



Spillover Effects in the Building Resilience and Adapting to Climate Change Programme

Learning Brief

Jennifer Leavy
February 2022

Spillover Effects in BRACC

Building Resilience and Adapting to Climate Change (BRACC) is a £90.6-million five-year programme that provides targeted support for the most vulnerable districts, communities, and high priority catchments in Malawi. The programme goal is to strengthen the resilience of poor and vulnerable households to shocks and reduce their annual dependence on humanitarian aid. Adopting an integrated framework for resilience, the programme uses a multi-layered strategy combining market-based approaches to improving people's livelihoods, management of natural resources, and scalable social safety net systems that respond more predictably and efficiently to weather and climate-related shocks.

To implement this multi-layered strategy of building resilience and adapting to climate change, the BRACC programme is implemented through a multi-consortium model to develop partnerships across diverse sectors, including non-governmental organisations (NGOs), United Nations (UN) agencies and private sector partners. This design is arranged through four projects, each comprising one or a consortium of implementing partners, together with a separate knowledge and policy unit (BRACC Hub) intended to support programme-level coordination, monitoring and evaluation, knowledge management and policy advocacy.

This brief discusses the evidence for spillover and local economy effects of the BRACC programme after 2.5 years of implementation. It draws on qualitative data collected for the midline evaluation of the programme with two of the projects: Promotion of Sustainable Partnerships for Empowered Resilience (PROSPER), implemented by a joint UN and NGO consortium and Building Climate Resilience in Communities Surrounding Protected Areas, implemented by African Parks. The wider effects of the BRACC programme are analysed for both participants and non-participants of the programme, considering whether the programme has generated any spillover and local economy effects and the nature of these spillovers. Where possible, we explore how, for whom, and in what contexts?

What Are Spillover Effects?

Interventions may often result in secondary benefits and spillover effects, both for direct programme participants as well as for the wider community, including programme effects on the non-target population and in the local economy. The scope for this is notably significant in BRACC because of the training-first approach (as opposed to an asset-first approach). Hence it is likely that there will be informal sharing of knowledge and information about new ways of working introduced and supported by the programme. Capturing spillover effects is important. By just measuring the difference between treatment and control groups (participants and non-participants) in the same or nearby communities, the full impact of the programme (both positive and negative) will not be captured. This underestimates the effect on the treatment group and does not measure effects on the 'untreated'. The target group therefore needs to be explicitly considered as part of, interacting with and influencing a wider 'economy', most importantly in their village, wider community and neighbouring areas.

Reasons for spillover effects include the informal sharing of knowledge and information about new ways of working introduced and supported by the programme. Other spillover effects may also be achieved through programme participants purchasing goods and services from non-participant households (local economy effects), and vice versa, or improved hygiene and sanitation practices by

programme participants that reduce transmission rates and incidence of illness and disease, which benefit the whole community.

Spillover effects can be intended – for example the intentional introduction of agricultural technology to participants with the expectation/hope that this will lead to further adoption in the wider community, unintended and even negative.¹ Evidence for peer effects in adopting agricultural technology suggests neighbourhood and peer effects encompassing information exchange through informal social networks are important for technology adoption.² This includes adoption of high-yielding rice varieties³ and learning about new technology for pineapple cultivation in Ghana.⁴ Spillovers through peer effects can arise through a number of channels, for example through coordination and cooperation, such as in marketing or water management, mutual assistance such as in labour, insurance, informal credit (so-called strategic interaction) or be rooted in ‘spatial’ or social factors such as knowledge spillovers, social conformity, imitation⁵ and ‘perceived positive or negative external effects of the adoption decision’.⁶

Types of spillover effect

Empirical evidence suggests different types of spillover effect:

