



Social Grants as a Lifeline: Assessing Their Impact on Poverty Reduction in African Countries

Chikwira Collin*, Mohammed Iqbal Jahed

School of Public Management, Governance and Public Policy Directors Office, University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg, South Africa. *Email: collincolchi1913@gmail.com

Received: 19 March 2025

Accepted: 10 September 2025

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32479/ijefi.19921>

ABSTRACT

The study aims to evaluate the effectiveness of social grants in reducing poverty across ten African countries: South Africa, Kenya, Nigeria, Ghana, Tanzania, Uganda, Rwanda, Botswana, Namibia, and Ethiopia. It seeks to understand how these programs influence household income, poverty rates, and access to essential services within inclusive development. The study employs a Difference-in-Differences (DiD) approach and a Fixed Effects (FE) regression model to assess the impact of social grants from 2019 to 2023. The analysis is grounded in Keynesian economics and Amartya Sen's capabilities approach, providing economic and human development perspectives. Findings indicate that social grants contribute to measurable improvements in household income, poverty reduction, and service access. The results further stressed that key constraints were identified as poor targeting, fiscal limitations, and potential long-term dependency. Social grants are effective tools for poverty alleviation, and their design and implementation require refinement to enhance sustainability and impact. The study provides robust empirical evidence and practical recommendations to policymakers and stakeholders. It supports expanding and optimising social grants as part of broader strategies for economic resilience, social inclusion, and equitable growth across Africa.

Keywords: Social Grants, Poverty Alleviation, Africa, Social Economic

JEL Classifications: I38, H53, O55

1. INTRODUCTION

Poverty remains one of the most pressing challenges across African countries, characterized by high levels of inequality, unemployment, and limited access to basic needs (Singh and Chudasama, 2020). Despite numerous policy interventions, millions remain impoverished, unable to meet their daily subsistence needs. Patel et al. (2023) stated that in South Africa, over 55% of the population lives below the national poverty line, with marginalized groups such as women, children, and rural households disproportionately affected. Social grants have emerged as a critical instrument in the fight against poverty across the African continent. Persistent challenges such as high unemployment rates, income inequality, and economic instability have left millions of individuals and households vulnerable and

unable to meet their basic needs. Zwane et al. (2022) explained that poverty remains a significant barrier to human development, depriving people of access to adequate food, healthcare, education, and opportunities for economic participation. This systemic issue perpetuates intergenerational cycles of poverty and hinders national economic growth and social cohesion.

Miyajima (2023) discussed that the lack of reliable income and social safety nets has exacerbated disparities, pushing the most disadvantaged further into destitution. For example, high unemployment rates and informal labour markets leave many households without stable sources of income, creating a reliance on external assistance. Without intervention, these conditions lead to malnutrition, preventable diseases, illiteracy, and exclusion from mainstream economic activities, perpetuating a cycle of

poverty that is difficult to break (Chingono, 2020). Therefore, Leila Patel (2023) shows that social grants represent a viable solution. These programs provide direct financial assistance to the most vulnerable populations, enabling them to access essential services and improve their quality of life. Countries such as South Africa, Kenya, Nigeria, Ghana, and Tanzania have implemented various social grant programs with varying levels of success. For instance, Patel et al. (2023) discovered that South Africa boasts one of the continent's most comprehensive social protection systems, covering over 18 million beneficiaries through programs like the Child Support Grant and Old Age Pension. Similarly, Murrey and Mutwiri (2022) stated that Kenya's Inua Jamii program targets older persons and persons with disabilities, offering crucial support to those who might otherwise fall through the cracks. Devereux (2021), the National Social Safety Nets Project (NASSP), has provided conditional cash transfers to vulnerable households to enhance human capital development in Nigeria.

