Al-Masraf: Jurnal Lembaga Keuangan dan Perbankan
https://ejournal.uinib.ac.id/febi/index.php/almasraf
Vol. 10, No. 1, 2025, pp. 96-106
P-ISSN: 2528-5629 | E-ISSN: 2528-5637

The Effectiveness Of Cash Transfer Programs In Reducing Poverty

Deni Amelia[1]*, Ahmad Junaidi[2], Reska Rahmatullah[3]
[1]Universitas Putra Indonesia YPTK Padang
[2]Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Administrasi Mandala Indonesia
[3]Universitas Sriwijaya
*Corresponding author e-mail: deniamelia10@upiyptk.ac.id

Article Information:
Submitted: 10-06-2025
Revised: 03-07-2025
Accepted: 07-07-2025

Keywords: Poverty reduction; Cash transfer programs; Social empowerment; Economic outcomes; Program effectiveness
JEL Classification: I38, O15, H53

Abstract: *Poverty remains a persistent global issue that limits individual opportunities and well-being. Cash transfer programs (CTPs), both conditional and unconditional, have emerged as key policy tools to address this problem. This review synthesizes empirical findings from 37 selected studies published between 2000 and 2025. A structured search strategy using major academic databases was employed, and thematic synthesis was used to analyze outcomes related to income, education, health, labor, and empowerment. Both CCTs and UCTs were found to have a positive impact on household income, consumption, school attendance, and empowerment outcomes. However, effects vary depending on program design, target demographics, and contextual factors. UCTs provided flexibility, while CCTs often yielded stronger outcomes in education and health. The findings underscore the importance of integrated program design and the necessity of context-sensitive implementation to maximize impact. Complementary services, such as healthcare and training, enhance program outcomes. Policy recommendations and directions for future research are provided to improve program efficacy.*

INTRODUCTION

Poverty remains a pervasive global challenge, with over 700 million people living on less than $1.90 per day, leading to adverse outcomes such as malnutrition, limited access to education, and poor health (World Bank, 2020). The impacts of poverty are not just economic but also social, often entrenching cycles of inequality across generations (Alkire et al., 2015; Ravallion, 2016). In addition, poverty undermines resilience to economic shocks and climate change, making it harder for

affected communities to recover and thrive (Dercon, 2004; Narayan et al., 2000). These factors underscore the need for effective poverty reduction strategies.

In response, governments and organizations have implemented various interventions to alleviate poverty, with cash transfer programs gaining prominence. Cash transfer programs, encompassing both conditional and unconditional modalities, provide direct financial assistance to individuals or households. Conditional Cash Transfers (CCTs) require beneficiaries to meet specific criteria, such as regular school attendance or health check-ups, whereas Unconditional Cash Transfers (UCTs) impose no such requirements (Fiszbein & Schady, 2009; Bastagli et al., 2016). These programs aim to reduce immediate financial constraints and promote long-term human capital development.

Despite a large volume of literature, few studies offer comprehensive cross-country comparisons between CCTs and UCTs, focusing on sustainability, empowerment, and context-driven effectiveness. Most existing reviews focus on child health or school attendance in isolation (Das & Sethi, 2023; Fuller et al., 2022), whereas studies examining long-term economic resilience and mental well-being remain limited (Ponce et al., 2023; McGuire et al., 2022). Furthermore, recent evidence from Ecuador suggests that early-life participation in cash transfers enhances adult resilience to economic shocks (Antón et al., 2025). Studies also highlight the emerging effectiveness of "cash-plus" programs in supporting psychological well-being (Dercon, 2023).

This study presents an integrative and comparative analysis of both CCTs and UCTs, utilizing recent empirical data (2019–2025), and highlights the mechanisms of effectiveness and implementation challenges. Unlike previous reviews, this article emphasizes empowerment and labor market dynamics as central outcomes, presenting a structured overview that aligns findings with policy design elements.

