Protocol

Main title	Question 30: What is the evidence of the impact of benefits of work guarantee schemes on the poor as compared with cash transfers?
Sub title	-
Review group	a) Maxime Gasteen, DFID Research Team b) Professor Naila Kabeer, University of Sussex/DFID c) Professor Andrew S. Pullin, Conservation Centre for Evidence-Based Conservation School of the Environment, Natural Resources and Geography, Bangor University
Section	PROCOTOL
Authors IN ORDER OF CREDIT	Dr Jessica Hagen-Zanker, Dr Anna McCord and Rebecca Holmes, Social Protection Programme, ODI with Francesca Booker and Elizabeth Molinari
EPPI-Centre reference number	[To be completed by EPPI-Centre]
Month/year of publication	[To be completed by EPPI-Centre]
This report should be cited as...	The impact of work guarantee schemes on the poor compared with cash transfers
Contact details	111 Westminster Bridge Road, London SE1 7JD a.mccord@odi.org.uk 020 7922 0300
Institutional base	Overseas Development Institute
Review Group	a) Maxime Gasteen, DFID Research Team b) Professor Naila Kabeer, University of Sussex/DFID c) Professor Andrew S. Pullin, Conservation Centre for Evidence-Based Conservation School of the Environment, Natural Resources and Geography, Bangor University
Advisory group	Maxime Gasteen, DFID Research Team
Conflicts of interest (if any)	Anna McCord has worked on assessing the impact of an EGS in South Africa which will be included in the study, however, no conflict of interest is anticipated, and Anna McCord can also function as a key informant.
Acknowledgements	We thank Shaheen Akter, Gina Bergh and Franzisca Zanker for their research inputs, Dr Chris Coles for his technical guidance and Alice Lemaitre for her work on information technology. We are grateful to Maxime Gasteen, Professor Naila Kabeer and Professor Andrew S. Pullin for comments on an earlier draft of this protocol and to Jeff Brunton, Kelly Dickson and Claire Stanesfield for much help with EPPI reviewer.

1. Background

1.1 Aims of and rationale for review

This review will identify and synthesize the literature in order to assess the evidence for the impact of employment guarantee schemes and cash transfers on the poor. Both are policy interventions that theoretically have a positive impact on the poor, albeit through different mechanisms. Employment guarantee schemes (EGS) provide a fixed, guaranteed number of days of employment to poor people every year, for cash, food, or inputs. Cash transfers (CT) provide a direct cash payment to households, not necessarily guaranteed or regular, sometimes with a number of conditions attached (e.g. school attendance of children).

For policy makers it is vital to know which impacts these interventions have in practice, whether they positively affect the poor and how the two interventions compare, e.g. does one have immediate effects on poverty and the other one long-term effects? Or does one have more positive effects on women and the other one on men? The provision of hard evidence will thus help with future policy development.

An initial review has indicated that it will not be possible to review papers which compare the two approaches, as such papers are extremely limited in number, and where they do exist deal primarily with the difficulties of attempting to compare across intervention types. Therefore the aim of this review is to identify two separate sets of literature, as well as any possible intersection between the two, relating to both i) the impact of employment guarantees and ii) the impact of cash transfers. While there is an extensive literature on the latter, there is little on the former, as there are very few Employment Guarantee programmes internationally. After identifying the effects of each intervention, a comparison across the two will be made.

If there is sufficient comparable research to enable the core elements of both cash transfer and EGS programming to be abstracted from their contexts, and broad theoretical conclusions drawn, then the impacts of both cash transfers and EGS on poverty will be compared. Some cash transfers programmes provide regular cash transfers to the poor and already for a long time, e.g. South Africa, Brazil and Mexico. Such programmes would be appropriate comparators, as they provide support to the poor over time, as do EGS, unlike other forms of short term or *ad hoc* transfer programmes. Assuming empirical data is available a meta-analysis of impact data for both CT and EGS will be attempted or a summary of quantitative analysis of impact – depending on quality of data available and the range of analytical approaches adopted.

