

Cash, Food, and Vouchers

An Overview of the Evidence

Jessica Leight
Ugo Gentilini

Introduction and theoretical framework

The choice of different modalities for transferring resources to extremely poor households—food provided in-kind, cash, or intermediate modalities such as vouchers—has long been the subject of active debate in both policy and research. This note provides an overview of the recent evidence around the relative effectiveness of cash and food aid, drawing on studies conducted over the last 20 years around the world.

Each modality has some potential advantages. Cash transfers are flexible in allowing recipients to use resources to meet a range of material needs (including, but not limited to food); and when they do choose to purchase food, allows them to choose a basket of items that is optimal based on their preferences. (The corresponding disadvantage of food transfers is that if recipients desire nonfood items, they have to resell food for funds, often at a nontrivial transaction cost.) Cash transfers are often easier and lower-cost to deliver (particularly given the substantial growth of electronic payment systems) compared with the more complex logistical requirements of delivering food, especially perishable food. They are also generally less observable, potentially rendering them less likely to generate stigma or demands for sharing from nonrecipients. Cash can also have indirect beneficiaries through positive spillover effects in the local economy, though the evidence base for this is not large, and suggests that spillovers may be negative in some contexts.

Food transfers have some countervailing advantages of their own. Directly transferring food eliminates any risk or even perceived risk of diversion of cash to “temptation goods” (such as alcohol or cigarettes) or other uses regarded by policymakers as unproductive or undesirable—though the evidence base, discussed in more detail below, generally suggests this risk is minimal. Delivering food also ensures that the true value of the transfer is consistent even in periods

of high inflation, protecting households against price risk though at the expense of higher procurement costs for the state.¹ These in-kind transfers also eliminate any potential inflationary effects of that cash transfers might cause: again, the evidence base here suggests limited, but not non-zero potential for these effects, as described in considerably more detail in a companion evidence note (Allen et al. 2025). Finally, food transfers can be appropriate in contexts where food is simply unavailable in local markets—generally in settings of acute crisis or widespread conflict associated with intense disruptions to food security. The final section of this note will discuss further how to identify these contexts.

For both food and cash transfers, there may be some risk of disincentives to work generated by the receipt of transfers (adverse labor supply effects). However, there is very little evidence of this phenomenon in low- and middle-income countries.

Empirical evidence

This section briefly summarizes the extant empirical evidence around the positive effects of both cash and food transfer options, and comparisons of the two transfer modalities.

Systematic reviews: Cash

The cash transfer literature is particularly large, and has included a number of recent systematic reviews and meta-analyses aggregating evidence across outcomes. In the area of economic outcomes, Kondylis and Loeser (2021) provide a detailed discussion of the effects of unconditional cash transfers and multifaceted graduation models on consumption and the magnitude and persistence of these effects over time, though focusing on only a subset of trials. Both Crosta et al. (2024) and Leight, Hirvonen, and Zafar (2024) provide more comprehensive estimates of the effects of cash transfers and cash-plus programs on consumption, income, assets, and labor force participation; the first focuses only on cash transfers or light cash-plus interventions evaluated in randomized trials, while the second encompasses the whole spectrum of cash-related interventions as evaluated in all study designs.² Both studies document increases in consumption or income of around \$2 per month per \$100 transferred; Leight, Hirvonen, and Zafar (2024) further document that this effect persists around two and a half years, on average.³

While there is some mixed evidence as to whether the effect of transfers on labor force participation is positive (Crosta et al., 2024) or null (Leight, Hirvonen, and Zafar, 2024), the literature has consistently found that there is no evidence of any discouragement of labor (Banerjee et al., 2017). There is also some evidence of positive spillovers via enhanced local economic activity from transfers provided by Progresa in Mexico (Angelucci and De Giorgi, 2009) and GiveDirectly in Kenya (Egger et al., 2022) as well as economic aid provided to refugees (Taylor et al., 2016), though some papers also document negative spillovers of cash transfers for local

¹ While in principle cash transfers could be indexed to inflation, in practice this is not usually the case and the value of transfers is updated infrequently.

² Effects on assets are not evaluated in Leight, Hirvonen, and Zafar (2024). There are also some more limited reviews of cash transfers and livelihoods outcomes provided in Kabeer and Waddington (2015), Sulaiman (2018) and Correa et al. (2023).

³ There is also evidence that the effects of cash transfers on the consumption of undesirable “temptation goods” are generally minimal (Evans and Popova, 2017).

nonrecipient households (Beegle, Galasso and Goldberg, 2017; Haushofer and Shapiro, 2018). There is also heterogeneous, but generally null, evidence on local inflationary effects discussed in a separate note (Allen and Gentilini, 2025).

