

Original Research Article

From Consumption Relief to Women-Led Productive Investment: Reframing Direct Cash Transfers, Women's Empowerment, and Electoral Welfare in India: A Theoretical Secondary-Data Research Framework

Purna Chandra Pradhan^{1*}, Pragatika Mishra¹

¹ Poverty and Inequality Lab Asia, India.

ORCID:  **PCP** 0000-0001-9277-0245^{1*}

Correspondence should be addressed to Dr Purna Chandra Pradhan: pcpradhan3055@gmail.com

Article No: 009 | **Accepted:** 13 September 2026 | **Published:** 10 October 2026

Abstract: India's rapid expansion of women-targeted direct cash transfers has altered the interface between social protection, women's financial inclusion, and electoral competition. The central problem is not whether transfers provide immediate relief, they often do, but whether recurring cash assistance changes women's durable economic position, productive capacity, and control over resources. This theoretical paper develops a secondary-data framework linking direct benefit transfer (DBT) design, women's control over cash, household expenditure, productive investment, local economic multipliers, and electoral outcomes. A structured review of recent high-quality development, economics, gender, and political-economy research is combined with a proposed India state-year panel using official DBT, fiscal, labour-market, financial-inclusion, and election data. The paper proposes a Women's Transfer-to-Enterprise (WTE) model and an Electoral Welfare–Economic Empowerment (EWEE) model, with women's control over transfers, productive reinvestment, savings, labour participation, and electoral response as linked outcomes. The synthesis suggests that cash transfers should not be treated as inherently consumptive or inherently empowering: their effects depend on transfer size, regularity, women's effective control, market access, complementary capabilities, and the time horizon used for evaluation. The paper argues for shifting policy evaluation from transfer delivery to post-transfer economic transformation. A redesigned transfer architecture that combines cash with savings, enterprise, skills, market access, and transparent fiscal rules could convert short-run welfare spending into a more durable women-led local economic cycle.

Keywords: Direct Benefit Transfer; Unconditional Cash Transfers; Women's Economic Empowerment; Women's Agency; Electoral Welfare; Productive Investment; Social Protection; India; Local Multiplier; Gender-Responsive Policy

1.0 Introduction

India entered the 2024 general election with women accounting for 48.62% of registered electors, while female voter turnout reached 65.78%, slightly above the male rate of 65.55%. The growing electoral weight of women coincides with a rapid diffusion of state-level cash-support programmes directed to women. At the national level, the Direct Benefit Transfer architecture has also expanded dramatically: the Government of India's DBT portal reports cumulative transfers exceeding ₹53 lakh crore, alongside hundreds of schemes and participating ministries. These developments make women-targeted transfers simultaneously a social-protection instrument, a financial-inclusion mechanism, and a politically salient policy technology.

The policy question is therefore more demanding than the conventional debate over whether a transfer is a welfare measure or a 'freebie'. A cash transfer can prevent deprivation, stabilize consumption, reduce vulnerability, and give a woman an identifiable financial claim. At the same time, a transfer that is received, spent, and exhausted within the same short consumption cycle may do little to change the structural conditions that determine women's long-run income, asset ownership, employment, bargaining power, and productive opportunities. Recent evidence shows why the distinction matters. Cash targeted to women can improve mobility, agency, nutrition, or selected dimensions of household decision-making, but the magnitude and persistence of these effects vary substantially across programmes and contexts (Ambler & de Brauw, 2024; Unnikrishnan, 2022).

The distinction between welfare receipt and economic empowerment is particularly important in India because women's economic participation remains constrained by unpaid care work, informality, limited control over productive assets, unequal access to credit and markets, and persistent social norms. Research on Indian employment programmes shows that access to paid work can have effects on women's agency that go beyond the immediate value of the wage, including greater demand for financial services and reductions in some forms of violence (Kumar, 2022; Sarma, 2022). Conversely, studies of unconditional transfers demonstrate that, women may receive money without necessarily acquiring the complementary resources required to convert that money into an enterprise, asset, savings stock, or independent income stream.

The electoral dimension adds another layer. Recent political-economy evidence from West Bengal finds that voters respond positively to excludable welfare benefits and that politically competitive environments can affect the allocation of such benefits, providing evidence consistent with clientelistic incentives (Bardhan et al., 2024). Evidence on welfare politics also suggests that, voters are not mechanically purchased by benefits: access, delivery quality, lived experience, and broader perceptions of government

performance influence electoral responses (Kailash, 2024). The analytical challenge, therefore, is not to assume that women-targeted transfers are electoral inducements, but to identify the conditions under which welfare creates durable capability and the conditions under which it primarily produces short-run political or consumption effects.

This paper addresses that gap by developing a theoretical model that connects five stages: (a) transfer receipt, (b) effective control, (c) household allocation, (d) productive conversion, and (e) wider economic circulation. The paper treats women's empowerment as multidimensional. Economic empowerment includes control over income, savings, productive assets, enterprise ownership, labour-market participation, and access to markets; social empowerment includes mobility, voice, bargaining power, dignity, and reduced acceptance of restrictive gender norms. A transfer may improve one dimension without transforming the others. The theoretical contribution is therefore to distinguish 'cash received' from 'cash controlled' and 'cash controlled' from 'cash converted into productive capacity'.

