Online Appendix

I. APPENDIX 1: EXTERNAL VALIDITY

In 2012, there were 12,174 schools in Chile, including 599 municipal schools in the municipalities where the evaluation was performed. We randomized the intervention in 25 of these schools. Only one of them included a high-school, and only 3 were rural.

The Chilean Ministry of Education has administrative data on the enrollment and vulnerability level of each school. The vulnerability is measured as the number of students that receive a voucher for vulnerable individuals (known as Subvención Escolar Preferencial). If we compare the 21 urban and solely primary schools of the evaluation sample with the 196 schools in the same municipalities with similar characteristics (urban, municipal administration in urban areas, only primary and non-zero enrollment), we find that the total number of students is statistically the same, and the number of vulnerable students is also the same.

This is reported in Table A1, column [1]. The dependent variable is an indicator of participating in the study, and the explanatory variables are enrollment in primary school and the number of vulnerable students (both in thousands of students). The regression is at the school level. The coefficients in both variables are not significant, indicating that they are not correlated with the school's participation in the study.

Regarding the labor market involvement of mothers, we can use parents' questionnaires from Simce 2009[1]. Using 4th graders' reports, we construct the share of mothers that work or participate in the labor market by school, and then merge it with the intervention and enrollment data. We find information in SIMCE for 212 out of the 217 schools. We then estimate the probability of being in the sample with the previous controls (enrollment and number of priority schools) adding the average mothers' employment and labor force participation. The results are presented in table A1, column [2] where we can see that none of these variables predicts being in the sample.

Finally, we compute the number of available daycare spots in all public facilities in 2012 per 1000 inhabitants. We also compute the number of daycare facilities by squared kilometers and the enrollment over the population. The results do not change. Vacancies come from the administrative data of JUNJI and INTEGRA, the public providers of daycare. We normalize the availability by the population size [2](or the km2 of the municipality in the case of number of daycare facilities). We then correlate the daycare availability with being in the sample, keeping the previous controls. Results are reported in table A1, column [3]; where we can see that there is no significant correlation.

[1] SIMCE is a standardized test that all students take. In 2009, there was also a survey for parents. Such information is not available for SIMCE 2011, the closest year to the implementation of the intervention.
[2] The dependent variable is defined as vacancies per .1000 inhabitants.

Table A1. External Validity

Dependent Variable: =1 if the school is in the sample	(1)	(2)	(3)
Enrollment (in thousands)	-0.1298	-0.1137	-0.1087
	(0.184)	(0.192)	(0.192)
Number of priority students (in thousands)	0.4607	0.4422	0.4108
	(0.298)	(0.307)	(0.311)
Mothers work (%)		-0.1539	-0.1775
		(0.286)	(0.288)
Mothers participating in the labor force (%)		-0.0040	0.0272
		(0.290)	(0.294)
Daycare availability (per 1000 inhabitants)			0.0058
			(0.009)
Observations	217	212	212
R-squared	0.0173	0.021	0.023

Note: Enrollment and number of vulnerable students are administrative data of the Ministry of Education. Vulnerability is defined by the Ministry (alumno prioritario), and entails a larger voucher. Both enrollment and number of priority students are in thousands. Mothers' labor force information is reported in Simce 2009. The data corresponds to mothers of 4th graders. Daycare availability is measured as the capacity (spots) per 1000 inhabitants at the municipality level. Standards errors in parenthesis. p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Therefore, we can conclude that in these observables, the selected schools seem no different from other urban and solely primary schools in the participating municipalities. However, there was an application and selection process that considered the demand for the program and likely, political considerations. Although we cannot describe it with observables, we cannot assume that our results are per se representative of all the potential schools. In other words, we cannot reject that there is external validity, but we cannot prove it either.

II. APPENDIX 2. VARIABLE CONSTRUCTION

In the endline survey, women were asked whether they had worked or searched for work in each month of the May-December 2012 time period[3]. They were also asked about hours of work and income from the current or most recent job held in the period. Women were also asked about their main expenses within the same period. These questions are presented in Section III of this appendix. Below we describe precisely how we define all the main outcomes used in tables 4 to 7 in the paper.

