**SEMINAR ON**

**SOCIAL TRANSFERS AND CHILD PROTECTION**

UNICEF Office of Research, Florence 19-20 March 2013

***Background***

Social protection programmes are increasingly being adopted in middle- and low-income countries, especially in Latin America, Africa, and parts of Asia, as key measures to address poverty and vulnerability. Among the different types of social protection schemes, social transfers are now dominating social protection interventions in the least developed countries.[[1]](#footnote-1) The adoption of these programmes has been boosted by the strong evidence provided by impact evaluation studies detecting positive effects on the welfare of the poorest and the most marginalized. The benefits for children have also been well documented, in particular in relation to their health and nutritional status and education outcomes.

Despite the growing number of social transfer impact evaluations, the relation between social transfers and issues like violence against children, child abuse, family separation, child labour, child marriage, sexual exploitation or trafficking (here called child protection outcomes) has rarely been rigorously investigated. Do social transfers have an impact in preventing or mitigating these and similar rights violations? And if so, under what conditions?

In 2012 the UNICEF Office of Research commissioned Professor Armando Barrientos, Juan Villa Lora and Paola Pe**ñ**a of the Brooks World Poverty Institute to review the evidence base in relation to these questions. Their study was a starting point for a two-day meeting that took place on 19-20 March 2013 in Florence. The seminar brought together researchers, academics and UNICEF staff working on social policy, economics and child protection with the aim to discuss the following themes:

a) evidence of links between social transfers and outcomes for children in relation to issues like violence, abuse, exploitation, birth registration, and family separation;

b) known and potential impact of poverty or economic deprivation on such outcomes and

c) synergies between social protection and child protection programmes, in terms of opportunities and constraints.

***Session 1: The Study on Social Transfers and Child Protection,***

***Brooks World Poverty Institute and UNICEF Office of Research***

The working paper entitled “Social Transfers and Child Protection”[[2]](#footnote-2) assessed available evidence from low- and middle-income countries on the potential effects of social transfers on the reduction of violence, exploitation and abuse of children, family separation and improved birth registration. The paper starts with a review of key concepts and approaches in social protection, social transfers and child protection literature in order to facilitate a shared understanding across the two communities of practice. The study evaluated three ways that social transfers could influence outcomes related to violence, abuse, exploitation and family separation: 1) direct effects where social transfers have explicit child protection objectives; 2) indirect effects which stem from the reduction in poverty associated with social transfers which then has effects on improved outcomes for children and the reduction of violence, abuse and exploitation; and 3) potential synergies in implementation of social transfers and child protection. The paper also discussed how the design and implementation of social transfers can maximise positive impact and serve policy makers and practitioners in designing their future programming. However, the majority of 79 impact evaluations examined, covering 45 medium and large-scale programmes, included few references to child protection indicators, and when they did they mostly addressed child labour and to a much smaller extent family separation and child marriage.

The study finds that social transfers are likely to benefit the most vulnerable children and that they can have direct effects on improved birth registration, reduction of child labour, family separation and child marriage. When child protection is an explicit programme objective, these violations are more likely to be successfully addressed. However, sometimes social transfers can have unintended negative consequences on children, for example public works programmes that have adverse effects on parents’ care provision. In some countries, the introduction of social transfer programmes has led to innovations in the social welfare system that may have improved the effectiveness of child protection services, but the impact has not yet been fully demonstrated. Regarding indirect effects, there is strong evidence that social transfers reduce poverty and exclusion, but research on the links between poverty, poverty reduction, and violence, abuse and exploitation in low- and middle-income countries is weak.

Two commentaries were provided to the paper. **Professor Frances Lund** of the University of KwaZulu Natal encouraged further analysis on how improved health, nutrition and education status can build resilience in children to minimize and overcome the impact of violence, abuse and exploitation. She also mentioned the positive impact public work programmes can have when, like India’s National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme, they provide child care entitlements or when other adults not participating in the programme are taking care of the child. In terms of cross-sectoral collaboration, social workers can have dual roles: they provide social services and pick up referrals. However, in many countries there are limited numbers of fully qualified and experienced staff, who are often overburdened with multiple roles and functions. While the opportunities for synergies are promising, further research is needed on where these have worked out, and where they have not and for what reasons.

