



A Critical Review of Community-Driven Development Programmes in Conflict-Affected Contexts

Technical Appendix

Elisabeth King, Ph.D.
Balsille School of International Affairs
eking@balsillieschool.ca

'This material has been funded by UK aid from the UK Government; however the views expressed do not necessarily reflect the UK Government's official policies.'

**A Critical Review of Community-Driven Development Programmes
in Conflict-Affected Contexts
Technical Appendix**

Contents

Guiding Questions	A3
Sample of Reading Instruments	A4
Discussion Guide for Interviews.....	A12
Synthesis Tables.....	A15
Impact estimates for Afghanistan Study	A15
Impact estimates for DRC Study	A17
Impact estimates for Aech Study	A19
Impact estimates for Liberia	A21
Impact estimates for Sierra Leone	A22

Guiding Questions

The following questions will guide the research:

1. Questions

- a. What is the underlying theory of change of the CDR/CDD model?
 - i) What are the assumptions on which the model is based?
 - ii) What are the primary components or design elements of the CDR model?
 - iii) What are the strengths and weaknesses of the theory of change?
 - iv) What are the primary outcomes? What are the possible tensions or tradeoffs between outcomes?
- b. What are the main findings of rigorous CDR/CDD evaluations to date?
- c. What factors contribute to the findings of CDR/CDD evaluations being mixed?
 - i) What contextual factors have been relevant for programme success and failure?
 - ii) How have outcomes been measured?
 - iii) How have different evaluation designs and measurement strategies affected the findings?
 - iv) How might different programmatic factors (such as the design of the interventions, the size of the block grants, the length and intensity of the program, the use of targeting, the simultaneous prioritization of social cohesion and socio-economic outcomes) affect outcomes?
- d. What practical lessons can be identified for CDR/CDD programmes and evaluations?
 - i) What contextual factors are necessary, common or influential for implementing the CDR /CDD model?
 - ii) What are the main challenges in program design and implementation? What would practitioners do differently in light of these challenges?
 - iii) What are the main challenges in evaluation design and implementation? What would researchers do differently in light of these challenges?
 - iv) How are communities defined, constructed and measured?
 - v) How are program design elements adapted to context?
 - vi) What would practitioners do differently in designing and implementing CDR programs?
 - vii) What would researchers do differently in designing and implementing CDR/CDD evaluations?
- e. What alternate hypotheses emerge from the analysis of the findings to date?
- f. What are the next questions that research should ask?

Sample of Reading Instrument

Coder Information
Name of person filling in this form
Date that the form was begun
General Study Information
Author 1
Author 2
Author 3
Title of Publication A
Year of Publication A
Type of Publication A
Title of Publication B
Year of Publication B
Type of Publication B
Title of Publication C
Year of Publication C
Type of Publication C
Title of Publication D
Year of Publication D
Type of Publication D
Title of Publication E
Year of Publication E
Type of Publication E
Title of Publication F
Year of Publication F
Type of Publication F
Title of Publication G
Year of Publication G
Type of publication G
Second set: Author 1
Author 2
Author 3
Title of Publication H
Year of Publication H
Type of Publication H
Title of Publication I
Year of Publication I

Type of Publication I
Third set: Author 1
Author 2
Author 3
Title of Publication J
Year of Publication J
Type of Publication J
Contextual Factors
Location of the Study (Country)
Specific Location (ie. Province/State, etc.)
Year program began
Year program ended
Year Study Began
Year Study Ended
Conflict Status
Governance
Failed State Index
HDI
National GDP
Explicit comments in study on relevance of contextual factors for success/failure of programme
Program Design
Project Goals as per project
theory as per project
a) General
Number of Intended direct beneficiaries
Number of intended indirect beneficiaries
What is the definition of "community" in this project? (ie. Village of 500 people; PTA, etc)
Is this community naturally recognized or devised by the project?
At what level(s) did the program operate? (village, ward, district, etc.)
Was the CDR project paired with any other intervention (i.e. radio program, village savings and loan program, etc.)
if yes, specify
Length of intervention in months
Times (in months, at which study measures taken)
b) Institution/community building component
Did the institution/community-building component include:
1. Trainings on project management?
2. Financial management?