Furthermore, Ekane et al. (2020) review that Uganda and Rwanda have adopted social protection initiatives such as the Senior Citizens Grant and Vision 2020 Umurenge Program to alleviate poverty and improve livelihoods. In Ghana, the Livelihood Empowerment Against Poverty (LEAP) program has played a transformative role in enhancing social security for the poorest households (Cuesta et al., 2021). Meanwhile, Botswana and Namibia stand out for their universal old-age pension schemes, significantly reducing old-age poverty (Svotwa et al., 2023; Valombola, 2022). Other nations, such as Ethiopia (Deshpande et al., 2022) and Zambia, have also integrated social grant programs into their poverty alleviation strategies. For example, Ethiopia's Productive Safety Net Programme (PSNP) combines cash and food transfers with community development activities, fostering resilience among vulnerable populations. Pruce (2023) shows that Zambia's Social Cash Transfer Scheme has similarly targeted rural and marginalized groups, contributing to improved nutrition and reduced poverty levels. Despite these advancements, the effectiveness of social grants in reducing poverty varies significantly across countries due to differences in program design, implementation capacity, and funding sustainability. Questions remain about the long-term impact of these programs and their ability to address the root causes of poverty beyond short-term relief. Nonetheless, social grants have proven to be vital to poverty reduction strategies in African countries, underscoring their potential to contribute to sustainable development and social equity. The current study seeks to assess the impact of social grants on poverty reduction in Africa by analyzing their outcomes in ten countries: South Africa, Kenya, Nigeria, Ghana, Tanzania, Uganda, Rwanda, Botswana, Namibia, and Ethiopia. The study aims to identify best practices and challenges through a comparative analysis, providing insights into how social protection programs can be optimized to achieve broader and more sustainable poverty alleviation goals.

2. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Poverty remains a pervasive challenge in Africa, with approximately 40% of the continent's population living below the international poverty line of \$1.90/day, according to recent World Bank

estimates. World Bank (2024) stated that the persistence of poverty is compounded by factors such as rapid population growth, political instability, inadequate infrastructure, and economic shocks. These factors have created a scenario where millions of people are trapped in cycles of deprivation, unable to access basic services or opportunities to improve their livelihoods.

African countries have increasingly turned to social protection measures to combat these challenges, with social grants being a cornerstone of these interventions. Leila Patel (2023) explains that social grants, including cash transfers, food subsidies, and pensions, are designed to address immediate needs while fostering long-term economic stability. Rooted in principles of social justice and equity, these programs aim to reduce poverty and vulnerability by providing financial support to marginalized groups such as the elderly, children, persons with disabilities, and unemployed individuals.

The adoption of social grants in Africa gained significant momentum in the late 20th and early 21st centuries, influenced by global advocacy for social protection systems as integral components of sustainable development. South Africa pioneered in this field, with its expansive grant system serving as a model for other nations. Over time, countries such as Kenya, Ghana, and Rwanda have implemented their versions of social grants tailored to their unique socio-economic contexts. These programs have demonstrated varying degrees of success in alleviating poverty, promoting education, improving health outcomes, and enhancing social cohesion.

However, the implementation of social grants is not without challenges. Issues such as limited fiscal space, mismanagement, targeting errors, and dependency concerns have raised questions about the sustainability and effectiveness of these programs. Additionally, socio-political dynamics and economic inequalities within countries often influence the reach and impact of social grants, leaving some vulnerable groups underserved.

Despite these challenges, social grants have proven to be a critical mechanism for reducing poverty and fostering social inclusion. They provide a safety net for millions who might otherwise face extreme hardship, contributing to broader development goals such as improved health, education, and economic resilience. As African countries continue to refine and expand their social protection systems, it is essential to assess the effectiveness of these programs in addressing poverty and inequality. This study focuses on ten African countries, South Africa, Kenya, Nigeria, Ghana, Tanzania, Uganda, Rwanda, Botswana, Namibia, and Ethiopia, to evaluate the impact of social grants on poverty reduction to identify best practices and areas for improvement.

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1. Theoretical Review

The theoretical foundation for social grants is anchored in social protection and welfare theories, which advocate for government intervention to address market failures and social inequalities. Keynesian economics underscores the importance of government

spending in stimulating economic activity, particularly during economic downturns. Social grants align with this perspective by providing financial resources to vulnerable populations, thereby boosting consumption and aggregate demand.

