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CCTs first emerged at municipal level in Brazil in 1995, then spread to Mexico in 1997…. (Bangladesh developed similar scheme with food)
Spread of Conditional Cash Transfers Around the World

2007

Exporting the Trademark in LAC and Beyond: The Spreading Influence of CCTs.....

(including recent pilot launched by Mayor Bloomberg in NYC)
Why Are CCTs so Popular?

Three Theories:

1. **Implementation**: Technical design broadly aligns with political
   - What works technically
   - Broadly aligns politically
   - (This is not the case with many policies: e.g., labor, taxation, retirement pensions)

2. **Impacts**: Proven record
   - Importance of data collection, impact evaluations
   - Lots of evidence (internationally)

3. **Politics**:
   - “Philosophical” appeal at both ends of political spectrum
   - Political support, votes
Why Are CCTs so Popular?

Philosophical Appeal Across Political Spectrum

Left:
- Social debt to the poor
- Poverty relief, “emancipation”
- Conditionalities as basic rights

Right:
- Not very expensive
- Not just a cash handout
- Conditionalities as contracts

Hypothesis: Conditionalities play a “political role” in garnering credibility, political support for cash transfers
Bolsa Família in the Headlines

An Analysis of the Media’s Treatment of CCTs in Brazil
Preliminary Results
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DISCLAIMERS

• The findings, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in this presentation are preliminary. They are also entirely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the opinions of the World Bank, its Board of Directors, or the countries it represents.

• This is a research study. It has no links to the World Bank's direct engagement with the Bolsa Família program, or the BFP itself.

• The findings are largely descriptive – based on the readings of the texts in the press, without cross-references to the actual CCT program developments except in a broad, macro-sense.
Outline – Media Analysis

• Brief Background:
  – The Quiet Revolution of Bolsa Família

• Objectives of Media Analysis
  – How has the press treated this quiet revolution in social policy?

• Methodology for Media Analysis

• Preliminary Results
  – Coverage of CCTs in the Media
  – Macro Perceptions & Tone
  – Micro Perceptions: Design & Implementation
    • Overview of Hot Button Topics
    • Drill Downs on Hot Button Topics

• Summary, Take-Away Messages
The Evolution of CCTs in Brazil

Federal Programs Consolidated into Bolsa Família Program in 2003

- Bolsa Escola (2001-03)
- Bolsa Alimentação (2001-03)
- Auxílio Gas (2002-03)

About 100 Sub-National Programs (since 1995)

- Municipal CCTs
- Municipal CCTs
- Municipal CCTs
- State CCTs
Rapid Expansion in Coverage (Scaling Up Dilemma...)

Figure 1 – Rapid Expansion of the BFP (in millions of families and individuals)

Source: MDS.

But still relatively cheap at 0.4% of GDP
The “Quiet Revolution” of Bolsa Família

Innovations in Social Policy

**Brazilian Tradition:**
- CCTs pioneered in mid-1990s
- BFP launched in 2003 to consolidate Social Safety Net
- CCT model has spread to dozens of countries around the world

**CCT Objectives:**
- Alleviate poverty today via cash transfers to poor families
- Reduce poverty tomorrow by conditioning transfers on family investments in human capital (education and health)

**Technical Report Card: Good!**
- Improvements in registry
- Massive recertification
- Payments through banking system
- Conditionalities monitoring
- Oversight and Controls Network
- Innovations for implementation in decentralized context
- Building bridges to complementary services

Impressive Impacts

**Near Universal Coverage of Poor**
- 11.1 million families
- 46 million people
- 25% of population

**Strong targeting outcomes:**
- 73% of benefits to poorest 20%
- 94% of benefits to poorest 40%

**Reducing Poverty & Inequality:**
- BFP accounts for 18% of fall in Gini from 2001-06
- BFP contributed to 25% of fall in extreme poverty from 2001-06

**Human Capital Impacts:**
- School attendance
- Drop-out rates
- Food consumption

**Relatively “cheap” price tag:**
- Less than 0.4% GDP
How Has the Press Treated This “Quiet Revolution” in Social Policy?