3. Conflict resolution/management?
4. Advocacy?
5. Leadership skills?
6. Public speaking?
7. Civic education?
8. a participatory needs assessment?
Other: Specify
Time on direct facilitation
Was there a participatory process to develop a community project plan/proposal?
Did the program require regular community meetings?
If yes, did the program require that quorum be met?
if yes, specify
Does the project work with existing community institutions?
Does the project create new community institutions?
Are the new community institutions elected?
i) If yes, what type of elections?
Does the project have rules as to women being a part of community institutions?
(+specify)
Does the project have rules as to youth being a part of community institutions?
(+specify)
Does the project have rules as to marginalized groups being part of community institutions?
(+specify specific groups)
<u>c) Investment component</u>
How does the community choose which project(s) it will work on? (by council, referendum, etc.)
Could communities choose to distribute funds (directly to individuals, or as microcredit to individuals or groups) rather than doing a "project"?
i) if so, who determined the distribution strategy?
ii) if so, what was the distribution strategy?
iii) if so, how much (as a percentage of total given to community) did each beneficiary get?
Were communities required to implement an infrastructure or services project?
Do communities have the freedom to plan any type of infrastructure or service project they choose?
i) If no, are they constrained to a specific sector?
(+specify)
ii) If no, are they constrained to a certain type of project?
(+specify)
iii) If no, are communities provided a negative list of projects (i.e. projects the program will not fund)?

(+specify)
iv) If no, are specific parts of the grant earmarked for certain groups?
(+specify specific groups)
Did the program specify the number of projects the community could/should implement?
(+specify)
Does the program allow dividing the investment to do both distribution and infrastructure/service?
Does the project have rules to women being beneficiaries?
(+specify)
Does the project have rules to youth being beneficiaries?
(+specify)
Is there a reintegration element to this program?
(+specify)
Is there a reconciliatory element to this program?
(+specify)
Is there an additional peacebuilding element to this program?
(+specify)
From the perspective of the implementer, what is the selection process for choosing proposals/projects to fund?
How much (total) is invested for each project/community?
Does the community directly control resources?
If no, does an intermediary manage resources?
(+specify)
Does the program obligate the community contribute financing?
i) If yes, in kind?
please specify type
ii) If yes, monetary?
Please specify how much (in percentage of project total)
If not a requirement, does the community contribute financing anyway?
i) If yes, in kind?
please specify type
ii) If yes, monetary?
Please specify how much (in percentage of project total)
Are donor funds channelled through the national government?
Are donor funds channelled through the local government?
Are donor funds given directly to an NGO?
Are donor funds given directly to the community/community committee?
Did the program require community monitoring?

Evaluation Design
Provide references to the documents and page numbers where the details of the study design are given.
Were any of the following experimental or quasi-experimental methodologies used to assess impact?
...randomized experiment or randomized control trial
...regression adjustment to control for confounding variables
...difference-in-differences methodology
...instrumental variables methodology
...panel/fixed-effects methodology
...regression discontinuity methodology
...matching or weighting methodology
Was there variation in type of treatment beyond a simple treatment/control? (if yes, specify)
What were the units of <i>intervention assignment</i> ?
Who performed the technical steps that assigned units to either receive or not receive the intervention?
Did the study report that there were any limitations, difficulties, or modifications in the assignment process?
If yes, what were they?
What were the units of observation/data collection?
Is this a clustered study? (Mark yes if the units of observation are nested within units of assignment--e.g., units of assignment are communities, but units of observation are households.)
Does the analysis adequately account for any clustering in the design of the intervention or the study?
What is the total number of units of intervention in the study?
How are the units of intervention distributed over treatment and control groups?
If this is a clustered study: what is the total number of units of observation?
Were any significant imbalances in the baseline characteristics of the intervention recipient and non-recipient groups noted?
If yes, for what variables was there imbalance?
Page, table, or figure numbers where this is presented:
Were non-compliance rates reported?
If yes, what were the rates of non-compliance over the treatment and control groups?
Page, table, or figure numbers where this is presented:
Were attrition/loss-to-follow-up rates reported?
Page, table, or figure numbers where this is presented:
If yes, what were the rates of attrition over the treatment and control groups?
how long after the end of the intervention was the endline study? (in months)
was there any post-endline study to examine lasting change? If yes, how many months

