## Online Supplementary Materials

Table A Test of balance in baseline characteristics before and after propensity score matching

Table A Test of Datafice II	ı Da	setille (	ciiaiac	LETT	SLIC	s ne		itei piopeii	Sity Stui	_	
							Before PSM			After PSM	
		Mean	S.E.				Contrast	t	P> t	Wald test F	P> F
Age wife (W)	T	37.90	0.86	CA	VS	T	-1.20	-0.98	0.33	0.00	0.98
	CA	36.71	0.87	CB	VS	T	-0.02	-0.01	0.99	0.88	0.35
	CB	37.89	1.43	CB	VS	CA	1.18	0.70	0.48	0.38	0.54
	CC	36.00	1.39	CC	VS	CA	-0.71	-0.43	0.67	0.01	0.94
				CC	VS	CB	-1.89	-0.94	0.35	0.00	0.97
Age husband (HB)	Τ	44.28	1.00	CA	VS	T	-0.95	-0.67	0.51	0.00	0.97
	CA	43.33	1.01	CB	VS	Τ	-0.34	-0.17	0.86	0.75	0.39
	CB	43.94	1.67	CB	VS	CA	0.61	0.31	0.75	0.22	0.64
	CC	42.66	1.62	CC	VS	CA	-0.67	-0.35	0.73	0.01	0.92
				CC	VS	CB	-1.28	-0.55	0.58	0.00	0.95
Age difference	Τ	6.37	0.45	CA	VS	Τ	0.25	0.39	0.70	0.00	0.98
<b>3</b>	CA	6.62	0.45	СВ	VS	Τ	-0.32	-0.37	0.71	0.02	0.89
	СВ	6.06	0.74	СВ	VS	CA	-0.57	-0.65	0.52	0.08	0.78
	CC	6.66	0.72	CC	VS	CA	0.04	0.05	0.96	0.00	0.95
	-	0.00	0., _	CC	VS	CB	0.60	0.58	0.56	0.00	0.95
(Some) secondary education	Т	0.07	0.02	CA	VS	T	0.00	0.07	0.95	0.06	0.80
(W)	•		0.02	CA	٧٥	į	0.00	0.07	0.55	0.00	0.00
	CA	0.07	0.02	CB	VS	T	-0.05	-1.31	0.19	3.34	0.07
	CB	0.02	0.03	CB	VS	CA	-0.05	-1.36	0.18	0.96	0.33
	CC	0.04	0.03	CC	VS	CA	-0.03	-0.93	0.35	2.57	0.11
				CC	VS	СВ	0.02	0.38	0.71	0.01	0.92
(Some) secondary education (HB)	T	0.11	0.03	CA	VS	T	0.02	0.65	0.51	0.00	0.99
(116)	CA	0.13	0.03	СВ	VS	Т	-0.07	-1.42	0.16	3.04	0.08
	СВ	0.13	0.03	СВ	VS	CA	-0.10	-1.89	0.10 <b>0.06</b>	2.13	0.15
	CC	0.13	0.04	CC	VS	CA	-0.01	-0.16	0.87	0.01	0.91
N I C III II	_	0.70	0.07	CC	VS	СВ	0.09	1.45	0.15	0.47	0.50
Number of cattle owned by household (HB reported)	T	2.73	0.27	CA	VS	T	0.01	0.02	0.99	0.01	0.93
	CA	2.74	0.27	CB	VS	Τ	0.45	0.87	0.39	0.68	0.41
	CB	3.19	0.45	CB	VS	CA	0.45	0.85	0.40	0.01	0.92
	CC	2.64	0.44	CC	VS	CA	-0.10	-0.19	0.85	0.04	0.84
				CC	VS	CB	-0.55	-0.87	0.38	0.37	0.54
Number of small livestock owned by HH (HB reported)	T	3.70	0.55	CA	VS	T	-0.20	-0.26	0.80	0.11	0.73
	CA	3.50	0.56	CB	VS	Τ	2.02	1.88	0.06	0.01	0.91
	СВ	5.72	0.92	СВ	VS	CA	2.22	2.06	0.04	0.93	0.34
	CC	2.80	0.90	CC	VS	CA	-0.69	-0.66	0.51	0.19	0.66
				CC	VS	СВ	-2.91	-2.27	0.02	2.63	0.11
Land (HB reported)	Т	6.67	4.14	CA	VS	T	7.35	1.25	0.21	0.03	0.85
( reperted)	ĊA	14.03	4.20	СВ	VS	Ť	0.97	0.12	0.90	0.22	0.64
	СВ	7.64	6.90	CB	VS	ĊA	-6.39	-0.79	0.43	0.10	0.75
	CC	5.09	6.71	CC	VS	CA	-8.94	-1.13	0.45	0.16	0.69
	CC	3.03	0.71	CC	VS	CB	-2.55	-0.27	0.79	0.61	0.44
Off-farm income (W) (amount	Т	122025	12702	CA	VS	T	-19269	-0.99	0.73	0.68	0.44
in Tanzanian Shilling (TSH))	•	122025	13/03	CA	VS	'	-19209	-0.99	0.55	0.08	0.41
2, ,,	CA	102756	13878	CB	VS	T	-67025	-1.47	0.14	14.55	0.00
	CB	55000	43334	CB	VS	CA	-47756	-1.05	0.30	7.04	0.01
		141364		CC	VS	CA	38607	1.30	0.20	0.74	0.39
				CC	VS	CB	86364	1.71	0.09	4.21	0.06
Off-farm income (HB) (amount	Т	205755	40787	CA	VS	T	102674	1.59	0.12	3.91	0.05
in TSH)											
		308429		CB	VS	T	-113755	-1.11	0.27	0.21	0.65
	CB	92000	93898	CB	VS	CA	-216429	-2.03	0.04	14.22	0.00
	CC	330500	69988	CC	VS	CA	22071	0.26	0.80	0.14	0.71
				CC	VS	CB	238500	2.04	0.04	2.84	0.10

