## Appendices: Not For Publication

## Appendix A: Checking for randomization balance

To check whether the randomization is balanced, we chose ten variables for this check prior to obtaining the data from the experiment. Specifically, we examined the following characteristics from the baseline survey: per capita expenditures, years of education of the household head, calculated PMT score, the share of households that are agricultural, and the years of education of the sub-village head. We also examined five village characteristics from the 2008 PODES, a census of villages conducted by BPS: log number of households, distance to district center in kilometers, log size of the village in hectares, the number of religious buildings per household, and the number of primary schools per household.

The results from this analysis are shown in Appendix Table 2. In Columns 1, 2, and 3, we present the mean of each variable for the sub-villages assigned to the PMT, community, and hybrid treatments, respectively. Standard deviations are listed below the means in brackets. We present the difference in means between the community and the PMT groups in Column 4, between the hybrid and the PMT in Column 5, and between the hybrid and the community in Column 6. In Columns 7 - 9, we replicate the analysis shown in Columns 4-6, but additionally control for stratum fixed effects. Robust standard errors are shown in parentheses in Columns 4 9. All variables are aggregated to the sub-village level; thus each regression includes 640 observations. In the final row of Table 3, we provide the p-value of a test of joint significance of the difference across each of the outcome variables.

The sub-villages appear to be generally well-balanced across the ten characteristics. Out of the sixty individual differences presented, three are statistically significant at the 5 percent level - precisely what one would expect from random chance. All of these significant differences
are in Column 9, which compares the community and hybrid methods, controlling for stratum fixed effects. Specifically, controlling for stratum fixed effects, households in community locations have less education and are less likely to be agriculturists than households in the hybrid treatment, and hybrid villages have 8 percent fewer households than community villages. Looking at the joint significance tests across all ten variables considered, without stratum fixed effects, the only jointly significant difference is between the hybrid and the community (Column 6, p-value 0.089 ); with stratum fixed effects (Column 9), the p-value is 0.028 . All results in this paper are robust to specifications that include these additional ten control variables.