Herzog (2023) explained that Amartya Sen's capabilities approach provides a critical framework for understanding the role of social grants. According to this approach, poverty is not merely the lack of income but the deprivation of basic capabilities, such as education, health, and participation in economic and social life. Thus, Social grants address these deprivations by enabling individuals to access essential services and opportunities, enhancing their overall well-being and potential for economic inclusion.

Modern development theories emphasize the need for inclusive growth and social equity, highlighting social grants as instruments for reducing inequality and promoting human development. The social risk management framework, introduced by the World Bank, further posits that social protection measures, including cash transfers, can help individuals manage risks associated with unemployment, illness, and other shocks, thereby preventing them from falling deeper into poverty.

Social grants are non-contributory cash transfers governments provide to support needy individuals and households (Patel, 2013). Research highlights their potential to improve household welfare by addressing immediate financial needs and fostering access to education, healthcare, and nutrition (Daniel, 2023; Zwane et al., 2022). According to Patrick et al. (2024), social protection systems, including grants, are instrumental in breaking intergenerational poverty cycles.

South Africa has one of the most extensive social grant systems in Africa, including programs such as the Child Support Grant (CSG), Old Age Pension (OAP), and Disability Grant (DG) (Van der Berg et al., 2010). Studies by Fofana et al. (2024) demonstrate that these grants significantly reduce income poverty and inequality. However, concerns about dependency, targeting inefficiencies, and fiscal sustainability persist.

Across African countries, the implementation of social grants is hindered by weak administrative systems, corruption, and inadequate targeting mechanisms. Scholars like Devereux (Cuesta et al., 2021; Leila Patel, 2023; Magawana, 2013) argue that for social grants to be effective, they must be complemented by broader economic and social policies to address structural poverty.

3.2. Empirical Review

Recent studies provide robust evidence of the impact of social grants in African countries. For instance, a study (Mackett, 2020) examined South Africa's social grant system, significantly reducing poverty and inequality, with the Child Support Grant improving child nutrition and educational outcomes. Similarly, Braden (2022) analyzed Kenya's social grants, reporting enhanced living standards and increased access to healthcare among beneficiaries.

Ipinnaiye and Olaniyan (2023) evaluated Nigeria's National Social Safety Nets Project, highlighting its role in reducing

poverty among rural households and promoting human capital development through conditional cash transfers. A comparative analysis by Brenyah et al. (2023) focused on Ghana's LEAP program, demonstrating its positive effects on food security, school attendance, and healthcare utilization.

Rwanda's Vision 2020 Umurenge Program was the subject of a study by Ekane et al. (2020), which showed significant improvements in poverty reduction and community resilience. In Ethiopia, an assessment of the PSNP by AI revealed its success in improving household food security and fostering asset accumulation. Namibia's universal pension scheme was studied by Valombola (2022), who highlighted its effectiveness in reducing old-age poverty and promoting intergenerational support.

Despite these successes, challenges persist. Studies have noted targeting errors, administrative inefficiencies, and dependency risks. The study by Namboozie et al. (2021) emphasized the need for improved targeting mechanisms in Uganda's Senior Citizens Grant to ensure inclusivity. These findings emphasise the importance of addressing implementation challenges while leveraging the proven benefits of social grants. By incorporating best practices and addressing structural barriers, African countries can enhance the effectiveness of social protection programs, ensuring broader and more sustainable poverty alleviation.

4. METHODOLOGY

The study employs a Difference-in-Differences (DiD) approach and a fixed effects (FE) regression model to assess the impact of social grants on poverty reduction. The DiD method evaluates interventions' causal effects by comparing outcome changes between treated and control groups (Botosaru and Gutierrez, 2018). The approach helps isolate the impact of social grants by controlling for time-invariant differences and common trends affecting both groups (Abadie, 2005).

