



GENDER DIMENSIONS OF FORCED DISPLACEMENT

Understanding Inequality Through Data & Analysis

PROPOSED
APPROACH FOR

THE GENDER DIMENSIONS OF FORCED DISPLACEMENT RESEARCH PROGRAM

JUNE 2021

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

THE GENDER DIMENSIONS OF FORCED DISPLACEMENT RESEARCH PROGRAM IS PART OF THE PROGRAM “BUILDING THE EVIDENCE ON PROTRACTED FORCED DISPLACEMENT: A MULTI-STAKEHOLDER PARTNERSHIP”.

The program is funded by UK aid from the United Kingdom’s Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO), it is managed by the World Bank Group (WBG) and was established in partnership with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). The scope of the program is to expand the global knowledge on forced displacement by funding quality research and disseminating results for the use of practitioners and policy makers. We further thank FCDO for additional funding support through its Knowledge for Change (KCP) program. This work does not necessarily reflect the views of FCDO, the WBG or UNHCR.

For more information about the GDFD research program, please contact Lucia Hanmer (lhanmer@worldbank.org) and Diana J. Arango (darango@worldbank.org)

LUCIA HANMER, DIANA JIMENA ARANGO, AND JENI KLUGMAN

Hanmer, Lucia; Arango, Diana Jimena; Klugman, Jeni (2021). Proposed Approach for the Gender Dimensions of Forced Displacement Research Program. Washington, D.C.: World Bank



Building the Evidence on Forced Displacement

INTRODUCTION

The World Bank has embarked on a partnership, in collaboration with UNHCR and FCDO, that aims to address under researched questions about service provision and access to health, education, social protection and jobs in contexts of protracted forced displacement.

Many reports about the hardships and human rights violations experienced by forcibly displaced persons highlight that women and children are a highly vulnerable group. However, to date, there is a dearth of research based on representative quantitative data. This type of research is needed to identify and understand patterns, trends and associations between the socio-economic characteristics of forcibly displaced persons and poverty compared to host communities, and to inform policy and program responses.

A major focus of the program is gender inequality, which will be addressed through a series of new empirical analyses across a range of settings which examine poverty and human development outcomes, as well as gender-based violence. Our approach goes beyond gender differences in outcomes (gender gaps). We approach gender inequality from the premise that it is rooted in power inequalities between women and men.

As a result of such power inequalities, women lack agency in many important areas of life, from high prevalence of intimate partner and other forms of gender-based violence to biased laws and norms that prevent women from owning property, engaging in paid work and making decisions about their own lives (Klugman et al, 2014).

This Approach Paper begins by setting out the context and what is known about the gender dimensions of forced displacement, outlines the key research questions to be investigated, the associated data and methodologies, the proposed countries and policy areas of focus, and sets out the expected process and outputs. It provides an overview to inform key stakeholders and interested parties, and a basis to elicit feedback on the research program.

For background on the World Bank’s approach towards Fragility, Conflict and Violence 2020-2025, on forcible displacement, commitments under IDA18,¹ the interested reader is referred directly to those strategy documents.

¹ The International Development Association (IDA) is the part of the World Bank that helps the world’s poorest countries. As part of IDA 18 replenishment of \$75 billion, a \$2 billion window was created to invest in durable solutions for host and forcibly displaced populations.



CONTEXT AND WHAT WE KNOW

We know that in all countries around the world, gender inequality is structured into the organization of social relations in society through gender norms, the intra-household division of assets, work and responsibility and relations of power between men and women (Kabeer and Sweetman, 2015; Kabeer, 2015).

Forced displacement – both within and across borders -- is frequently associated with several shifts that would be expected to affect multiple dimensions of poverty, access to services, child outcomes and the risk of gender-based violence, as well as potential changes in drivers of gender inequality.

