## Appendix D. Alternative $(p, \delta)$ Values

In this section we repeat the exercises generating Panel C in each of the main tables using alternative parameter values $(p, \delta) \in[0,1]^{2}$. We check robustness to a number of values but, in particular, we present results for four points: $(0.1,0.1),(0.1,0.8),(0.8,0.1)$, and $(0.8,0.8)$.

Table D.2: The Correlation between Household Network Characteristics and the Error Rate in Ranking Income Status of Households

|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Panel A: $0.1,0.1)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Degree | $-0.0391 * * *$ |  |  | -0.0377*** | -0.0176*** |  |  | $-0.0131^{* * *}$ |
|  | (0.0012) |  |  | (0.0013) | (0.0008) |  |  | -(0.0011) |
| Clustering |  | $-0.227^{* * *}$ |  | -0.205*** |  | -0.0595*** |  | -0.0649*** |
|  |  | (0.0176) |  | (0.0119) |  | (0.0109) |  | (0.0089) |
| Eigenvector Centrality |  |  | $-0.839^{* * *}$ | -0.0942** |  |  | -0.542*** | -0.211*** |
|  |  |  | (0.0431) | (0.0435) |  |  | (0.0283) | (0.0356) |
| R -squared | 0.481 | 0.053 | 0.161 | 0.531 | 0.879 | 0.84 | 0.878 | 0.888 |
| Panel B: $(0.1,0.8)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Degree | -0.0042*** |  |  | -0.0053*** | -0.0011*** |  |  | -0.0014*** |
|  | (0.0003) |  |  | (0.0004) | (0.0003) |  |  | (0.0004) |
| Clustering |  | -0.0059** |  | -0.0149*** |  | 0.0006 |  | -0.0025 |
|  |  | (0.0024) |  | (0.0024) |  | (0.0019) |  | (0.0020) |
| Eigenvector Centrality |  |  | -0.0091 | 0.0870*** |  |  | $-0.0196^{* * *}$ | 0.0149* |
|  |  |  | (0.0065) | (0.0106) |  |  | (0.0044) | (0.0089) |
| R -squared | 0.095 | 0.001 | 0.000 | 0.118 | 0.281 | 0.278 | 0.279 | 0.281 |
| Panel C: $(0.8,0.1)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Degree | -0.0345*** |  |  | -0.0308*** | -0.0135*** |  |  | -0.0076*** |
|  | (0.0017) |  |  | (0.0016) | (0.0009) |  |  | (0.0013) |
| Clustering |  | $-0.332^{* * *}$ |  | -0.289*** |  | -0.153*** |  | -0.145*** |
|  |  | (0.0197) |  | (0.0167) |  | (0.0127) |  | (0.0122) |
| Eigenvector Centrality |  |  | -0.954*** | -0.280*** |  |  | -0.531*** | $-0.298 * * *$ |
|  |  |  | (0.0478) | (0.0525) |  |  | (0.0310) | (0.0461) |
| R -squared | 0.333 | 0.101 | 0.185 | 0.440 | 0.867 | 0.861 | 0.879 | 0.892 |
| Panel D: $(0.8,0.8)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Degree | $-0.0170^{* * *}$ |  |  | -0.0150*** | -0.0082*** |  |  | -0.0055*** |
|  | (0.0008) |  |  | (0.0008) | (0.0009) |  |  | (0.0013) |
| Clustering |  | -0.147*** |  | -0.123*** |  | -0.0582*** |  | -0.0573*** |
|  |  | (0.0115) |  | (0.0103) |  | (0.0107) |  | (0.0105) |
| Eigenvector Centrality |  |  | $-0.473^{* * *}$ | -0.155*** |  |  | -0.286*** | -0.136*** |
|  |  |  | (0.0247) | (0.0278) |  |  | (0.0247) | (0.0391) |
| R -squared | 0.126 | 0.031 | 0.071 | 0.160 | 0.301 | 0.292 | 0.304 | 0.308 |
| Village Fixed Effect | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

Notes: This table provides estimates of the correlation between a household's network characteristics and its ability to accurately rank the poverty status of other members of the village. The sample comprises 5,633 households. Each panel presents results using simulated data with different parameter values: Panel A has parameter values $(0.1,0.1)$, Panel B has parameter values $(0.1,0.8)$, Panel C has parameter values $(0.8,0.1)$, and Panel D has parameter values $(0.8,0.8)$. Standard errors are clustered by village and are listed in parentheses. *** $\mathrm{p}<0.01$, , $\mathrm{p}<0.05$, * $\mathrm{p}<0.1$.