## Appendix Table 1: PMT Regressions by district



| is Elementary School | (0.023) | (0.040) |  | (0.028) | (0.025) | (0.035) | (0.018) | (0.028) | (0.019) |  | (0.032) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Education Attainment of HH Head is Junior School | $\begin{gathered} 0.072 \\ (0.027) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.164 \\ (0.040) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.198 \\ (0.031) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.166 \\ (0.032) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.153 \\ (0.028) \end{gathered}$ | $0.164$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.128 \\ (0.026) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.204 \\ (0.054) \end{gathered}$ | $0.099$ | $0.081$ | $0.080$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.156 \\ (0.035) \end{gathered}$ |
| Education Attainment of HH Head | 0.096 | 0.194 | 0.143 | 0.140 | 0.113 | 0.088 | 0.198 | 0.317 | 0.099 | 0.129 | 0.170 | 0.196 |
| is Senior + | (0.033) | (0.045) | (0.032) | (0.051) | (0.036) | (0.045) | (0.032) | (0.035) | (0.035) | (0.020) | (0.036) | (0.053) |
| Number of children 0-4 | $\begin{aligned} & -0.043 \\ & (0.011) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.078 \\ & (0.017) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.029 \\ & (0.013) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.044 \\ & (0.010) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.028 \\ & (0.016) \end{aligned}$ |
| Number of Children in Elementary School |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Children in Junior H.School |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.056 \\ (0.022) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.056 \\ (0.018) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.086 \\ (0.020) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.072 \\ (0.019) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.045 \\ (0.017) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.073 \\ (0.020) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Children in Senior |  | 0.076 | 0.069 | 0.165 | 0.150 | 0.135 | 0.116 | 0.167 |  | 0.029 | 0.049 | 0.109 |
| H.School |  | (0.023) | (0.017) | (0.024) | (0.024) | (0.024) | (0.022) | (0.015) |  | (0.014) | (0.018) | (0.012) |
| Highest Education Attainment of | 0.053 | 0.152 |  |  | 0.061 | -0.045 | 0.105 | 0.133 | 0.064 |  | 0.063 | 0.077 |
| HH Members is Elementary School | (0.023) | (0.040) |  |  | (0.025) | (0.019) | (0.028) | (0.054) | (0.026) |  | (0.032) | (0.031) |
| Highest Education Attainment of | 0.077 | 0.058 | 0.113 | 0.122 | 0.153 | 0.164 | 0.070 | 0.221 | 0.120 | 0.081 $(0.016)$ | 0.050 | ${ }_{0}^{0.170}$ |
| HH Members is Junior School | (0.025) | (0.032) | (0.083) | (0.034) | (0.028) | (0.036) | (0.030) | (0.032) | (0.035) | (0.016) | (0.024) | (0.051) |
| Highest Education Attainment of | 0.110 | 0.135 | 0.211 | 0.317 | 0.267 | 0.281 | 0.133 | 0.310 | 0.170 | 0.129 | 0.109 | 0.231 |
| HH Members is Senior + | (0.033) | (0.044) | (0.082) | (0.044) | (0.042) | (0.043) | (0.035) | (0.054) | (0.041) | (0.020) | (0.032) | (0.039) |
| Dependency Ratio |  | $-0.039$ | $-0.034$ | -0.027 |  | $-0.075$ |  |  | $-0.034$ | $-0.022$ | $-0.040$ | $-0.074$ |
|  |  | (0.018) |  | (0.016) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distance to District |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.004 \\ & (0.001) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.025 \\ & (0.010) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.003 \\ & (0.001) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.004 \\ & (0.001) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.007 \\ & (0.001) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.004 \\ & (0.000) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.004 \\ & (0.002) \end{aligned}$ |
| Existence of SD |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.224 \\ & (0.040) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.183 \\ (0.102) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & -1.438 \\ & (0.057) \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.093 \\ (0.041) \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Existence of SLTP | $\begin{aligned} & -0.150 \\ & (0.019) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.051 \\ & (0.028) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.088 \\ & (0.020) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.041 \\ (0.017) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.053 \\ (0.016) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |
| Existence of Puskesmas/Pustu | $\begin{aligned} & -0.047 \\ & (0.020) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.116 \\ & (0.024) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.100 \\ (0.031) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.032 \\ (0.017) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.049 \\ (0.020) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.038 \\ (0.019) \end{gathered}$ |
| Existence of Polindes | $\begin{aligned} & -0.054 \\ & (0.017) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.114 \\ & (0.028) \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.048 \\ & (0.016) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.029 \\ (0.015) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Existence of Posyandu | $\begin{aligned} & -0.062 \\ & (0.018) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.081 \\ & (0.040) \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.184 \\ & (0.073) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.174 \\ (0.038) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.205 \\ & (0.038) \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Availability of Doctor |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.050 \\ & (0.021) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.080 \\ & (0.018) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.092 \\ (0.023) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.085 \\ (0.025) \end{gathered}$ |
| Availability of Bidan | $\begin{gathered} 0.082 \\ (0.025) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.089 \\ (0.035) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.144 \\ & (0.068) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.065 \\ & (0.027) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.072 \\ (0.036) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.093 \\ (0.034) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.068 \\ & (0.021) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.084 \\ (0.025) \end{gathered}$ |
| Road type is Asphalt | $\begin{gathered} 0.101 \\ (0.015) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.132 \\ (0.023) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.280 \\ & (0.057) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.137 \\ (0.018) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.042 \\ & (0.018) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.053 \\ (0.017) \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.114 \\ & (0.018) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.057 \\ (0.015) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.247 \\ & (0.066) \end{aligned}$ |
| Existence of Semi permanent market place |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.276 \\ (0.098) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.049 \\ (0.021) \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.065 \\ (0.018) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.090 \\ & (0.018) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.099 \\ & (0.034) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.048 \\ (0.021) \end{gathered}$ |
| Existence of Credit Facility |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.055 \\ (0.022) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.072 \\ & (0.018) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.040 \\ & (0.017) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.031 \\ & (0.014) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.185 \\ & (0.022) \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Constant | $\begin{aligned} & 12.839 \\ & (0.106) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.884 \\ & (0.150) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.131 \\ & (0.218) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.119 \\ & (0.123) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.287 \\ & (0.127) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.756 \\ & (0.076) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.344 \\ & (0.131) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.008 \\ & (0.149) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.577 \\ & (0.109) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.852 \\ & (0.082) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.082 \\ & (0.087) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.098 \\ & (0.118) \end{aligned}$ |
| Observations | 1920 | 2239 | 1824 | 2112 | 2208 | 2208 | 2208 | 2496 | 2016 | 1824 | 1920 | 2208 |
| R -squared | 0.606 | 0.284 | 0.486 | 0.457 | 0.436 | 0.363 | 0.471 | 0.516 | 0.474 | 0.556 | 0.478 | 0.583 |