Off-farm income (W) (dummy)	Т	0.27	0.03	CA	VS	Т	0.00	0.01	0.99	0.17	0.68
( ) ( 3)	CA	0.27	0.04	CB	VS	T	-0.20	-2.92	0.00	0.00	0.99
	CB	0.08	0.06	CB	VS	CA	-0.20	-2.91	0.00	0.15	0.70
	CC	0.20	0.06	CC	VS	CA	-0.08	-1.15	0.25	3.74	0.05
				CC	VS	CB	0.12	1.50	0.14	0.84	0.36
Off-farm income (HB) (dummy)	T	0.36	0.04	CA	VS	T	-0.12	-2.18	0.03	5.44	0.02
, , , , , , ,	CA	0.24	0.04	CB	VS	T	-0.17	-2.37	0.02	1.15	0.28
	СВ	0.19	0.06	СВ	VS	CA	-0.06	-0.77	0.44	0.24	0.63
	CC	0.32	0.06	CC	VS	CA	0.08	1.08	0.28	0.50	0.48
				CC	VS	CB	0.13	1.53	0.13	0.18	0.67
Bicycle ownership (HB)	T	0.59	0.04	CA	VS	T	0.02	0.28	0.78	0.61	0.44
. , ,	CA	0.60	0.04	CB	VS	T	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.01	0.94
	CB	0.58	0.07	CB	VS	CA	-0.02	-0.21	0.84	0.04	0.84
	CC	0.52	0.07	CC	VS	CA	-0.08	-1.07	0.29	0.36	0.55
				CC	VS	CB	-0.07	-0.71	0.48	0.18	0.67
W manages main food crop alone	T	0.01	0.02	CA	VS	T	0.02	0.96	0.34	0.00	1.00
	CA	0.03	0.02	CB	VS	T	0.04	1.42	0.16	0.01	0.93
	CB	0.06	0.03	CB	VS	CA	0.02	0.71	0.48	0.00	1.00
	CC	0.09	0.03	CC	VS	CA	0.05	1.82	0.07	0.00	0.96
				CC	VS	CB	0.03	0.90	0.37	0.10	0.75
HB manages main food crop alone	T	0.33	0.04	CA	VS	T	0.21	3.68	0.00	0.00	0.98
	CA	0.54	0.04	СВ	VS	Т	0.18	2.33	0.02	0.00	0.99
	СВ	0.51	0.07	СВ	VS	CA	-0.03	-0.37	0.71	0.47	0.49
	CC	0.54	0.07	CC	VS	CA	0.00	-0.04	0.97	0.09	0.76
				CC	VS	СВ	0.03	0.28	0.78	2.41	0.12
W manages main cash crop alone	T	0.02	0.01	CA	VS	T	0.02	1.07	0.29	0.25	0.62
	CA	0.04	0.01	СВ	VS	Т	-0.02	-0.75	0.45	3.04	0.08
	СВ	0.00	0.02	СВ	VS	CA	-0.04	-1.53	0.13	4.94	0.03
	CC	0.05	0.02	CC	VS	CA	0.01	0.42	0.68	0.34	0.56
	-	0.05	0.02	CC	VS	CB	0.05	1.63	0.10	2.41	0.12
HB manages main cash crop	Т	0.52	0.04	CA	VS	T	0.11	1.85	0.07	0.63	0.43
alone	•					-					
	CA	0.63	0.04	СВ	VS	T	0.19	2.48	0.01	0.24	0.63
	СВ	0.72	0.07	СВ	VS	CA	0.09	1.12	0.26	0.37	0.54
	CC	0.64	0.07	CC	VS	CA	0.01	0.18	0.86	0.14	0.71
				CC	VS	СВ	-0.07	-0.79	0.43	0.05	0.82
HH is food secure (W reported)	Τ	0.60	0.04	CA	VS	T	-0.03	-0.43	0.67	0.00	0.99
, ,	CA	0.57	0.04	СВ	VS	T	-0.03	-0.41	0.68	0.35	0.56
	CB	0.57	0.07	CB	VS	CA	-0.01	-0.09	0.93	0.05	0.82
	CC	0.61	0.07	CC	VS	CA	0.03	0.43	0.67	0.03	0.85
				CC	VS	CB	0.04	0.43	0.67	0.24	0.63
Household better off than average HH (W reported)	T	0.17	0.03	CA	VS	T	0.06	1.33	0.18	1.36	0.24
- , , ,	CA	0.23	0.03	СВ	VS	T	0.00	0.03	0.98	0.42	0.52
	CB	0.17	0.06	CB	VS	CA	-0.06	-0.94	0.35	0.08	0.78
	CC	0.20	0.05	CC	VS	CA	-0.04	-0.60	0.55	0.02	0.88
				CC	VS	CB	0.02	0.30	0.76	1.18	0.28
Household wellbeing improved over time (W reported)	T	0.20	0.03	CA	VS	T	0.08	1.66	0.10	2.93	0.09
,	CA	0.28	0.04	CB	VS	T	-0.02	-0.36	0.72	0.13	0.72
	CB	0.17	0.06	CB	VS	CA	-0.11	-1.57	0.12	0.51	0.48
	CC	0.18	0.06	CC	VS	CA	-0.10	-1.53	0.13	2.15	0.14
				CC	VS	CB	0.01	0.07	0.95	0.88	0.35
House built with fire-baked bricks (W reported)	T	0.89	0.02	CA	VS	T	0.05	1.71	0.09	2.40	0.12
,	CA	0.94	0.02	СВ	VS	T	0.07	1.68	0.09	1.00	0.32
	СВ	0.96	0.04	СВ	VS	CA	0.02	0.43	0.67	0.71	0.40
	CC	0.93	0.04	CC	VS	CA	-0.02	-0.37	0.71	0.07	0.79
				CC	VS	CB	-0.03	-0.67	0.51	0.58	0.45