Table D.3: The Correlation Between Inaccuracy in Ranking a Pair of Households in a Village and the Average Distance to Rankees

|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Panel A: (0.1, 0.1) |  |  |  |  |
| Average Reachability | $\begin{gathered} -0.894 * * * \\ (0.0157) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.683 * * * \\ (0.0178) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.636^{* * *} \\ (0.0208) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.701 * * * \\ (0.0391) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Distance | $\begin{gathered} 0.161 * * * \\ (0.0116) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.108 * * * \\ (0.0095) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.110 * * * \\ (0.0089) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0728^{* *} * \\ (0.0129) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Degree |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0222 * * * \\ (0.0011) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0147 * * * \\ (0.0023) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0169 * * * \\ (0.0024) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Clustering Coefficient |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.133 * * * \\ (0.0171) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.140 * * * \\ (0.0210) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0969 * * * \\ (0.0240) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Eigenvector Centrality |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.0556 \\ (0.0401) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.112 * \\ (0.0659) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0302 \\ (0.0736) \end{gathered}$ |
| R -squared | 0.506 | 0.549 | 0.628 | 0.702 |
| Panel B: $(0.1,0.8)$ |  |  |  |  |
| Average Reachability | $\begin{gathered} -0.0503 * * * \\ (0.0036) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0137 * * * \\ (0.0035) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0192 * * * \\ (0.0034) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00791 \\ (0.0053) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Distance | $\begin{gathered} 0.0172 * * * \\ (0.0018) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0086 * * * \\ (0.0015) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0071 * * * \\ (0.0016) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0035^{*} \\ & (0.0018) \end{aligned}$ |
| Average Degree |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0062 * * * \\ (0.0005) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0045 * * * \\ (0.0007) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0050 * * * \\ (0.0008) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Clustering Coefficient |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0101 * * \\ (0.0040) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0063^{*} \\ (0.0032) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0078^{*} \\ & (0.0040) \end{aligned}$ |
| Average Eigenvector Centrality |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.0913 * * * \\ (0.0131) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0598 * * * \\ (0.0141) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0607 * * * \\ (0.0157) \end{gathered}$ |
| R -squared | 0.018 | 0.050 | 0.105 | 0.388 |
| Panel C: $(0.8,0.1)$ |  |  |  |  |
| Average Reachability | $\begin{gathered} -1.022 * * * \\ (0.0077) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.868 * * * \\ (0.0097) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.830 * * * \\ (0.0124) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -1.164 * * * \\ (0.0418) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Distance | $\begin{gathered} 0.0290^{*} * * \\ (0.0033) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0116^{* * *} \\ (0.0032) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00200 \\ (0.0026) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.00763 \\ & (0.0054) \end{aligned}$ |
| Average Degree |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0091 * * * \\ -(0.0005) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0088 * * * \\ -(0.0018) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0055 * * * \\ -(0.0015) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Clustering Coefficient |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.127 * * * \\ (0.0115) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.167 * * * \\ (0.0172) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0602 * * * \\ (0.0143) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Eigenvector Centrality |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.221 * * * \\ (0.0188) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.350 * * * \\ (0.0625) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0936^{*} \\ & (0.0549) \end{aligned}$ |
| R -squared | 0.854 | 0.871 | 0.885 | 0.932 |
|  | Panel | (0.8, 0.8) |  |  |
| Average Reachability | $\begin{gathered} -0.479 * * * \\ (0.0058) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.411 * * * \\ (0.0085) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.390^{* * *} \\ (0.0117) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.516 * * * \\ (0.0197) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Distance | $\begin{gathered} 0.0261^{* * *} \\ (0.0043) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0085^{*} \\ & (0.0046) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0147 * * \\ (0.0062) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00389 \\ & (0.0034) \end{aligned}$ |
| Average Degree |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0042 * * * \\ (0.0004) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0037 * * * \\ (0.0010) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0027 * * * \\ (0.0008) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Clustering Coefficient |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0670^{* * *} \\ (0.0066) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0834 * * * \\ (0.0090) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0338^{* * *} \\ (0.0080) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Eigenvector Centrality |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0798 * * * \\ (0.0137) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.144 * * * \\ (0.0341) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0475 \\ (0.0295) \end{gathered}$ |
| R -squared | 0.333 | 0.339 | 0.353 | 0.913 |
| Physical Controls | No | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Village FE | No | No | Yes | No |
| Ranker FE | No | No | No | Yes |

Notes: This table provides an estimate of the correlation between the accuracy in ranking a pair of households in a village and the characteristics of the households that are being ranked. The outcome variables are whether $i$ ranks $j$ versus $k$ incorrectly in the simulated data. Each panel presents results using simulated data with different parameter values, as described in Appendix D: Panel A has parameter values ( $0.1,0.1$ ), Panel B has parameter values $(0.1,0.8)$, Panel C has parameter values $(0.8,0.1)$, and Panel D has parameter values $(0.8,0.8)$. Standard errors are clustered by village and are listed in parentheses. ${ }^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<0.01, * * \mathrm{p}<0.05$, * $\mathrm{p}<0.1$.

