

Coping with negative shocks and the role of the Farm Input Subsidy

Programme in rural Malawi

Joseph B. Ajefu^{1,*}, Uchenna Efobi² and Ibukun Beecroft³

¹Newcastle Business School, Northumbria University, Newcastle Upon Tyne, United Kingdom, ² College of Business and Social Sciences, and Centre for Economic Policy and Development Research, Covenant University, Nigeria and

³ Department of Economics, and Centre for Economic Policy and Development Research, Covenant University, Nigeria

*Corresponding author. E-mail: joeajefu@gmail.com

ONLINE APPENDIX

Table A1. First-stage results of the interaction between FISP vouchers and rainfall shock

Variables	Dummy vouchers*shock	Dummy vouchers
Share of voucher by district*negative shock	1.212*** (0.148)	1.709** (0.724)
Share of voucher by district	-0.016** (0.007)	0.841*** (0.086)
Negative rainfall shock	-0.147** (0.070)	-0.911*** (0.327)
Controls	Yes	Yes
Year fixed effect	Yes	Yes
F test of excluded instruments:	43.86	118.57
<i>Weak identification test</i>		
Cragg-Donald Wald F statistic	114.07	
Kleibergen-Paap Wald rk F statistic	85.57	

Notes: The regressions comprise 4,058 observations. Robust standard errors clustered at the household level are reported in parentheses. *** and ** represent significance levels at 1 per cent and 5 per cent, respectively. Control variables are the same as in table 3.

Table A2. Reduced-form results of the effect of district voucher receipt on household welfare

Variable	Consumption (1)	Food consumption (2)	Non-food consumption (3)	FCS (4)
District voucher	0.137* (0.079)	0.121*** (0.035)	0.004* (0.002)	0.594 (0.614)
Household Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Community Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year fixed effect	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Constant	5.627*** (0.104)	5.064*** (0.088)	2.439*** (0.168)	39.961*** (1.535)
R-squared	0.308	0.304	0.134	0.142

Notes: The regressions comprise 4,058 observations. Robust standard errors clustered at the household level are reported in parentheses. *** and * represent significant levels at 1 per cent and 10 per cent, respectively. Control variables are the same as in table 3.

Table A3. Robustness checks of effect of rainfall shock on household welfare and role of FISP (IV-2SLS)

Variable	Consumption (1)	Food consumption (2)	Non-food consumption (3)	Food consumption score (4)
Negative rain shock	-4.780*** (0.997)	-4.504*** (1.054)	-6.735*** (1.441)	-1.993* (1.178)
Shock*voucher	10.786*** (2.234)	9.713*** (2.315)	14.769*** (3.261)	5.350** (2.766)
Dummy voucher	0.663*** (0.228)	-1.489*** (0.299)	-2.255*** (0.449)	5.811 (3.893)
Constant	5.317*** (0.155)	6.188*** (0.188)	3.563*** (0.303)	41.022*** (2.620)
Household controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Community controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: The regressions comprise 2,932 observations. Robust standard errors clustered at the household level are reported in parentheses. ***, ** and * represent significant levels at 1 per cent, 5 per cent and 10 per cent, respectively. Control variables are the same as in table 3.