Intensively coached group (Encouraged) (T), Group who received couple seminars with potential spillovers (CA), resp. not exposed to spillovers (CB), Control group without Gender Household Approach exposure (CC).

Table B Covariates included propensity score matching per comparison

T vs CA	T vs CB	CA vs CC	CB vs CC	CA vs CB
Х	Х	Х	Х	Х
Χ	Χ	Χ	Χ	Χ
Χ	Χ	Χ	Χ	Χ
Χ	Χ	Χ	Χ	Χ
X	X	X	X	Х
Χ	Χ	Χ	Χ	Χ
Χ	Χ	Χ	Χ	Χ
Χ	Χ	Χ	Χ	Χ
Х	Х	Х	Х	Х
Χ	Χ	Χ	Χ	Χ
Χ	Χ	Χ	Χ	Χ
Х				
	Χ			
	Χ			Χ
	X X X X X X X X	X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	X	X

Intensively coached group (Encouraged) (T), Group who received couple seminars with potential spillovers (CA), resp. not exposed to spillovers (CB), Control group without Gender Household Approach exposure (CC).

Table C Estimates of first stage of instrumental variable (IV) regressions

		~
		(1) Effective treatment status
Panel A		
T vs CA	βx (Randomised encouragement status)	0.844
	S.E.	(0.033)
	p-value	0.000
	Constant	0.086
	S.E.	(0.024)
	p-value	0.000
N		288
Panel B		
T vs CB	$\beta_x$ (Randomised encouragement status)	0.952
	S.E.	(0.024)
	p-value	0.000
	Constant	0.000
	S.E.	(0.000)
	p-value	0.000
N		200

Estimates of first stage of IV regression using two-step GMM in case of T vs CA and T vs CB (Panel A and B) with robust standard errors (S.E.) on matched samples using PSM. Intensively coached group (Encouraged) (T), Group who received couple seminars with potential spillovers (CA), resp. not exposed to spillovers (CB).