 results above present the results of this second regression, which were used for the PMT calculation. All variables above are statistically significant at least at the $10 \%$ level.

Appendix Table 2: Testing Balance Between Treatment Groups

|  |  | Means |  | Differen | es, No Fixe | Effects | Differences, Controlling for Stratum Fixed Effects |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PMT <br> (1) | Community (2) | Hybrid <br> (3) | Community <br> - PMT <br> (4) | Hybrid - <br> PMT <br> (5) | Hybrid Community (6) | Community <br> - PMT <br> (7) | Hybrid PMT | Hybrid Community (9) |
| Average per capita expenditure (Rp. 000s) | $\begin{gathered} \hline 558.576 \\ {[245.845]} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 550.579 \\ {[220.237]} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 564.295 \\ {[337.172]} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-7.997 \\ (22.728) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.719 \\ (28.535) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 13.716 \\ (27.416) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-1.331 \\ (20.661) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11.980 \\ (25.973) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 13.312 \\ (24.913) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average years of education of household head among survey respondents | $\begin{gathered} 7.360 \\ {[2.616]} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7.566 \\ {[2.644]} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7.087 \\ {[2.627]} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.206 \\ (0.256) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.273 \\ & (0.254) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.4785^{*} \\ & (0.254) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.219 \\ (0.204) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.255 \\ & (0.200) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.4739^{* *} \\ & (0.209) \end{aligned}$ |
| PMT score <br> (calculated from Baseline survey) | $\begin{aligned} & 12.467 \\ & {[0.436]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.519 \\ & {[0.414]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.474 \\ & {[0.423]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.052 \\ (0.041) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.007 \\ (0.042) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.045 \\ & (0.040) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.053 \\ (0.037) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.011 \\ (0.037) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.043 \\ & (0.037) \end{aligned}$ |
| Pct. of households that are agricultural | $\begin{gathered} 45.827 \\ {[34.889]} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 42.887 \\ {[33.789]} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 48.438 \\ {[35.038]} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -2.940 \\ & (3.343) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.612 \\ (3.391) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.5515 * \\ & (3.318) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -3.7806 * \\ & (2.060) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.264 \\ (2.096) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.0442 * * \\ & (2.027) \end{aligned}$ |
| Years of education of RT head | $\begin{gathered} 8.856 \\ {[4.018]} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.860 \\ {[4.244]} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.604 \\ {[3.796]} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.003 \\ (0.402) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.253 \\ & (0.379) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.256 \\ & (0.388) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.033 \\ (0.352) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.206 \\ & (0.336) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.238 \\ & (0.335) \end{aligned}$ |
| Log number of households | $\begin{gathered} 3.832 \\ {[0.491]} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.895 \\ {[0.489]} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.810 \\ {[0.460]} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.063 \\ (0.048) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.022 \\ & (0.046) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0853^{*} \\ & (0.046) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.057 \\ (0.044) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.028 \\ & (0.043) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0846^{* *} \\ & (0.041) \end{aligned}$ |
| Distance to kecamatan in km | $\begin{gathered} 0.444 \\ {[0.652]} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.416 \\ {[0.473]} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.482 \\ {[0.431]} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.028 \\ & (0.056) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.039 \\ (0.054) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.067 \\ (0.044) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.029 \\ & (0.050) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.038 \\ (0.046) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0673^{*} \\ & (0.037) \end{aligned}$ |
| Log size of villages in hectares | $\begin{gathered} 3.105 \\ {[1.278]} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.271 \\ {[1.197]} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.282 \\ {[1.187]} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.166 \\ (0.121) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.177 \\ (0.120) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.011 \\ (0.115) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1435 * \\ & (0.075) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1376 * \\ & (0.075) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.006 \\ & (0.076) \end{aligned}$ |
| Religious building per household | $\begin{gathered} 0.0070 \\ {[0.0050]} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0060 \\ {[0.0050]} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0060 \\ {[0.0050]} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0004 \\ & (0.0005) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0004 \\ & (0.0005) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0001 \\ & (0.0005) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0004 \\ & (0.0004) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0005 \\ & (0.0004) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0001 \\ & (0.0003) \end{aligned}$ |
| Primary school per household | $\begin{gathered} 0.0030 \\ {[0.0030]} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0030 \\ {[0.0030]} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0030 \\ {[0.0020]} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0001 \\ (0.0003) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0002 \\ & (0.0002) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0003 \\ & (0.0002) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0000 \\ (0.0002) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0002 \\ & (0.0002) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0003 \\ & (0.0002) \end{aligned}$ |
| P-value from joint test |  |  |  | 0.275 | 0.689 | 0.089 | 0.165 | 0.322 | 0.028 |

