b>	65.48	<b>134.96***</b>	54.52	<b>125.97*</b>	122.62	<b>141.65***</b>	42.05	<b>148.62***</b>	77.33	<b>100.04**</b>	113.83
	[3.99]		[5.63]		[1.76]		[3.78]		[4.22]		[2.30]	
axe	<b>8.70*</b>	2.04	5.39	1.31	<b>22.46***</b>	5.86	3.24	1.75	<b>13.31**</b>	1.87	<b>17.28***</b>	2.86
	[1.89]		[0.95]		[5.68]		[0.59]		[2.21]		[3.53]	
panga knife	<b>10.14***</b>	4.21	<b>8.70**</b>	2.14	22.51	14.99	<b>11.56***</b>	1.60	<b>11.15***</b>	1.09	3.83	12.71
	[3.84]		[2.32]		[1.04]		[3.98]		[4.20]		[0.79]	
sickle	<b>8.51***</b>	3.69	<b>9.60***</b>	3.43	1.05	5.04	<b>8.59***</b>	3.10	<b>5.83**</b>	3.13	<b>13.97***</b>	5.52
	[4.58]		[5.28]		[0.27]		[3.28]		[2.17]		[2.73]	
<i>HH ownership (prop.)</i>												
hand hoe	0.01	0.87	0.01	0.86	0.01	0.93	0.01	0.83	0.00	0.93	0.01	0.93
	[0.32]		[0.34]		[0.42]		[0.15]		[0.20]		[0.57]	
axe	0.04	0.14	0.03	0.12	0.04	0.24	0.02	0.10	0.06	0.16	<b>0.09**</b>	0.20
	[0.84]		[0.68]		[0.91]		[0.41]		[0.83]		[2.08]	
panga knife	0.02	0.23	0.03	0.19	-0.05	0.45	0.00	0.19	0.05	0.24	0.05	0.33
	[0.48]		[0.58]		[-1.21]		[0.12]		[0.99]		[1.06]	
sickle	<b>0.06***</b>	0.18	0.04	0.17	<b>0.16***</b>	0.27	<b>0.06**</b>	0.15	0.05	0.22	0.05	0.24
	[2.88]		[1.42]		[5.92]		[2.34]		[0.78]		[1.05]	
<i>Number owned</i>												
hand hoe	<b>0.18*</b>	1.84	<b>0.18*</b>	1.74	<b>0.20*</b>	2.34	0.11	1.58	0.15	2.09	<b>0.38***</b>	2.29

	[1.75]		[1.77]		[1.81]		[0.93]		[1.11]		[3.68]	
axe	0.05	0.14	0.05	0.12	0.05	0.25	0.03	0.11	0.09	0.17	<b>0.10*</b>	0.21
	[1.33]		[1.13]		[1.29]		[0.95]		[1.51]		[1.92]	
panga knife	0.05	0.25	0.05	0.20	0.01	0.49	0.05	0.20	<b>0.09*</b>	0.26	0.05	0.36
	[1.22]		[1.10]		[0.27]		[1.37]		[1.67]		[0.84]	
sickle	<b>0.10***</b>	0.19	0.05	0.17	<b>0.32***</b>	0.29	<b>0.09***</b>	0.15	<b>0.22*</b>	0.23	0.04	0.26
	[3.30]		[1.52]		[5.09]		[3.46]		[1.69]		[0.45]	
N	6 733		5 623		1 110		3 965		1 126		1 642	

Note: Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*), 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels. Robust standard errors presented in parentheses. Bold indicates that they are significant at  $p < .10$ . Directly above the standard errors is the treatment effect for the indicator, and in the following column is the baseline value. † refers to an instance where the estimation could not converge, a lack of observations across strata, or where there were no observations. Estimates for binary outcomes are reported using marginal effects.

**Table 17 Impact of SCTP on overall livestock, last 12 months**

	all	fhh	mhh	small or no farm	medium farm	large farm
total HH expenditure for livestock	<b>1 152.98***</b>	74.03	<b>1 154.42***</b>	83.57	<b>1 039.36***</b>	<b>1 791.92***</b>
	[11.74]		[10.22]		[9.44]	[11.07]
hh raised or owned livestock, proportion	<b>0.14***</b>	0.29	<b>0.14***</b>	0.40	<b>0.15***</b>	<b>0.09***</b>
	[2.58]		[2.81]		[3.79]	[1.21]
total livestock units (TLU) owned	<b>0.04***</b>	0.01	<b>0.03***</b>	0.03	<b>0.03***</b>	<b>0.05***</b>
	[4.34]		[2.78]		[4.20]	[8.69]
total hh livestock sales	<b>-111.74**</b>	379.63	-75.83	578.35	52.36	<b>-523.09***</b>
	[-2.01]		[-1.18]		[0.66]	[-3.49]
N	6 733		5 623		3 965	1 642

Note: Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*), 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels. Robust standard errors presented in parentheses. Bold indicates that they are significant at  $p < .10$ . Directly above the standard errors is the treatment effect for the indicator, and in the following column is the baseline value. † refers to an instance where the estimation could not converge, a lack of observations across strata, or where there were no observations. Estimates for binary outcomes are reported using marginal effects.

**Table 18 Impact of SCTP on livestock ownership and number of livestock owned, last 12 months**

	all		fhh		mhh		small or no farm		medium farm		large farm	
<i>Livestock ownership</i>												
chickens	<b>0.08***</b>	0.16	<b>0.09***</b>	0.14	0.02	0.24	<b>0.09***</b>	0.11	0.09	0.18	<b>0.05**</b>	0.25
	[2.60]		[3.71]		[0.23]		[3.19]		[1.21]		[2.56]	
goats or sheep	<b>0.11***</b>	0.10	<b>0.10***</b>	0.09	<b>0.15***</b>	0.16	<b>0.10***</b>	0.07	<b>0.16***</b>	0.13	<b>0.10***</b>	0.15
	[5.30]		[3.39]		[4.01]		[6.56]		[3.19]		[4.05]	
cows, bulls or oxen	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	†	0.01	†	0.00	†	0.00	<b>-0.01***</b>	0.00
	[-1.15]		[-1.21]								[-3.16]	
pigeons, ducks or doves	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.06	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.04	-0.01	0.05
	[0.30]		[0.23]		[0.30]		[0.57]		[0.91]		[-0.39]	
pigs	<b>0.00**</b>	0.00	<b>0.01*</b>	0.00	†	0.01	†	0.00	†	0.00	<b>0.01***</b>	0.01
	[2.04]		[1.87]								[3.69]	
<i>Number owned</i>												
chickens	<b>0.45***</b>	0.62	<b>0.45***</b>	0.52	<b>0.65***</b>	1.11	<b>0.40***</b>	0.40	<b>0.59**</b>	0.69	<b>0.60**</b>	1.10
	[4.17]		[4.76]		[3.12]		[3.88]		[2.31]		[2.19]	
goats or sheep	<b>0.28***</b>	0.28	<b>0.23***</b>	0.23	<b>0.48**</b>	0.50	<b>0.20***</b>	0.19	<b>0.51***</b>	0.32	<b>0.313***</b>	0.47
	[6.36]		[2.91]		[2.15]		[5.51]		[6.70]		[3.80]	
cows, bulls or oxen	0.01	0.00	-0.001	0.00	0.04	0.00	-0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.04	0.01
	[0.63]		[-0.12]		[0.96]		[-1.63]		[0.95]		[1.17]	
pigeons, ducks or doves	-0.05	0.24	0.023	0.13	-0.46	0.76	0.05	0.16	<b>-0.22*</b>	0.22	-0.16	0.43
	[-0.69]		[0.44]		[-0.75]		[0.54]		[-1.84]		[-0.62]	
pigs	<b>0.003***</b>	0.01	0.003	0.01	<b>0.09***</b>	0.02	<b>0.02***</b>	0.00	-0.01	0.01	<b>0.05**</b>	0.02
	[2.77]		[0.71]		[4.70]		[3.06]		[-0.98]		[1.96]	
N	6 733		5 623		1 110		3 965		1 126		1 642	

Note: Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*), 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels. Robust standard errors presented in parentheses. Bold indicates that they are significant at  $p < .10$ . Directly above the standard errors is the treatment effect for the indicator, and in the following column is the baseline value. † refers to an instance where the estimation could not converge, a lack of observations across strata, or where there were no observations. Estimates for binary outcomes are reported using marginal effects.

**Table 19 Impact of SCTP on livestock expenditure (MWK) and number of livestock purchased, last 12 months**

	all		fhh		mhh		small or no farm		medium farm		large farm	
<i>Livestock expenditure</i>												
chickens	<b>207.12***</b>	30.45	<b>210.56***</b>	27.57	<b>195.16***</b>	45.49	<b>201.58***</b>	19.81	<b>253.61***</b>	47.57	<b>194.54***</b>	45.58
	[5.28]		[6.15]		[2.71]		[5.89]		[4.57]		[3.02]	
goats or sheep	<b>1 211.90***</b>	72.04	<b>1 153.61***</b>	65.91	<b>1 584.72***</b>	104.00	<b>1 094.40***</b>	47.29	<b>1 558.00***</b>	61.92	<b>1 376.28***</b>	139.09
	[12.46]		[10.31]		[6.65]		[11.41]		[9.00]		[7.10]	
cows, bulls or oxen	<b>-81.70**</b>	29.06	<b>-101.75**</b>	34.64	†	0.00	†	0.00	11.98	0.00	<b>-277.84*</b>	119.85
	[-2.10]		[-2.11]						[0.85]		[-1.92]	
pigeons, ducks or doves	14.25	5.13	<b>16.12**</b>	4.57	1.99	8.04	<b>21.674***</b>	3.67	<b>44.07**</b>	5.32	-12.17	8.54
	[1.52]		[2.12]		[0.07]		[2.64]		[2.40]		[-0.89]	
Pigs	35.77	8.33	31.68	4.31	<b>63.11*</b>	29.26	23.695	0.00	6.14	13.15	84.21	25.09
	[1.51]		[1.34]		[1.86]		[1.23]		[0.40]		[1.06]	
<i>Number purchased</i>												
chickens	<b>0.26***</b>	0.06	<b>0.27***</b>	0.05	<b>0.25***</b>	0.10	<b>0.25***</b>	0.04	<b>0.36***</b>	0.08	<b>0.24***</b>	0.10
	[5.11]		[5.52]		[3.67]		[6.49]		[5.17]		[2.68]	
goats or sheep	<b>0.15***</b>	0.02	<b>0.14***</b>	0.02	<b>0.24***</b>	0.02	<b>0.13***</b>	0.01	<b>0.20***</b>	0.02	<b>0.17***</b>	0.04
	[14.18]		[9.85]		[6.09]		[12.92]		[10.09]		[7.38]	
cows, bulls or oxen	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	†	0.00	†	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.00
	[-0.93]		[-0.92]						[0.85]		[-1.39]	
pigeons, ducks or doves	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.03	-0.03	0.02
	[0.40]		[0.97]		[-0.23]		[1.40]		[1.24]		[-0.92]	
pigs	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	<b>0.01**</b>	0.00	<b>0.00**</b>	0.00	-0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01
	[1.14]		[0.68]		[2.38]		[2.36]		[-1.22]		[1.36]	
N	6 733		5 623		1 110		3 965		1 126		1 642	

Note: Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*), 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels. Robust standard errors presented in parentheses. Bold indicates that they are significant at  $p < .10$ . Directly above the standard errors is the treatment effect for the indicator, and in the following column is the baseline value. † refers to an instance where the estimation could not converge, a lack of observations across strata, or where there were no observations. Estimates for binary outcomes are reported using marginal effects.

**Table 20 Impact of SCTP on number of livestock consumed by hh, last 12 months**

	all		fhh		mhh		small or no farm		medium farm		large farm	
<i>Livestock</i>												
chickens	<b>0.08**</b>	0.27	0.06	0.24	0.22	0.45	<b>0.13***</b>	0.19	0.03	0.31	0.04	0.45
	[1.96]		[0.90]		[1.08]		[3.03]		[0.22]		[0.72]	
goats or sheep	<b>0.03***</b>	0.02	<b>0.03***</b>	0.02	<b>0.07**</b>	0.06	<b>0.02***</b>	0.01	0.03	0.02	<b>0.08***</b>	0.06
	[4.12]		[3.18]		[2.43]		[3.95]		[0.96]		[3.57]	
pigeons, ducks or doves	0.02	0.05	0.01	0.03	0.06	0.16	0.05	0.02	-0.05	0.07	0.00	0.10
	[0.53]		[0.40]		[1.14]		[1.33]		[-1.11]		[0.05]	
pigs	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	†	0.00	†	0.00	0.00	0.00
	[0.36]		[1.05]		[-0.15]						[0.49]	
N	6 733		5 623		1 110		3 965		1 126		1 642	

Note: Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*) , 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels. Robust standard errors presented in parentheses. Bold indicates that they are significant at  $p < .10$ . Directly above the standard errors is the treatment effect for the indicator, and in the following column is the baseline value. † refers to an instance where the estimation could not converge, a lack of observations across strata, or where there were no observations. Estimates for binary outcomes are reported using marginal effects.

**Table 21 Impact of SCTP on hh involvement in farming activities, last rainy season**

	all		fhh		mhh		severely constrained		moderately constrained		unconstrained	
<i>Participation</i>												
all farming activities	-0.01	0.93	-0.01	0.92	0.01	0.96	-0.02	0.87	-0.01	0.98	0.00	0.98
	[-0.38]		[-0.37]		[0.47]		[-0.73]		[-0.63]		[0.14]	
land preparation and planting	-0.00	0.92	-0.00	0.92	0.02	0.95	-0.01	0.86	-0.00	0.97	-0.00	0.97
	[-0.01]		[-0.12]		[1.01]		[-0.20]		[-0.08]		[-0.15]	
non-harvest work	-0.00	0.90	-0.01	0.90	0.00	0.93	-0.00	0.84	0.00	0.96	-0.02	0.95
	[-0.02]		[-0.21]		[0.38]		[-0.05]		[0.21]		[-0.78]	
harvest work	0.00	0.87	-0.00	0.87	0.04	0.90	0.01	0.82	-0.01	0.92	-0.04	0.92
	[0.08]		[-0.14]		[1.42]		[0.41]		[-0.40]		[-1.14]	
<i>Total days</i>												
all farming activities	-0.96	89.77	0.05	87.76	-4.82	100.23	0.79	72.59	-2.10	101.86	-3.27	111.15
	[-0.17]		[0.01]		[-0.94]		[0.16]		[-0.33]		[-0.32]	
land preparation and planting	-0.02	47.79	0.39	46.72	-1.18	53.40	0.07	38.75	<b>-0.22*</b>	54.19	-0.23	59.00
	[-0.01]		[0.10]		[-0.56]		[0.02]		[-1.83]		[-0.05]	
non-harvest work	-0.64	34.79	-0.27	34.15	-2.25	38.13	0.95	27.93	-1.83	39.61	-1.71	43.37
	[-0.31]		[-0.11]		[-0.91]		[0.59]		[-0.65]		[-0.36]	
harvest work	-0.26	7.18	-0.07	6.89	-1.03	8.70	-0.11	5.92	-0.08	8.06	-1.33	8.78
	[-0.42]		[-0.10]		[-0.52]		[-0.18]		[-0.15]		[-1.02]	
N	6 731		5 621		1 110		3 130		2 363		1 238	

Note: Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*), 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels. Robust standard errors presented in parentheses. Bold indicates that they are significant at  $p < .10$ . Directly above the standard errors is the treatment effect for the indicator, and in the following column is the baseline value. † refers to an instance where the estimation could not converge, a lack of observations across strata, or where there were no observations. Estimates for binary outcomes are reported using marginal effects.