after end of intervention?
Findings
Output 1: Participation
Does the study report on extent or quality of community members' participation in community-level CDD processes?
If yes...
Metrics used to measure extent or quality of participation:
Do the study authors suggest there were any problems or limitations with the extent or quality of participation?
Summary of quantitative findings on participation:
Page, table, or figure numbers where this is presented:
Any findings on trends in participation? If yes, summarize here.
Page, table, or figure numbers where this is presented:
Any findings on relation between participation and gender, age, class, or ethnicity? If yes, summarize here.
Page, table, or figure numbers where this is presented:
Output 2: Bringing divided people together
Do the study authors discuss divisions or lines of potential conflict that are relevant within communities?
If yes...
What were the divisions stressed by the study authors?
Did the program make any special effort to bring people across these lines of conflict?
If yes, by what means did the program do this?
Summarize any findings on how successful these methods were.
Page, table, or figure numbers where this is presented:
Output 3: Community determines priority
Does the study discuss the methods by which communities establish their development priorities (e.g., participatory rapid assessments, etc.)?
If yes...
What were the methods that the communities used to set such priorities?
Summarize any findings on how successful these methods were.
Intermediate Outcome 1: Empowerment/Voice (MUST BE QUANT)
Does the study report on such effects?
If yes...
metrics re: willingness and ability to be part of public decision making
Summary of quantitative findings on such effects:
metrics re: right and responsibility to take part in community decisions
Summary of quantitative findings on such effects:
metrics re: beliefs that people are influential part of decision-making
Summary of quantitative findings on such effects:

Intermediate Outcome 2: Infrastructure/Service Delivery (MUST BE QUANT)
Does the study report on such effects?
If yes...
metrics: new infrastructure and services by type
summary of quantitative findings of such effects:
metric: improved access to utilities, services and infrastructure
summary of quantitative findings of such effects:
metrics: quality of service
summary of quantitative findings of such effects:
metrics: access across groups
summary of quantitative findings of such effects:
Final Outcomes 1: Improved Socio-Economic Recovery (MUST BE QUANT)
Does the study report on effects on material welfare (e.g., income, consumption, poverty, etc.)?
If yes...
metrics re: consumption and income
Summary of quantitative findings on such effects:
metrics re: health and education
Summary of quantitative findings on such effects:
metrics re: income, employment, and productivity
Summary of quantitative findings on such effects:
metrics re: asset holdings
Summary of quantitative findings on such effects:
metrics re: quality of housing
Summary of quantitative findings on such effects:
metrics re: subjective perceptions of improved welfare
Summary of quantitative findings on such effects:
Final Outcomes 2: Improved Social Cohesion (MUST BE QUANT)
Does the study report on such effects with respect to intra-community social cohesion?
If yes...
metrics re: collective action
Summary of quantitative findings on such effects:
metrics re: trust, solidarity, and inclusion
Summary of quantitative findings on such effects:
metrics re: strengthened networks/reciprocity:
Summary of quantitative findings on such effects:
metrics re: conflict management:
Summary of quantitative findings on such effects:
Does the study report on such effects with respect to <i>inter</i> -community social cohesion?
If yes...

Metrics used to measure such effects:
Summary of quantitative findings on such effects:
Final Outcomes 3: Improved Governance (MUST BE QUANT)
Does the study report on such effects?
If yes...
metrics re: participation
Summary of quantitative findings on such effects:
metrics re: accountability
Summary of quantitative findings on such effects:
metrics re: transparency
Summary of quantitative findings on such effects:
metrics re: efficiency
Summary of quantitative findings on such effects:
metrics re: equity
Summary of quantitative findings on such effects:
metrics re: gender
Summary of quantitative findings on such effects:
metrics re: support for democracy:
Summary of quantitative findings on such effects:
Other outcomes:
metrics
Summary of quantitative findings on such effects:
Analysis
Explicit thoughts on trade offs between outcomes
Explicit thoughts on alternate hypotheses
Authors thoughts on problems in measurement
Other analysis thoughts you'd like to note
Conflict Specific Issues
1. Did the study/project implementers explicitly raise any do no harm type issues (i.e. risks in seeking to challenge power structures; risks in raising role of women seen to undermine that of men?) (explain)
2. Did the study/project implementers raise any ethical concerns? (explain)
3. Did the study/project implementers raise any specific security risks? (explain)
4. Did the implementer state any change to the program design/roll out due to issues of security/conflict? (explain)