- J Temporal spillovers for participant households: based on the observation that behaviour at time 1 will affect behaviour at time 2.
- J Externalities: effects operating from programme participants to non-participants. For example, changes to the environment such as afforestation that impact everyone (environmental externalities).
- J Social interactions: indirect effects of interventions on non-participant households through social and economic interaction with participants, including neighbourhood peer effects. For example, sharing of resources provided by the programme such as seed.
- J Context equilibrium effects: spillovers arising from interventions that affect the context in terms of behavioural and social norms. For example, widespread changes in sanitation practices introduced by a programme and embedded within the wider community.
- J General equilibrium effects: changes in prices and markets due to shifts in supply and demand caused or stimulated by an intervention. Includes local economy effects.
- J Programmatic spillover effects: effects that spread programme-to-programme.

Evidence of Spillover Effects from the BRACC Programme

The BRACC programme has been implemented for just over two years, so the programme is only part of the way along its theory of change. Nevertheless, the midterm evaluation suggests emerging evidence for a number of potential spillover effects from the programme, both for programme participants and in the wider communities.

Temporal spillovers

¹ Angelucci, M. & Di Maro, V. (2016). Programme evaluation and spillover effects. *Journal of Development Effectiveness*, 8:1, 22-43, DOI: [10.1080/19439342.2015.1033441](https://doi.org/10.1080/19439342.2015.1033441)

² Skevas, T., Skevas, I., & Kalaitzandonakes, N. (2021). The role of peer effects on farmers' decision to adopt unmanned aerial vehicles: evidence from Missouri. *Applied Economics*, DOI: [10.1080/00036846.2021.1976384](https://doi.org/10.1080/00036846.2021.1976384)

³ Holloway, G., Shankar, B., & Rahman, S. (2002). Bayesian Spatial Probit Estimation: A Primer and an Application to Hyv Rice Adoption. *Agricultural Economics* 27 (3): 383-402. DOI: <https://doi-org.uea.idm.oclc.org/10.1111/j.1574-0862.2002.tb00127.x>

⁴ Conley, T. G., & Udry, C. R. (2010). Learning about a New Technology: Pineapple in Ghana. *American Economic Review* 100 (1): 35-69. DOI: <https://doi-org.uea.idm.oclc.org/10.1257/aer.100.1.35>

⁵ Maertens, A., & Barrett, C. B. (2012). Measuring Social Networks' Effects on Agricultural Technology Adoption. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 95 (2): 353-359. DOI: <https://doi-org.uea.idm.oclc.org/10.1093/ajae/aas049>

⁶ Skevas, T., Skevas, I., & Swinton, S.M. (2018). Does spatial dependence affect the intention to make land available for bioenergy crops? *Journal of Agricultural Economics* 69 (2):393-412.

Temporal spillovers for BRACC programme participants include emerging evidence of investment in businesses outside of agriculture/livestock, stemming from access to savings and loans as start-up capital from the Village Savings and Loan Association (VSLA) groups. This potentially points towards strengthened resilience if the enterprises are weather independent. It may also signal increased dynamism or vibrancy in the local economy – for example shops opening to cater to pent up or increased demand and more cash circulating in the economy, particularly related to access to cash via VSLA groups.

Whenever people have received their savings or loans, we take it also as an opportunity to start up or top up businesses in the community. If you can go around our community, you will realise that there are shops, groceries and different businesses being conducted. All these were generated from savings and loans from our VSLA groups. We have seen that now there is sustainability of most of the small-scale businesses because we boost these from the savings and loans. – Women's Focus Group Discussion (FGD) female_SU_Phalombe)

I wanted to say that one of these spillovers that we also noticed is a shift in the kind of businesses that we had previously seen. Previously, most of the businesses were traditional, like the selling of groundnuts. But now, because there's a shift from traditional businesses, big businesses, for example, you would find an agrodealer shop which was being run by one of the beneficiaries. This is something which was not a norm in the past before the project. And he would say that this was a spillover because the project was supporting some farmers; some entrepreneurs were able to see an opportunity in that open shop. So yes, that's one of the spillovers. – Key Informant Interview (KII) programme implementer

One respondent reported being better connected and informed as they were now able to access news because of radios they were able to buy with money they have made from participating in the programme (potentially leading to increased crop sales). There is also less reliance on others for news now that they can access it directly in their own homes (which is potentially a good foundation/enabler for sharing climate-related information and early warning). Also, the ability to purchase bicycles can lead to increasing mobility. Accumulation of assets extends to purchasing a TV, which influences how people spend their leisure time.