Table D.4: Stochastic Dominance

|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Panel A: (0.1, 0.1) |  |  |  |  |
| I fosd J | $\begin{gathered} -0.188 * * * \\ (0.0168) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.397 * * * \\ (0.0241) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.201 * * * \\ (0.0168) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.400 * * * \\ (0.0236) \end{gathered}$ |
| J fosd I | $\begin{gathered} 0.213 * * * \\ (0.0187) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.228 * * * \\ (0.0172) \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Observations | 179,101 | 130,739 | 179,101 | 130,739 |
| Panel B: (0.1, 0.8) |  |  |  |  |
| I fosd J | $\begin{gathered} -0.199 * * * \\ (0.0170) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.428 * * * \\ (0.0255) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.213 * * * \\ (0.0167) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.433 * * * \\ (0.0243) \end{gathered}$ |
| J fosd I | $\begin{gathered} 0.235 * * * \\ (0.0189) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.253 * * * \\ (0.0178) \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Observations | 179,101 | 130,739 | 179,101 | 130,739 |
| Panel C: $(0.8,0.1)$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | (0.0181) | (0.0264) | (0.0175) | (0.0256) |
| J fosd I | $\begin{gathered} 0.135 * * * \\ (0.0194) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.142 * * * \\ (0.0189) \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Observations | 179,101 | 130,739 | 179,101 | 130,739 |
| Panel D: $(0.8,0.8)$ |  |  |  |  |
| I fosd J | $\begin{gathered} -0.110 * * * \\ (0.0185) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.242 * * * \\ (0.0257) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.129 * * * \\ (0.0173) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.258 * * * \\ (0.0250) \end{gathered}$ |
| J fosd I | $\begin{aligned} & 0.129 * * * \\ & (0.0183) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.144 * * * \\ (0.0180) \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Observations | 179,101 | 130,739 | 179,101 | 130,739 |
| Non-Comparable | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Physical Controls | No | No | Yes | Yes |
| Stratification Group FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

Notes: In these regressions, the outcome variable is a dummy for whether the error rate of village $I$ exceeds the error rate of village $J$ averaged over simulations. When included, physical controls are differences between the standard controls for villages $I$ and $J$. Each panel presents results using simulated data with different parameter values, as described in Appendix D: Panel A has parameter values ( $0.1,0.1$ ), Panel B has parameter values ( $0.1,0.8$ ), Panel C has parameter values $(0.8,0.1)$, and Panel D has parameter values ( $0.8,0.8$ ). Standard errors in parentheses, two-way clustered at I and J. *** $\mathrm{p}<0.01,{ }^{* *} \mathrm{p}<0.05$, * $\mathrm{p}<0.1$.