**Table 22 Impact of SCTP on participation in farming activities, last rainy season**

	all		fhh		mhh		severely constrained		moderately constrained		unconstrained	
<i>All farming activities</i>												
all individuals 18+	0.01	0.90	0.01	0.89	0.02	0.95	-0.00	0.82	0.01	0.97	0.01	0.97
	[0.40]		[0.30]		[1.28]		[-0.28]		[1.05]		[0.37]	
adult males 18-59	0.03	0.86	0.04	0.84	-0.00	0.91	0.08	0.71	0.02	0.86	0.05	0.88
	[0.68]		[0.66]		[-0.12]		[1.44]		[0.61]		[0.45]	
adult females 18-59	-0.01	0.93	0.00	0.93	- <b>0.09***</b>	0.91	-0.04	0.83	0.01	0.95	- <b>0.06***</b>	0.95
	[-0.54]		[0.07]		[-2.62]		[-1.41]		[0.66]		[-2.67]	
elderly males 60+	0.04	0.74	0.07	0.68	0.01	0.78	<b>0.04*</b>	0.72	†	0.78	†	0.69
	[1.41]		[0.84]		[0.20]		[1.81]					
elderly females 60+	<b>0.05***</b>	0.73	<b>0.05***</b>	0.72	0.05	0.86	0.03	0.79	0.08	0.63	†	0.59
	[3.54]		[3.31]		[0.83]		[1.19]		[0.99]			
<i>Land preparation or planting</i>												
all individuals 18+	0.01	0.89	0.01	0.88	0.02	0.95	0.00	0.81	<b>0.02**</b>	0.97	0.01	0.97
	[0.82]		[0.66]		[1.54]		[0.12]		[2.43]		[0.41]	
adult males 18-59	<b>0.07**</b>	0.82	<b>0.07*</b>	0.80	<b>0.06**</b>	0.88	0.05	0.61	<b>0.09***</b>	0.81	0.08	0.86
	[2.44]		[1.84]		[2.47]		[0.94]		[4.36]		[1.09]	
adult females 18-59	-0.01	0.92	-0.00	0.92	-0.07	0.88	-0.04	0.82	0.01	0.94	<b>-0.05**</b>	0.94
	[-0.39]		[-0.14]		[-1.63]		[-1.32]		[0.84]		[-2.22]	
elderly males 60+	<b>0.04*</b>	0.71	0.06	0.65	0.02	0.76	0.07	0.70	†	0.75	†	0.64
	[1.69]		[1.04]		[0.32]		[1.59]					
elderly females 60+	<b>0.06***</b>	0.71	<b>0.06***</b>	0.69	0.08	0.84	<b>0.04**</b>	0.77	0.10	0.59	†	0.58
	[2.68]		[2.67]		[0.87]		[2.42]		[0.93]			
<i>Non-harvest work</i>												
all individuals 18+	0.01	0.87	0.01	0.86	<b>0.02*</b>	0.93	0.01	0.79	0.01	0.95	-0.01	0.95
	[0.62]		[0.34]		[1.72]		[0.34]		[0.78]		[-0.39]	

adult males 18-59	0.04	0.80	0.04	0.79	0.04	0.85	<b>0.12*</b>	0.65	0.03	0.79	0.04	0.84
	[1.03]		[0.69]		[1.42]		[1.87]		[0.91]		[0.55]	
adult females 18-59	-0.01	0.90	-0.00	0.90	<b>-0.08**</b>	0.86	-0.01	0.80	0.02	0.92	<b>-0.08***</b>	0.91
	[-0.39]		[-0.18]		[-2.35]		[-0.39]		[0.51]		[-6.01]	
elderly males 60+	<b>0.07**</b>	0.70	0.13	0.65	0.02	0.74	0.03	0.68	†	0.75	†	0.64
	[2.17]		[1.59]		[0.28]		[0.55]					
elderly females 60+	<b>0.05***</b>	0.69	<b>0.070***</b>	0.67	0.02	0.83	<b>0.04***</b>	0.74	0.06	0.58	†	0.57
	[2.58]		[2.78]		[0.41]		[2.58]		[0.82]			
<b>Harvest work</b>												
all individuals 18+	0.02	0.84	0.01	0.83	<b>0.05*</b>	0.89	0.02	0.76	0.03	0.92	-0.03	0.92
	[0.74]		[0.56]		[2.29]		[0.71]		[1.61]		[-0.94]	
adult males 18-59	0.06	0.74	0.06	0.72	0.00	0.80	<b>0.13**</b>	0.58	<b>0.08**</b>	0.72	0.04	0.78
	[1.37]		[1.25]		[0.03]		[2.47]		[2.43]		[0.44]	
adult females 18-59	-0.00	0.87	0.02	0.87	<b>-0.13***</b>	0.84	0.03	0.78	0.02	0.88	<b>-0.10***</b>	0.89
	[-0.04]		[1.09]		[-3.35]		[0.92]		[1.28]		[-3.51]	
elderly males 60+	<b>0.10***</b>	0.65	<b>0.13*</b>	0.59	0.06	0.70	<b>0.11*</b>	0.63	†	0.69	†	0.61
	[4.52]		[1.84]		[0.89]		[1.95]					
elderly females 60+	0.04	0.67	0.04	0.65	0.03	0.80	0.02	0.73	0.09	0.56	†	0.54
	[0.96]		[1.17]		[0.26]		[0.51]		[0.91]			
N (all individuals 18+)	6 731		5 622		1 109		3 131		2 363		1 237	
N (adult males 18-59)	2 105		1 597		508		316		947		842	
N (adult females 18-59)	3 966		3394		572		835		2 086		1 045	
N (elderly males 60+)	1 295		618		677		773		370		152	
N (elderly females 60+)	3 558		3 136		422		2 371		784		403	

Note: Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*), 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels. Robust standard errors presented in parentheses. Bold indicates that they are significant at  $p < .10$ . Directly above the standard errors is the treatment effect for the indicator, and in the following column is the baseline value. † refers to an instance where the estimation could not converge, a lack of observations across strata, or where there were no observations. Estimates for binary outcomes are reported using marginal effects.



**Table 23 Impact of SCTP on total days in hh spent in farming activities, last rainy season**

	all		fhh		mhh		severely constrained		moderately constrained		unconstrained	
<i>All farming activities</i>												
all individuals 18+	-1.10	63.49	-0.90	60.32	-1.75	80.03	-1.41	47.56	-0.78	70.10	-1.74	92.02
	[-0.37]		[-0.25]		[-0.33]		[-0.62]		[-0.18]		[-0.24]	
adult males 18-59	-1.64	39.49	-1.42	38.77	-2.97	41.68	-0.53	31.87	<b>-7.09**</b>	35.77	5.42	44.46
	[-0.63]		[-0.39]		[-1.06]		[-0.08]		[-2.01]		[0.84]	
adult females 18-59	-1.40	46.87	-1.19	47.59	-3.05	42.60	<b>-7.23**</b>	37.20	2.05	46.28	-5.53	53.61
	[-0.57]		[-0.43]		[-0.81]		[-2.42]		[0.97]		[1.24]	
elderly males 60+	-0.44	34.68	-1.74	32.62	0.48	36.38	0.28	34.66	†	35.73	†	32.09
	[-0.15]		[-0.31]		[0.14]		[0.10]					
elderly females 60+	0.51	34.32	0.37	33.51	1.70	40.70	0.81	38.03	2.21	26.69	†	25.98
	[0.36]		[0.25]		[0.55]		[0.43]		[0.46]			
<i>Land preparation or planting</i>												
all individuals 18+	-0.58	34.48	-0.73	32.79	0.16	43.30	-1.16	25.91	-0.84	38.08	0.50	49.74
	[-0.29]		[-0.31]		[0.08]		[-0.67]		[-0.33]		[0.14]	
adult males 18-59	-1.79	21.61	-2.05	21.23	-0.124	22.76	0.13	16.92	<b>-5.48***</b>	19.66	3.13	24.34
	[-1.05]		[-0.83]		[-0.82]		[0.04]		[-2.73]		[0.85]	
adult females 18-59	-0.43	25.49	-0.40	25.91	-1.02	23.03	<b>-5.87***</b>	21.01	1.44	25.18	-1.26	28.69
	[-0.28]		[-0.22]		[-0.41]		[-2.66]		[1.04]		[-0.57]	
elderly males 60+	0.10	18.87	-0.61	17.76	0.72	19.79	0.38	19.04	†	19.10	†	17.34
	[0.06]		[-0.25]		[0.49]		[0.27]					
elderly females 60+	0.07	18.50	-0.10	18.10	1.31	21.60	0.25	20.51	0.51	14.28	†	14.14
	[0.07]		[-0.11]		[0.41]		[0.27]		[0.20]			
<i>Non harvest work</i>												
all individuals 18+	-0.48	24.59	-0.30	23.43	-1.28	30.66	-0.25	18.22	-0.19	27.40	-1.23	35.72
	[-0.43]		[-0.23]		[-0.49]		[-0.20]		[-0.10]		[-0.38]	
adult males 18-59	0.17	15.18	0.39	14.97	-0.85	15.81	0.45	12.99	-1.80	13.64	2.14	17.05

	[0.21]		[0.37]		[0.58]		[0.13]		[-1.27]		[0.90]	
adult females 18-59	-0.80	18.28	-0.81	18.59	-0.91	16.47	-1.50	13.72	0.43	18.18	-2.93	21.13
	[-0.82]		[-0.80]		[-0.83]		[-1.03]		[0.48]		[-1.49]	
elderly males 60+	-0.68	13.21	-0.85	12.52	-0.76	13.78	-0.40	13.05	†	14.06	†	11.92
	[-0.47]		[-0.37]		[-0.42]		[-0.22]					
elderly females 60+	0.30	13.30	0.34	12.98	0.19	15.84	0.37	14.72	1.42	10.52	†	9.88
	[0.47]		[0.54]		[0.14]		[0.35]		[0.66]			
<i>Harvest work</i>												
all individuals 18+	-0.02	2.71	0.24	2.57	-0.88	3.11	-1.10	1.96	0.20	2.47	0.15	3.07
	[-0.06]		[0.83]		[-1.61]		[-1.25]		[0.89]		[0.23]	
adult males 18-59	-0.02	2.71	0.24	2.57	-0.88	3.11	-1.10	1.96	0.20	2.47	0.15	3.07
	[-0.06]		[0.83]		[-1.61]		[-1.25]		[0.89]		[0.23]	
adult females 18-59	-0.17	3.09	0.02	3.09	-1.11	3.09	0.14	2.48	0.18	2.92	<b>-1.33***</b>	3.80
	[-0.90]		[0.83]		[-1.44]		[0.48]		[0.82]		[-2.72]	
elderly males 60+	0.15	2.60	-0.28	2.34	0.53	2.80	0.30	2.56	†	2.58	†	2.83
	[0.34]		[-0.30]		[0.46]		[0.46]					
elderly females 60+	0.17	2.52	0.14	2.43	0.39	3.26	0.24	2.80	0.28	1.90	†	1.96
	[0.87]		[0.95]		[0.46]		[0.79]		[1.42]			
N (all individuals 18+)	6 731		5 622		1 109		3 131		2 363		1 237	
N (adult males 18-59)	2 105		1 597		508		316		947		842	
N (adult females 18-59)	3 966		3 394		572		835		2 086		1 045	
N (elderly males 60+)	1 295		618		677		773		370		152	
N (elderly females 60+)	3 558		3 136		422		2 371		784		403	

Note: Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*), 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels. Robust standard errors presented in parentheses. Bold indicates that they are significant at  $p < .10$ . Directly above the standard errors is the treatment effect for the indicator, and in the following column is the baseline value. † refers to an instance where the estimation could not converge, a lack of observations across strata, or where there were no observations. Estimates for binary outcomes are reported using marginal effects.

**Table 24 Impact of SCTP on non-farm enterprises**

	all		fhh		mhh		severely constrained		moderately constrained		unconstrained	
hh operated NFE in last 12 months	-0.04	0.23	-0.04	0.22	-0.01	0.32	<b>-0.07***</b>	0.18	-0.02	0.28	0.01	0.29
	[-1.40]		[-1.60]		[-0.23]		[-4.18]		[-0.32]		[0.27]	
n enterprises operated by hh	<b>-0.05*</b>	0.26	<b>-0.05**</b>	0.24	-0.01	0.37	<b>-0.08***</b>	0.19	-0.02	0.31	0.01	0.33
	[-1.72]		[-2.10]		[-0.25]		[-3.73]		[-0.46]		[0.22]	
hh operated petty trader enterprise	<b>0.03*</b>	0.10	0.02	0.10	<b>0.08***</b>	0.12	0.00	0.08	<b>0.03**</b>	0.12	<b>0.07**</b>	0.14
	[1.82]		[1.29]		[4.65]		[0.21]		[2.53]		[2.29]	
hh operated charcoal or firewood enterprise	<b>-0.04***</b>	0.07	<b>-0.05*</b>	0.07	<b>-0.04*</b>	0.07	-0.04	0.05	<b>-0.03*</b>	0.10	<b>-0.09***</b>	0.06
	[-2.64]		[-1.93]		[-1.66]		[-1.46]		[-1.67]		[-3.46]	
hh operated crafts enterprise	-0.01	0.03	-0.01	0.02	-0.02	0.10	<b>-0.02*</b>	0.03	-0.01	0.04	0.00	0.03
	[-1.51]		[-0.83]		[-1.30]		[-1.88]		[-0.37]		[0.09]	
total months of business op. last year	<b>-0.48**</b>	1.51	<b>-0.54**</b>	1.39	-0.15	2.13	<b>-0.59***</b>	1.08	-0.30	1.86	-0.45	1.95
	[-2.06]		[-2.45]		[-0.41]		[-3.52]		[-0.77]		[-1.22]	
total months of petty businesses in hh op. last year	0.10	0.56	0.00	0.53	<b>0.62**</b>	0.67	-0.14	0.43	<b>0.25***</b>	0.60	0.41	0.81
	[0.65]		[0.01]		[2.56]		[-0.77]		[2.93]		[1.61]	
total months of charcoal business in hh op. last year	<b>-0.30***</b>	0.49	<b>-0.31**</b>	0.51	-0.26	0.39	-0.04	0.35	<b>-0.50***</b>	0.71	<b>-0.67***</b>	0.42

	[-3.71]		[-2.40]		[-1.34]		[-0.33]		[-4.30]		[-3.26]	
total months of crafts business in hh op. last year	<b>-0.16***</b>	0.22	<b>-0.09**</b>	0.13	<b>-0.46***</b>	0.67	<b>-0.23***</b>	0.20	-0.08	0.25	-0.50	0.19
	[-5.37]		[-2.22]		[-3.10]		[-2.83]		[-0.75]		[-0.50]	
<i>expenditure in last month (MWK) from all hh on inputs/goods</i>	56.04	246.47	20.54	227.07	193.05	347.63	-6.33	127.06	13.80	330.93	<b>334.2***</b>	394.30
	[0.74]		[0.35]		[1.00]		[-0.18]		[0.09]		[2.81]	
<b><i>Last operating month</i></b>												
total sales from enterprises	15.12	517.53	-31.36	466.25	168.18	784.87	<b>-116.99*</b>	306.23	75.35	670.21	342.79	773.01
	[0.11]		[-0.28]		[0.56]		[-1.69]		[0.33]		[1.25]	
total monthly profit by hh	-18.17	300.66	-41.84	267.88	94.18	471.54	<b>-91.08*</b>	197.71	30.98	378.50	136.83	418.61
	[-0.25]		[-0.79]		[0.45]		[-1.89]		[0.26]		[1.01]	
N	6 731		5 621		1 110		3 130		2 363		1 238	

Note: Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*), 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels. Robust standard errors presented in parentheses. Bold indicates that they are significant at  $p < .10$ . Directly above the standard errors is the treatment effect for the indicator, and in the following column is the baseline value. † refers to an instance where the estimation could not converge, a lack of observations across strata, or where there were no observations. Estimates for binary outcomes are reported using marginal effects.

**Table 25 Impact of SCTP on wage work, last 12 months**

	all		fhh		mhh		severely constrained		moderately constrained		unconstrained	
<i>Participation, prop hh</i>												
all individuals 18+	-0.00	0.07	-0.01	0.06	0.01	0.08	0.00	0.04	-0.01	0.09	-0.00	0.09
	[-0.10]		[-0.26]		[0.41]		[0.44]		[-0.24]		[-0.03]	
adult males 18-59	0.03	0.07	0.04	0.07	-0.03	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.02	0.05	-0.01	0.09
	[1.29]		[1.01]		[-1.15]		[1.09]		[0.30]		[-0.41]	
adult females 18-59	-0.02	0.05	-0.02	0.06	0.02	0.02	†	0.05	-0.02	0.07	-0.01	0.02
	[-0.77]		[-0.83]		[1.10]				[-0.60]		[-0.80]	
elderly males 60+	-0.01	0.04	0.02	0.05	0.00	0.04	-0.02	0.04	†	0.07	†	0.04
	[-0.24]		[0.48]		[0.12]		[-0.99]					
elderly females 60+	-0.00	0.02	<b>-0.01*</b>	0.02	†	0.04	-0.00	0.02	†	0.06	†	0.01
	[-0.05]		[-1.66]				[-0.20]					
<i>Total days worked in a year in hh</i>												
all individuals 18+	1.02	8.02	0.79	7.33	-0.56	11.63	<b>2.48**</b>	4.85	0.03	9.52	-1.52	13.36
	[0.45]		[0.27]		[-0.10]		[2.15]		[0.01]		[-0.35]	
adult males 18-59	4.48	9.85	5.66	10.38	-0.95	8.26	<b>14.39***</b>	6.41	3.653	5.94	-4.49	14.22
	[0.96]		[0.79]		[-0.21]		[2.82]		[0.63]		[-0.91]	
adult females 18-59	-1.08	4.51	-0.89	5.05	-2.41	1.31	2.63	3.78	-0.608	5.68	-0.62	2.65
	[-0.57]		[-0.42]		[-1.31]		[1.39]		[-0.20]		[-0.47]	
elderly males 60+	-3.34	9.35	-3.01	11.77	-0.82	7.36	<b>-8.48**</b>	8.98	-3.642	12.64	†	2.90
	[-1.10]		[-0.64]		[-0.15]		[-2.50]		[-0.30]			
elderly females 60+	1.07	1.45	0.87	0.84	2.94	6.24	1.89	1.93	0.061	0.38	†	0.48
	[0.87]		[1.49]		[0.67]		[1.16]		[0.07]			
N (all individuals 18+)	6 731		5 621		1 110		3 130		2 363		1 238	
N (adult males 18-59)	2 105		1 597		508		316		947		842	
N (adult females 18-59)	3 966		3 394		572		835		2 086		1 045	

N (elderly males 60+)	1 295	618	677	773	370	152
N (elderly females 60+)	3 558	3 136	422	2 371	784	403

Note: Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*), 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels. Robust standard errors presented in parentheses. Bold indicates that they are significant at  $p < .10$ . Directly above the standard errors is the treatment effect for the indicator, and in the following column is the baseline value. † refers to an instance where the estimation could not converge, a lack of observations across strata, or where there were no observations. Estimates for binary outcomes are reported using marginal effects.