The study has four objectives. First, it synthesizes recent evidence on the effects of cash transfers and DBTs on women's welfare, agency, savings, employment, productive investment, and social empowerment. Second, it examines the political-economy relationship between women-targeted welfare and electoral outcomes without assuming that correlation implies clientelism. Third, it proposes a secondary-data research architecture for comparing Indian states across transfer intensity, women's economic outcomes, and electoral cycles. Fourth, it develops a policy alternative to an exclusively consumption-oriented transfer model: a gender-responsive transfer-plus architecture that preserves immediate consumption support while creating an institutional pathway to savings, enterprise, skills, market access, and local economic circulation.

The research questions are: (1) Do women-targeted cash transfers improve women's effective control over resources, or mainly increase short-term household consumption? (2) Under what institutional and household conditions do transfers translate into savings, assets, self-employment, or productive investment? (3) Does greater exposure to women-targeted transfers predict electoral support after accounting for economic performance, welfare access, and political competition? (4) Can a transfer-plus model generate stronger economic multipliers and more durable empowerment than unconditional cash alone? (5) What indicators should governments use to distinguish social protection from politically timed distributive expenditure?

The principal hypotheses are correspondingly structured. Hypothesis 1 proposes that transfer receipt improves immediate welfare, but the effect on durable economic empowerment is conditional on women's effective control. Hypothesis 2 proposes that effective control has a stronger association with productive investment and savings than nominal receipt alone. Hypothesis-3 proposes that complementary interventions, financial capability, savings instruments, skills, market access, and enterprise support, strengthen the conversion of transfers into productive capacity. Hypothesis 4 proposes that women-targeted transfer exposure can be electorally valuable, but the electoral effect is

mediated by perceived access, reliability, and broader government performance rather than by transfer receipt alone. Hypothesis 5 proposes that a higher share of transfers converted into productive investment will be associated with stronger local economic circulation and more persistent empowerment outcomes.

2.0 Literature Review

The theoretical foundation of this study combines the collective household model, the capability approach, feminist economics, social-protection theory, financial-inclusion theory, and political-economy theories of clientelism and programmatic politics. Together, these perspectives suggest that the impact of a transfer depends not simply on the amount delivered, but on who controls it, how household bargaining changes, which constraints are relaxed, and how political actors and voters interpret the benefit.

First, the collective household framework rejects the assumption that a household behaves as a single decision-maker with a single preference function. When income is directed to women, the intra-household distribution of resources can change even when total household income changes only modestly. Recent evidence confirms that transfers targeted to women can affect agency and household choices, although effects are heterogeneous. Ambler and de Brauw (2024) find limited but meaningful improvements in women's agency in Pakistan, particularly in mobility and voting. Unnikrishnan (2022), using Indian longitudinal data, finds that female recipients of social assistance shifted household food expenditure toward nutrient-rich items. These findings support the proposition that recipient identity matters.

Second, the capability perspective shifts attention from the possession of money to the capacity to convert resources into valued functioning. A woman who receives ₹1,000 or ₹2,500 per month may experience genuine welfare gains without acquiring a new productive capability. Capability conversion requires access to time, information, markets, finance, mobility, skills, assets, and social legitimacy. The recent meta-analysis by Balasubramanian et al. (2024) finds that women's economic empowerment interventions can improve employment, income, consumption, asset accumulation, and human-capital investment, while also emphasizing the constraining role of social norms. This supports the central argument that money alone is insufficient to guarantee structural empowerment.

Third, feminist social-protection scholarship warns against interpreting the targeting of women as automatically gender-transformative. Cookson et al. (2024) argue for a systems approach in which social protection addresses risks over the life course rather than relying on isolated women-targeted programmes. Puorideme and Rolandsen Agustín (2023) similarly show that cash programmes can reproduce conventional gender roles even while giving women greater agency within those roles. Rao and Ramnarain (2023) demonstrate how social-protection programmes interact with gendered systems of social reproduction in India. The implication is that the policy architecture must recognize women's unpaid care work and the constraints that limit the conversion of cash into paid work or enterprise.

Fourth, the empirical literature challenges the claim that transfers necessarily reduce work incentives. Vera-Cossio (2022) finds that cash transfers can increase employment and self-employment when liquidity constraints are binding. In India, employment through the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS) has been associated with stronger indicators of women's empowerment, while MGNREGS also appears to buffer women against adverse shocks (Kumar, 2022; Sarma, 2022). The relevant policy distinction is thus between an unconditional transfer that merely substitutes for missing income and a transfer that relaxes liquidity constraints sufficiently to permit productive entry.

Fifth, evidence on productive investment indicates that complementary constraints matter. Aggarwal et al. (2024) show in Malawi that cash transfers increased investment, but that combining cash with an input fair produced larger effects by reducing market-access costs. Mostafavi-Dehzooei and Heshmatpour (2024) find that cash transfers can influence agricultural input use partly through changes in time preferences. Viberti et al. (2025) find direct effects of cash transfers on productive and saving capacity among rural women in Zambia, but also note that income support alone is insufficient to guarantee stronger decision-making power. These findings strongly support the proposed transfer-to-enterprise mechanism: the policy question should be how to remove the next constraint after cash is delivered.

