

	<i>Full Sample (CTs and NCTs)</i>					<i>RDD (CTs and NCTs)</i>				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	Pro-WEAI Empowerment Index	Decision Making Index	Who decides how money from a relative is shared... (Yes =1)			Pro-WEAI Empowerment Index	Decision Making Index	Who decides how money from a relative is shared... (Yes =1)		
			<i>Self</i>	<i>Spouse</i>	<i>Joint</i>			<i>Self</i>	<i>Spouse</i>	<i>Joint</i>
CT in CT villages [A]	0.52** [0.22]	0.55** [0.27]	-0.08 [0.08]	-0.14* [0.07]	0.19*** [0.05]	0.42 [0.28]	0.35 [0.35]	-0.06 [0.11]	-0.21*** [0.08]	0.24*** [0.07]
NCT in CT villages [B]	0.38* [0.22]	0.28 [0.27]	-0.15* [0.09]	-0.08 [0.07]	0.21*** [0.06]	0.32 [0.25]	0.15 [0.33]	-0.08 [0.11]	-0.18** [0.08]	0.24*** [0.08]
PET[C]	-0.23 [0.33]	-0.05 [0.44]	0.14 [0.12]	0.05 [0.10]	-0.17* [0.09]	-0.37 [0.41]	0.17 [0.60]	0.12 [0.18]	0.12 [0.13]	-0.20* [0.11]
PEV[D]	-0.12 [0.26]	-1.03*** [0.28]	-0.17** [0.08]	0.29*** [0.09]	-0.11 [0.07]	0.03 [0.57]	-0.94** [0.45]	-0.46*** [0.16]	0.43** [0.20]	0.05 [0.12]
#HH[E]	-0.01 [0.07]	-0.02 [0.08]	0.01 [0.03]	0.04 [0.03]	-0.05*** [0.02]	0.06 [0.12]	0.07 [0.14]	-0.04 [0.04]	0.08** [0.04]	-0.04 [0.03]
Observations	1166	1166	1166	1166	1166	467	467	467	467	467
Adjusted R-squared	0.01	0.05	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.06
Local neighborhood radius (Mts)	400	400	400	400	400	400	400	400	400	400
Outcome Mean Pure Control	0.95	0.68	0.61	0.36	0.04	0.95	0.68	0.61	0.36	0.04
CT recipients around (%)	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40
EVs around (%)	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30
HH around(#)	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	0.78	0.78	0.78	0.78	0.78

Notes: *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001. EV = extremely vulnerable; CT = cash transfers; NCT = no cash transfers; RDD = regression

(1) Outcome variables are as follows: (1) 'Pro-WEAI Empowerment Index' is a variance-weighted index based on the methodology described by Anderson (2008) consisting of 11 dummy variables that represent "adequacy in empowerment" based on a modified version of the project-level Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (Pro-WEAI) toolkit (see Alkire et al. 2013). (2) 'Decision Making Index' is a variance-weighted based on Anderson (2008) that comprises seven key decisions where the woman has some influence. (3) 'Who decides how money from a relative is shared...' (self, spouse, or joint)" are 3 dummy variables from a vignette/scenario question that asks hypothetically who within the household would have the final say over how money (10,000 NGN) from a close relative gets shared?

(2) Regressions use an ANCOVA estimation, which accounts for the baseline level of the outcome variable. The baseline empowerment index (0-11) is a modified A-WEAI rescaled to a 0-1 scale. For the Decision-Making Index and sharing variables, we control for the baseline Decision-Making Index (0-6)

(3) All regressions control for location i.e. local government area (LGA) fixed effects and Conley standard errors that account for spatial correlation in the data are used throughout (Conley 1999; 2008).

(4) CT in CT villages = 1 if household was randomly assigned to receive cash transfers in a cash transfer program village; NCT in CT villages = 1 if household was randomly assigned to receive no cash transfers in program villages; and Pure Control = 1 if household did not receive cash transfers in a non-program village where no cash transfers were ever paid.

(5) We include a set of variables to control for local neighborhood effects that includes the size of the local market (#HH), the density of cash transfers (PET) and the relative level of poverty (PEV) in a 400 meter radius. #HH is the total number of households in the local area rescaled by a factor of 100. PET is a vector for the proportion of cash transfer households in the local area equivalent to the total number of cash transfer households over the number of eligible households around household i in a 400m radius. PEV is the proportion of extremely vulnerable households out of the total number of households in the local neighborhood.

(6) Women's empowerment outcomes were measured at baseline and endline only and sample is a cross-section that includes all ultra-poor households surveyed at both midline and endline.

(7) The regression discontinuity (RD) estimation is presented in Table 6 columns 6 to 10 that exploits the sharp discontinuity at the 18 EV cutoff that determined village-level program eligibility to receive cash transfers. We estimate the local average treatment effect (LATE) using only observations close to the cutoff where the bandwidth is defined as +/- 18 EVs around the cutoff.