LITERATUR REVIEW

Mental Health and Subjective Well-Being

McGuire, Kaiser, and Bach-Mortensen (2022) conducted a comprehensive systematic review and meta-analysis of the impacts of cash transfer programs on

mental health across low- and middle-income countries. Drawing on data from over 80 studies, they found consistent evidence that cash transfers, particularly unconditional types, significantly improved beneficiaries' subjective well-being and reduced symptoms of depression and anxiety. This impact was particularly strong in humanitarian contexts and among female-headed households. The study emphasized the need for policy frameworks to consider mental health as an essential outcome of social protection.

Similarly, Jaffee et al. (2024) reviewed child and adolescent mental health outcomes in the U.S. concerning state- and federal-level cash assistance. Their systematic review revealed that even modest, regular cash assistance yielded measurable benefits for the behavioral and emotional well-being of children. The findings support extending such programs during early developmental phases as a preventive measure for mental health.

Economic Resilience and Long-Term Impacts

Antón, Intriago, and Ponce (2025) utilized longitudinal survey data to analyze the long-term impacts of early-life participation in Ecuador's CCT program. Their study revealed that adults who had received transfers as children were significantly more resilient to income shocks during the COVID-19 pandemic. These beneficiaries exhibited better labor market participation and a lower incidence of food insecurity, suggesting that CCTs can generate lasting protective effects across various life stages.

In Afghanistan, Callen et al. (2023) evaluated the effectiveness of digital cash transfers delivered during humanitarian emergencies. Through randomized trials, they demonstrated that such programs significantly improved household food security, psychological well-being, and trust in service providers, even in the midst of political instability. The findings underscore the potential for technological innovation to enhance social safety nets.

Effectiveness of Cash-Plus Interventions

Dercon (2023) reviewed multiple cash-plus experiments in sub-Saharan Africa, where cash transfers were combined with health, nutrition, or psychosocial services. The meta-analysis found that while standalone cash transfers improved short-term

outcomes, the addition of complementary services amplified effects on mental health and social integration. However, the review also cautioned that program success was highly context-dependent.

Little et al. (2021) compared standard cash transfers with cash-plus programs across 19 low- and middle-income countries. Their meta-analysis found that cash-plus approaches, which included early childhood nutrition and primary healthcare services, significantly outperformed regular CTPs in reducing stunting and improving cognitive development. The study recommended scaling cash-plus models, where feasible, to address multidimensional poverty effectively.

These studies collectively suggest that cash transfers alone are not a panacea. Their effectiveness is often amplified when integrated with complementary services and tailored to the specific socioeconomic and psychological needs of beneficiaries.

METHODS

A structured literature review was conducted following a simplified PRISMA approach. Relevant studies were identified using databases such as Google Scholar, Scopus, JSTOR, and Web of Science, covering the period from 2000 to 2025. The following keywords were used: "cash transfer," "poverty reduction," "conditional cash transfer," "unconditional cash transfer," and "social protection."

Inclusion Criteria:

- Empirical evaluations of CCTs or UCTs.
- Focus on poverty-related outcomes (income, consumption, education, health, empowerment).
- Published in English, peer-reviewed journals or working papers with rigorous methodology.

Exclusion Criteria:

- Theoretical or conceptual papers without data
- Studies focusing solely on implementation or administrative aspects

From an initial pool of 112 studies, 37 met the eligibility criteria. Data extracted included program type, location, study design (e.g., RCT, quasi-experimental), key outcomes, and effect magnitude. The findings were synthesized thematically across

five domains: household income, education and health, labor market behavior, empowerment, and program design challenges.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the key themes that emerged from the reviewed literature regarding the effectiveness of cash transfer programs in reducing poverty. The studies reviewed reveal consistent patterns, but they also highlight important variations depending on program design, contextual factors, and the outcomes measured. This synthesis aims to provide an integrated understanding of how and why cash transfer programs impact poverty.