The shifts often include:

- Changes in household demographics with the broader absence of men from the home and often higher dependency ratios (UNHCR, 1981; UNHCR, 2013, Hanmer et al, 2020).
- Disrupted livelihood opportunities, due to loss of assets like land, livestock and other property, non-recognition of skills and legal prohibitions on work (World Bank, 2017).
- Specific risk factors for men, particularly male youth -- witnessing and experience of childhood violence, war related violence, and interpersonal violence including perpetration of IPV and sexual violence.
- Lawlessness, lack of community and state protection, disruption of community services, and weakened infrastructure.
- Deepening of patriarchal power differentials and decision making that leaves out voices of women and girls, especially in access to aid.
- Changing cultural and gender norms, which can open up new opportunities for women, or impose larger restrictions.

It appears that forcibly displaced women and men can face higher barriers to taking up economic opportunities and accessing public services than their host communities (World Bank, 2017; Justino et al, 2015). At the same time qualitative, case study and anecdotal evidence suggests that the challenges and vulnerabilities associated with forced displacement are highly differentiated by gender and age, as well as by setting (Forced Migration Review, 2018).

Increases in female and child headed households, combined with higher dependency ratios, mean that women's paid work becomes more critical for family welfare during displacement. However, women are also often limited in their ability to access labor markets –

for example due to care responsibilities, and lack of formal documentation for work. Women carry most of the responsibility for caring for children and elderly, and the time they can devote to paid work is further constrained if the number of dependents in the family increases during their displacement. And when women are working outside the home, their economic activities are often low status and poorly remunerated.

When paid work requires permits or other forms of documentation, such as licenses, women face particularly high barriers. For example, when the Government of Jordan opened up employment to Syrian refugees in 2015 very few Syrian women initially applied for work permits: 95 percent of work permits issued by 2016 were issued to men (Hanmer et al, 2020). In response, the government started an initiative on home-based work to help women access the labor market, changing regulations and providing information to facilitate the formalization of home-based enterprises.

Displacement may give women and girls more access to services than in their place of origin (Rohwerder, 2016) - for example, South Sudanese women living as IDPs in Khartoum and as refugees in neighboring countries report having access to schools, water pumps, markets and health centers (Bermudez et al, 2014). At the same time, access to services will vary based on whether a person is displaced into a formal camp, or whether they are urban refugees and IDPs seeking services on their own. Forcibly displaced individuals may be less likely than other populations to access services in their host locations (ODI Health, 2016). And during flight – movement to host location – there may be a

lack of gender sensitive services such as private and secure family-only and/or women-only accommodation, common areas and separate Water and Sanitation for Health (WASH) facilities for men and women (Rohwerder, 2016). This can exacerbate the risk of gender-based violence.

There is evidence of elevated levels of gender-based violence (GBV) -- including Intimate Partner Violence experienced in the home, as well as sexual violence and child marriage -- among the forcibly displaced. This can create additional barriers to women and girl's ability to freely move and exercise agency and can limit women's access to paid work, services and education. However, little is known about how GBV in conflict-affected settings impacts women's ability to take up economic opportunities or its impact on child health and educational attainment. Nor is much known about how GBV risk for forcibly

displaced women and girls compares to GBV risks faced by local women and girls in host communities.²

The good news is that gender norms are not necessarily fixed in time and space (Justino et al, 2016). It has been widely observed that men's absence during conflict can open up opportunities for women to exercise more agency in household decision making (World Bank, 2017), including decisions about their labor force participation and engagement in economic activities (Buvinic et al, 2013; Justino, 2018). However, we know little about the extent of these various changes, and how these can impact different dimensions of poverty, livelihoods and the risk of gender-based violence. It is interesting to assess whether changes persist over time, and what happens in the context of protracted displacement.

It has been widely observed that men's absence during conflict can open up opportunities for women to exercise more agency in household decision making.

² UN and other agencies and NGOs report elevated GBV risk based on case management data and qualitative data. There are no comparisons of GBV incidence in host and forcibly displaced populations that use internationally agreed indicators derived from surveys conducted following 2013 UN Statistical Division Guidelines.



RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The research will build the evidence base on gender specific drivers and vulnerabilities of forcibly displaced persons, using existing household survey data. We will examine how gender inequality affects different dimensions of poverty and other key outcomes of interest, including the experience of intimate partner violence, child wasting and stunting, and access to services, like schooling, with a focus on protracted displacement.