Table D Correlation coefficients per comparison after matching used to calculate p-values adjusted for multiple hypotheses testing

	Involvemen	Involvemen						
T vs CA (matched)	t farm decisions	t household decisions	Share TLU	Personal income	Share coffee income	Time	Improved welfare	Transparenc y
Involvement farm decisions Involvement household	1 0.3739	1						
decisions	0.1/67	0.2067	1					
Share TLU Personal income	-0.1467 0.0185	-0.3067 -0.1473	1	1				
Share coffee income			-0.038	1	1			
Time	-0.0529 0.0587	-0.0881 0.1363	0.0392 -0.0805	-0.0918 -0.0804	1 -0.1962	1		
Improved welfare	-0.1512	-0.2576	0.1537	0.1102	0.2009	0.0203	1	
Transparency	-0.1512	-0.2576	0.1537	-0.0592	0.2009	-0.0815	0.2072	1
Transparency	Involvemen	Involvemen	Share TLU	Personal	Share coffee	Time	Improved	
T vs CB (matched)	t farm	t household	Silate ILU	income	income	Tille	welfare	Transparenc
i vs cb (matched)	decisions	decisions		ilicollie	IIICOIIIE		wellale	У
Involvement farm decisions	1	uecisions						
Involvement household	0.4377	1						
decisions	0.4377	1						
Share TLU	0.0652	-0.1168	1					
Personal income	-0.109	-0.2169	0.0345	1				
Share coffee income	-0.128	-0.1026	-0.0304	0.1242	1			
Time	0.0141	0.2765	-0.2356	-0.1423	-0.0361	1		
Improved welfare	0.0095	-0.2308	0.1505	0.1492	0.2332	-0.0317	1	
Transparency	0.0144	-0.0888	-0.0015	0.0535	0.6305	-0.1978	0.2132	1
Transparency		Involvemen	Share TLU	Personal	Share coffee	Time	Improved	Transparenc
CA vs CC (matched)	t farm	t household	Share 120	income	income	Time	welfare	У
,	decisions	decisions					.,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	3
Involvement farm decisions	1	4001310113						
Involvement household	0.448	1						
decisions	01110	-						
Share TLU	0.0619	-0.0732	1					
Personalincome	-0.1529	-0.0869	-0.1308	1				
Share coffee income	0.1694	0.0369	-0.005	-0.1113	1			
Time	-0.2945	-0.1541	-0.1527	0.2044	-0.1927	1		
Improved welfare	-0.0194	-0.1247	0.2164	0.0069	0.3002	0.0383	1	
Transparency	0.0471	0.0204	0.1189	-0.096	0.3084	-0.0684	0.1716	1
, ,	Involvemen	Involvemen	Share TLU	Personal	Share coffee	Time	Improved	Transparenc
CB vs CC (matched)	t farm decisions	t household decisions		income	income		welfare	У
Involvement farm decisions	1							
Involvement household	0.4608	1						
decisions								
Share TLU	0.0679	-0.1095	1					
Personalincome	-0.067	-0.1899	0.1096	1				
Share coffee income	0.045	0.0072	0.1588	0.0965	1			
Time	-0.1769	0.1162	-0.3564	0.0141	-0.1459	1		
Improved welfare	0.0328	-0.1519	0.2467	0.0585	0.2657	-0.0443	1	
Transparency	0.1324	0.0777	-0.0202	0.0162	0.5318	-0.0547	0.0509	_ 1
	Involvemen	Involvemen	Share TLU	Personal	Share coffee	Time	Improved	Transparenc
CA vs CB (matched)	t farm decisions	t household decisions		income	income		welfare	У
Involvement farm decisions	1							
Involvement household	0.4326	1						
decisions			_					
Share TLU	0.0384	-0.1973	1					
Personalincome	-0.1332	-0.1268	0.088	1				
Share coffee income	-0.0477	-0.0793	0.1424	0.1053	1	4		
Time	-0.0027	0.2324	-0.2322	-0.1619	-0.1054	1		
Improved welfare	-0.0422	-0.0954	0.227	0.0533	0.2073	0.0474	1	