For other human capital-related outcomes, Crosta et al. (2024) provide pooled estimates of the effects of cash transfers on children’s health, education, and psychological well-being. Separate meta-analyses have analyzed effects on psychological well-being (McGuire, Kaiser, and Bach-Mortensen, 2022) and education (Baird et al., 2013), confirming consistently positive effects for these outcomes. Other reviews focused on the effects of cash on child nutritional outcomes suggest the effects are positive, but somewhat heterogeneous and small overall (Manley et al., 2020; Manley, Alderman, and Gentilini, 2022).⁴

In contrast to this extensive literature, large-scale reviews of food transfers are limited, though there are several reviews of cash versus food aid. One review assesses the rapid evolution of food aid instruments (inclusive of a shift toward cash as a mechanism to facilitate greater purchases of food) and explores the desirability of various modalities from the perspective of implementers (cost, timeliness, and so on), but does not compile rigorous evidence around the effectiveness of aid (Lentz et al., 2013). Gentilini (2015) reviews the debate over cash versus food transfers and finds that the pattern of effects cannot be generalized but depends on context and program design, and an earlier briefing paper (Harvey, 2007) as well as a more recent review (Jeong and Trako, 2022) summarize evidence around the effectiveness of food versus cash in humanitarian settings specifically.⁵ This most recent review again concludes that there is no robust evidence that either transfer modality is preferable, but does note the lower cost of delivering cash (again, this evidence should be considered only with reference to humanitarian settings). Gadenne and Singhal (2024) analyze both food and cash transfers from the perspective of planners and beneficiaries and suggest that general equilibrium effects should also be central elements in the policy debate.

Comparing cash versus food

There is a much smaller literature that evaluates the effect of varying the transfer modality on economic outcomes of interest, and limited review evidence other than Jeong and Trako (2022) as cited above. Here, we provide a brief overview of the evidence from rigorous evaluations (experimental and quasi-experimental) that directly compare food and cash transfers, with or without a control arm; we also include some relevant papers that evaluate vouchers for food, as distinct from direct provision of food.⁶

In general, this literature suggests two key conclusions. First, in terms of the effects of transfers on key economic outcomes of interest (consumption, food security, other livelihoods-related indicators such as assets, and other indicators of diet quality), there are generally few meaningful differences across cash and food transfers. Differences can arise when the transfer is extra-

⁴ These findings are broadly consistent with the evidence presented in Crosta et al. (2024) along this dimension.

⁵ Although there is also a robust recent literature on school meals for children, including multiple systematic reviews, we consider these to be a distinct intervention and do not include that evidence here.

⁶ Note this review is not all-encompassing and, in particular, does not include qualitative evidence or empirical evidence that is not plausibly causal, such as simple pre/post evaluations.

marginal (larger in quantity than the amount of food that would otherwise be consumed), but these can be reduced by households' endogenous responses (for example, selling in-kind transfers). Second, while costing data are somewhat sparse, they do suggest that the costs of disbursing cash transfers (as opposed to vouchers or food transfers) are always lower, and can be significantly lower. Given no robust evidence of differences in impacts, the evidence of lower cost implies a general preference for cash transfers as the more cost-effective modality.

We highlight here some more specific findings from this literature that identify effects in specific contexts and for specific outcomes of interest. Most of this literature analyzes smaller-scale, localized projects, often implemented by specific nongovernmental organizations. There are some exceptions: the evidence from Ethiopia, Indonesia, and Mexico is drawn from national cash and food transfer programs implemented with significant government and donor investment.

- In Bangladesh, food and cash transfers are generally found to have positive effects on livelihood outcomes (consumption and assets) as well as nutritional outcomes during the program, though the cash effects are more persistent post-program (Ahmed et al., 2024a; Ahmed, Hoddinott, and Roy, 2024; Ahmed et al., 2024b).
- In the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), both vouchers and cash have positive effects of equal magnitude on consumption, assets, and income; vouchers do have distortionary effects on both the extensive and intensive margin (encouraging households to buy more staple foods such as salt), but the ultimate effect of these differences is limited as households resell the excess goods purchased with vouchers. The cost per voucher is around 20 percent lower for the implementer (cost of \$11 compared to \$14 per recipient, for a total transfer of \$130), and is not significantly different from the perspective of beneficiary cost (Aker, 2017).
- In Ecuador, cash, food, and vouchers all have significant positive effects on household consumption expenditure that are not significantly different comparing across modalities. Food transfers have larger positive effects on calories, and vouchers have larger positive effects on dietary diversity. A detailed cost analysis finds that the cost of delivering a \$40 cash transfer (\$2.99) or a voucher (\$3.27) is less than one-third of the cost of delivery for a similar-value food transfer (\$11.46) (Hidrobo et al., 2014).
- In Ethiopia, a (lump-sum) cash transfer and an in-kind transfer in the form of a poultry package had generally consistent effects on livelihood outcomes; the poultry package leads to a larger increase in egg consumption, but this effect did not persist in the medium-term (Alderman et al., 2022; Leight et al., 2023; Alderman et al., 2024). (Note that the poultry package arguably has characteristics rendering it more similar to an asset transfer, as the objective was to raise chickens as an ongoing livelihoods activity; but it also has some characteristics of a food transfer.)