Sixth, the literature on local multipliers provides an important correction to the assumption that consumption spending is economically unproductive. Egger et al. (2022) find a local transfer multiplier of approximately 2.5 in rural Kenya, with recipient spending generating spillovers for local households and firms. Della Guardia et al. (2022) also find positive economic spillovers from cash-transfer programmes while documenting possible social costs from selective inclusion. Thus, short-term consumption can itself create local demand and income effects. The relevant distinction is not consumption versus production in a simplistic sense; it is whether the spending cycle remains entirely transitory or whether part of the transfer becomes savings, assets, enterprise capital, skills, or recurring local demand.

Seventh, the duration of exposure matters. Buvinic et al. (2022) show that several women's economic empowerment outcomes emerged more strongly in the second year of an intervention than in the first. Molina-Vera and Oosterbeek (2024), however, find a negative wealth effect from a particular long-duration monthly cash-transfer programme, illustrating that persistent transfers do not automatically create asset accumulation. The combined evidence implies that programme duration and programme design interact: repeated transfers may stabilize consumption, but a transformation in productive capacity may require explicit mechanisms that encourage or enable accumulation.

Eighth, education and conditionality provide additional evidence about conversion mechanisms. Banerjee and Sen (2024) find persistent empowerment effects from Kanyashree in West Bengal, including greater independent movement and lower tolerance of domestic violence, with education and access to bank accounts as plausible pathways.

Sen and Thamarapani (2023) similarly find that Kanyashree improved girls' schooling outcomes. Ahmed et al. (2024) show that adding training to transfers can improve assets and income-generation outcomes. These findings suggest that the most promising alternative to an exclusively cash-based model is not the elimination of cash, but the strategic bundling of cash with capability-enhancing services.

The ninth literature stream concerns the relationship between welfare and elections. Bardhan et al. (2024) show that voters respond to excludable welfare benefits and interpret the pattern as consistent with clientelism in rural West Bengal. Kailash (2024), however, demonstrates that voters can be discerning and evaluate not only whether benefits are received but also how they are accessed and experienced. The 2026 qualitative evidence from West Bengal further illustrates the salience of gendered welfare in contemporary political narratives, although it should not be treated as causal evidence of electoral effects. The gap is therefore clear: India needs state-level longitudinal work that simultaneously measures transfer intensity, women's economic outcomes, welfare quality, and electoral change.

Finally, the literature on measurement warns that 'empowerment' is often compressed into a small number of indicators. Khed and Krishna (2023) show that women's agency may coexist with high workloads and time poverty in Central India. Rink and Barros (2021) find that empowered women in Meghalaya allocate more to welfare-enhancing consumption but may have less savings. This is especially relevant to the present argument: spending is not evidence of failure, and saving is not the only measure of empowerment. The theoretically appropriate outcome is a portfolio consisting of welfare, agency, time, assets, savings, income, enterprise, and social power.

Taken together, the literature converges on four propositions. First, transfers can reduce deprivation and improve welfare. Second, targeting women can change bargaining and selected dimensions of agency. Third, productive and durable empowerment depends on complementary constraints and time. Fourth, welfare can have political effects without being reducible to electoral clientelism. What remains underdeveloped is an integrated Indian framework that links these channels at the state-year level and explicitly tests whether the route from transfer to empowerment passes through productive reinvestment and local economic circulation. This paper addresses that gap.

3.0 Theoretical Framework and Proposed Models

The proposed framework treats the transfer as an input into a conversion process rather than as the final policy outcome. Let T_{it} denotes the real value of women-targeted transfers in state i and year t . Let C_{it} denotes effective control over the transfer; S_{it} savings; P_{it} productive investment; A_{it} assets; E_{it} women's employment or enterprise participation; WEE_{it} economic empowerment; SEE_{it} social empowerment; and Y_{it} electoral support or incumbent vote share. The framework is represented as:

$T_{it} \rightarrow C_{it} \rightarrow \{\text{Consumption, Savings, Assets, Skills, Enterprise}\} \rightarrow P_{it} \rightarrow \text{Local Economic Circulation} \rightarrow WEE_{it} \rightarrow SEE_{it}$; while T_{it} and perceived delivery quality also influence Y_{it} through a separate political channel.

The first proposed model is the Women's Transfer-to-Enterprise (WTE) model:

$$P_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 T_{it} + \beta_2 C_{it} + \beta_3 \text{Savings}_{it} + \beta_4 \text{MarketAccess}_{it} + \beta_5 \text{Skills}_{it} + \beta_6 \text{SHG}_{it} + \mu_i + \tau_t + \varepsilon_{it}.$$

Where, P_{it} is the Productive participation or productive economic outcome of woman i in period t , such as income-generating activity, enterprise participation, employment, or productive investment.

$\beta_1 T_{it}$ is Direct Benefit Transfer / Direct Cash Transfer (DCT/DBT) received by the woman. A positive β_1 would indicate that transfers contribute to productive participation.

C_{it} is the control over income/cash resources. A positive β_2 suggests that greater control over financial resources improves women's productive capacity.

Savings: it is savings behaviour or accumulated savings. A positive β_3 indicates that savings provide financial security and facilitate productive investment.

MarketAccess_{it} is access to markets, buyers, financial institutions, inputs, and business opportunities. A positive β_4 implies that better market connectivity increases productive engagement.

Skills_{it} is technical, vocational, entrepreneurial, or financial skills. A positive β_5 indicates that skill development strengthens women's ability to participate in income-generating activities.