Transparency	-0.0031 Involvemen	-0.0216 Involvemen	0.1063 Share TLU A	-0.0407 Share coffee	0.3308 Improved	-0.0214	0.2034	1
T vs CA (matched)	t farm decisions A	t household		income A	welfare A			
Involvement farm decisions A	1							
Involvement household	0.3946	1						
decisions A Share TLU A	0.1775	-0.0386	1					
Share coffee income A	0.1773	0.0742	-0.1017	1				
Improved welfare A	-0.2248	-0.216	-0.162	0.1154	1			
improved wedate /t		Involvemen		Share coffee	Improved			
T vs CB (matched)	t farm	t household	311416 120 71	income A	welfare A			
(	decisions A							
Involvement farm decisions A	1							
Involvement household	0.4936	1						
decisions A								
Share TLU A	0.1078	-0.139	1					
Share coffee income A	0.1886	0.227	0.0699	1				
Improved welfare A	-0.0679	-0.2135	-0.0035	0.1748	1			
			Share TLU A	Share coffee	Improved			
CA vs CC (matched)	t farm	t household		income A	welfare A			
	decisions A	decisions A						
Involvement farm decisions A	1	1						
Involvement household decisions A	0.3498	1						
Share TLU A	0.2719	0.105	1					
Share coffee income A	0.2719	-0.0224	-0.0645	1				
Improved welfare A	-0.0923	-0.0224	-0.0858	0.1509	1			
improved wedate A				Share coffee	Improved			
CB vs CC (matched)	t farm	t household	0	income A	welfare A			
·- ·- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	decisions A	decisions A						
Involvement farm decisions A	1							
Involvement household	0.4984	1						
decisions A								
Share TLU A	-0.0037	-0.1314	1					
Share coffee income A	0.1946	0.1542	-0.1058	1				
Improved welfare A	-0.0582	-0.2297	0.069	0.1574	_ 1			
64 6D ( . I I)		Involvemen	Share TLU A	Share coffee	Improved			
CA vs CB (matched)	t farm	t household		income A	welfare A			
Involvement farm decisions A	decisions A	decisions A						
Involvement household	1	1						
decisions A	0.4985	1						
Share TLU A	0.0464	-0.263	1					
Share coffee income A	0.2471	0.2435	0.0338	1				
Improved welfare A	-0.1128	-0.1157	0.0133	0.1357	1			
1					-			

Intensively coached group (Encouraged) (T), Group who received couple seminars with potential spillovers (CA), resp. not exposed to spillovers (CB), Control group without Gender Household Approach exposure (CC).

Share TLU = Share of household tropical livestock units (TLU) (excluding poultry) the wife reported to personally or jointly own (Share TLU A = based on averages of husband and wife reports). Personal income = Indicator taking the value one if the wife reported she personally earned any income from off-farm activities, fishing, sales of livestock and/or remittances in three months prior to endline. Share coffee income = Share of total household income from selling coffee in which the wife was involved, personally or jointly with her husband, in sales transaction including receiving money (Share coffee income A = based on averages of reported by husband and wife). Transparency = Ratio of wife versus husband reported total household coffee income as an indicator of transparency. Time = Difference in proportion of total work time wife and husband reported to allocate to tasks in reproductive and domestic sphere. Involvement farm decisions = Percentage out of four types of strategic farm decisions in which the wife was involved, personally or jointly with her husband or another household member, based on women's accounts (Involvement farm decisions A= based on women's accounts (Involvement household member, based on women's accounts (Involvement household member, based on women's accounts (Involvement household member, based on women's involvement household decisions A= based on husband and wife agreeing upon wife's involvement). Improved welfare =

Indicator taking the value one if wife believes that the household has improved its (economic) wellbeing and/or food security situation as compared to a year before ( $Improved\ welfare\ A = based\ on\ husband\ and\ wife\ agreeing\ upon\ improved\ wellbeing\ and/or\ food\ security$ ).

Table E Estimates of spillover effects

		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
		Share TLU	Share TLU A	Personal income	Share coffee income	Share coffee income A	Transparency	Time	Involvemen t farm decisions	Involvemen t farm decisions A	Involvemen t household decisions	Involvemen t household decisions A	Improved welfare	Improved welfare A
CA vs CB	β× S.E.	-0.102 (0.091)	0.108 (0.051)	-0.130 (0.074)	0.245 (0.089)	0.305 (0.073)	0.524 (0.167)	0.009 (0.032)	0.193 (0.040)	0.215 (0.043)	0.044 (0.049)	0.066 (0.054)	0.028 (0.079)	0.029 (0.073)
	p-value	0.265	0.036	0.082	0.006	0.000	0.002	0.783	0.000	0.000	0.365	0.229	0.725	0.686
	Constant	0.334	0.372	0.194	0.583	0.648	0.553	0.256	0.731	0.608	0.821	0.700	0.252	0.176
	S.E.	(0.083)	(0.047)	(0.071)	(0.082)	(0.071)	(0.072)	(0.026)	(0.038)	(0.040)	(0.045)	(0.050)	(0.068)	(0.063)
	p-value	0.000	0.000	0.007	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.006
N		154	159	194	165	163	157	193	194	194	194	194	193	191
$R^2$		0.016	0.046	0.038	0.073	0.198	0.044	0.001	0.192	0.170	0.007	0.013	0.001	0.001
F statistic		1.250	4.470	3.070	7.670	17.230	9.910	0.080	23.450	24.610	0.830	1.460	0.120	0.160
Adj. R <sup>2</sup>		0.010	0.040	0.030	0.070	0.190	0.040	0.000	0.190	0.170	0.000	0.010	0.000	0.000

Estimates of average treatment effects ( $\beta$ x) using ordinary least square (OLS) regression, with robust standard errors (S.E.) on matched samples using PSM. Group who received couple seminars with potential spillovers (CA), resp. not exposed to spillovers (CB).

