

Cash Transfers and Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) in Low- and Middle-Income Settings

A Joint Research Agenda to Inform Policy and Practice

The Cash Transfer & IPV Research Collaborative and Innovations for Poverty Action, with input from the research and practice community¹

1. Motivation and Background

Over the last five years, there has been increasing interest from global stakeholders in the relationship between cash transfers and gender-based violence, and in particular, intimate partner violence (IPV). Interest has grown both within the development and humanitarian spaces, although empirical research is mainly concentrated in the former. A mixed-method review paper published in 2018 found that, across 22 quantitative or qualitative studies in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), the majority (73%) showed that cash decreased IPV; however, two studies showed mixed effects, and several others showed heterogeneous impacts (Buller *et al.* 2018). A more recent meta-analysis of 14 experimental and quasi-experimental cash transfer studies found average decreases in physical/sexual IPV (4 percentage points (pp)), emotional IPV (2 pp) and controlling behaviors (4 pp) (Baranov *et al.* 2021). A feature of this literature is the high representation of evaluations from Latin America, primarily government conditional cash transfer programs. In addition, programming was generally focused on poverty-related objectives, and none of the programming was explicitly designed to affect IPV or violence outcomes more broadly.

¹ This research agenda was drafted by Amber Peterman and Shalini Roy, with inputs from Melissa Hidrobo, Lucy Billings, Tia Palermo, Clare Barrington, Meghna Ranganathan, Ana Maria Buller and Lori Heise (Cash Transfer and IPV Research Collaborative), Pace Phillips and Ellen Bates-Jeffreys (IPA), as well as workshop participants at the “Cash Transfers and IPV: Sharing Evidence & Aligning Research Agendas to Inform Policy” event, held on October 29-30, 2020 (see Annex C). We gratefully acknowledge the support from an anonymous donor. For questions or comments: Amber Peterman (amberpeterman@gmail.com) and Shalini Roy (s.roy@cgjar.org).

Since the time that literature was compiled for the aforementioned reviews, the number of papers examining the relationship between cash and IPV has nearly doubled. This second generation of studies involves increasingly complex designs that are able to unpack mechanisms (e.g. Lees *et al.* 2020 in Mali), examine the role of possible design features (e.g. WFP 2019 cross-country), disentangle effects of complementary programming (e.g. Haushofer *et al.* 2019), examine post-intervention impacts (e.g. Roy *et al.* 2020) and expand the geographic scope of previous evidence (e.g. Briaux *et al.* 2020 in Togo; Peterman *et al.* 2021 in Ghana; Iqbal *et al.* 2020 in Pakistan). Moreover, additional work exploring these relationships is underway. With the increased spotlight on the role of social protection in the COVID-19 response and recovery, as well as a prominent narrative on gendered impacts of the pandemic, the importance of this work is expected to grow in the future.

A focus on the intersection of cash transfers and IPV is of interest to stakeholders in LMICs for several additional reasons. From a policy perspective, cash transfers and other social safety nets are attractive instruments for addressing violence, as they are rapidly expanding in resource-poor settings (social safety nets reach approximately 2.5 billion people in LMICs; World Bank 2018) and often directly reach women and the most vulnerable segments of society. Therefore, reductions within programmatic periods found to date (which range from 11 to 66%) are policy-relevant, and offer a notable platform for at-scale reductions (Buller *et al.* 2018). This widespread reach is an important consideration, as dedicated IPV programming has struggled to maintain quality and achieve cost-effectiveness at scale. Second, as social protection programs have largely been designed without violence (or gender equality) as an objective, learning more about possible gender- and violence-sensitive design components, offers potential additional benefits which could be leveraged to achieve cross-sectoral objectives. Accordingly, the RESPECT framework highlighting promising prevention responses for violence against women has included economic transfers as a core recommended strategy within the 'reduced poverty' domain (WHO 2019). In addition, evaluation learning from cash and other economic transfers offers opportunities to learn more about linkages between poverty, women's economic empowerment and violence more broadly. These insights are valuable for stakeholders interested in better understanding violence and how it relates to women's status in the household and community, including how to leverage policy and programmatic interventions that increase income earning and employment, asset ownership, and broader social protection coverage.

