

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| 1. Record Nr. | UNINA9910966671903321 |
| Autore | Evans David K. <1975-> |
| Titolo | Community-based conditional cash transfers in Tanzania : results from a Randomized trial // David K. Evans, Stephanie Hausladen, Katrina Kosec, and Natasha Reese |
| Pubbl/distr/stampa | Washington, DC : , : World Bank, , 2014 |
| ISBN | 9781464801426 1464801428 |
| Edizione | [1st ed.] |
| Descrizione fisica | 1 online resource (pages cm) |
| Collana | World bank studies |
| Disciplina | 303.309678 |
| Soggetti | Transfer payments - Tanzania Tanzania Social policy Tanzania Economic policy |
| Lingua di pubblicazione | Inglese |
| Formato | Materiale a stampa |
| Livello bibliografico | Monografia |
| Note generali | Description based upon print version of record. |
| Nota di bibliografia | Includes bibliographical references and index. |
| Nota di contenuto | Front Cover; Contents; Acknowledgments; Abbreviations; Executive Summary; Figures; Figure ES.1 How Do the Study Population and the Rest of the Country Compare?; Figure ES.2 How Large Were the Bimonthly Payments to the Families?; Tables; Table ES.1 What Were the Conditions that Households Needed to Meet?; Figure ES.3 Impact Evaluation Design; Figure ES.4 How Similar Were the Treatment and Comparison Households before the Program?; Figure ES.5 How Much Less Sick Were Members of Treatment Households Relative to Members of Households in the Comparison Group? Figure ES.6 How Much Less Sick Were Members of the Poorest Half of Treatment Households Relative to Members of the Poorest Half Figure ES.7 How Much Better Did Treatment Group Children (Age 0-18 Years) Do in Literacy, Attendance, and Completion?; Figure ES.8 How Much Better Did Females in Treatment Households Do in Literacy, Attendance, and Completion?; Figure ES.9 How Much Better Did Students Out of School at Baseline in Treatment Households Do in Literacy, Attendance, and Completion?; Figure ES.10 For Someone Sick in the Last Month, Did You Finance Treatment with Health Insurance? Figure ES.11 Does the Child Have Shoes? Figure ES.12 What Share of Households Have Nonbank Savings?; Figure ES.13 How Much Did the |

Program Affect Livestock Asset Ownership?; Figure ES.14 How Much More Do Individuals in Treatment Communities Trust These Groups than Do Individuals in Comparison Communities?; Chapter 1 Background; Motivation for Project; Project Description; Map; Map 1.1 Map of Project Areas; Figure 1.1 Project Cycle for Community-Based Conditional Cash Transfer; Table 1.1 Interviewed, Eligible, and Invited Households; Figure 1.2 Distribution of Household Transfer Size Table 1.2 Conditions to Receive Benefits from Conditional Cash Transfer Programs Impact Evaluation Description; Table 1.3 Logic Model for Impacts of CCT Program; Notes; Table 1.4 Timeline for Implementation of CCT and Accompanying Impact Evaluation; Chapter 2 Results of the Baseline Survey; Vulnerable Groups; Household Characteristics; Figure 2.1 Parental Status for Children in the Sample; Figure 2.2 Most Common Shocks Suffered by Sample Households in the Past 5 Years; Figure 2.3 Household Composition by Age; Figure 2.4 Distribution of Children's Ages Figure 2.5 Percentage of Households That Are Female-Headed, by District Figure 2.6 Housing Construction Materials; Figure 2.7 Sanitary Facilities of Households; Figure 2.8 Source of Water for Households; Education; Figure 2.9 Sources of Home Lighting; Figure 2.10 Literacy by District and Age; Figure 2.12 Percentage of Study Participants Attended School Ever; Figure 2.11 Percent of Children Currently Enrolled in School; Health; Economic Activity; Figure 2.13 Among Individuals Suffering Some Injury or Illness in the Past Month, Share Who Suffered From Each of the Following; Child Activities Figure 2.14 Adult Time Use, by Gender

Sommario/riassunto

Given the success of conditional cash transfer (CCT) programs elsewhere, in 2010 the Government of Tanzania rolled out a pilot CCT program in three districts. Its aim was to see if, using a model relying on communities to target beneficiaries and deliver payments, the program could improve outcomes for the poor the way centrally-run CCT programs have in other contexts. The program provided cash payments to poor households, but conditioned payments on complying with certain health and education requirements. Given scarce resources, the Government randomly selected 40 out of 80 eligible villages