**Anthony Hodges** of Oxford Policy Management highlighted the problem of data limitations on specific child protection issues. Evidence of the impact of violence, abuse and exploitation is limited partly due to the fact that data does not exist or is difficult to collect for impact evaluations. The problems are sometimes ‘hidden’, or relevant measurable indicators are difficult to formulate. This is particularily the case for child trafficking and sexual exploitation. However, even where data is easy to collect through large household surveys, very few impact evaluations of cash transfers take into account the effects of transfers on birth registration or child marriage, for example. The absence of these indicators appears to reflect a lower degree of interest in child protection outcomes than other dimensions of child well-being. Anthony Hodges also offered another interpretation of the term ‘indirect impact’ that could be observed in a temporal sense. Social transfers can have an impact on *long-term* poverty reduction (via the development of beneficiaries’ human and productive capital) that could have further knock-on effects on reduction of early marriage, female genital mutilation (FGM), and other forms of violence and abuse. Exploring these links would require panel studies with beneficiary and control groups over long periods, which may not always be realistic or practical.

***Session 2: The links between poverty, poverty reduction and violence, abuse and exploitation***

The impact of poverty and economic deprivation on violence, abuse and exploitation was further discussed in Session 2. **Rachel Marcus** of ODI shared the findings from the ODI study of links between child protection and economic deprivation. Poor parents are more likely to emigrate, to send their children to work, to pressurise children into early marriage, to live in insecure neighbourhoods. This in turn could translate into higher risks of sexual exploitation, involvement in gang/neighbourhood violence (as victims and perpetrators), inadequate childcare or institutionalisation, and physical and sexual abuse of children at work. Evidence on the relationship between physical abuse and poverty is generally limited, especially where corporal punishment is widely accepted. The ODI study concluded that programmes aimed at strengthening families’ economic situation are more likely to be successful in addressing violations such as sexual exploitation of children when they include components like awareness-raising campaigns, good quality vocational training and school fees subsidies.

**Paul Dornan from Young Lives, Oxford University** presented data from a longitudinal study related to child poverty in Ethiopia, India, Peru and Vietnam. While poverty has increased the likelihood of children’s work it has not impacted on the extent to which children experience physical violence. Other factors such as family strain and stigma were also at play. In order to address violence, abuse and exploitation, poverty should thus be interpreted in terms broader than economic deprivation, and these multi-dimensional interpretations need to be integrated into social protection interventions.

**Chris de Neubourg** from UNICEF Office of Research presented on how Multiple Overlapping Deprivation Analysis (MODA)[[3]](#footnote-3) can help shed more light on child protection issues. He gave an insight into how violence against children and domestic violence interrelate with deprivations in health and education, for example, and to what extent violence is conditioned by various household characteristics. Contrary to other domains (health, nutrition, education), MICS and DHS data used for MODA analysis show that incidence of violence is not linked to the level of the household income. These results confirm the need to address issues of violence and abuse within a holistic social policy framework which takes into account the complex relationship between child deprivation, child well-being and child protection.

**Maria Herczog from** Eszterhazy Karoly College, Budapest, Hungary and the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child talked about opportunities and limitations in the implementation of social transfers. She presented a case study of the school allowance programme[[4]](#footnote-4) which did not succeed in reaching the intended outcome – an increase in school attendance and decrease in early drop-out – for a number of reasons: lack of consultation with stakeholders; lack of preparation of families, administrators, school officials and child welfare services; lack of budgetary support for administration costs; and poor monitoring and evaluation. Furthermore, the families who, for various reasons, failed to send children to school, were penalised and stigmatised by authorities and the general public. This led to weakened social cohesion and increased distrust between families and institutions.

***Session 3: Social Protection and Child Protection Synergies***

Synergies between social protection and child protection systems can arise on multiple levels, as **Jennifer Yablonski**, Social Policy and Strategy, UNICEF, New York, pointed out. She highlighted potential links between social protection and child protection with a specific emphasis on how social protection can enhance outcomes linked to prevention and protection from violence, abuse and exploitation. Social protection can contribute to child protection by integrating services (e.g. through provision of common contact points and referrals), by lowering barriers to access child protection services, by enhancing caregivers’ capacity (e.g. through family and parenting support programmes) and by legislation enforcement. Moreover, linking the two systems can set forth a more integrated and multi-sectoral approach to addressing vulnerability and exclusion.