**Table 26 Impact of SCTP on ganyu labour, last 12 months**

	all		fhh		mhh		severely constrained		moderately constrained		unconstrained	
<b>Participation, prop HH</b>												
all individuals 18+	-0.05	0.69	-0.03	0.69	<b>-0.09*</b>	0.66	-0.01	0.46	<b>-0.08*</b>	0.89	<b>-0.08***</b>	0.88
	[-1.55]		[-0.97]		[-1.76]		[-0.23]		[-1.76]		[-4.11]	
adult males 18-59	<b>-0.13***</b>	0.73	<b>-0.13**</b>	0.72	-0.10	0.76	<b>-0.11***</b>	0.56	<b>-0.19***</b>	0.75	<b>-0.07**</b>	0.75
	[-5.08]		[-2.29]		[-1.00]		[-2.70]		[-7.88]		[-2.34]	
adult females 18-59	-0.07	0.77	-0.04	0.81	-0.12	0.57	<b>-0.06*</b>	0.69	<b>-0.09*</b>	0.81	-0.03	0.74
	[-1.60]		[-0.89]		[-1.28]		[-1.73]		[-1.67]		[-0.66]	
elderly males 60+	<b>-0.07***</b>	0.31	-0.03	0.28	<b>-0.08**</b>	0.33	<b>-0.09*</b>	0.29	†	0.36	†	0.28
	[-2.99]		[-0.85]		[-2.30]		[-1.76]					
elderly females 60+	-0.01	0.33	0.01	0.34	-0.12	0.25	-0.01	0.35	-0.03	0.32	†	0.23
	[-0.27]		[0.26]		[-1.30]		[-0.17]		[-0.66]			
<b>Total number of days worked in hh</b>												
all individuals 18+	<b>-15.76***</b>	59.43	<b>-12.32***</b>	59.35	<b>-30.34***</b>	59.83	<b>-9.55***</b>	26.25	<b>-25.12***</b>	86.28	-9.62	94.13
	[-7.26]		[-5.37]		[-8.27]		[-3.28]		[-7.57]		[-1.33]	
adult males 18-59	<b>-17.35***</b>	56.98	<b>-10.38***</b>	55.76	<b>-39.76***</b>	60.66	<b>-30.12***</b>	36.59	<b>-21.72***</b>	54.69	<b>-14.39**</b>	62.91
	[-5.22]		[-3.95]		[-2.75]		[-2.59]		[-4.71]		[-2.36]	

adult females 18-59	<b>-12.89***</b>	54.82	<b>-12.40***</b>	58.86	-9.32	30.90	<b>-26.42***</b>	45.35	<b>-16.52***</b>	61.18	2.81	47.89
	[-3.85]		[-4.00]		[-1.33]		[-4.09]		[-4.63]		[0.42]	
elderly males 60+	<b>-5.57*</b>	17.62	-4.99	16.75	-6.64	18.28	0.91	14.65	†	24.93	†	15.28
	[-1.76]		[-0.55]		[-1.63]		[0.27]					
elderly females 60+	-2.59	15.27	-1.47	15.65	-8.87	12.21	-2.69	14.87	0.25	18.42	†	11.50
	[-1.07]		[-0.66]		[-1.29]		[-1.07]		[0.07]			
N (all individuals 18+)	6731		5621		1110		3130		2363		1238	
N (adult males 18-59)	2 105		1 597		508		316		947		842	
N (adult females 18-59)	3 966		3 394		572		835		2 086		1 045	
N (elderly males 60+)	1 295		618		677		773		370		152	
N (elderly females 60+)	3 558		3 136		422		2 371		784		403	

Note: Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*), 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels. Robust standard errors presented in parentheses. Bold indicates that they are significant at  $p < .10$ . Directly above the standard errors is the treatment effect for the indicator, and in the following column is the baseline value. † refers to an instance where the estimation could not converge, a lack of observations across strata, or where there were no observations. Estimates for binary outcomes are reported using marginal effects.

**Table 27 Impact of SCTP on hh involvement in household activities, last week**

	all		fhh		mhh		severely constrained		moderately constrained		unconstrained	
<i>Participation, prop hh</i>												
NFE	-0.04	0.14	-0.04	0.13	-0.04	0.18	<b>-0.06**</b>	0.11	-0.03	0.16	-0.03	0.19
	[-1.46]		[-1.55]		[-0.89]		[-2.31]		[-0.71]		[-0.43]	
livestock activity	<b>0.04*</b>	0.05	0.03	0.04	<b>0.08**</b>	0.09	<b>0.04*</b>	0.04	0.02	0.04	<b>0.08***</b>	0.06
	[1.86]		[1.63]		[2.23]		[1.85]		[0.63]		[2.89]	
fruit collecting	0.00	0.87	-0.00	0.87	0.04	0.90	0.01	0.82	-0.01	0.92	-0.04	0.92
	[0.08]		[-0.14]		[1.42]		[0.41]		[-0.40]		[-1.14]	
<i>ganyu</i> work	<b>-0.09***</b>	0.45	<b>-0.07**</b>	0.46	<b>-0.23***</b>	0.42	<b>-0.08***</b>	0.29	<b>-0.10**</b>	0.60	<b>-0.10**</b>	0.57
	[-4.23]		[-2.12]		[-3.87]		[-3.15]		[-2.28]		[-2.37]	
formal wage work	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.04
	[0.62]		[0.84]		[0.23]		[0.59]		[0.05]		[0.05]	
<i>Total hours</i>												
NFE	-0.88	3.13	-0.96	2.92	-0.98	4.25	-0.98	2.14	-0.95	3.69	-0.45	4.63
	[-0.76]		[-0.78]		[-0.59]		[-1.24]		[-0.56]		[-0.28]	
livestock activity	0.11	0.61	0.05	0.44	0.36	1.45	-0.03	0.53	-0.43	0.68	1.40	0.66
	[0.27]		[0.14]		[0.46]		[-0.19]		[-0.77]		[1.25]	
fruit collecting	-0.26	7.18	-0.07	6.89	-1.03	8.70	-0.11	5.92	-0.08	8.06	-1.33	8.78
	[-0.42]		[-0.10]		[-0.52]		[-0.18]		[-0.15]		[-1.02]	
<i>ganyu</i> work	<b>-3.48***</b>	10.82	<b>-2.69*</b>	11.05	<b>-7.77***</b>	9.63	<b>-3.65***</b>	6.46	-2.68	14.77	<b>-3.36*</b>	14.59
	[-2.96]		[-1.76]		[-4.77]		[-4.41]		[-1.35]		[-1.75]	
formal wage work	<b>0.66**</b>	1.21	<b>0.69*</b>	1.22	0.43	1.15	0.67	0.79	0.92	1.50	0.01	1.73
	[2.26]		[1.91]		[0.25]		[1.18]		[1.62]		[0.01]	
N	6 733		5 623		1 110		3 132		2 363		1 238	

Note: Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*), 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels. Robust standard errors presented in parentheses. Bold indicates that they are significant at  $p < .10$ . Directly above the standard errors is the treatment effect for the indicator, and in the following column is the baseline value. † refers to an instance where the estimation could not converge, a lack of observations across strata, or where there were no observations. Estimates for binary outcomes are reported using marginal effects.



**Table 28 Impact of SCTP on participation in household activities in hh, last week**

	all		fhh		mhh		severely constrained		moderately constrained		unconstrained	
<i>Household non-farm enterprise</i>												
all individuals 18+	-0.03	0.13	-0.03	0.12	-0.04	0.17	-0.03	0.09	-0.04	0.15	-0.03	0.18
	[-1.21]		[-1.15]		[-1.04]		[-0.94]		[-1.23]		[-0.72]	
adult males 18-59	-0.01	0.10	<b>-0.04***</b>	0.09	<b>0.12***</b>	0.13	<b>0.05*</b>	0.06	-0.01	0.08	-0.04	0.12
	[-0.90]		[-3.91]		[3.61]		[1.86]		[-0.47]		[-0.79]	
adult females 18-59	-0.03	0.13	-0.03	0.13	-0.03	0.12	-0.06	0.11	-0.02	0.13	-0.03	0.13
	[-0.88]		[-1.00]		[-0.54]		[-1.40]		[-0.62]		[-0.51]	
elderly males 60+	-0.06	0.10	-0.04	0.09	-0.04	0.11	<b>-0.09*</b>	0.10	†	0.12	†	0.07
	[-1.55]		[-0.71]		[-1.49]		[-1.78]					
elderly females 60+	<b>-0.04***</b>	0.06	<b>-0.03**</b>	0.06	†	0.07	<b>-0.05***</b>	0.06	-0.03	0.05	†	0.05
	[-3.86]		[-2.57]				[-3.23]		[-1.46]			
<i>Livestock activities</i>												
all individuals 18+	<b>0.05***</b>	0.03	<b>0.05***</b>	0.02	<b>0.07***</b>	0.06	<b>0.07***</b>	0.03	<b>0.04***</b>	0.03	<b>0.06*</b>	0.04
	[3.45]		[3.40]		[2.58]		[2.70]		[3.16]		[1.78]	
adult males 18-59	<b>0.05***</b>	0.02	<b>0.04**</b>	0.01	0.08	0.04	<b>-0.28***</b>	0.01	<b>0.06***</b>	0.02	<b>0.05***</b>	0.02
	[2.68]		[2.56]		[1.40]		[-9.83]		[2.76]		[2.98]	
adult females 18-59	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.02	<b>-0.06*</b>	0.03	0.07	0.02	0.01	0.02	-0.07	0.03
	[0.20]		[0.36]		[-1.91]		[1.59]		[0.68]		[-1.61]	
elderly males 60+	0.02	0.03	-0.01	0.01	<b>0.06*</b>	0.04	<b>0.07***</b>	0.02	†	0.04	†	0.04
	[0.47]		[-0.53]		[1.84]		[2.99]					
elderly females 60+	<b>0.02**</b>	0.02	<b>0.02***</b>	0.02	-0.04	0.04	0.01	0.02	-0.02	0.01	†	0.02
	[2.01]		[3.13]		[-1.26]		[0.65]		[-0.71]			
<i>Collecting nuts or other tree fruits, honey or other products</i>												
all individuals 18+	0.02	0.84	0.01	0.83	<b>0.05**</b>	0.89	0.02	0.76	0.03	0.92	-0.03	0.92
	[0.74]		[0.56]		[2.29]		[0.71]		[1.61]		[-0.94]	

adult males 18-59	0.06	0.74	0.06	0.72	0.00	0.80	<b>0.13**</b>	0.55	<b>0.08**</b>	0.72	0.04	0.78
	[1.37]		[1.25]		[0.03]		[2.47]		[2.43]		[0.44]	
adult females 18-59	-0.00	0.87	0.02	0.87	<b>-0.13***</b>	0.84	0.03	0.78	0.02	0.88	<b>-0.10***</b>	0.89
	[-0.04]		[1.21]		[-3.35]		[0.92]		[1.28]		[-3.51]	
elderly males 60+	<b>0.10***</b>	0.65	<b>0.13*</b>	0.59	0.06	0.70	<b>0.11*</b>	0.63	†	0.69	†	0.61
	[4.52]		[1.84]		[0.89]		[1.95]					
elderly females 60+	0.04	0.67	0.04	0.65	0.03	0.80	0.02	0.73	0.09	0.56	†	0.54
	[0.96]		[1.17]		[0.26]		[0.51]		[0.91]			
<i>Ganyu labour</i>												
all individuals 18+	<b>-0.08***</b>	0.39	<b>-0.05*</b>	0.37	<b>-0.24**</b>	0.46	<b>-0.21***</b>	0.31	<b>-0.14***</b>	0.40	<b>-0.05**</b>	0.39
	[-5.35]		[-1.76]		[-2.00]		[-2.91]		[-5.04]		[-2.01]	
adult males 18-59	<b>-0.08***</b>	0.39	<b>-0.04*</b>	0.37	<b>-0.24**</b>	0.46	<b>-0.24***</b>	0.31	<b>-0.13***</b>	0.40	<b>-0.05*</b>	0.39
	[-5.30]		[-1.68]		[-1.96]		[-2.81]		[-4.90]		[-1.77]	
adult females 18-59	-0.04	0.42	-0.02	0.46	-0.07	0.21	0.03	0.34	-0.02	0.45	<b>-0.16*</b>	0.40
	[-0.78]		[-0.43]		[-1.16]		[0.93]		[-0.25]		[-1.69]	
elderly males 60+	<b>-0.09***</b>	0.12	-0.02	0.11	<b>-0.15***</b>	0.13	<b>-0.09*</b>	0.11	†	0.19	†	0.04
	[-2.64]		[-0.73]		[-3.02]		[-1.74]					
elderly females 60+	-0.02	0.11	-0.00	0.11	<b>-0.16***</b>	0.09	-0.01	0.11	-0.03	0.13	†	0.10
	[-1.31]		[-0.25]		[-5.71]		[-0.68]		[-0.90]			
<i>Formal wage labour</i>												
all individuals 18+	-0.00	0.02	-0.00	0.02	0.00	0.03	0.01	0.02	-0.01	0.03	-0.00	0.03
	[-0.16]		[-0.25]		[0.16]		[0.58]		[-0.61]		[-0.17]	
adult males 18-59	<b>0.03***</b>	0.02	<b>0.02**</b>	0.02	†	0.02	<b>0.12***</b>	0.03	-0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02
	[3.64]		[2.47]				[7.18]		[-0.40]		[0.63]	
adult females 18-59	<b>-0.01*</b>	0.02	-0.02	0.02	†	0.01	0.00	0.02	<b>-0.02*</b>	0.02	-0.03	0.02
	[-1.75]		[-1.60]				[0.17]		[-1.94]		[-1.61]	
elderly males 60+	-0.00	0.02	<b>0.03*</b>	0.03	†	0.02	†	0.02	†	0.03	†	0.04
	[-0.23]		[1.76]									
elderly females 60+	-0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.00	†	0.02	-0.01	0.01	†	0.00	†	0.00

	[-0.70]	[-1.34]		[-1.15]		
N (all individuals 18+)	6 731	5 622	1 109	3 131	2 363	1 237
N (boys 6-17)	4 144	3 531	613	1 614	1 859	671
N (girls 6-17)	4 273	3 661	612	1 721	1 830	722
N (adult males 18-59)	2 105	1 597	508	316	947	842
N (adult females 18-59)	3 966	3 394	572	835	2 086	1 045
N (elderly males 60+)	1 295	618	677	773	370	152
N (elderly females 60+)	3 558	3 136	422	2 371	784	403

Note: Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*) , 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels. Robust standard errors presented in parentheses. Bold indicates that they are significant at  $p < .10$ . Directly above the standard errors is the treatment effect for the indicator, and in the following column is the baseline value. † refers to an instance where the estimation could not converge, a lack of observations across strata, or where there were no observations. Estimates for binary outcomes are reported using marginal effects.