2. A Joint Research Agenda

The growing interest in the relationship between cash and IPV across different research and implementing organizations is an important development, as these institutions' diverse agendas can be leveraged to fill research gaps and inform policy at a rapid pace with a coordinated research agenda. Rather than working in silos, there are recognized benefits to sharing information, coordinating, and aligning this work. In the absence of formal collaboration, there are also gains to learning from one another during the research process—particularly during a fast-moving research environment linked to the COVID-19 response. In October of 2020, the [Cash Transfer and IPV Research Collaborative](#) and [Innovations for Poverty Action](#) convened a workshop with researchers, implementers and donors with the overall goal of sharing the latest evidence and emerging research and discussing research gaps and priority questions. More specifically, the workshop objectives were to:

- ▶ **Understand the landscape of emerging research and research frontiers** related to cash transfers and IPV (including cash plus and linkages to broader social protection) via information sharing and research presentations;
- ▶ **Brainstorm how organizations can better align and complement their future research agendas** particularly around cash transfers, IPV and COVID-19;
- ▶ **Foster collaboration** between the fields of public health and development economics, with respect to violence prevention, thereby encouraging better cross fertilization regarding research questions, ethics and measurement.

What follows is a joint research agenda building on workshop discussions and consultations across a wide range of stakeholders (See Annex C for list workshop participants). This is meant to be a living document, to help guide priorities and coordinate knowledge generation across stakeholders, building on and complementing broader research agendas on global knowledge generation on violence prevention (SVRI & The Equality Institute, 2020). In addition, workplans shared in Annex A and B are meant to provide concrete information on forthcoming and ongoing research across stakeholders. These workplans complement broader research agendas in the areas of gender and social protection.

2.1 Research principles

Stakeholders agree that research process and principles are important elements of the ultimate success of research in both generating rigorous, innovative knowledge – as well as affecting policy and programmatic change. To date, evaluations of cash transfer on IPV have primarily been conducted by development economists from institutions in high-income countries, dominated by quantitative methods. However, more interdisciplinary, mixed-method research, and inclusion of national researchers would strengthen the evidence base, relevance, and uptake of this work. Building on global research agenda principles (SVRI & The Equality Institute, 2020), we believe key process and methodological tenets are essential to promote in the next generation of research (Box 1).

Box 1: Key process and methodological tenets of future cash transfer and IPV research

- ▶ Promote inter-disciplinary evaluation teams, including public health and economics—drawing on the strengths of each discipline;
- ▶ Encourage mixed-method research to expand, strengthen and triangulate findings—particularly encouraging implementation research and qualitative research embedded in quantitative impact evaluations;
- ▶ Include and promote national scholars from LMICs (broadly defined), both as principal or co-investigators, as well as via training opportunities for junior scholars (postdoc and graduate students), fellowships for protected writing time, and institutional collaborations;
- ▶ Focus on informing the design of government and large-scale programming, for policy impact at the national level;
- ▶ Pay critical attention to research ethics around collection of violence measures, including a do-no-harm approach;
- ▶ Expand and innovate in measurement and analysis of IPV outcomes (e.g. maximizing disclosure of IPV and reducing response bias; improving measurement of types of IPV that are less commonly analyzed - psychological IPV, economic IPV, indicators of frequency/severity of IPV), as well as mechanisms for impact on IPV (e.g. poverty, intra-household conflict, women’s empowerment), in order to maximize learning—building on current best practice.
- ▶ Pay attention to differential impacts across groups and possible adverse effects by program target group or setting (e.g. diverse household structures, or at risk groups such as ethnic minorities, disabled women, extreme poor, women with a history of IPV), as well as contextual factors which may shape outcomes (e.g. gender norms and access to services).

While research efforts will differ in their ability to meet all tenets to the same extent—based on funding and research logistics considerations—these components are expected to be important for maximizing future learning.

2.2. Priority Research Questions

We propose five priority research questions linking cash transfers and IPV. The priority research questions are not explicitly ranked - however are numbered for reference within ongoing or planned stakeholder research (Annex A).

1. **What is the role of design and operational features of cash transfers?** Implementers of cash transfer programs may seek to understand if and how changing routine design components, listed below, can lead to more favorable impacts on IPV. However, the evidence-base thus far is unable to provide robust evidence in this regard, as most evaluations are not set up to contrast effects of routine design features. For example, this theme would prioritize studying the role of:
 - ▶ **Transfer recipient**, specifically if transfers are targeted to men, women, or both – particularly in locations and for programs which have been traditionally targeted at men – or how targeting methodology might influence impacts (e.g. means-based versus universal);
 - ▶ **Transfer size, frequency and duration**, specifically how lump-sum large transfers compare to smaller routine transfers and how long support must be sustained to produce impacts (the latter particularly relevant for short-term humanitarian or shock-responsive programming, including during COVID-19 recovery and response efforts);
 - ▶ **Delivery mechanism**, specifically if transfers are delivered via group-based implementation structures (e.g. women’s groups) or other platforms (e.g. mobile money), and if these result in significant benefits to women in terms of control of transfers, financial inclusion, or social capital;
 - ▶ **Messaging or labeling** of the transfer, for example, to encourage male buy-in or how transfers are spent.