1.2 Definitional and conceptual issues

While cash transfers are not complex to define and have a series of conventional synonyms, programmes guaranteeing employment do not necessarily mention the employment 'guarantee' in their names, and some programmes which do include the term do not in fact offer a guarantee. For the purposes of this review, an initial review has been carried out to identify programmes offering an employment guarantee schemes function, and these programmes will be included in search strings by name, rather than using the term 'guarantee'. See Appendix 1.2 for a listing of proposed EGS for inclusion. In order to capture all cash transfer schemes, a range of synonyms for cash transfers will be used.

1.3 Policy and practice background

Cash transfers have been implemented all over the world for decades in developed countries (e.g. child benefits), as well as developing countries. They have been implemented in developing countries all over the world, but in particular Latin America. They have been implemented both by national governments and donor and non-governmental organisations, at different geographical scales (nationally, or in a local community) and at different time scales (one time transfer in time of need or regular monthly payment). Policy discussion focus on implementation issues, for example size of benefit, who to target, which may also affect the impacts. There is also a lively debate on whether CT should be conditional, i.e. whether there are conditions attached to receiving the transfer. This review will ignore the conditionality debate and will consider both conditional and unconditional cash transfers.

Employment guarantee schemes are not as wide-spread as CT. In the 1930s they were implemented by the US administration during the great depression. While public works programmes are now found in many developing countries, these differ from EGS as they are often only temporary or irregular. Currently there are the Maharashtra Employment Guarantee Programme (formerly known as NREGA) in India, the EGS component of the Productive Safety Nets Programme (PSNP) in Ethiopia, the Jefes de Hogar programme in Argentina and the small scale Zibambele Programme in South Africa. Governments and donors are more reluctant to implement EGS due to the commitment implied by the guaranteed provision of employment.

1.4 Research background

A high number of programme evaluation reviews has been carried out into a limited number of EGS, notably the Maharashtra and to a lesser extent NREGA programmes in India (due to their relatively long duration, MEGS having been initiated in 1967), but others are the subject of relatively limited analytical review due to the fact that they have only recently implemented. There has not been a prior attempt to summarise empirical findings in relation to EGS, nor to formally compare this to CT programming lessons. Equally, many CT reviews do not adopt robust approaches to assessing the impact of the programme on poverty, but focus on process, or anecdotal or non-rigorous reporting of impact. This review will attempt to address the deficit in terms of quality of the evidence and will also draw out comparative insights where the research permits. This will enable more informed discussion regarding policy choice and policy impact in future.

For both EGS and cash transfer programmes however, the focus of impact evaluations tends to be on process indicators and the distribution of funds, rather than impact on the poor, rendering this review a critical step in highlighting any limitations in the current research.

Within the EGS literature, there have been some empirical studies on impact most notably the work of Ravallion (1998), Datt (1994) and Subbarao (2003)examining the benefits of EGS in India, and the work of McCord (2004) on the impact of the Zibambele programme in South Africa. These studies adopted similar approaches and may be generally comparable. However, within the cash transfer literature, there is a wider range of quantitative analyses of the impact of cash transfers on poverty, many of which are based on experiences in South Africa, Mexico and Brazil.

While the extent of quantitative research focusing on an empirical examination of economic impacts research may be limited, and refer primarily to a small number of countries, if a range of dimensions of benefits for the poor are taken into

consideration and qualitative studies are included then there is a more significant literature base to draw from.

It is important to include in the review the extent to which 'the poor' are reached by such programmes, this is also addressed in a limited way in the literature (see for example the questions raised by Ellis, 2008, and Slater and Farrington, 2009). McCord has attempted to address this question of targeting using propensity score matching techniques for EGS and similar analyses have been carried out using other techniques in relation to cash transfer programmes. This needs to be included as an additional dimension in the research.