**Table 29 Impact of SCTP on total hours spent in household activities in hh, last week**

	all		fhh		mhh		severely constrained		moderately constrained		unconstrained	
<i>Household non-farm enterprise</i>												
all individuals 18+	-0.98	2.55	-0.98	2.36	-1.34	3.56	-1.13	1.57	-0.80	3.06	-1.01	4.10
	[-1.06]		[-0.94]		[-0.83]		[-1.58]		[-0.53]		[-0.82]	
adult males 18-59	-0.57	1.88	<b>-1.45*</b>	1.83	<b>2.12***</b>	2.04	-0.02	0.59	0.42	1.65	<b>-2.32**</b>	2.34
	[-1.08]		[-1.68]		[2.64]		[-0.06]		[0.36]		[-2.10]	
adult females 18-59	-0.48	2.34	-0.33	2.34	-1.86	2.30	<b>-1.75*</b>	2.46	-0.80	2.23	0.87	2.48
	[-0.41]		[-0.28]		[-0.83]		[-1.93]		[-0.68]		[0.48]	
elderly males 60+	-1.15	1.46	-0.67	1.16	-1.00	1.71	-1.61	1.66	†	1.35	†	0.64
	[-1.50]		[-0.45]		[-1.54]		[-1.30]					
elderly females 60+	<b>-0.60***</b>	0.73	<b>-0.51**</b>	0.70	<b>-1.51***</b>	0.89	<b>-0.59*</b>	0.82	<b>-0.97***</b>	0.61	†	0.36
	[-2.82]		[-2.02]		[-3.59]		[-1.73]		[-3.73]			
<i>Livestock activities</i>												
all individuals 18+	0.06	0.30	0.02	0.18	0.20	0.90	0.13	0.26	-0.19	0.39	0.29	0.22
	[0.50]		[0.13]		[0.52]		[1.23]		[-0.58]		[0.92]	
adult males 18-59	0.13	0.14	0.12	0.03	0.27	0.45	0.15	0.04	0.23	0.22	-0.12	0.08

	[1.38]		[0.81]		[0.43]		[0.70]		[1.05]		[-0.46]	
adult females 18-59	0.11	0.13	0.08	0.10	0.09	0.31	0.06	0.07	0.16	0.16	0.03	0.10
	[0.76]		[0.49]		[0.66]		[0.36]		[0.82]		[0.17]	
elderly males 60+	-0.15	0.37	<b>-0.48**</b>	0.28	0.21	0.44	0.19	0.37	†	0.36	†	0.36
	[-0.63]		[-2.31]		[0.56]		[0.74]					
elderly females 60+	-0.02	0.20	-0.03	0.15	-0.12	0.65	0.09	0.19	-0.79	0.32	†	0.10
	[-0.16]		[-0.26]		[-0.54]		[1.43]		[-1.48]			
<b>Collecting nuts or other tree fruits, honey or other products</b>												
all individuals 18+	-0.02	4.42	0.14	4.10	-0.53	6.07	0.04	3.43	0.25	4.63	-1.01	6.56
	[-0.05]		[0.73]		[-0.35]		[0.14]		[0.81]		[-1.19]	
adult males 18-59	-0.02	2.71	0.24	2.57	-0.88	3.11	-1.10	1.96	0.20	2.47	0.15	3.07
	[-0.06]		[0.83]		[-1.61]		[-1.25]		[0.89]		[0.23]	
adult females 18-59	-0.17	3.09	0.02	3.09	-1.11	3.09	0.14	2.48	0.18	2.92	<b>-1.33***</b>	3.80
	[-0.90]		[0.15]		[-1.44]		[0.48]		[0.82]		[-2.72]	
elderly males 60+	0.15	2.60	-0.28	2.34	0.53	2.80	0.30	2.56	†	2.58	†	2.83
	[0.34]		[-0.30]		[0.46]		[0.46]					
elderly females 60+	0.17	2.52	0.14	2.43	0.39	3.26	0.24	2.80	0.28	1.90	†	1.96
	[0.87]		[0.95]		[0.46]		[0.79]		[1.42]			
<b>Ganyu labour</b>												
all individuals 18+	<b>-2.06*</b>	8.32	-1.27	8.25	<b>-6.40***</b>	8.66	-1.78	3.78	-1.48	11.93	<b>-3.25**</b>	13.18
	[-1.72]		[-0.90]		[-4.75]		[-1.52]		[-0.88]		[-2.04]	
adult males 18-59	-1.58	8.47	-0.84	8.00	<b>-5.58*</b>	9.90	-1.70	4.50	<b>-4.14***</b>	8.21	0.19	9.45
	[-1.45]		[-0.48]		[-1.71]		[-1.33]		[-3.49]		[0.13]	
adult females 18-59	-1.21	7.41	-0.86	8.04	-2.01	3.71	<b>-4.47*</b>	6.83	0.49	8.28	<b>-3.40**</b>	6.07
	[-0.83]		[-0.57]		[-1.39]		[-1.67]		[0.39]		[-2.29]	
elderly males 60+	<b>-2.34**</b>	2.23	<b>-2.25*</b>	2.05	<b>-2.54*</b>	2.38	-1.14	2.31	†	2.60	†	0.83
	[-2.14]		[-1.74]		[-1.83]		[-0.66]					
elderly females 60+	-0.34	2.23	0.06	2.28	<b>-3.10*</b>	1.91	-0.81	2.06	0.51	2.74	†	2.34
	[-0.43]		[0.09]		[-1.82]		[-1.35]		[0.35]			
<b>Formal wage labour</b>												

all individuals 18+	<b>0.43**</b>	0.94	0.40	0.90	0.48	1.15	0.40	0.62	0.73	1.15	-0.08	1.38
	[2.02]		[1.05]		[0.29]		[1.10]		[1.03]		[-0.08]	
adult males 18-59	0.87	0.95	0.98	1.03	0.74	0.69	<b>4.17***</b>	1.16	0.24	0.95	-0.24	0.91
	[0.94]		[0.83]		[1.05]		[3.50]		[0.28]		[-0.16]	
adult females 18-59	-0.18	0.59	-0.14	0.69	<b>-0.43*</b>	0.03	0.05	0.78	-0.13	0.48	-0.50	0.70
	[-0.58]		[-0.40]		[-1.84]		[0.10]		[-0.36]		[-1.47]	
elderly males 60+	0.97	1.42	2.19	2.00	0.33	0.95	-0.57	1.15	†	2.24	†	0.85
	[1.58]		[1.58]		[0.21]		[-0.55]					
elderly females 60+	-0.01	0.10	-0.05	0.05	0.49	0.52	-0.03	0.15	0.02	0.01	†	0.00
	[-0.09]		[-0.77]		[0.58]		[-0.16]		[0.85]			
N (all individuals 18+)	6 731		5 622		1 109		3 131		2 363		1 237	
N (adult males 18-59)	2 105		1 597		508		316		947		842	
N (adult females 18-59)	3 966		3 394		572		835		2 086		1 045	
N (elderly males 60+)	1 295		618		677		773		370		152	
N (elderly females 60+)	3 558		3 136		422		2 371		784		403	

Note: Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*), 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels. Robust standard errors presented in parentheses. Bold indicates that they are significant at  $p < .10$ . Directly above the standard errors is the treatment effect for the indicator, and in the following column is the baseline value. † refers to an instance where the estimation could not converge, a lack of observations across strata, or where there were no observations. Estimates for binary outcomes are reported using marginal effects.

**Table 30 Impact of SCTP on participation in chores, yesterday**

	all		fhh		mhh		severely constrained		moderately constrained		unconstrained	
<i>Collecting water</i>												
all individuals 18+	<b>0.06***</b>	0.67	<b>0.08***</b>	0.67	-0.02	0.66	<b>0.08***</b>	0.50	-0.01	0.81	<b>0.13***</b>	0.83
	[3.60]		[3.15]		[-0.58]		[2.73]		[-0.40]		[3.34]	
adult males 18-59	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.13	0.05	0.20	0.11	0.14	0.02	0.18	0.06	0.12
	[1.03]		[0.95]		[0.35]		[0.79]		[0.63]		[1.47]	
adult females 18-59	<b>0.08***</b>	0.79	<b>0.09***</b>	0.80	0.00	0.72	<b>0.10*</b>	0.68	<b>0.04**</b>	0.79	<b>0.14***</b>	0.83
	[6.51]		[7.47]		[0.01]		[1.81]		[1.98]		[3.35]	
elderly males 60+	0.04	0.08	<b>0.28***</b>	0.02	-0.03	0.13	<b>0.06*</b>	0.10	†	0.05	†	0.03
	[1.07]		[10.19]		[-0.54]		[1.79]					
elderly females 60+	<b>0.08***</b>	0.39	<b>0.10***</b>	0.38	-0.07	0.46	<b>0.08**</b>	0.43	0.02	0.29	†	0.31
	[3.64]		[3.93]		[-0.23]		[2.35]		[0.91]			
<i>Collecting firewood</i>												
all individuals 18+	-0.02	0.34	-0.00	0.32	<b>-0.11***</b>	0.42	-0.00	0.26	-0.08	0.42	0.08	0.40
	[-0.45]		[-0.06]		[-3.02]		[-0.05]		[-1.24]		[1.53]	
adult males 18-59	0.01	0.07	-0.00	0.06	0.05	0.12	0.03	0.12	-0.00	0.06	0.03	0.08
	[1.36]		[-0.29]		[1.56]		[0.66]		[-0.12]		[1.01]	
adult females 18-59	-0.07	0.38	-0.04	0.37	<b>-0.24***</b>	0.42	-0.06	0.34	-0.09	0.39	0.01	0.37
	[-1.49]		[-0.81]		[-2.93]		[-0.74]		[-1.49]		[0.20]	
elderly males 60+	-0.02	0.07	0.01	0.02	-0.05	0.12	-0.00	0.09	†	0.04	†	0.04
	[-1.02]		[0.45]		[-0.99]		[-0.12]					
elderly females 60+	0.00	0.20	0.01	0.19	-0.10	0.26	0.00	0.21	<b>-0.05*</b>	0.17	†	0.17
	[0.04]		[0.24]		[-0.89]		[0.05]		[-1.88]			
<i>Taking care of children, cooking or cleaning</i>												
all individuals 18+	0.01	0.82	0.02	0.81	-0.03	0.84	0.01	0.70	-0.02	0.91	0.04	0.94
	[0.60]		[0.83]		[-1.18]		[0.33]		[-1.18]		[1.43]	

adult males 18-59	0.02	0.24	0.05	0.21	<b>-0.15***</b>	0.35	<b>0.25***</b>	0.18	0.02	0.25	-0.07	0.25
	[0.27]		[0.83]		[-2.84]		[2.85]		[0.43]		[-1.09]	
adult females 18-59	0.00	0.88	0.01	0.89	-0.04	0.85	0.01	0.79	-0.01	0.89	0.01	0.91
	[0.10]		[0.43]		[-0.90]		[0.46]		[-0.87]		[0.42]	
elderly males 60+	-0.07	0.17	0.05	0.06	<b>-0.18***</b>	0.26	-0.06	0.22	†	0.11	†	0.06
	[-1.20]		[0.78]		[-3.54]		[-1.05]					
elderly females 60+	0.03	0.58	0.03	0.58	0.01	0.59	0.03	0.64	-0.02	0.44	†	0.48
	[0.69]		[0.47]		[0.06]		[0.42]		[-0.53]			
N (all individuals 18+)	6 731		5 622		1 109		3 131		2 363		1 237	
N (adult males 18-59)	2 105		1 597		508		316		947		842	
N (adult females 18-59)	3 966		3 394		572		835		2 086		1 045	
N (elderly males 60+)	1 295		618		677		773		370		152	
N (elderly females 60+)	3 558		3 136		422		2 371		784		403	

Note: Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*), 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels. Robust standard errors presented in parentheses. Bold indicates that they are significant at  $p < .10$ . Directly above the standard errors is the treatment effect for the indicator, and in the following column is the baseline value. † refers to an instance where the estimation could not converge, a lack of observations across strata, or where there were no observations. Estimates for binary outcomes are reported using marginal effects.

**Table 31 Impact of SCTP on total hours spent on chores, yesterday**

	all		fhh		mhh		severely constrained		moderately constrained		unconstrained	
<i>Total hrs collecting water in hh</i>												
all individuals 18+	<b>0.15*</b>	1.16	<b>0.17**</b>	1.16	0.07	1.19	<b>0.11***</b>	0.74	0.02	1.48	<b>0.44***</b>	1.64
	[1.69]		[2.20]		[0.39]		[2.63]		[0.13]		[3.65]	
adult males 18-59	0.07	0.23	<b>0.10**</b>	0.19	-0.05	0.35	<b>0.16*</b>	0.21	0.02	0.27	<b>0.12**</b>	0.20
	[0.80]		[2.29]		[-0.20]		[1.94]		[0.17]		[2.35]	
adult females 18-59	0.08	1.34	0.11	1.34	-0.03	1.30	-0.10	0.97	0.01	1.36	<b>0.34***</b>	1.50
	[1.02]		[1.34]		[-0.20]		[-0.99]		[0.09]		[3.01]	
elderly males 60+	0.09	0.11	<b>0.14***</b>	0.02	0.03	0.19	0.09	0.15	†	0.06	-0.12	0.04
	[1.54]		[3.66]		[0.36]		[1.20]					
elderly females 60+	<b>0.10**</b>	0.58	<b>0.11***</b>	0.57	0.10	0.65	<b>0.12***</b>	0.63	0.03	0.41	0.08	0.53
	[2.50]		[3.20]		[0.55]		[3.71]		[0.37]			
<i>Total hrs collecting firewood in hh</i>												
all individuals 18+	-0.16	0.72	-0.10	0.69	<b>-0.43**</b>	0.92	-0.10	0.48	<b>-0.29*</b>	0.97	-0.02	0.90
	[-1.21]		[-0.86]		[-2.26]		[-0.68]		[-1.83]		[-0.08]	
adult males 18-59	0.03	0.15	-0.01	0.12	<b>0.16***</b>	0.23	-0.01	0.29	0.05	0.12	0.02	0.14
	[1.16]		[-0.47]		[2.88]		[-0.09]		[1.28]		[0.24]	
adult females 18-59	<b>-0.28**</b>	0.83	<b>-0.16*</b>	0.79	<b>-0.98**</b>	1.05	-0.37	0.75	<b>-0.29**</b>	0.88	-0.12	0.78
	[-2.06]		[-1.81]		[-2.11]		[-1.12]		[-2.08]		[-0.54]	
elderly males 60+	<b>-0.06*</b>	0.11	0.03	0.04	<b>-0.13*</b>	0.18	<b>-0.06**</b>	0.13	†	0.08	†	0.11
	[-1.80]		[1.63]		[-1.80]		[-2.14]					
elderly females 60+	-0.01	0.34	-0.01	0.33	-0.02	0.43	-0.01	0.36	-0.08	0.32	†	0.30
	[-0.18]		[-0.09]		[-0.08]		[-0.11]		[-1.01]			
<i>Total hrs taking care of children, cooking, or cleaning in HH</i>												



all individuals 18+	0.17	2.90	<b>0.30**</b>	2.85	<b>-0.50***</b>	3.17	0.08	2.05	0.02	3.60	0.49	3.79
	[1.18]		[1.96]		[-2.82]		[0.85]		[0.08]		[1.53]	
adult males 18-59	0.10	0.54	0.19	0.43	<b>-0.34*</b>	0.87	<b>0.58**</b>	0.42	0.02	0.52	-0.01	0.58
	[0.61]		[1.35]		[-1.77]		[2.34]		[0.08]		[-0.11]	
adult females 18-59	0.14	3.24	0.19	3.21	-0.24	3.40	0.02	2.76	-0.01	3.29	0.30	3.42
	[0.74]		[0.98]		[-1.01]		[0.09]		[-0.04]		[1.33]	
elderly males 60+	-0.09	0.41	0.13	0.18	<b>-0.26*</b>	0.59	-0.19	0.50	†	0.31	†	0.12
	[-0.55]		[0.66]		[-1.79]		[-1.26]					
elderly females 60+	0.09	1.52	<b>0.17**</b>	1.50	-0.60	1.74	0.02	1.73	0.07	1.11	†	1.08
	[1.25]		[1.97]		[-1.16]		[0.24]		[0.62]			
N (all individuals 18+)	6 731		5 622		1 109		3 131		2 363		1 237	
N (adult males 18-59)	2 105		1 597		508		316		947		842	
N (adult females 18-59)	3 966		3 394		572		835		2 086		1 045	
N (elderly males 60+)	1 295		618		677		773		370		152	
N (elderly females 60+)	3 558		3 136		422		2 371		784		403	

Note: Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*), 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels. Robust standard errors presented in parentheses. Bold indicates that they are significant at  $p < .10$ . Directly above the standard errors is the treatment effect for the indicator, and in the following column is the baseline value. † refers to an instance where the estimation could not converge, a lack of observations across strata, or where there were no observations. Estimates for binary outcomes are reported using marginal effects.

**Table 32 Impact of SCTP on participation in farming activities – child labour, last rainy season**

	all	fhh	mhh	severely constrained	moderately constrained	unconstrained						
<i>All farming activities</i>												
children 6-9	-0.04	0.28	-0.07	0.27	0.07	0.30	0.01	0.33	-0.08	0.24	-0.06	0.26
	[-0.70]		[-0.93]		[1.25]		[0.20]		[-1.14]		[-0.88]	
boys 6-9	-0.01	0.27	-0.03	0.25	+	0.31	0.02	0.31	-0.01	0.22	<b>-0.13**</b>	0.24
	[-0.15]		[-0.41]				[0.27]		[-0.12]		[-1.99]	
girls 6-9	-0.07	0.26	-0.09	0.27	-0.04	0.25	-0.02	0.31	<b>-0.14***</b>	0.23	-0.00	0.26
	[-1.49]		[-1.51]		[-0.57]		[-0.22]		[-3.05]		[-0.10]	
children 10-17	-0.01	0.83	0.01	0.82	<b>-0.12***</b>	0.83	-0.01	0.83	-0.04	0.83	0.05	0.80
	[-0.27]		[0.20]		[-3.78]		[-0.25]		[-1.34]		[1.24]	
boys 10-17	-0.01	0.79	0.02	0.78	<b>-0.16***</b>	0.81	-0.00	0.79	-0.04	0.79	0.02	0.75
	[-0.15]		[0.30]		[-5.03]		[-0.07]		[-0.92]		[0.29]	
girls 10-17	-0.01	0.80	0.01	0.80	<b>-0.16**</b>	0.79	-0.01	0.81	-0.05	0.80	0.02	0.77
	[-0.36]		[0.21]		[-2.41]		[-0.08]		[-1.45]		[0.26]	
<i>Land preparation or planting</i>												
children 6-9	-0.01	0.13	-0.01	0.14	-0.01	0.12	0.05	0.16	-0.04	0.12	-0.05	0.11
	[-0.21]		[-0.17]		[-0.12]		[0.93]		[-0.84]		[-0.82]	
boys 6-9	0.01	0.12	0.01	0.13	+	0.10	0.03	0.16	0.00	0.10	-0.06	0.10
	[0.23]		[0.15]				[0.39]		[0.03]		[-0.65]	
girls 6-9	-0.02	0.12	-0.02	0.12	-0.05	0.11	<b>0.07***</b>	0.14	-0.08	0.11	<b>-0.08***</b>	0.09
	[-0.65]		[-0.52]		[-1.45]		[2.66]		[-1.36]		[-2.70]	
children 10-17	0.01	0.72	0.03	0.72	<b>-0.13**</b>	0.68	-0.00	0.72	-0.01	0.73	0.06	0.68
	[0.22]		[0.67]		[-2.55]		[-0.00]		[-0.39]		[1.16]	
boys 10-17	-0.01	0.68	0.00	0.67	<b>-0.12**</b>	0.70	0.02	0.69	-0.07	0.68	0.03	0.62
	[-0.33]		[0.03]		[-2.19]		[0.33]		[-1.39]		[0.48]	
girls 10-17	0.03	0.67	<b>0.06**</b>	0.68	-0.15	0.59	0.02	0.68	0.02	0.67	0.01	0.64
	[1.10]		[1.98]		[-1.51]		[0.41]		[0.60]		[0.12]	
<i>Non-harvest work</i>												