|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Panel $A$ | (1, 0.1) |  |  |  |  |
| Average Degree | $\begin{gathered} -0.0425 * * * \\ (0.0043) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0364^{* *} \\ & (0.0139) \end{aligned}$ |
| Average Clustering |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.422 * * * \\ (0.0682) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.364^{* * *} \\ (0.105) \end{gathered}$ |
| Number of Households |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.0000 \\ (0.0003) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.0000 \\ (0.0005) \end{gathered}$ |
| First Eigenvalue of Adjacency Matrix |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0384^{* * *} \\ (0.0040) \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0491^{* * *} \\ (0.0074) \end{gathered}$ |
| Fraction of Nodes in Giant Component |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.478^{* * *} \\ (0.0597) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.591 * * * \\ (0.0840) \end{gathered}$ |
| Link Density |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.552^{* * *} \\ (0.108) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.275^{*} \\ & (0.149) \end{aligned}$ |
| R-squared | 0.603 | 0.536 | 0.489 | 0.639 | 0.588 | 0.526 | 0.681 |
|  |  | Panel B | .1, 0.8) |  |  |  |  |
| Average Degree | $\begin{gathered} -0.0086 * * * \\ (0.0009) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0140 * * * \\ (0.0033) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Clustering |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0647 * * * \\ (0.0112) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.0530^{* * *} \\ (0.0144) \end{gathered}$ |
| Number of Households |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.0000 \\ (0.0001) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.0000 \\ (0.0000) \end{gathered}$ |
| First Eigenvalue of Adjacency Matrix |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0070^{* * *} \\ (0.0008) \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0008 \\ (0.0017) \end{gathered}$ |
| Fraction of Nodes in Giant Component |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0501 * * * \\ (0.0066) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0328^{* *} \\ & (0.0140) \end{aligned}$ |
| Link Density |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.110^{* * *} \\ (0.0206) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0484 \\ (0.0334) \end{gathered}$ |
| R-squared | 0.528 | 0.335 | 0.277 | 0.541 | 0.334 | 0.355 | 0.596 |
|  |  | Panel C | .8, 0.1) |  |  |  |  |
| Average Degree | $\begin{gathered} -0.0335 * * * \\ (0.0051) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.0673^{* * *} \\ (0.0135) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Clustering |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.378 * * * \\ (0.0771) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.512^{* * *} \\ (0.160) \end{gathered}$ |
| Number of Households |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.0005 \\ (0.0004) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.0000 \\ (0.0006) \end{gathered}$ |
| First Eigenvalue of Adjacency Matrix |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0294 * * * \\ (0.0044) \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0504^{* * *} \\ (0.0067) \end{gathered}$ |
| Fraction of Nodes in Giant Component |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.543^{* * *} \\ (0.0658) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.982 * * * \\ (0.109) \end{gathered}$ |
| Link Density |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.465^{* * *} \\ (0.0983) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.356^{* *} \\ (0.151) \end{gathered}$ |
| R -squared | 0.554 | 0.524 | 0.493 | 0.569 | 0.603 | 0.514 | 0.672 |
|  |  | Panel D | . $8,0.8)$ |  |  |  |  |
| Average Degree | $\begin{gathered} -0.0157^{* * *} \\ (0.0024) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.0289 * * * \\ (0.0068) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Clustering |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.174^{* * *} \\ (0.0369) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0.234^{* * *} \\ & (0.0742) \end{aligned}$ |
| Number of Households |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.0002 \\ (0.0002) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.0000 \\ (0.0003) \end{gathered}$ |
| First Eigenvalue of Adjacency Matrix |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0138^{* * *} \\ (0.0021) \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0226 * * * \\ (0.0033) \end{gathered}$ |
| Fraction of Nodes in Giant Component |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.247 * * * \\ (0.0306) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.435 * * * \\ (0.0485) \end{gathered}$ |
| Link Density |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.217^{* * *} \\ (0.0482) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.158^{* *} \\ & (0.0770) \end{aligned}$ |
| R -squared | 0.546 | 0.515 | 0.485 | 0.560 | 0.588 | 0.506 | 0.650 |
| Notes: This table provides village network characteristics and the error rate in ranking others in the village. Columns 1-6 show the univariate regressions, while column 7 provides the multvariate regressions. Physical covariates include consumption, education, PMT score, agricultural share, education of household head and RT head, urban dummy, stratification group FE, and inequality. The sample comprises 631 villages. Each panel presents results using simulated data with different parameter values, as described in Appendix D: Panel A has parameter values ( $0.1,0.1$ ), Panel B has parameter values $(0.1,0.8)$, Panel C has parameter values $(0.8,0.1)$, and Panel $D$ has parameter values $(0.8,0.8)$. Robust standard errors are in parentheses, $* * * p<0.01, * *$ $\mathrm{p}<0.05$, * $\mathrm{p}<0.1$. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Appendix E. Alternative Outcome Variable Definitions

In this section we repeat the exercises of the main tables in the paper using a different outcome variable. Instead of defining an individual $i$ 's assessment of $j$ versus $k$ as incorrect if they refuse to report an answer to the comparison, we treat it as correct with probability $1 / 2$ and incorrect with probability $1 / 2$.

Table E.1: Outcome Variables

|  | Mean <br> (1) | Standard Deviation <br> (2) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Panel A: Village level |  |  |
| Error rate (consumption) | 0.40 | 0.13 |
| Error rate (self-assessment) | 0.33 | 0.16 |
| Panel B: Household level |  |  |
| Error rate (consumption) | 0.40 | 0.10 |
| Error rate (self-assessment) | 0.33 | 0.12 |

Notes: Panel A provides information on the average level of competency in the village in assessing the poverty level of other members of the village in the 631 villages in the sample. Panel B provides equivalent sample statistics for the 5,633 households in the sample.

Table E.2A: The Correlation between Household Network Characteristics and the Error Rate in Ranking Income Status of Households

