

List of Tables

1	Eq 1: Mean Recipient Valuation-Cost Ratio by Program Sector	2
2	Eq 1: Mean Donor Valuation-Cost Ratio by Program Sector	3
3	Eq 1: Median Recipient Valuation-Cost Ratio by Program Sector	4
4	Eq 1: Median Donor Valuation-Cost Ratio by Program Sector	5
5	Eq 2: Mean Recipient Valuation-Cost Ratio by Program Type	6
6	Eq 2: Mean Donor Valuation-Cost Ratio by Program Type	7
7	Eq 2: Median Recipient Valuation-Cost Ratio by Program Type	8
8	Eq 2: Median Donor Valuation-Cost Ratio by Program Type	9
9	Eq 3: Mean Valuation-Cost Ratio for Recipients vs Donors	10
10	Eq 3: Median Valuation-Cost Ratio for Recipients vs Donors	11
11	Eq 4: Mean Valuation-Cost Ratio for Recipients vs Donors by Development Sector Experience	12
12	Eq 4: Median Valuation-Cost Ratio for Recipients vs Donors by Development Sector Experience	13
13	Eq 5: Mean Recipient Valuation-Cost Ratio - Heterogeneity by Household Characteristics	14
14	Eq 5: Mean Recipient Valuation-Cost Ratio for Intervention Categories - Heterogeneity by Household Characteristics	15
15	Eq 5: Median Recipient Valuation-Cost Ratio - Heterogeneity by Household Characteristics	16
16	Eq 5: Median Recipient Valuation-Cost Ratio for Intervention Categories - Heterogeneity by Household Characteristics	17
17	Eq 6: Mean Recipient Valuation-Cost Ratio - Heterogeneity by Program and Household Characteristics	18
18	Eq 6: Median Recipient Valuation-Cost Ratio - Heterogeneity by Program and Household Characteristics	19
19	Eq 7: Recipient Valuation Consistency by Elicitation Method	20
20	Eq 8: Recipient Valuation Consistency by Elicitation Method	21
21	Eq 9: Mean Recipient Valuation-Cost Ratio by Program and Elicitation Method	22
22	Eq 9: Median Recipient Valuation-Cost Ratio by Program and Elicitation Method	23

Table 1: Eq 1: Mean Recipient Valuation-Cost Ratio by Program Sector

	Constant	Agriculture	Water	Health	Energy	Education	N
Intervention Value / Cost	123.533*** (3.771)	-119.711*** (4.446)	-77.713*** (3.923)	-122.040*** (4.453)	-122.673*** (4.456)	-38.523*** (5.192)	15660

NOTES: Table shows estimates from linear regression of recipient valuation-cost ratio on program sectors with respondent fixed effects. The omitted category is the miscellaneous sector. Agricultural intervention covers agricultural inputs and extension; water intervention covers water supply, WASH education, and WASH supplies; health intervention covers family planning, condom distribution, bed net distribution, donation to HIV research, donation to malaria research, and donation to deworming program; energy intervention covers household solar light supply; education intervention covers computer skills training, teacher training, inputs for ICT in schools, and weekly tutoring to school children; miscellaneous intervention covers digital stress reduction and technical assistance on finance. Standard errors are clustered at the respondent level and reported in parentheses. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table 2: Eq 1: Mean Donor Valuation-Cost Ratio by Program Sector

	Constant	Agriculture	Water	Health	Energy	Education	N
Intervention Value / Cost	46.769*** (8.833)	-42.917*** (10.415)	-17.723* (9.284)	-43.676*** (10.669)	-46.530*** (10.909)	-42.804*** (10.090)	15660