children 6-9	-0.02	0.15	-0.01	0.15	-0.02	0.14	0.06	0.19	-0.07	0.13	-0.04	0.11
	[-0.36]		[-0.28]		[-0.46]		[0.75]		[-1.39]		[-1.05]	
boys 6-9	-0.02	0.13	-0.01	0.13	†	0.14	0.01	0.18	-0.02	0.11	<b>-0.11**</b>	0.09
	[-0.35]		[-0.19]				[0.06]		[-0.29]		[-2.56]	
girls 6-9	-0.03	0.14	-0.04	0.14	-0.04	0.14	<b>0.09***</b>	0.18	<b>-0.11***</b>	0.11	-0.04	0.11
	[-1.11]		[-1.19]		[-0.87]		[2.67]		[-3.27]		[-0.74]	
children 10-17	-0.00	0.72	0.00	0.72	-0.04	0.68	0.02	0.72	-0.05	0.73	0.03	0.68
	[-0.02]		[0.06]		[-0.61]		[0.31]		[-0.91]		[1.16]	
boys 10-17	-0.00	0.68	-0.01	0.67	0.01	0.69	0.04	0.70	-0.08	0.67	0.05	0.63
	[-0.08]		[-0.15]		[0.20]		[0.48]		[-1.50]		[0.51]	
girls 10-17	0.02	0.67	0.04	0.68	-0.08	0.61	0.06	0.68	-0.02	0.68	0.01	0.63
	[0.68]		[1.08]		[-0.85]		[1.14]		[-0.68]		[0.11]	
<b>Harvest work</b>												
children 6-9	-0.08	0.23	-0.10	0.23	-0.01	0.24	-0.06	0.29	-0.10	0.20	<b>-0.10*</b>	0.19
	[-1.16]		[-1.15]		[-0.20]		[-0.69]		[-1.11]		[-1.75]	
boys 6-9	-0.04	0.21	-0.04	0.20	†	0.26	-0.03	0.26	-0.02	0.18	<b>-0.17***</b>	0.18
	[-0.44]		[-0.45]				[-0.55]		[-0.14]		[-3.35]	
girls 6-9	<b>-0.11**</b>	0.23	<b>-0.13*</b>	0.23	-0.08	0.20	-0.08	0.28	<b>-0.14***</b>	0.19	-0.02	0.21
	[-1.96]		[-1.78]		[-1.11]		[-0.77]		[-2.98]		[-0.50]	
children 10-17	-0.00	0.71	0.02	0.71	<b>-0.13***</b>	0.72	0.01	0.74	-0.04	0.70	0.02	0.67
	[-0.08]		[0.27]		[-3.76]		[0.15]		[-0.76]		[0.23]	
boys 10-17	0.00	0.65	0.03	0.64	<b>-0.17***</b>	0.70	0.00	0.67	-0.03	0.65	0.07	0.60
	[0.03]		[0.35]		[-4.28]		[0.02]		[-0.48]		[0.43]	
girls 10-17	0.00	0.69	0.03	0.70	<b>-0.15**</b>	0.66	0.03	0.74	-0.02	0.66	-0.01	0.65
	[0.07]		[0.53]		[-1.98]		[0.47]		[-0.50]		[-0.07]	
N (children 6-9)	3 613		3 087		526		1 292		1 731		590	
N (boys 6-9)	2 133		1 821		312		742		1 066		325	
N (girls 6-9)	2 174		1 868		306		776		1 037		361	
N (children 10-17)	4 851		4 135		716		1 977		2 058		816	
N (boys 10-17)	3 298		2 811		475		1 288		1 489		509	

N (girls 10-17)	3 613	2 820	478	1 334	1 411	553
-----------------	-------	-------	-----	-------	-------	-----

Note: Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*), 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels. Robust standard errors presented in parentheses. Bold indicates that they are significant at  $p < .10$ . Directly above the standard errors is the treatment effect for the indicator, and in the following column is the baseline value. † refers to an instance where the estimation could not converge, a lack of observations across strata, or where there were no observations. Estimates for binary outcomes are reported using marginal effects.

**Table 33 Impact of SCTP on total days in HH spent in farming activities – child labour, last rainy season**

	all		fhh		mhh		severely constrained		moderately constrained		unconstrained	
<i>All farming activities</i>												
children 6-9	-0.72	3.13	-0.51	3.12	-1.35	3.20	0.51	4.42	-1.52	2.50	-0.62	2.04
	[-0.53]		[-0.37]		[-1.02]		[0.34]		[-1.01]		[-0.88]	
boys 6-9	-0.17	2.56	0.30	2.50	†	2.89	0.43	4.01	-1.09	1.88	0.09	1.35
	[-0.13]		[0.23]				[0.18]		[-0.75]		[0.07]	
girls 6-9	-1.11	2.68	-1.24	2.71	-0.32	2.48	0.43	3.51	-1.40	2.23	-2.38	2.11
	[-1.06]		[-1.20]		[-0.27]		[0.23]		[-0.85]		[-1.23]	
children 10-17	0.82	34.91	1.81	35.78	<b>-4.46*</b>	29.75	3.28	38.38	0.06	34.28	-1.76	28.17
	[0.27]		[0.52]		[-1.88]		[0.96]		[0.02]		[-0.41]	
boys 10-17	0.77	26.49	1.04	26.65	-1.49	25.52	<b>4.50*</b>	30.18	-1.33	25.06	-0.96	21.36
	[0.23]		[0.28]		[-0.49]		[1.78]		[-0.37]		[-0.17]	
girls 10-17	-0.17	25.37	0.44	26.25	-4.38	19.82	1.52	28.23	-0.38	23.91	-2.94	22.39
	[-0.09]		[0.23]		[-1.54]		[0.52]		[-0.28]		[-0.64]	
<i>Land preparation or planting</i>												
children 6-9	-0.12	1.33	0.04	1.32	-0.70	1.38	0.53	1.92	-0.56	1.05	-0.02	0.78
	[-0.18]		[0.05]		[-1.23]		[0.71]		[-0.65]		[-0.06]	
boys 6-9	0.04	1.05	0.31	1.02	†	1.19	0.04	1.71	-0.34	0.71	0.82	0.59
	[0.06]		[0.43]				[0.03]		[-0.50]		[0.91]	
girls 6-9	-0.28	1.18	-0.30	1.18	-0.33	1.13	0.88	1.55	-0.60	1.02	-1.58	0.74
	[-0.53]		[-0.52]		[-0.76]		[1.16]		[-0.62]		[-1.56]	
children 10-17	0.89	17.88	1.54	18.36	-2.07	15.04	1.60	19.92	1.38	17.57	-1.20	13.79
	[0.54]		[0.81]		[-1.40]		[0.66]		[0.93]		[-0.66]	

boys 10-17	0.23	13.72	0.33	13.80	-0.36	13.26	1.53	15.94	-0.35	12.99	-0.17	10.25
	[0.14]		[0.18]		[-0.21]		[0.84]		[-0.20]		[-0.13]	
girls 10-17	0.78	12.84	1.31	13.35	-2.53	9.66	1.31	14.37	<b>1.48**</b>	12.10	-2.24	11.14
	[0.62]		[1.08]		[-1.57]		[0.71]		[1.98]		[-0.78]	
<b><i>Non-harvest work</i></b>												
children 6-9	-0.13	1.10	-0.00	1.11	-0.77	1.03	0.57	1.70	-0.63	0.79	-0.03	0.65
	[-0.26]		[-0.01]		[-1.28]		[0.97]		[-1.33]		[-0.09]	
boys 6-9	-0.01	0.94	0.21	0.94	+	0.95	0.56	1.62	-0.59	0.64	0.00	0.30
	[-0.01]		[0.48]				[0.58]		[-1.43]		[0.00]	
girls 6-9	-0.25	0.90	-0.30	0.92	-0.29	0.78	0.39	1.28	-0.44	0.65	-0.43	0.78
	[-0.66]		[-0.95]		[-0.35]		[0.74]		[-1.00]		[-0.55]	
children 10-17	-0.01	13.64	0.17	14.06	-1.03	11.12	<b>1.77*</b>	14.91	-1.25	13.33	-0.52	11.39
	[-0.01]		[0.13]		[-0.91]		[1.81]		[-1.03]		[-0.20]	
boys 10-17	0.35	10.24	0.47	10.39	-0.38	9.40	<b>2.97**</b>	11.55	-1.23	9.59	-1.07	8.85
	[0.25]		[0.31]		[-0.33]		[2.50]		[-0.77]		[-0.34]	
girls 10-17	-0.63	10.02	-0.67	10.41	-0.60	7.55	0.24	11.13	<b>-1.34**</b>	9.45	-0.25	8.84
	[-1.20]		[-1.08]		[-0.94]		[0.27]		[-2.15]		[-0.14]	
<b><i>Harvest work</i></b>												
children 6-9	<b>-0.48*</b>	0.70	<b>-0.54*</b>	0.69	0.11	0.79	<b>-0.59*</b>	0.80	-0.34	0.65	<b>-0.57***</b>	0.62
	[-1.65]		[-1.68]		[0.38]		[-1.74]		[-1.21]		[-2.64]	
boys 6-9	-0.20	0.57	-0.21	0.54	+	0.75	-0.16	0.68	-0.16	0.53	<b>-0.73**</b>	0.46
	[-0.81]		[-0.91]				[-0.37]		[-0.34]		[-2.30]	
girls 6-9	<b>-0.58**</b>	0.60	<b>-0.64**</b>	0.61	0.29	0.58	-0.83	0.68	-0.36	0.55	<b>-0.38*</b>	0.59
	[-2.25]		[-2.16]		[0.97]		[-1.23]		[-1.10]		[-1.73]	
children 10-17	-0.03	3.39	0.08	3.36	<b>-1.00*</b>	3.58	0.04	3.56	-0.09	3.38	-0.04	3.00
	[-0.06]		[0.13]		[-1.93]		[0.07]		[-0.18]		[-0.04]	
boys 10-17	0.17	2.52	0.22	2.47	<b>-0.74**</b>	2.86	0.01	2.69	0.21	2.48	0.28	2.25
	[0.33]		[0.38]		[-2.09]		[0.02]		[0.45]		[0.20]	
girls 10-17	-0.26	2.51	-0.20	2.49	-0.72	2.61	0.13	2.72	<b>-0.52*</b>	2.35	-0.45	2.40
	[-0.76]		[-0.61]		[-0.72]		[0.34]		[-1.89]		[-0.62]	

N (children 6-9)	3 613	3 087	526	1 292	1 731	590
N (boys 6-9)	2 133	1 821	312	742	1 066	325
N (girls 6-9)	2 174	1 868	306	776	1 037	361
N (children 10-17)	4 851	4 135	716	1 977	2 058	816
N (boys 10-17)	3 298	2 811	475	1 288	1 489	509
N (girls 10-17)	3 613	2 820	478	1 334	1 411	553

Note: Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*) , 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels. Robust standard errors presented in parentheses. Bold indicates that they are significant at  $p < .10$ . Directly above the standard errors is the treatment effect for the indicator, and in the following column is the baseline value. † refers to an instance where the estimation could not converge, a lack of observations across strata, or where there were no observations. Estimates for binary outcomes are reported using marginal effects.

**Table 34 Impact of SCTP wage work – child labour, last 12 months**

	all	fhh	mhh	severely constrained	moderately constrained	unconstrained						
<i>Participation, prop hh</i>												
children 10-17	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.02	<b>-0.01**</b>	0.01	-0.00	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.02
	[0.65]		[1.06]		[-1.98]		[-0.04]		[0.84]		[0.49]	
boys 10-17	0.01	0.02	<b>0.01***</b>	0.02	<b>-0.02***</b>	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	-0.00	0.02
	[1.50]		[2.85]		[-3.12]		[0.68]		[1.20]		[-0.05]	
girls 10-17	-0.00	0.01	-0.00	0.01	-0.00	0.01	-0.01	0.01	-0.00	0.01	<b>0.01**</b>	0.01
	[-0.39]		[-0.31]		[-0.50]		[-0.98]		[-0.53]		[2.13]	
<i>Total days worked in a year in hh</i>												
children 10-17	<b>1.10*</b>	1.70	<b>1.65***</b>	1.90	<b>-1.83**</b>	0.50	0.80	1.97	<b>2.07***</b>	1.29	-0.35	2.06
	[1.95]		[3.00]		[-2.42]		[1.24]		[4.72]		[-0.14]	
boys 10-17	<b>1.57*</b>	2.03	<b>2.28**</b>	2.25	<b>-2.25**</b>	0.73	1.44	2.56	<b>2.54***</b>	1.32	0.09	2.77
	[1.76]		[2.38]		[-2.30]		[1.36]		[4.69]		[0.02]	
girls 10-17	-0.05	0.49	0.04	0.56	<b>-0.51**</b>	0.01	-0.35	0.45	0.20	0.52	-0.20	0.48
	[-0.28]		[0.18]		[-2.52]		[-1.18]		[0.70]		[-0.79]	
N (children 10-17)	4 851		4 135		716		1 977		2 058		816	4 851
N (boys 10-17)	3 286		2 811		475		1 288		1 489		509	3 286
N (girls 10-17)	3 298		2 820		478		1 334		1 411		553	3 298

Note: Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*), 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels. Robust standard errors presented in parentheses. Bold indicates that they are significant at  $p < .10$ . Directly above the standard errors is the treatment effect for the indicator, and in the following column is the baseline value. † refers to an instance where the estimation could not converge, a lack of observations across strata, or where there were no observations. Estimates for binary outcomes are reported using marginal effects.

**Table 35 Impact of SCTP *ganyu* labour – child labour, last 12 months**

	all		fhh		mhh		severely constrained		moderately constrained		unconstrained	
<i>Participation, prop hh</i>												
children 10-17	<b>-0.12**</b>	0.51	<b>-0.12**</b>	0.53	<b>-0.12*</b>	0.38	-0.09	0.53	<b>-0.14**</b>	0.52	-0.11	0.41
	[-2.06]		[-2.02]		[-1.94]		[-1.13]		[-2.28]		[-1.47]	
boys 10-17	<b>-0.13**</b>	0.46	<b>-0.12**</b>	0.48	-0.16	0.39	-0.01	0.50	<b>-0.18***</b>	0.47	<b>-0.21***</b>	0.38
	[-2.47]		[-2.44]		[-1.54]		[-0.12]		[-3.44]		[-2.60]	
girls 10-17	-0.10	0.43	-0.09	0.46	-0.12	0.29	<b>-0.13**</b>	0.48	-0.09	0.43	0.02	0.33
	[-1.34]		[-1.21]		[-1.53]		[-1.98]		[-1.09]		[0.41]	
<i>Total days worked in a year in hh</i>												
children 10-17	<b>-14.23***</b>	27.12	<b>-15.30***</b>	28.48	-4.64	19.02	<b>-14.77**</b>	30.76	<b>-15.07***</b>	27.87	<b>-7.34**</b>	16.46
	[-2.93]		[-3.28]		[-0.59]		[-2.52]		[-2.63]		[-2.49]	
boys 10-17	<b>-11.31***</b>	21.90	<b>-13.04***</b>	22.70	1.89	17.07	-9.00	24.74	<b>-12.53***</b>	21.88	<b>-7.60*</b>	14.85
	[-2.64]		[-3.82]		[0.23]		[-1.08]		[-4.49]		[-1.93]	
girls 10-17	<b>-10.36***</b>	18.39	<b>-10.39***</b>	19.41	<b>-7.02**</b>	11.89	<b>-12.49***</b>	22.07	<b>-10.28*</b>	17.89	-3.22	10.83
	[-3.06]		[-2.60]		[-2.30]		[-3.46]		[-1.84]		[-0.95]	
N (children 10-17)	4 851		4 135		716		1 977		2 058		816	4 851
N (boys 10-17)	3 286		2 811		475		1 288		1 489		509	3 286
N (girls 10-17)	3 298		2 820		478		1 334		1 411		553	3 298

Note: Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*), 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels. Robust standard errors presented in parentheses. Bold indicates that they are significant at  $p < .10$ . Directly above the standard errors is the treatment effect for the indicator, and in the following column is the baseline value. † refers to an instance where the estimation could not converge, a lack of observations across strata, or where there were no observations. Estimates for binary outcomes are reported using marginal effects.