Table 4. Take Up and Childcare

- Participation. Attend at least one day in any given month: =1 if the individual reports that her children show-up at least one day a week in a given month in the May-December period (column 1).

- Substitution. Older children, any Childcare: =1 if 6-13 year-old children in the household are usually taken care of by a third party (not their mother) in the afternoons (column 2).

- Substitution. Older children, formal childcare: =1 if 6-13 year-old children in the household usually attend a formal childcare facility in the afternoons (column 3).

- Use. Young children, formal childcare: =1 if young children (<=5 years old) usually attend a formal childcare facility (column 4).

- Use. Older children, formal childcare: =1 if young children (<=5 years old) usually attend a free formal childcare facility (column 5).

Table 5 and table 6. Labor Market Effects

Labor Force Participation

- Participates (at least one month during May-Dec): =1 if individual participates at least one month in any given month during the May-December period of observation. (column 1, table 5)

- Participates (always): =1 if individual participates every month during the May-December period of observation. (column 2, table 5)

- Months Participating (May-Dec): number of months that the woman participates in the labor market during the May-December period of observation. (column 3, table 5)

[3] In fact, women were asked about their employment status in the period March-December. But most schools began the program at the end of April, so we chose the May-December period.

Employment

- Works (at least one month during May-Dec): =1 if individual works at least one month in any given month during the May-December period of observation. (column 5, table 5)

- Works (always): =1 if individual works every month during the May-December period of observation. (column 6, table 5)

- Months working (May-Dec): number of months that the woman works during the May-December period of observation. (column 7, table 5)

Hours of work, income, and stress measure

- Working Hours: Total hours worked in the last (or current) job held during the May-December 2012 period of observation. (column 1, table 6).

- Monthly Income: monthly income earned in the last (or current) job held during the May-December 2012 period of observation. (columns 2-3, table 6).

- Hourly Income: hourly income earned in the last (current) job held during the May-December 2012 period of observation. (columns 4-5, table 6).

- Stress measure: stress index defined according to the Cohen-Kamarck-Mermelstein scale adapted for Chile by Tapia et al. (2007). (column 6, table 6).

Table 7. Expenditures

- Educational Expenses: monthly household expenses on items such as school tuition, materials, transport, and clothes. (column 1, table 7).

- Food: monthly household expenses on food (column 2, table 7).

- Child, female, and male clothing: monthly household expenses on clothing for children, females, and males (columns 3, 4, 5, respectively, table 7).

- Other expenses: monthly expenses on utilities, cellphones, internet, transport, recreation, health, etc. (column 6, table 7)

III. APPENDIX 3. SURVEY' QUESTIONS UTILIZED FOR LABOR OUTCOMES

In this section, we present the employment and educational questions used in the baseline to define eligibility. We also present the employment and labor force participation questions included in the follow-up that were used to construct the employment and labor force participation outcomes.

Baseline

Labor Supply Questions

B1. During the past week, did you work at least one hour, excluding household chores?

1. Yes
2. No

88. Does not know
99. Does not answer

If the individual answer 2 or 88/99, go to B2.

B2. Even if you didn't work during the past week, did you perform some activity?

1. Yes
2. No

88. Does not know
99. Does not answer

If the individual answer 2 or 88/99, go to B3.

B3. Even if you didn't work during the past week, did you have a job in which you were temporarily absent due to sickness, strike, vacation, or any other reason?

1. Yes
2. No

88. Does not know
99. Does not answer

If the individual answer 2 or 88/99, go to B4.

B4. Did you search for a job during the past four weeks?

1. Yes
2. No

88. Does not know
99. Does not answer

C9. Are you currently attending school?

1. Yes
2. No

88. Does not know

99. Does not answer

Follow-up Survey Labor Supply Questions

Next, I will ask you about your occupational status in 2012 (All questions are asked each month in the March-December Window; see table below).