Share TLU = Share of household tropical livestock units (TLU) (excluding poultry) the wife reported to personally or jointly own (Share TLU A = based on averages of husband and wife reports). Personal income = Indicator taking the value one if the wife reported she personally earned any income from off-farm activities, fishing, sales of livestock and/or remittances in three months prior to endline. Share coffee income = Share of total household income from selling coffee in which the wife was involved, personally or jointly with her husband, in sales transaction including receiving money (Share coffee income A = based on averages of reported by husband and wife). Transparency = Ratio of wife versus husband reported total household coffee income as an indicator of transparency. Time = Difference in proportion of total work time wife and husband reported to allocate to tasks in reproductive and domestic sphere. Involvement farm decisions = Percentage out of four types of strategic farm decisions in which the wife was involved, personally or jointly with her husband or another household member, based on women's accounts (Involvement household decisions = Percentage out of four types of strategic household decisions in which the wife was involved, personally or jointly with her husband or another household member, based on women's accounts (Involvement household decisions A= based on husband and wife agreeing upon wife's involvement). Improved welfare = Indicator taking the value one if wife believes that the household has improved its (economic) wellbeing and/or food security situation as compared to a year before (Improved welfare A = based on husband and wife agreeing upon improved wellbeing and/or food security).

Table F Full results Table 3 – Estimates of average treatment effects ( $\beta x$ ) on women's control over assets and income and on time allocation

		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
		Share TLU	Share TLU A	Personal income	Share coffee income	Share coffee income A	Transparency	Time
Panel A				income	IIICOIIIE	IIICOIIIE A		
T vs CA	βx	-0.033	-0.035	0.009	0.021	-0.030	-0.230	-0.031
I V3 CA	S.E.	(0.063)	(0.035)	(0.036)	(0.060)	(0.029)	(0.179)	(0.033)
		0.602	0.322	0.801	0.727	0.298	0.198	0.349
	p n adi	0.999	0.829	1.000		0.838	0.198	0.974
	p adj Constant				1.000			
	Constant	0.236	0.493	0.060	0.813	0.960	1.089	0.270
	S.E.	(0.042)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.041)	(0.017)	(0.163)	(0.021)
	p ,;	0.000	0.000	0.008	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	p adj	0.000	0.000	0.060	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Ex-post MDES		0.176	0.098	0.101	0.168	0.081	0.501	0.092
N		232	240	288	238	234	230	288
<sup>2</sup>		-0.003	0.007	0.001	0.001	0.004	0.008	0.003
degrees of reedom		230.00	238.00	286.00	236.00	232.00	228.00	286.00
F statistic		0.270	0.970	0.060	0.120	1.080	1.640	0.870
Adj. R²		-0.010	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Panel B								
T vs CB	βx	-0.141	0.112	-0.086	0.351	0.410	0.344	-0.001
	S.E.	(0.122)	(0.069)	(0.068)	(0.124)	(0.119)	(0.087)	(0.042)
	p	0.245	0.103	0.203	0.005	0.001	0.000	0.975
	р p adj	0.243	0.325	0.766	0.034	0.001	0.000	1.000
	Constant	0.334	0.350	0.766	0.517	0.561	0.558	0.247
	S.E.	(0.105)	(0.059)	(0.058)	(0.110)	(0.108)	(0.072)	(0.032)
	p	0.001	0.000	0.013	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	p adj	0.006	0.000	0.080	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
x-post MDES		0.342	0.193	0.190	0.347	0.333	0.244	0.118
N		152	157	200	171	167	163	199
R <sup>2</sup>		0.007	0.026	0.010	0.115	0.211	0.112	0.000
degrees of reedom		150.00	155.00	198.00	169.00	165.00	161.00	197.00
statistic		1.330	2.620	1.600	7.970	11.720	15.310	0.000
Adj. R²		0.000	0.020	0.000	0.110	0.210	0.110	-0.010
Panel C								
CA vs CC	βx	0.125	0.150	-0.122	0.130	0.149	0.345	-0.090
.A V3 CC	S.E.				(0.079)			
		(0.053)	(0.039)	(0.061)		(0.053)	(0.225)	(0.039)
	p n adi	0.019	0.000	0.046	0.101	0.006	0.128	0.022
	p adj	0.123	0.000	0.262	0.550	0.026	0.642	0.123
	Constant	0.104	0.336	0.189	0.685	0.807	0.797	0.363
	S.E.	(0.036)	(0.033)	(0.056)	(0.069)	(0.050)	(0.119)	(0.034)
	p ,;	0.004	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	p adj	0.027	0.000	0.006	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
x-post MDES		0.148	0.109	0.171	0.221	0.148	0.630	0.109
V		153	158	185	154	153	148	185
₹2		0.036	0.108	0.034	0.022	0.066	0.015	0.041
statistic		5.670	14.980	4.050	2.710	7.770	2.340	5.360
Adj. R²		0.030	0.100	0.030	0.020	0.060	0.010	0.040
Panel D								
CB vs CC	$\beta_x$	0.198	0.049	0.050	-0.048	-0.128	-0.191	-0.108
	S.E.	(0.081)	(0.061)	(0.089)	(0.105)	(0.079)	(0.147)	(0.046)
		0.016	0.422	0.574	0.650	0.110	0.197	0.022
	p n adi							
	p adj	0.097	0.872	0.995	0.999	0.423	0.786	0.105
	Constant	0.101	0.323	0.166	0.672	0.797	0.770	0.356
		(0.020)	(0.036)	(0.053)	(0.076)	(0.056)	(0.129)	(0.035)
	S.E.	(0.039)	(0.036)					
	S.E. p p adj	0.039) 0.011 0.067	0.000	0.002 0.012	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Ex-post MDES	0.227	0.171	0.249	0.294	0.221	0.412	0.129
N	84	86	109	96	94	89	108
R <sup>2</sup>	0.085	0.009	0.004	0.002	0.029	0.023	0.066
F statistic	6.030	0.650	0.320	0.210	2.600	1.690	5.400
Adj. R <sup>2</sup>	0.070	0.000	-0.010	-0.010	0.020	0.010	0.060

