

Addendum to
The Impact of Social Accountability on Service Delivery: Experimental Evidence
from a Large-scale Community-driven Development Program in Uganda

Pre-analysis plan

Nathan Fiala¹ and Patrick Premand²

1. Introduction

This addendum is for an extension of the pre-analysis plan for an experimental intervention designed to evaluate the impact of a social accountability program on service delivery in Uganda. This document outlines how we will seek to analyze data from an additional data collection exercise to be conducted in June and July 2016.

As mentioned in the original pre-analysis plan, the previous data collections include a survey of local officials conducted in 2012 and assessments (similar to audits) of the projects funded by the Government of Uganda under the NUSAF2 program.

Between the project assessment and individual survey, a scorecard exercise was implemented. A separate pre-analysis plan will be produced for the analysis of the scorecard intervention.

This addendum focuses on an additional individual survey to be conducted on individual participants of the programs in June and July 2016. There are four goals of this survey.

First, we will collect information that will be used for balance and heterogeneity analysis. Due to timing of project approval and intervention implementation, we were unable to conduct a full baseline survey at the project level. We have administrative data on pre-intervention program budgets, number of participants and broad project type. The individual survey data collection will allow us to collect data on age, gender, education and assets of participants for different types of participants (including members of the various committees overseeing the NUSAF2 projects in local communities). In addition, we will collect further information on the local context of the program, specifically the capacity of local governments. Characteristics that are unlikely to be affected by the program (and balanced across treatment and control arms) shall be used for heterogeneity analysis.

Second, the information to be collected during the individual survey will allow us to test for the robustness of individual level effects from the program as identified from the project assessment data. The results of the project assessment survey suggest that there is a small but

¹ Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Connecticut.

² World Bank.

significant effect from the TAAC SACM intervention on project quality. This impact is concentrated among the livestock programs, specifically for whether an animal is dead or stolen, and is particularly strong in the in the Eastern and Karamoja regions. The impact of the program is especially large in Karamoja. Given these results, we will use the individual survey to test whether the program had an overall impact on livestock at the household level. This will provide a robustness check of the project assessment results that focused on the outputs delivered by the program, as well as provide an indicator related to household welfare.

Third, the individual-level survey will allow us to measure a broader range of potential mechanisms and intermediary outcomes than those measured in the project assessment. This includes additional information on individuals' knowledge and attitudes, on whether individuals faced issues in projects, and on individuals' reporting of potential issues with project. This additional information on intermediary outcomes will complement project assessment data on intermediary outcomes related to (i) procurement and contracting, (ii) monitoring/information, and (iii) interaction with local officials and technical staff.

Finally, the individual survey will allow us to study whether the SACM intervention had indirect effects on higher-order outcomes beyond the main outcomes of interest related to project quality. In particular, it will provide measures of the legitimacy of the program and of local leaders, as well as indicators for potential spill-overs from the social accountability intervention to other government services and programs.

2. Outcomes and indicators

We specify here the main outcomes that we are interested in, the intermediary outcomes (or main underlying mechanisms) that can lead to changes in final outcomes, as well as indirect outcomes that capture side effects beyond the main outcomes of interest.

1. Outcome: livestock index in the household (for robustness check and proxy for household welfare impact)
2. Mechanisms and intermediary outcomes:
 - a. Interference of outside actors
 - b. Reporting of issues
 - c. Group composition and cooperation
3. Indirect outcomes:
 - a. Perceived legitimacy of local government and NUSAF2 program
 - b. Trust in local leaders and community cooperation
 - c. Potential spill-overs on other government services and programs

For the primary outcomes, intermediary outcomes, and indirect outcomes, the study will also analyze specific heterogeneities in program impacts that were planned in the initial pre-analysis plan. This includes heterogeneity by region, project type and baseline perception of local levels of corruption. Additional dimensions of heterogeneity will be built from the individual survey:

- a. Assets not likely to be affected by treatment
- b. Human capital
- c. Distance of community from local headquarters
- d. Connections with local leader
- e. Importance of animals in a community
- f. Gender of individual participant
- g. Type of individual participant (in particular type of committee the participant is a member of)

3. Sample

The sample to be surveyed is a selection of individuals within the NUSAF2 group and the broader community. 6-8 people per community will be surveyed. This will include the chairpersons of each of the executive committee in the project, called CPC and CPMC, two members of the original community social accountability committee, called the SACM, two members from the expanded community accountability committee in the treatment group, called the CMG, and two regular members. In control communities, the CMG does not exist and so this group will be replaced with two regular members.

The sample is constructed this way so as to be able to test the impact of the program on beneficiaries (8 in control communities, 6 in treatment), as well as test for the effect of accountability group composition (the addition of CMG members from the broader community), and the quality of group leadership (CPC and CPMC chairpersons).

4. Empirical specification

We will use data from the project assessment and individual surveys to test the differential effects of each program on the various outcomes presented in the previous section. We will run the following intention to treat (ITT) regression model:

$$Y_i = \alpha + \beta T + \gamma X_i + \delta R + \varepsilon_i$$

where i refers to the group, Y is the outcome of interest, T is a set of dummy variables for which treatment a community belonged to³, X is a matrix of project controls (administrative data on project type, start date and budget)⁴, R is a set of region, district and sub-county dummies, and ε is the error term. We will also explore the effect of heterogeneities using interactions with the treatment variable.

³ If we do not find a statistical difference between treatments we will pool the two treatment indicators into one treatment indicator.

⁴ Community controls will be used in robustness tests only.

Note that the level of analysis will vary depending on the variable of interest. For the majority of outcomes, we will use data aggregated at the community level.

Topic	Question	Use
Demographics	Age	Balance test and controls if unbalanced
	Married	
	Gender	Balance test and heterogeneity analysis if balanced
	Children under 15	Household composition and working age for assets per capita calculation
	Adults over 15	
	Total HH size	
Assets	HH durable goods and land	Asset index for balance test and heterogeneity analysis
	Livestock index	Robustness check of impacts on sub-project outputs (proxy for welfare impact)
Education	Read in any language	Human capital index for balance test and heterogeneity by capacity of community
	Write in any language	
	Highest education	
Local infrastructure	Distance to sub-county headquarters	Remoteness index for heterogeneity analysis
	Time for police to arrive to home	
NUSAF program	Who is responsible for NUSAF2 program	Indirect outcome: Legitimacy of NUSAF2 program
	Selection of committee members	
	Personal involvement in selection of program	
	Position in group	Leadership within group for heterogeneity test by type of leaders
TAAC	When first SACM training	Confirm treatment
	Areas to monitor in NUSAF2	
	Most useful skill from training	
Interference	Did someone outside the group acquire materials for program	Intermediary outcome: procurement and contracting
	Who?	
	Any management issues	Intermediary outcomes: monitoring, information and reporting
	Did you or people in the community talk to anyone about problems with the program?	
	Did you have any disputes during program implementation?	
Community cooperation	Can community come together to solve problems?	Indirect outcome and heterogeneity analysis

Trust in project and local leader	Performance of group members	Indirect outcome: trust and legitimacy
	Who is responsible for bringing project?	
	Satisfaction with project	
	Trust in group leaders	
	Would you choose different leaders?	
	What would you do differently?	
	Do you feel you can contact the IG?	
Other programs	Has community received other NUSAF2 like programs?	Balance test and control if unbalanced
Legitimacy local government	Does government act in the interest of your community	Indirect outcome: Legitimacy of local government
	Performance of local government	
	Relationship with local government	Connection to local leaders for heterogeneity analysis
	Ability to make changes in community	Indirect outcome and heterogeneity analysis
Other	How important are animals to you?	Heterogeneity by importance of livestock for community