

Uganda - Social Assistance Grants for Empowerment Programme 2014, Endline: Impact After Two Years of Programme Operations

Oxford Policy Mangement Ltd.

Report generated on: July 25, 2016

Visit our data catalog at: <http://microdata.worldbank.org>

Sampling

Sampling Procedure

Overview

In order to deliver the quantitative impact evaluation study design, a three-round longitudinal household panel survey was conducted. The quantitative survey was implemented in 398 clusters across 48 sub-counties in eight programme districts. The evaluation was conducted in eight of the 14 districts, in agreement with the programme. This was in order to minimise the operational burden of the evaluation on the programme, due to the requirement that the evaluation randomly assign targeting mechanisms between sub-counties within evaluation districts. Consequently, it was agreed to exclude from the evaluation the six 'new' districts that were created from the original districts when the administrative boundaries were redrawn in 2010.

Selection of Sub-counties

Evaluation sub-counties were randomly selected from a list of sub-counties provided by the Uganda 2002 census. This list had to be adjusted to incorporate the 2010 sub-county boundary changes, with the populations of the new sub-counties provided by SAGE. The sample frame was thus comprised of the 74 sub-counties (as defined by the old administrative boundaries) in the eight programme evaluation districts, minus six that were excluded from selection for the evaluation.

Prior to selection, this list of 68 sub-counties was first randomly divided into two lists, one from which SCG sub-counties were drawn and one from which VFSG sub-counties were drawn. This random allocation of treatment was done to ensure a similar spread of sub-counties in both SCG and VFSG lists, allowing for rigorous comparison across the two targeting methodologies. The 24 SCG and 24 VFSG sub-counties to be covered by the evaluation were then randomly selected from the SCG and VFSG sub-county lists respectively. Sub-counties were selected using probability proportional to size (PPS).

The sampling of evaluation sub-counties had to account for the fact that in Karamoja only the SCG targeting mechanism was to be applied. To avoid sub-counties in the Karamoja region being over-represented in the SCG sub-county list, the list of VFSG sub-counties was not restricted to exclude those in the Karamoja region. Instead those Karamoja sub-counties that were randomly allocated to the VFSG sub-county list were then excluded, with the 24 VFSG evaluation sub-counties randomly selected from the restricted sub-county list.

Selection of Evaluation Primary Sampling Units

Within selected evaluation sub-counties a number of primary sampling units (PSUs) or clusters were drawn. The precise number of clusters depended on balancing a number of different factors: whether the unit was practically viable for use as a cluster for survey implementation; the population density of treatment and comparison households per cluster at the specified bandwidth; the number of clusters required at the specified bandwidth in order to achieve the proposed household sample size; and the number of clusters that it was financially viable to survey.

400 clusters (200 SCG; 200 VFSG) were randomly selected from across the 48 evaluation sub-counties, where the unit of cluster was the village, and using PPS based on the number of households within the bandwidth in each PSU. Due to the use of PPS and the relatively large size of a few villages compared to all the other villages, one SCG community was selected twice. Furthermore, during fieldwork it was found that two SCG communities in the sample frame that had been selected were in fact one community. This means that the final number of SCG communities is 198 and not 200, meaning that the final cluster sample comprised 398 discrete villages.

Sampling of Evaluation Households

From each of the 398 sampled villages, five treatment and five comparison group households were randomly selected for interview; with the exception of the two clusters that were sampled twice, from which 10 treatment and 10 comparison households were selected. In cases where insufficient treatment or comparison households were present within a particular village, the sample was re-distributed according to the following protocol:

- For low density villages that contain between six and nine evaluation households (i.e. treatment or comparison households within the evaluation bandwidth), replacements were taken from other sampled villages within the same sub-county. This was done by randomly selecting replacement households from the full list of households living in sampled evaluation villages in the same sub-county, that had not already been sampled.
- In order to minimise the negative effect of the redistribution of sampled households between clusters on the logistics of the fieldwork, we restricted the total number of households to be interviewed within a particular village to a maximum of 12 households.
- Extremely low density villages containing less than six households within the bandwidth in total (either treatment or comparison) were dropped from the sample frame. Analysis of the most recent available SAGE MIS data from the six pre-pilot sub-counties shows that this represents only a very small proportion of beneficiaries and villages.

Selection of Control Communities

A sample of 100 control communities was also surveyed in order to measure impact on a selection of community-level outcomes. The control communities survey did not include a household survey. The control communities were identified using matching techniques, which match treatment and control communities using characteristics drawn from the 2002 Uganda Census. The control communities are located across six control districts, chosen using the same rationale as was used to select the 14 pilot programme districts, to obtain maximum comparability. The six control districts selected were: Nakasongola in the Central region; Kamuli and Buyende in the Eastern region; Pader and Agago in the Northern region; and Kamwenge in the Western region.

Weighting

Weights were given by the inverse of the probability of being selected. The household's probability of selection was broken down into two component parts: 1) the probability of selection of the PSU; and 2) the probability of being selected into treatment and comparison groups from the list of all possible SAGE eligible and non-eligible households within the specified bandwidths in that PSU. In the calculation of the survey weights we ignored the probability associated with the selection of the evaluation sub-counties. Doing so reduces the variance of the final weights, thereby reducing the variance of point estimates and increasing the likelihood of detecting impact should the SAGE programme impact key outcome indicators. Furthermore, 48 out of a total 68 sub-counties have been included in the evaluation, meaning that the evaluation sample of sub-counties is already very representative of the total pilot population of sub-counties.