NOTES: Table shows estimates from linear regression of donor valuation-cost ratio on program sectors with respondent fixed effects. The omitted category is the miscellaneous sector. Agricultural intervention covers agricultural inputs and extension; water intervention covers water supply, WASH education, and WASH supplies; health intervention covers family planning, condom distribution, bed net distribution, donation to HIV research, donation to malaria research, and donation to deworming program; energy intervention covers household solar light supply; education intervention covers computer skills training, teacher training, inputs for ICT in schools, and weekly tutoring to school children; miscellaneous intervention covers digital stress reduction and technical assistance on finance. Standard errors are clustered at the respondent level and reported in parentheses. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table 3: Eq 1: Median Recipient Valuation-Cost Ratio by Program Sector

	Constant	Agriculture	Water	Health	Energy	Education	N
Intervention Value / Cost	22.857*** (0.169)	-21.249*** (0.172)	-5.415*** (0.232)	-21.896*** (0.166)	-22.076*** (0.168)	-12.857*** (0.320)	15660

NOTES: Table shows estimates from quantile regression of recipient valuation-cost ratio on program sectors with respondent fixed effects. The omitted category is the miscellaneous sector. Agricultural intervention covers agricultural inputs and extension; water intervention covers water supply, WASH education, and WASH supplies; health intervention covers family planning, condom distribution, bed net distribution, donation to HIV research, donation to malaria research, and donation to deworming program; energy intervention covers household solar light supply; education intervention covers computer skills training, teacher training, inputs for ICT in schools, and weekly tutoring to school children; miscellaneous intervention covers digital stress reduction and technical assistance on finance. Standard errors are clustered at the respondent level and reported in parentheses. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table 4: Eq 1: Median Donor Valuation-Cost Ratio by Program Sector

	Constant	Agriculture	Water	Health	Energy	Education	N
Intervention Value / Cost	2.857*** (0.440)	-1.524*** (0.417)	2.500 (2.474)	-1.857*** (0.427)	-2.742*** (0.425)	-1.857*** (0.391)	15660

NOTES: Table shows estimates from quantile regression of donor valuation-cost ratio on program sectors with respondent fixed effects. The omitted category is the miscellaneous sector. Agricultural intervention covers agricultural inputs and extension; water intervention covers water supply, WASH education, and WASH supplies; health intervention covers family planning, condom distribution, bed net distribution, donation to HIV research, donation to malaria research, and donation to deworming program; energy intervention covers household solar light supply; education intervention covers computer skills training, teacher training, inputs for ICT in schools, and weekly tutoring to school children; miscellaneous intervention covers digital stress reduction and technical assistance on finance. Standard errors are clustered at the respondent level and reported in parentheses. * p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01

Table 5: Eq 2: Mean Recipient Valuation-Cost Ratio by Program Type

	Constant	Private Interventions	Spillover Interventions	N
Intervention Value / Cost	69.236*** (1.291)	-67.098*** (2.076)	-18.194*** (2.346)	15660

NOTES: Table shows estimates from linear regression of recipient valuation-cost ratio on program type with respondent fixed effects. The omitted category is public goods intervention. Private intervention covers agricultural inputs, water supply, WASH supplies, family planning services, condoms, bed nets and solar energy connections; spillover intervention covers agricultural extension and after school tutoring; public intervention covers WASH education, teacher training, mass deworming and research on malaria and HIV. Standard errors are clustered at the respondent level and reported in parenthesis. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table 6: Eq 2: Mean Donor Valuation-Cost Ratio by Program Type

	Constant	Private Interventions	Spillover Interventions	N
Intervention Value / Cost	16.428*** (1.672)	-13.051*** (2.995)	0.942 (3.152)	15660

NOTES: Table shows estimates from linear regression of donor valuation-cost ratio on program type with respondent fixed effects. The omitted category is public goods intervention. Private intervention covers agricultural inputs, water supply, WASH supplies, family planning services, condoms, bed nets and solar energy connections; spillover intervention covers agricultural extension and after school tutoring; public intervention covers WASH education, teacher training, mass deworming and research on malaria and HIV. Standard errors are clustered at the respondent level and reported in parenthesis. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table 7: Eq 2: Median Recipient Valuation-Cost Ratio by Program Type

