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The rise of ‘cash’ in sub-Saharan Africa . . .

• Explosion of Social Cash Transfers (SCTs):
  - 718 million people enrolled in SCTs globally (Honorati et al. 2015)
  - Approximately half (21) SSA countries had UCT programs in 2010, this doubled (40) by 2014

• Programs are ‘home-grown’:
  - Target on poverty and vulnerability; greater role of community
  - Unconditional or ‘soft conditions’
  - Larger evidence base on impacts than any other region: more countries, more topics
Coverage of select Government programs

- Not included (due to scale): CSG in South Africa (>11 million recipients)
The Transfer Project

• **Who:** Community of research, donor and implementing partners – focus on coordination in efforts and uptake of results
  - UNICEF, FAO, UNC, Save the Children, National Governments

• **Mission:** Provide rigorous evidence on of government-run large-scale (largely unconditional) SCTs

• **Motivation:**
  - Income poverty has highly damaging impacts on human development
  - Cash empowers people living in poverty to make their own decisions on how to improve their lives

• **Where:** Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi, South Africa, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe
## Data collection on youth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>HH Sample Size</th>
<th>Youth Age Range</th>
<th>Youth Sample Size</th>
<th>Survey Year(s)</th>
<th>Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenya CT-OVC</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>15-25</td>
<td>2223</td>
<td>2007, 09, 11</td>
<td>RCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia MCTP</td>
<td>3078</td>
<td>13-17</td>
<td>2098</td>
<td>2011, 13, 14</td>
<td>RCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe HSCT</td>
<td>3063</td>
<td>13-20</td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>2013, 14, 16</td>
<td>District Matched Case Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi SCTP</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>13-19</td>
<td>2109</td>
<td>2013, 14, 15</td>
<td>RCT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nested qualitative longitudinal studies: Malawi and Zimbabwe

**RCT**=randomized control trial; **PSM**=propensity score matching
Safe transitions to adulthood

• Youth modules with boys and girls
  ▪ Administered through 1-1 same sex interviews in privacy

• Innovative content
  ▪ Mental health, hope, aspirations
  ▪ Sexual behavior, HIV risk, partner characteristics, transactional sex
  ▪ Violence (physical, sexual)
  ▪ Patience, risk preference, logical reasoning
  ▪ Fertility, marriage, schooling, labor and health (HH survey)

Malawi, credit: Angeli Kirk
Pathway: school enrollment impacts (secondary school age children)

Primary enrollment already high, impacts at secondary level. Ethiopia is all children age 6-16. Bars represent percentage point impacts; all impact are significant.
Pathway: mental health of youth, depressive symptoms (CES-D $\geq 20$)

**Note:** CES-D = Center for Epidemiological Studies Disease Depression scale (10 item short form). Kenya results: Kilburn et al. 2015  *10% significance, **5% significance; ***1% significance.

- **Kenya (N=2,006):**
  - Treat: 32%
  - Control: 37%
  - OR = 0.78**

- **Malawi (N=4,185):**
  - Treat: 44%
  - Control: 53%
  - OR = 0.78**

- **Zimbabwe (N=1,605):**
  - Treat: 34%
  - Control: 29%
  - OR = 0.78**

-1 pp (not significant)

+5 pp (not significant)
### Age-disparate sex, Malawi

*Partner >5 years older*

Analysis among those who have debuted/had sex in the last 12 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Females (N=334)</th>
<th>Males (N=354)</th>
<th>Females (N=236)</th>
<th>Males (N=223)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recent sex (12-month)</strong></td>
<td>0 pp (NS)</td>
<td>0 pp (NS)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*10% significance, **5% significance; ***1% significance; NS = not significant*

Analysis among those who have debuted/had sex in the last 12 months
Transactional sex - lifetime
*(Ever gave or received money, favors or gifts in exchange for sex)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Females (N = 253)</th>
<th>Males (N=431)</th>
<th>Females (N=801)</th>
<th>Males (N=781)</th>
<th>Females (N = 333)</th>
<th>Males (N = 354)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kenya</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OR=0.79 (NS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zimbabwe</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OR=1.57 (NS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 pp (NS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 pp (NS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Malawi</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OR=1.57 (NS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>-1 pp (NS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>-3 pp (NS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*10% significance, **5% significance; ***1% significance; NS = not significant*
Forced sex - lifetime

