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Overall Aims

1) Review quantitative and qualitative evidence linking cash transfers (CT) and IPV, focusing on mechanisms underlying impacts

2) Using a ‘realist informed’ perspective, build a program theory linking CT and IPV

3) Propose promising program design features and research gaps needed to further understand linkages/leverage potential of CTs
# Theoretical viewpoints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Use of IPV</th>
<th>Response to increase in woman’s income [resources]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolute resource or stress</td>
<td>Improve aggressor’s self-esteem or release frustration</td>
<td>Decrease in IPV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargaining (Extractive)</td>
<td>Extract resources from the victim or her family</td>
<td>Increase in IPV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargaining (Instrumental)</td>
<td>Control the victim’s behavior or allocation of resources within the household</td>
<td>Ambiguous relationship with IPV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital dependency or feminist</td>
<td>Assert and maintain male authority</td>
<td>Ambiguous relationship with IPV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Study design

- **Studies identified via**: scoping, expert interviews, electronic databases, forward and backward citation

- **Inclusion criteria** (15 quantitative & 9 qualitative):
  - Published or grey literature completed before June 2017
  - **IPV**: Physical, sexual, emotional, psychological, controlling behaviours between marital/cohabiting/dating partners
  - **CT**: CCTs, UCTs, one-time lump transfers, bundled
  - **Quantitative** if utilized an experimental or quasi-experimental design, including a rigorously defined counterfactual
  - **Qualitative** if methodology sufficiently rigorous to be assessed as credible using the COREQ assessment tool
Nearly all programs targeted women (*Kenya, South Africa)

10 quantitative & 3 qualitative Govt run

‘Plus’: In-kind transfer; Education, health sector linkages; trainings; behavior change communication

Multiple in Mexico, Ecuador, Peru, Uganda
**Mixed:** Nuwakora, 2014 (Uganda); Haushofer & Shapiro, 2016 (Kenya)

**Increase:** Green et al. 2015 (Uganda)
Pathway 1: Economic security & emotional wellbeing

- 4 quantitative and 5 qualitative supported pathway
- Linear linkages well supported by large body of rigorous literature

“Well, I think that it [relationship with partner] improved a lot, because as we were saying, the way to a man’s heart is his stomach, so the basic food improves the relationship, and the family gets integrated…”

Male from FGD in Cash, Food & Voucher Transfers plus nutrition training in Northern Ecuador (Buller et al. 2016)
Pathway 2: Intra-household conflict

- 0 quantitative and 7 qualitative supported pathway
- Linear linkages supported by reviews and select studies

“There had been many fights. Because children needed many things that we could not have afforded. I asked my husband and he used to say there is no money. Then I used to get upset and started to yell. We had many fights because of poverty. Not only for us, for all poor, fights come from suffering”

Female from IDI in CCT plus in-kind transfers in Turkey (Yidrim et al. 2014)
Pathway 3: Women’s empowerment

- 11 quantitative and 5 qualitative supported pathway
- Large body of literature with mixed/inconclusive findings

“Earlier, … my husband would sometimes sell household items without consulting me. But now that I have my own money, I can have a say on how to spend income. …With the money, a woman may buy seedlings for planting, and hire an ox-plough or tractor or casual labor to dig for her. In case of GBV, the man cannot complain that the woman has made-off with his money or his crops from the garden.”

Female from IDI in UCT in Northern Uganda (Nuwakora 2014)
Program design features

- Intra-HH relationships are key: design features to allow women to **retain control** (messaging, frequency, size of transfer)
- Woman as **transfer recipient** appears important, but few tests of this theory
- **Plus components** potential for synergies (and driver) of reductions in IPV, however cost of implementation must be considered—no evidence on these trade offs
Conclusions & research gaps

- Strong evidence suggest CTs are proven ‘structural’ prevention complements to dedicated vertical programming
- Geographic and program design gaps (ability to attribute transfer recipient and plus components)
- Better measurement and analysis of mechanisms
- Need for more mixed-methods evaluations, and measurement of dynamics over the long(er)-term
- Cost-effectiveness measures needed to compare relative to other (vertical/dedicated) programming
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