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What do we know and not know about group-based livelihood programs? A synthesis of recent evidence

Debate
• Groups may be able more effective in access livelihood assets such as finance, trainings, other support programs
• Reduction in costs
• Improved targeting
• Public action
• Groups are exclusionary
• Empirical evidence is mixed

Main Questions
• What is the effect of group-based livelihoods interventions on final outcomes such as income, consumption, vulnerability and social cohesion?
• Do group-based livelihoods interventions lead to more savings, debt, investment in productive activities, livelihoods diversification and labor force participation?
• What contextual and programmatic factors related to these interventions led to impacts or lack thereof?

Scope of the review
• Group based livelihoods program (GBLPs) that provide access to and use of
• Financial capital (internal and external): Examples, credit, grants, savings
• Human capital: Examples, trainings for enterprises, productivity enhancement
• Social capital: Examples, linkages with institutions and community
• Combination of these
• Example of programs included: SHGs in India, group MFIs in Bangladesh, VSLAs in Africa, SHGs and youth groups by NGOs for livelihoods development.
A (very) simple Theory of Change

FINAL OUTCOMES
- Income and assets increase
- Consumption increases
- Resilience to shocks increase
- Human development indicators improve
- Increase in personal and group empowerment
- Social cohesion improves

INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES
- Households increase labor force participation
- Households engage in diverse livelihoods
- Credit increases
- Productivity increases

FIRST LEVEL OUTCOMES
- Savings increase

INTERVENTIONS
- Financial Capital
- Human Capital
- Social Capital

PRISMA Diagram

30053 records identified through academic database searching
32 records identified through grey literature search and citation tracking

19015 records screened at title (after duplicates removed)
7826 records excluded

11189 records screened at abstract
10692 records excluded

497 articles screened at full-text

129 included impact evaluations
8 included systematic reviews

Included in EGM

23 Low or medium risk of bias
Included in review
Evidence Gaps

Main Findings of the EGM

- Financial programs are the bulk of evidence (micro-credit etc.).
- Economic outcomes certainly form the bulk of outcomes studied. These outcomes have been studied at the household level; few analyses of individual impacts (and particularly women) are available.
- Social cohesion outcomes need more examination.
- A quarter of the impact evaluations assess impacts on engagement in economic activities, diversification of livelihoods (including enterprises) and productivity.
• 23 studies were found to be low and medium risk of bias and included in the review to draw findings
Findings from Meta-Analysis of Low Risk of Bias Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Dropping outliers</th>
<th>RCTs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMD/RR</td>
<td>Lower CI</td>
<td>Upper CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>SMD</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption</td>
<td>SMD</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings</td>
<td>SMD</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihood activities</td>
<td>RR</td>
<td>1.264</td>
<td>1.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td>SMD</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets</td>
<td>SMD</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation between Program characteristics and Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Loans</th>
<th>Consumption</th>
<th>Savings</th>
<th>Livelihoods diversification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uptake of the programme</td>
<td>0.8195*</td>
<td>0.2728</td>
<td>0.5484</td>
<td>0.8003*</td>
<td>0.8560*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of exposure to programme</td>
<td>-0.4174</td>
<td>-0.6861*</td>
<td>-0.2813</td>
<td>-0.4191</td>
<td>-0.3139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women only groups</td>
<td>0.4135</td>
<td>-0.1126</td>
<td>0.2325</td>
<td>0.3312</td>
<td>0.9752*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable context</td>
<td>0.4135</td>
<td>0.1237</td>
<td>0.2803</td>
<td>0.2931</td>
<td>0.4755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial plus human or social capital</td>
<td>0.0921</td>
<td>0.0977</td>
<td>0.2259</td>
<td>0.5847</td>
<td>0.9752*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of studies</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings from qualitative synthesis

• Improved food security in times of increased economic stress
• Improved social cohesion measured by access to group and community support and access to public institutions
• Too few studies on labor force participation to analyse
• Take-up is positively correlated with how effective a program is
• Longer term programs are not necessarily more effective.
• Trainings and linkages to other social programs help improve the impact of credit and financial interventions.
• We find that SHG programs seem to benefit the poor, the vulnerable and the landless.