**Keetie Roelen**, Research Fellow at the Institute of Development Studies stressed the importance of a strong social welfare work force as they play a key role in determining the success of a programme.[[5]](#footnote-5) The factors that promote synergies between social protection and child protection include coordination across sectors with clearly defined roles and responsibilities, stronger political mandate and the recognition of the role of the community.

The opportunities and constraints of synergies between social protection and child protection have already been documented in some countries in Africa. **Mayke Huijbregts**, Chief of Child Protection at UNICEF Mozambique, shared four country case studies (Malawi, Mozambique, Kenya and Zimbabwe) where both direct and indirect synergies between the two programmes have had a positive effect on child well-being. In Malawi, cash transfers have proven to be effective in addressing child marriage, child labour, teen pregnancy and child trafficking. In other countries, the implementation of social transfers and social protection programmes led to improvement in information management, a more systematic procedure of identification and follow-up of cases of violence, abuse and exploitation as well as promotion of social workers’ training.

The efforts made by the Government of Indonesia to integrate child protection, poverty reduction and social protection were illustrated by **Niloufar Pourzand,** Chief of Social Policy at UNICEF Indonesia. Social Protection Policy came to the forefront of the Government’s policy agenda following the 1997 crisis, when it was expanded in terms of the number of programmes and the coverage. Today, social protection programmes address household vulnerabilities through an inclusive, holistic and life cycle perspective. Thus, many programmes, such as the country’s largest conditional cash transfer PKH, address issues such as violence, abuse and exploitation. Evidence of the impact, however, is still scarce and programmes are fragmented and insufficiently coordinated.

**Anna Nordenmark Severinsson**, Child Protection Specialist, UNICEF CEE/CIS illustrated some key issues related to the impact and the outreach of social protection systems in Albania, Kazakhstan and Ukraine.[[6]](#footnote-6) Social assistance and family support services designed to reduce vulnerability to family separation were assessed for their inclusiveness and access. The study showed that lack of awareness about eligibility, the complexity of the application procedure, the lack of supply in remote areas and the lack of transparency prevented the most vulnerable families from accessing the programmes. Furthermore, discrimination and social stigma toward the users exacerbated the exclusion of some individuals. This evidence indicates that simply merging and integrating the systems does not necessarily lead to better outcomes. Effectiveness, efficiency, transparency and equity are key to reaching the most marginalised and ensuring that the opportunities for such synergies are maximised.

***Observations, conclusions and recommendations***

Discussions following the presentations were focused around the three central themes. The key points, observations and conclusions as well as recommendations for further research are summarised below:

1. ***Need for conceptual clarity***

The development of an adequate understanding of the links between child protection and social protection requires further clarity of the related concepts. These may include a) the conceptual understandings of terms such as vulnerability, risks, capacity and resilience that are used in child protection, poverty reduction and social protection and b) conceptual and contextual understanding of some of the key terms related to child well-being outcomes including the term ‘child protection outcome’.

* Social protection, for example, addresses economic and social vulnerabilities to poverty and deprivation, while child protection addresses vulnerability to violence, abuse and exploitation that may, or may not be rooted in economic and social vulnerability. Other concepts such as risks and resilience, that are commonly used to describe the possibility of a negative outcome and the capacity to cope with adverse effects, may have different meanings when applied in poverty or child protection discussions.
* Child protection outcomes are usually understood as either positive outcomes for children resulting from reduction of incidence of exploitation, violence and abuse; or negative outcomes (or damaging exposure) of children to violence, exploitation, abuse and neglect. However, when operationalized, these concepts require further unpacking and contextualizing. For instance, ‘family separation’ due to migration may have both positive and negative implications for child well-being. Negative if it leads to child neglect, and positive if remittances are used to improve outcomes for children. Furthermore, the current definition of ‘family separation’ is better suited to depict the western family model and not the model of extended family that characterizes most households in least developed countries. The concepts of family care, parenting and separation need to be contextualized and different types of family structures recognized in research, where primary caregivers, for instance, are either grandparents or other relatives. It was also suggested that the term “child protection outcome”, may be problematic as it lends itself to different interpretations, in part also because the term ’child protection‘ has multiple resonances in different parts of the world.
* When discussing the impact poverty reduction programmes can have on the elimination of violence against children, it is essential to distinguish the different forms of violence that children may experience or be exposed to: physical, sexual and emotional violence in the home, schools, community or institutions, and even neglect. Finally, questions were raised about whether outcomes related to adolescent behaviour, in terms of sexual activity and use of drugs, for example, should be considered as part of the child protection domain.