Notes: An observation is a sub-village, and therefore, there are 640 observations. Standard deviations are shown in brackets in columns (1) - (3); robust standard errors are shown in parentheses in columns (4) - (9).

Appendix Table 3: Results of Different Targeting Methods on Error Rate - Time elapsed between survey and targeting

|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | By In | Status | By Detailed Income Status |  |  |  | Per-capita |
| Sample: | Full population | Inclusion Error | Exclusion Error | Rich | Middle income | Near Poor | Very Poor | consumption of beneficiaries |
| Community treatment | $\begin{gathered} 0.088 \\ (0.072) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.098 \\ (0.074) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.042 \\ (0.129) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.090 \\ (0.086) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.102 \\ (0.111) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.127 \\ (0.170) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.072 \\ (0.178) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 68.008 \\ (78.501) \end{gathered}$ |
| Hybrid treatment | $\begin{gathered} 0.018 \\ (0.072) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.074 \\ (0.071) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.226^{*} \\ & (0.125) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.023 \\ (0.081) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.117 \\ (0.108) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.252 \\ & (0.166) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.227 \\ (0.176) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.139 \\ (90.750) \end{gathered}$ |
| Time elapsed | $\begin{gathered} 0.000 \\ (0.001) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.000 \\ & (0.001) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.001 \\ (0.002) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.001 \\ & (0.002) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.000 \\ (0.002) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.004 \\ (0.003) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.002 \\ & (0.003) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.759 \\ (1.552) \end{gathered}$ |
| Time elapsed x | -0.001 | -0.001 | -0.001 | -0.001 | -0.001 | -0.003 | 0.002 | -1.358 |
| Community Treatment | (0.002) | (0.002) | (0.003) | (0.002) | (0.003) | (0.004) | (0.004) | (1.852) |
| Time elapsed x | 0.000 | -0.001 | 0.005 | 0.000 | -0.001 | 0.005 | 0.005 | -0.322 |
| Hybrid Treatment | (0.002) | (0.002) | (0.003) | (0.002) | (0.003) | (0.004) | (0.004) | (2.049) |
| Observations | 5595 | 3617 | 1978 | 1791 | 1826 | 1052 | 926 | 1687 |
| Mean in PMT treatment | 0.30 | 0.18 | 0.52 | 0.13 | 0.23 | 0.55 | 0.48 | 366 |

Notes: All regressions include stratum fixed effects. Robust standard errors are shown in parentheses, adjusted for clustering at the village level. All coefficients are interpretable relative to the PMT treatment, which is the omitted category. The mean of the dependent variable in the PMT treatment is shown in the bottom row. All specifications include stratum fixed effects. *** $\mathrm{p}<0.01,{ }^{* *} \mathrm{p}<0.05,{ }^{*} \mathrm{p}<0.1$