Estimates of local average treatment effects (LATE) ( $\beta_x$ ) based on second stage of IV regression using two-step GMM in case of T vs CA and T vs CB (Panel A and B) and estimates of average treatment effects using ordinary least square (OLS) regression in case of CA vs CC and CB vs CC (Panel C and D), with robust standard errors (S.E.) on matched samples using PSM. Ex-post MDES (minimum detectable effect size) (calculated as proposed in McKenzie, D., & Ozier, O. (2019) and Jakiela and Ozier (2019)) <sup>1</sup>

Intensively coached group (Encouraged) (T), Group who received couple seminars with potential spillovers (CA), resp. not exposed to spillovers (CB), Control group without Gender Household Approach exposure (CC). p=p-value; p adj.=p-value adjusted for multiple hypotheses testing.

Share TLU = Share of household tropical livestock units (TLU) (excluding poultry) the wife reported to personally or jointly own (Share TLU A = based on averages of husband and wife reports). Personal income = Indicator taking the value one if the wife reported she personally earned any income from off-farm activities, fishing, sales of livestock and/or remittances in three months prior to endline. Share coffee income = Share of total household income from selling coffee in which the wife was involved, personally or jointly with her husband, in sales transaction including receiving money (Share coffee income A = based on averages of reported by husband and wife). Transparency = Ratio of wife versus husband reported total household coffee income as an indicator of transparency. Time = Difference in proportion of total work time wife and husband reported to allocate to tasks in reproductive and domestic sphere.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> McKenzie, D., & Ozier, O. (2019). Why ex-post power using estimated effect sizes is bad, but an ex-post MDE is not. World Bank Blogs: Development Impact. https://blogs.worldbank.org/impactevaluations/why-ex-post-power-using-estimated-effect-sizes-bad-ex-post-mde-not (Accessed 22 July 2020); Jakiela, P., and Ozier, O. (2019) ECON 626: Applied Micro economics. Lecture 7: Power. http://economics.ozier.com/econ626/lec/econ626-L07-handout-2019.pdf (Accessed 22 July 2020).

Table G Full results Table 4 – Estimates of average treatment effects ( $\beta x$ ) on women's involvement in strategic farm and household decisions and on improved household welfare