C7. In 2012, did you attend any educational institution or training program during *INTERVIEWER READS THE MONTH*?

C8. In 2012, did you **work** (excluding chores) **during** *INTERVIEWER READS THE MONTH***? IF C8=1** (YES) FOR **EVERY MONTH**, SKIP TO **C12**

C9. FOR EACH MONTH YOU DID NOT WORK **C8=2, DID YOU SEARCH FOR A PAID JOB** *INTERVIEWER READS THE MONTH***?** YES **C9=1** IN AT LEAST ONE MONTH, SKIP TO **C11**

	C7				C8				C9			
	SI	NO	DOES NOT KNOW	DOES NOT ANS.	SI	NO	DOES NOT KNOW	NO ANS.	SI	NO	DOES NOT KNOW	DOES NOT ANS
MARCH 2012	1	2	88	99	1	2	88	99	1	2	88	99
APRIL 2012	1	2	88	99	1	2	88	99	1	2	88	99
MAY 2012	1	2	88	99	1	2	88	99	1	2	88	99
JUNE 2012	1	2	88	99	1	2	88	99	1	2	88	99
JULY 2012	1	2	88	99	1	2	88	99	1	2	88	99
AUGUST 2012	1	2	88	99	1	2	88	99	1	2	88	99
SEPTEMBER 2012	1	2	88	99	1	2	88	99	1	2	88	99
OCTOBER 2012	1	2	88	99	1	2	88	99	1	2	88	99
NOVEMBER 2012	1	2	88	99	1	2	88	99	1	2	88	99
DECEMBER 2012	1	2	88	99	1	2	88	99	1	2	88	99

IV. APPENDIX 4. RESULTS WITHOUT CLUSTER

Table A4.1: Childcare Use by Children´s age

		Children 6-13 years old		*Children <=5 years old*	
		SUBSTITUTION		USE	
	PARTICIPATION	Any Childcare	Formal Childcare	Formal Childcare	Free Formal Childcare
		Panel A: Whole Sample			
	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
Treatment	0.290***	0.059**	0.042***	0.065*	0.055*
	(0.022)	(0.024)	(0.015)	(0.034)	(0.031)
Observations	1,778	1,684	1,684	400	400
R-squared	0.220	0.152	0.160	0.131	0.149
Control group mean	0.238	0.496	0.074	0.078	0.067
		Panel B: By strata			
	[1]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]
T *Works at baseline and child <= 5	0.242***	0.020	0.078**	0.070*	0.048
	(0.048)	(0.054)	(0.035)	(0.039)	(0.035)
T*Does not Work at baseline and child <= 5	0.318***	0.041	0.023	0.047	0.081
	(0.103)	(0.096)	(0.054)	(0.070)	(0.063)
T*Works at baseline and child > 5	0.287***	0.069**	0.027		
	(0.029)	(0.031)	(0.019)		
T*Does not Work at baseline and child > 5	0.385***	0.081	0.074**		
	(0.062)	(0.067)	(0.036)		
Observations	1,778	1,684	1,684	400	400
R-squared	0.221	0.152	0.161	0.131	0.149
Control group mean					
Works at baseline and child <= 5	0.235	0.500	0.078	0.075	0.068
Does not Work at baseline and child <= 5	0.229	0.319	0.043	0.087	0.065
Works at baseline and child > 5	0.249	0.543	0.082		
Does not Work at baseline and child > 5	0.189	0.314	0.035		

Note: The follow-up survey data was collected from February to April 2013. The sample size varies according to the number of observations with missing responses for the respective variable. The table indicates the treatment impact (being offered the 4-7 Program) on the given outcome. Fixed effects at school-strata level are included in all regressions. The regressions also include additional controls for whether the applicant was the head of household, her years of education, the number of children in the household, and the age of the applicant. Panel A presents the program effects for the overall sample while panel B shows effects by strata. Heteroskedastic robust standard errors are presented in parentheses. *** p < 0.01, ** p < 0.05, * p < 0.10