Gender inequality refers to inequalities faced by women as compared to their male peers. These inequalities stand in the way of women's achieving a better quality of life, becoming more independent and exercising their rights as citizens. Adopting a gender perspective means recognizing that men and women experience poverty differently and that the likelihood of being poor is not randomly distributed throughout the population.

Below we outline how this can be measured in practice, which will vary depending on data availability, and mean that we use more direct indicators as well as proxies.

The overarching research questions are:

- How does gender inequality affect the extent and patterns of different dimensions of poverty in forcibly displaced populations?
- How does conflict affect the prevalence and nature of IPV and child marriage for women and girls?
- What are the implications for the design and implementation of policies and programs, and for institutional arrangements?

Where possible, the analysis will examine whether gender gaps and gender-based constraints experienced by forcibly displaced persons differ relative to host and non-conflict affected communities, as well as the impact of the length of displacement.

We are capturing gender inequality in three main ways:

1. Descriptive data on FDPs which highlights difference between men and women's access to income, access to economic opportunities and resources and to services, where possible relative to host populations.
2. Models that examine correlations between indicators of women's lack of agency/ disempowerment and other observables (controlling for displacement status). For example, correlations between:
 - Types of female headed households (widows, single caregivers, de jure/de facto) and household characteristics, economic opportunities, education, women's decision-making power;
 - Male and female labor market access respectively and gender norms + household and individual characteristics;
 - Risk and severity of being multi-dimensionally poor, and gender norms and intra-household differences (e.g. in age and education)

- IPV risk/ child marriage against individual and household characteristics and social norms.

3. Models that investigate correlations between human development outcomes and gender, using interaction terms -- looking at poverty risk/ economic opportunities against individual and household characteristics, interacted with gender and, possibly, indices of gender disadvantage.

Different methods will be used depending on the structure of the data, for example whether repeated panels are available or whether it is possible to match samples, or whether single datasets contain information on forcibly displaced and other populations.

In each case, we will begin with basic descriptive analysis documenting differences in the following variables for FDPs/IDPs, highlighting differences compared with host communities, and where possible pre-displacement status.

4. Household composition, including the shares of male and female headed households or the shares of different household types.
5. Gendered and social norms, including controlling behaviors and measures of intrahousehold disparities (e.g. educational attainment of adult males versus women in the household).
6. Incidence and severity of Income/expenditure poverty, by household type.
7. Incidence and severity of multidimensional poverty, using the multidimensional poverty index (MPI), adapted as appropriate.
8. Access to education and health services, for adults and children, sex disaggregated
9. Livelihood opportunities – Informal versus formal sector, wage work versus entrepreneurship, agriculture versus other sectors of employment -- how these differ by sex, skills and so on, as well as displacement experience.
10. The institutional and policy context relevant to employment, services and entitlements, and protection against violence.

The key research questions related to GBV focus on the impact of conflict and displacement on the risks of IPV and child marriage. Unfortunately, there are very few observations on FDPs in nationally representative household survey data collected on IPV and other forms of GBV following UN Guidelines (UN 2014) or other internationally recognized protocols. Most of our analysis will thus focus on conflict-affected households, providing information on levels of violence against women experienced before, during and after conflict if possible.

The GBV analysis will use data from the Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) which are nationally representative cross-sectional household surveys. The IPV module is designed to collect information in the specific country settings to address a range of drivers and outcomes. We aim to address the following questions:

- What is the impact of conflict on the prevalence and severity of IPV?
- What is the impact of conflict on the main risk main risk factors associated with IPV?
- Are rates of child marriage impacted in communities experiencing conflict?

All the quantitative analysis will seek to compare different types of forcibly displaced households, and between forcibly displaced populations and host communities and/or non-conflict affected communities. Attention will be given to sample sizes, as well as, where possible, the nature and duration of the displacement. Specific comparisons will depend on the sample design and coverage of different data sources at the country and community level. Differences across FDP groups will be examined

-- for example internally displaced persons versus refugees in and out of camps – and depending on the nature of displacement for example its scale (whether mass or relatively few and integrated), location (rural vs urban and peri urban) and length of time displaced.