SHG_{it} is the Participation in Self-Help Groups (SHGs). A positive β_6 would suggest that SHG membership improves access to credit, savings, collective support, information, and markets.

μ_i is individual-specific fixed effects capturing time-invariant characteristics of women, households, or communities.

τ_t is time-specific effects capturing common changes such as policy reforms, inflation, economic shocks, or changes in government programmes.

ε_{it} is the random/error component.

The model essentially asks whether receiving cash transfers actually translates into productive economic improvement for women, rather than merely providing short-term consumption support. The underlying argument is that a cash transfer by itself may not be sufficient to create sustainable economic empowerment. Its productive impact may depend on whether women have control over the money, the ability to save, access to markets, relevant skills, and institutional support through SHGs.

Thus, the model moves beyond measuring the receipt of benefits and examines whether those benefits are converted into productive participation, income generation, investment, and longer-term economic empowerment.

In particular, β_1 captures the direct relationship between cash transfers and productive outcomes, while β_2 to β_6 represent complementary conditions that can strengthen the conversion of transfers into sustainable economic activity. A statistically significant positive coefficient for these variables would support the argument that financial transfers become more economically meaningful when accompanied by agency, savings, skills, market access, and collective institutional support.

The second is the Electoral Welfare–Economic Empowerment (EWEE) model:

$$Y_{it} = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 T_{it} + \gamma_2 WEE_{it} + \gamma_3 DeliveryQuality_{it} + \gamma_4 FiscalSpace_{it} + \gamma_5 PoliticalCompetition_{it} + \gamma_6 PublicGoods_{it} + \mu_i + \tau_t + v_{it}.$$

Where, Y_{it} is the dependent variable representing the overall outcome of interest for unit i in period t . Depending on the study, this could represent electoral outcome, welfare outcome, socioeconomic development, or public policy effectiveness.

T_{it} – Direct cash transfer/benefit transfer received by beneficiaries. γ_1 measures whether transfer-based welfare programmes are associated with changes in Y .

WEE_{it} – Women’s Economic Empowerment. γ_2 captures whether improvements in women's control over resources, income generation, decision-making, and productive participation influence Y .

$DeliveryQuality_{it}$ – Quality and effectiveness of benefit delivery, including timeliness, transparency, accessibility, targeting, and leakage-free transfer. A positive γ_3 would indicate that better implementation strengthens programme outcomes.

$FiscalSpace_{it}$ – The government's fiscal capacity or room to finance welfare and development programmes. γ_4 indicates whether stronger fiscal capacity contributes to better outcomes.

$PoliticalCompetition_{it}$ – Degree of electoral/political competition. γ_5 examines whether political competition affects the scale, targeting, or effectiveness of welfare interventions and their outcomes.

$PublicGoods_{it}$ – Availability and quality of public goods and services such as healthcare, education, roads, drinking water, sanitation, electricity, and other basic infrastructure. γ_6 measures their contribution to the dependent outcome.

μ_i – Unit-specific fixed effects capturing unobserved characteristics that remain relatively constant over time.

τ_t – Time fixed effects capturing common shocks, policy changes, inflation, economic conditions, or other period-specific influences.

v_{it} – Random/error term.

The model goes beyond asking whether women receive cash transfers and instead examines whether these transfers generate meaningful socioeconomic and political outcomes when supported by a broader institutional environment.

The central proposition is that cash transfers alone may not be sufficient to produce sustainable empowerment or development outcomes. Their effectiveness can depend on the quality of programme delivery, women's actual economic empowerment, the government's fiscal capacity, the political environment, and the availability of essential public goods.

In this framework, γ_1 captures the direct effect of transfers, while γ_1 -to- γ_6 capture the wider economic, administrative, fiscal, political, and developmental conditions surrounding the transfer programme.

For a study on women, welfare transfers, and electoral outcomes, the model can therefore be conceptualised as:

Direct Cash Transfers $\rightarrow$ Women's Economic Empowerment $\rightarrow$ Socioeconomic/Political Outcomes.

This formula is particularly useful for distinguishing between the short-term political visibility of welfare transfers and their long-term developmental impact through women's economic empowerment and improved access to public goods.

A third mediation model tests whether productive investment is the bridge between transfers and empowerment:

$$WEE_{it} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 T_{it} + \alpha_2 P_{it} + \alpha_3 C_{it} + \alpha_4 Norms_{it} + \alpha_5 CareBurden_{it} + \mu_i + \tau_t + \eta_{it}.$$

WEE_{it} – Women's Economic Empowerment of woman i in period t , reflected through income, employment, control over resources, financial decision-making, productive investment, and economic autonomy.

T_{it} – Direct cash/benefit transfer received by the woman. α_1 measures whether receiving transfers contributes to women's economic empowerment.

P_{it} – Productive participation/productive activity, such as employment, self-employment, enterprise activity, agricultural production, or other income-generating work. A positive α_2 suggests that greater productive participation strengthens empowerment.

C_{it} – Control over income and financial resources. α_3 captures the extent to which women's control over money translates into greater economic autonomy.

$Norms_{it}$ – Gender and social norms, including restrictions on women's mobility, employment, asset ownership, financial decisions, and participation in public or economic activities. The expected coefficient is often negative when restrictive norms are coded with higher values.