- In Indonesia, switching from food transfers to voucher transfers significantly improved the performance of a national food assistance program in a large-scale experiment: poorer households received significantly more assistance and the poverty rate dropped. This experiment also documents a roughly 50 percent decline in cost associated with the switch to vouchers: delivery and administrative costs are 4 percent of the benefits disbursed for food, but only 0.75–2 percent of benefits disbursed through vouchers (Banerjee et al., 2023).
- In Kenya, refugees who received a restricted cash transfer (usable only for food purchases) had lower nonfood expenditure than those receiving an unrestricted cash transfer; they were also more likely to engage in a shadow food resale market (Siu, Sterck, and Rodgers, 2023).
- In Mexico, cash and food transfers generally had identical positive effects on consumption and nutritional outcomes, reflecting the fact that overall, the food transfer is infra-marginal (quantity lower than the amount households would consume in any case) and nondistortionary (though it can be distortionary for some specific food items). There is also some evidence that food transfers slightly lowered prices while cash transfers slightly raised prices, and these effects were more noticeable in more remote areas (Leroy et al., 2010; Cunha, 2014; Skoufias and Di Maro, 2008; Cunha, De Giorgi, and Jayachandran, 2018)
- In Niger, a food transfer was extra-marginal—particularly with respect to the quantity of the non-grain components—and thus led to a larger increase in dietary diversity vis-à-vis the corresponding cash transfer. Households receiving cash directed it primarily to purchases of grain as well as private transfers and debts (Hoddinott, Sandström, and Upton, 2018).
- In Sri Lanka, both cash and food transfers had positive effects on household consumption; households receiving cash spent more on food, but less on staple food items. A summary cost analysis suggests cash was around 5 percent cheaper to deliver (Sandström and Tchatchua, 2010).
- In Yemen, both cash and food transfers had positive effects on assets and investment that did not meaningfully differ across modalities. For consumption outcomes, the effects on dietary diversity are larger for cash, while the effects on calories consumed are larger for food (Schwab, 2019).

Again, the magnitude of the implied gap in costs for program delivery between different modalities can be very large, though it is not uniformly large. Focusing purely on the cost of delivery (separate from the cost of transfer itself), in both Indonesia and Ecuador, the costs of delivering via voucher or cash was around 50–70 percent lower, per recipient, than the cost of delivering food directly. In Sri Lanka and the DRC, the costs were around 5–30 percent lower. Additional

estimates, provided in a separate paper about the costs of alternate transfer modalities (Margolies and Hoddinott, 2015), of the cost of transfer delivery for the Niger case analyzed in Hoddinott, Sandström, and Upton (2018) find the modality-specific cost of delivering cash is around 70 percent lower than the cost of delivering food. The same paper provides additional estimates for transfer programs in Uganda and Yemen, where the cost of delivering cash is likewise found to be 50–70 percent lower than the cost of delivering food.

In absolute terms, the cost of delivering food ranges from \$6 to \$11 per transfer in these four case studies, for transfers that are themselves valued around \$50 (except in Uganda where the transfer value was significantly lower), while the cost of delivering cash is around \$3 per transfer (hence the estimate that the transfer cost alone is around 50–70 percent lower). Thus, inclusive of the total value of the transfer itself (fixed across modalities), the total cost of the transfer program is around 15–20 percent lower for cash compared with food in the four examples analyzed in Margolies and Hoddinott (2015). Importantly, any comparison of cost could be very different for a program implemented at wider scale and/or over a longer period of time.

A final point to consider in assessing transfer modalities is recipient preferences. There is not a large literature here, but some evidence is suggestive of divergent patterns. In favor of cash, receipt of cash (as opposed to non-cash interventions) increased recipients' feelings of autonomy and the sense that they were respected in Kenya (Shapiro, 2019). Similarly, in Ecuador, around half of voucher and food recipients reported preferring to receive their entire transfer in their designated modality while nearly 80 percent of cash recipients reported preferring cash, suggesting by comparison some overall preference for cash (Hidrobo et al 2014). In Kenya, a restricted cash transfer for food only (described above) negatively affected subjective well-being compared to a sample receiving an unrestricted cash transfer; there was no comparison in this study to a sample receiving no transfers at all (Siu, Sterck, and Rodgers, 2023).

In favor of food transfers, a majority of households surveyed in a study in India expressed a preference for food and many highlighted issues linked to self-control or a fear that cash would not be used effectively (Khera, 2014). A broadly similar pattern was observed in Ethiopia among beneficiaries of the Productive Safety Net Program, which disburses transfers both in food and in cash: most beneficiaries preferred their payments at least partly or fully in food, particularly when food prices are high, and again seemingly partly due to self-control concerns (Hirvonen and Hoddinott, 2021). Cash was reported to be preferred, though, by more food-secure households and households closer to markets. A recent paper suggested that recipients in Kenya and the United States preferred receiving cash vis-à-vis receiving food from a charity, but were indifferent when receiving aid from the government (Kassirer, Jami, and Kouchaki, 2024).