Qualitative analysis will be undertaken in two countries where quantitative analysis has been conducted and where face to face data collection is possible. The goal of the qualitative work is to deepen our understanding of the underlying drivers of the quantitative results. Expected methods include structured focus group discussions divided by gender of respondents and stratified for different groups (e.g. youth/adolescents, adults, older people); semi-structured key informant interviews employing a questionnaire with close- and open-ended questions, and case studies, listing and prioritization exercises and community mapping exercises related to GBV risk and help seeking. Research partnerships and or the award of contracts will be conditional on meeting all criteria for ethical research practices/protocols for research with human subjects.

DATA SOURCES AND COUNTRY SELECTION

The geographical focus will cover a range of low- and middle-income countries in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Middle East. Studies are being undertaken in **Colombia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ethiopia, Jordan, Mali, Nigeria, Somalia, and Sudan**. In addition, we will complete multi country studies on multidimensional poverty analysis, and countries with multiple DHS IPV modules will be examined in the GBV multicountry paper.

The main criterion for country selection is data availability, specifically surveys which allow for:

- i. identification of forcibly displaced populations and host communities;
- ii. large enough sample size compared to the population of interest, and;
- iii. timing of survey fieldwork overlaps with displacement waves as well as pre and post conflict events.

We expect to combine different sources of data using innovative approaches. For example, some household surveys identify the forcibly displaced (including those living in camps) and host communities and/or include a migration question that achieves this end, and this can be combined with administrative or other sources. For example, UNHCR's registry database (ProGres) is a rich source of information that includes data on refugee family composition and multiple vulnerabilities, but it does not include data on income and expenditure.³ These data can be combined with home visits household survey data to produce data on household income poverty and explore gender issues as done for Syrian refugees in Jordan (see Verme et al., 2016; Hanmer et al., 2020).

Work conducted for this project shows that is also possible to combine data about conflict locations and events with household survey data to identify conflict-affected communities and con-

trast them to communities that are not exposed to conflict. Kelly et al (2109) showed that conflict-affected communities in Liberia faced up to 50% incidence of IPV even 5 years after the second civil war ended. Ekhaton-Mobayode (2020) show that in Nigeria it is possible to contrast communities living in close proximity to Boko Haram attacks in Northern States to communities living in other States not affected by Boko Haram.

Annex 2 Table 1 presents the longer list of countries and data sources that were examined to arrive the final countries for the IPV multicountry studies.

DHS and LSMS surveys exist for several countries with forcibly displaced persons, while the WBG has conducted several surveys which encompass FDPs in the survey frame. The UNHCR World Bank Joint Data Center on Forced Displacement is working to anonymize UNHCR data such as its refugee registration database ProGres so that it can be put in the public domain used by the research community. Some preliminary datasets are available for WBG/ UNHCR use. By combining household surveys with data about incidents of conflict that cause displacement and data on migration flows we can gain insights about the relationship between gender inequality, forcible displacement and poverty. And we can compare impacts how gender inequality impacts forcibly displaced populations versus host communities

LIST OF PAPERS AND AUTHORS

POVERTY AND INEQUALITY

Differences in Household Composition: Hidden Dimensions of Poverty and Displacement in Somalia
Lucia Hanmer, Eliana Rubiano-Matulevich, and Julieth Santamaria

Examining the Resilience of Syrian Refugees in Jordan: taking a gender lens to the evolution of poverty during displacement
Lucia Hanmer, Eliana Rubiano-Matulevich, and Julieth Santamaria

Multidimensional Poverty, Gender, and Forced Displacement: A Multi-Country, Intrahousehold Analysis in Sub-Saharan Africa
Sabina Alkire, Sophie Scharlin-Pettee, Julieth Santamaria, and Yeshwas Bogale

Gendered Dimensions of Multidimensional Poverty in Contexts of Forced Displacement
Sabina Alkire, Corinne Mitchell, Sophie Scharlin-Pettee, Julieth Santamaria, and Yeshwas Bogale

GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE

The Risk that Travels with You: The Links between Forced Displacement, Conflict and Intimate Partner Violence in Colombia and Liberia
Jocelyn Kelly, Uche Eseosa Ekhaton-Mobayode, Amalia Rubin, and Diana J. Arango

Child Marriage and Conflict: A Multi-country Study
Caroline Krafft, Jocelyn Kelly, Amalia Rubin, and Diana J. Arango

Conflict, Displacement and Overlapping Vulnerabilities: Understanding Risk Factors for Gender-based Violence among Displaced Women in Eastern Democratic Republic of Congo
Jocelyn Kelly, Maarten Voors, and Morgan Holmes

Increased employment, increased decision autonomy and increasingly unsafe: Evidence from women in Mali
Uche Eseosa Ekhaton-Mobayode, Jocelyn Kelly, Amalia Rubin, and Diana J. Arango

GENDER NORMS

Gender Norms and Gendered Education and Domestic Work Outcomes: Syrian Refugee Adolescents in Jordan
Ragui Assaad, Caroline Krafft, and Isabel Pastoor

Do Gender Norms Change with Conflict-Induced Displacement? The Case of Colombia
Eliana Rubiano-Matulevich

LIVELIHOODS AND DEVELOPMENT

The double burden of female displacement: Survey data evidence on gendered livelihoods and welfare from protracted forcibly displaced and host community women in El Fasher in Darfur, Sudan
Tilman Brück and Wolfgang Stojetz

Gendered Dimensions of Protracted Forced Displacement in North-east Nigeria
Tilman Brück and Wolfgang Stojetz

Forced Displacement, Gender, and Livelihoods: A Case of Refugees in Ethiopia
Yeshwas Bogale

³ ProGres does not collect data on host communities; national household survey data could be used to compare refugees to host communities.



PROPOSED APPROACHES

There are several ways to undertake rigorous comparisons, using multivariate statistical analysis.

The methods we will apply are outlined below with examples of countries and datasets, with more detail available on request. The brief descriptions below are intended to be illustrative in order to elicit feedback:

First, in the case of Syrian refugees in Jordan. The UNHCR's ProGRES data for 2013-2014 and 2017-2018, will be combined to create a panel dataset. This will enable us to examine the impact of forced displacement over the five-year period, taking into account the amount of time individuals have been displaced, covered by both datasets. More specifically, building on Hanmer et al (2020) we will analyze the impact of protracted displacement on poverty outcomes using a gender lens. The UNHCR data also provides information that will allow us to investigate the incidence of (and changes in) child marriage among Syrian refugees and its links to poverty and other household characteristics between over the 5-year period covered by the panel. Additionally, the latest DHS survey for Jordan (2017-2018) provides information on Syrian nationals, which will allow us to explore some of the differences in child health and nutrition (wasting and stunting) between refugees and host communities.

Second, data collected by the World Bank in Somalia, Ethiopia and Sudan (Pape and Sharma 2019) can be used for multivariate statistical analysis to estimate the probability of poverty or other welfare outcomes (such as child stunting or wasting or school attendance) for forcibly displaced persons compared to host communities. For example, we may find that on average poverty rates are higher for displaced persons than for the host community. The hypothesis tested is whether there is a significant difference or not between the probability of a household being poor if forcibly displaced compared to if it has not been forcibly displaced, everything else being equal. We will test whether gender of the household head has a significant

association with poverty and other outcomes, controlling for other household and individual characteristics.

Third, for a set of countries for which appropriate data is available – provisionally Colombia Ethiopia, Iraq, Nigeria, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Timor Leste, Uganda – we will undertake analysis to examine how measures of gender inequality are associated with the risk and severity of multidimensional poverty. Methods to establish causality, which may run both ways, will be investigated.