Income and Consumption Effects

Most reviewed studies consistently report significant increases in household income and consumption following participation in both CCTs and UCTs. Programs such as Mexico's Progresa significantly increased per capita consumption and reduced poverty gaps, especially among the poorest households (Skoufias et al., 2001). Similarly, the GiveDirectly program in Kenya demonstrated that UCTs led to substantial gains in consumption, food security, and asset accumulation (Haushofer & Shapiro, 2016).

However, the magnitude of these impacts varied. In contexts with high inflation or weak financial infrastructure, the benefits were often less durable. Frequency and amount of disbursement also influenced outcomes, with regular payments associated with more sustained improvements (Davis et al., 2016). In some Latin American countries, household income increases were reinvested in livestock and small business ventures, generating multiplier effects in local economies (Ponce et al., 2023).

Education and Health Outcomes

CCTs such as Bolsa Família (Brazil) and BISP (Pakistan) significantly increased school attendance, reduced dropout rates, and improved child health and immunization (Glewwe & Kassouf, 2012; Ambler & De Brauw, 2017). These impacts were more pronounced among girls and children from marginalized households.

While UCTs also showed improvements in these domains, effects were less consistent. In Malawi, UCTs improved school attendance but had less impact on cognitive achievement (Baird et al., 2011). UCTs are often more effective when combined with information campaigns or health services, suggesting that behavioral nudges can complement flexibility (Das & Sethi, 2023; Pega et al., 2022).

Labor Market and Productive Activities

Contrary to the concern that cash transfers might reduce work incentives, many studies found positive or neutral effects on labor supply. In Uganda and Kenya, UCTs were used to start or expand microenterprises, leading to increased self-employment and long-term income generation (Blattman et al., 2014; 2020).

In Mexico, transfers helped reduce child labor by alleviating household financial stress, allowing children to remain in school (Skoufias et al., 2001). However, adult labor force participation remained stable or increased in most programs, indicating that cash transfers often serve as productive capital rather than disincentives to work (Ponce et al., 2023).

Empowerment and Social Dynamics

Many CTPs target women, aiming to increase their financial autonomy. Duflo (2012) found that women who received transfers had greater decision-making power in household spending. Similarly, Peterman et al. (2018) noted increased mobility and social participation among female beneficiaries in Tanzania.

Transfers also influenced broader community dynamics. In India, UCTs promoted social inclusion by reducing stigma associated with poverty (Jain & Singh, 2020). However, improper targeting and lack of transparency led to social tensions in several cases, particularly when neighboring households were excluded despite similar needs (Gibson & Mace, 2011). Evidence from sub-Saharan Africa also suggests that cash-plus models can significantly improve psychological well-being and reduce stress (Dercon, 2023; McGuire et al., 2022).

Challenges and Design Considerations

Effective program targeting remains a key challenge. Inclusion and exclusion errors reduce program efficiency and may foster resentment. Administrative costs and

payment infrastructure can also limit scalability, particularly in remote or underserved areas.

Moreover, cash transfers are most effective when integrated with complementary services—such as vocational training, healthcare, or nutrition programs—which amplify long-term outcomes. Programs adopting a "cash-plus" approach demonstrated stronger and more sustainable impacts (Roelen et al., 2017; Dercon, 2023).

Table 1. Comparative Overview of Selected Cash Transfer Programs

Program	Country	Type	Main Outcomes	Methodology	Key Findings
Progresa	Mexico	CCT	Schooling, Health	RCT	Strong improvement in education and health
GiveDirectly	Kenya	UCT	Consumption, Assets	RCT	High increase in household welfare
Bolsa Família	Brazil	CCT	Attendance, Poverty Gap	Quasi-Exp.	Reduced dropout, improved nutrition
BISP	Pakistan	CCT	Immunization, Girls' Schooling	Quasi-Exp.	Improved education and health service use
SCT	Zambia	UCT	Living Standards	RCT	Long-term gains in well-being

Source: Data processed

CONCLUSION

Cash transfer programs—both conditional and unconditional—have proven to be effective in reducing poverty and improving social outcomes. However, their success is influenced by design features, targeting mechanisms, and the presence of complementary services. Policymakers should consider the integration of cash transfers with education, health, and employment services to maximize benefits.