	Constant	Private Interventions	Spillover Interventions	N
Intervention Value / Cost	17.391*** (0.509)	-16.334*** (0.505)	-15.606*** (0.500)	15660

NOTES: Table shows estimates from quantile regression of recipient valuation-cost ratio on program type with respondent fixed effects. The omitted category is public goods intervention. Private intervention covers agricultural inputs, water supply, WASH supplies, family planning services, condoms, bed nets and solar energy connections; spillover intervention covers agricultural extension and after school tutoring; public intervention covers WASH education, teacher training, mass deworming and research on malaria and HIV. Standard errors are clustered at the respondent level and reported in parenthesis. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table 8: Eq 2: Median Donor Valuation-Cost Ratio by Program Type

	Constant	Private Interventions	Spillover Interventions	N
Intervention Value / Cost	2.000*** (0.247)	-1.114*** (0.193)	-0.929*** (0.182)	15660

NOTES: Table shows estimates from quantile regression of donor valuation-cost ratio on program type with respondent fixed effects. The omitted category is public goods intervention. Private intervention covers agricultural inputs, water supply, WASH supplies, family planning services, condoms, bed nets and solar energy connections; spillover intervention covers agricultural extension and after school tutoring; public intervention covers WASH education, teacher training, mass deworming and research on malaria and HIV. Standard errors are clustered at the respondent level and reported in parenthesis. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table 9: Eq 3: Mean Valuation-Cost Ratio for Recipients vs Donors

	Constant	Donor	N
Agricultural intervention	5.450*** (0.230)	-1.598** (0.688)	15660
Water intervention	45.736*** (1.179)	-16.690** (6.710)	15660
Health intervention	1.419*** (0.029)	1.674*** (0.612)	15660
Energy intervention	0.775*** (0.018)	-0.536*** (0.043)	15660
Education intervention	84.638*** (3.253)	-80.673*** (3.383)	15660
Miscellaneous intervention	123.457*** (4.324)	-76.688*** (11.396)	15660
Private value intervention	2.140*** (0.043)	1.237* (0.728)	15660
Public intervention	69.248*** (2.027)	-52.820*** (3.969)	15660
Spillover intervention	51.024*** (1.753)	-33.654*** (4.146)	15660
Digital Stress Reduction	7.003*** (0.255)	-5.944*** (0.331)	15660
Vocation: Computer skills training	1.342*** (0.063)	0.174 (0.654)	15660
Water: Water supply tank or borehole	43.225*** (1.490)	-33.322*** (2.674)	15660
Water: WASH education	88.190*** (2.910)	-17.631 (16.900)	15660
Water: WASH supplies	5.791*** (0.179)	0.884 (2.119)	15660
Health: Family planning services	1.071*** (0.041)	0.741 (0.525)	15660
Health: Condom distribution	1.361*** (0.049)	3.399** (1.418)	15660
Health: Bed net distribution	2.147*** (0.072)	2.410 (1.473)	15660
Health: Donation to HIV research	1.680*** (0.060)	1.331* (0.767)	15660
Health: Donation to malaria reseach	1.345*** (0.040)	1.002 (0.627)	15660
Health: Donation to deworming program	0.908*** (0.026)	1.164** (0.472)	15660
Education: Teacher training	27.631*** (0.751)	-19.505*** (1.899)	15660
Education: Inputs for ICT in school	254.104*** (10.632)	-249.485*** (10.721)	15660
Education: Tutoring school children	0.654*** (0.020)	0.947*** (0.312)	15660
Finance: Technical assistance	240.059*** (8.645)	-147.580*** (22.671)	15660
Energy: Solar light supply	0.775*** (0.018)	-0.536*** (0.043)	15660
Agriculture: Inputs	1.463*** (0.039)	0.754 (0.516)	15660
Agriculture: Extension	9.438*** (0.448)	-3.949*** (1.009)	15660