**Table 36 Impact of SCTP on participation in household activities – child labour, last week**

	all	fhh	mhh	severely constrained	moderately constrained	unconstrained						
<i>Household non-farm enterprise</i>												
children 6-9	<b>-0.01*</b>	0.03	-0.01	0.03	<b>-0.02*</b>	0.01	-0.01	0.04	<b>-0.01*</b>	0.02	<b>0.01*</b>	0.02
	[-1.76]		[-1.34]		[-1.87]		[-0.76]		[-1.80]		[1.69]	
boys 6-9	<b>-0.01**</b>	0.02	<b>-0.01**</b>	0.02	+	0.01	<b>-0.03***</b>	0.02	<b>-0.01*</b>	0.02	<b>0.02*</b>	0.01
	[-2.48]		[-2.31]				[-3.04]		[-1.81]		[1.74]	
girls 6-9	-0.00	0.03	-0.00	0.04	-0.01	0.01	0.01	0.06	-0.01	0.02	<b>0.01*</b>	0.02
	[-0.69]		[-0.40]		[-0.67]		[0.80]		[-0.63]		[1.82]	
children 10-17	-0.01	0.06	-0.01	0.06	-0.01	0.06	0.00	0.07	-0.02	0.05	0.01	0.07
	[-0.61]		[-0.65]		[-0.81]		[0.02]		[-1.61]		[0.37]	
boys 10-17	0.00	0.05	-0.00	0.05	0.02	0.06	0.01	0.06	-0.02	0.04	0.04	0.05
	[0.20]		[-0.05]		[1.07]		[0.79]		[-1.25]		[1.19]	
girls 10-17	-0.02	0.06	-0.01	0.06	<b>-0.04*</b>	0.05	-0.00	0.07	<b>-0.03**</b>	0.05	-0.00	0.08
	[-1.31]		[-1.11]		[-1.91]		[-0.11]		[-2.28]		[-0.07]	
<i>Livestock activities</i>												
children 6-9	<b>0.04**</b>	0.01	<b>0.03*</b>	0.01	<b>0.09**</b>	0.02	<b>0.04*</b>	0.01	0.02	0.01	<b>0.09*</b>	0.01
	[2.03]		[1.74]		[2.28]		[1.79]		[1.34]		[1.81]	
boys 6-9	<b>0.05*</b>	0.01	0.03	0.01	+	0.03	0.03	0.01	<b>0.04**</b>	0.01	0.13	0.03
	[1.75]		[1.39]				[1.24]		[2.39]		[1.52]	
girls 6-9	<b>0.02***</b>	0.00	<b>0.02***</b>	0.00	<b>0.04**</b>	0.00	<b>0.03**</b>	0.00	-0.00	0.00	<b>0.05***</b>	0.00
	[2.74]		[2.88]		[2.22]		[2.22]		[-0.30]		[2.65]	
children 10-17	<b>0.05***</b>	0.03	<b>0.04***</b>	0.02	<b>0.09**</b>	0.05	<b>0.05**</b>	0.03	<b>0.04**</b>	0.02	<b>0.04*</b>	0.03
	[2.63]		[2.64]		[2.36]		[2.20]		[2.56]		[1.71]	
boys 10-17	<b>0.05**</b>	0.03	<b>0.04*</b>	0.03	<b>0.15***</b>	0.05	<b>0.06**</b>	0.04	<b>0.07***</b>	0.02	-0.00	0.03
	[2.52]		[1.82]		[4.74]		[2.31]		[3.12]		[-0.08]	
girls 10-17	0.02	0.01	<b>0.02***</b>	0.01	-0.00	0.03	0.03	0.02	-0.01	0.01	<b>0.05***</b>	0.01
	[1.44]		[2.95]		[-0.08]		[1.13]		[-0.64]		[2.77]	
<i>Collecting nuts or other tree fruits, honey or other products</i>												

children 6-9	-0.08	0.23	-0.09	0.23	-0.01	0.24	-0.06	0.29	-0.10	0.20	<b>-0.10*</b>	0.19
	[-1.16]		[-1.15]		[-0.20]		[-0.69]		[-1.11]		[-1.75]	
boys 6-9	-0.04	0.20	-0.04	0.20	+	0.26	-0.03	0.26	-0.02	0.18	<b>-0.17***</b>	0.18
	[-0.44]		[-0.45]				[-0.55]		[-0.14]		[-3.35]	
girls 6-9	<b>-0.11**</b>	0.23	<b>-0.13*</b>	0.23	-0.08	0.20	-0.08	0.28	<b>-0.14***</b>	0.19	-0.02	0.21
	[-1.96]		[-1.78]		[-1.11]		[-0.77]		[-2.98]		[-0.50]	
children 10-17	-0.00	0.71	0.02	0.71	<b>-0.13***</b>	0.72	0.01	0.74	-0.04	0.70	0.02	0.67
	[-0.08]		[0.27]		[-3.76]		[0.15]		[-0.76]		[0.23]	
boys 10-17	0.00	0.65	0.03	0.64	<b>-0.17***</b>	0.70	0.00	0.67	-0.03	0.65	0.07	0.60
	[0.03]		[0.35]		[-4.28]		[0.02]		[-0.48]		[0.43]	
girls 10-17	0.00	0.69	0.03	0.70	<b>-0.15**</b>	0.66	0.03	0.74	-0.02	0.66	-0.01	0.65
	[0.07]		[0.53]		[-1.98]		[0.47]		[-0.50]		[-0.07]	
<b><i>Ganyu labour</i></b>												
children 6-9	-0.01	0.02	-0.01	0.02	-0.00	0.02	-0.00	0.03	-0.00	0.02	-0.02	0.01
	[-0.61]		[-0.45]		[-0.24]		[-0.16]		[-0.12]		[-1.46]	
boys 6-9	-0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.02	+	0.01	<b>-0.02**</b>	0.02	0.01	0.02	-0.01	0.00
	[-1.06]		[-0.89]				[-2.53]		[0.35]		[-0.90]	
girls 6-9	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.02	-0.02	0.03	<b>0.03*</b>	0.03	-0.01	0.02	-0.01	0.01
	[0.03]		[0.30]		[-0.80]		[1.79]		[-0.75]		[-1.22]	
children 10-17	<b>-0.10***</b>	0.20	<b>-0.10***</b>	0.21	<b>-0.11***</b>	0.11	<b>-0.11***</b>	0.23	<b>-0.10***</b>	0.20	<b>-0.04*</b>	0.13
	[-4.02]		[-3.30]		[-4.73]		[-3.06]		[-3.68]		[-1.88]	
boys 10-17	<b>-0.11***</b>	0.16	<b>-0.11***</b>	0.17	<b>-0.14***</b>	0.12	<b>-0.09**</b>	0.19	<b>-0.12***</b>	0.16	<b>-0.14***</b>	0.12
	[-4.91]		[-3.31]		[-2.88]		[-2.00]		[-3.35]		[-3.80]	
girls 10-17	<b>-0.08***</b>	0.16	<b>-0.08***</b>	0.18	<b>-0.11*</b>	0.06	<b>-0.12***</b>	0.20	<b>-0.11***</b>	0.16	<b>0.08***</b>	0.09
	[-3.66]		[-3.91]		[-1.74]		[-4.97]		[-2.78]		[2.59]	
<b><i>Formal wage labour</i></b>												
children 6-9	<b>-0.01***</b>	0.00	<b>-0.01**</b>	0.00	+	0.00	<b>-0.01***</b>	0.00	-0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00
	[-2.61]		[-2.48]				[-4.10]		[-1.33]		[0.82]	
boys 6-9	<b>-0.01***</b>	0.00	<b>-0.01**</b>	0.00	+	0.00	<b>-0.02***</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.00
	[-2.58]		[-2.50]				[-3.25]		[0.56]		[-1.45]	

girls 6-9	-0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.00	†	0.00	-0.01	0.00	<b>-0.01**</b>	0.00	0.02	0.00
	[-1.03]		[-1.15]				[-0.84]		[-2.20]		[1.58]	
children 10-17	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	-0.01	0.01
	[1.08]		[1.26]		[0.35]		[1.21]		[0.61]		[-0.36]	
boys 10-17	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	<b>0.02**</b>	0.00	<b>0.02***</b>	0.01	-0.00	0.01	0.00	0.02
	[1.56]		[1.17]		[2.07]		[2.86]		[-0.66]		[0.01]	
girls 10-17	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.02	0.00	-0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	-0.01	0.00
	[-0.34]		[-0.08]		[-1.32]		[-0.56]		[0.07]		[-0.88]	
N (children 6-9)	3 613		3 087		526		1 292		1 731		590	
N (boys 6-9)	2 133		1 821		312		742		1 066		325	
N (girls 6-9)	2 174		1 868		306		776		1 037		361	
N (children 10-17)	4 851		4 135		716		1 977		2 058		816	
N (boys 10-17)	3 298		2 811		475		1 288		1 489		509	
N (girls 10-17)	3 613		2 820		478		1 334		1 411		553	

Note: Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*), 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels. Robust standard errors presented in parentheses. Bold indicates that they are significant at  $p < .10$ . Directly above the standard errors is the treatment effect for the indicator, and in the following column is the baseline value. † refers to an instance where the estimation could not converge, a lack of observations across strata, or where there were no observations. Estimates for binary outcomes are reported using marginal effects.

**Table 37 Impact of SCTP on total hours spent in household activities in hh – child labour, last week**

	all	fhh	mhh	severely constrained	moderately constrained	unconstrained						
<i>Household non-farm enterprise</i>												
children 6-9	<b>-0.08**</b>	0.11	<b>-0.12***</b>	0.11	<b>0.12*</b>	0.11	<b>-0.11***</b>	0.15	-0.06	0.10	<b>0.14***</b>	0.04
	[-2.28]		[-3.16]		[1.68]		[-2.90]		[-0.84]		[4.29]	
boys 6-9	-0.11	0.08	<b>-0.19**</b>	0.07	+	0.16	<b>-0.20***</b>	0.07	-0.02	0.11	<b>0.11***</b>	0.03
	[-1.25]		[-2.41]				[-2.85]		[-0.13]		[2.95]	
girls 6-9	-0.02	0.10	-0.02	0.11	0.02	0.03	0.04	0.18	-0.07	0.06	<b>0.14***</b>	0.04
	[-0.40]		[-0.46]		[0.31]		[0.71]		[-1.03]		[3.19]	
children 10-17	0.20	0.74	0.12	0.70	0.51	1.01	0.32	0.84	-0.08	0.63	0.70	0.80
	[0.61]		[0.42]		[1.25]		[0.75]		[-0.29]		[1.32]	
boys 10-17	0.31	0.50	0.23	0.44	<b>0.75**</b>	0.84	<b>0.60**</b>	0.65	0.03	0.39	<b>0.79**</b>	0.45
	[1.39]		[1.22]		[2.07]		[2.44]		[0.10]		[2.29]	
girls 10-17	-0.02	0.60	-0.07	0.59	0.14	0.70	-0.13	0.63	-0.10	0.51	0.34	0.78
	[-0.08]		[-0.24]		[0.62]		[-0.28]		[-0.77]		[0.74]	
<i>Livestock activities</i>												
children 6-9	0.22	0.12	0.26	0.06	0.14	0.48	0.05	0.06	-0.21	0.09	<b>1.58**</b>	0.34
	[0.90]		[1.22]		[0.22]		[0.40]		[-0.92]		[2.06]	
boys 6-9	0.21	0.18	0.18	0.08	+	0.78	0.03	0.07	-0.05	0.12	<b>1.56**</b>	0.63
	[0.94]		[1.03]				[0.13]		[-0.31]		[2.52]	
girls 6-9	0.19	0.03	0.28	0.03	0.25	0.03	<b>0.07***</b>	0.03	-0.23	0.03	1.38	0.00
	[0.85]		[1.19]		[1.48]		[2.84]		[-1.21]		[1.16]	
children 10-17	-0.08	0.35	-0.15	0.32	0.31	0.51	-0.29	0.41	-0.10	0.25	0.36	0.43
	[-0.32]		[-0.76]		[0.43]		[-0.87]		[-0.80]		[0.64]	
boys 10-17	0.06	0.40	-0.02	0.35	0.43	0.65	-0.08	0.42	0.02	0.28	0.26	0.65
	[0.22]		[-0.12]		[0.50]		[-0.52]		[0.08]		[0.33]	
girls 10-17	-0.18	0.12	-0.21	0.12	0.06	0.12	-0.39	0.20	-0.19	0.08	<b>0.17***</b>	0.03
	[-1.34]		[-1.47]		[0.60]		[-0.77]		[-1.41]		[2.59]	
<i>Collecting nuts or other tree fruits, honey or other products</i>												

children 6-9	<b>-0.48*</b>	0.70	<b>-0.54*</b>	0.69	0.11	0.79	<b>-0.59*</b>	0.80	-0.34	0.65	<b>-0.57***</b>	0.62
	[-1.65]		[-1.68]		[0.38]		[-1.74]		[-1.21]		[-2.64]	
boys 6-9	-0.20	0.57	-0.21	0.54	+	0.75	-0.16	0.68	-0.16	0.53	<b>-0.73**</b>	0.46
	[-0.81]		[-0.91]				[-0.37]		[-0.34]		[-2.30]	
girls 6-9	<b>-0.58**</b>	0.60	<b>-0.64**</b>	0.61	0.29	0.58	-0.83	0.68	-0.36	0.55	<b>-0.38*</b>	0.59
	[-2.25]		[-2.16]		[0.97]		[-1.23]		[-1.10]		[-1.73]	
children 10-17	-0.03	3.39	0.08	3.36	<b>-1.00*</b>	3.58	0.04	3.56	-0.09	3.38	-0.04	3.00
	[-0.06]		[0.13]		[-1.93]		[0.07]		[-0.18]		[-0.04]	
boys 10-17	0.17	2.52	0.22	2.47	<b>-0.74**</b>	2.86	0.01	2.69	0.21	2.48	0.28	2.25
	[0.33]		[0.38]		[-2.09]		[0.02]		[0.45]		[0.20]	
girls 10-17	-0.26	2.51	-0.20	2.49	-0.72	2.61	0.13	2.72	<b>-0.52*</b>	2.35	-0.45	2.40
	[-0.76]		[-0.61]		[-0.72]		[0.34]		[-1.89]		[-0.62]	
<b><i>Ganyu labour</i></b>												
children 6-9	<b>-0.22*</b>	0.17	<b>-0.27***</b>	0.18	-0.07	0.11	<b>-0.64***</b>	0.29	0.02	0.13	0.18	0.04
	[-1.86]		[-3.21]		[-0.16]		[-2.63]		[0.06]		[1.62]	
boys 6-9	-0.14	0.17	-0.17	0.19	+	0.06	<b>-0.55***</b>	0.35	0.02	0.10	<b>0.30**</b>	0.00
	[-1.46]		[-1.30]				[-3.52]		[0.10]		[2.12]	
girls 6-9	<b>-0.22*</b>	0.12	<b>-0.27***</b>	0.12	0.10	0.12	-0.48	0.15	-0.01	0.11	-0.03	0.06
	[-1.66]		[-2.75]		[0.12]		[-1.28]		[-0.03]		[-0.53]	
children 10-17	<b>-1.78***</b>	3.42	<b>-1.67**</b>	3.75	<b>-2.18***</b>	1.47	-2.35	4.24	<b>-1.45**</b>	3.14	-0.19	2.16
	[-2.61]		[-2.21]		[-2.96]		[-1.53]		[-2.39]		[-0.23]	
boys 10-17	<b>-1.55**</b>	2.77	<b>-1.49**</b>	2.99	<b>-1.81**</b>	1.44	-1.53	3.41	<b>-1.35**</b>	2.32	-0.92	2.45
	[-2.53]		[-2.00]		[-1.97]		[-1.59]		[-2.37]		[-0.76]	
girls 10-17	<b>-1.21**</b>	2.32	<b>-1.13**</b>	2.56	<b>-1.48**</b>	0.80	-1.82	3.05	-0.94	2.17	0.22	0.94
	[-2.19]		[-1.96]		[-2.37]		[-1.23]		[-1.20]		[0.68]	
<b><i>Formal wage labour</i></b>												
children 6-9	0.04	0.08	0.04	0.09	+	0.00	<b>-0.07***</b>	0.05	0.09	0.05	0.18	0.23
	[1.36]		[1.15]				[-2.71]		[0.92]		[1.19]	
boys 6-9	0.05	0.06	0.07	0.07	+	0.00	<b>-0.17**</b>	0.05	0.22	0.07	-0.04	0.00
	[0.61]		[0.63]				[-2.55]		[1.54]		[-1.45]	

girls 6-9	0.03	0.07	0.03	0.09	†	0.00	0.02	0.03	<b>-0.05*</b>	0.00	0.51	0.38
	[0.54]		[0.44]				[0.43]		[-1.76]		[1.56]	
children 10-17	0.27	0.32	0.35	0.37	-0.08	0.00	0.43	0.24	0.14	0.36	-0.05	0.37
	[1.44]		[1.56]		[-0.83]		[1.19]		[0.49]		[-0.14]	
boys 10-17	<b>0.51*</b>	0.41	<b>0.63*</b>	0.48	0.06	0.00	<b>0.98***</b>	0.33	0.28	0.42	-0.11	0.58
	[1.85]		[1.79]		[0.48]		[2.58]		[0.77]		[-0.17]	
girls 10-17	-0.13	0.06	-0.12	0.07	<b>-0.15***</b>	0.00	-0.39	0.04	-0.08	0.10	-0.02	0.00
	[-1.24]		[-0.99]		[-3.33]		[-1.15]		[-1.52]		[-0.88]	
N (children 6-9)	3 613		3 087		526		1 292		1 731		590	
N (boys 6-9)	2 133		1 821		312		742		1 066		325	
N (girls 6-9)	2 174		1 868		306		776		1 037		361	
N (children 10-17)	4 851		4 135		716		1 977		2 058		816	
N (boys 10-17)	3 298		2 811		475		1 288		1 489		509	
N (girls 10-17)	3 613		2 820		478		1 334		1 411		553	

Note: Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*), 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels. Robust standard errors presented in parentheses. Bold indicates that they are significant at  $p < .10$ . Directly above the standard errors is the treatment effect for the indicator, and in the following column is the baseline value. † refers to an instance where the estimation could not converge, a lack of observations across strata, or where there were no observations. Estimates for binary outcomes are reported using marginal effects.