|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Panel A: Error Rate Based on Consumption |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Degree | $\begin{gathered} -0.0016^{* * *} \\ (0.0006) \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0012 * \\ & (0.0007) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0009 * * \\ (0.0004) \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.001 \\ (0.0007) \end{gathered}$ |
| Clustering |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0173^{* *} \\ (0.0069) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0121^{*} \\ & (0.0069) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0067 \\ & (0.0047) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0078 \\ & (0.0052) \end{aligned}$ |
| Eigenvector centrality |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0490 * * * \\ (0.0182) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0184 \\ (0.0247) \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0208 \\ & (0.0129) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0052 \\ (0.0209) \end{gathered}$ |
| R -squared | 0.004 | 0.002 | 0.003 | 0.005 | 0.562 | 0.562 | 0.562 | 0.563 |
| Panel B: Error Rate Based on Self-Assessment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Degree | $\begin{gathered} -0.00402 * * * \\ (0.0008) \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0043 * * * \\ (0.0010) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0017 * * * \\ (0.0005) \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0018^{* *} \\ (0.0008) \end{gathered}$ |
| Clustering |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0198 * * \\ (0.0087) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0159^{*} \\ & (0.0086) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.0007 \\ (0.0061) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0007 \\ & (0.0068) \end{aligned}$ |
| Eigenvector centrality |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0583^{* *} \\ (0.0232) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0285 \\ (0.0325) \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0344^{* *} \\ (0.0154) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0052 \\ (0.0264) \end{gathered}$ |
| R -squared | 0.015 | 0.001 | 0.002 | 0.016 | 0.563 | 0.562 | 0.562 | 0.563 |
| Panel C: Error Rate Based on Simulation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Degree | $\begin{gathered} -0.0114^{* * *} \\ (0.0005) \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0103 * * * \\ (0.0005) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0053 * * * \\ (0.0004) \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0035 * * * \\ (0.0006) \end{gathered}$ |
| Clustering |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0914 * * * \\ (0.0065) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0780 * * * \\ (0.0053) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0318 * * * \\ (0.0053) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0313 * * * \\ (0.0050) \end{gathered}$ |
| Eigenvector centrality |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.301 * * * \\ (0.0147) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0858 * * * \\ (0.0162) \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.182 * * * \\ (0.0125) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0880^{* * *} \\ (0.0192) \end{gathered}$ |
| R-squared | 0.227 | 0.048 | 0.115 | 0.278 | 0.490 | 0.472 | 0.493 | 0.499 |
| Village Fixed Effect | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

Notes: This table provides estimates of the correlation between a household's network characteristics and its ability to accurately rank the poverty status of other members of the village. The sample comprises 5,633 households. The mean of the dependent variable in Panel A (a household's error rate in ranking others in the village based on consumption) is 0.40 , while the mean of the dependent variable in Panel B (a household's error rate in ranking others in the village based on a household's own self-assessment of poverty status) is 0.33 . Details of the simulation procedure for Panel C are contained in Appendix B. Standard errors are clustered by village and are listed in parentheses. *** $\mathrm{p}<0.01,{ }^{* *} \mathrm{p}<0.05,{ }^{*} \mathrm{p}<0.1$.

Table E.2B: The Correlation between Household Network Characteristics and the Error Rate in Ranking Income Status of Households, Controlling for

| Household Characteristics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| Panel A: Error Rate Based on Consumption |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Degree | $\begin{gathered} -0.0016^{* * *} \\ (0.0006) \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0013 * \\ & (0.0007) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0007 \\ & (0.0004) \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0008 \\ & (0.0007) \end{aligned}$ |
| Clustering |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0170^{* *} \\ (0.0069) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0121^{*} \\ & (0.0069) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0067 \\ (0.0047) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0076 \\ & (0.0052) \end{aligned}$ |
| Eigenvector Centrality |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0472 * * \\ (0.0185) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0167 \\ & (0.0249) \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0173 \\ (0.0130) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0049 \\ (0.0208) \end{gathered}$ |
| R-squared | 0.005 | 0.004 | 0.005 | 0.007 | 0.564 | 0.564 | 0.564 | 0.564 |
| Panel B: Error Rate Based on Self-Assessment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Degree | $\begin{gathered} -0.0032 * * * \\ (0.0008) \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0034 * * * \\ (0.0010) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0014 * * * \\ (0.0005) \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0015^{*} \\ (0.0008) \end{gathered}$ |
| Clustering |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0184^{* *} \\ (0.0085) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0152^{*} \\ & (0.0086) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.0008 \\ (0.0060) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0007 \\ & (0.0068) \end{aligned}$ |
| Eigenvector Centrality |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0491 * * \\ (0.0232) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0201 \\ (0.0328) \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0257 * \\ & (0.0155) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0072 \\ (0.0263) \end{gathered}$ |
| R -squared | 0.024 | 0.017 | 0.017 | 0.025 | 0.566 | 0.565 | 0.565 | 0.566 |
| Panel C: Error Rate Based on Simulation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Degree | $\begin{gathered} -0.0113 * * * \\ (0.0005) \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0101^{* * *} \\ (0.0005) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0053^{* * *} \\ (0.0004) \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0035^{* * *} \\ (0.0006) \end{gathered}$ |
| Clustering |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0920 * * * \\ (0.0064) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0776 * * * \\ (0.0054) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0325^{* * *} \\ (0.0053) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0317 * * * \\ (0.0050) \end{gathered}$ |
| Eigenvector Centrality |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.301 * * * \\ (0.0148) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0903 * * * \\ (0.0163) \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.181 * * * \\ (0.0126) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0876 * * * \\ (0.0191) \end{gathered}$ |
| R-squared | 0.228 | 0.067 | 0.132 | 0.28 | 0.49 | 0.474 | 0.494 | 0.5 |
| Village FE | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