We are able to access news through radios that we bought after being successful in these programmes. It was not easy to get this news; earlier on it was only the selected individuals that got it. At least now we have this in our own homes. We also have bicycles that we are using for mobility. – Men's FGD_Balaka_CashForInputs

My children don't go very far, they just stay indoors and watch TV. It means they have something to relax with when they are not studying or doing other things.” – SSI_Nkhotakota_High income_Older_male-headed household (MHH)

There is strong evidence for participants' increased ability to pay school fees – this is what many prioritise along with meeting basic household (including food) needs when their income has increased due to programme participation. This has far-reaching effects into the next generation.

The number of people coming to the social welfare office seeking bursaries has reduced as a result of increased income. Many people are able to pay school fees for their own children. – District KII_Chikwawa_District Community Development Officer (DCDO)

Externalities

A number of externalities – effects operating from the programme to non-participants – can be seen from BRACC. These relate to services provided by the programme that non-participants also benefit from as well as environmental externalities that impact everyone in a locality.

There is strong evidence that improved sanitation practices and reduced open defecation have had amplified results and spillover effects, helped by making those training sessions open to all and building on previous similar interventions, but also in some cases changed practices advocated by BRACC may be strictly enforced by local leaders/chiefs. Many interviewees in both Chikwawa and Balaka described a decline in cholera and other waterborne diseases in communities, linked directly to the programme. Lower incidence of disease has knock-on effects in terms of lower spending on health costs.

Through community meetings conducted by GOAL Malawi officials, extension workers, health workers and chiefs, where sanitation and hygiene practices were being encouraged, most people in the area are now practicing these activities. As a result of this, we have seen a decline in cholera cases. In the past, when most households did not practice sanitation and hygiene, cholera incidences were rampant every year, especially during the rainy season. – Women’s FGD_Chikwawa_Female_Livestock Pass-on)

Since diseases like cholera have now been reduced, we don’t spend money on drugs and hospital bills. – KII_Chikwawa_Community Based Targeting (CBT)

The environmental management interventions supported by the programme generate a number of externalities for the wider communities, who are experiencing a range of benefits (medium to strong evidence). Tree planting in communal forests benefits the whole community, as does reduced tree felling to use for firewood where cookstoves have been introduced. Some non-participants have adopted cookstoves having seen how they demand less firewood (evidence from Phalombe and Chikwawa). Exposure and vulnerability to weather-related shocks and stressors have been reduced, for example through tree planting and the construction and use of check dams, while water recharge benefits everyone downstream.

As for the environmental management, it does benefit everyone because the trees that we have planted serve as wind breaks for everyone that is in the community regardless of whether they are participants of the programme or not. – Men’s FGD_Chikwawa_Insurance

Where the environmental management work protects and improves conditions around schools, this has increased safety for children, contributing to improved school attendance.

For example, as already stated, our school used to be affected by floods every year before we planted trees and constructed check dams. After the project came, we were trained and given resources to plant trees around the school and construct check dams. This initiative worked as our school no longer experiences floods and our children are safe and learning comfortably. As you can see, this programme has worked for everyone, even if some people did not take part in it. (Women’s FGD_Chikwawa_Insurance)

Households keeping livestock in communities where the programme operates have reported benefits from improved access to livestock services, notably trained community animal health workers with drug boxes for deworming and treating animals, which responds to wider, pre-existing demand in communities (medium evidence): “community animal health workers, having the drug boxes and the

demand was already there, as you said, from the farmers”. (Endline interview, Pos. 38). One interviewee suggested that community animal health workers trained under PROSPER have championed village-level livestock clubs (outside of the programme), with positive impacts on animal health, including lowering mortality rates.