3		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
		Involvement	Involvement farm decisions A	Involvement household decisions	Involvement household decisions A	Improved welfare	Improved welfare A
Panel A				uecisions	uecisions A		
T vs CA	βx S.E. p p adj Constant S.E. p p adj	-0.011 (0.023) 0.625 1.000 0.923 (0.013) 0.000 0.000	-0.017 (0.033) 0.597 0.994 0.822 (0.020) 0.000	-0.014 (0.031) 0.652 1.000 0.867 (0.020) 0.000	-0.023 (0.039) 0.551 0.985 0.770 (0.024) 0.000 0.000	-0.001 (0.065) 0.991 1.000 0.286 (0.043) 0.000 0.000	-0.011 (0.055) 0.846 0.999 0.197 (0.037) 0.000 0.000
Ex-post MDES		0.064	0.092	0.087	0.109	0.182	0.154
N R <sup>2</sup> F degrees of		288 -0.004	288 -0.002	288 0.001	288 0.002	288 -0.000	287 -0.000
freedom		286.00	286.00	286.00	286.00	286.00	285.00
F statistic Adj. R <sup>2</sup>		0.240 -0.010	0.280 -0.010	0.200 0.000	0.350 0.000	0.000 0.000	0.040 0.000
Panel B T vs CB	β <sub>×</sub> S.E. p p adj Constant S.E. p p adj	0.184 (0.053) 0.001 0.007 0.740 (0.047) 0.000 0.000	0.223 (0.046) 0.000 0.000 0.604 (0.038) 0.000 0.000	0.039 (0.056) 0.490 0.990 0.825 (0.049) 0.000	0.070 (0.059) 0.236 0.672 0.693 (0.050) 0.000	0.101 (0.080) 0.205 0.816 0.197 (0.062) 0.002 0.015	0.070 (0.068) 0.304 0.710 0.132 (0.053) 0.012 0.040
Ex-post MDES		0.148	0.129	0.157	0.165	0.224	0.190
N R <sup>2</sup> F degrees of freedom F statistic Adj. R <sup>2</sup>		200 0.141 198.00 11.830 0.140	200 0.135 198.00 23.280 0.130	200 0.003 198.00 0.470 0.000	200 0.008 198.00 1.390 0.000	199 0.011 197.00 1.590 0.010	198 0.010 196.00 1.040 0.010
Panel C							
CA vs CC	βx S.E. p p adj Constant S.E. p p adj	0.145 (0.042) 0.001 0.008 0.779 (0.040) 0.000	0.156 (0.044) 0.000 0.000 0.663 (0.040) 0.000	0.030 (0.039) 0.440 0.984 0.848 (0.035) 0.000	0.031 (0.042) 0.461 0.926 0.751 (0.036) 0.000	0.016 (0.074) 0.824 1.000 0.268 (0.062) 0.000 0.000	-0.031 (0.069) 0.653 0.975 0.236 (0.059) 0.000
Ex-post MDES		0.118	0.123	0.109	0.118	0.207	0.193
N R <sup>2</sup> F statistic Adj. R <sup>2</sup>		185 0.093 11.650 0.090	185 0.090 12.680 0.080	185 0.005 0.600 0.000	185 0.004 0.550 0.000	185 0.000 0.050 -0.010	185 0.001 0.200 0.000
Panel D CB vs CC	β× S.E. p p adj Constant S.E. p p adj	-0.063 (0.058) 0.275 0.889 0.773 (0.045) 0.000	-0.095 (0.064) 0.141 0.545 0.667 (0.046) 0.000	-0.080 (0.067) 0.232 0.812 0.849 (0.035) 0.000	-0.102 (0.070) 0.151 0.522 0.750 (0.039) 0.000	-0.010 (0.094) 0.912 1.000 0.259 (0.067) 0.000	-0.073 (0.088) 0.409 0.873 0.237 (0.066) 0.000

Ex-post MDES	0.162	0.179	0.188	0.196	0.263	0.246
N	109	109	109	109	108	107
R <sup>2</sup>	0.013	0.026	0.018	0.026	0.000	0.008
F statistic	1.200	2.200	1.450	2.090	0.010	0.690
Adj. R <sup>2</sup>	0.000	0.020	0.010	0.020	-0.010	0.000

Estimates of local average treatment effects (LATE) ( $\beta_x$ ) based on second stage of IV regression using two-step GMM in case of T vs CA and T vs CB (Panel A and B) and estimates of average treatment effects using ordinary least square (OLS) regression in case of CA vs CC and CB vs CC (Panel C and D), with robust standard errors (S.E.) on matched samples using PSM. Ex-post MDES (minimum detectable effect size) (calculated as proposed in McKenzie, D., & Ozier, O. (2019) and Jakiela and Ozier (2019))<sup>1</sup>

Intensively coached group (Encouraged) (T), Group who received couple seminars with potential spillovers (CA), resp. not exposed to spillovers (CB), Control group without Gender Household Approach exposure (CC). p=p-value; p adj.=p-value adjusted for multiple hypotheses testing.

Involvement farm decisions = Percentage out of four types of strategic farm decisions in which the wife was involved, personally or jointly with her husband or another household member, based on women's accounts (Involvement farm decisions A= based on husband and wife agreeing upon wife's involvement). Involvement household decisions = Percentage out of four types of strategic household decisions in which the wife was involved, personally or jointly with her husband or another household member, based on women's accounts (Involvement household decisions A= based on husband and wife agreeing upon wife's involvement). Improved welfare = Indicator taking the value one if wife believes that the household has improved its (economic) wellbeing and/or food security situation as compared to a year before (Improved welfare A = based on husband and wife agreeing upon improved wellbeing and/or food security).