Table A4.2: Labor Force Participation and Employment

	Labor Force Participation			Employment		
	Participates (at least one month during May-Dec)	Participates (always)	Months Participating	Works (at least one month during May-Dec)	Works (always)	Worked Months
	Panel A: Whole Sample					
	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]
Treatment	0.028	0.043*	0.296*	0.034*	0.033	0.310
	(0.020)	(0.022)	(0.155)	(0.020)	(0.023)	(0.199)
Observations	1,767	1,767	1,767	1,767	1,767	1,767
R-squared	0.207	0.207	0.237	0.217	0.195	0.237
Control group mean	0.754	0.605	5.395	0.716	0.526	6.162
	Panel B: Strata					
	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]
T *Works at baseline and child <= 5	0.046	0.088*	0.586*	0.052	0.067	0.584
	(0.043)	(0.050)	(0.344)	(0.046)	(0.052)	(0.448)
T*Does not Work at baseline and child <= 5	0.095	0.188*	1.210	0.080	0.123	1.077
	(0.105)	(0.097)	(0.748)	(0.103)	(0.082)	(0.790)
T*Works at baseline and child > 5	0.019	0.027	0.171	0.027	0.015	0.146
	(0.023)	(0.028)	(0.190)	(0.024)	(0.030)	(0.247)
T*Does not Work at baseline and child > 5	0.013	-0.007	0.085	0.019	0.029	0.402
	(0.068)	(0.068)	(0.507)	(0.071)	(0.068)	(0.627)
Observations	1,767	1,767	1,767	1,767	1,767	1,767
R-squared	0.207	0.208	0.239	0.217	0.196	0.238
Control Group Mean						
Works at baseline and child <= 5	0.733	0.553	5.112	0.696	0.497	5.963
Does not Work at baseline and child <= 5	0.438	0.229	2.438	0.396	0.146	2.292
Works at baseline and child > 5	0.819	0.690	6.053	0.793	0.606	7.019
Does not Work at baseline and child > 5	0.578	0.400	3.633	0.478	0.311	3.578

Note: The follow-up survey data was collected from February to April 2013. The table indicates the treatment impact (being offered the 4-7 Program) on the given coefficient. Fixed effects at school-strata level are included in all regressions. The regressions also include additional controls for whether the applicant was the head of household, her years of education, the number of children in the household, and the age of the applicant. Panel A presents the program effects for the overall sample while panel B shows effects by strata. Heteroskedastic robust standard errors are presented in parentheses. *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.10$

Table A4.3: Hours of work, income, and stress

	Working Hours	Total Income	Hourly Income	Stress Index
	Panel A: Whole Sample			
	[1]	[2]	[4]	[6]
Treatment	0.512	12.217	0.306**	-0.164
	(1.020)	(12.896)	(0.131)	(0.446)
Observations	1,681	1,666	1,618	1,665
R-squared	0.189	0.217	0.132	0.123
Control group mean	27.655	263.426	1.846	25.330
	Panel B: Strata			
	[1]	[2]	[4]	[6]
T *Works at baseline and child <= 5	1.127	18.707	0.358	-0.235
	(2.298)	(24.785)	(0.282)	(1.010)
T*Does not Work at baseline and child <= 5	4.212	54.271	0.580*	0.513
	(3.778)	(35.569)	(0.327)	(1.887)
T*Works at baseline and child > 5	0.600	12.216	0.162	0.184
	(1.293)	(17.730)	(0.156)	(0.565)
T*Does not Work at baseline and child > 5	-2.762	-16.868	0.893	-2.343*
	(2.961)	(29.315)	(0.544)	(1.203)
Observations	1,681	1,666	1,618	1,665
R-squared	0.189	0.217	0.134	0.125
Control group mean				
Works at baseline and child <= 5	26.417	240.876	1.747	26.000
Does not Work at baseline and child <= 5	12.830	106.969	0.987	23.045
Works at baseline and child > 5	31.066	301.363	2.070	25.132
Does not Work at baseline and child > 5	17.747	169.865	1.205	26.464