The design components listed above are not exhaustive. In addition, insofar as these design components have significant cost implications, cost-effectiveness additions will be important to understand the investment case for specific design features.

2. **What is the role of complementary programming?** Evidence suggests the importance of complementary programming in addition to cash in delivering lasting protective effects—however to date there have been few studies designed to isolate the total, differential and synergistic effects of ‘cash’ and ‘plus’ components. In addition, no studies we are aware of specifically focus on plus components that are IPV-specific (added with the specific objective of reducing IPV). As implementers are increasingly interested in developing program models that have IPV objectives, understanding the role of complementary programming with the ability to be implemented at scale, across settings is of great interest to program implementers and policymakers. This programming can be designed as a conditionality for receiving cash transfers or simply be provided alongside cash transfers. Examples include programming that brings together women in groups; links to health services; provides training, assets, or livelihood support; works with couples to increase communication, conflict and mutual support; engages the community to shift gender norms via behavior change or mass media and edutainment. There is particular interest in understanding the role of complementary programming in reducing IPV via mechanisms outlined in Buller *et al.* (2018) – including reducing alcohol use, improving mental health, empowering women, engaging men or tackling harmful gender-norms. Similar to RQ1, cost-effectiveness additions will be important to understand the investment case across sectors for adding complementary programming.
3. **What are the mechanisms underling impacts of cash transfers on IPV?** The majority of papers reviewed in Buller *et al.* (2018) hypothesized or provided preliminary evidence suggesting one or

more pathways through which cash can impact IPV, but studies were not designed to rigorously test these mechanisms. While three hypothesized pathways dominate the evidence - impacts via: 1) economic security and emotional wellbeing, 2) reductions in intra-household conflicts and 3) women's empowerment - there could be additional mechanisms, or a more nuanced interplay between these pathways. To date, a lack of mixed-methods research, in particular, limits understanding of how or why changes observed in empirical studies occur. Qualitative studies can aid in further refining hypothesized mechanisms, as well as obtaining more in-depth understanding of processes of impact and lived experiences, including any potential unintended or adverse impacts of programs. Qualitative work can also better inform how to develop quantitative measures of pathways. This evidence will not only help explain why impacts occur, but also how to better design programs, sustain impacts and translate evidence across contexts.

4. **What is the role of heterogeneity and contextual factors?** Recent studies have highlighted the importance of individual and contextual factors in determining impacts. In particular, there is concern that among women in particularly at-risk groups (e.g. extreme poor, women with a history of IPV, ethnic minorities etc.) - or in settings with restrictive gender norms or underlying fragility (e.g. humanitarian or displacement settings) - the beneficial impacts of cash may not be realized, or adverse impacts may occur. Impacts may also differ across different ages or life stages (e.g., adolescence, pregnancy, older ages). Yet quantitative evaluations are rarely designed to test these heterogenous impacts or unpack the role of context. Mixed-method work should be prioritized in generating and testing hypotheses for this research question.
5. **How do impacts evolve over time, including post-intervention?** The sustainability of impacts is a critical factor in understanding the prevention power of cash transfers for IPV, yet few studies to date have been able to unpack post-intervention impacts (e.g. Roy *et al.* 2019). Scarce evidence also exists on how soon impacts on IPV emerge after the start of cash transfers and how these impacts change over the duration of receiving them (for example, if mechanisms related to relationship dynamics take time to play out). Therefore, examining the trajectory and sustainability of impacts (or inter-generational impacts), is very useful to inform debates around the investment case and limitations of cash transfers.

While these questions are only a sub-set of possible interesting research questions within the cash transfer and IPV theme, they are of interest to a broad range of stakeholders. In addition, there is interest in a broader range of violence outcomes - for example, violence against children and violence from other perpetrators - which falls outside the direct focus of this initiative. Ongoing and planned research across stakeholders is summarized in Annex A with tags to priority research questions.