Vogelsang (2012) stated that the FE regression model further strengthens the analysis by accounting for unobserved heterogeneity across countries and periods. This model specification is particularly relevant given the diverse socio-economic contexts of the ten African countries under study. The models are specified as follows:

4.1. DID Approach

$$Y_{it} = \alpha + \beta(Treatment_i \times Post_t) + \gamma X_{it} + \delta_t + \lambda_i + \epsilon_{it}$$

Where:

- Y_{it} : Outcome variable (poverty rate) for country i at time t .
- $Treatment_i$: Binary indicator variable (1 if country i has implemented social grants, 0 otherwise).
- $Post_t$: Binary indicator variable (1 for post-implementation period, 0 otherwise).
- $Treatment_i \times Post_t$: Interaction term capturing the DiD effect (impact of social grants).
- X_{it} : Vector of control variables (GDP per capita, unemployment rate, education level).

- δ_t : Time fixed effects (controls for common shocks affecting all countries at time t).
- λ_i : Country fixed effects (accounts for unobserved, time-invariant heterogeneity across countries).
- ϵ_{it} : Error term (unexplained variation in)

4.2. Fixed Effects (FE) Regression Model

$$Y_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Grant_{it} + \beta_2 X_{it} + \mu_i + \lambda_t + \epsilon_{it}$$

- Y_{it} : Outcome variable (poverty rate, household income) for country i at time t .
- $Grant_{it}$: Continuous or binary variable indicating the level or existence of social grant implementation in country i at time t .
- X_{it} : Vector of control variables (GDP per capita, unemployment rate, education level).
- μ_i : Country-specific fixed effects (captures unobserved, time-invariant factors specific to each country).
- λ_t : Time-specific fixed effects (captures unobserved factors common across countries at each time).
- ϵ_{it} : Error term (unexplained variation in Y_{it})

4.3. DiD Model

The interaction term $Treatment_i \times Post_t$ Isolates the causal effect of social grants by leveraging pre- and post-implementation data across treated and control groups.

4.4. FE Model

The inclusion of μ_i and λ_t controls for unobserved heterogeneity, ensuring that the estimates for $Grant_{it}$ Reflect within country temporal variations in grant implementation. These models together enable the study to robustly estimate the impact of social grants on poverty reduction while controlling for potential confounding factors.

4.5. Data Sources

The study utilizes secondary data from the following sources: World Bank Development Indicators (WDI), which provides comprehensive economic and social data, that is, poverty rates, GDP per capita, and unemployment rates for African countries. National Statistics Agencies: Individual countries' statistical offices (Statistics South Africa, Kenya National Bureau of Statistics) provide detailed data on household income, social grant distributions, and poverty measures

5. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

5.1. Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 provides summary statistics for the variables used in the analysis, highlighting differences in poverty rates, household incomes, and socio-economic factors across the ten African countries.

The mean represents the average poverty rate across all observations. On average, it is 35,20, showing a higher average poverty rate, which indicates a significant poverty level, Standard Deviation, which Measures variability. A standard deviation of

10,5 indicated that the variability is low, showing that the poverty rates suggest considerable disparities among countries. These highlight the range of the data. A minimum poverty rate of 15 implies that the country's poverty is high in Africa and a high maximum value of 60, which shows extreme cases of poverty.

5.2. Difference-in-Differences Analysis

Table 2 presents the results of the DiD model. The interaction term ($Treatment \times Post$) captures the causal impact of social grants on poverty reduction.

The results indicate a statistically significant reduction in poverty rates attributable to the implementation of social grants. The Interaction Term ($Treatment \times Post$) had a Coefficient of -0.057 and a $P < 0.01$. The results suggest that Social grants contribute to a 5.7% point reduction in poverty rates post-implementation, holding other factors constant. It implies that social grants effectively reduce poverty with appropriate targeting and design.

On average, countries implementing social grants experienced a 0.21% point decline in poverty rates compared to non-implementing countries. It highlights the pivotal role of social protection mechanisms in addressing poverty.

GDP per capita negatively correlates with poverty, indicating that higher economic productivity translates into reduced poverty. Higher GDP per capita correlates with lower poverty rates. Economic growth policies should complement social grants for sustainable poverty reduction.

Unemployment Rate had a Coefficient of 0.027 and a $P < 0.01$. Higher unemployment rates increase poverty, highlighting labour market vulnerabilities. Addressing unemployment through active labour market policies is essential.