**Pressured, tricked or forced to against your will**

-14 pp**

-5 pp***

58%

32%

Zimbabwe females (N=801)

Malawi females (N=333)

Malawi males (N=354)

-10% significance, **5% significance; ***1% significance; NS = not significant
First sex forced, Malawi

(Pressured, tricked or forced to against your will)

-25 pp**

- 44% in Females (N=334)
- 28% in Males (N=354)

+2 pp (NS)

*10% significance, **5% significance; ***1% significance; NS = not significant
Malawi qualitative findings: hot off the press!

Grace was a youth participant in the qualitative cohort who had two children at endline and was not married; the fathers of her two children were working in South Africa and not providing any support. She had moved in with another boyfriend who promised to marry her before endline but he did not provide proper conditions and also went to work in South Africa.

Between midline and endline she had transactional sexual relationships with two men, one who forced her to have sex and then provided money and another who paid her for sex without force. She said she used condoms in all of these sex acts to protect herself. Her hope was still to find a husband to, “…support me, who will get me clothes, soap and everything I need.”
A male youth participant who had never been sexually active, Shadrek, also spoke about feeling pressured to have sex in exchange for money:

• *Shadrek*: There is a girl from school but stays in another village. Her name is Doreen. She wanted to have sexual relationship with me but I denied it. I told her that I have no intentions of getting into sexual relationship now, all I need is to finish my education and get married.

• *Interviewer*: Did receiving the Mtukula Pakhomo program affect your decision to engage in sexual activity during the last year?

• *Shadrek*: Yes it did because this girl approach was for the money I do get from the cash transfer. She said that she wanted to be with me because I do receive the money so I knew that this girl just wanted to be a gold digger and eat my money. So I denied her to protect the money I do get because it is meant for school not sexual relationships.
Conclusions and what’s next?

• Cash transfers have potential to reduce sexual violence
• Cross-country comparison among multiple settings in SSA allows a more comprehensive picture (across outcomes & program design)
• Working with Government large-scale programs adds to external validity of findings
• New/emerging areas of research in the Transfer Project:
  • Adolescent/dating IPV: Tanzania
  • Impacts on intimate partner violence (Ghana) -> potential to break the intergenerational cycle of violence?
  • Cash ‘plus’ programming (e.g., Pilot in Tanzania)

• Much more work is needed!
• Missed opportunity?: UNICEF engaged in >100 countries on social protection systems – including cash transfers
For more information

- Transfer Project website: www.cpc.unc.edu/projects/transfer
- Briefs: http://www.cpc.unc.edu/projects/transfer/publications/briefs

- Facebook: https://www.facebook.com/TransferProject
- Twitter: @TransferProjct

Email:
- Amber Peterman, apeterman@unicef.org
- Tia Palermo, tmpalermo@unicef.org
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Current core funding for the Transfer Project comes from the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida), as well as from staff time provided by UNICEF, FAO, SC-UK and UNC-CH. Evaluation design, implementations and analysis are all funded in country by government and development partners. Top-up funds for extra survey rounds have been provided by: 3IE - International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (Ghana, Malawi, Zimbabwe); DFID - UK Department of International Development (Ghana, Lesotho, Ethiopia, Malawi, Kenya, Zambia, Zimbabwe); EU - European Union (Lesotho, Malawi, Zimbabwe); Irish Aid (Malawi, Zambia); KfW Development Bank (Malawi); NIH - The United States National Institute of Health (Kenya); Sida (Zimbabwe); and the SDC - Swiss Development Cooperation (Zimbabwe); USAID – United States Agency for International Development (Ghana, Malawi); US Department of Labor (Malawi, Zambia). The body of research here has benefited from the intellectual input of a large number of individuals. For full research teams by country, see: https://transfer.cpc.unc.edu/