Note: The follow-up survey data was collected from February to April 2013. The sample size varies according to the number of observations with missing responses for the respective variable. The table indicates the treatment impact (being offered the 4-7 Program) on the given outcome. Fixed effects at school-strata level are included in all regressions. The regressions also include additional controls for whether the applicant was the head of household, her years of education, the number of children in the household, and the age of the applicant. Panel A presents the program effects for the overall sample while panel B shows effects by strata. Heteroskedastic robust standard errors are presented in parentheses. *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.10$

Table A4.4: Expenses

	Expenses					
	Educational Expenses	Food	Child Clothing	Female Clothing	Male Clothing	Other Expenses
	Panel A: Whole Sample					
	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]
Treatment	5.991*	-4.887	-19.282	3.337**	0.215	0.490
	(3.385)	(7.143)	(21.711)	(1.409)	(1.199)	(7.157)
Observations	1,639	1,731	1,670	1,651	1,613	1,594
R-squared	0.108	0.159	0.019	0.098	0.107	0.176
Control group mean	48.273	224.866	61.243	17.655	12.928	180.974
	Panel B: Strata					
	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]
T *Works at baseline and child <= 5	2.409	6.050	15.484*	6.382**	2.724	19.227
	(6.198)	(11.620)	(8.463)	(3.006)	(2.564)	(12.641)
T*Does not Work at baseline and child <= 5	0.829	-4.534	-38.429	-3.569	1.277	-18.845
	(12.575)	(18.410)	(38.543)	(8.082)	(3.305)	(37.960)
T*Works at baseline and child > 5	6.424	-12.312	-34.553	2.747	-0.370	-7.812
	(4.513)	(9.927)	(36.080)	(1.757)	(1.417)	(9.566)
T*Does not Work at baseline and child > 5	12.390	17.795	13.189	3.960	-1.753	22.798
	(9.576)	(21.125)	(10.188)	(3.986)	(5.568)	(16.278)
Observations	1,639	1,731	1,670	1,651	1,613	1,594
R-squared	0.109	0.160	0.019	0.099	0.108	0.178
Control group mean						
Works at baseline and <= 5	52.329	210.483	33.382	15.699	11.003	160.791
Does not Work at baseline and <= 5	53.249	220.429	59.081	19.723	13.120	196.338
Works at baseline and > 5	47.382	232.275	74.421	18.457	12.322	190.482
Does not Work at baseline and > 5	43.537	209.936	34.861	15.449	20.215	152.958

Note: The follow-up survey data was collected from February to April 2013. The sample size varies according to the number of observations with missing responses for the respective variable. The table indicates the treatment impact (being offered the 4-7 Program) on the given outcome. Fixed effects at school-strata level are included in all regressions. The regressions also include additional controls for whether the applicant was the head of household, her years of education, the number of children in the household, and the age of the applicant. Panel A presents the program effects for the overall sample while panel B shows effects by strata. Heteroskedastic robust standard errors are presented in parentheses. *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.10$

V. APPENDIX 5. INSTRUMENTAL VARIABLE RESULTS

Table A5.1: Childcare Use by Children´s age

	Children 6-13 years old		*Children <=5 years old*	
	SUBSTITUTION		USE	
	Any Childcare	Formal Childcare	Formal Childcare	Free Formal Childcare
	Panel A: Whole Sample			
	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
Treatment	0.206**	0.147***	0.231**	0.195**
	(0.084)	(0.049)	(0.101)	(0.089)
Observations	1,684	1,684	400	400
R-squared	0.172	0.230	0.068	0.092
Control group mean	0.496	0.074	0.078	0.067
	Panel B: By Strata			
	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]
T *Works at baseline and child <= 5	0.080	0.322**	0.250*	0.172
	(0.220)	(0.134)	(0.134)	(0.114)
T*Does not Work at baseline and child <= 5	0.128	0.073	0.164	0.279*
	(0.169)	(0.133)	(0.204)	(0.166)
T*Works at baseline and child > 5	0.247***	0.094*		
	(0.091)	(0.054)		
T*Does not Work at baseline and child > 5	0.210	0.194*		
	(0.153)	(0.113)		
Observations	1,684	1,684	400	400
R-squared	0.170	0.206	0.070	0.084
Control group mean				
Works at baseline and child <= 5	0.500	0.078	0.075	0.068
Does not Work at baseline and child <= 5	0.319	0.043	0.087	0.065
Works at baseline and child > 5	0.543	0.082		
Does not Work at baseline and child > 5	0.314	0.035		

