## Appendix D: Additional results and descriptive statistics

Table D-1: WTP sample summary statistics

|  | (1) <br> Full <br> sample <br> Mean <br> (Std. Dev.) | (2) <br> BDM <br> (Std. Dev.) | (3) <br> RLIS | (4) <br> Networks <br> (Std. Dev.) | (5) <br> BDM vs. <br> RLIS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0.78 | 0.83 | 0.71 | 0.81 | $0.04^{* *}$ |
|  | $(0.57)$ | $(0.65)$ | $(0.47)$ | $(0.56)$ |  |
| Maize land | 6.79 | 6.82 | 6.23 | 7.36 | 0.13 |
|  | $(3.94)$ | $(4.14)$ | $(3.79)$ | $(3.79)$ |  |
| Education (years) | 0.41 | 0.33 | 0.4 | 0.52 | 0.16 |
|  | $(0.49)$ | $(0.47)$ | $(0.49)$ | $(0.5)$ |  |
| Male | 42.87 | 42.66 | 43.33 | 42.62 | 0.61 |
|  | $(13.21)$ | $(13.38)$ | $(13.56)$ | $(12.66)$ |  |
| Age | 0.73 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.78 | 0.96 |
|  | $(0.45)$ | $(0.46)$ | $(0.46)$ | $(0.41)$ |  |
| Can read | 0.52 | 0.47 | 0.5 | 0.59 | 0.47 |
| Wears shoes | $(0.5)$ | $(0.5)$ | $(0.5)$ | $(0.49)$ |  |
| Knows Innovations | 0.77 | 0.72 | 0.72 | 0.86 | 0.95 |
| for Poverty Action |  |  |  |  |  |
| test plots | $(0.42)$ | $(0.45)$ | $(0.45)$ | $(0.34)$ |  |
| Used fertilizer | 0.72 | 0.69 | 0.69 | 0.8 | 0.95 |
| before |  | $(0.46)$ | $(0.46)$ | $(0.4)$ |  |
| $N$ | $(0.45)$ | 210 | 205 | 185 |  |

Note: This table shows summary statistics for the sample of farmers from which we elicited WTP. Columns (2) and (3) show farmers in Group 1 by elicitation method. Column (4) shows farmers in the Network group (all WTP elicited was through BDM). Column (5) reports the p-value of the differences between BDM and RLIS sample. The variable Maize Land, is the size of the land in which they plant maize, wears shoes is an indicator if the respondent was wearing shoes (and proxies for income), knows about Innovations for Poverty Action test plots asks respondents whether they knew about the individual plots Innovations for Poverty Action helped set up. Statistical significance is indicated at the 1 percent ( $* * *$ ), 5 percent ( $* *$ ) and 10 percent ( $*$ ) levels.

Table D-2: Correlates of WTP (RLIS)

| Variables | (1) WTP | (2) WTP | (3) WTP | (4) <br> WTP | (5) WTP | (6) WTP | (7) WTP | (8) WTP | (9) WTP | (10) <br> WTP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land devoted to maize last season | $\begin{gathered} -120^{* *} \\ (51.7) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -148^{* * *} \\ (51.18) \end{gathered}$ |
| Years of education |  | $\begin{aligned} & 12.9^{*} \\ & (6.75) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 17.2^{*} \\ & (8.92) \end{aligned}$ |
| Male |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 98.2^{*} \\ (52.40) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 142.2^{* *} \\ & (62.90) \end{aligned}$ |
| Age |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.5 \\ (1.94) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.2 \\ (2.06) \end{gathered}$ |
| Can read |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 77.9 \\ (58.34) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 8.6 \\ (77.30) \end{gathered}$ |
| Wears shoes |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -4.3 \\ (52.39) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -85.9 \\ (62.49) \end{gathered}$ |
| Knows of households with Innovations for Poverty Action test plots |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 15.3 \\ (57.31) \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -9.6 \\ (59.54) \end{gathered}$ |
| Other land different |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 12.4 \\ (52.56) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 6.2 \\ (55.12) \end{gathered}$ |
| Used fertilizer last season |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -8.5 \\ (57.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -79.4 \\ (62.32) \end{gathered}$ |
| Observations | 185 | 199 | 199 | 199 | 199 | 199 | 199 | 199 | 199 | 185 |
| R-squared | 0.024 | 0.018 | 0.017 | 0.000 | 0.009 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.086 |
| Mean WTP | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 150 |

[^0] close landmark. Statistical significance is indicated at the 1 percent $(* * *), 5$ percent $(* *)$ and 10 percent ( $*$ ) levels.