Policy tools to inform choice of transfer modality

This section provides an overview of the key policy tools available to help policymakers choose a transfer modality. Table 1 provides a summary.

Table 1: Summary of policy tools to inform choice of transfer modality

	MIFIRA	MFI	Omega value	Market Information Framework	EMMA Toolkit
Policy objective	Reduction of food insecurity	More general	Enhancing nutritional status or quality of diet	Stabilizing markets in emergency settings	Rapid assessments of market systems in early phase of crisis
Level of flexibility	High: Guiding tool but does not use a particular formula	Low: Tool and formula fully specified	Intermediate: Requires assumptions about food items accessed in different modalities	High: Guiding questions but no particular tool	Intermediate: Includes fairly specific guidelines for qualitative data collection
Type of data	Secondary data, both micro and macro	Primary data collected through trader survey	Data on nutrient values and prices of food	Does not provide specific guidance about types of data	Primary qualitative data
Output of model	Does not generate a numerical score or decision	Generates a score	Generates a score for each modality	Does not generate a numerical score or decision	Insights into change in market functioning in the emergency
Decision-making rule	Designed to guide decision-making, but does not imply a particular choice	MFI scores can be reviewed, but no defined cut-off	Recommended choice of modality is highest nutrient value score	Designed to guide decision-making, but does not imply a particular choice	No explicit emphasis on choice of transfer modality

MIFIRA

MIFIRA (Market Information and Food Insecurity Response Analysis), created by a team of experts from Cornell and Tufts Universities, is a tool to assist policymakers in identifying the most appropriate transfer modality to address challenges linked to current food insecurity (Barrett et al., 2009). It is important to note that the presumed goal of this tool is reducing food insecurity, a concept distinct from (for example) reducing poverty or enhancing longer-term stable livelihoods, and thus it would not be appropriate for stakeholders who are designing transfer programs that primarily seek to achieve other policy goals.

More specifically, MIFIRA is designed to characterize the context faced by a particular food insecure population and the behavioral responses of key participants in the local market. The key questions that the framework seeks to answer are: are local markets functioning well, and (as applicable) is there sufficient food available nearby to fill the gap faced by food insecure households.⁷ With respect to the first question, in general if local food markets are functioning well, cash-based transfers are preferred, and preferred particularly for households with relatively

⁷ Each question is also broken down into multiple subquestions. For the first question, these includes: are food insecure households connected to local markets, how will local demand respond to transfers, how much additional food will traders supply at current costs, do local traders behave competitively, and do food insecure households have a preference over the form of aid they receive. For the second question, they include: where are viable prospective markets, will agency purchases drive up food prices, and will local or regional purchases affect producer prices differently.

good market access. If some food aid is preferred, the second question will guide stakeholders to identify the most appropriate location for purchasing food; generally, if a marketing hub can provide food readily and purchasing will have little impact on prices, local or regional purchases are preferred as a strategy for procuring food aid, as opposed to transoceanic purchases of food.

It is important to note that this framework does not employ a mechanical formula, but is a structured tool that allows for a systematic exploration of factors relevant to the choice of transfer. The analysis can draw on a range of data types (macro and micro data) that may already be widely available and thus is designed to be relatively flexible and easy to deploy.

Market information

The World Food Program (WFP) has developed the Market Functionality Index or MFI (World Food Program, 2020), a quantitative measure designed to benchmark market functionality and serve as a feasibility assessment to inform the choice of transfer modality. The key principle underlying the MFI is that better-functioning markets render the use of cash or voucher-based transfer modalities more appealing, while direct food transfers are typically more appropriate in areas where markets are not functioning well.

Unlike MIFIRA, the MFI is a structured, specific data collection tool accompanied by an associated standardized package of data processing, visualization, and reporting; this may be useful for contexts where policymakers would like a more specific tool, but is also less flexible. The survey tool itself is administered to market traders, and customization to the local context (in the form of changing questions) is not recommended, though adding questions is of course feasible if a longer survey can be administered.⁸ The MFI does not have any associated threshold that leads to a recommendation of one particular transfer type, but can be used to order settings as more or less suitable for cash-based interventions.

The nine dimensions assessed as part of the MFI are an assortment of essential goods, availability, price, resilience of supply chains, competition, infrastructure, services, food quality, and access and protection. In general, the key questions are whether there is a wide range of goods present and whether they are scarce or are anticipated to be scarce; whether prices have been increasing recently, or are volatile; how long current stocks will last and how quickly they can be replenished; the number and location of suppliers; the number of traders and the degree of control exerted by any one trader; the quality of infrastructure and services; the level of access to the market; and the presence of any physical security or protection risk. Measuring and scoring these dimensions (using the pre-specified scoring and weighting methods) allows for a summary score of functionality in a range of zero to 10.