PROSPER trained animal health workers on all species of livestock, including chicken, even though PROSPER only distributed goats. The livestock clubs in the communities are called “Chitopa toto clubs”. These clubs are not under PROSPER, they are merely village-based clubs being championed by community animal health workers trained by PROSPER. Farmers are encouraged to vaccinate their chickens routinely. Outbreaks of Newcastle disease is just history now – the community workers are there to vaccinate the chickens. This has significantly lowered the mortality rate of chickens.

PROSPER distributed drug boxes to these community animal health workers, who do not only attend to animals belonging to PROSPER participants but serve everybody who owns any species of livestock. The mortality rate of young animals such as calves and kids has also declined. The community health workers deworm the animals on time.

Non-participants who own goats have also constructed raised kraals for the goats, making the collection of goat droppings easy. – District KII_Balaka

Another positive spillover mentioned in interviews was lower transport costs – specifically for buying inputs due to the cash-for-inputs element of the programme bringing in agrodealers to sell to communities. Others involved in African Parks mentioned lower transport costs for local vendors able to source produce from participants close by to resell, thereby no longer having to order produce from far away – leading to higher profits for vendors, as well as being able to supply local lodges with fresh produce direct from farms. Linked to this, respondents described food being more readily available in communities and villages in surrounding areas because more households have a surplus to sell (weak evidence). In one district, overall increased availability of food has reportedly reduced the incidence of farm theft considerably, according to one respondent.

Nowadays we don't even bother to walk long distances to buy maize, for example if we are in shortfall at household level, because most of the people in our community still have more than enough stock to sell to others. Issues of theft of farm produce have abruptly declined since almost everyone in the community is able to have adequate food. In addition to that, Cash for Inputs has minimised issues of shocks and natural disasters such as flooding and dry spells. Most of us have planted trees around our fields and also some grass to control water while bringing back forests. Therefore, had it been that we had no Cash for Inputs, then we would have knowledge and skills on good and modern farming practices. – Women's FGD_Phalombe_Cash for Inputs

Social interactions

Strongest evidence for spillover effects relates to changes in behaviour/knowledge due to neighbourhood peer effects, in particular where non-participants learn from the experiences of participants. This is not surprising given the socially embedded nature of livelihood activities and the importance of informal social networks and social support systems. In the case of the BRACC programme, this is likely to be reinforced by the widely held perception within communities that everybody needs support so everybody should have been included in the programme (PROSPER respondents, Process Evaluation 2021), and there is evidence of sharing of resources by programme participants with non-participants:

Non-participants also benefited from the vegetables we were planting. We would be given a packet of seeds to share, and everyone was planting in his/her garden. The vegetable seedlings would be too much for one person to plant all of them considering the water shortage in this area that makes irrigating a large piece of land hard. In the end, we would share the vegetable seedlings with seven to eight non-beneficiaries that would also plant the vegetables in their gardens. – Women’s FGD_Chikwawa_Access to Finance

Interviewees in Nkhotakota described how both stove-making and beekeeping have caught on in their wider community, not just among African Parks programme participants but non-participants too. Non-participants learn from the trainers trained by the programme.

Even for beekeeping, people who weren’t trained ended up starting when they saw other people benefiting. We also have other people who are not part of the programme doing beekeeping in their own forests – these people learn from the groups and start to do beekeeping individually by buying the beehives by themselves. – African Parks and PROSPER KII_Chikwawa_DFO

Non-participants have also been borrowing the bee suits given to participants (PROSPER). Further evidence for spillover effects are signs that honey is coming from a wider radius than the programme implementation area.