Discussion Guide for Interviews

Note: Not all questions will be asked to each participant. Question choice will depend on their background/expertise and available time. The order of questions may change with the flow of conversation. The probes stem from the literature and will only be used as necessary for conversation.

- ALL: Please tell me about your experience with CDD/R.

- PRACTITIONERS/POLICY-MAKERS:
 - a) What is your rationale/motivation for using/supporting a CDD/R approach?
 - b) Of the multiple CDD/R goals (including empowerment/voice, service delivery or direct economic improvements, economic improvement, improved governance, and improved social cohesion) is one paramount in your view?
 - c) How would you explain the theory of change? (By theory of change, we mean an explicit presentation of the assumptions about how CDD/R is supposed to result in desired outcomes or how changes are expected to happen within any particular context).
 - d) What are the main challenges (or risks) in program design and implementation of CDD/R (in post-conflict contexts)?
 - e) What should practitioners do differently in light of these challenges?

- RESEARCHERS/PRACTITIONERS WITH EXPERTISE ON ONE THE FIVE STUDIES INCLUDED IN THE REVIEW:
 - a) Please review the attached spreadsheet where we have extracted information from your study. Is there anything you can correct or add? (Please look in particular at the timing of the intervention and study components and the program design)
 - b) How did you adapt program design elements to your particular post-conflict context X?
 - c) Which elements of the programme were well implemented, and which were badly implemented? How would you rate the quality of program implementation in X? Was implementation according to plan? (probes: *community/institution building* such as institutions created, quality of facilitation, knowledge of participants post-training active participation in program; *investment component* such as grant disbursement as planned; timely grant disbursement; *participation* such meeting attendance, quality of participation across different groups; *community sets priorities* such as communities receiving preferred projects; *success at bringing divided people together*; *other*, such as degree of space for communities to make mistakes.)
 - d) Were any communities (for instance those where the project was being poorly implemented) excluded from the program and/or evaluation?

- ALL: My review of outcomes of community driven-development (CDD) and community-driven reconstruction (CDR) programs, evaluated to rigorous standards, in conflict affected states (Afghanistan, DRC, Indonesia/Aceh, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Sudan and Nepal) suggest that CDD/R has quite mixed results and is not producing on all desired outcomes. (Although the results are all over the board, there are generally more positive effects on socio-economic welfare, less positive effects on improving governance, and improving social cohesion).
 - a) Given your experience with CDD/R what is your general reaction?
 - b) In your view, how much of the blame for these mixed CDD/R results lies with the theory of CDD/R (i.e. theory doesn't work) vs. moving from theory to concrete inputs (aren't doing right activities to get at theory) vs. implementation on the ground (didn't do it right) vs. some problem with the evaluation (e.g. timescales, measures)?
 - c) In your view, what contextual factors have been relevant for programme success and failure? (Probes: supportive government, existing social cohesion, security, etc.)
 - d) How might different programmatic factors affect outcomes? (probes: the design of the interventions, the size of the block grants, the length and intensity of the program, the use of targeting, the simultaneous prioritization of social cohesion and socio-economic outcomes, types of (sub)-projects permitted or the ways in which the communities are allowed to use the sub-grants)
 - e) Nearly every study posits that negative or lack of results may be due to the short time frame of the project. "In your experience, what would be the average number of years needed for project support of community groups initially formed under the project to reach a level of sustainability of community processes requiring very limited outside support (such as simply a supporting/maintenance visit once a year)?" (Kumar, 2005). After what length of time would you feel confident that finding no or negative results should lead us to reject the CDD/R model?
 - f) Are there reasons you or others may be committed to CDD/R over alternative approaches even if there is a lack of evidence that it "works" to produce the ultimate outcomes of interest?