The examination of the temporal aspect of impacts of both cash transfers and EGS also needs to be taken into account in any comparison, especially since EGS are often intended to promote skills and create assets which will impact on economic activity and livelihoods in the medium term. This issue has only been addressed in a very limited way in the literature to date, in relation to either form of intervention for the poor.

1.5 Objectives

The original research question "What is the evidence of the impact of benefits of work guarantee schemes on poor women and men as compared with cash transfers?" has been rephrased to "The impact of employment guarantee schemes on the poor compared with cash transfers" in order to make clearer what the population, intervention and outcome is.

The population is broadly defined as poor people living in countries that have either EGS (India, Ethiopia, South Africa, Argentina and the USA in the 1930s) or CT schemes (many Latin American, sub-Saharan African and South and East Asian countries) or both who are participants in either EGS or CT programmes. The list of countries included in relation to CT programming will be significantly more extensive than those with EGS programmes. The research reviewed will also consider non participants, or create proxies for them as part of the research methodology. The definition of poverty will be taken from the reviews analysed, and set out in a framework analysis, as it may refer to income poverty, or other forms of non-income poverty.

This review will consider two interventions: 1) EGS and 2) CT schemes. The former should not be confused with Public Work Programmes in general, which also provide cash or food for work. EGS are distinctive in that they *guarantee* employment to a specified population over time, in effect taking the form of an unemployment insurance. CT schemes are diverse in conception and execution and all those which offer regular ongoing transfers will be included in the study in order to be comparable with EGS. The outcome is the effect of EGS and CT on poverty of beneficiary household, i.e. it will be assessed whether poverty has been reduced. Poverty is likely to be mainly defined in financial terms (income, assets etc), in the literature, but other studies will also be considered (for example those analysing food security or livelihoods).

The comparator is the type of intervention. EGS have a work requirement in order for households to receive the transfer. CTs may or may not have conditionalities (e.g. school enrolment requirement), but will not have a work requirement. The differences in programme design are expected to affect the impact and through causal chain analysis these differences will be highlighted. However, we need to keep in mind that the two programmes often aim at different parts of the population (EGS at those that can work, whereas CT are also aimed at the elderly and children), so a comparison may not always be possible.

The main limitations in this review will stem from i) the shortage of quantitative data and RCT research into the impact of either EGS or cash transfer programmes, iii) the adoption of dissimilar approaches within both the quantitative and qualitative literature , iii) the preoccupation with process rather than outcomes in the literature, and iv) the fact that EGS and CT often aim at different populations so are not comparable v) the fact that EGS and cash transfer programmes may have different impacts on poverty, and so theoretically acceptable ways must be found to facilitate comparison.

2. Methods used in the review

2.2 User involvement

2.1.1 Approach and rationale

Review users (DFID) have not been consulted regarding the core objective of the question since the originator of the systematic review question is no longer within DFID, and a replacement has not yet been identified. This review is an attempt to identify the nature and quality of existing literature on this subject and to draw some rough comparisons on the relative effectiveness of the two instruments and differences in terms of impact. Key additional questions relating to cost per unit transferred efficacy of targeting etc would be required to make a full comparison across instruments, for a full evidence base to inform policy choice, but these questions will need to be addressed in subsequent reviews.

2.2 Identifying and describing studies

2.2.1 Defining relevant studies: inclusion and exclusion criteria

The population is defined as the poor population in the country/ area of intervention. Interventions are defined as:

- Employment Guarantee Schemes (NREGA, PSNP, Jefes de Hogar, Zibambele, Maharashtra employment guarantee programme, New Deal see Appendix 1.2)

- Cash Transfer Schemes

The outcome is defined as the scheme's impact on the poor. A range of impact indicators will be considered including:

- Poverty head count, poverty depth and poverty severity

- Income

- Consumption

- Wealth/ assets/ capital

- Food security

- Livelihoods

The comparators are the two types of interventions (EGTs and CTs).

We will restrict our analysis to econometric studies. We will accept articles containing data analysis of quality grade 3 and above (see section 2.3.1 for the quality scale as defined by the authors).