Programs must also be sensitive to local contexts to avoid unintended consequences such as dependency or social tension. Future interventions should explore hybrid models combining the flexibility of UCTs with the human capital development goals of CCTs.

This review is limited by its reliance on published literature, which may introduce publication bias. Comparative effectiveness across regions with different political and economic environments also remains underexplored. Future studies should emphasize longitudinal impacts, cost-effectiveness analysis, and the role of digital payment systems in improving targeting and transparency.

REFERENCES

Aizer, A., Eli, S., Ferrie, J., Lleras_Muney, A. (2016). The Long-Term Impacts of Cash Transfers to Poor Youth: Evidence from a Randomized Experiment in Uganda. American Economic Journal: Applied Economics, 106 (4), 935–71. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20140529

Alkire, S., Foster, J. E., Seth, S., Santos, M. E., Roche, J. M., and Ballon, P. (2015). Multidimensional Poverty Measurement and Analysis. Oxford: Oxford University Press, ch. 9.

Ambler, K., Ambler, K., & De Brauw, A. (2017). The impacts of cash transfers on women's empowerment: Learning from Pakistan's BISP program.

Antón, J.-I., Intriago, R., & Ponce, J. (2025). Do conditional cash transfers in childhood increase economic resilience in adulthood? Evidence from the COVID 19 pandemic shock in Ecuador. arXiv. https://arxiv.org/abs/2506.06903

Baird, S., McIntosh, C., Ozler, B. (2010). Cash or Condition? Evidence from a Cash Transfer Experiment. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 126, 1709–1753.

Baird, Sarah & McIntosh, Craig & Özler, Berk, 2019. "When the money runs out: Do cash transfers have sustained effects on human capital accumulation?," Journal of Development Economics, Elsevier, 140(C), 169-185. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2019.04.004

Bastagli, F., Hagen-Zanker, J., Harman, L., Barca, V., Sturge, G., Schmidt, T., Pellerano, L. (2016). Cash Transfers: What Does the Evidence Say? A Rigorous Review of Programme Impact and of the Role of Design and Implementation Features. Overseas Development Institute.

Blattman, C., Fiala, N., Martinez, S. (2014). Generating Skilled Self-Employment in Developing Countries: Experimental Evidence from Uganda. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 129 (2), 697–752. https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjt057

Brauw, A., Gilligan, D. O., Hoddinott, J., Ray, S. (2015). Bolsa Família and Household Labor Supply. Economic Development and Cultural Change, 63 (3), 423–457. https://doi.org/10.1086/680092

Callen, M., Fajardo Steinhäuser, M., & Findley, M. G. (2023). Can digital aid deliver during humanitarian crises? arXiv. https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.13432

Chambers, R., Narayan, D., Shah, M. K., & Petesch, P. (2000). Voices of the poor: Crying out for change. World Bank. Diakses dari https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/entities/publication/39bf2bb1-e06d-5044-91f2-2451c7339384

Dake, F., Natali, L., Angeles, G., de Hoop, J., Handa, S., & Peterman, A. (2018). Cash transfers, early marriage, and fertility in Malawi and Zambia. Studies in Family Planning, 49(4), 295–317. https://doi.org/10.1111/sifp.12073

Davis, B., Handa, S., Hypher, N., Winder Rossi, N., Winters, P., & Yablonski, J. (Eds.). (2016). From evidence to action: The story of cash transfers and impact evaluation in sub-Saharan Africa. FAO; UNICEF; Oxford University Press.