- RESEARCHERS:
 - a) What are the main challenges in evaluation design and implementation of CDD/R (in post-conflict contexts)? (probe: need better monitoring)
 - b) What are the main challenges (or risks) in program design and implementation of CDD/R (in post-conflict contexts)?
 - c) What would you do differently in light of these challenges?
 - d) In your view, how have different evaluation designs and measurement strategies affected the findings? (Probes: for instance, results from surveys vs. behavioural

- games vs. structured community activities; different conceptualizations of difficult-to-measure outcomes, proxy measures)
- e) Have elements of the evaluations (such as data collection in control areas or random selection of treatment groups) had any measurable impact on either outcomes or conflict?
 - f) What do you think are 'best practices' in terms of evaluation design based on the CDD/R literature so far?
 - g) What are the next questions that research should ask? (Probes: CDD vs other types of projects rather than no project; facilitator effects; bundled treatment; links local and national dev't and civic spheres; short-term vs. long-term effects and trade-offs)

Synthesis Tables

Impact estimates for Afghanistan study

Empowerment and Voice*				
<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Control mean</i>	<i>Treatment Effect</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t-statistic</i>
Std. index of women's acceptance of women's participation in village governance	0.00	0.04	0.02	2.53
Std. index of men's acceptance of women's participation in village governance	0.00	0.07	0.02	3.65
Std. index of women's perception that local leaders are responsive to them	-0.01	0.11	0.03	4.44
Std. index of women's social activity outside home	0.00	0.08	0.02	4.88
Proportion of women engaged in income generating activity	0.42	0.05	0.02	3.53
Std. index of women's acceptance of roles for women outside the home	0.00	0.03	0.02	1.94
Std. index of men's acceptance of roles for women outside the home	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.75
Infrastructure and Service Delivery				
N/A				
Socio-Economic Recovery**				
<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Control mean</i>	<i>Treatment Effect</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t-statistic</i>

ln(Annual Household Income)	7.08	0.03	0.02	1.35
ln(Annual Household Consumption)	7.51	0.00	0.02	0.21
Unemployed	0.07	0.01	0.01	0.71
Std. index of income, consumption, and employment	0.00	0.03	0.01	1.86
Men's perception that economic situation improved over past year	0.41	0.04	0.01	3.14
Women's perception that economic situation improved over past year	0.29	0.04	0.02	2.75

Governance**

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Control mean</i>	<i>Treatment Effect</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t-statistic</i>
Std. index of men's perceptions that various officials act for benefit of all villagers	0.00	0.13	0.02	5.82

Social Cohesion

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Control mean</i>	<i>Treatment Effect</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	
N/A				

"Std. index" refers to a summary index of outcomes standardized with respect to control group means and standard deviations

* Source: Beath et al. (2012b); sample: ca. 4,600 survey respondents.

** Source: Beath et al. (2012c); sample: ca. 4,600 survey respondents.

Impact estimates for DRC study

Empowerment and Voice				
<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Control mean</i>	<i>Treatment Effect</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t-statistic</i>
Share of women on RAPID committees	0.16	0.03	0.02	1.50
Share saying that they are free to express opinions in their village	84.2	-0.14	1.52	-0.09
Chief dominance score on RAPID project decision making, prior to deliberation	0.04	-0.01	0.03	-0.33
Chief dominance score on RAPID project decision making, after deliberation	0.00	0.02	0.03	0.67
Male dominance score on RAPID project decision making, prior to deliberation	0.04	-0.03	0.03	-1.00
Male dominance score on RAPID project decision making, after deliberation	0.07	0.00	0.03	0.00
Infrastructure and Service Delivery				
Std. index of access to services	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.00
* Note 1,700 classrooms and 150 clinics constructed or rehabilitated				
Socio-Economic Recovery				
<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Control mean</i>	<i>Treatment Effect</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	
Income earned over past 2 weeks (US\$)	22.77	-3.09	1.28	-2.41
Hours per day allocated to productive activities	16.67	-0.28	0.53	-0.53
Value of annual agricultural output (US\$)	185.02	8.11	15.50	0.52
Household assets index	0.00	-0.01	0.05	-0.20
Share of households with high quality walls	0.08	-0.02	0.01	-1.78
Days children went to school in past 2 weeks	5.02	-0.12	0.30	-0.40
Std. index of health problems	0.00	0.05	0.04	1.25
Governance				
<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Control mean</i>	<i>Treatment Effect</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t-statistic</i>
RAPID meeting attendance	130.48	-1.98	7.40	-0.27
Std. index of activeness of participation in RAPID deliberations	0.00	-0.12	0.09	-1.33
Std. index of using electoral process for RAPID planning	0.00	0.07	0.09	0.78
Std. index of perceptions that leaders are duty bound to citizens	0.00	-0.02	0.06	-0.33
Std. index of perceptions that citizens have a duty to contribute to governing	0.00	-0.02	0.05	-0.40