The full list of inclusion and exclusion criteria is set out in Appendix 2.1.

2.2.2 Identification of potential studies: Search strategy

The search strategy will combine;

- Direct requests to key informants (including Dreze, Ravallion, McCord, Chopra, Datt, Subbarao)

- Hand searches of bibliographies of articles accepted at final stage full text level

- Hand search of grey literature and reference lists supplied by key informants

- Website searches (see Appendix 2.2 for list)

- Databases searches (see Appendix 2.2 for list)

- Internet and meta search engine searches (see Appendix 2.2 for list)

Given the limited material available on these topics, no time limitation will be set in terms of when the material was produced and all sources of data will be considered, including data on US programmes during 1930s (grey, narrative, analytical etc).The review will be limited to English language only, given the limitations of the search team.

A number of search strings has been constructed (see Appendix 2.3) based around combinations of these search terms:

- Impact of employment guarantee schemes **and** cash transfer schemes on the poor

- Impact of employment guarantee schemes on the poor

- Impact of cash transfer schemes on the poor

While we attempt to use consistent search strings across databases, some databases and websites may require adjustments to the search strings due to a limited number of search strings or Boolean operators being allowed. If the number of search hits for a certain database becomes unmanageable (more than 2000) "not keywords"[1] will be used, to reduce the number of hits (see Appendix 2.4). Furthermore an iterative research process will be used in the piloting stage, with frequent discussions on the relevance of the results found, so search strings may be revised in the course of the process.

A database system (EPPI reviewer) will be set up to keep track of and coding studies found during the review. Titles and abstracts will be imported and entered into the database.

2.2.3 Screening studies: applying inclusion and exclusion criteria

Before screening starts, we may search all titles and abstracts and exclude those including certain "not keywords", coding them as "excluded by searching", see Appendix 2.4 for a list of those keywords.

Next inclusion and exclusion criteria will be applied successively to

- titles

- if title sounds broadly relevant, then on abstracts

- if the abstract seems relevant, then on the full report

Full reports will be obtained for those studies where 1) title and 2) abstract appear to meet the criteria, or where there is some uncertainty regarding relevance. The inclusion and exclusion criteria will be re-applied to the full reports and those that do not meet these initial criteria will be excluded. At this stage in particular, the quality of the evidence will be assessed. The full list of inclusion and exclusion criteria are listed in Appendix 2.1.

2.2.4 Characterising of included studies

Studies included in the review will be coded on the following basis;

- Employment Guarantee Schemes

---

[1]"Not keywords" can be applied in some databases to exclude articles containing keywords that will exclude non-relevant articles, e.g. banking in the case at hand.

- Cash Transfer Schemes
- Both

A second coding outlining the type of effect may also be introduced, if there is adequate time and enough variation in the literature to enable a typology of impacts to be identified.

Eg E/I = Effects of **Employment Guarantee Scheme** on **Income**

2.2.5 Identifying and describing studies: quality assurance process

The questions, strings and search terms have been piloted prior to protocol formulation in order to assess literature availability and the adequacy of the terms. This has resulted in a revision of both search terms and strings.

Application of the inclusion and exclusion criteria and the coding will be conducted by pairs of RG members working independently and then comparing their decisions and coming to a consensus.

The process of searching will be iterative, given the scarcity of literature on this topic, and search terms may be modified during the 12 week search period.

The researchers will be monitored daily by the Research Managers and the team will meet weekly to discuss and review findings.

2.3 Methods for synthesis

2.3.1 Assessing quality of studies

An assessment of the quality of the studies will be made on the basis of the technical rigour (e.g. methodological rigour, analysis) and quality of the data (sample size, collection method etc). On this basis they will be graded by quality on a scale of 1-5.