Fourth, data on gender roles and attitudes can be used to explore the impact of gender norms on women and girls. The impact of gender norms on adolescent girl refugees can be explored using the Jordan Labor Market Panel Survey (JLMPS) 2016 data. The survey includes a sizeable sample of Syrian adolescents, as well as data on their families' and communities' attitudes – including towards domestic violence, women's mobility, gender equality (in school, work, leadership, etc.), and decision-making. These data can be used to assess girls' own-, family, Syrian-community, and host-community gender role attitudes and how they are associated with gendered outcomes across a variety of developmental dimensions, including enrollment in school, access to health care, market work, and domestic work (chores). The Colombia DHS surveys can be used to examine whether conflict-induced displacement alters gender norms around women's access to economic opportunities and reproductive health and to assess whether intra-household bargaining power changes. These research questions will be examined with reference to the policy setting in Colombia regarding displaced women's access to economic opportunities.

Fifth, comparisons can be made between households and communities that have been more exposed to conflict-related events that drive displacement (e.g. terrorist activities or attacks) and between households in communities that have not been exposed to such conflict-related events. Rigorous empirical comparisons between conflict exposed individuals and households and their non-exposed counterparts can be provided for countries with existing household surveys collected during or after periods coinciding with episodes of conflict. GPS locations provided in these household surveys allow the temporal and spatial matching of household data to conflict events. A multi-level modeling approach helps account for the nested structure of the data, with clustering of individuals within districts. This temporal and geographic variation in conflict within the same country can allow for analyses that examine the impact of conflict on key IPV outcomes. In Colombia, Liberia, Philippines, Tajikistan, Uganda and other countries, the Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) with the module of interest, the Domestic Violence (DV) module, was collected during extended conflict episodes, and measured key GBV outcomes of interest. This analysis will be done leveraging DHS data from 23 countries, which have both the DV module and conflict-related data (Annex 2 , Table 1).

⁴ The DHS DV module collected in 2006, corresponds to the period of peace before the ongoing Mali civil war while the DHS DV modules collected in 2012-13 and 2018 corresponds to the period during the war

Further, one country – Mali – provides DHS data before and during the ongoing Mali civil war.⁴ This framework allows the identification of treatment (conflict-affected) and control (not conflict affected) groups before and during the conflict, which can be exploited in a difference-in-difference framework to examine the impact of conflict on IPV outcomes in Mali. A similar approach can be used to look at the outcome of child marriage.

Sixth, in Eastern DRC a household level survey of forcibly displaced men and women has collected data on exposure to IPV, perpetration of IPV and exposure to conflict related violence and includes information on social norms and behaviors. These data can be used to examine whether the experience of forced displacement has differential effects depending on key individual characteristics of the survivors. The work will include and analyze institutional and policy settings, and other factors that help explain differences.



OUTPUTS

We expect to complete and publish about five country studies and two multicountry studies and several policy papers over the coming year, and the findings will be disseminated in various ways, ranging from academic articles, to policy notes and blogs.

All outputs produced under this research program will be peer reviewed by the Senior Advisory Panel as well as expert reviewers. Selected outputs will be submitted to publication in World Bank Working Paper Series and academic journals.

Key outputs will aim to reach a policymaker/stakeholder audience, and thereby shorter and less technical.

Country-level research papers for countries on gender, poverty and forced displacement, and multi-country papers –exploring multidimensional poverty, as well as investigating the risk of gender-based violence.

Three thematic / policy notes which extract relevant findings from the country papers, grounded in the broader literature, and highlight policy implications, as well as data gaps and future research priorities.

Provisional topics are:

- GBV incidence and impacts on conflict affected forcibly displaced persons (a multi country comparison).
- How does gender inequality impact multiple dimensions of poverty in forcibly displaced populations?
- How norms and changing norms shape the opportunities and outcomes of forcibly displaced women and girls.

Guidelines on strengthening primary data collection in survey instruments – with a focus on potential new standardized indicators and sampling issues.