3. Evidence to policy and research translation

The communication and translation of research to inform policy and practice is critical. However, policymakers focused on social protection often do not have IPV on their agendas, nor are they necessarily aware of the growing evidence linking cash transfers to IPV. Further, when they do focus on IPV, it tends to be on potential negative consequences, rather than positive benefits of cash transfers. Focused communication, dissemination, and advocacy are necessary to build this awareness and give implementers and policymakers confidence to act to maximize the benefits of cash. Moreover, as much

of the evidence is new and emerging, there is a lag between individual studies' research findings and availability and communication of these findings, even within the larger group of researchers and implementation partners interested in cash transfers and IPV. We offer a number of recommendations on facilitating research translation for policy and practice change (Box 2).

Box 2: Recommendations to guide research to policy efforts

- ▶ Work at the outset with dedicated national implementation and policy teams - both from the social protection and violence sectors -- building trust, creating dialogue, and understanding what the government wants to learn;
- ▶ Identify national and international advocacy and research champions across sectors - including those who can maintain discussions with policymakers in country and those who have had success in neighboring countries;
- ▶ Provide concrete recommendations - lead with what the evidence has shown rather than evidence gaps, use understanding of mechanisms and humanitarian guidance to make recommendations, focus on "no regrets" options that are promising to try and unlikely to do harm;
- ▶ Develop guidance that governments can act on even if violence prevention is not an explicit priority - design tweaks to basic delivery systems, plus components not specifically related to violence;
- ▶ Consider how to sell the message - researchers should equip interlocutors who interact with policymakers to use effective language (e.g., reframing arguments to connect to different objectives and priorities, linked to poverty, gender or violence more generally), speak to civil society and feminist advocacy;
- ▶ Use alternative communication products (briefs, blogs, etc.) to translate research findings for non-academic audiences - including policy and programmatic actionable recommendations;
- ▶ Share research in different forums, including via presentations at conferences and workshops, via social media, and integration of evidence summaries into practitioner trainings for both social protection and violence sectors.

As a topic that spans sectors and disciplines, building linkages amongst these stakeholders will help to design a more coherent long-term approach to addressing the key knowledge gaps in this area. Annex B summarizes concrete approaches on communication and translation of research ongoing or planned by stakeholders. It is our hope that these activities will help facilitate a stronger second generation of research—and support better policy and practice for the prevention and reduction of IPV in LMICs.

REFERENCES

- Baranov V, Cameron L, Contreras Suarez D, Thibout C. 2021. Theoretical Underpinnings and Meta-analysis of the Effects of Cash Transfers on Intimate Partner Violence in Low- and Middle-Income Countries. *Journal of Development Studies*, 57(1).
- Briaux J, Martin-Prevel Y, Carles S, Fortin S, Kameli Y, Adubra L et al. 2020. Evaluation of an unconditional cash transfer program targeting children's first 1,000 days linear growth in rural Togo: A cluster-randomized controlled trial. *PLoS Medicine*, 17(11): e1003388.
- Buller AM, Peterman A, Ranganathan M, Bleile A, Hidrobo M & L Heise. 2018. A mixed-method review of intimate partner violence and cash transfers in low- and middle-income countries. *World Bank Research Observer*, 33(2): 218-258.
- Iqbal T, Farooq S, Padda IUH. 2020. Can Empowerment be Enhanced by Putting Cash in the Hands of Poor Women? Learning from Pakistan's BISP Program. *The European Journal of Development Research (online first)*.
- Lees S, Kyegombe N, Diatta A, Zogrone A, Roy S, Hidrobo M. 2020. Intimate partner Relationships and Gender Norms in Mali: The Scope of Cash Transfers Targeted to Men to Reduce Intimate Partner Violence. *Violence Against Women (online first)*.
- Haushofer J, Mudida R, Shapiro J. 2019. The Comparative Impact of Cash Transfers and Psychotherapy on Psychological and Economic Well-being. Working paper.
- Peterman A, Valli E, Palermo T on behalf of the LEAP 1000 Evaluation Team. 2021. Government Anti-Poverty Programs and Intimate Partner Violence. *Economic Development and Cultural Change (online first)*.
- Roy S, Hidrobo M, Hoddinott J, Koch B, Ahmed A. 2019. Can Transfers and Behavior Change Communication Reduce Intimate Partner Violence Four Years Post-program? Experimental Evidence from Bangladesh. IFPRI Discussion Paper 01869.
- SVRI & The Equality Institute. 2020. Global Shared Research Agenda. Accessed: <https://svri.org/sites/default/files/attachments/2020-09-08/GRA%20Brief%20Draft%20Six.pdf>
- WHO. 2019. RESPECT Women: Preventing violence against women. Geneva: World Health Organization. Accessed: <https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/312261/WHO-RHR-18.19-eng.pdf?ua=1>
- World Bank. 2018. The State of Social Safety Nets. World Bank: Washington, D.C.
- World Food Programme. 2019. The potential of cash-based interventions to promote gender equality and women's empowerment: A multi-country study. Technical Report, WFP: Rome.