NOTES: Table shows estimates from linear regressions of valuation-cost ratio on indicator for being a donor for various intervention categories. Standard errors are clustered at respondent level and reported in parenthesis. * p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01

Table 10: Eq 3: Median Valuation-Cost Ratio for Recipients vs Donors

	Constant	Donor	N
Agricultural intervention	1.608*** (0.041)	-0.274* (0.152)	15660
Water intervention	17.442*** (0.672)	-12.085*** (0.921)	15660
Health intervention	0.962*** (0.032)	0.038 (0.079)	15660
Energy intervention	0.782*** (0.014)	-0.667*** (0.027)	15660
Education intervention	10.000*** (0.734)	-9.000*** (0.803)	15660
Miscellaneous intervention	22.857*** (0.685)	-20.000*** (1.002)	15660
Private value intervention	1.058*** (0.018)	-0.172* (0.104)	15660
Public intervention	17.391*** (0.612)	-15.391*** (0.741)	15660
Spillover intervention	1.786*** (0.043)	-0.714*** (0.129)	15660
Digital Stress Reduction	4.286*** (0.407)	-4.000*** (0.447)	15660
Vocation: Computer skills training	1.000*** (0.057)	-0.600*** (0.091)	15660
Water: Water supply tank or borehole	32.143*** (1.741)	-28.571*** (2.201)	15660
Water: WASH education	69.565*** (3.651)	-52.174*** (5.369)	15660
Water: WASH supplies	3.488*** (0.116)	-1.744*** (0.276)	15660
Health: Family planning services	0.769*** (0.040)	-0.192 (0.125)	15660
Health: Condom distribution	1.000*** (0.063)	0.200 (0.156)	15660
Health: Bed net distribution	1.111*** (0.096)	0.889** (0.378)	15660
Health: Donation to HIV research	1.000*** (0.040)	0.000 (0.116)	15660
Health: Donation to malaria reseach	1.000*** (0.044)	0.000 (0.101)	15660
Health: Donation to deworming program	0.800*** (0.038)	0.200** (0.101)	15660
Education: Teacher training	20.000*** (0.968)	-18.000*** (1.430)	15660
Education: Inputs for ICT in school	120.000*** (9.134)	-118.667*** (10.595)	15660
Education: Tutoring school children	0.536*** (0.031)	0.060 (0.122)	15660
Finance: Technical assistance	136.364*** (5.944)	-110.390*** (9.551)	15660
Energy: Solar light supply	0.782*** (0.014)	-0.667*** (0.027)	15660
Agriculture: Inputs	1.286*** (0.022)	-0.400*** (0.078)	15660
Agriculture: Extension	6.000*** (0.423)	-3.667*** (0.551)	15660

NOTES: Table shows estimates from quantile regressions of valuation-cost ratio on indicator for being a donor for various intervention categories. Standard errors are clustered at respondent level and reported in parenthesis. * p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01

Table 11: Eq 4: Mean Valuation-Cost Ratio for Recipients vs Donors by Development Sector Experience

	Constant	Donors Without Experience	Donors With Experience	N
Intervention Value / Cost	8.793*** (0.383)	-33.966*** (1.665)	-25.856*** (2.639)	20448

NOTES: Table shows estimates from linear regression of valuation-cost ratio on indicators for donors with and without development sector experience with recipients being omitted category. Regression includes program fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered at respondent level and reported in parenthesis. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table 12: Eq 4: Median Valuation-Cost Ratio for Recipients vs Donors by Development Sector Experience

	Constant	Donors Without Experience	Donors With Experience	N
Intervention Value / Cost	3.429*** (0.271)	-0.667*** (0.091)	-0.644*** (0.072)	20448

NOTES: Table shows estimates from quantile regression of valuation-cost ratio on indicators for donors with and without development sector experience with recipients being omitted category. Regression includes program fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered at respondent level and reported in parenthesis. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table 13: Eq 5: Mean Recipient Valuation-Cost Ratio - Heterogeneity by Household Characteristics