1 = anecdotal

2 = qualitative/ descriptive

3 = basic econometric analysis

4= advanced econometric analysis (e.g. Propensity Score Matching), with controls

5 = fully randomised control trial/ longitudinal analysis

2.3.2 Overall approach to and process of synthesis

There will be two discrete but interlinked synthesis processes:

- Framework analysis of impacts found using vote counting techniques
- Summary and analysis of quantitative analysis of quantitative impact – depending on quality of data

The most important syntheses will be to attempt to identify the empirical basis of the impact of i) EGS and ii) CT schemes on poverty.

Depending on the number of papers identified and the quality of the data, it may be possible also to carry out a meta-analysis, comparing and testing the results of the different studies, inasmuch as consistent approaches have been developed. In any case the types of effects identified will be classified in a framework.

2.3.2.1 Selection of studies for synthesis (if not all studies that are included in the synthesis)

All relevant studies will be included in at least one of the two syntheses proposed, depending on their relevance, as assessed by inclusion/ exclusion criteria.

Studies will be selected on the basis of the search strategy set out in 2.2.2 above.

2.3.2.2 Selection of outcome data for synthesis

Principles for selecting outcome data from primary studies in the review will be credibility, empirical rigour and use of established techniques.

2.3.2.3 Process used to combine/ synthesise data

This has been addressed in 2.3.2 above.

2.4 Deriving conclusions and implications

The two synthesis methods outlined above should provide an answer to the question regarding the adequacy of the empirical basis for the effects of EGTs and CT schemes on the poor. These tables will be used to provide an initial narrative summary which will be discussed with the review team and review advisory group, and relevant academic colleagues.

References

Datt, G. and Ravallion, M. 1994b. Income Gains for the Poor from Public Works Employment. LSMS Working Paper No. 100. Washington: The World Bank

Ellis, F. (2008) '"We are all poor here": Economic difference, social divisiveness and targeting cash transfers in sub-Saharan Africa'. Paper presented at the conference Social Protection for the poorest in Africa: Learning from experience, Entebbe, Uganda, 8-10 September.

McCord, A. 2003. An Overview of the Performance and Potential of Public Works Programmes in South Africa. SALDRU/CSSR Working Paper No. 49. Cape Town: Southern Africa Labour and Development Research Unit / Centre for Social Science Research University of Cape Town.

McCord, A. 2004. Policy Expectations and Programme Reality: The Poverty Reduction and Employment Performance of Two Public Works Programmes in South Africa. Overseas Development Institute/Economics and Statistics Analysis Unit (ODI/ESAU) Working Paper No.8. London: ODI.

McCord, A. and Wilkinson, C. 2009. PSM and PWP Incidence; Evidence from Two Case Studies in South Africa, SALDRU Working Paper. Cape Town: Southern Africa Labour and Development Research Unit, University of Cape Town.

Ravallion, M. 1998. Appraising Workfare Programs, Policy Research Working Paper, WPS 1955. Washington D.C.: Development Research Group Poverty and Human Resources Agricultural and Rural Development Department, The World Bank

Slater, R. and Farrington, J. (2009). Cash transfers: targeting. Project Briefing 27. ODI and SDC.

Subbarao, K. 2003. Systemic Shocks and Social Protection: Role and Effectiveness of Public Works Programs. Social Protection Discussion Paper Series No. 0302. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank

Appendices

Appendix 1.1: Authorship of this report

Authors IN ORDER OF CREDIT	Dr Jessica Hagen-Zanker, Dr Anna McCord and Rebecca Holmes, Social Protection Programme, ODI with Francesca Booker and Elizabeth Molinari
Review Group	a) Maxime Gasteen, DFID Research Team Professor b) Professor Naila Kabeer, University of Sussex/ DFID c) Professor Andrew S. Pullin, Conservation Centre for Evidence-Based Conservation School of the Environment, Natural Resources and Geography, Bangor University
Advisory group	Maxime Gasteen, DFID Research Team
Conflicts of interest (if any)	Anna McCord has worked on assessing the impact of an EGS in South Africa which will be included in the study, however, no conflict of interest is anticipated, and Anna McCord can also function as a key informant.
Acknowledgements	We thank Shaheen Akter, Gina Bergh and Franzisca Zanker for their research inputs, Dr Chris Coles for his technical guidance and Alice Lemaitre for her work on information technology. We are grateful to Maxime Gasteen, Professor Naila Kabeer and Professor Andrew S. Pullin for comments on an earlier draft of this protocol and to Jeff Brunton, Kelly Dickson and Claire Stanesfield for much help with EPPI reviewer.