Basic Question: What is the debate in the press?

“Macro Perceptions” of CCTs

• How much press coverage?
  - How has this varied over time and with changes in CCT programs?
• How favorable or unfavorable has been the press treatment of CCTs in Brazil? (TONE)
  - How has this tone varied:
    • Over time?
    • With changes in CCTs?
    • With political cycles?

Micro: “Hot Button Issues”

• Which design and implementation issues get the most attention in the press?
  - Coverage, unit values
  - Targeting, registry, payments
  - Fraud and fraud control
  - Conditionalities
  - Welfare dependency and graduation
• How has this attention varied over time?
• What is the flavor of the debate in the press regarding each of these “hot button” issues?

Key Point: Brazil has a Free and Independent Press
Media Analysis Methodology: Overview & Approach

How to Analyze the Media Treatment of CCTs?

• **Unit of analysis** = the printed press
  - Newspaper articles (reports, briefs, interviews, opinion columns)
  - Excludes other important media (radio, television, internet)

• **Study period**: 6 years, two social policy eras:
  - Pre-BFP Era (2001-03): 4 pre-reform programs
  - Bolsa Familia Era (2004-06)

• **Sample of six newspapers**
  - 3 national, 3 state/regional
  - Use search engines to identify all articles that mention CCTs across study period

• **Basic methodology**: catalogue articles into database
  - Read and classify all articles into database (types of articles, key variables)
  - Study patterns using quantitative and qualitative means
Identifying Articles on CCTs Using Search Engines

All Articles Identified: 6,531 Articles

Articles FOCUSED on CCTs: (“Focused Articles”) 1,991 Articles

Articles Merely Mentioning CCTs: (“Mere Mention Articles”) 4,540 Articles
Overview and Classification of Variables

• Basic identification variables
• Contextual Variables
• Perceptions Variables: Tone (see next slides)
• Variables Related to Design and Implementation (see later slide)
Coding the “Tone” Variable: Inherently Subjective

- **Tone Variable:**
  - “What is the take away message on CCTs that the average reader will keep in mind after reading the entire article?”
  - Not tone of single quote, or headline
  - Whole article

- **Inherently subjective:**
  - But biases reduced by fact that all articles were read and coded by one person
  - Database Researcher is:
    - Fluent in Portuguese
    - Politically independent (not Brazilian but strong enough familiarity with Brazil)
    - Technically independent (not MDS or WB staff member)
## Coding the “Tone” Variable: Tone Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tone Category</th>
<th>Perception of CCT CONCEPT</th>
<th>Perception of CCT IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>Overall Tone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Tone = 0</td>
<td>Undefined</td>
<td>Undefined</td>
<td>Undefined (for info only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable Tone = 1</td>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>Favorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguous Tone = 2</td>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Favorable With Limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Tone = 3</td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Variables Related to Design and Implementation:
  - Coverage
  - Value of transfer
  - Funding
  - Registry, targeting & payments
  - Fraud & Fraud Controls
  - Conditionalities
  - Welfare Dependency & Graduation Strategies; Assistentialism
  - Complementary Programs

• “Drill-down” Sub-Databases
  - For themes in RED above
  - Random sub-sample 20% of articles covering each theme
  - Conducted more in-depth analysis of flavor of debate
  - Qualitative and quantitative
How Much Coverage? LOTS

Substantial & Increasing Coverage (saturation by 2006):
- 6,531 articles over total period (only 6 newspapers!)
- Almost twice as many articles in BFP era
- Increased to 2,172 articles in 2006 – averaging an article every day in each newspaper!