	Constant	Per-Capita Monthly Consumption	Total Assets Value	Average Adult Education	N
Intervention Value / Cost	-0.874 (3.881)	2.268** (0.933)	-0.996 (0.920)	0.460 (0.327)	20448

NOTES: Table shows estimates from linear regression of recipient valuation-cost ratio on household characteristics with program fixed effects. A positive coefficient in the first column indicates that a change in per-capita monthly household consumption to the next quartile is associated with an increase in the valuation-cost ratio. A positive coefficient in the second column indicates that a change in total value of household assets to the next quartile is associated with an increase in the valuation-cost ratio. A positive coefficient in the third column indicates that a unit change in average household education level is associated with an increase in the valuation-cost ratio. Standard errors are clustered at the respondent level and reported in parenthesis. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table 14: Eq 5: Mean Recipient Valuation-Cost Ratio for Intervention Categories - Heterogeneity by Household Characteristics

	Constant	Per-Capita Monthly Consumption	Total Assets Value	Average Adult Education	N
Agricultural intervention	4.462*** (0.931)	0.183 (0.224)	-0.100 (0.204)	0.089 (0.079)	20448
Water intervention	38.200*** (4.383)	3.896*** (1.077)	-3.066*** (1.032)	0.536 (0.363)	20448
Health intervention	1.210*** (0.113)	0.057** (0.026)	-0.013 (0.026)	0.009 (0.010)	20448
Energy intervention	0.897*** (0.070)	-0.003 (0.017)	0.015 (0.016)	-0.015** (0.006)	20448
Education intervention	92.954*** (12.642)	-1.533 (3.005)	0.413 (2.950)	-0.483 (1.001)	20448
Miscellaneous intervention	94.101*** (16.310)	10.489*** (4.046)	-4.535 (4.119)	1.435 (1.370)	20448
Private value intervention	1.456*** (0.161)	0.070* (0.038)	0.071* (0.038)	0.033** (0.014)	20448
Public intervention	58.313*** (7.790)	2.647 (1.836)	-1.119 (1.797)	0.720 (0.644)	20448
Spillover intervention	40.364*** (6.630)	4.073** (1.641)	-1.857 (1.667)	0.509 (0.555)	20448
Digital Stress Reduction	4.616*** (0.952)	0.726*** (0.241)	0.572** (0.248)	-0.082 (0.080)	15660
Vocation: Computer skills training	1.474*** (0.283)	0.204*** (0.063)	-0.048 (0.067)	-0.051*** (0.020)	15660
Water: Water supply tank or borehole	37.159*** (5.441)	1.547 (1.393)	-0.472 (1.332)	0.355 (0.428)	15660
Water: WASH education	73.646*** (11.258)	10.023*** (2.705)	-8.941*** (2.611)	1.140 (0.938)	15660
Water: WASH supplies	3.794*** (0.649)	0.118 (0.161)	0.214 (0.162)	0.114** (0.055)	15660
Health: Family planning services	0.546*** (0.148)	0.140*** (0.038)	-0.004 (0.038)	0.018 (0.012)	15660
Health: Condom distribution	1.161*** (0.191)	0.030 (0.042)	-0.060 (0.043)	0.027* (0.014)	15660
Health: Bed net distribution	1.512*** (0.265)	0.063 (0.066)	0.199*** (0.069)	-0.002 (0.023)	15660
Health: Donation to HIV research	1.659*** (0.243)	0.057 (0.057)	-0.094 (0.058)	0.012 (0.020)	15660
Health: Donation to malaria reseach	1.506*** (0.166)	0.014 (0.036)	-0.087** (0.037)	0.002 (0.013)	15660
Health: Donation to deworming program	0.867*** (0.101)	0.040* (0.024)	-0.033 (0.024)	0.002 (0.009)	15660
Education: Teacher training	24.605*** (3.005)	0.678 (0.719)	0.663 (0.684)	-0.024 (0.241)	15660
Education: Inputs for ICT in school	214.728*** (40.498)	3.267 (9.693)	1.276 (9.493)	2.868 (3.301)	15660
Education: Tutoring school children	0.384*** (0.074)	0.053*** (0.018)	0.038** (0.018)	0.004 (0.006)	15660
Finance: Technical assistance	184.377*** (32.661)	20.382** (8.108)	-9.828 (8.242)	2.905 (2.741)	15660
Energy: Solar light supply	0.897*** (0.070)	-0.003 (0.017)	0.015 (0.016)	-0.015** (0.006)	15660
Agriculture: Inputs	1.350*** (0.162)	-0.047 (0.035)	0.041 (0.035)	0.013 (0.013)	15660
Agriculture: Extension	7.573*** (1.817)	0.412 (0.441)	-0.240 (0.397)	0.165 (0.155)	15660