$CareBurden_{it}$ – Unpaid care and domestic work burden, including childcare, eldercare, household work, and family responsibilities. A negative α_5 would indicate that heavier care responsibilities constrain women's economic empowerment.

μ_i – Individual/household fixed effects controlling for unobserved characteristics that do not change over time.

τ_t – Time fixed effects capturing common changes such as policy reforms, economic conditions, inflation, or major shocks.

η_{it} – Error term.

The model asks a more fundamental question: Does receiving a cash transfer actually empower women economically, or does the money remain primarily a short-term welfare benefit?

The model proposes that the answer depends not only on the transfer itself but also on whether women are able to participate productively, control their own income, and make decisions about financial resources. At the same time, restrictive gender norms and a heavy burden of unpaid care work may prevent women from converting financial assistance into sustained economic independence.

Thus, α_1 represents the direct contribution of cash transfers to women's empowerment, while α_1 and α_3 capture the productive and agency-related channels through which empowerment can emerge. Conversely, α_4 and α_5 capture structural barriers that may weaken the impact of transfers.

The conceptual innovation is the distinction between nominal transfer exposure and effective economic conversion. A state can have high transfer intensity but weak empowerment conversion if women lack control, time, skills, markets, credit, or secure property rights. Conversely, a moderate transfer can have a larger developmental effect when embedded in savings, enterprise, skills, and market institutions.

4.0 Methodology

This study is designed as a theory-building secondary-data study with a structured evidence synthesis and a proposed longitudinal state-year empirical framework. The design is appropriate because the research problem spans several disciplines, development economics, gender economics, public finance, social protection, and political economy, and cannot be adequately captured by a single household outcome. The study does not claim to estimate causal effects from an original survey. Instead, it identifies theoretically testable mechanisms and specifies the data architecture required for subsequent causal estimation.

The evidence population comprises peer-reviewed studies published primarily from 2021 to 2025 in high-quality economics, development, gender, and public-policy journals, with preference for journals indexed in Scopus and/or listed in ABDC. Studies were included when they examined cash transfers, social protection, women's agency, women's economic empowerment, financial inclusion, productive investment, labour outcomes, local multipliers, or welfare/electoral politics. Studies were excluded when they lacked a clear empirical or theoretical contribution, were opinion pieces, duplicated another publication, or were outside the substantive scope. The review intentionally excludes references whose author names were specified as exclusions in the research brief.

For the India-facing secondary dataset, the proposed unit of analysis is the state-year. The study covers states and Union Territories that introduced substantial women-targeted unconditional or quasi-unconditional cash-transfer programmes during the study period, subject to data availability. The observation window extends sufficiently before and after programme introduction to permit event-study and difference-in-differences specifications. Programme exposure are measured as annual transfer expenditure per eligible woman, beneficiaries per 1,000 adult women, and transfer value as a share of state revenue expenditure.

Data are assembled from the Government of India DBT portal, Reserve Bank of India State Finances reports, state budget documents, Election Commission of India election statistics, Periodic Labour Force Survey releases, financial-inclusion indicators, National Family Health Survey indicators where relevant, and state programme administrative records. The DBT portal provides cumulative and current-year transfer information, while the RBI provides comparable state fiscal indicators. The Election Commission supplies gender-disaggregated turnout and electoral results. These administrative sources are harmonized with a state-year codebook and deflated using an appropriate price index.

The primary outcome domains are: (1) immediate welfare, food, health, education and consumption proxies; (2) economic empowerment, women's labour-force participation, self-employment, enterprise activity, savings, assets, credit access and bank usage; (3) social empowerment, mobility, household decision-making, attitudes toward gender roles, and selected violence indicators; (4) productive conversion, enterprise investment, agricultural inputs, livestock or equipment acquisition, and savings; and (5) political outcomes, female turnout, incumbent vote share, change in vote share, and electoral margins. Fiscal outcomes include revenue deficit, fiscal deficit, debt, capital expenditure, and the ratio of transfer expenditure to own revenue.

The analytical strategy proceeds in stages. First, descriptive statistics compare states by transfer intensity, beneficiary coverage, women's labour participation, financial inclusion, and fiscal space. Second, event-study plots examine trends around programme adoption. Third, two-way fixed-effects models are estimated only after testing the plausibility of staggered-treatment assumptions, where treatment timing differs across states; modern heterogeneous-treatment estimators are preferred to a mechanically applied two-way fixed-effects model. Fourth, mediation analysis tests whether savings, productive investment, or enterprise participation transmit transfer effects to economic empowerment. Fifth, electoral models control for pre-existing political trends, public goods, macroeconomic conditions, and incumbent performance.

Robustness checks include alternative transfer-intensity measures, exclusion of election years, placebo adoption dates, lagged transfer exposure, alternative electoral outcomes, and sensitivity to states with unusually large programmes. Where data permit, instrumental-variable or regression-discontinuity strategies based on programme eligibility thresholds are considered. Because electoral outcomes can be influenced by many

simultaneous policy interventions, the paper avoided interpreting a simple positive correlation between transfers and votes as evidence of vote buying.

Software for the proposed empirical phase includes R, Stata, or Python. Reproducibility is built into the protocol through a public codebook, version-controlled scripts, documented transformations, and a source-level audit trail. The meta-synthesis component uses a PRISMA-inspired screening log, although a formal systematic review registration is not claimed unless the protocol is prospectively registered. No primary human subjects are involved in the present theoretical manuscript; if future researchers collect beneficiary data, institutional ethics approval and informed consent will be required.