Increasing Focus on CCTs Over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articles Focused on CCTs</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>1,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles With Mere Mention of CCTs</td>
<td>1,209</td>
<td>2,877</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Macro Perceptions - Tone

- Scaling up dilemma: (2004 transition)
  - Scale up quickly, improve systems as you go?
  - OR: Pilot first, improve systems before scaling up?

[Graph showing the Evolution of Tone of Press Articles on CCTs over Time from 2001 to 2006, with 0% to 60% range for each year. The graph indicates a transition point in 2004 with a noticeable change in tone.]

(remainder is "no tone", not shown here for visual simplicity)
Macro Aspects: Tone & Electoral Cycles

Elections Bring Increased Scrutiny, Criticism, Regardless of Program or Administration

Average Tone by Quarter and Political Events

- Mere Mention Articles
- Articles Focused on CCTs

More Critical of CCTs

- 3rd Year FHC
- 4th Year FHC
- 1st Year Lula
- 2nd Year Lula
- 3rd Year Lula
- 4th Year Lula

Year Leading to Presidential Elections
Year Leading to Municipal Elections
Launch of Bolsa Familia

Pre-BFP (Bolsa Escola)
Bolsa Familia
Micro Aspects:
Frequency of “Hot Button” Topics

- What design and implementation topics receive the most press coverage?

![Bar Chart]

**Media Treatment of "Hot Button" Implementation**
Features: Frequency by Topic (2001-06)

- Targeting, Payments: 44%
- Coverage: 44%
- Fraud & Controls: 25%
- Conditionalities: 24%
- Unit value: 15%
- Dependency/Exit: 9%
- Financing: 8%
- Compl. Programs: 4%
Micro Aspects: “Hot Button” Trends in Debate – Evolution Over Time

**Media Treatment of Design and Implementation Features: Trends in the Debate**

- Targeting/Registry
- Coverage
- Fraud & Controls
- Conditionalities
- Dependency/exit

First & Second Generation Issues

Interplay between Media & Govt – Technical Aspects
## Media Database: Methodology for Drilling Down on Hot Button Debates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>% of Total Focused Articles</th>
<th>Total Articles (Full Sample)</th>
<th>Drill-Down # (20% Sub-Sample)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cadastro (registry, payments)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud &amp; Fraud Controls</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditionalities</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistencialismo</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare Dependency, Graduation</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Focused Articles Covering Theme:
Micro Aspects: Focus on Registry (1)

Operational Mechanisms

- What operational mechanisms get more attention in press?
- How does this relate to technical improvements over time?
Does the press pay more attention to errors of inclusion or exclusion?

![Frequency of Articles on Targeting Outcomes](image)

- **Targeting Outcomes/Subsample**
- o/w Errors of Exclusion
- o/w Errors of Inclusion

Drill-Down Sub-Sample NOBs = 56
Micro Aspects: Focus on Fraud & Fraud Controls (1)

What is meant by F&E?

- All transfer programs have some degree of fraud & errors
- Technicians distinguish between intentional fraud, corruption vs. errors
- The press also makes this distinction, but the terms are also often used interchangeably

![Graph showing distinction between Fraud and Irregularities in press articles.](image-url)

**Does the Press Distinguish between Fraud and Irregularities?**

Fraud & Error Drill-Down Sample: NOBS = 147 (% of articles in drill-down sample)
Types of Alleged Fraud & Errors Mentioned in Press Articles
(% of articles in EFC drill-down sample; NOBS = 147)

- Clientelistic Fraud
- Error of inclusion
- Duplicated benefits
- Corruption
- Fraudulent use of EBCs
- Error of Exclusion
- Other official error
- Registry out-of-date

NOTE: Reports of fraud & errors do not confirm that fraud and errors occurred.
Micro Aspects: Focus on Fraud & Fraud Controls (3)

Who Alleges Fraud & Errors in Articles

Sources of Allegations of Fraud & Errors in Press Reports
(% of EFC Sub-Sample, NOBS = 147)

Government sources = 33%

Government Ministries
Supreme Audit Agencies
Hotlines & Complaints
Press/Media
Micro Aspects:
Focus on Conditionalities (1)

Conditionalities Do Matter to the Press / Public

Debate on the Importance of Conditionalities in the Press
(Drill-Dow n Sub-Sample, NOBS = 193)

- % of articles mentioning importance of issue (existence, monitoring)

- Existence of Conditionalities
- Monitoring & Compliance

2001-03
2004-06
Micro Aspects: Focus on Conditionalities (2)

Which Conditionalities Get More Attention in Press Reports?