NOTES: Table shows estimates from linear regression of recipient valuation-cost ratio on household characteristics for various intervention categories. A positive coefficient in the first column indicates that a change in per-capita monthly household consumption to the next quartile is associated with an increase in the valuation-cost ratio. A positive coefficient in the second column indicates that a change in total value of household assets to the next quartile is associated with an increase in the valuation-cost ratio. A positive coefficient in the third column indicates that a unit change in average household education level is associated with an increase in the valuation-cost ratio. Standard errors are clustered at the respondent level and reported in parenthesis. * p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01

Table 15: Eq 5: Median Recipient Valuation-Cost Ratio - Heterogeneity by Household Characteristics

	Constant	Per-Capita Monthly Consumption	Total Assets Value	Average Adult Education	N
Intervention Value / Cost	3.983*** (0.144)	0.057*** (0.021)	0.019 (0.021)	0.003 (0.008)	20448

NOTES: Table shows estimates from quantile regression of recipient valuation-cost ratio on household characteristics with program fixed effects. A positive coefficient in the first column indicates that a change in per-capita monthly household consumption to the next quartile is associated with an increase in the valuation-cost ratio. A positive coefficient in the second column indicates that a change in total value of household assets to the next quartile is associated with an increase in the valuation-cost ratio. A positive coefficient in the third column indicates that a unit change in average household education level is associated with an increase in the valuation-cost ratio. Standard errors are clustered at the respondent level and reported in parenthesis. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table 16: Eq 5: Median Recipient Valuation-Cost Ratio for Intervention Categories - Heterogeneity by Household Characteristics