Funding for this work was provided by an anonymous donor. This publication has been prepared as an output of The Cash Transfer & IPV Research Collaborative and has not been independently peer reviewed. Any opinions expressed here belong to the author(s) and are not necessarily representative of or endorsed by IFPRI and IPA.

INTERNATIONAL FOOD POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE

A world free of hunger and malnutrition

IFPRI is a CGIAR Research Center

1201 Eye Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005 USA | T. +1-202-862-5600 | F. +1-202-862-5606 | Email: ifpri@cgiar.org | www.ifpri.org | www.ifpri.info

© 2021 International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI). This publication is licensed for use under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0). To view this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>.

Annex A: Ongoing and planned research on cash transfers and IPV

Research listed alphabetical by country. This list is also maintained and updated in [google docs](#)

	Organizations (lead/contact)	Project title	Program name (country)	Evaluation design / methodology	Description (Research questions + links to priorities as identified in the research agenda)	Timeline (start - finish)
1	World Bank Africa Gender Innovation Lab, Government of Cameroon Social Safety Net project Contact person(s): Rachael Pierotti	The Impact of Intimate Partner Violence Prevention Interventions among Refugees and Host Populations under the Social Safety Nets project in Cameroon	Cameroon Social Safety Net Project	RCT and embedded qualitative research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the impact of adding couples' training to a cash transfer program on IPV, cooperation within the household, and women's economic empowerment? What is the impact on these same outcomes of adding edutainment, in the form radionovela listening groups, to a cash transfer program? Is there a differential impact of either intervention on refugee vs. host households? Is there a differential impact of either intervention on monogamous vs. polygamous households? How cost-effective is each intervention? What are the mechanisms of impact of the IPV prevention interventions? (qualitative research) How do institutional dynamics hinder or facilitate the implementation of IPV prevention interventions in the context of this national safety net program? (qualitative research) <p><i>Priority RQs: 2, 3 and 4</i></p>	Ongoing
2	National Planning Department (DNP) of Colombia & <i>Departamento para la Prosperidad Social</i> Contact person(s): Juliana Londoño-Vélez & Pablo Querubin	The Impact of Emergency Cash Assistance During a Pandemic Experimental Evidence	Colombia	RCT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the impact of an emergency UCT on IPV? How does this differ by rural/urban areas and whether transfers are manual or digital? <p>More information: https://www.poverty-action.org/study/impact-emergency-cash-assistance-during-covid-19-pandemic-colombia</p> <p><i>Priority RQs 1 and 4</i></p>	Ongoing
3	President's Social Policy Cabinet Contact person(s): Seth Garz	Extending a large-scale Conditional Cash Transfer Evaluation to Include Impacts on Intimate Partner Violence	Dominican Republic	RCT, 3 intervention arms	<p>The project includes 3 intervention arms, including (1) conditional cash transfers, (2) transfers plus volunteer home visits, (3) transfers plus paid professional home visits, and (4) a pure control.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the benefits and costs of hiring paid professional staff to reduce IPV? 	Ongoing

- What is the importance of intrinsic “pro-social” motivation vs. monetary incentives on IPV?
- What are the sub-groups of the population that may most benefit from targeted professional enlances?
- What are the different reported IPV rates using Audio-CASI vs. face-to-face survey administration?

Priority RQs 2, 3 and 4

4	<p>UNC, UB & Navrongo Health Research Center (Cash Transfer & IPV Research Collaborative)</p> <p>Contact person(s): Clare Barrington</p>	<p>Qualitative study of the Ghana Livelihoods Empowerment Against Poverty (LEAP) 1000 on IPV</p>	<p>Ghana LEAP 1000</p>	<p>Qualitative (In-depth interviews with female beneficiaries and focus groups with male partners of female beneficiaries)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the mechanisms through which LEAP 1000 reduces IPV? • How do these mechanisms vary across different family structures (monogamous vs polygamous)? • How does the health insurance premium fee waiver provided to all beneficiary women in LEAP 1000 affect these mechanisms? • How do men view and respond to the receipt of LEAP 1000 by their wives and other women in their communities? 	<p>Q3 2019 – Q3 2021 (ongoing)</p>
----------	--	--	------------------------	--	---	------------------------------------