Appendix 1.2: List of Employment Guarantee Schemes

- National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA), India
- Maharashtra employment guarantee programme, India
- Productive Safety Net Programme (PSNP), Ethiopia
- Jefes de Hogar, Argentina
- Zibambele, South Africa
- New Deal, USA

Appendix 2.1: Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Inclusion criteria

- <u>Language</u>: English

- <u>Intervention</u>:

  Employment guarantee programme that <u>guarantees</u> a specific amount of days employment/ year for poor households/ individuals. In exchange for the work the households/ individuals will receive cash, food, assets or a combination.

  Cash transfer, i.e. a transfer of money to poor households/ individuals. Cash transfers may also be known as social grant, welfare, social assistance, social transfer, pension etc. They can be either conditional (e.g. school attendance required) or unconditional.

  Intervention should be non-contributory, i.e. people don't need to have paid into a pension system to receive the benefits.

- <u>Geographical location</u>: Be conducted in a lower or middle income country or USA in the 1930s

- <u>Date</u>: any (with the exception of the USA – see #3 above)

- <u>Population</u>: Beneficiaries of cash transfers/ employment guarantee programme and possibly a comparison group

- <u>Aim of study</u>: Should be investigating **impact** of intervention. We are interested in OUTCOMES

- <u>Study design</u>: Be high quality empirical research

- Econometric studies that rank 3 and above on quality ranking

Exclusion criteria

1) <u>Language</u>: Not in English

2) <u>Geographical location</u>: Was not conducted in a lower or middle income country, e.g. European countries (including Eastern Europe and Russia), or in USA after the 1930s

3) <u>Date</u>: the USA after the 1930s

4) <u>Intervention</u>:

   <u>a)</u> Public Works Programme that does not GUARANTEE employment. For example temporary public works programme that responds to some kind of shock/ emergency.

   <u>b)</u> Any other social protection intervention (e.g. cash transfers to communities or to services (e.g. health centres or school) rather than households or individuals)

   <u>c)</u> Intervention is contributory, i.e. people need to have paid into a (pension) system to receive the benefits.

5) <u>Population:</u> Not beneficiaries of cash transfers/ employment guarantee programme and or possible comparison group

6) **Aim of study**: Not investigating impact of intervention, for example

   a. Policy document, describing a new programme to be implemented

   b. Implementation report, describing administrative issues (e.g. there was not enough qualified staff to implement programme properly) or OUTPUTS (e.g. 500 people received a grant)

7) **Study design** Is either 'non-empirical' research:

   a. editorial, commentary, book review

   b. policy document

   c. resource, textbook

   d. bibliography

   e. position paper

   f. methodological paper

   g. theoretical paper

or not high quality empirical research:

   h. descriptive: Just describes what the impact is (in words)

   i. not academic: no methodology section

   j. anecdotal: The results don't seem to be based on survey results. Evidence is either based on hear-say (e.g. "everyone agrees this programme is good") or a couple of people the author seems to have talked to.

   k. Poor sample selection: it is not clear how the sample was selected, for example authors don't mention whether sample is random, which methods they used to select the sample, or characteristics of their sample.

List of low and middle income countries (based on WB definition, GNI per capita):

Afghanistan

Albania

Algeria

American Samoa

Angola

Antigua and Barbuda

Argentina

Armenia

Azerbaijan

Bangladesh

Belarus

Belize

Benin

Bhutan

Bolivia

Bosnia and Herzegovina

Botswana

Brazil

Bulgaria

Burkina Faso

Burundi

Cambodia

Cameroon

Cape Verde

Central African Republic

Chad

Chile

China

Colombia

Comoros

Congo, Dem. Rep

Congo, Rep.