The MFI is a relatively new index, tested in 2019 and 2020. As noted above, the WFP does not recommend any particular threshold as indicative of the choice of transfer modality, and MFI scores compiled by WFP programs (or other stakeholders) are not usually published externally. Accordingly, one disadvantage of using the MFI may be that it is not obvious how to interpret

⁸ The core tool has 27 questions, all of which are binary.

any particular score, unless the analysis either can be conducted longitudinally to track evolution in conditions in one site over time or entails comparison across multiple sites.

Omega value

The omega value indicator is available for policymakers specifically interested in using transfers to achieve nutritional objectives or objectives related to the quality of diet; again, this tool would not be useful for the design of transfers where the primary goal is different (Ryckembusch et al., 2013). It is also mainly intended for the comparison of in-kind food transfers and vouchers.

The first step in constructing the omega value is to capture a nutrient value score that compares the total nutrient content in a food basket with the nutrient requirements established by a particular program. To compare multiple modalities, the nutrient content across each (that is, the content of an in-kind food transfer basket vis-à-vis a basket of food commodities purchased at the market using a voucher) can be calculated to identify whether one generates a preferable nutritional outcome. For vouchers that allow some flexibility in the commodities that can be purchased—or, potentially, for fully flexible cash transfers—the analysis must employ assumptions about the basket of commodities that will likely be purchased, though the calculation could also be made for multiple potential commodity baskets.

The second step is to normalize the nutrient value score with respect to cost for each modality and then compare the normalized score for the in-kind delivery to voucher delivery. The modality with the higher nutrient value score per dollar will be more attractive. Again, however, this analysis is dependent on underlying assumptions about the food basket and the nutritional goals of the transfer program, and will be most useful when both the basket and the goals are fully specified.

Market Information Framework

The Market Information Framework (MIF) was developed by the International Rescue Committee with support from the U.S. Agency for International Development. It has some broad similarities to the MFI, but is intended primarily for assessing markets in emergency settings and designed for use by field-focused humanitarian staff (International Rescue Committee, 2018). The goals are broader, but include informing what modality of assistance (cash or in-kind) is appropriate as well as other types of support required to stabilize market functions. The framework centers around key questions and information required to answer the questions; but importantly, the framework does not provide specific assessment instruments or analysis methods, instead referring the user to other tools (such as those described in this note).

The key questions that structure the framework include the following: does the market have the capacity to deliver part or all of the needed assistance; what else might determine the appropriateness of determining the response through the market; what kind of support could increase the feasibility and appropriateness of a market-based response; what are appropriate values and frequency for any cash assistance; and what payment mechanism should be used to deliver cash to affected groups.

EMMA Toolkit

The EMMA (Emergency Market Mapping and Analysis) Toolkit was developed by Oxfam in 2010 to facilitate rapid assessments of market systems in the early phase of a crisis by frontline staff (Albu, 2010). It is one of the older tools available and is primarily qualitative. Its emphasis is on short-term analysis (within a year) in an emergency setting. Similar to the MIF, the tool is not specifically geared toward assessing an appropriate transfer modality, but it could generate findings relevant to determining transfer types.

The process begins with the selection of market systems that will be analyzed: typically, either the most significant or urgently relevant market systems (most essential to livelihoods) or the market systems that were most adversely affected by the current shock. Each market system is then mapped visually to identify key nodes of operation, and the map is updated to show the market both prior to the emergency, and post-emergency.

For each market system of interest, detailed qualitative data collection is conducted with key stakeholders to better understand market operation. This includes households (the target beneficiaries of any proposed aid), key market actors, and other local stakeholders and key informants. (Note that EMMA includes a range of sample questions for these various purposes, but does not provide full instruments, as the intention is for the instrument to be locally adapted.) It also provides guidance for collecting key quantitative data about prices, market volumes, and other characteristics of interest, if that is feasible.

Among the key questions that EMMA seeks to answer are whether cash-based or in-kind interventions will be more effective in meeting emergency needs and whether the local market system can meet increased demand; the likely impact of any intervention on markets; the key interventions required to rehabilitate and stabilize markets over the longer term; and key market indicators to be monitored.

Conclusion

This evidence note highlights a few key points about the literature on cash and food transfers. Both individual studies and a range of prior reviews suggest there is no consistent evidence on which modality performs better in terms of positive effects on either food security or nutritional outcomes, and the evidence of recipient preferences for either cash or food is also mixed. Assuming a basic level of market functionality, program design plays a key role in shaping performance, including in terms of target population, timing, and setting key parameters such as gender of beneficiaries, transfer amount, and duration (Goldberg et al 2024). Also, it is important to recognize that this evidence is generally assessed with respect to a set of common food security-related goals; in practice, cash transfers can pursue objectives other than food assistance, such as rent support. Furthermore, recent crisis responses show that the boundaries between cash and vouchers are increasingly blurred, with new hybrid transfer modalities having the flexibility of money but being time-bound or geo-restricted (Gentilini 2022).