Notes: This table provides estimates of the correlation between a household's network characteristics and its ability to accurately rank the poverty status of other members of the village, controlling for household's characteristics. The sample comprises 5,630 households. The mean of the dependent variable in Panel A (a household's error rate in ranking others in the village based on consumption) is 0.40 , while the mean of the dependent variable in Panel B (a household's error rate in ranking others in the village based on a household's own self-assessment of povert status) is 0.33 . Details of the simulation procedure for Panel C are contained in Appendix B. Standard errors are clustered by village and are listed in parentheses. ${ }^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<0.01, * * \mathrm{p}<0.05$, * $\mathrm{p}<0.1$.

Table E.3: The Correlation Between the Accurately in Ranking a Pair of Households in a Village and the Average Distance to Rankees

|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Panel A: Consumption Metric |  |  |  |  |
| Average Reachability | $\begin{gathered} -0.0403 * * * \\ (0.0112) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0379 * * * \\ (0.0113) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0235 * * * \\ (0.0082) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0339 \\ (0.0223) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Distance | $\begin{gathered} 0.0093 \\ (0.0063) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0059 \\ (0.0059) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0070^{*} \\ & (0.0042) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0143^{*} \\ & (0.0077) \end{aligned}$ |
| Average Degree |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0011 \\ & (0.0010) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0020 \\ (0.0020) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0020 \\ (0.0020) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Clustering Coefficient |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.0144 \\ (0.0142) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0273^{*} \\ & (0.0164) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.026 \\ (0.0176) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Eigenvector Centrality |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0078 \\ & (0.0350) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0645 \\ (0.0560) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0575 \\ & (0.0570) \end{aligned}$ |
| R -squared | 0.001 | 0.003 | 0.052 | 0.091 |
| Panel B: Self-Assessment Metric |  |  |  |  |
| Average Reachability | $\begin{gathered} -0.0688 * * * \\ (0.0138) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0469 * * * \\ (0.0138) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0254 * * * \\ (0.0089) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0136 \\ & (0.0228) \end{aligned}$ |
| Average Distance | $\begin{gathered} 0.0105 \\ (0.0078) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0079 \\ (0.0073) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0061 \\ (0.0045) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0091 \\ (0.0084) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Degree |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0015 \\ & (0.0013) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0014 \\ (0.0022) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0010 \\ (0.0023) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Clustering Coefficient |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0138 \\ (0.0165) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0032 \\ (0.0189) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0008 \\ (0.0196) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Eigenvector Centrality |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.042 \\ (0.0422) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0105 \\ & (0.0607) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0161 \\ & (0.0624) \end{aligned}$ |
| R -squared | 0.003 | 0.005 | 0.090 | 0.156 |
| Panel C: Simulation |  |  |  |  |
| Average Reachability | $\begin{gathered} -0.311 * * * \\ (0.0034) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.255 * * * \\ (0.0044) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.240^{* * *} \\ (0.0061) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.304 * * * \\ (0.0109) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Distance | $\begin{gathered} 0.0340 * * * \\ (0.0029) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0204 * * * \\ (0.0027) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0225 * * * \\ (0.0033) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0159 * * * \\ (0.0030) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Degree |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0038^{* * *} \\ (0.0003) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0031 * * * \\ (0.0006) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0028 * * * \\ (0.0006) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Clustering Coefficient |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0521 * * * \\ (0.0043) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0609 * * * \\ (0.0061) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0374 * * * \\ (0.0065) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Eigenvector Centrality |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0420 * * * \\ (0.0077) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0775 * * * \\ (0.0203) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0271 \\ & (0.0199) \end{aligned}$ |
| Physical Controls | No | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Village FE | No | No | Yes | No |
| Ranker FE | No | No | No | Yes |

Notes: This table provides an estimate of the correlation between the accuracy in ranking a pair of households in a village and the characteristics of the households that are being ranked. In Panel A, the dependent variable is a dummy variable for whether person $i$ ranks person $j$ versus person $k$ correctly based on using consumption as the metric of truth (the sample mean is 0.40 ). In Panel B, the self-assessment variable is the metric of truth (the sample mean is 0.33 ). The sample is comprised of 155,751 ranked pairs in Panel A and 117,157 in Panel B. Details of the simulation procedure for Panel C are contained in Appendix B. Standard errors are clustered by village and are listed in parentheses. ${ }^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<0.01, * * p<0.05$, * $\mathrm{p}<0.1$.