Education levels exhibit a significant negative relationship with poverty rates, underscoring the importance of human capital development.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics

Variable	Mean	Standard deviation	Min	Max
Poverty rate (Y_{it})	35.20	10.5	15.0	60.0
Social grant coverage ($Grant_{it}$)	0.45	0.49	0.0	1.0
GDP per capita (X_{it})	4,500	2,000	1,200	9,000
Education level (X_{it})	7.5	2.1	3.0	12.0
Unemployment rate (X_{it})	12.5	5.3	5.0	25.0

Table 2: DiD regression results

Variable	Coefficient	Standard error	t-Statistic	P-value
Treatment	-0.021	0.015	-1.40	0.163
Post	-0.035	0.012	-2.92	0.004
Treatment \times post	-0.057***	0.018	-3.17	0.002
GDP per capita	-0.012**	0.006	-2.00	0.048
Unemployment rate	0.027***	0.009	3.00	0.003
Education level	-0.35	0.014	-1.92	0.006
Constant	0.480***	0.045	10.67	0.000

The dependent variable is the poverty rate. $R^2=0.67$. ***Significant at 1%,

**Significant at 5%

5.3. Fixed Effects Regression Analysis

Table 3 shows the results of the FE model, providing further insight into the relationship between social grant coverage and poverty reduction.

The fixed effects model highlights the importance of the social grant coverage, which had a Coefficient of -0.065 , with a $P = 0.01$, which is statistically significant. That is a 10% increase in grant coverage, which results in a 6.5% point reduction in poverty rates. It economically implies that expanding grant coverage is crucial for maximizing poverty reduction.

The Education Level had a Coefficient of -0.20 , with a $P < 0.05$, which negatively correlates with poverty reduction. Improved education levels are associated with reduced poverty. Therefore, investments in education are vital to enhancing the long-term impact of social grants.

Regarding the Effectiveness of Social Grants, the findings confirm that social grants significantly reduce poverty rates in African countries. Both the DiD and FE models highlight the critical role of these interventions in improving socio-economic outcomes. The interaction term in the DiD model (-0.057) and the grant coverage coefficient in the FE model (-0.065) underline their transformative potential. Policymakers should prioritize expanding social grants while addressing fiscal constraints.

Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction: in the study, GDP per capita emerges as a significant determinant of poverty, suggesting that social grants alone cannot eradicate poverty without broader economic growth. The results in Both models indicate a strong negative correlation between GDP per capita and poverty rates. Thus, governments should adopt integrated approaches that combine social grants with economic development initiatives.

The variability in education levels and unemployment rates across countries emphasizes the importance of context-specific interventions. It was found that higher education levels and lower unemployment are associated with reduced poverty. Enhanced targeting mechanisms and complementary investments in education and employment are needed to optimize social grant programs.

The FE model corroborates the DiD findings, emphasizing that social grants (Grantit) strongly predict poverty reduction. The within-country variations controlled in the FE model affirm the reliability of the estimates.

Table 3: Fixed effects regression results

Variable	Coefficient	Standard error	t-statistic	P-value
Social grant coverage	-0.065^{***}	0.020	-3.25	0.001
GDP per capita	-0.018^{**}	0.008	-2.25	0.026
Unemployment rate	0.030^{***}	0.010	3.00	0.003
Education level	-0.20	0.10	-2.00	0.045
Constant	0.510^{***}	0.050	10.20	0.000

The dependent variable is the Poverty Rate. $R^2=0.72$. ***Significant at 1%,

**Significant at 5%.

These findings are consistent with recent studies by Leila Patel (2023), which demonstrated the effectiveness of South Africa's social grant system, and Skovdal et al.(2011), which found similar results in Kenya. However, challenges remain in targeting and fiscal sustainability, as Chitonge (2023) highlight. The evidence stresses the transformative potential of social grants in alleviating poverty, provided they are implemented within a framework of economic resilience and social equity.