**Table 38 Impact of SCTP on participation in chores – child labour, yesterday**

	all	fhh	mhh	severely constrained	moderately constrained	unconstrained						
<i>Collecting water</i>												
children 6-9	<b>0.11***</b> [2.76]	0.32	<b>0.12***</b> [2.76]	0.32	0.06 [1.33]	0.33 [0.61]	0.07 [6.19]	0.39 [6.19]	<b>0.17***</b> [6.19]	0.28	<b>0.07**</b> [1.98]	0.29
boys 6-9	0.05 [1.29]	0.18	0.06 [1.40]	0.18	+	0.16	0.00 [0.06]	0.23	<b>0.11***</b> [4.29]	0.16	-0.02 [-0.60]	0.15
girls 6-9	<b>0.16***</b> [3.18]	0.38	<b>0.16***</b> [2.67]	0.38	0.02 [0.26]	0.43	0.19 [1.19]	0.46	<b>0.14***</b> [4.59]	0.33	<b>0.25**</b> [2.29]	0.36
children 10-17	0.02 [0.86]	0.70	0.01 [0.50]	0.70	0.07 [1.35]	0.73	0.02 [0.32]	0.75	<b>0.06***</b> [2.92]	0.69	-0.02 [-1.01]	0.63
boys 10-17	<b>0.03*</b> [1.82]	0.33	0.01 [0.30]	0.31	<b>0.11**</b> [2.47]	0.41	0.04 [1.02]	0.38	<b>0.05*</b> [1.87]	0.30	-0.02 [-0.17]	0.26
girls 10-17	0.02 [0.99]	0.84	0.01 [0.28]	0.83	<b>0.11*</b> [1.78]	0.84	0.03 [0.47]	0.88	0.02 [0.62]	0.81	0.06 [0.75]	0.78
<i>Collecting firewood</i>												
children 6-9	0.00 [0.16]	0.10	0.00 [0.09]	0.10	0.01 [0.81]	0.08	<b>-0.04*</b> [-1.84]	0.13	0.04 [0.91]	0.08	0.00 [0.24]	0.07
boys 6-9	<b>-0.03**</b> [-2.42]	0.06	<b>-0.03**</b> [-2.13]	0.06	+	0.06	<b>-0.08***</b> [-3.45]	0.08	-0.00 [-0.01]	0.05	-0.05 [-1.27]	0.03
girls 6-9	0.03 [1.46]	0.12	0.02 [1.04]	0.12	<b>0.06**</b> [2.23]	0.09	0.01 [0.68]	0.15	0.06 [1.48]	0.09	0.03 [1.19]	0.09
children 10-17	-0.02 [-0.31]	0.31	-0.00 [-0.05]	0.31	<b>-0.09*</b> [-1.93]	0.31	-0.04 [-0.46]	0.36	0.01 [0.14]	0.31	<b>-0.06***</b> [-2.69]	0.22
boys 10-17	-0.05 [-1.53]	0.12	-0.07 [-1.63]	0.11	0.05 [0.74]	0.15	-0.05 [-0.82]	0.15	-0.05 [-1.57]	0.11	<b>-0.06**</b> [-2.13]	0.07
girls 10-17	0.00 [0.03]	0.38	0.03 [0.29]	0.39	<b>-0.15**</b> [-2.52]	0.37	-0.00 [-0.01]	0.45	0.03 [0.33]	0.37	<b>-0.10***</b> [-2.62]	0.28
<i>Taking care of children, cooking or cleaning</i>												

children 6-9	0.03	0.24	0.03	0.25	0.01	0.21	<b>0.10**</b>	0.27	-0.00	0.22	-0.01	0.22
	[1.02]		[1.02]		[0.12]		[2.02]		[-0.01]		[-0.24]	
boys 6-9	-0.02	0.14	-0.03	0.14	†	0.14	0.02	0.16	-0.03	0.13	<b>-0.13**</b>	0.10
	[-0.88]		[-0.87]				[0.42]		[-1.29]		[-2.23]	
girls 6-9	<b>0.07*</b>	0.29	<b>0.08*</b>	0.30	-0.06	0.23	<b>0.16***</b>	0.33	0.02	0.26	0.09	0.27
	[1.76]		[1.91]		[-0.54]		[2.81]		[0.31]		[1.55]	
children 10-17	0.02	0.65	0.03	0.66	-0.04	0.63	0.03	0.71	-0.01	0.63	<b>0.06*</b>	0.59
	[0.94]		[1.14]		[-0.69]		[0.64]		[-0.24]		[1.83]	
boys 10-17	-0.04	0.34	-0.02	0.34	<b>-0.20***</b>	0.38	-0.05	0.40	-0.05	0.32	0.04	0.29
	[-1.50]		[-1.06]		[-3.57]		[-0.78]		[-0.89]		[0.41]	
girls 10-17	<b>0.04*</b>	0.75	0.03	0.76	0.05	0.71	<b>0.06*</b>	0.82	-0.00	0.71	0.05	0.72
	[1.77]		[1.27]		[0.68]		[1.77]		[-0.17]		[1.53]	
N (children 6-9)	3 613		3 087		526		1 292		1 731		590	
N (boys 6-9)	2 133		1 821		312		742		1 066		325	
N (girls 6-9)	2 174		1 868		306		776		1 037		361	
N (children 10-17)	4 851		4 135		716		1 977		2 058		816	
N (boys 10-17)	3 298		2 811		475		1 288		1 489		509	
N (girls 10-17)	3 613		2 820		478		1 334		1 411		553	

Note: Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*), 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels. Robust standard errors presented in parentheses. Bold indicates that they are significant at  $p < .10$ . Directly above the standard errors is the treatment effect for the indicator, and in the following column is the baseline value. † refers to an instance where the estimation could not converge, a lack of observations across strata, or where there were no observations. Estimates for binary outcomes are reported using marginal effects.



**Table 39 Impact of SCTP on total hours spent on chores – child labour, yesterday**

	all	fhh	mhh	severely constrained	moderately constrained	unconstrained						
<i>Total hrs collecting water in hh</i>												
children 6-9	0.10	0.46	0.08	0.45	0.19	0.56	0.06	0.59	<b>0.22***</b>	0.39	-0.02	0.40
	[1.54]		[1.20]		[1.03]		[0.26]		[4.80]		[-0.28]	
boys 6-9	0.06	0.23	0.06	0.24	+	0.18	0.02	0.32	<b>0.15***</b>	0.20	-0.07	0.17
	[0.79]		[0.83]				[0.12]		[2.70]		[-0.88]	
girls 6-9	<b>0.12*</b>	0.54	0.08	0.50	0.21	0.75	0.12	0.67	<b>0.22***</b>	0.44	0.05	0.49
	[1.68]		[0.83]		[1.00]		[0.47]		[3.09]		[0.28]	
children 10-17	-0.15	1.48	<b>-0.23***</b>	1.48	0.42	1.46	-0.20	1.58	-0.14	1.46	-0.03	1.28
	[-1.52]		[-3.64]		[1.37]		[-0.72]		[-1.54]		[-0.22]	
boys 10-17	0.01	0.55	-0.04	0.53	0.23	0.69	-0.12	0.66	<b>0.12*</b>	0.51	0.07	0.40
	[0.17]		[-1.15]		[1.19]		[-1.37]		[1.66]		[0.40]	
girls 10-17	<b>-0.26***</b>	1.65	<b>-0.37***</b>	1.66	0.45	1.56	-0.18	1.74	<b>-0.40***</b>	1.59	-0.09	1.56
	[-3.91]		[-7.25]		[1.06]		[-0.63]		[-2.62]		[-0.41]	
<i>Total hrs collecting firewood in hh</i>												
children 6-9	-0.04	0.16	-0.05	0.17	-0.04	0.13	-0.11	0.22	-0.01	0.15	-0.00	0.09
	[-0.50]		[-0.42]		[-0.75]		[-1.08]		[-0.10]		[-0.07]	
boys 6-9	-0.14	0.10	-0.14	0.11	+	0.06	-0.23	0.14	-0.09	0.09	-0.12	0.03
	[-1.22]		[-1.00]				[-1.33]		[-0.68]		[-1.12]	
girls 6-9	0.06	0.17	0.05	0.18	0.03	0.15	0.03	0.22	0.07	0.15	<b>0.10*</b>	0.13
	[1.46]		[1.31]		[0.63]		[1.07]		[1.06]		[1.77]	
children 10-17	-0.31	0.76	-0.32	0.76	<b>-0.25**</b>	0.75	<b>-0.36*</b>	0.86	-0.19	0.75	<b>-0.55***</b>	0.53
	[-1.51]		[-1.35]		[-2.10]		[-1.88]		[-0.56]		[-2.92]	
boys 10-17	-0.13	0.21	-0.19	0.21	<b>0.28***</b>	0.24	-0.12	0.24	-0.15	0.22	-0.01	0.10
	[-1.36]		[-1.62]		[3.53]		[-1.20]		[-1.38]		[-0.24]	
girls 10-17	-0.34	0.91	-0.30	0.91	<b>-0.58***</b>	0.92	<b>-0.43*</b>	1.06	-0.11	0.85	<b>-0.81***</b>	0.70
	[-1.46]		[-1.24]		[-2.75]		[-1.94]		[-0.29]		[-3.24]	
<i>Total hrs taking care of children, cooking or cleaning in hh</i>												

children 6-9	-0.02	0.40	-0.03	0.41	0.10	0.34	0.07	0.48	-0.11	0.34	0.07	0.38
	[-0.24]		[-0.44]		[0.81]		[0.75]		[-1.43]		[0.68]	
boys 6-9	-0.04	0.20	-0.04	0.20	†	0.19	-0.03	0.27	-0.03	0.18	-0.15	0.12
	[-0.66]		[-0.56]				[-0.44]		[-0.55]		[-1.49]	
girls 6-9	0.01	0.46	-0.01	0.47	0.11	0.38	0.13	0.54	<b>-0.15*</b>	0.38	0.22	0.51
	[0.11]		[-0.19]		[0.61]		[1.31]		[-1.73]		[1.64]	
children 10-17	-0.12	1.86	-0.10	1.89	-0.25	1.70	0.06	2.18	<b>-0.29**</b>	1.70	-0.20	1.52
	[-0.75]		[-0.73]		[-0.62]		[0.24]		[-2.04]		[-1.38]	
boys 10-17	<b>-0.16**</b>	0.69	<b>-0.16**</b>	0.67	-0.24	0.80	-0.16	0.88	-0.13	0.59	-0.03	0.49
	[-2.21]		[-2.30]		[-0.91]		[-0.97]		[-0.95]		[-0.15]	
girls 10-17	-0.08	2.07	-0.09	2.11	-0.06	1.82	0.24	2.42	<b>-0.36**</b>	1.85	-0.21	1.84
	[-0.42]		[-0.57]		[-0.12]		[0.88]		[-2.29]		[-0.61]	
N (children 6-9)	3 613		3 087		526		1 292		1 731		590	
N (boys 6-9)	2 133		1 821		312		742		1 066		325	
N (girls 6-9)	2 174		1 868		306		776		1 037		361	
N (children 10-17)	4 851		4 135		716		1 977		2 058		816	
N (boys 10-17)	3 298		2 811		475		1 288		1 489		509	
N (girls 10-17)	3 613		2 820		478		1 334		1 411		553	

Note: Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*), 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels. Robust standard errors presented in parentheses. Bold indicates that they are significant at  $p < .10$ . Directly above the standard errors is the treatment effect for the indicator, and in the following column is the baseline value. † refers to an instance where the estimation could not converge, a lack of observations across strata, or where there were no observations. Estimates for binary outcomes are reported using marginal effects.

**Table 40 Impact of SCTP on hired labour**

	all		fhh		mhh		severely constrained		moderately constrained		unconstrained	
HH hire someone for activity	0.02	0.04	<b>0.03**</b>	0.04	-0.00	0.07	0.01	0.05	<b>0.03*</b>	0.03	0.02	0.04
	[1.64]		[2.02]		[-0.18]		[0.56]		[1.83]		[0.97]	
<i>All farming activities, last rainy season</i>												
total days, men	0.12	0.40	<b>0.25**</b>	0.36	-0.43	0.60	<b>-0.18*</b>	0.43	-0.13	0.18	<b>1.25***</b>	0.75
	[1.05]		[2.57]		[-1.08]		[-1.71]		[-1.33]		[2.77]	
total days, women	0.12	0.24	-0.03	0.17	0.81	0.61	<b>-0.31**</b>	0.23	0.24	0.12	0.87	0.49
	[0.46]		[-0.26]		[0.80]		[-2.46]		[1.11]		[0.77]	
total days, children	-0.04	0.11	-0.07	0.09	0.11	0.18	-0.10	0.20	-0.01	0.02	<b>0.07*</b>	0.04
	[-0.49]		[-0.98]		[0.64]		[-0.81]		[-0.13]		[1.82]	
<i>Land preparation and planting, last rainy season</i>												
n men hired	0.01	0.04	0.02	0.03	-0.05	0.07	0.01	0.05	-0.02	0.02	<b>0.07*</b>	0.03
	[0.28]		[0.68]		[-0.74]		[0.12]		[-0.77]		[1.78]	
total days, men	<b>0.13*</b>	0.23	<b>0.20***</b>	0.22	-0.20	0.32	-0.09	0.25	-0.02	0.08	<b>0.91***</b>	0.48
	[1.89]		[3.50]		[-0.75]		[-0.90]		[-0.28]		[2.95]	
n women hired	-0.00	0.04	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.08	-0.05	0.05	0.03	0.03	<b>0.05*</b>	0.02
	[-0.02]		[0.48]		[0.02]		[-1.07]		[0.58]		[1.74]	
total days, women	0.02	0.07	-0.05	0.05	0.40	0.16	<b>-0.14***</b>	0.10	0.01	0.02	0.41	0.06
	[0.24]		[-1.35]		[1.17]		[-2.63]		[0.13]		[0.89]	
n children hired	<b>0.02**</b>	0.01	<b>0.02**</b>	0.01	0.01	0.01	<b>0.04**</b>	0.01	-0.00	0.00	+	0.00
	[2.39]		[1.98]		[0.61]		[2.49]		[-0.58]			
total days, children	-0.02	0.06	-0.01	0.04	-0.05	0.14	-0.02	0.12	-0.02	0.00	+	0.00
	[-0.33]		[-0.29]		[-0.31]		[-0.18]		[-0.63]			
<i>Weeding, fertilizing or any other non-harvest activity, last rainy season</i>												
n men hired	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.03	<b>-0.08***</b>	0.04	0.02	0.04	-0.01	0.02	-0.03	0.03
	[0.30]		[0.85]		[-3.87]		[0.46]		[-0.34]		[-0.64]	
total days, men	-0.04	0.11	0.01	0.09	-0.31	0.22	-0.06	0.16	-0.10	0.07	0.05	0.09
	[0.97]		[0.23]		[-1.55]		[-1.17]		[-0.93]		[0.22]	

n women hired	<b>0.06*</b>	0.06	0.05	0.05	<b>0.08***</b>	0.10	0.00	0.05	<b>0.14**</b>	0.05	0.04	0.08
	[1.93]		[1.42]		[2.79]		[0.13]		[2.33]		[0.98]	
total days, women	0.10	0.12	0.03	0.11	0.45	0.16	-0.11	0.11	<b>0.23*</b>	0.09	0.30	0.20
	[0.93]		[0.41]		[1.64]		[-1.34]		[1.79]		[0.86]	
n children hired	-0.00	0.02	-0.01	0.02	<b>0.04**</b>	0.02	0.01	0.02	<b>-0.05*</b>	0.02	0.04	0.02
	[0.35]		[-0.60]		[2.45]		[0.59]		[-1.79]		[1.32]	
total days, children	-0.02	0.05	-0.05	0.05	<b>0.13***</b>	0.04	<b>-0.08*</b>	0.08	0.01	0.02	<b>0.07*</b>	0.04
	[-0.48]		[-0.92]		[3.87]		[-1.67]		[0.17]		[1.82]	
<i>Harvesting activity, last rainy season</i>												
n men hired	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	-0.00	0.01	0.03	0.03
	[0.58]		[0.54]		[0.95]		[0.12]		[-0.17]		[1.13]	
total days, men	0.04	0.05	0.03	0.05	0.07	0.05	-0.03	0.02	-0.01	0.02	0.29	0.18
	[1.44]		[0.78]		[0.69]		[-1.63]		[-0.24]		[1.49]	
n women hired	-0.01	0.01	-0.00	0.01	-0.01	0.04	-0.02	0.01	-0.00	0.01	0.02	0.03
	[-0.65]		[-0.34]		[-0.19]		[-1.35]		[-0.10]		[0.81]	
total days, women	-0.00	0.05	-0.01	0.01	-0.04	0.29	<b>-0.06***</b>	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.16	0.22
	[-0.01]		[-0.40]		[-0.08]		[-2.74]		[0.08]		[0.39]	
n children hired	-0.01	0.00	<b>-0.01*</b>	0.00	0.01	0.00	-0.02	0.00	-0.01	0.00	†	0.00
	[-1.50]		[-1.75]		[1.28]		[-1.63]		[-1.33]			
total days, children	-0.00	0.00	<b>-0.01**</b>	0.00	0.03	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.00	†	0.00
	[-0.62]		[-2.11]		[1.40]		[-0.24]		[-1.52]			
<i>Non-agricultural household enterprises, last 12 months</i>												
n men hired	<b>0.02**</b>	0.00	<b>0.03***</b>	0.00	-0.01	0.00	<b>0.01***</b>	0.00	<b>0.04**</b>	0.00	<b>0.01***</b>	0.00
	[2.45]		[3.14]		[-0.60]		[3.76]		[2.10]		[3.19]	
total days, men	<b>0.28**</b>	0.07	<b>0.32**</b>	0.09	0.05	0.00	<b>0.06***</b>	0.00	<b>0.11***</b>	0.01	<b>1.13**</b>	0.39
	[2.42]		[2.40]		[0.63]		[3.47]		[2.84]		[2.29]	
n women hired	-0.01	0.01	-0.02	0.01	†	0.00	†	0.00	-0.04	0.02	†	0.00
	[-1.04]		[-1.03]						[-1.06]			
total days, women	†	0.00	†	0.00	†	0.00	†	0.00	†	0.00	†	0.00

n children hired	0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	†	0.00	†	0.00
	[0.35]		[-0.01]		[0.55]		[0.26]						
total days, children	-0.03	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.20	0.00	-0.07	0.01		†	0.00	†	0.00
	[-1.04]		[-0.01]		[-0.80]		[-1.06]						
N	6 733		5 623		1 110		3 132			2 363		1 238	

Note: Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*) , 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels. Robust standard errors presented in parentheses. Bold indicates that they are significant at  $p < .10$ . Directly above the standard errors is the treatment effect for the indicator, and in the following column is the baseline value. † refers to an instance where the estimation could not converge, a lack of observations across strata, or where there were no observations. Estimates for binary outcomes are reported using marginal effects.