Std. index of level of community oversight of village RAPID committees	0.00	0.01	0.10	0.10
Index of propensity to complain given additional unit of mismanaged RAPID funds	0.26	0.68	0.37	1.84
Std. index of RAPID accounting quality	0.00	0.03	0.11	0.27
Std. index of activeness in pursuing support from external actors	0.00	0.01	0.05	0.20
Share aware of RAPID grant value	0.38	0.01	0.03	0.42
Share willing to participate in exercise to collect information on public resource management	0.38	0.04	0.03	1.13
Amount of \$1000 RAPID funds traceable	850.39	1.58	20.58	0.08
Share in RAPID private transfer communities with evidence of receiving a transfer	0.40	0.04	0.06	0.71

Social Cohesion

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Control mean</i>	<i>Treatment Effect</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t-statistic</i>
Std. index of household participation in collective action	0.00	0.01	0.05	0.20
Differential in RAPID benefits allocated to migrants	0.69	-1.83	1.56	-1.17
Std. index of willingness to lend money to others in community (trust)	0.00	0.07	0.05	1.40
Std. index of perception of inter-group cleavages in community	0.00	-0.01	0.05	-0.20
Proportion willing to share hypothetical grant with other villages	0.50	0.01	0.03	0.32

RAPID refers to a block grant program administered in a random selection of 560 program villages and used as a basis of evaluating governance impacts in Humphreys et al. (2012).

"Std. index" refers to a summary index of outcomes standardized with respect to control group means and standard deviations.

Source: Humphreys et al. (2012).

Sample: varies from estimate to estimate---e.g., ca. 150-450 communities for RAPID estimates, ca. 1,500-5,000 respondents for survey estimates.

Impact estimates for Aceh study

Empowerment and Voice				
<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Control mean</i>	<i>Treatment Effect [a]</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t-statistic</i>
Share believing that villagers play most important role in community decision-making	0.44	-0.16	0.08	-2.00
Share believing that they play an influential role at least some of the time in community decisions	0.38	-0.03	0.03	-1.00
Share indicating village had youth/sports group	0.91	-0.01	0.05	-0.20
Share indicating village had women's group	0.94	0.12	0.05	2.40
Share agreeing that women should have the same role as men in positions of village authority	0.32	0.02	0.08	0.25
Infrastructure and Service Delivery				
<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Control mean</i>	<i>Treatment Effect [a]</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t-statistic</i>
Share indicating that local development activities did not address most important needs	0.12	0.10	0.09	1.11
Share indicating that local development activities did not benefit enough people in the village	0.14	-0.05	0.09	-0.56
Share agreeing that local development institutions (KDP) were typically helpful for village	0.96	-0.03	0.07	-0.43
Share reporting elementary school in village	0.51	0.07	0.10	0.70
Share reporting village meeting hall in village	0.27	0.06	0.10	0.60
Share reporting health center in village	0.40	0.09	0.10	0.90
Socio-Economic Recovery				
<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Control mean</i>	<i>Treatment Effect [a]</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t-statistic</i>
Share of households classified as poor	0.69	-0.11	0.05	-2.20
Asset index scores	0.22	0.04	0.12	0.33
Share with concrete houses	0.29	0.03	0.08	0.38
Share with access to clean water	0.63	0.12	0.11	1.09
Sq. meters farmed by household	7740.00	12201.00	7940.23	1.54
Employment rate	0.81	0.03	0.03	1.00
Avg. daily wage, women (Rp.)	29954.00	1429.00	1608.00	0.89
Avg. daily wage, men (Rp.)	41748.00	856.00	2098.00	0.41
Share sick in last month	0.06	-0.01	0.02	-0.50
Share school age youth in school	0.65	0.01	0.03	0.33
Share reporting living conditions had improved over past year	0.33	0.07	0.06	1.17
Governance				
<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Control mean</i>	<i>Treatment Effect [a]</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t-statistic</i>
Share indicating that there were obvious diversions of money in local development activities	0.16	0.15	0.12	1.25