Table D-3: Heterogeneous treatment effects: KALRO

|  | Acres Owned | Raven Score | Reading Score | Female | Knowledge input index | Heard about NPK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Panel A: Dependent Variable: Purchased Fertilizer (coupon redeemed) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| [X]*Field Day | 0.010 | -0.182 | -0.081** | -0.058 | -0.002 | 0.122* |
|  | (0.010) | (0.152) | (0.038) | (0.074) | (0.017) | (0.071) |
| [ X ]*SMS | 0.001 | 0.121 | -0.074** | -0.096 | 0.006 | 0.084 |
|  | (0.016) | (0.148) | (0.037) | (0.072) | (0.017) | (0.070) |
| Field Day | 0.109*** | 0.212*** | 0.122*** | 0.163*** | 0.126*** | 0.064 |
|  | (0.039) | (0.080) | (0.038) | (0.059) | (0.035) | (0.050) |
| SMS | 0.023 | -0.034 | 0.024 | 0.084 | 0.023 | -0.020 |
|  | (0.043) | (0.076) | (0.037) | (0.058) | (0.035) | (0.048) |
| [X] | -0.002 | 0.060 | 0.033 | 0.083 | 0.004 | -0.064 |
|  | (0.002) | (0.140) | (0.028) | (0.053) | (0.013) | (0.051) |
| R-squared | 0.106 | 0.109 | 0.109 | 0.107 | 0.106 | 0.108 |
| Observations | 1,138 | 1138 | 998 | 1,138 | 1,138 | 1,138 |
| Panel B: Dependent Variable: Purchased Lime (coupon redeemed) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| [X]*Field Day | 0.020* | 0.055 | 0.033 | 0.044 | -0.009 | 0.046 |
|  | (0.011) | (0.098) | (0.027) | (0.051) | (0.011) | (0.047) |
| [X]*SMS | 0.000 | 0.017 | -0.006 | 0.060 | 0.003 | 0.082* |
|  | (0.013) | (0.100) | (0.025) | (0.048) | (0.010) | (0.044) |
| Field Day | 0.001 | 0.010 | 0.032 | 0.008 | 0.036 | 0.017 |
|  | (0.027) | (0.047) | (0.025) | (0.043) | (0.023) | (0.031) |
| SMS | -0.009 | -0.018 | -0.014 | -0.048 | -0.008 | -0.042 |
|  | (0.029) | (0.048) | (0.024) | (0.041) | (0.022) | (0.029) |
| [X] | -0.000 | -0.071 | 0.003 | -0.038 | 0.010 | -0.037 |
|  | (0.001) | (0.093) | (0.021) | (0.037) | (0.008) | (0.031) |
| R-squared | 0.090 | 0.086 | 0.100 | 0.087 | 0.089 | 0.086 |
| Observations | 1,138 | 1,138 | 998 | 1,138 | 1,138 | 1,138 |

Note: The dependent variable in Panel A is redemption of the fertilizer coupon. Each column shows the coefficient from the interaction between the corresponding treatment (FFD or SMS) with the variable noted in the column and denoted by [X]. Reading and raven scores are standardized. Knowledge of inputs is an index constructed based on 12 possible variables. Significance indicated at $1 \% * * *, 5 \% * *$, and $10 \% *$ level.

Table D-4: Attrition checks

|  | Attrition |
| :--- | :---: |
| Field Day | 0.024 |
|  | $(0.017)$ |
| SMS | -0.019 |
|  | $(0.017)$ |
| R-squared | 0.002 |
| Observations | 1,250 |

Note: This table shows a regression of an attrition indicator on treatment indicators. Statistical significance is indicated at the 1 percent ( $* * *$ ), 5 percent $(* *)$ and 10 percent ( $*$ ) levels.
Table D-5: Instrumental variable results for SMS

|  | First-Stage Regression <br> (1) | Lime Coupon (2) | Lime Quantity (kg) (3) | Lime Expenditures (KES) <br> (4) | Fert. Coupon (5) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SMS treatment | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.553^{\star * *} \\ (0.029) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |
| SMS received (self-reported) |  | $-0.019$ <br> (0.039) | $\begin{aligned} & -4.150 \\ & (4.576) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -24.899 \\ & (39.457) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.053 \\ (0.062) \end{gathered}$ |
| R-squared |  | 0.072 | 0.109 | 0.109 | 0.083 |
| Observation |  | 1,166 | 1,166 | 1,166 | 1,166 |
| Y mean |  | 0.11 | 16.97 | 59.79 | 0.41 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fert. } \\ & \text { Quantity } \\ & \text { (kg) } \\ & \text { (6) } \end{aligned}$ | Fert. Expenditures (KES) (7) | $\begin{gathered} \text { DAP } \\ \text { Quantity (kg) } \end{gathered}$ | CAN Quantity (kg) | Mavuno Quantity (kg) |
| FFD participation | 2.646 | 195.964*** | 2.511*** | 0.136 | -0.001 |
|  | (1.619) | (109.943) | (1.371) | (0.777) | (0.012) |
| R-squared | 0.048 | 0.049 | 0.045 | 0.059 | 0.016 |
| Observation | 1,166 | 1,166 | 1,166 | 1,166 | 1,166 |
| Y mean | 6.91 | 513.60 | 5.61 | 5.61 | 0.00 |

Note: Each test includes demographic characteristics and baseline input use that were used as randomization strata. The dependent variable mean is displayed for the control group. Column (1) includes the first stage regression of reporting receiving SMS messages on an indicator of whether farmers had been assigned to the SMS group. All regressions control for FFD participation. The standard errors in each regression are robust. Statistical significance is indicated at the 1 percent $(* * *), 5$ percent ( $* *$ ) and 10 percent ( $*$ ) levels.


[^0]:    Note: This table shows regression in which the dependent variable is the willingness to pay (elicited through RLIS) for one soil test result within 10 km of a