We defined the two component probabilities as follows:

P1 : Probability of a PSU being selected. PSUs were randomly selected using the PPS techniques separately for SCG and VFSG areas, drawn from a sample frame of all PSUs within evaluation sub-counties.

P1 = Number of households in bandwidth in PSU/total number of households in bandwidth in evaluation sub-counties

P2 : Probability of being selected from the full list of treatment or comparison group households within a PSU (depending on whether household was a treatment or comparison household)

P2 = Number of sampled treatment or control households in PSU/total number of treatment or control households in PSU

The final probability of a household being selected for the SAGE baseline survey was calculated by combining **P1** & **P2**, as follows:

Probability of selection = **P1 x P2**.

Thus, the final analytical weights applied to each household were constructed by taking the inverse of the probability of selection.

Questionnaires

Overview

In each round there was a household questionnaire which was administered to each household and collected the household and individual level information. This contained modules on household characteristics, education, health, activities of the household members, migration, housing conditions, empowerment, assets, land and livestock, subjective poverty, saving and borrowing, formal/informal transfers, hunger scale, consumption, operational and targeting, anthropometry. In addition a community questionnaire was conducted in each community. This includes modules on communities access to facilities, wages, local goods and prices.

Data Collection

Data Collection Dates

Start	End	Cycle
2014-09	2014-10	Second Follow-up data collection

Data Collection Mode

Face-to-face [f2f]

Data Collectors

Name	Abbreviation	Affiliation
Research Guide Africa	RGA	
Ipsos Synovate Uganda		

SUPERVISION

There were a total of 8 team, each with a supervisor. There was also a roving quality assurance team that circulated between the teams, which provided support and monitoring. Additionally, international staff did some fieldword support/supervision, particularly at the start of each survey round.

Data Processing

Data Editing

Once data had been entered, the data was exported and sent to OPM. This data was checked in STATA, which produced a list of queries which were responded to by going back to field teams and households. Data was then revised and sent back to OPM to be checked once again. This whole process was repeated iteratively until all queries that could be resolved were.

Other Processing

The questionnaire was conducted on paper. This data was then double entered in Nairobi by RGA using CSPRO.

Data Appraisal

No content available

Related Materials

Questionnaires

Evaluation Follow-Up 2 Survey 2014: Household Questionnaire

Title	Evaluation Follow-Up 2 Survey 2014: Household Questionnaire
Author(s)	Oxford Policy Management, Economic Policy Research Centre, RGA, Ipsos-Synovate, UBOS
Date	2014-01-01
Country	Uganda
Language	English
Contributor(s)	Government of Uganda
Filename	SAGE_HH_QNN_FU2_.pdf

Evaluation Follow-Up 2 Survey 2014: Community Questionnaire

Title	Evaluation Follow-Up 2 Survey 2014: Community Questionnaire
Author(s)	Oxford Policy Management, Economic Policy Research Centre, RGA, Ipsos-Synovate, UBOS
Country	Uganda
Language	English
Contributor(s)	Government of Uganda
Filename	SAGE_COMM_QNN_fu2.pdf

Reports

Evaluation of the Uganda Social Assistance Grants for Empowerment (SAGE) Programme

Title	Evaluation of the Uganda Social Assistance Grants for Empowerment (SAGE) Programme
subtitle	Impact After Two Years of Program Operations 2012-2014
Author(s)	Oxford Policy Management, Economic Policy Research Centre, Department of Anthropology and Sociology, University of Makerere
Date	2016-04-01
Country	Uganda
Language	English
Description	This report presents the impact evaluation of the Uganda Social Assistance Grants for Empowerment (SAGE) programme. Its purpose is to provide an evaluation of the impact of the SAGE programme in the 24 months since the baseline study. A separate report provides an assessment of the operational performance of the SAGE programme
Filename	OPM_SAGE_endline_report.pdf

Other materials

Technical Annexes

Title	Technical Annexes
Author(s)	Oxford Policy Management, Economic Policy Research Centre, Department of Anthropology and Sociology, University of Makerere.

Date 2016-04-01

Country Uganda

Language English

This volume provides the technical annexure to Merttens et al. Evaluation of The Uganda Social Assistance Grants for Empowerment (SAGE) Programme - Impact after two years of programme operations 2012-2014 Final report, April 2016. The authors of these annexes are: Fred Merttens, Esmeralda Sindou, Alina Lipcan, Luca Pellerano, Michele Binci, Sarah Ssewanyana, Stella Neema, Ramlatu Attah, Sope Otulana, Chris Hearle and Sabine Garbarino.

Suggested citation: Merttens et al. Evaluation of The Uganda Social Assistance Grants for Empowerment (SAGE) Programme - Impact after two years of programme operations 2012-2014 - Technical Annexes, Oxford Policy Management, April 2016.

Filename OPM_SAGE_endline_report_annexes.pdf