Priority RQs 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5

5	<p>IFPRI, LSHTM, World Vision, JaRCO Consulting (Cash Transfer & IPV Research Collaborative)</p> <p>Contact person(s): Melissa Hidrobo & Meghna Ranganathan</p>	<p>Evaluation of the Strengthen PSNP4 Institutions and Resilience (SPIR) on IPV</p>	<p>Ethiopia’s Productive Safety Net Program 4 (PSNP4)</p>	<p>RCT and embedded qualitative (IDIs and FGDs with men and women)</p>	<p>Quantitative objective: The impact evaluation uses a clustered RCT design to learn about the effect of different combinations of the SPIR intervention on the well-being of PSNP4 households: the livelihoods package (L), the nutrition package (N), and enhanced versions of each package (L* and N*, respectively).</p> <p>Qualitative objective: To better understand how the cash for work, and complementary programming affect IPV.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does cash for work affect the three pathways hypothesized in Buller et al. 2018? • How do complementary activities, such as male engagement in the nutrition BCC or the livelihoods grants in the livelihoods model, compare with cash for work only in terms of enhancing (or not) the three pathways to IPV? • How do men respond to women’s empowerment or an increase of their respectability or status in the community? • How does including men in complementary programming contribute or not to reducing intra-household conflict or improving household dynamics? 	<p>2016-Q3 2021 (Ongoing)</p>
----------	---	---	---	--	--	-------------------------------

Priority RQs 2, 3 and 4

6	University of Oxford, GiveDirectly Contact person(s): Mahreen Mahmud, Kate Orkin & Emma Riley	Economic and Psychological Constraints to Women's Empowerment	GiveDirectly, Kenya	RCT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the effect of an unconditional cash transfer and a light touch psychological intervention on IPV? • Are there synergies in combining the light touch psychological intervention with the cash transfer? <p><i>Priority RQs 2, 3 and 4</i></p>	2017-2019 (analysis ongoing)
7	World Bank, East Asia and Pacific Gender Innovation Lab Contact person(s): Elizaveta Perova	Public work programs and gender-based violence: Evidence from Lao PDR	Laos' Road Management Group Program (cash-for-work)	RCT	<p>The study examines the effects of a cash-for-work program over the short-term (18 months) in rural Laos targeted at women aged 18 to 50 years in poor households. The study seeks to answer the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the long-term impacts of the program on a IPV, domestic violence perpetrated by other household members, and violence outside the home? • What is the impact of the program on women's income and labor force participation? <p><i>Priority RQs 1 and 3</i></p>	2018 -2021 (ongoing)
8	GiveDirectly Contact person(s): Jon Robinson	GiveDirectly Cash Benchmarking & IPV Measurement	GiveDirectly, Liberia & Malawi	RCT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measuring IPV outcomes with large UCTs in rural regions • Comparing Audio-CASI and face-to-face measurement of WHO violence against women survey <p>More information: https://www.poverty-action.org/recover-study/effect-cash-transfers-and-market-access-households-rural-liberia-and-malawi</p> <p><i>Priority RQs 1 and 5</i></p>	Ongoing
9	Red Cross Contact person(s): David Sungho Park	Red Cross "Cash Plus" program & IPV Measurement	Liberia	RCT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measuring IPV outcomes of a comprehensive assistance program, including a cash transfer component • Comparing Audio-CASI and face-to-face measurement of WHO violence against women survey <p><i>Priority RQs 1 and 2</i></p>	Ongoing
10	Trinity College Dublin, Africa Gender Innovation Lab (World Bank), Concern Malawi Contact person(s): Tara Bedi & Julia Vaillant	Enabling Sustainable Graduation out of Poverty for the Extreme Poor in Malawi	Malawi	RCT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the impact of a graduation intervention on livelihoods, women's empowerment, and IPV? • What is the relative impact of the graduation package when it is targeted to women in the household vs. men in the household? • What is the impact of adding a couple's empowerment program to the graduation program targeted at women? <p><i>Priority RQ 1 and 2</i></p>	Ongoing