6. CONCLUSION

This study underscores the transformative potential of social grants in reducing poverty across African countries. The econometric analysis using Difference-in-Differences (DiD) and fixed effects (FE) models demonstrates that social grants significantly alleviate poverty, with reductions of 5.7 and 6.5% points, respectively, post-implementation. These findings highlight the effectiveness of social grants as a vital social protection mechanism, particularly in addressing the immediate needs of marginalized populations. The study also reveals that social grant impacts are enhanced with broader socio-economic policies, such as investments in education and employment creation, which foster sustainable poverty reduction.

However, the results also indicate persistent challenges, including targeting inefficiencies, fiscal constraints, and the risk of dependency among recipients. The variability in the outcomes across countries emphasizes the need for context-specific strategies that address unique socio-economic conditions. For instance, the strong negative correlation between GDP per capita and poverty rates highlights the importance of economic growth in complementing social grants. Similarly, the role of education in reducing poverty rates underlines the necessity of integrating social grants with long-term human capital development initiatives. Addressing these challenges requires a multi-faceted approach that balances immediate poverty alleviation with sustainable development objectives.

Moving forward, policymakers should prioritize expanding social grant coverage while strengthening targeting mechanisms to ensure resources reach the most vulnerable. Innovative funding strategies, such as public-private partnerships and conditional grant programs, can enhance fiscal sustainability and promote self-reliance among recipients. Additionally, investments in education and labour market interventions are crucial for amplifying the long-term impact of social grants. By adopting these strategies, African countries can harness the full potential of social grants, fostering inclusive growth, reducing inequality, and achieving sustainable development. This study contributes to the growing body of evidence supporting social grants as a cornerstone of poverty reduction and a critical component of equitable social policy.

REFERENCES

- Abadie, A. (2005), Semiparametric difference-in-differences estimators. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 72(1), 1-19.
- Botosaru, I., Gutierrez, F.H. (2018), Difference-in-differences when the treatment status is observed in only one period. *Journal of Applied*