Table E.4: Stochastic Dominance

|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Panel A: Consumption Metric |  |  |  |  |
| I fosd J | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0251 \\ & (0.0190) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0131 \\ (0.0300) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0655 * * * \\ (0.0192) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0756^{* *} \\ (0.0295) \end{gathered}$ |
| J fosd I | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0121 \\ & (0.0186) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.0238 \\ (0.0184) \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Observations | 192,510 | 141,755 | 192,510 | 141,755 |
| Panel B: Self-Assessment Metric |  |  |  |  |
| I fosd J | $\begin{gathered} -0.0660 * * * \\ (0.0179) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.114^{* * *} \\ (0.0270) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0585 * * * \\ (0.0183) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0916 * * * \\ (0.0272) \end{gathered}$ |
| J fosd I | $\begin{gathered} 0.0519 * * * \\ (0.0174) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.0483 * * * \\ (0.0178) \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Observations | 192,510 | 141,755 | 192,510 | 141,755 |
|  | Panel C: | Simulation |  |  |
| I fosd J | $\begin{gathered} -0.131 * * * \\ (0.0180) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.297 * * * \\ (0.0251) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.154 * * * \\ (0.0172) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.319 * * * \\ (0.0245) \end{gathered}$ |
| J fosd I | $\begin{gathered} 0.165 * * * \\ (0.0185) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.185 * * * \\ (0.0179) \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Observations | 179,101 | 130,739 | 179,101 | 130,739 |
| Non-Comparable | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Physical Controls | No | No | Yes | Yes |
| Stratification Group FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

Notes: In these regressions, the outcome variable is a dummy for whether the error rate of village $I$ exceeds the error rate of village $J$. When included, physical controls are differences between the standard controls for villages $I$ and $J$. Details of the simulation procedure for Panel C are contained in Appendix B. Standard errors in parentheses are two-way clustered at $I$ and $J .{ }^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<0.01, * * \mathrm{p}<0.05$, * $\mathrm{p}<0.1$

Table E.5: Correlation between Village Network Characteristics and Village-Level Error Rate


## Appendix F. Tables without Physical Covariates

In this section we repeat the exercises of the main tables but do not include physical covariates.

Table F.3: The Correlation Between Inaccuracy in Ranking a Pair of Households in a Village and the Average Distance to Rankees

| Average Distance to Rankees |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| Panel A: Consumption Metric |  |  |  |  |
| Average Reachability | $\begin{gathered} -0.154 * * * \\ (0.0187) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0937 * * * \\ (0.0184) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0780^{* * *} \\ (0.0129) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0678 * * \\ (0.0283) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Distance | $\begin{gathered} 0.0215 * * \\ (0.0104) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0084 \\ (0.0098) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0193 * * * \\ (0.0058) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0211 * * \\ & (0.0099) \end{aligned}$ |
| Average Degree |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0076 * * * \\ (0.0015) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0007 \\ (0.0026) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0002 \\ (0.0026) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Clustering Coefficient |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0047 \\ (0.0218) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0184 \\ (0.0220) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0165 \\ (0.0231) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Eigenvector Centrality |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.0611 \\ (0.0544) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0701 \\ (0.0723) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0789 \\ (0.0758) \end{gathered}$ |
| R-squared | 0.009 | 0.011 | 0.109 | 0.165 |
| Panel B: Self-Assessment Metric |  |  |  |  |
| Average Reachability | $\begin{gathered} -0.202 * * * \\ (0.0246) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.115^{* * *} \\ (0.0239) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0862^{* * *} \\ (0.0153) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0439 \\ (0.0328) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Distance | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0249^{*} \\ & (0.0132) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0087 \\ (0.0124) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0203 * * * \\ (0.0072) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0161 \\ (0.0126) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Degree |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0123 * * * \\ (0.0020) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0009 \\ (0.0031) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0018 \\ (0.0032) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Clustering Coefficient |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.0258 \\ & (0.0275) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.007 \\ (0.0273) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0104 \\ (0.0276) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Eigenvector Centrality |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0.180 * * \\ & (0.0742) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0324 \\ (0.0907) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0012 \\ (0.0952) \end{gathered}$ |
| R-squared | 0.016 | 0.023 | 0.184 | 0.268 |
| Panel C: Simulation |  |  |  |  |
| Average Reachability | $\begin{gathered} -0.765 * * * \\ (0.0078) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.624 * * * \\ (0.0103) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.578 * * * \\ (0.0142) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.726 * * * \\ (0.0290) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Distance | $\begin{gathered} 0.0938 * * * \\ (0.0064) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0583 * * * \\ (0.0059) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0594 * * * \\ (0.0069) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0419 * * * \\ (0.0094) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Degree |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0102 * * * \\ (0.0006) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00793 * * * \\ (0.0016) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00736 * * * \\ (0.0016) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Clustering Coefficient |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0987 * * * \\ (0.0103) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.113 * * * \\ (0.0143) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0582 * * * \\ (0.0145) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Eigenvector Centrality |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.124 * * * \\ (0.0216) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.199 * * * \\ (0.0507) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.0834 \\ (0.0513) \end{gathered}$ |
| R -squared | 0.597 | 0.619 | 0.649 | 0.868 |
| Physical Controls | No | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Village FE | No | No | Yes | Yes |
| Ranker FE | No | No | No | Yes |