Note: The follow-up survey data was collected from February to April 2013. We instrument auto-reported program participation with program assignment. Fixed effects at school-strata level are included in all regressions. The regressions also include additional controls for whether the applicant was the head of household, her years of education, the number of children in the household, and the age of the applicant. Panel A presents the program effects for the overall sample while panel B shows effects by strata. Clustered standard errors at the municipality level are given in parentheses. *** p < 0.01, ** p < 0.05, * p < 0.10

Table A5.2: Labor Force Participation and Employment

	Labor Force Participation			Employment		
	Participates (at least one month during May-Dec)	Participates (always)	Months Participating (May-Dec)	Works (at least one month during May-Dec)	Works (always)	Worked Months
	Panel A: Whole Sample					
	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]
Treatment	0.094	0.148*	1.008*	0.115*	0.112	1.055
	(0.058)	(0.085)	(0.558)	(0.064)	(0.081)	(0.655)
Observations	1,767	1,767	1,767	1,767	1,767	1,767
R-squared	0.211	0.203	0.238	0.220	0.196	0.239
Control group mean	0.754	0.605	5.395	0.716	0.526	6.162
	Panel B: Strata					
	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]
T *Works at baseline and child <= 5	0.186	0.358	2.378*	0.209	0.274	2.368
	(0.141)	(0.230)	(1.354)	(0.203)	(0.238)	(1.967)
T*Does not Work at baseline and child <= 5	0.304	0.601***	3.858***	0.254	0.392*	3.431*
	(0.226)	(0.168)	(1.257)	(0.261)	(0.218)	(1.836)
T*Works at baseline and child > 5	0.066	0.094	0.593	0.094	0.053	0.506
	(0.066)	(0.108)	(0.644)	(0.068)	(0.119)	(0.815)
T*Does not Work at baseline and child > 5	0.033	-0.018	0.221	0.049	0.076	1.042
	(0.167)	(0.169)	(1.155)	(0.134)	(0.143)	(1.380)
Observations	1,767	1,767	1,767	1,767	1,767	1,767
R-squared	0.210	0.183	0.228	0.217	0.184	0.232
Control Group Mean						
Works at baseline and child <= 5	0.733	0.553	5.112	0.696	0.497	5.963
Does not Work at baseline and child <= 5	0.438	0.229	2.438	0.396	0.146	2.292
Works at baseline and child > 5	0.819	0.690	6.053	0.793	0.606	7.019
Does not Work at baseline and child > 5	0.578	0.400	3.633	0.478	0.311	3.578

Note: The follow-up survey data was collected from February to April 2013. We instrument auto-reported program participation with program assignment. Fixed effects at school-strata level are included in all regressions. The regressions also include additional controls for whether the applicant was the head of household, her years of education, the number of children in the household, and the age of the applicant. Panel A presents the program effects for the overall sample while panel B shows effects by strata. Clustered standard errors at the municipality level are given in parentheses. *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.10$.