These types of spillover effects extend to communities not targeted by the programme, with four different communities cited by the interviewee as emulating programme activities, seeking out support from the district office, and carrying out bee-keeping, stove-making and fruit-growing in their communities with some success. One community has gone on to set up VSLA groups for the savings they accrue through sales of honey from the 20 beehives they have installed in their own forests.

Evidence of spillover effects (emulation) of conservation activities by non-participants of both the African Parks project and PROSPER amplifies the benefits from tree-planting and less tree felling (strong evidence).

Communities that were not targeted in the programme have adopted these activities that are being implemented in their communities, especially on environmental conservation, which has led to forest restoration. – SSI Ntchisi Social Welfare Officer

There is strong evidence of behavioural change through neighbourhood peer effects in the use of improved farming techniques, with non-participants either emulating their neighbours or benefiting from the guidance of the lead farmers.

Most of the households have adopted modern farming practices. They have reduced ridge spacing, reduced planting station spacing, have adopted sasakawa, they apply manure in their crop fields and have adopted conservation agriculture. Some plant hybrid seed, those that can afford it. There are frequent dry spells in our area, and they have started using hybrid seed because it matures early and is drought tolerant. They have adopted all these modern farming technologies because people get high yield from the very same piece of land, which enables them to have food to feed our families. They have also adopted the modern farming technologies because of climate change. – Women’s FGD_Balaka_Mbera_Mtira_PROSPER Livestock Pass-on)

There is substantial, strong evidence that participants are actively sharing know-how beyond the programme, with some suggestion that it is not only in response to requests from non-participants, but also freely shared as a means to include those not targeted or included in PROSPER. The main

techniques taken up by non-participants, having seen improvements in participant yields, include:

-) Use of manure
-) Sasakawa planting system
-) Canal irrigation
-) Swales (there is a particularly strong demand by non-participants for help from participants with swales after seeing how effective they were)
-) Use of hybrid seeds/modern varieties
-) Growing vegetables in backyard gardens, with potential knock-on effects on dietary diversity and food security.

One non-participant in Balaka, a PROSPER District, described how he was able to increase crop production by emulating a range of activities that the programme was implementing, leading to increased crop sales.

I have benefited through increased crop production in a way that I have learned manure making and the use of manure, hence I was able to use manure in my farm because I cannot afford fertiliser and I noticed an increase in crop yield. In addition, I also tried the modern farming practices (i.e. planting one seed per planting station, reducing ridges, mulching) that were being promoted by PROSPER. In that part of my farm, I was able to harvest more crops than in the part where I used the old farming practices. In past years I could harvest about seven bags of maize, but in the 2020/21 growing season I was able to harvest about 14 bags. Through the skills and knowledge that were being disseminated in this community, when our friends were receiving cash for garden inputs, I also took up the initiative to purchase my own vegetables (tomatoes) and maize seed so that I could also try what these people who were in the programme were advised to do, and I was able to benefit from these crops through sales. – Balaka SSI Hanging-in male-headed household

As well as evidence of non-participants taking up livestock rearing (goats), for existing keepers of livestock there is evidence of improved keeping practices by following advice advocated by the programme and supported by the availability of vets or community animal health workers. Non-participants have also been emulating herding livestock (PROSPER) to prevent theft.

Yes, construction of standard goat houses and worm control by deworming as well as dipping, these have been copied and implemented by community members in project sites that were not part of the programme, just by appreciating the benefits as observed from the beneficiaries. – KII District Animal Health and Livestock Development Officer

VSLA groups have also been set up or joined by non-participants with some (weak) evidence that this links to being less dependent on doing *ganyu* (piecework), allowing people to invest in their own farming activities and other enterprises. In Nkhotakota (African Parks programme), interviewees described VSLA groups set up by non-participant community members as having increased income and savings through emulating beehive activities.

Nutrition spillovers have also been described by community members. Part of the design of the programme was for the nutrition information to be available and accessible to all, but participants also described passing on know-how in cooking healthy recipes to non-participants.