11	Africa Gender Innovation Lab (World Bank), Trinity College Dublin, Taazour (Mauritania) Contact person(s): Julia Vaillant	Family Dialog: a couples-based intervention to improve economic cooperation and change gender norms in the Mauritanian Safety Net Program	Mauritania Safety Net Program	RCT	All the research questions are to be understood within the Mauritanian Safety Net program, so all study participants are cash transfer recipients. The overall goal of the study is to understand how an add-on intervention for couples can reduce or mitigate conflicts raised by the cash transfer and increase the efficiency of the cash transfer. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the impact of couple’s training focused on economic cooperation and joint planning on household wellbeing, intra-household dynamics, intimate-partner violence, and women’s economic empowerment? • What is the additional impact of expanding the training topics to gender norms and healthy relationships? • What is the additional impact of a community-level edutainment intervention? • What is the relative impact of a community-level edutainment intervention vs. a couple’s level intervention? <p><i>Priority RQ 2 and 3</i></p>	Ongoing
12	American Institutes for Research, UNICEF Innocenti and UNICEF Mozambique Contact(s): Amber Peterman	Impact Evaluation of the Child Grant 0-2 Years Program in Mozambique	Mozambique’s Child Grant (Cash and Care) program	Geographic RDD and qualitative process evaluation	The evaluation seeks to measure the impact of a government UCT give to primary caregivers of children 0-2 years paired with integrated case management services for protection concerns. Key questions are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the impacts of cash alone, and cash plus care on IPV and violence against children? • What are possible mechanisms through which the program affects IPV and violence against children? • What are the barriers, facilitators and beneficiary experience with the program, including gender and case management components? (qualitative) <p><i>Priority RQ 2 and 3</i></p>	2019 - 2021 (ongoing)
13	World Bank, East Asia and Pacific Gender Innovation Lab Contact(s): Elizaveta Perova	Long-term impacts of a short exposure to CCTs in adolescents: Evidence from the Philippines	Philippines’ <i>Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program</i> (4Ps)	RCT	The study is a long-term follow up of men and women in their twenties who were exposed to the 4Ps CCT for up to 1.5 years while they were adolescents (between the ages of 12.5 and 14 years)–representing a 10 year time period between benefits and the follow-up survey. The follow-up examines the following questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the long-term impacts of the program on IPV, domestic violence perpetrated by other household members, and violence outside the home? 	2019 -2021 (ongoing)

- What are the long-term impacts of the program on a range of related outcomes, including empowerment, gender norms, safe transitions and economic outcomes?

Priority RQs 3 and 5

<p>14 UNICEF Tanzania, UNICEF Office of Research - Innocenti, University at Buffalo, EDI Global, TASAF, TACAIDS</p> <p>Contacts: Tia Palermo & Nyasha Tirivayi</p>	<p>Impact Evaluation of Ujana Salama: A Cash Plus Model for Safe and Healthy Transitions to a Productive Adulthood</p>	<p>Cash Plus for Adolescents Layered onto Tanzania’s Productive Social Safety Net Program (PSSN)</p>	<p>RCT</p>	<p>This study examines impacts of layered intervention targeted to adolescents within the PSSN, so all study participants live in households receiving cash transfers. The layered intervention or “plus” component adolescents (comprised of face-to-face training, mentoring, an asset transfer, and linkages to services) is randomized. All adolescents were aged 14-19 years in 2017 and living in PSSN households. They have been interviewed annually in 2017 2018, 2019, 2020 (a sub-set via mobile phone interviews), and 2021. Research questions include:</p> <p>What is the impact of a plus component on violence (including IPV and transactional sex) and pathways of impact such as gender equitable attitudes, self-efficacy, stress, and other outcomes.</p> <p>How do contextual factors such as quality of existing health services and distance to markets and schools moderate program impacts?</p>	<p>2017-2021 (analysis on-going)</p>
---	--	--	------------	---	--------------------------------------

Priority RQs 2 and 4

Notes: N/A if not applicable or TBD if to be decided. Definitions: CASI = Computer assisted self-interviewing; CCT = Conditional cash transfer; RCT = Randomized control trial; RDD = Regression Discontinuity Design; UCT = Unconditional Cash Transfer.

Annex B: Ongoing and planned communication and dissemination activities / products on cash transfers and IPV (alphabetical by organization lead)