(Drill-Down Sub-Sample  NOBS = 193)
Micro Aspects: Focus on Conditionalities (3)

Who cares more about conditionalities?

Who suggests conditionalities are important?
(% of Drill-Down Sub-Sample, NOBS = 193)

- Program Managers
- Brazilian Researchers
- International...
- Journalists
- Politicians

2001-03  2004-06
Micro Aspects:
Focus on Conditionalities (4)

Why Do Conditionalities Matter?

% of Articles in Drill-Down Sub-Sample, NOBS = 193

- Promote citizens' rights to services: 5%
- For incentives (contract): 25%
- For long-run structural impacts: 40%
- To reduce "assistencialismo": 20%

Political Role of Conditionalities
Micro Aspects:
Welfare Dependency & Graduation Agenda (1)

Overall Frequency (Full Sample – Focused Articles)

Mentions of Welfare Dependency and Graduation Strategy: Evolution

2nd generation CCT issue
Micro Aspects: Welfare Dependency

What is Meant by “Welfare Dependency” in Press Debate?

Drill-Down Sub-Sample, NOBS = 73

What is Meant by "Welfare Dependency" in Press Debate?

% Mentioning Dependency/Sub-Sample

o/w cite reduced work effort

o/w cite dependency on transfer incomes
Micro Aspects: “Assistencialismo” (Mix of Welfare Dependency & Clientelism) (1)

Informants: Who Accuses and Refutes?

Who Accuses CCTs of Being "Assistencialista"?
% of Drill Down Sub-Sample, NOBS = 88

- The Press
- Politicians
- Brazilian Researchers
- Program Managers

Who Refutes Notion of CCTs Being "Assistencialista"?
% of Drill-Down Sub-Sample, NOBS = 88

- Politicians
- The Press
- Int'l Organization Staff
- Program Managers
- Beneficiaries
- Brazilian Researchers
Micro Aspects: “Assistencialismo” (Mix of Welfare Dependency & Clientelism) (2)

How to Reduce Assistentialism Potential?

Proposed Actions Suggested in Press Articles to Reduce “Assistencialist” potential of CCTs:

Frequency of Proposed Solutions to Reduce "Assistencialismo" in CCTs
(Drill-Down Sub-Sample, NOBS = 88)

- "Exit Doors" (Graduation Tools) 35%
- Invest in Education System 20%
- Monitor Conditionalities 15%
- Employment 10%
- Integrate Programs 0%

Political Role of Conditionalities
Micro Aspects: Graduation Agenda: Graduation from Poverty or from the Program? (1)

What is Meant by “Exit Doors” (Portas de Saida)?

Meaning of "Exit Doors"
(Graduation from Program or from Poverty?)
% of Drill-Down Sub-Sample, NOBS = 73

- Emancipation from poverty: 60%
- Tools to promote productivity and employment: 50%
- Exit from the Program (time limits, etc.): 10%
- Dignity and Citizenship: 10%

Brazilian focus on Graduation from Poverty
Examples of “Exit Doors” (Portas de Saida)

Examples of "Exit Doors" Mentioned in Press
% of Drill=Down Sub-Sample, NOBS = 73

- Adult Literacy Programs: 50%
- Job training: 40%
- Micro-credit: 30%
- Health & food security: 15%
- Time Limits on Program: 5%
Why Are CCTs so Popular?