Share agreeing that local development institutions (KDP) were typically helpful for village	0.96	-0.03	0.07	-0.43
Share satisfied with village decision-making	0.91	0.02	0.04	0.50
Share of researcher-provided endowment given to district government to invest in development	0.25	0.00	0.05	0.00
Share of hypothetical endowment that respondents think village government should manage rather than villagers themselves	0.37	-0.03	0.04	-0.75
Share reporting that local authorities would be effective in improving community situation	0.31	0.17	0.09	1.89
Share agreeing they should be more active in questioning actions of leaders	0.33	-0.01	0.07	-0.14
Share agreeing that leaders should not favor their ethnic group or family	0.98	-0.01	0.02	-0.50
Share agreeing that all should be permitted to take part in important decisions	0.22	0.08	0.07	1.14

Social Cohesion

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Control mean</i>	<i>Treatment Effect [a]</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t-statistic</i>
Share reporting full willingness to accept ex-combatants	0.77	-0.08	0.06	-1.33
"	0.80	-0.19	0.07	-2.71
Share reporting full willingness to accept IDPs	0.68	-0.08	0.07	-1.14
"	0.73	0.06	0.08	0.75
Share reporting divisions between those receiving government assistance and those not	0.45	-0.02	0.07	-0.29
Share reporting divisions between rich and poor	0.21	0.02	0.05	0.40
Share reporting divisions between men and women	0.06	0.03	0.05	0.60
Share reporting divisions between generations	0.04	0.00	0.03	0.00
Share reporting divisions between IDPs and villagers	0.02	0.02	0.02	1.00
Share reporting divisions between migrants and villagers	0.03	0.03	0.02	1.50
Share reporting divisions between ex-combatants and villagers	0.03	0.02	0.02	1.00
Share reporting divisions between ethnic groups	0.03	0.05	0.02	2.50
Share reporting divisions between village and neighboring village	0.06	0.09	0.03	3.00
Share agreeing that problems in village are normally resolved satisfactorily	0.81	-0.05	0.05	-1.00
Share reporting there has been a village project in past 6 months to build/repair school	0.32	0.03	0.08	0.38
Share reporting there has been a village project in past 6 months to build/repair road	0.44	0.08	0.08	1.00
Share reporting there has been a village project in past 6 months to dig/repair well	0.19	-0.05	0.07	-0.71
Share reporting there has been a village project in past 6 months to organize security	0.20	0.00	0.06	0.00

Share reporting there has been a village project in past 6 months to increase agr. productivity	0.25	0.07	0.07	1.00
Share reporting there has been a village project in past 6 months to build/repair mosque	0.67	0.08	0.07	1.14
Share indicating village had producers' groups	0.75	0.06	0.08	0.75
Share indicating village had credit group	0.21	0.08	0.08	1.00
Share indicating village had community development group	0.06	-0.03	0.04	-0.75
Share indicating village had religious group	0.93	0.03	0.03	1.00
Share indicating village had cultural group	0.21	0.09	0.08	1.13
Share indicating village had political group	0.15	0.07	0.06	1.17
Share indicating village had local development organization (KDP)	0.03	0.06	0.04	1.50
Share that participate in some community group	0.40	0.04	0.04	1.00

[a] Treatment effect estimates are based on instrumental variables multiple regression accounting for (i) differential treatment assignment based on village spending capacity and past conflict exposure and (ii) village level non-compliance with treatment status. As such, the effect estimates are a form of "local average treatment effect" and may not reflect effects that are relevant for all control villages.