The existing evidence suggests that cash transfers can be much cheaper to deliver than food transfers, though importantly this evidence is largely drawn from smaller-scale trials and may

not be informative about costs at scale. Conversely, there are some risks that cash transfers can increase inflationary pressures, though a companion note suggests these risks are generally low and can be effectively mitigated by transfer design (Allen and Gentilini 2025). Thus, while there is no clear presumption of greater effectiveness of either transfer modality, the case for greater cost-effectiveness of cash transfers is fairly compelling.

Policymakers seeking to use a specific data-driven tool to inform decisions around transfer modality and programming structure more broadly have a range of tools at their disposal, including some specifically targeted for crisis or emergency settings. All of these methods generally seek to identify how well markets are functioning and whether they could meet the population's most urgent needs (and whether they could flexibly meet higher demand if there were an infusion of cash support). As a broad rule, contexts where markets are not functioning adequately are generally better served by in-kind transfers. In a policy setting where increasing food security is the goal, MIFIRA is generally the most widely applicable and easy-to-use tool that allows key stakeholders to identify the relative suitability of cash and food aid, as well as addressing secondary questions such as the best source for any food procured.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Jessica Leight is a Senior Research Fellow in the Poverty, Gender, and Inclusion Unit of the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI). She holds a PhD in Economics and works on a wide range of topics including poverty, social protection, agriculture, and gender.