Further discussion and unpacking of these conceptual issues is needed. The contextualization of the definitions will also require development of indicators that are specific to certain environments, regions, gender and subgroups (ethnicity, age, ability). Through this disaggregation, the indicators can help reveal patterns or processes that lead to improved outcomes.

1. ***Need to build a holistic and integrated framework for analysis and response***

The links between economic deprivation and incidences of violence and abuse have not yet been explored in depth in middle-income and lower-income countries. Existing evidence from higher income countries shows that economic deprivation may increase the risk of these violations through adoption of harmful coping strategies, lack of parental monitoring, greater likelihood of living in unsafe neighbourhoods and lack of access to family support. However, other factors that are closely associated with poverty in a broader sense also need to be taken into account: the bargaining power of each member of the family, gender roles, existence or absence of social support networks, access to social services, stigma, discrimination and social exclusion.

The assessment of the impact of social transfers on violence, abuse and exploitation of children therefore requires grounding the empirical evidence in a common *conceptual framework* that needs to take into account much broader influences at social and structural levels beyond measuring the mere impact of specific interventions. These would include the role of social norms in the wider community, discrimination, social exclusion and inequities. At the *structural level* these influences are national policies, political will, administrative and legal characteristics, the type of welfare state and systems of provision, institutional capacities and the relevance and capacity of the informal sector. In short, the social protection framework should be based on universal principles promoting the holistic well-being of the child and inclusive and accessible services, but also relevant to the national context.

1. ***Need to maximize opportunities for synergies at different levels***

Synergies between child protection and social protection can contribute to the improvements in institutional capacities, better use of resources, improved multi-sectoral collaboration and better outcomes for children. However, there are still many obstacles to achieving these objectives.

* ***Institutional synergies between two systems improve multi-sectoral collaboration***

As many countries are moving towards a systemic approach to both social protection and child protection the synergies between these systems provide opportunities for improved multi-sectoral coordination and harmonization of interventions and policies. These synergies can lead to improved public agency capacity to deliver social services, a more efficient use of resources and a better coverage. This is not necessarily straightforward and the achievement of programme synergies can be constrained by poor governance, absence of political will, lack of conducive policy environment and programme design complexity.

The role of the private sector has not been investigated in depth, but there is a widespread consensus that it deserves more attention particularly in respect of the engagement in service provision and evaluations of social protection programmes.

* ***Synergies between child protection and social protection lead to improved well-being outcomes***

Greater integration of the two systems not only has the potential to lead to a more efficient use of resources, but can also result in longer term positive effects on children, as outputs of the interventions are mutually reinforcing. Violence, abuse and exploitation are closely linked to other well-being outcomes such as health and education, and addressing these requires multi-sectoral approaches. For example, increased school attendance (a social protection intended outcome) is likely to decrease child labour supply (child protection outcomes) and vice versa. Coordination between different programmes is likely to foster the achievement of a holistic approach to child well-being which recognizes the importance of both economic and social factors.

* ***Implementation synergies: better identification of those in need and referral will depend on targeting mechanisms, social workers capacity and governments’ investments***

The positive effects of implementation synergies have already been documented in a number of countries. The delivery of cash transfers by social workers can enhance the opportunity to better monitor access to health care, immunization and school attendance. Social workers can also identify those children at risk of violence, abuse and neglect and refer them to family support and child protection services.

However, there are some***challenges*** associated with social transfers implementation particularly in low-income countries.