Source: Barron et al. (2009).

Sample: ca. 460 village head surveys and 2,300 household surveys.

Impact estimates for Liberia study

Empowerment and Voice				
<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Control mean</i>	<i>Treatment Effect</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t-statistic</i>
Std. index of efficacy	0.00	0.51	0.20	2.55
Std. index of participation	-0.02	0.54	0.21	2.54
Std. index of women's rights	-0.01	0.33	0.20	1.63
Infrastructure and Service Delivery*				
<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Control mean</i>	<i>Treatment Effect</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t-statistic</i>
No. wells	2.96	-0.65	0.45	-1.44
No. of classrooms	1.28	0.11	0.23	0.48
No of latrines	2.86	0.42	0.77	0.55
No. of health clinics	0.59	-0.27	0.09	-3.00
No. of community facilities	0.62	0.14	0.08	1.75
Min. walk to water	14.55	-2.38	1.81	-1.31
Min. walk to market	97.39	7.42	17.63	0.42
Min. walk to transport	79.00	7.84	18.14	0.43
Min. walk to primary school	32.99	-2.88	6.49	-0.44
Min. walk to secondary school	52.33	0.22	9.81	0.02
Min. walk to clinic	70.40	28.30	16.07	1.76

Min. wal to latrine	7.72	-0.94	0.91	-1.03
---------------------	------	-------	------	-------

Socio-Economic Recovery

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Control mean</i>	<i>Treatment Effect</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t-statistic</i>
Std. index of food consumption	0.01	0.05	0.24	0.19
Std. index of assets	0.01	-0.06	0.20	-0.28
Std. index of house quality	0.02	-0.18	0.17	-1.05
Std. index of all material well-being	0.02	-0.11	0.18	-0.59

Governance

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Control mean</i>	<i>Treatment Effect</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t-statistic</i>
Std. index of democraticness	0.00	0.32	0.18	1.78

Social Cohesion

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Control mean</i>	<i>Treatment Effect</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t-statistic</i>
Std. index of inclusion of excombatants	-0.01	0.54	0.21	2.54
Std. index of inclusion of migrants	-0.02	0.53	0.19	2.71
Std. index of trust in leaders	0.00	0.63	0.21	3.09
Std. index of reduced tensions	0.00	0.48	0.21	2.24
Std. index of social capital	-0.02	0.45	0.20	2.28

"Std. index" refers to a summary index of outcomes standardized with respect to control group means and standard deviations

Source: Fearon et al. (2011).

Sample: 83 communities

Source for * is Fearon et al. (2008), sample: ca. 1500 survey respondents.

Impact estimates for Sierra Leone study

Empowerment and Voice

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Control mean</i>	<i>Treatment Effect</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t-statistic</i>
Std. index of inclusion and participation community decisions	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.03
Std. index of participation in local governance	0.00	0.11	0.05	2.43

Infrastructure and Service Delivery

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Control mean</i>	<i>Treatment Effect</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t-statistic</i>
------------------	---------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------

Std. index of local public services infrastructure	0.00	0.16	0.04	4.1
--	------	------	------	-----

Socio-Economic Recovery

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Control mean</i>	<i>Treatment Effect</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t-statistic</i>
Std. index of general economic welfare	0.00	0.40	0.05	8.49

Governance

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Control mean</i>	<i>Treatment Effect</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t-statistic</i>
Std. index of development committee functioning	0.00	0.35	0.03	11.73
Std. index of local authority	0.00	0.05	0.04	1.33
Std. index of access to information on local governance	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.08

Social Cohesion

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Control mean</i>	<i>Treatment Effect</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t-statistic</i>
Std. index of collection action and public goods contribution	0.00	0.04	0.04	0.98
Std. index of trust	0.00	0.04	0.06	0.66
Std. index of group and network ties	0.00	0.03	0.04	0.75
Std. index of crime and conflict reduction	0.00	0.03	0.05	0.52

"Std. index" refers to a summary index of outcomes standardized with respect to control group means and standard deviations.
Source: Casey et al. (2011).
Sample: 236 communities.