Some people have also changed their eating habits, they are able to emulate what some of us are doing, for example adding sesame flour in the maize porridge that children eat. They would see that the children eating such porridge are growing well, with healthy bodies, and they would emulate the same so that their kids can also grow well. In the

past, such people would say they could not feed their children porridge containing sesame or millet because it looks black, which is not appetising, but nowadays they have realised that even kids love such porridge, and it is highly nutritious since kids eating such porridge do not get sick regularly. – Womens' FGD_Chikwawa_Katunga_Access to Finance

Context equilibrium effects: changes in social norms

Emerging evidence from the BRACC programme suggests two potential spillover effects related to changes in context and social norms: school attendance and sanitation/hygiene. Improved school attendance can be directly linked to people being better able to pay school costs because of increased access to cash – either through increased sales, access to savings and loans through VSLAs or from watershed payments for the environmental management activities. Improved environmental conditions due to programme activities, discussed previously, also make it safer for children to attend school, thus supporting improved attendance rates. Other interviewees ascribe improved school attendance and reduced dropouts to families' ability to meet their food needs.

The rise in income levels has led to a reduction in the school dropout rate because they get food, school uniform and school fees, thereby reducing the main issues that were causing children to drop out of school. – Chikwawa District KII

As well as the spillover effects from improved sanitation and hygiene practices of participants creating overall better conditions for all, with reduced disease and a cleaner environment, there is also evidence of non-participants changing their own practices, either as individuals or as whole communities supported strongly and enforced by local leaders.

General equilibrium: wider economy effects

Given the short timeframe (2.5 years) of implementation, the likelihood of seeing general equilibrium effects and spillover effects in the wider economy, for example in supply and demand and prices, is low. This is especially affected by cutting short the market-focused interventions under the BRACC programme. Qualitative data, however, do suggest some early signs that point towards such effects should implementation continue. For example, several strands of evidence suggest there is more cash circulating in the local economy, stimulating demand for goods and services. Another potential wider economy effect is on labour markets (weak evidence). Some PROSPER participants mentioned being able to employ labourers because they now have cash to pay them.

We are able to hire casual labourers to do some piecework for us because we have money. In the past, it was hard because we didn't have money to hire and pay a person. We have created a source of livelihood for other people. – Men's FGD_Chikwawa_Maseya_Insurance

District-level interviews from the African Parks project described a range of wider economy effects resulting from the programme. Tourism has picked up due to the improved environment in the reserves, leading to job creation, for example as tour guides and in lodges. This in turn has increased revenues to councils who are able to invest in development activities, sanitation and environmental management, and pay staff.

Programmatic spillover effects

In terms of programme-to-programme spillover effects, improved food security in participant communities means district offices are now reportedly able to focus on other sectors rather than

shoring up food security. In addition, participant communities are widening what they include in the village-level action plans.

As a district we are mostly hit by dry spells or floods. So now these farmers are able to get food from other sources. After getting money from the sales of honey and after investing in VSLAs and engaging themselves in small-scale business, the people are becoming more food secure, and their nutrition is improving. As a district we are now able to invest in other development activities rather than just providing food to the communities. We can now invest in other sectors. Previously, if you go to the communities and tell them to produce their village action plans, all they could think of were activities to do with public works like constructing roads, bridges and school blocks, but now they realise that even issues to do with nutrition, VSLAs and engagement in small-scale business are development. So, they are able to incorporate these in their village-level action plan and subsequently into the district development plan. – SS1 Balaka_Assistant District Forest Officer

One interviewee also reported that learnings from African Parks experiences have been carried over into other programmes and by other NGOs implementing in other areas. Research carried out by BRACC implementers has also been used outside the programme by other actors. Consumer market research and a baseline survey carried out by Modern Cooking for Healthy Forests (MCHF) to understand the urban cooking energy context, and a charcoal point time survey, were designed to be compliant with Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) guidelines and therefore conducted with rigour. This was so others interested in developing a stove, carbon project or a charcoal carbon project, could pick up and use that data. Interviewees have suggested that stove promoters have entered the Malawi market partly as a result of this – pointing to spillover effects in terms of investment and delivery of solutions, from the project to an investor in a private sector entity.