Table 1: Proposed Variables and Measures

Construct	Core indicator	Expected role	Primary source
Transfer intensity	Transfer expenditure per eligible woman; beneficiaries/1,000 women	Main explanatory variable	DBT/state budgets
Effective control	Own-account receipt, independent withdrawal/use, decision authority	Mediator/moderator	NFHS/administrative/household surveys
Productive conversion	Savings, assets, enterprise/agricultural investment	Mediator	PLFS/household surveys/state records
Economic empowerment	WLFPR, self-employment, enterprise, assets, financial access	Main outcome	PLFS/NFHS/RBI
Social empowerment	Mobility, decision-making, norms, violence	Outcome	NFHS/other surveys
Electoral outcome	Female turnout, incumbent vote share, vote-share change	Political outcome	ECI
Fiscal space	Revenue/fiscal deficit, debt, capital expenditure	Control/moderator	RBI/state budgets
Political competition	Margin, effective number of parties, incumbent status	Control/moderator	ECI

5.0 Results and Expected Results

Because this is a theoretical secondary-data paper rather than a completed original causal evaluation, the results presented here are propositions generated from the reviewed evidence and the proposed empirical architecture. They should not be reported as observed coefficients. The expected results move from the most immediate outcome, consumption

smoothing, to more demanding outcomes such as productive investment, economic empowerment, and electoral change.

First, the evidence is expected to show a robust positive association between women-targeted transfers and short-run household welfare. Indian evidence on pensions and maternity transfers, together with international evidence on cash and food transfers, indicates that women-directed resources can improve nutrition, household welfare, mobility, and selected aspects of agency. This result matters because it establishes that a critique of 'freebies' cannot simply equate consumption expenditure with waste. Consumption can be a legitimate welfare outcome and can reduce vulnerability.

Second, the expected relationship between transfers and durable economic empowerment is likely to be weaker and more heterogeneous than the relationship with consumption. The literature indicates that women may gain agency without proportionate gains in assets or independent income. The proposed WTE model, therefore, predicts that the coefficient on nominal transfer intensity will be positive but smaller for productive investment than for consumption, while the coefficient on effective control will be substantially larger.

Third, complementary interventions are expected to increase conversion. Evidence from Malawi, Bangladesh, Zambia, and Indonesia indicates that training, market access, financial infrastructure, and enterprise support can strengthen the productive response to cash. The proposed empirical model should therefore produce positive interaction effects between transfer intensity and market access, financial inclusion, self-help-group participation, skills, or enterprise support. This is the principal theoretical mechanism behind the proposed transfer-plus alternative.

Fourth, the local economic circulation effect should not be dismissed even when beneficiaries use cash for consumption. Evidence from Kenya demonstrates that large transfers can produce spillovers to non-recipient households and firms and can generate substantial local multipliers. Therefore, the expected result is a two-channel multiplier: an immediate demand channel through local consumption and a slower supply-side channel through savings, enterprise formation, asset accumulation, and productive investment. The second channel is expected to be more important for long-run empowerment.

Fifth, the electoral relationship is expected to be positive but conditional. Women-targeted welfare may increase the probability of incumbent support, especially when women perceive benefits as accessible, reliable, and personally attributable. Yet the effect should weaken when fiscal stress, poor service delivery, unemployment, inflation, or dissatisfaction with government performance becomes salient. This expectation is consistent with the distinction between clientelistic exchange and programmatic welfare: the same transfer can be interpreted as social citizenship by one beneficiary and as electoral inducement by another.

Sixth, the proposed model predicts an empowerment threshold. Below the threshold, transfer resources primarily stabilize consumption. Near the threshold, savings

and small asset accumulation become more feasible. Above the threshold, and when complementary services are available, transfers can facilitate enterprise and recurring income. The threshold is unlikely to be a single rupee amount; it should vary with household size, local prices, credit access, care responsibilities, and market opportunities.

The central expected finding is therefore not that cash transfers fail, nor that they automatically empower women. Rather, the likely empirical pattern is a conversion gradient: transfer receipt produces immediate welfare; effective control increases agency; control combined with savings and complementary capabilities produces productive conversion; productive conversion creates stronger and more persistent economic empowerment; and the visibility of these outcomes can generate political returns. The policy implication is that governments should measure the entire chain rather than stopping at the number of beneficiaries or the amount transferred.

6.0 Discussion

The theoretical contribution of this study is to relocate the debate from 'cash versus no cash' to 'cash plus what, for whom, under which constraints, and with what time horizon'. This is important because the empirical literature rejects both extreme positions. Cash can improve welfare and sometimes agency, but its empowerment effects are not automatic. Equally, consumption spending can stimulate local demand and should not be dismissed as economically unproductive. The more useful distinction is between temporary income support and the institutional creation of durable economic capacity.

The paper also proposes a more careful understanding of electoral welfare. A democratic government has a legitimate reason to provide social protection, including to women who have historically carried disproportionate unpaid care responsibilities. The presence of electoral incentives does not by itself invalidate the policy. The relevant governance question is whether programmes are transparent, fiscally sustainable, rules-based, non-discriminatory, and evaluated against developmental outcomes rather than vote returns. Electoral responsiveness becomes problematic when short-term distributive promises crowd out public investment or weaken accountability.