Costa Rica

Côte d'Ivoire

Cuba

Djibouti

Dominica

Dominican Republic

Ecuador

Egypt, Arab Rep.

El Salvador

Eritrea

Ethiopia

Fiji

Gabon

Gambia, The

Georgia

Ghana

Grenada

Guatemala

Guinea

Guinea-Bisau

Guyana

Haiti

Honduras

India

Indonesia

Iran, Islamic Rep.

Iraq

Jamaica

Jordan

Kazakhstan

Kenya

Kiribati

Korea, Dem Rep.

Kosovo

Kyrgyz Republic

Lao PDR

Lebanon

Lesotho

Liberia

Libya

Lithuania

Macedonia, FYR

Madagascar

Malawi

Malaysia

Maldives

Mali

Marshall Islands

Mauritania

Mauritius

Mayotte

Mexico	Panama	Somalia
Micronesia, Fed. Sts.	Papua New Guinea	South Africa
Moldova	Paraguay	Sri Lanka
Mongolia	Peru	St. Kitts and Nevis
Montenegro	Philippines	St. Lucia
Morocco	Romania	St. Vincent and the Grenadines
Mozambique	Russian Federation	Sudan
Myanmar	Rwanda	Suriname
Namibia	Samoa	Swaziland
Nepal	São Tomé and Principe	Syrian Arab Republic
Nicaragua	Senegal	Tajikistan
Niger	Serbia	Tanzania
Nigeria	Seychelles	Thailand
Pakistan	Sierra Leone	Timor-Leste
Palau	Solomon Islands	Togo

Appendix 2.2: Search strategy for electronic databases

Subject-specific databases to be searched:

1.   Econlit (Ebsco)

2.   Francis (Ebsco)

3.   Africa-Wide Information (Ebsco)

4.   International Political Science Abstracts (IPSA) (Ebsco)

8.   Political Science Complete (Ebsco)

9.   Public Administration Abstracts (Ebsco)

10.   Public Affairs Index (Ebsco)

11.   Social Sciences Abstracts (Ebsco)

12.   Family & Society Studies Worldwid (FSSW) (Ebsco)

13.   Social Science Citation Index (Web of Knowledge)

Publisher platforms to be searched:

1. Wiley Interscience (All Economic; All Development Studies; Social Policy & Welfare; All Political Science)   using short search string

2. International Bibliography of the Social Sciences

3. Sage Journals (Public Administration, Economics and Development, Regional Studies, Politics & International Relations)

4. Jstor

5. Cab Direct

Institutional websites to be searched

1. International Policy Centre for Inclusive Growth (IPC-IG)

2. MDRC (Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation)

3. World Bank

4. Eldis

5. Governance Resource Centre:

6. Research4DFID

7. International Labour Organization

8. Chronic Poverty Research Centre

9. IDEAS

10. Social Science Research Network

11. Overseas Development Institute

12. International Food Policy Research Institute

13. Wahenga

14. Centre for Global Development

15. Poverty Action Research Lab

(Meta) search engines to be searched

1. Google Scholar
2. Metacrawler

<u>Journals to be searched:</u>

1. Development Policy Review
2. Journal of Development Studies
3. Journal of International Development
4. Journal of Development Economics
5. World Development

Appendix 2.3: Search strings

During the protocol testing period it became clear that long search strings incorporating a wide range of synonyms cannot be used in all search engines. We have subsequently shortened search strings and split them into several sets of strings. We have also included short strings for those databases that do now allow for long strings. Furthermore it became clear that the term "employment guarantee" only leads to results on India, or irrelevant findings in Bangladesh, so subsequent search strings include programme names instead.
We are not anticipating that the search strings under (1) relating to comparative analysis will furnish a significant number of abstracts, but will carry out this initial search in order to test our assumptions regarding the literature.