	Constant	Per-Capita Monthly Consumption	Total Assets Value	Average Adult Education	N
Agricultural intervention	1.294*** (0.236)	-0.018 (0.049)	0.126** (0.060)	0.020 (0.018)	20448
Water intervention	13.574*** (2.946)	0.774 (0.619)	-0.179 (0.657)	0.238 (0.236)	20448
Health intervention	0.733*** (0.133)	0.067** (0.031)	-0.000 (0.027)	-0.000 (0.010)	20448
Energy intervention	0.850*** (0.064)	0.008 (0.014)	0.019 (0.015)	-0.015** (0.007)	20448
Education intervention	22.340*** (2.224)	-2.356*** (0.524)	0.904* (0.462)	-0.711*** (0.155)	20448
Miscellaneous intervention	14.857*** (3.493)	1.143 (0.797)	1.143 (0.746)	-0.000 (0.239)	20448
Private value intervention	0.899*** (0.076)	0.031* (0.018)	0.035** (0.017)	-0.000 (0.007)	20448
Public intervention	12.609*** (3.341)	1.304* (0.694)	0.543 (0.672)	0.000 (0.252)	20448
Spillover intervention	2.087*** (0.243)	0.023 (0.047)	-0.061 (0.045)	-0.013 (0.018)	20448
Digital Stress Reduction	1.416** (0.578)	0.335* (0.179)	0.373* (0.194)	0.077 (0.053)	15660
Vocation: Computer skills training	1.033*** (0.292)	0.051 (0.056)	0.008 (0.067)	-0.014 (0.019)	15660
Water: Water supply tank or borehole	21.080*** (5.213)	1.279 (1.171)	0.058 (1.232)	0.696 (0.430)	15660
Water: WASH education	40.192*** (13.890)	10.339*** (3.254)	-3.766 (3.170)	0.890 (1.281)	15660
Water: WASH supplies	3.488*** (0.483)	0.000 (0.103)	0.000 (0.108)	-0.000 (0.041)	15660
Health: Family planning services	0.345* (0.200)	0.124*** (0.047)	0.042 (0.055)	-0.003 (0.016)	15660
Health: Condom distribution	0.733*** (0.219)	0.067 (0.047)	-0.000 (0.046)	-0.000 (0.019)	15660
Health: Bed net distribution	0.727*** (0.250)	0.051 (0.064)	0.227*** (0.079)	-0.028 (0.023)	15660
Health: Donation to HIV research	0.855*** (0.158)	0.073** (0.035)	-0.041 (0.036)	0.014 (0.014)	15660
Health: Donation to malaria reseach	1.020*** (0.188)	0.010 (0.040)	-0.005 (0.040)	-0.003 (0.015)	15660
Health: Donation to deworming program	0.533*** (0.134)	0.067** (0.027)	-0.000 (0.030)	0.000 (0.012)	15660
Education: Teacher training	20.000*** (4.345)	-0.000 (1.000)	0.000 (1.090)	-0.000 (0.347)	15660
Education: Inputs for ICT in school	87.047** (36.760)	12.211 (7.850)	7.361 (7.691)	-1.141 (3.012)	15660
Education: Tutoring school children	0.185 (0.129)	0.080*** (0.028)	0.053* (0.028)	-0.002 (0.011)	15660
Finance: Technical assistance	115.260*** (23.273)	3.653 (5.411)	-0.609 (5.492)	1.218 (1.919)	15660
Energy: Solar light supply	0.850*** (0.064)	0.008 (0.014)	0.019 (0.015)	-0.015** (0.007)	15660
Agriculture: Inputs	1.099*** (0.129)	-0.014 (0.024)	0.022 (0.020)	0.016 (0.011)	15660
Agriculture: Extension	1.364 (1.217)	0.515 (0.339)	-0.083 (0.319)	0.341*** (0.114)	15660

NOTES: Table shows estimates from quantile regression of recipient valuation-cost ratio on household characteristics for various intervention categories. A positive coefficient in the first column indicates that a change in per-capita monthly household consumption to the next quartile is associated with an increase in the valuation-cost ratio. A positive coefficient in the second column indicates that a change in total value of household assets to the next quartile is associated with an increase in the valuation-cost ratio. A positive coefficient in the third column indicates that a unit change in average household education level is associated with an increase in the valuation-cost ratio. Standard errors are clustered at the respondent level and reported in parenthesis. * p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01

Table 17: Eq 6: Mean Recipient Valuation-Cost Ratio - Heterogeneity by Program and Household Characteristics

	Constant	Agriculture intervention	Time spent on agriculture	Time spent on agriculture X Agriculture intervention	N
Intervention Value / Cost	41.480*** (2.556)	-36.497*** (2.487)	0.529* (0.286)	-0.456 (0.279)	20448
	Constant	Water intervention	Water shortage	Water shortage X Water intervention	N
Intervention Value / Cost	39.973*** (1.274)	4.817*** (1.383)	-0.153 (2.461)	3.524 (2.307)	20448
	Constant	Bednet intervention	Has no net	Has no net X Bednet intervention	N
Intervention Value / Cost	43.886*** (1.836)	-41.657*** (1.829)	-0.656 (2.275)	0.528 (2.272)	20448
	Constant	Education intervention	Education index	Education index X Education intervention	N
Intervention Value / Cost	30.057*** (0.837)	54.591*** (3.216)	2.259** (1.101)	1.459 (2.848)	20448
	Constant	Energy intervention	Has no electricity	Has no electricity X Energy intervention	N
Intervention Value / Cost	45.253*** (2.050)	-44.568*** (2.038)	-2.492 (2.411)	2.625 (2.398)	20448