An alternative policy architecture could therefore retain a basic cash floor while adding an opt-in 'productive conversion window'. For example, a defined portion of a transfer could remain fully fungible for household needs, while beneficiaries would be offered matched savings, low-cost enterprise accounts, skills modules, procurement links, digital financial training, and small productive-asset vouchers. Importantly, the design should avoid coercing women into investments that conflict with their household priorities. The objective is to expand choice and capability, not to dictate spending.

The fiscal case should also be framed in terms of dynamic returns rather than only annual expenditure. If a transfer increases local demand, stimulates microenterprise, raises women's income, and expands the future tax base, part of the initial expenditure may generate economic returns. If it remains purely recurrent consumption without improving capability or local productivity, the fiscal burden may remain high. The proposed model

therefore calls for a 'Transfer-to-Transformation Ratio' that compares the share of expenditure producing durable assets, savings, enterprise, skills, or independent income with the total transfer outlay.

7.0 Clear Research Gaps, Originality, Weaknesses, and Future Research

Clear research gaps remain. First, India lacks a harmonized state-year dataset that connects women-targeted transfer intensity with women's economic empowerment and election outcomes over multiple electoral cycles. Second, most evaluations examine one programme and one outcome rather than the full conversion chain from cash receipt to control, investment, income, and political response. Third, there is limited evidence on whether women actually retain control over DBT accounts after transfer receipt. Fourth, little work explicitly estimates the share of transfer expenditure that enters productive assets or local enterprise activity. Fifth, the timing of programmes relative to elections is rarely separated from the broader political and economic context.

The originality of the proposed paper lies in integrating three literatures that are usually treated separately: gendered social protection, local economic multipliers, and electoral political economy. It also introduces the concept of a 'transfer conversion gradient' and proposes a measurable Transfer-to-Transformation Ratio. The framework challenges the binary classification of welfare as either empowerment or dependency and instead predicts a continuum determined by control, complementary capabilities, and time.

The study has important weaknesses. It is theoretical and does not present original causal estimates. Cross-state programme definitions are not perfectly comparable; a DBT can represent wages, subsidies, pensions, maternity benefits, or unconditional income support. Electoral outcomes are endogenous to many policies and shocks. Secondary data may not measure effective control over money, which is conceptually different from having an account in a woman's name. Finally, 'circular economy' is used here in the sense of recurring local economic circulation and productive reinvestment, not as a strict industrial ecology measure.

Future research should build a linked administrative-household dataset; conduct beneficiary surveys on actual control and use of transfers; estimate heterogeneous effects by rurality, caste, age, marital status, care burden, and labour-market opportunity; examine whether women-targeted transfers crowd in or crowd out employment; and test whether matched savings or enterprise components generate larger long-run returns than unconditional cash alone. Randomized or quasi-experimental evaluations of transfer-plus designs would be especially valuable. Research should also examine whether visible improvements in women's economic agency influence political participation independently of party identification.

8.0 Conclusion

Direct cash transfers to women represent a major transformation in the delivery of social protection in India, but their developmental meaning depends on what happens after the money reaches the account. The evidence reviewed in this paper indicates that transfers

can reduce immediate vulnerability, improve welfare, strengthen selected aspects of agency, and sometimes generate local economic spillovers. Yet durable economic empowerment requires more than receipt. It requires effective control, savings capacity, productive opportunities, market access, skills, time, and social legitimacy. The proposed WTE and EWEE models provide a framework for testing these relationships with secondary state-year data. The central policy recommendation is therefore not to abandon cash transfers, but to redesign their evaluation and, where appropriate, their architecture. A women-targeted transfer should be judged not only by how much money is disbursed or how many women receive it, but by how successfully it expands women's economic choices, productive assets, independent income, and social power while preserving fiscal sustainability.

References

1. Aggarwal, S., Jeong, D., Kumar, N., Park, D. S., Robinson, J., & Spearot, A. (2024). Shortening the path to productive investment: Evidence from input fairs and cash transfers in Malawi. *Journal of Development Economics*, 170, 103288. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2024.103288>
2. Ahmed, A. U., Hoddinott, J., Roy, S., & Sraboni, E. (2024). Transfers, nutrition programming, and economic well-being: Experimental evidence from Bangladesh. *World Development*, 173, 106414. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2023.106414>
3. Agarwal, S., & Katewa, N. (2024). Improving women's position in the household: Evidence from a maternity cash transfer programme in India. *European Journal of Development Research*, 36, 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41287-024-00647-8>
4. Ambler, K., & de Brauw, A. (2024). Cash transfers and women's agency: Evidence from Pakistan's BISP program. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 72(3), 1117–1150. <https://doi.org/10.1086/722966>
5. Balasubramanian, P., Ibanez, M., Khan, S., & Sahoo, S. (2024). Does women's economic empowerment promote human development in low- and middle-income countries? A meta-analysis. *World Development*, 178, 106588. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2024.106588>
6. Banerjee, S., & Sen, G. (2024). Persistent effects of a conditional cash transfer: A case of empowering women through Kanyashree in India. *Journal of Population Economics*, 37(4), 1–38. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00148-024-01045-4>
7. Baranov, V., Cameron, L., Contreras Suarez, D., & Thibout, C. (2021). Theoretical underpinnings and meta-analysis of the effects of cash transfers on intimate partner violence in low- and middle-income countries. *Journal of Development Studies*, 57(1), 1–25.
8. Bardhan, P., Mitra, S., Mookherjee, D., & Nath, A. (2024). How do voters respond to welfare vis-à-vis public good programs? Theory and evidence of political clientelism. *Quantitative Economics*, 15(3), 655–697. <https://doi.org/10.3982/QE2315>
9. Buvinic, M., Knowles, J. C., & Witoelar, F. (2022). The unfolding of women's economic empowerment outcomes: Time path of impacts in an Indonesia trial. *World Development*, 158, 105974. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2022.105974>
10. Chatterjee, S., & Poddar, P. (2024). Women's empowerment and intimate partner violence: Evidence from a multidimensional policy in India. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 72(2), 801–832. <https://doi.org/10.1086/721281>
11. Cookson, T. P., Ebner, N., Amron, Y., & Kukreja, K. (2024). Social protection systems and gender: A review of the evidence. *Journal of International and Comparative Social Policy*, 40(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14680181231180507>
12. Della Guardia, A., Lake, M., & Schnitzer, P. (2022). Selective inclusion in cash transfer programs: Unintended consequences for social cohesion. *World Development*, 157, 105922. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2022.105922>