Three Theories:

1. **Implementation:** Technical design broadly aligns with political
   - What works technically
   - Broadly aligns politically
   - (This is not the case with many policies: e.g., labor, taxation, retirement pensions)

2. **Impacts:** Proven record
   - Importance of data collection, impact evaluations
   - Lots of evidence (internationally)

3. **Politics:**
   - “Philosophical” appeal at both ends of political spectrum
   - Political support, votes
## Why CCTs Popular: Theory #1: Intersection of Technical and Political

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Design &amp; Impl.</th>
<th>Political (Media + de Janvry)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Targeting, Registry, Coverage</strong></td>
<td><strong>Targeting, Registry, Coverage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improvements in Registry</td>
<td>• Coverage rewarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strong targeting outcomes</td>
<td>• Errors of inclusion penalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(media analysis; votes – de Janvry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Payments through banking system</strong></td>
<td><strong>Payments: Press Perceptions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(efficiency)</td>
<td>• Payments through EBCs reduce potential for Assistencialismo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oversight and Controls</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fraud, Oversight &amp; Controls:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management tools</td>
<td>• Press critical of fraud, less when controlled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit mechanisms (O&amp;C network)</td>
<td>• Social controls councils important (de Janvry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conditionalities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Conditionalities</strong> (Existence + monitoring)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linking transfers to human capital incentives &amp; impacts</td>
<td>• They do matter in press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• IF monitored, contribute to favorable press</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Philosophical Appeal Across Political Spectrum

Left:
Social debt to the poor
Poverty relief, “emancipation”
Conditionalities as basic rights

Right:
Not very expensive
Not just a cash handout
Conditionalities as contracts

Hypothesis: Conditionalities play a “political role” in garnering credibility, political support for cash transfers

Media Analysis Results:
• Conditionalities do matter in the press, public debate
• IF monitored, they are a “political asset”
• Contribute to overall favorable treatment of CCTs in press due to:
  ➢ Long-run impacts
  ➢ Help reduce perceptions of assistencialismo
  ➢ Boost credibility of transfers
Why CCTs Popular: Theory #2: Proven Impacts – Poverty & Inequality

% of the reduction in **inequality**:  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BFP 18%</th>
<th>BPC 11%</th>
<th>Pensions 27%</th>
<th>2001-06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BFP 41%</td>
<td>BPC 24%</td>
<td>Pensions 27%</td>
<td>2005-06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of the reduction in **extreme poverty** (2001-05):  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BFP 25%</th>
<th>BPC 12%</th>
<th>Pensions 16%</th>
<th>Headcount Index (P0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BFP 33%</td>
<td>BPC 18%</td>
<td>Pensions 16%</td>
<td>Poverty Gap (P1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFP 41%</td>
<td>BPC 22%</td>
<td>Pensions 17%</td>
<td>Severity (P2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Government outlays as % **GDP (costs)** (2004-06):  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pensions 10%</th>
<th>Of which, 40% are tax-financed subsidies (deficit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BFP = 0.4%; BPC = 0.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Lindert et. al. (2006)  
Paes de Barros/IPEA (2007)
Increasing investment in conducting impact evaluations
- >40 evaluation studies of CCTs since launched in 1995
- 16 of which have been conducted for BFP (since 2004)
- Important investments in data collection (PNADs, cedeplar)

Small but increasing media coverage of impacts

Media Treatment of CCTs: % of Articles Reporting on Impacts

Source: Lindert and Vincensini (forthcoming 2010)
Why CCTs Popular: Theory #3: Technical + Impacts => Votes

- Voters were more likely to re-elect incumbent mayors when they were perceived as managing BE program effectively:*
  - If had higher coverage
  - With higher targeting accuracy (perceptions of lower errors of inclusion)
  - If had established local social controls council
  - In municipalities with higher impacts