- Econometrics, 33(1), 73-90.
- Braden, N. (2022), The Collateralisation of Social Protection in Kenya: A Review of the Financial Inclusion-Social Policy Nexus. The SOAS Department of Economics Student Working Paper Series, Working Paper No. 7, London.
- Brenyah, J.K., Dassah, E., Yeboah, G. (2023), Social protection supports and management of non-communicable diseases in Ghana: A qualitative cross-sectional perspective of health stakeholders. *Saudi Journal of Health Systems Research*, 3(1-4), 188-203.
- Chingono, N. (2020), Zimbabwe Urged to Prioritise Children as Record Poverty Cause Food Shortages. London: The Guardian.
- Chitonge, H. (2023). Social protection challenges in sub-Saharan Africa: 'Rethinking regimes and commitments'. *African Studies*, 71(3), 323-345.
- Cuesta, J., Devereux, S., Abdulai, A.G., Gupte, J., Ragno, L.P., Roelen, K., Sabates-Wheeler, R., Spadafora, T. (2021), Urban social assistance: Evidence, challenges and the way forward, with application to Ghana. *Development Policy Review*, 39(3), 360-380.
- Daniel, S. (2023), Social Grants: How South Africa's System has Changed Since 1994. SA People News. Available from: <https://www.sapeople.com/featured/social-grants-how-south-africas-system-has-changed-since-1994-02-11-23>
- Deshpande, A.S., Mulat, A.K., Mao, W., Diab, M.M., Ogbuaji, O. (2022), Coverage of social assistance in Ethiopia during the COVID-19 pandemic: A time-to-event analysis. *BMJ Global Health*, 7(7), e008432.
- Devereux, S. (2021), Social protection responses to COVID-19 in Africa. *Global Social Policy*, 21(3), 421-447.
- Ekane, N., Kjellén, M., Westlund, H., Ntakirutimana, A., Mwesige, D. (2020), Linking sanitation policy to service delivery in Rwanda and Uganda: From words to action. *Development Policy Review*, 38(3), 344-365.
- Fofana, I., Mabugu, R.E., Camara, A., Abidoye, B. (2024), Ending poverty and accelerating growth in South Africa, through the expansion of its social grant system. *Journal of Policy Modeling*, 46(6), 1090-1102.
- Herzog, B. (2023). Review of: Economics rationality in the world of Amartya Sen (2632-3834). *Qeios*.
- Ipinaiye, O., Olaniyan, F. (2023), An exploratory study of local social innovation initiatives for sustainable poverty reduction in Nigeria. *Sustainable Development*, 31(4), 2222-2239.
- Leila Patel, V.D., Archer, J. (2023), Social Grants, Livelihoods and Poverty Responses of Social Grant Beneficiaries in South Africa. London: IntechOpen.
- Mackett, O. (2020), Social grants as a tool for poverty reduction in South Africa? A longitudinal analysis using the NIDS survey. *African Studies Quarterly*, 19(1), 41-64.
- Magawana, X. T. (2013). The Impact of Social Grants on Poverty Reduction, (Doctoral dissertation, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University).
- Miyajima, M.K. (2023), The Link Between Social Grant and Employment in South Africa. United States: International Monetary Fund.
- Murrey, K., Mutwiri, F. (2022), Factors influencing implementation of social protection projects in uasin gishu county, kenya. *International Journal of Social Sciences Management and Entrepreneurship*, 39(6), 119-130.
- Namboozee, J., Mbabazi, M., Nyanzi, L., Kakande, J., Nahalamba, S., Mayengo, H. (2021), The potential contribution of senior Citizens' grant (SCG) towards nutrition outcomes in older persons' households in Uganda. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 810, 012035.
- Patel, L. (2013), Poverty, gender and social protection: Child support grants in Soweto, South Africa. In: *Poverty, Income and Social Protection*. London: Routledge. p106-120.
- Patel, L., Dikoko, V., Archer, J. (2023), Social Grants, Livelihoods and Poverty Responses of Social Grant Beneficiaries in South Africa. Johannesburg: University of Johannesburg, Centre for Development in Africa.
- Patrick, H.O., Sheidu, C.F., Mbara, G.C. (2024), Social protection and peacebuilding: Exploring the causal relationship between social protection programmes and conflict reduction in Nigeria. *African Journal of Peace and Conflict Studies (formerly Ubuntu: Journal of Conflict and Social Transformation)*, 13(1), 209-231.
- Pruce, K. (2023), The politics of who gets what and why: Learning from the targeting of social cash transfers in Zambia. *The European Journal of Development Research*, 35(4), 820-839.
- Singh, P.K., Chudasama, H. (2020), Evaluating poverty alleviation strategies in a developing country. *PLoS One*, 15(1), e0227176.
- Svotwa, T.D., Makanyeza, C., Wealth, E. (2023), Exploring digital financial inclusion strategies for urban and rural communities in Botswana, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe. In: *Financial Inclusion and Digital Transformation Regulatory Practices in Selected SADC Countries: South Africa, Namibia, Botswana and Zimbabwe*. Berlin: Springer. p161-179.
- Skovdal, M., Mwasiagi, W., Webale, A., & Tomkins, A. (2011). Building orphan competent communities: experiences from a community-based capital cash transfer initiative in Kenya. *Health policy and planning*, 26(3), 233-241.
- Valombola, A.T. (2022), An Explorative Study of the Role of Child Social Grants in the Livelihoods of Recipients: A Case Study of Ondobe Constituency. Ohangwena Region: Namibia University of Namibia.
- Van der Berg, S., Siebrits, K., & Lekezwa, B. (2010). Efficiency and equity effects of social grants in South Africa, Stellenbosch Economic Working Papers: 15/10, <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1727643>
- Vogelsang, T.J. (2012), Heteroskedasticity, autocorrelation, and spatial correlation robust inference in linear panel models with fixed-effects. *Journal of Econometrics*, 166(2), 303-319.
- World Bank. (2024), Poverty and Equity and Macroeconomics. Trade and Investment Global Practices. Available from: <https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/bae48ff2f5a869546775b3f010735-0500062021/related/mpo-zaf.pdf>
- Zwane, T., Biyase, M., Rooderick, S. (2022), Assessing the impact of social grants on household welfare using propensity score matching approach. *International Journal of Development Issues*, 24, 1-15.