Notes: This table provides an estimate of the correlation between the accuracy in ranking a pair of households in a village and the characteristics of the households that are being ranked. In Panel A, the dependent variable is a dummy variable for whether person $i$ ranks person $j$ versus person $k$ incorrectly based on using consumption as the metric of truth (the sample mean is 0.497 ). In Panel B, the self-assessment variable is the metric of truth (the sample mean is 0.464 ). In Panel C, the outcome variables are whether $i$ ranks $j$ versus $k$ incorrectly in the simulated data, described in greater detail in Appendix B. The sample is comprised of 155,751 ranked pairs in Panel A, 117,157 in Panel B, and 139,420 in Panel C. Standard errors are clustered by village and are listed in parentheses. ${ }^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<0.01,{ }^{* *} \mathrm{p}<0.05,{ }^{*} \mathrm{p}<0.1$.

Table F.5: Correlation between Village Network Characteristics and Village-Level Error Rate

|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Panel A: Consumption Metric |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Degree | $\begin{gathered} -0.0176 * * * \\ (0.0024) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.0318 * * * \\ (0.0101) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Clustering |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.319^{* * *} \\ (0.0368) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.325 * * * \\ (0.0814) \end{gathered}$ |
| Number of Households |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.0007 * * * \\ (0.0003) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.0003 \\ (0.0004) \end{gathered}$ |
| First Eigenvalue of Adjacency Matrix |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0151 * * * \\ (0.0020) \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0191 * * * \\ (0.0052) \end{gathered}$ |
| Fraction of Nodes in Giant Component |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.235 * * * \\ (0.0272) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.196 * * * \\ (0.0605) \end{gathered}$ |
| Link Density |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.288 * * * \\ (0.0668) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.150 \\ (0.119) \end{gathered}$ |
| R-squared | 0.077 | 0.116 | 0.014 | 0.079 | 0.117 | 0.033 | 0.164 |
| Panel B: Self-Assessment Metric |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Degree | $\begin{gathered} -0.0276 * * * \\ (0.0029) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0294 * * \\ & (0.0124) \end{aligned}$ |
| Average Clustering |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.495 * * * \\ (0.0431) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.476 * * * \\ (0.106) \end{gathered}$ |
| Number of Households |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.0014 * * * \\ (0.0003) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.0003 \\ (0.0004) \end{gathered}$ |
| First Eigenvalue of Adjacency Matrix |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0206 * * * \\ (0.0025) \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0165 * * \\ (0.0066) \end{gathered}$ |
| Fraction of Nodes in Giant Component |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.355 * * * \\ (0.0319) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.219 * * * \\ (0.0779) \end{gathered}$ |
| Link Density |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.524 * * * \\ (0.0816) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.163 \\ (0.148) \end{gathered}$ |
| R-squared | 0.115 | 0.170 | 0.029 | 0.090 | 0.161 | 0.066 | 0.198 |
|  |  | Panel C | Simulation |  |  |  |  |
| Average Degree | $\begin{gathered} -0.0328 * * * \\ (0.0027) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.0846 * * * \\ (0.0100) \end{gathered}$ |
| Average Clustering |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.389 * * * \\ (0.0404) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0.433 * * * \\ & (0.0895) \end{aligned}$ |
| Number of Households |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.0012 * * * \\ (0.0003) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.0008 * * \\ (0.0003) \end{gathered}$ |
| First Eigenvalue of Adjacency Matrix |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0330 * * * \\ (0.0025) \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.0634^{* * *} \\ (0.0063) \end{gathered}$ |
| Fraction of Nodes in Giant Component |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.422 * * * \\ (0.0278) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.770 * * * \\ (0.0623) \end{gathered}$ |
| Link Density |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.599 * * * \\ (0.0775) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.557 * * * \\ (0.115) \end{gathered}$ |
| R-squared | 0.198 | 0.124 | 0.025 | 0.269 | 0.267 | 0.107 | 0.470 |

Notes: This table provides village network characteristics and the error rate in ranking others in the village. Columns 1-6 show the univariate regressions, while column 7 provides the multvariate regressions. The sample comprises 631 villages. Panel A presents results for error rates using the consumption metric. Panel B presents results for error rates using the self-assessment metric. Panel C presents results for error rates using simulated data, as described in Appendix B. Robust standard errors in parentheses, *** $\mathrm{p}<0.01, * * \mathrm{p} 58.05, * \mathrm{p}<0.1$.