Ugo Gentilini is a Lead Economist with the Social Protection and Labor Global Practice at the World Bank. In his current capacity he supports countries across the Middle East and North Africa region while producing a weekly newsletter with a wide global audience (www.ugogentilini.net). His areas of interest include the analytics and practice of social protection with an emphasis on urbanization, disaster risks, fragile states, and food security. He holds a PhD in Development Economics and has published extensively on these topics.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The paper was generously supported by the World Bank's Social Protection Response Multidonor Trust Fund. The authors are grateful to peer reviewers, namely Imane Helm and Melissa Hidrobo, for feedback. However, this publication has not undergone IFPRI's standard peer-review process. Any opinion expressed here belongs to the author(s) and is not necessarily representative of or endorsed by IFPRI or the World Bank.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, Akhter, John Hoddinott, and Shalini Roy. 2024. "Food transfers, cash transfers, behavior change communication and child nutrition: Evidence from Bangladesh." *The World Bank Economic Review*, Ihae023.
- Ahmed, Akhter, Melissa Hidrobo, John Hoddinott, Bastien Kolt, Shalini Roy, and Salauddin Tauseef. 2024a. "Sustainable poverty reduction through social assistance: Modality, context, and complementary programming in Bangladesh." *Forthcoming, American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*.
- Ahmed, Akhter U., John Hoddinott, Shalini Roy, and Esha Sraboni. 2024b. "Transfers, nutrition programming, and economic well-being: Experimental evidence from Bangladesh." *World Development*, 173: 106414.
- Aker, Jenny C. 2017. "Comparing cash and voucher transfers in a humanitarian context: Evidence from the Democratic Republic of Congo." *The World Bank Economic Review*, 31(1): 44–70.
- Albu, Mike. 2010. "Emergency Market Mapping and Analysis Toolkit." <https://policypractice.oxfam.org/resources/emergency-market-mapping-and-analysis-toolkit-115385/>, retrieved October 25, 2024.
- Alderman, Harold, Daniel O. Gilligan, Jessica Leight, Michael Mulford, and Heleene Tambet. 2022. "The role of poultry transfers in diet diversity: A cluster randomized intent to treat analysis." *Food Policy*, 107: 102212.
- Alderman, Harold, Daniel O. Gilligan, Jessica Leight, Tigist Mamo, Michael Mulford, and Heleene Tambet. 2024. "Including Scalable Nutrition Interventions in a Graduation Model Program: Experimental Evidence from Ethiopia." *Forthcoming, Economic Development and Cultural Change*.
- Allen, James and Ugo Gentilini. 2025. "Cash Transfers and Inflation: An Overview of the Evidence". IFPRI. Washington, DC.
- Angelucci, Manuela, and Giacomo De Giorgi. 2009. "Indirect Effects of an Aid Program: How Do Cash Transfers Affect Ineligibles' Consumption?" *American Economic Review*, 99(1): 486–508.
- Baird, Sarah, Francisco H. G. Ferreira, Berk Özler, and Michael Woolcock. 2013. "Relative effectiveness of conditional and unconditional cash transfers for schooling outcomes in developing countries: a systematic review." *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 9(1): 1–124.
- Banerjee, Abhijit, Rema Hanna, Benjamin A. Olken, Elan Satriawan, and Sudarno Sumarto. 2023. "Electronic food vouchers: Evidence from an at-scale experiment in Indonesia." *American Economic Review*, 113(2): 514–547.
- Banerjee, Abhijit V., Rema Hanna, Gabriel E. Kreindler, and Benjamin A. Olken. 2017. "Debunking the Stereotype of the Lazy Welfare Recipient: Evidence from Cash Transfer Programs." *The World Bank Research Observer*, 32(2): 155–184.
- Barrett, Christopher B., Robert Bell, Erin C. Lentz, and Daniel G. Maxwell. 2009. "Market information and food insecurity response analysis." *Food Security*, 1: 151–168.
- Beegle, Kathleen, Emanuela Galasso, and Jessica Goldberg. 2017. "Direct and Indirect Effects of Malawi's Public Works Program on Food Security." *Journal of Development Economics*, 128: 1–23.
- Correa, Juan Sebastian, Silvio Daidone, Benjamin Davis, and Nicholas J. Sitko. 2023. "Social Protection and Rural Transformation in Africa." *Annual Review of Resource Economics*, 15: 305–327.
- Crosta, Tommaso, Dean Karlan, Finley Ong, Julius Ruschenpohler, and Christopher Udry. 2024. "Unconditional Cash Transfers: A Bayesian Meta-Analysis of 50 Randomized Evaluations in 26 Low and Medium Income Countries."
- Cunha, Jesse M. 2014. "Testing Paternalism: Cash versus In-Kind Transfers." *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 6(2): 195–230.
- Cunha, Jesse M., Giacomo De Giorgi, and Seema Jayachandran. 2018. "The Price Effects of Cash Versus In-Kind Transfers." *The Review of Economic Studies*, 86(1): 240–281.
- Egger, Dennis, Johannes Haushofer, Edward Miguel, Paul Niehaus, and Michael Walker. 2022. "General Equilibrium Effects of Cash Transfers: Experimental Evidence From Kenya." *Econometrica*, 90(6): 2603–2643.
- Evans, David K., and Anna Popova. 2017. "Cash transfers and temptation goods." *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 65(2): 189–221.
- Gadenne, Lucie, and Monica Singhal. 2024. "The Form of Transfers: Cash, In-Kind, Vouchers." Working Paper.
- Gentilini, Ugo. 2015. "Revisiting the 'Cash versus Food' Debate: New Evidence for an Old Puzzle?" *The World Bank Research Observer*, 31(1): 135–167.
- Gentilini, Ugo. 2022. "Cash Transfers in Pandemic Times: Lessons from the Largest Scale Up in History". World Bank. Washington, DC.
- Goldberg, Nathaniel, Lauren Whitehead, Savanna Henderson, Ana Alatraste Tamayo, Julie Kedroske, Ugo Gentilini, Yuko Okamura, Mohamed Almenfi, Giorgia Valleriani, Hrishikesh TMM Iyengar, and Mia Blakstad. 2024. "Evidence Briefs on Cash Transfers: Overview and Ten Key Messages". World Bank, Policy and Technical Note 33. Washington, DC.
- Harvey, Paul. 2007. "Cash-based responses in emergencies."
- Haushofer, Johannes, and Jeremy Shapiro. 2018. "The long-term impact of unconditional cash transfers: experimental evidence from Kenya." *Busara Center for Behavioral Economics*, Nairobi, Kenya.
- Hidrobo, Melissa, John Hoddinott, Amber Peterman, Amy Margolies, and Vanessa Moreira. 2014. "Cash, Food, or Vouchers? Evidence from a Randomized Experiment in Northern Ecuador." *Journal of Development Economics*, 107: 144–156.
- Hirvonen, Kalle, and John Hoddinott. 2021. "Beneficiary views on cash and in-kind payments: Evidence from Ethiopia's Productive Safety Net Programme." *The World Bank Economic Review*, 35(2): 398–413.