NOTES: Table shows estimates from linear regression of recipient valuation-cost ratio on program and household characteristics. Standard errors are clustered at the respondent level and reported in parentheses. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table 18: Eq 6: Median Recipient Valuation-Cost Ratio - Heterogeneity by Program and Household Characteristics

	Constant	Agriculture intervention	Time spent on agriculture	Time spent on agriculture X Agriculture intervention	N
Intervention Value / Cost	1.933*** (0.103)	-0.141 (0.130)	0.031** (0.014)	-0.042*** (0.016)	20448
	Constant	Water intervention	Water shortage	Water shortage X Water intervention	N
Intervention Value / Cost	1.400*** (0.030)	15.991*** (0.093)	0.029 (0.066)	1.866 (5.315)	20448
	Constant	Bednet intervention	Has no net	Has no net X Bednet intervention	N
Intervention Value / Cost	2.000*** (0.062)	-0.889*** (0.147)	0.143* (0.078)	-0.143 (0.199)	20448
	Constant	Education intervention	Education index	Education index X Education intervention	N
Intervention Value / Cost	1.889*** (0.045)	8.111*** (0.149)	0.035 (0.045)	-0.035 (0.195)	20448
	Constant	Energy intervention	Has no electricity	Has no electricity X Energy intervention	N
Intervention Value / Cost	2.400*** (0.086)	-1.756*** (0.082)	0.000 (0.106)	0.138 (0.104)	20448

NOTES: Table shows estimates from quantile regression of recipient valuation-cost ratio on program and household characteristics. Standard errors are clustered at the respondent level and reported in parentheses. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table 19: Eq 7: Recipient Valuation Consistency by Elicitation Method

	Constant	MPL	BDM On Faith	BDM With Example	Certainty	N
Consistency	0.504*** (0.072)	0.072 (0.064)	0.027 (0.060)	0.021 (0.059)	-0.255*** (0.077)	793

NOTES: Table shows estimates from linear regression of recipient valuation consistency on elicitation method with program fixed effects. Consistency is defined as the respondent's choice between cash or program matching the choice predicted from their indifference point. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table 20: Eq 8: Recipient Valuation Consistency by Elicitation Method

	Constant	MPL	BDM On Faith	BDM With Example	BDM on Faith With Certain Payoff	BDM With Example With Certain Payoff	N
Consistency	0.504*** (0.072)	0.072 (0.064)	0.027 (0.061)	0.021 (0.060)	-0.243*** (0.082)	-0.264*** (0.080)	793

NOTES: Table shows estimates from linear regression of recipient valuation consistency on elicitation method with program fixed effects. Consistency is defined as the respondent's choice between cash or program matching the choice predicted from their indifference point. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table 21: Eq 9: Mean Recipient Valuation-Cost Ratio by Program and Elicitation Method

	Constant	MPL	BDM With Example	BDM On Faith	Certainty	N
Intervention Value / Cost	8.088*** (2.399)	-3.801 (2.664)	-3.636 (3.680)	-2.196 (3.735)	1.481 (3.280)	20448

NOTES: Table shows estimates from linear regression of recipient valuation-cost ratio on elicitation method and program. Regression includes program fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered at the respondent level and reported in parentheses. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table 22: Eq 9: Median Recipient Valuation-Cost Ratio by Program and Elicitation Method

	Constant	MPL	BDM With Example	BDM On Faith	Certainty	N
Intervention Value / Cost	4.286*** (0.118)	0.738*** (0.064)	0.000 (0.073)	0.000 (0.074)	0.000 (0.061)	20448

NOTES: Table shows estimates from quantile regression of recipient valuation-cost ratio on elicitation method and program. Regression includes program fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered at the respondent level and reported in parentheses. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$