1. Impact of employment guarantee schemes **and** cash transfer schemes

1.	"employment guarantee" AND "cash transfer" AND poverty OR impact
2.	NREG* AND "cash transfer" AND poverty OR impact
3.	"Jefes" AND "cash transfer" AND poverty OR impact
4.	PSNP AND"cash transfer" AND poverty OR impact
5.	Productive Safety Nets Programme AND"cash transfer" AND poverty OR impact
6.	"Maharashtra employment guarantee" AND "cash transfer" AND poverty OR impact
7.	"MEGS" AND "cash transfer" AND poverty OR impact
8.	"New deal" AND "cash transfer" AND poverty OR impact

9.	"employment guarantee" AND grant AND poverty OR impact
10.	NREG* AND grant AND poverty OR impact
11.	"Jefes" AND grant AND poverty OR impact
12.	PSNP AND grant AND poverty OR impact
13.	Productive Safety Nets Programme AND grant AND poverty OR impact
14.	Zibambele AND grant AND poverty OR impact
15.	"Maharashtra employment guarantee" AND grant AND poverty OR impact "MEGS" AND grant AND poverty OR impact
16.	"New deal" AND grant AND poverty OR impact

2. Impact of employment guarantee schemes

Long version:

17.	"employment guarantee" AND poverty OR Asset* OR Wealth OR Capital OR Income OR Consumption OR food OR Livelihood* OR Inequal* OR impact
18.	NREG* AND poverty OR Asset* OR Wealth OR Capital OR Income OR Consumption OR food OR Livelihood* OR Inequal* OR impact
19.	"Jefes" AND poverty OR Asset* OR Wealth OR Capital OR Income OR Consumption OR food OR Livelihood* OR Inequal* OR impact
20.	PSNP AND poverty OR Asset* OR Wealth OR Capital OR Income OR Consumption OR food OR Livelihood* OR Inequal* OR impact
21.	Zibambele AND poverty OR Asset* OR Wealth OR Capital OR Income OR Consumption OR food OR

	Livelihood* OR Inequal* OR impact
22.	MEGS AND poverty OR Asset* OR Wealth OR Capital OR Income OR Consumption OR food OR Livelihood* OR Inequal* OR impact
23.	"Maharashtra employment guarantee" AND poverty OR Asset* OR Wealth OR Capital OR Income OR Consumption OR food OR Livelihood* OR Inequal* OR impact
24.	"New deal" AND poverty OR Asset* OR Wealth OR Capital OR Income OR Consumption OR food OR Livelihood* OR Inequal* OR impact

Short version:

25.	"employment guarantee" poverty impact
26.	NREG* poverty impact
27.	"Jefes" poverty impact
28.	PSNP poverty impact
29.	Zibambele poverty impact
30.	MEGS poverty impact
31.	"Maharashtra employment guarantee)" poverty impact
32.	"New deal" poverty impact

3. Impact of cash transfer schemes

Long version:

33.	"cash transfer*" AND poverty OR Asset* OR Wealth OR Capital OR Income OR Consumption OR food OR Livelihood* OR Inequal* OR impact
34.	grant AND poverty OR Asset* OR Wealth OR Capital OR Income OR Consumption OR food OR Livelihood* OR Inequal* OR impact
35.	Social AND transfer AND poverty OR Asset* OR Wealth OR Capital OR Income OR Consumption OR food OR Livelihood* OR Inequal* OR impact
36.	pension AND poverty OR Asset* OR Wealth OR Capital OR Income OR Consumption OR food OR Livelihood* OR Inequal* OR impact

Short version:

37.	"cash transfer*" poverty impact
38.	grant poverty impact
39.	Social transfer poverty impact
40.	pension poverty impact

Appendix 2.4

The following "not" terms were used in a number of cases to reduce the number of hits that needed to be downloaded and screened (notably Jstor):

1. crime
2. religion
3. colonial
4. Canada
5. Japan
6. UK
7. Britain
8. Germany
9. equilibrium
10. theory
11. model
12. retirement
13. technology
14. marketing
15. commercial
16. medical
17. psychology