- Hoddinott, John, Susanna Sandström, and Joanna Upton. 2018. "The impact of cash and food transfers: evidence from a randomized intervention in Niger." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 100(4): 1032–1049.
- International Rescue Committee. 2018. "Market Information Framework." <https://www.calpnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/1527621831.Market-Information-Framework-Final-May-2018-1.pdf>, retrieved October 25, 2024.
- Jeong, Dahyeon, and Iva Trako. 2022. "Cash and in-kind transfers in humanitarian settings: a review of evidence and knowledge gaps."
- Kabeer, Naila, and Hugh Waddington. 2015. "Economic impacts of conditional cash transfer programmes: a systematic review and meta-analysis." *Journal of Development Effectiveness*, 7(3): 290–303.
- Kassirer, Samantha, Ata Jami, and Maryam Kouchaki. 2024. "Is in-kind kinder than cash? The impact of money vs. food aid on social emotions and aid take-up." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 121(38): e2310025121.
- Khera, Reetika. 2014. "Cash vs. in-kind transfers: Indian data meets theory." *Food Policy*, 46: 116–128.
- Kondylis, Florence, and John Loeser. 2021. "Intervention size and persistence." *World Bank, Washington, DC. Policy Research Working Paper 9769*.
- Leight, Jessica, Harold Alderman, Daniel Gilligan, Melissa Hidrobo, and Michael Mulford. 2023. "Can a light-touch graduation model enhance livelihood outcomes? Evidence from Ethiopia." *International Food Policy Research Institute*.
- Leight, Jessica, Kalle Hirvonen, and Sarim Zafar. 2024. "The effectiveness of cash and cash plus interventions on livelihoods outcomes: Evidence from a systematic review and meta-analysis." *IFPRI Discussion Paper 02262*.
- Lentz, Erin C., Christopher B. Barrett, Miguel I. Gómez, and Daniel G. Maxwell. 2013. "On the choice and impacts of innovative international food assistance instruments." *World Development*, 49: 1–8.
- Leroy, Jef L., Paola Gadsden, Sonia Rodríguez-Ramírez, and Teresa González De Cossío. 2010. "Cash and In-Kind Transfers in Poor Rural Communities in Mexico Increase Household Fruit, Vegetable, and Micronutrient Consumption but Also Lead to Excess Energy Consumption." *The Journal of Nutrition*, 140(3): 612–617.
- Manley, James, Harold Alderman, and Ugo Gentilini. 2022. "More evidence on cash transfers and child nutritional outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis." *BMJ Global Health*, 7(4): e008233.
- Manley, James, Yarlini Balarajan, Shahira Malm, Luke Harman, Jessica Owens, Sheila Murthy, David Stewart, Natalia Elena Winder-Rossi, and Atif Khurshid. 2020. "Cash transfers and child nutritional outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis." *BMJ Global Health*, 5(12): e003621.
- Margolies, Amy, and John Hoddinott. 2015. "Costing alternative transfer modalities." *Journal of Development Effectiveness*, 7(1): 1–16.
- McGuire, Joel, Caspar Kaiser, and Anders M. Bach-Mortensen. 2022. "A systematic review and meta-analysis of the impact of cash transfers on subjective well-being and mental health in low- and middle-income countries." *Nature Human Behaviour*, 6(3): 359–370.
- Ryckembusch, David, Romeo Frega, Marcio Guilherme Silva, Ugo Gentilini, Issa Sanogo, Nils Grede, and Lynn Brown. 2013. "Enhancing nutrition: A new tool for ex ante comparison of commodity-based vouchers and food transfers." *World Development*, 49: 58–67.
- Sandström, Susanna, and Levan Tchatchua. 2010. "Do cash transfers improve food security in emergencies? Evidence from Sri Lanka." In Steven Were Omamo, Ugo Gentilini, Susanna Sandstrom, *Revolution: From Food Aid to Food Assistance-Innovations in Overcoming Hunger*. World Food Programme (WFP), 75–88.
- Schwab, Benjamin. 2019. "Comparing the Productive Effects of Cash and Food Transfers in a Crisis Setting: Evidence from a Randomised Experiment in Yemen." *The Journal of Development Studies*, 55(sup1): 29–54.
- Shapiro, Jeremy. 2019. "The impact of recipient choice on aid effectiveness." *World Development*, 116: 137–149.
- Siu, Jade, Olivier Sterck, and Cory Rodgers. 2023. "The freedom to choose: Theory and quasi-experimental evidence on cash transfer restrictions." *Journal of Development Economics*, 161: 103027.
- Skoufias, Emmanuel, and Vincenzo Di Maro. 2008. "Conditional Cash Transfers, Adult Work Incentives, and Poverty." *The Journal of Development Studies*, 44(7): 935–960.
- Sulaiman, Munshi. 2018. "Livelihood, cash transfer, and graduation approaches: How do they compare in terms of cost, impact, and targeting?" In *Boosting Growth to End Hunger by 2025: The Role of Social Protection*, 102–20.
- Taylor, J. Edward, Mateusz J. Filipski, Mohamad Alloush, Anubhab Gupta, Ruben Irvin Rojas Valdes, and Ernesto Gonzalez-Estrada. 2016. "Economic impact of refugees." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(27): 7449–7453.
- World Food Program. 2020. "Market Functionality Index: Technical Guidance." <https://www.wfp.org/publications/market-functionality-index-mfi>, retrieved October 25, 2024.
- World Bank. 2025. State of Social Protection Report 2025: The 2-Billion-Person Challenge. Washington, DC.

INTERNATIONAL FOOD POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE

A world free of hunger and malnutrition

IFPRI is a CGIAR Research Center

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

© 2025 International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI). This publication is licensed for use under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0). To view this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>.