* Social transfer programmes may fail to reach the most deprived due to relatively high entry costs (in terms of information gathering and transportation costs), and challenges with identification of vulnerable children. In Kenya, for example, a common and digitalized data system is being developed, which facilitates knowledge sharing and integrated case management. In Zimbabwe, efforts are being made to ensure that social transfers targeting mechanisms are more child-sensitive, through the engagement of child protection committees.
* The social welfare workforce is usually poorly developed, overstretched, under-resourced and lacking in social legitimacy. In many instances, community based mechanisms take on the case management function. However, these community groups too often rely on volunteers who are overburdened and lack the appropriate training and capacity. Solutions that strengthen both formal and informal systems and foster collaboration between community mechanisms and statutory bodies need to be sought.
* Conditionality linked to social transfers may carry certain risks:

conditionalities may impose burdens on the target group to provide the proof of their compliance which can sometimes be complex and cumbersome;

conditional cash transfers can become administratively demanding;

conditional cash transfers can further overburden social workers or undermine their supportive role as they will be expected to monitor compliance with the conditions.

Simplicity, transparency and clarity are particularly needed in social protection systems in countries where administrative capacity and governance are issues of concern.

1. ***Need for better systematization of evidence, analysis of existing data and gathering of new data***

Despite the growing attention given to social transfers, issues such as violence and abuse of children, child marriage, trafficking and family separation are still rarely considered in impact evaluation studies. Such a gap reflects both the complexity of inferring a causal relationship between specific deprivations and violence, abuse and exploitation, as well as the lack of purposely collected data. Nevertheless the latest generations of randomized controlled trials are increasingly paying attention to child protection issues, and new data may be available soon for analysis. Pulling together the already existing evidence and further investigating the collected data can shed light on the relative efficacy of a range of interventions and the conditions under which the interventions work.

Some key points on how evidence generation can be strengthened are:

* Collecting quantitative and qualitative *baseline data* at the onset of a programme is of critical importance, while monitoring and evaluation frameworks should always be developed at the beginning of interventions. This data should also assess vulnerability and risk factors in children, families and communities, but also their capacities and resilience.
* Evaluation design of social transfer programmes needs to include *mixed methods,* both quantitative and qualitative, so that the impact and barriers to positive outcomes are better understood.
* In some instances, the gap in understanding the links is due more to the insufficient *systematization and sharing of evidence*, rather than a gap in the data. Therefore, there is a need to promote systematic reviews and meta-analysis as key elements of evidence-based interventions and sharing of evidence among researchers and practitioners across different regions to build a common knowledge.
* *Gender- and age-disaggregated* data should be generated systematically to enable a more refined and child- and gender-sensitive analysis of the programmes.
* There is a continuous need for *evidence of effectiveness* of different interventions that includes understanding the process and the social and structural influences that lead to desired outcomes as well as how different components of the programme contributed to the overall results. The documentation of best practice is important for possible replication, scaling up or adaptation to different contexts. However, many lessons can be learned from failure – so understanding what factors hinder implementation of programmes can contribute to improving the programme set up but also to strengthening the institutional framework.
* *Partnerships* in the development and assessment of the social transfer programmes should be strategic, long term and innovative. Strengthened collaboration with academia and the private sector is of particular relevance.
* A possible inclusion of *child protection indicators* into planned and ongoing social-transfer impact evaluations should be considered. A multidisciplinary group could be in charge of developing a common module that can be piloted and rolled out in different countries to facilitate better assessment of outcomes that are related to prevention of violence, abuse, exploitation, family separation and birth registration.

***Conclusions***

The relationship between child protection and the different domains of deprivation has not been clearly identified and further investigation is required in order to develop a conceptual framework and the related theories of change. It is clear that social transfers can, under certain conditions, deliver positive child protection related outcomes. As cash transfers can easily be scaled up, this is an opportunity to reach large numbers of vulnerable children. However, social transfers should not be seen as a ‘silver bullet’ able to offer a solution to any kind of poverty related issue. It is important to understand the boundaries of social transfers and that they do not work in all contexts. Social transfers should therefore be viewed as a set of tools that are part of a wider systems approach to realizing a protective environment.

Nonetheless, fostering coordination between social transfer programmes and child protection interventions is a mutually reinforcing strategy that should be promoted. Child protection is a multisectoral responsibility and requires a holistic and systemic approach towards child well-being, which can only be achieved if the different institutions concerned are committed to full collaboration.

There is a wide range of possible entry points to ensure synergies between child protection and social protection programmes, so policy makers should be committed to developing an integrated framework in such a way as to maximize the positive effects of both systems. Improvements are still needed in relation to collection of baseline data and evidence of impact, knowledge sharing, integrated case management, community empowerment and implementation efficiency.
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