13. Egger, D., Haushofer, J., Miguel, E., Niehaus, P., & Walker, M. (2022). General equilibrium effects of cash transfers: Experimental evidence from Kenya. *Econometrica*, 90(6), 2603–2643. <https://doi.org/10.3982/ECTA17945>
14. Kailash, K. K. (2024). The politics of social welfare: The BJP and the discerning voter. *Studies in Indian Politics*, 12(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/23210230241291220>
15. Khed, V. D., & Krishna, V. V. (2023). Agency and time poverty: Linking decision-making powers and leisure time of male and female farmers of Central India. *World Development Perspectives*, 29, 100484. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wdp.2022.100484>
16. Marquez-Padilla, F., & Parker, S. W. (2024). The leaky bucket: Transition costs from cash to deposits in a Mexican transfer program. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 73(1), 37–59. <https://doi.org/10.1086/726538>
17. Molina-Vera, A., & Oosterbeek, H. (2024). The effect of monthly cash transfers during 5 years on households' wealth. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 72(2), 633–658. <https://doi.org/10.1086/721908>
18. Mostafavi-Dehzoeei, M. H., & Heshmatpour, M. (2024). Cash transfers, time discounting, and agricultural inputs utilization in Lesotho. *World Development*, 184, 106738. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2024.106738>
19. Pace, N., Sebastian, A., Daidone, S., Dela O Campos, A. P., Prifti, E., & Davis, B. (2022). Cash transfers' role in improving livelihood diversification strategies and well-being: Short- and medium-term evidence from Zimbabwe. *World Development*, 154, 105874. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2022.105874>
20. Perera, C., et al. (2022). Impact of social protection on gender equality in low- and middle-income countries: A systematic review of reviews. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 18, e1249.
21. Puorideme, D., & Rolandsen Agustín, L. (2023). The discursive construction of gender identities and roles for women in cash transfer programmes: Implications for gender power relations. *World Development Perspectives*, 29, 100487. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wdp.2023.100487>
22. Rao, S., & Ramnarain, S. (2023). Gender, social protection, and crises of social reproduction: Contextualizing NREGA. *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 55(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/04866134221123817>
23. Rink, U., & Barros, L. (2021). Spending or saving? Female empowerment and financial decisions in a matrilineal society. *World Development*, 141, 105342. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2020.105342>
24. Sarma, N. (2022). Domestic violence and workfare: An evaluation of India's MGNREGS. *World Development*, 149, 105688. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2021.105688>
25. Sen, G., & Thamarapani, D. (2023). Keeping girls in schools longer: The Kanyashree approach in India. *Feminist Economics*, 29(4), 36–64. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13545701.2023.2263542>
26. Unnikrishnan, V. (2022). The welfare effects of social assistance programs for women in India. *Journal of Development Studies*, 58(6), 1211–1230. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2022.2043277>
27. Vera-Cossio, D. A. (2022). Dependence or constraints? Cash transfers and labor supply. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 70(4), 1439–1477. <https://doi.org/10.1086/714010>
28. Viberti, F., Daidone, S., Pace, N., & Sitko, N. (2025). Cash transfers and women's economic inclusion in rural Zambia. *World Development Perspectives*, 37, 100644. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wdp.2024.100644>
29. Torre, I. (2023). Social protection Engel curve. *World Bank Economic Review*, 37(4), 519–548. <https://doi.org/10.1093/wber/lhad016>
30. Mookherjee, D., & Napel, S. (2021). Welfare rationales for conditionality of cash transfers. *Journal of Development Economics*, 151, 102665.
31. Secondary Data Sources for the Empirical Extension
32. Election Commission of India. (2025). *An atlas: General election to Lok Sabha 2024*. Official election statistics.
33. Government of India, Direct Benefit Transfer Mission. (2026). DBT Bharat dashboard and scheme statistics.

34. Reserve Bank of India. (2024). *State finances: A study of budgets 2024–25*. Reserve Bank of India.
35. Government of India, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation. Periodic Labour Force Survey releases.
36. Government of India, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare. National Family Health Survey datasets and reports.



© 2026 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>).