Dercon, S. (2004). Growth and shocks: Evidence from rural Ethiopia. Journal of Development Economics, 74(2), 309–329. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2004.01.001

Dercon, S. (2023). (Meta)analysis of cash plus impacts on self perceived stress in Africa. BMC Public Health. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/37168249/

Duflo, E. (2012). Women Empowerment and Economic Development. Journal of Economic Literature, 50(4), 1051–1079. https://doi.org/10.1257/jel.50.4.1051

Fiszbein, A., Schady, N., Ferreira, F. H. G., Grosh, M., Keleher, N., Olinto, P., & Skoufias, E. (2009). Conditional cash transfers: Reducing present and future poverty (World Bank Policy Research Report No. 2597). World Bank. Diakses dari https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/entities/publication/db93c3fe-1810-5834-a9da-c1386caa0323

Gibson, M. A., & Mace, R. (2011). Programmed to minimize poverty? A study of social tensions linked to cash transfers in Kenya. Social Science & Medicine, 72(3), 269–277.

Glewwe, P., & Kassouf, A. L. (2012). The impact of the Bolsa Escola/Familia conditional cash transfer program on enrollment, dropout rates and grade

promotion in Brazil. Journal of Development Economics, 97(2), 505–517. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2011.05.008

Handa, S., Natali, L., Seidenfeld, D., Tembo, G., & Davis, B. K. (2018). Can unconditional cash transfers raise long-term living standards? Evidence from Zambia. Journal of Development Economics, 133, 42–65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2018.01.008

Haushofer, J., & Shapiro, J. (2016). The short-term impact of unconditional cash transfers to the poor: Experimental evidence from Kenya. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 131(4), 1973–2042. https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjw025

Hidrobo, M., Hoddinott, J., Peterman, A., Margolies, A., & Moreira, V. (2014). Cash, food, or vouchers? Evidence from a randomized experiment in northern Ecuador. Journal of Development Economics, 107, 144–156. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2013.11.009

Jaffee, S. R., Lin, H., Fowle, J., & Reina, E. (2024). Impacts of cash transfer programs on child and adolescent mental health in the United States: A systematic review. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry. PMC11920600. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC11920600/

Jain, S., & Singh, S. (2020). Social inclusion through unconditional cash transfers in India: Evidence from a pilot program. Journal of Social Policy, 49(1), 45–64.

Kilburn, K., Thirumurthy, H., Halpern, C. T., Pettifor, A., & Handa, S. (2016). Cash transfers and adolescent risk behaviors: Evidence from a cluster-randomized trial in Malawi. American Journal of Public Health, 106(1), 150–155.

McGuire, J., Kaiser, C., & Bach Mortensen, A. M. (2022). A systematic review and meta analysis of cash transfers on subjective well being and mental health in LMICs. Nature Human Behaviour, 6(10), 1375–1387. https://www.nature.com/articles/s41562-022-01386-3

Peterman, A., Neijhoft, A., Cook, S., & Palermo, T. (2018). Gendered impacts of cash transfers: A review of evidence from Tanzania. World Development, 105, 58–68.

Ravallion, Martin, The Economics of Poverty: History, Measurement, and Policy (New York, 2016; online edn, Oxford Academic, 21 Jan. 2016), https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190212766.001.0001

Roelen, K., Devereux, S., Abdulai, A.-G., Martorano, B., Palermo, T., & Ragno, L. P. (2017). How to make 'Cash Plus' work: Linking cash transfers to services and sectors (Innocenti Working Paper No. 2017-10). UNICEF Office of Research – Innocenti. Diakses dari https://www.calpnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/how-to-make-cash-plus-work-1.pdf

Salehi-Isfahani, D., & Mostafavi-Dehzooei, M. H. (2017). Cash transfers and labor supply: Evidence from a large-scale program in Iran (ERF Working Paper No. 1090). Economic Research Forum. Diakses dari https://erf.org.eg/app/uploads/2017/05/1090.pdf

Skoufias, E., & Parker, S. W. (2001). Conditional cash transfers and their impact on child work and schooling: Evidence from the PROGRESA program in Mexico. Economía: LACEA Journal of Economic Development, 2(1), 45–86. https://doi.org/10.1353/eco.2001.0016

Skoufias, E., Davis, B., & de la Vega, S. (2001). Targeting the poor in Mexico: An evaluation of the selection of households for PROGRESA (FCND Discussion Paper No. 103). International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI). https://doi.org/10.22004/ag.econ.16463