Table A5.3: Hours of work, income, and stress

	Working Hours	Total Income	Hourly Income	Stress Index
	Panel A: Whole Sample			
	[1]	[2]	[4]	[6]
Treatment	1.731	41.088	1.040**	-0.564
	(3.624)	(27.054)	(0.426)	(1.412)
Observations	1,681	1,666	1,618	1,665
R-squared	0.193	0.222	0.123	0.121
Control group mean	27.655	263.426	1.846	25.330
	Panel B: Strata			
	[1]	[2]	[4]	[6]
T *Works at baseline and child <= 5	4.280	71.046	1.323	-0.902
	(7.538)	(86.284)	(1.342)	(3.731)
T*Does not Work at baseline and child <= 5	12.882	158.861*	1.729*	1.946
	(10.043)	(94.834)	(0.972)	(6.894)
T*Works at baseline and child > 5	2.104	42.412	0.560	0.652
	(4.787)	(42.257)	(0.523)	(1.838)
T*Does not Work at baseline and child > 5	-7.707	-44.491	2.484**	-6.402***
	(5.439)	(90.414)	(1.107)	(1.549)
Observations	1,681	1,666	1,618	1,665
R-squared	0.185	0.217	0.110	0.116
Control group mean				
Works at baseline and child <= 5	26.417	240.876	1.747	26.000
Does not Work at baseline and child <= 5	12.830	106.969	0.987	23.045
Works at baseline and child > 5	31.066	301.363	2.070	25.132
Does not Work at baseline and child > 5	17.747	169.865	1.205	26.464

Note: The follow-up survey data was collected from February to April 2013. We instrument auto-reported program participation with program assignment. The sample size varies according to the number of observations with missing responses for the respective variable. Fixed effects at school-strata level are included in all regressions. The regressions also include additional controls for whether the applicant was the head of household, her years of education, the number of children in the household, and the age of the applicant. Panel A presents the program effects for the overall sample while panel B shows effects by strata. Income variables include zeros when the individual is not working. Clustered standard errors at the school level are given in parentheses. *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.10$.

Table A5.4: Expenses

	Expenses					
	Educational Expenses	Food	Child Clothing	Female Clothing	Male Clothing	Other Expenses
	Panel A: Whole Sample					
	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]
Treatment	20.294**	-16.421	-64.723	11.073*	0.740	1.661
	(8.950)	(25.997)	(68.230)	(5.894)	(3.613)	(22.729)
Observations	1,639	1,731	1,670	1,651	1,613	1,594
R-squared	0.084	0.157	0.012	0.067	0.108	0.176
Control group mean	48.273	224.866	61.243	17.655	12.928	180.974
	Panel B: Strata					
	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]
T *Works at baseline and child <= 5	8.802	24.678	60.471	24.127*	10.663	74.438
	(19.295)	(44.270)	(44.614)	(13.303)	(11.058)	(47.563)
T*Does not Work at baseline and child <= 5	1.601	-14.466	-112.146	-10.695	3.892	-59.291
	(38.797)	(64.612)	(95.607)	(19.915)	(8.977)	(70.615)
T*Works at baseline and child > 5	22.087	-41.882	-118.520	9.248	-1.276	-27.020
	(15.213)	(31.834)	(121.298)	(6.628)	(4.371)	(28.427)
T*Does not Work at baseline and child > 5	34.880	46.139	35.398	10.486	-5.151	64.750**
	(29.621)	(39.842)	(28.717)	(10.448)	(12.237)	(29.423)
Observations	1,639	1,731	1,670	1,651	1,613	1,594
R-squared	0.081	0.153	0.004	0.061	0.102	0.175
Control group mean						
Works at baseline and child <= 5	52.329	210.483	33.382	15.699	11.003	160.791
Does not Work at baseline and child <= 5	53.249	220.429	59.081	19.723	13.120	196.338
Works at baseline and child > 5	47.382	232.275	74.421	18.457	12.322	190.482
Does not Work at baseline and child > 5	43.537	209.936	34.861	15.449	20.215	152.958

Note: The follow-up survey data collected from February to April 2013. All columns correspond to monthly expenses. We instrument auto-reported program participation with program assignment. The sample size varies according to the number of observations with missing responses for the respective variable. Fixed effects at school-strata level are included in all regressions. The regressions include additional controls for whether the applicant was the head of household, her years of education, the number of children in the household, and the age of the applicant. Panel A presents the program effects for the overall sample while panel B shows effects by strata. Income variables include zeros when the individual is not working. Clustered standard errors at the school level are given in parentheses. *** p<0.01, **p<0.05, *p<0.10.