## Appendix Table 4: Results of Different Targeting Methods on Error Rate - Heterogeneity for Java/Non-Java

|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | By Inco | Status | By Detailed Income Status |  |  |  | Per-capita |
| Sample: | Full population | Exclusion Error | Inclusion Error | Rich | Middle income | Near Poor | Very Poor | consumption of beneficiaries |
| COMMUNITY | $\begin{aligned} & 0.038 * \\ & (0.022) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.055^{* *} \\ & (0.023) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.017 \\ (0.040) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.048^{* *} \\ & (0.024) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.066^{*} \\ & (0.035) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.058 \\ (0.051) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.030 \\ & (0.062) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 26.028 \\ (23.419) \end{gathered}$ |
| HYBRID | $\begin{gathered} 0.021 \\ (0.021) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.016 \\ (0.020) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.001 \\ & (0.038) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.034 \\ (0.023) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.001 \\ (0.032) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.025 \\ (0.051) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.024 \\ & (0.057) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -3.088 \\ (22.716) \end{gathered}$ |
| COMMUNITY $\times$ Java | $\begin{aligned} & -0.016 \\ & (0.033) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.026 \\ & (0.037) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.012 \\ (0.056) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.047 \\ & (0.043) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.012 \\ & (0.053) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.016 \\ & (0.075) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.035 \\ (0.080) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -26.834 \\ & (36.993) \end{aligned}$ |
| HYBRID $\times$ Java | $\begin{gathered} 0.019 \\ (0.032) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.053 \\ (0.036) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.016 \\ (0.054) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.032 \\ (0.043) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.127^{* *} \\ & (0.051) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.010 \\ (0.075) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.027 \\ (0.075) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.673 \\ (37.739) \end{gathered}$ |

Notes: All regressions include stratum fixed effects. Robust standard errors are shown in parentheses, adjusted for clustering at the village level. All coefficients are interpretable relative to the PMT treatment, which is the omitted category. The mean of the dependent variable in the PMT treatment is shown in the bottom row. All specifications include stratum fixed effects. *** $\mathrm{p}<0.01,{ }^{* *} \mathrm{p}<0.05$, * $\mathrm{p}<0.1$

## Appendix Table 5: Simulated poverty impacts after subtracting targeting costs .

| Transfer Size (Rp. 000s) |  | Poverty line $=$ Poor |  |  | Poverty line $=$ Very poor |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | PMT | Community | Hybrid | PMT | Community | Hybrid |
| No transfer | headcount | 33.86 | 33.86 | 33.86 | 15.64 | 15.64 | 15.64 |
|  | pov. gap | 9.45 | 9.45 | 9.45 | 3.55 | 3.55 | 3.55 |
|  | sq. pov gap | 3.73 | 3.73 | 3.73 | 1.21 | 1.21 | 1.21 |
| 50 | headcount | 33.07 | 32.91 | 33.41 | 15.11 | 14.69 | 14.74 |
|  | pov. gap | 8.96 | 8.92 | 8.96 | 3.22 | 3.17 | 3.22 |
|  | sq. pov gap | 3.46 | 3.42 | 3.44 | 1.06 | 1.03 | 1.05 |
| 100 | headcount | 31.73 | 32.11 | 32.19 | 14.17 | 13.78 | 13.89 |
|  | pov. gap | 8.43 | 8.43 | 8.42 | 2.88 | 2.84 | 2.88 |
|  | sq. pov gap | 3.18 | 3.14 | 3.15 | 0.93 | 0.89 | 0.90 |
| 200 | headcount | 29.66 | 30.09 | 30.32 | 12.46 | 12.13 | 12.44 |
|  | pov. gap | 7.53 | 7.56 | 7.54 | 2.40 | 2.34 | 2.35 |
|  | sq. pov gap | 2.74 | 2.70 | 2.70 | 0.75 | 0.68 | 0.69 |
| 500 | headcount | 24.24 | 25.24 | 25.53 | 8.86 | 9.19 | 9.25 |
|  | pov. gap | 5.78 | 5.89 | 5.87 | 1.70 | 1.59 | 1.62 |
|  | sq. pov gap | 2.03 | 1.99 | 1.98 | 0.54 | 0.45 | 0.46 |

 Rp. 000s. Assuming that targeting is done once per year, so the one-time cost of targeting is amortized over twelve monthly transfers, the costs of targeting per beneficiary are Rp. 7,000 for PMT, Rp. 3,100 for community, and Rp. 8,000 for hybrid.