	Organizations (lead/contact)	Activity / Output	Audience	Title and description	Timeline (product or event)
1	IFPRI & UNC Contact person(s): Shalini Roy & Amber Peterman	Research Brief	Researchers, Program implementers	Operational guidance on cash transfers for prevention of IPV, conceptualized by mechanisms This brief will consolidate insights on cash transfer program design for IPV prevention from various documents - existing impact evaluations, qualitative studies, documents with operational guidance on making programs gender-sensitive, etc. - to structure them around mechanisms for impact, with the goal of providing a framework for implementers to make decisions about design features in their own context.	Q1 2021 (Ongoing)
2	World Bank Contact person(s): Alessandra Heinemann	Operational Guidelines	World Bank Social Safety Net Practice; National Social Safety Net Policy and Program Managers	Safety First: Operational Guidance on Leveraging Social Safety Nets to Prevent Gender Based Violence The note provides operational guidance on how to optimize SSN program design and implementation to prevent GBV and empower women. It applies to SSN programs that provide regular, non-contributory benefits (cash transfers, near-cash or in-kind transfers) which may include public works or economic inclusion activities. Part A provides an overview of the evidence and of the pathways through which SSNs influence risk of GBV. Part B provides operational guidance at different stages of the social protection delivery chain: risk assessment, needs assessment, enrollment, provision, management, monitoring and evaluation.	Publication (Q2) 2021; Training (ongoing)

Notes: N/A if not applicable or TBD if to be decided. Definitions: GBV = gender-based violence; SSN = social safety net.

Annex C: Participant List for “Cash Transfers and Intimate Partner Violence (IPV): Sharing Evidence & Aligning Research Agendas to Inform Policy” workshop held in October, 2020

1. Diana J. Arango, Sr. GBV and Development Specialist, The World Bank Group
2. Tesmerelna Atsbeha, Senior Program Officer, Wellspring Philanthropic Fund
3. Sarah Baird, Associate Professor, George Washington University
4. Clare Barrington, Associate Professor, UNC - Health Behavior
5. Ellen Bates-Jefferys, Research Manager, Innovations for Poverty Action (IPA)
6. Lucy Billings, Sr. Project Manager, IFPRI
7. Ioana Botea, Social Protection Specialist, World Bank
8. Ana Maria Buller, Deputy Director - Gender, Violence and Health Centre, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine
9. Marlous de Milliano, Economic Researcher, American Institutes for Research
10. Ervin Dervisevic, Consultant, World Bank
11. Mary Ellsberg, Director, Global Womens Institute
12. Emily Esplen, Adviser, violence against women and girls, Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (formerly DFID)
13. Kate Falb, Senior Violence Researcher, International Rescue Committee
14. Veronica Frisancho, Senior Research Economist, Inter-American Development Bank
15. Seth Garz, Program Officer, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
16. Dan Gilligan, Deputy Division Director, Poverty Health and Nutrition Division, International Food Policy Research Institute
17. Ruth Graham-Goulder, Social Protection & Gender Adviser (Programme Division), UNICEF
18. Margaret Grosh, Senior Advisor, Social Protection & Jobs, World Bank
19. Caren Grown, Global Director, Gender, World Bank
20. Lucia Hanmer, Lead Economist, Gender, World Bank
21. Abigail Hatcher, Assistant Professor, UNC CH
22. Alessandra Heinemann, Senior Social Protection Specialist & Gender Lead, World Bank
23. Lori Heise, Technical Director/Professor, Prevention Collaborative/ Johns Hopkins School of Public Health

24. Lusajo Kajula, Analyst, UNICEF Office of Research-Innocenti
25. Eeshani Kandpal, Research Economist, The World Bank
26. Estelle Koussoube, Economist, The World Bank
27. Stephanie Kuttner, Gender and Social Protection Consultant, World Bank
28. Shelley Lees, Associate Professor in Anthropology of Gender, Violence and HIV, LSHTM
29. Mahreen Mahmud, Assistant Professor, University of Exeter
30. Clare McCrum, Social Development Adviser, FCDO
31. Manisha Mehta, Program Director, Wellspring Philanthropic Fund
32. Rachna Nag Chowdhuri, Senior Director - Analytics, Global Innovation Fund
33. Megan O'Donnell, Assistant Director, Gender, CGD
34. Tia Palermo, Associate Professor, University at Buffalo
35. Elizaveta Perova, Senior Economist, World Bank
36. Amber Peterman, Associate Research Professor, UNC
37. Pace Phillips, Director of Program Development and IPV Research Initiative, IPA - Innovations for Poverty Action
38. Marjorie Pichon, RA, LSHTM
39. Rachael Pierotti, Social Development Specialist, World Bank
40. Meghna Ranganathan, Assistant Professor, LSHTM
41. Emma Riley, Junior Research Fellow, University of Oxford
42. Shalini Roy, Research Fellow, IFPRI
43. Lauren Rumble, Principal Advisor, Gender Equality, UNICEF
44. Abhilasha Sahay, Economist (ETC), World Bank
45. Heidi Stöckl, Director Gender Violence & Health Centre, LSHTM
46. Julia Vaillant, Senior Economist, The World Bank