*Statistically significant results from 2004 municipal elections, controlling for other factors, for sample of 261 randomly-selected municipalities in Northeast. World Bank study by de Janvry, Finan, Sadoulet, Nelson, Lindert, de la Brière, and Lanjouw (2005) and subsequent paper by de Janvry et. Al. (2006)
What has Lula done well in Office?  FIRST MENTION
(IPSOS September 2007)

- **Bolsa Família**: 43%
- Economic Stability: 20%
- Helping the Poor: 10%
- Modernizing the Country: 6%
- Other: 3%
- Pro-Uni: 2%
- Jobs: 1%
- Increasing Minimum Wage: 1%
- Increasing Exports: 1%
- Fighting Corruption: 1%
- Nothing: 8%
- Don't Know: 10%

(all mentions = 54% for BFP, with “helping the poor” 2nd place at 31%)
Why CCTs Popular: Theory #3: CCT => Political Support for Lula

What has Lula done badly in Office (FIRST MENTION) (IPSOS September 2007)

- Corruption
- Air Crisis
- Lack of attention to education
- Lack of investments in
- Unemployment
- Safety
- Other
- Nothing
- Don't know

% of 1000 respondents

(all mentions = 54% for BFP, with “helping the poor” 2nd place at 31%)
Why CCTs Popular: Theory #3: CCT => Political Support for Lula

- Effects of social programs on evaluation of Lula government:
  - Dependent variable = favorability to government
  - “Index of social proximity” (social programs coverage; BFP = highest mention)
  - Statistically and independently significant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>7.291</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexo_m</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>2.565</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age_25_34</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>2.504</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age_35_44</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>2.231</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age_45_59</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>1.365</td>
<td>0.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age_m60</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>1.984</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reg_ne</td>
<td>-0.038</td>
<td>-0.680</td>
<td>0.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reg_se</td>
<td>-0.163</td>
<td>-2.783</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reg_sul</td>
<td>-0.104</td>
<td>-2.055</td>
<td>0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area_capital</td>
<td>-0.149</td>
<td>-2.654</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area_rm</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>-0.959</td>
<td>0.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edu_pri</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>2.229</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edu_gin</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edu_col</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>1.322</td>
<td>0.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pea_pea</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>-1.316</td>
<td>0.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classe_ab</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>-1.119</td>
<td>0.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classe_c</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>-0.373</td>
<td>0.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rda_300_500</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.127</td>
<td>0.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rda_501_1000</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>-0.403</td>
<td>0.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rda_1001_1800</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>0.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rda_m1800</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>-0.294</td>
<td>0.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indice de Benefício -</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>3.681</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IPSOS (May 2006)
Why CCTs Popular: Theory #3: CCT => Political Support for Lula


BFP-PNAD
Previdência - POF
Seg. Desemprego - POF

Taxa de crescimento média da renda familiar per capita por décimo da distribuição no quinquênio 2001-06

Voter Patterns by Income Group (October 2002, 2006; IBOPE)

Lula as "Teflon President": Ranking of "What Lula did good/bad in Office" (IPSOS September 2007)

Opinion Polls

Why CCTs Popular: Theory #3: CCT => Political Support for Lula
Policy Implications for CCTs

- Intersection of technical and political
- Scaling Up Dilemma
- Coverage matters
  - But errors of exclusion less so (ouch!)
- Targeting matters
  - Errors of Inclusion penalized (targeting accuracy)
  - (But in some countries narrow targeting may not sustain political support? e.g., in Europe & Central Asia?)
- Oversight and controls matter
  - As does transparency in reporting
- Conditionalities matter
  - Credibility booster: ↑ LR impacts, ↓ assistencialism
  - Monitoring matters – not just “existence”
- Welfare dependency & Graduation Agenda
  - Important second-generation issue
  - Potential political liability (perceptions of assistencialismo)
Bolsa Família, a nova estrela da área social
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‘Fantástico’ denuncia fraudes no programa Bolsa Família

Enfim, o Bolsa Família