**Table 41 Impact of SCTP on credit**

	all		fhh		mhh		small or no farm		medium farm		large farm	
hh still owes money for loans contracted before June 2012	-0.02	0.07	-0.02	0.06	<b>-0.05***</b>	0.07	-0.01	0.07	0.00	0.04	<b>-0.08**</b>	0.08
	[-1.54]		[-1.04]		[-4.33]		[-1.10]		[0.20]		[-2.56]	
amount hh owes on previous loans, in MWK	<b>-162.33***</b>	233.28	<b>-186.15***</b>	215.92	-97.08	323.81	-108.82	243.15	30.11	121.42	<b>-385.53***</b>	288.13
	[-3.11]		[-3.96]		[-0.58]		[-1.20]		[0.34]		[-2.89]	
in last 12 months did hh borrow	<b>-0.03*</b>	0.26	-0.03	0.27	-0.02	0.24	-0.05	0.24	0.05	0.29	-0.04	0.30
	[-1.74]		[-1.26]		[-0.64]		[-1.62]		[0.89]		[-1.15]	
amount borrowed, in MWK	-196.91	839.20	-199.56	800.96	-119.67	1038.48	-183.65	799.64	-173.40	782.66	-230.81	974.64
	[-1.27]		[-1.06]		[-0.51]		[-0.75]		[-1.48]		[-0.74]	
hh has to pay interest on loan	<b>-0.02*</b>	0.06	<b>-0.03***</b>	0.06	-0.02	0.06	-0.02	0.05	-0.00	0.07	<b>-0.04***</b>	0.09
	[-1.92]		[-2.77]		[-1.17]		[-1.33]		[-0.17]		[-3.43]	
amount still owed by hh on loans in the last 12 months, in MWK	-107.23	625.64	<b>-118.91**</b>	593.30	-19.31	794.17	-137.02	584.60	126.61	621.34	-221.13	727.95
	[-1.46]		[-2.12]		[-0.07]		[-0.87]		[0.78]		[-1.63]	
desire larger loan at same interest rate	-0.02	0.12	-0.02	0.11	-0.04	0.14	-0.02	0.10	0.00	0.12	-0.02	0.15
	[-0.56]		[-0.48]		[-1.09]		[-0.72]		[0.08]		[-0.31]	
hh purchased food, other goods on credit	<b>-0.06**</b>	0.29	<b>-0.04**</b>	0.29	-0.14	0.26	<b>-0.05**</b>	0.27	0.01	0.31	<b>-0.13**</b>	0.32
	[-2.03]		[-2.00]		[-1.29]		[-2.05]		[0.23]		[-2.37]	
N	6 733		5 623		1 110		3 965		1 127		1 642	

Note: Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*), 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels. Robust standard errors presented in parentheses. Bold indicates that they are significant at  $p < .10$ . Directly above the standard errors is the treatment effect for the indicator, and in the following column is the baseline value. † refers to an instance where the estimation could not converge, a lack of observations across strata, or where there were no observations. Estimates for binary outcomes are reported using marginal effects.

**Table 42 Impact of SCTP on other income, last 12 months**

	all		fhh		mhh		small or no farm		medium farm		large farm	
hh received income from rentals	-0.00	0.02	-0.01	0.02	-0.00	0.03	<b>-0.01***</b>	0.01	-0.01	0.02	0.01	0.05
	[-0.32]		[-0.86]		[-0.11]		[2.60]		[-0.56]		[0.16]	
amount received, MWK	18.44	71.51	1.05	67.88	69.29	90.43	56.24	47.52	23.71	45.60	-81.40	147.79
	[0.49]		[0.03]		[1.02]		[0.91]		[0.32]		[-0.60]	
hh received income from selling assets	-0.00	0.03	0.00	0.02	<b>-0.06***</b>	0.03	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.04	<b>-0.03*</b>	0.03
	[-0.32]		[0.28]		[-2.88]		[0.19]		[0.26]		[-1.73]	
amount received, MWK	<b>-147.34**</b>	97.99	-93.16	96.14	<b>-447.59**</b>	107.64	-114.40	88.44	138.63	126.07	<b>-405.68***</b>	101.34
	[-2.43]		[-1.64]		[-2.37]		[-1.17]		[1.54]		[-3.56]	
N	6 729		5 619		1 110		3 963		1 125		1 641	

Note: Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*), 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels. Robust standard errors presented in parentheses. Bold indicates that they are significant at  $p < .10$ . Directly above the standard errors is the treatment effect for the indicator, and in the following column is the baseline value. † refers to an instance where the estimation could not converge, a lack of observations across strata, or where there were no observations. Estimates for binary outcomes are reported using marginal effects.

**Table 43 Impact of SCTP on private transfers received and given, last 12 months**

	all	fhh	mhh	small or no farm	medium farm	large farm						
<i>Transfers received</i>												
any transfers	<b>-0.04*</b>	0.82	-0.04	0.83	-0.05	0.81	<b>-0.06***</b>	0.83	0.05	0.81	<b>-0.05*</b>	0.80
	[-1.77]		[-1.30]		[-0.99]		[-2.66]		[1.52]		[-1.88]	
cash transfers	0.04	0.43	0.04	0.43	0.03	0.42	0.05	0.44	0.05	0.41	-0.02	0.42
	[0.79]		[0.72]		[0.77]		[1.15]		[0.57]		[-0.45]	
food or other consumables	-0.05	0.75	-0.05	0.75	-0.03	0.71	<b>-0.07*</b>	0.77	-0.00	0.74	-0.03	0.69
	[-0.93]		[-0.82]		[-0.55]		[-1.68]		[-0.03]		[-0.58]	
labour or time	-0.00	0.35	-0.00	0.35	0.01	0.34	-0.03	0.36	0.08	0.35	-0.00	0.33
	[-0.03]		[-0.02]		[0.13]		[-0.48]		[0.67]		[-0.16]	
agricultural implements or input	-0.03	0.22	-0.05	0.21	0.04	0.22	-0.03	0.22	-0.07	0.21	-0.01	0.21
	[-0.81]		[-1.02]		[1.46]		[-0.64]		[-1.18]		[-0.58]	
<i>Amount received</i>												
all transfers	-617.83	5 365.10	-620.51	5 395.19	-547.07	5 208.30	-614.88	5 650.92	-429.82	5 051.23	<b>-883.62***</b>	4 893.43
	[-0.92]		[-0.88]		[-0.93]		[-0.82]		[-0.41]		[-2.88]	
cash transfers	185.24	1 554.32	119.46	1 543.69	<b>421.01*</b>	1 609.69	112.26	1 590.08	170.12	1 465.26	<b>323.19**</b>	1 530.42
	[0.68]		[0.39]		[1.83]		[0.45]		[0.33]		[2.08]	
food or other consumables	-	2 812.48	-	2 843.73	-	2 649.61	-534.61	3 030.12	<b>-572.31*</b>	2 622.54	<b>-828.85***</b>	2 419.11
	[-2.12]		[-2.06]		[-2.09]		[-1.56]		[-1.83]		[-3.22]	
labour or time	-205.39	997.57	-171.79	1 006.89	-260.12	948.99	-193.34	1 030.73	-27.63	963.43	<b>-376.65***</b>	941.23
	[-1.02]		[-0.87]		[-1.33]		[-0.86]		[-0.07]		[-4.63]	
<i>If did not receive [transfer], hh could ask someone for...</i>												
any transfer	<b>-0.11**</b>	0.58	<b>-0.11**</b>	0.59	-0.15	0.52	<b>-0.14***</b>	0.59	-0.03	0.56	-0.13	0.56
	[-2.33]		[-2.49]		[-1.16]		[-2.58]		[-0.37]		[-1.20]	
N	2598		2193		405		1478		472		648	
cash transfers	<b>0.05**</b>	0.10	<b>0.05**</b>	0.10	0.03	0.10	<b>0.09***</b>	0.10	<b>-0.07**</b>	0.09	0.04	0.10



	[2.05]		[2.55]		[0.45]		[2.99]		[-1.96]		[0.62]	
N	3635		3019		616		2077		642		916	
food or other consumables	-0.03	0.14	<b>-0.08***</b>	0.14	<b>0.17***</b>	0.18	-0.03	0.12	<b>0.12*</b>	0.12	†	0.19
	[-1.42]		[-3.04]		[5.02]		[-0.77]		[1.80]			
N	1664		1379		285		903		311		450	
labour or time	<b>-0.05*</b>	0.16	<b>-0.05*</b>	0.17	<b>-0.07*</b>	0.11	-0.04	0.16	<b>-0.09*</b>	0.15	-0.06	0.15
	[-1.73]		[-1.69]		[-1.67]		[1.52]		[-1.76]		[-1.09]	
N	4467		3742		725		2579		764		1124	
agricultural implements or inputs	-0.03	0.14	-0.02	0.15	-0.07	0.12	-0.02	0.14	-0.01	0.14	-0.04	0.15
	[-1.06]		[-0.94]		[-1.04]		[-0.87]		[-0.41]		[-0.95]	
N	5486		4596		890		3234		932		1320	
<b>Transfers given</b>												
any transfers	0.05	0.31	0.04	0.31	0.06	0.31	0.04	0.28	0.10	0.36	0.01	0.35
	[0.68]		[0.73]		[0.46]		[0.60]		[1.17]		[0.12]	
cash transfers	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.04	0.01	0.09	<b>0.03**</b>	0.04	-0.01	0.06	-0.05	0.07
	[0.28]		[0.25]		[0.12]		[1.99]		[-0.40]		[-1.40]	
food or other consumables	0.04	0.24	0.04	0.24	0.02	0.22	0.02	0.20	0.10	0.29	0.02	0.28
	[0.51]		[0.58]		[0.23]		[0.24]		[1.20]		[0.28]	
labour or time	0.00	0.12	-0.00	0.12	0.03	0.13	0.00	0.11	0.04	0.13	-0.03	0.15
	[0.08]		[-0.06]		[0.81]		[0.01]		[1.35]		[-0.63]	
agricultural implements or inputs	-0.02	0.03	<b>-0.02**</b>	0.03	-0.01	0.03	-0.00	0.02	0.00	0.03	<b>-0.07**</b>	0.04
	[-1.53]		[-1.98]		[-0.26]		[-0.52]		[0.11]		[-2.10]	
<b>Amount given</b>												
all transfers	-2.27	550.29	-22.62	528.93	89.90	661.67	51.09	469.20	16.38	634.35	-204.61	687.39
	[-0.01]		[-0.13]		[0.29]		[0.42]		[0.06]		[-0.62]	
cash transfers	6.99	53.50	2.16	41.64	17.64	115.36	<b>56.09***</b>	39.62	-44.25	71.11	-72.95	74.70

	[0.23]		[0.16]		[0.13]		[3.63]		[-1.48]		[-1.25]	
food or other consumables	37.83	259.95	47.73	256.74	-32.02	276.64	50.49	221.36	113.15	316.26	-71.32	313.69
	[0.30]		[0.36]		[-0.20]		[0.40]		[0.78]		[-0.51]	
labour or time	-46.48	236.84	-71.82	230.54	104.29	269.67	-55.13	208.21	-52.53	246.98	-60.34	298.99
	[-0.72]		[-1.25]		[1.00]		[-0.89]		[-0.37]		[-0.33]	
N	6730		5618		1110		3962		1125		1641	

Note: Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*), 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels. Robust standard errors presented in parentheses. Bold indicates that they are significant at  $p < .10$ . Directly above the standard errors is the treatment effect for the indicator, and in the following column is the baseline value. † refers to an instance where the estimation could not converge, a lack of observations across strata, or where there were no observations. Estimates for binary outcomes are reported using marginal effects.

**Table 44 Impact of SCTP on food security and daily per capita food caloric intake**

	all		fhh		mhh		small or no farm		medium farm		large farm	
<i>Food security</i>												
in past 7 days, hh worried would not have enough food	<b>-0.11*</b>	0.83	<b>-0.10**</b>	0.84	-0.17	0.78	<b>-0.08*</b>	0.87	<b>-0.15***</b>	0.81	-0.14	0.76
	[-1.78]		[-2.10]		[-1.56]		[-1.88]		[-4.02]		[-1.13]	
# meals taken per day in hh	<b>0.17**</b>	1.93	<b>0.19**</b>	1.93	<b>0.12*</b>	1.92	<b>0.19***</b>	1.88	<b>0.18***</b>	2.00	0.13	2.00
	[2.31]		[2.46]		[1.88]		[2.71]		[3.66]		[1.10]	
# months maize from last year's harvest lasted	0.29	3.93	0.30	3.84	0.41	4.41	0.20	3.47	<b>0.80**</b>	4.38	0.15	4.72
	[0.91]		[0.86]		[1.07]		[0.44]		[2.42]		[0.28]	
<i>Daily per capita food caloric intake</i>												
consumed	<b>361***</b>	1927	<b>393***</b>	1905	123	2040	<b>336***</b>	1928	<b>471***</b>	1828	<b>337*</b>	1993
	[6.05]		[6.54]		[0.82]		[5.14]		[3.44]		[1.92]	
from purchases	<b>321***</b>	685	<b>348***</b>	661	151	810	<b>333***</b>	644	<b>350**</b>	771	253	722
	[4.78]		[6.28]		[0.86]		[9.79]		[2.35]		[1.35]	
from own production	72	967	60	952	123	1046	27	859	109	1038	116	1179
	[0.80]		[0.60]		[1.55]		[0.21]		[0.85]		[1.05]	
from gifts and other sources	-39	371	-38	384	-82	304	-25	490	-60	144	-37	242
	[-0.63]		[-0.54]		[-1.30]		[-0.27]		[-1.32]		[-0.73]	
N	6 732		5 622		1 110		3 965		1 125		1 642	

Note: Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*), 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels. Robust standard errors presented in parentheses. Bold indicates that they are significant at  $p < .10$ . Directly above the standard errors is the treatment effect for the indicator, and in the following column is the baseline value. † refers to an instance where the estimation could not converge, a lack of observations across strata, or where there were no observations. Estimates for binary outcomes are reported using marginal effects.

**Table 45 Impact of SCTP on daily per capita caloric intake (by extreme poverty status at baseline)**

	<b>all</b>		<b>extremely poor</b>		<b>not extremely poor</b>	
consumed	<b>361***</b>	1927	<b>411***</b>	1118	<b>317**</b>	2567
	[6.05]		[10.62]		[2.09]	
from purchases	<b>321***</b>	685	<b>318***</b>	525	<b>343***</b>	811
	[4.78]		[5.16]		[5.22]	
from own production	72	967	73	466	66	1363
	[0.80]		[0.90]		[0.67]	
from gifts and other sources	-39	371	-2	180	-75	522
	[-0.63]		[-0.04]		[-0.90]	
N	6 732		3 090		3 642	

Note: Statistical significance at the 99% (\*\*\*) , 95% (\*\*) and 90% (\*) confidence levels. Robust standard errors presented in parentheses. Bold indicates that they are significant at  $p < .10$ . Directly above the standard errors is the treatment effect for the indicator, and in the following column is the baseline value. † refers to an instance where the estimation could not converge, a lack of observations across strata, or where there were no observations. Estimates for binary outcomes are reported using marginal effects.

## Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)

Viale delle Terme di Caracalla

00153 Rome, Italy

FAO, together with its partners, is generating evidence on the impacts of coordinated agricultural and social protection interventions and is using this to provide related policy, programming and capacity development support to governments and other actors.