They used the market information package that we developed to understand the market potential. They used the consumer market research and the charcoal data to develop a gold standard carbon project. – MCHF

Spillover effects and sustainability

Some spillover effects provide signals for likely sustainability of BRACC once programme support ends. Training and knowledge building rather than asset transfer seem to be more effective in embedding improved practices in communities. Interviewees mentioned greater motivation of non-participants who emulate and take up new practices introduced by the programme, suggesting self-motivation means the activities are likely to be sustained. However, as these people self-select into the programme, there are likely to be systematic differences between them and people who do not, or are unable to, respond to neighbourhood peer effects. For example, interviewees mentioned access to inputs or capital as a key determinant of being able to carry out agricultural practices, in line with the wider literature that finds liquidity constraints to be associated with lack of adoption among farmers living near to programme participants, which further stymies agricultural productivity and growth.⁷

Some have changed their ways of farming after seeing how we are benefiting, but

⁷ de Janvry A., Emerick, K., Sadoulet, E., & Dar, M. (2016). *The Agricultural Technology Adoption Puzzle: What Can We Learn From Field Experiments?* Ferdi Working paper 178. [pdf](#). de Janvry, A., Macours, K., & Sadoulet, E. (eds). (2017). *Learning for adopting: Technology adoption in developing country agriculture*. Ferdi. [pdf](#). Skevas, T., Skevas I., & Swinton, S.M. (2018). Does spatial dependence affect the intention to make land available for bioenergy crops? *Journal of Agricultural Economics* 69 (2):393-412.

some are continuing with old farming methods because they say sasakawa requires a lot of fertiliser. – Women’s FGD_Phalombe_Kaduya_Mankhamba_Access to Finance

Summary

Evidence from the mid-term evaluation suggests that BRACC interventions are already generating secondary benefits and spillover effects, both for direct programme participants and for the wider community. While evidence for spillovers at the systems level – for example in the local economy – is still nascent, stronger evidence is available for programme effects on the non-target population, owing in part to the programme focus on training. Notably, people who are not participating in the programme are benefiting from knowledge shared about new ways of working. The ability to take up new practices still rests on the availability of resources to do so. The evaluation provides evidence that by just measuring the difference between treatment and control groups in the quantitative impact evaluation, we will not capture the full impact of the programme (both positive and negative). This underestimates the effect on programme participants and does not measure effects on non-participants. The target group therefore needs to be explicitly considered as part of, interacting with and influencing a wider ‘economy’, most importantly in their village, wider community and neighbouring areas.

Acknowledgements

This brief has been distilled out of the evaluation of the BRACC programme undertaken in 2021 by the BRACC Hub. The BRACC Hub is very grateful for all the support and assistance provided during the evaluation by the BRACC programme participants, implementing partners and funder. We would like to thank the team members who were involved in data collection, analysis, and particular studies that fed into the evaluation, including Gulden Bayaz, Nick Brooks, Khandan Danish, Catherine Gould, Obioma Egemonye, Merlin Hanauer, Ying-Syuan (Elaine) Huang, Zemira Humphrey, Jennifer Leavy, Emmillian Kasililika-Mlagha, Mackenzie Klema, Sarah Wilson Knight, Diana Mataya, Matthew McConnachie, Dylan Pyman, Bright Sibale and the Centre for Development Management team, Danny Smith, Kirsti Thornber, Liz Venable, Katharine Vincent and Lena Weingärtner. We would also like to thank Mitzi du Plessis for her help in copyediting and proofreading.