## Appendix Table 6: Are elite results driven by social connections?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | $(4)$ |  |
|  |  | Error |  | On beneficiary list dummy |  |
| Elite connectedness | -0.034 | -0.034 | $-0.078^{* * *}$ | $-0.078^{* * *}$ |  |
|  | $(0.021)$ | $(0.021)$ | $(0.023)$ | $(0.023)$ |  |
| Connectedness | $0.041^{*}$ | $0.041^{*}$ | $0.067^{* * *}$ | $0.067^{* * *}$ |  |
|  | $(0.023)$ | $(0.023)$ | $(0.022)$ | $(0.022)$ |  |
| Elite connectedness | -0.010 | -0.002 | $-0.064^{*}$ | $-0.075^{* *}$ |  |
| $\times$ community treatment | $(0.035)$ | $(0.039)$ | $(0.034)$ | $(0.037)$ |  |
| Elite connectedness | 0.003 | -0.004 | -0.022 | -0.010 |  |
| $\times$ hybrid treatment | $(0.034)$ | $(0.036)$ | $(0.034)$ | $(0.037)$ |  |
| Elite connectedness | -0.032 | -0.050 | 0.040 | 0.062 |  |
| $\times$ elite treatment | $(0.031)$ | $(0.047)$ | $(0.031)$ | $(0.043)$ |  |
| Elite connectedness |  | 0.030 |  | -0.050 |  |
| $\times$ elite treatment $\times$ hybrid | -0.002 | $(0.064)$ |  | $(0.061)$ |  |
| Connectedness | -0.026 | 0.008 | 0.019 |  |  |
| $\times$ community treatment | $(0.038)$ | $(0.043)$ | $(0.036)$ | $(0.041)$ |  |
| Connectedness $\times$ | 0.041 | 0.064 | 0.055 | 0.042 |  |
| hybrid treatment | $(0.037)$ | $(0.041)$ | $(0.035)$ | $(0.037)$ |  |
| Connectedness $\times$ | -0.000 | 0.043 | -0.004 | -0.029 |  |
| elite treatment | $(0.035)$ | $(0.051)$ | $(0.032)$ | $(0.047)$ |  |
| Connectedness $\times$ elite treatment $\times$ |  | -0.090 |  | 0.050 |  |
| hybrid treatment | $(0.071)$ |  | $(0.065)$ |  |  |
| Observations | 5753 |  | 5756 | 5756 |  |

Notes: All specifications include dummies for the community, hybrid, and elite treatment main effects, as well as stratum fixed effects; columns (2) and (4) also include a dummy for elite $\times$ hybrid. Robust standard errors in parentheses, adjusted for clustering at the village level. Dependent variable in columns (1) and (2) is the mis-target dummy for the full sample, as in column (1) of Table 4 . Dependent variable in columns (3) and (4) is a dummy for being a beneficiary of the program. ${ }^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<0.01,{ }^{* *} \mathrm{p}<0.05,{ }^{*} \mathrm{p}<0.1$

## Appendix Table 7: Rank correlation matrix of alternative welfare metrics

|  | $(1)$ | $(2)$ | $(3)$ | (4) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Consumption $\left(r_{q}\right)$ | Community survey <br> ranks $\left(r_{\underline{c}}\right)$ | Sub-village head <br> survey ranks $\left(r_{\underline{e}}\right)$ | Self-Assessment <br> $\left(r_{\underline{s}}\right)$ |
| Consumption $\left(r_{q}\right)$ | 1.000 |  |  |  |
| Community survey ranks $\left(r_{\underline{c}}\right)$ | 0.376 | 1.000 | 1.000 |  |
| Sub-village head survey ranks $\left(r_{\underline{e}}\right)$ | 0.335 | 0.746 | 0.407 | 1.000 |

[^0]
[^0]:    Notes: This table reports the correlation matrix between the within-village ranks of the four variables listed. All correlations are statistically significantly different from 0 at the $1 \%$ level.