GENDER DIMENSIONS OF FORCED DISPLACEMENT TIMELINE



PROCESS

Five research partners are working with the World Bank to work on the research questions. These partners are: 1) Tilman Brück and Wolfgang Stojetz, International Security and Development Center, Berlin, Germany; 2) Sabina Alkire and Corinne Mitchell, Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative, University of Oxford, UK; 3) Ragui Assaad, University of Minnesota, USA (Economic Research Consortium, Egypt) and Caroline Krafft, St Catherine University, USA (Economic Research Consortium, Egypt); 4) Jeni Klugman, Georgetown Institute for Women, Peace and Security Georgetown University; 5) Jocelyn

Kelly, Harvard Humanitarian Initiative, USA. These partners will participate in a research group that will come together in July 2020 and to review the draft papers in spring 2021.

A Senior Advisory Panel on Gender and Forced Displacement has been constituted to review and discuss emerging findings and to ensure that the conclusions and recommendations are useful and relevant to practitioners and decision-makers. Leading experts and key agencies have agreed to join the panel.

- Elizabeth Dartnall (Research Manager, Sexual Violence Research Initiative)
- Rebeca Eapen (Senior Adviser Gender Equality, The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR))
- Elizabeth Ferris (Research Professor, School of Foreign Service, Institute for the Study of International Migration, Georgetown University)
- Patricia Justino (Senior Research Fellow, UNU-WIDER)
- Anne C. Richard (James R. Schlesinger Distinguished Professor, Miller Center, University of Virginia (January 2020-June 2021))
- Barri Shorey (Senior Technical Director Economic Recovery & Development Technical Unit at International Rescue Committee)
- Phillip Verwimp (Professor of Development Economics, ECARES, Solvay Brussels School of Economics and Management, Université libre de Bruxelles)
- Kristin Kim Bart, Former - Senior Director Gender Equality, International Rescue Committee
- Cindy Huang, Former - VP Strategic Outreach, Refugees International*

There will be two convenings of the panel in June 2020, and summer 2021—most likely virtual in nature during the COVID19 crisis.

We will liaise with World Bank, FCDO and UNHCR teams in country offices where country studies are being conducted to inform about the research and ensure that we are aware of relevant research and data collection initiatives. We will invite colleagues in operational teams to informal consultations and to contribute to review processes. We have such a mechanism in place for Syrian refugees in Jordan where the UNHCR

*Until February 2021

MENA Regional Office provided technical feedback and comments on the study design and will continue to provide inputs going forward in collaboration with staff from the WBG's Jordan office.

The Senior Director for the Gender Group, Hana Brixi, will lead the WBG's quality assurance process. Peer reviewers will be selected from inside and outside the World Bank.

A broader group of stakeholders will be engaged through presentations at seminars and internal events in the academic and research community. We will seek to present emerging findings at the World Bank Group's Fragility Forum and events hosted by the other organizations and networks, such as the Joint Data Center and Households in Conflict Network and contribute to learning events with operational staff at the World Bank and UNHCR.

DISSEMINATION

The outputs from this research program will be built into the wider uptake strategy for the overarching FCDO UNHCR WB Project "Building the Evidence-base on Forced Displacement", and actively seek opportunities for this work to reach three broad audiences: those who engage in key data production (such as the LSMS and DHS), operational colleagues (be they in the World Bank or other agencies), and policy makers (at the country level and in international organizations).

As the body of research continues to grow, it will be important to step up communication activities. We intend to

identify key stakeholders early in the timeline with the help of communications colleagues for Africa and MENA regions and reaching out to selected country offices where the Bank supports programs and projects that target both refugee and host communities for medium- to long-term socio-economic solutions, such as Lebanon and Jordan in MENA and Uganda, Ethiopia and Cameroon in Africa.

All members of the research project team, and the group of authors, will be expected to contribute to producing and disseminating findings through blogs, presentations and multi-media events as part of the wider uptake strategy. Leveraging dissemination through our research partners and their links with the broader academic institution community and identifying policy makers and practitioners to support dissemination will support uptake.

The Senior Advisory Panel will be key for connecting to a wider audience, identifying entry points to raising awareness about the work and helping to disseminate the findings.

The major focus of the program is gender inequality, which will be addressed through a series of new empirical analyses across a range of settings which examine poverty and human development outcomes, as well as gender-based violence.

Efforts to reach as wide an audience as possible will include through a combination of face-to-face and virtual engagements, with an emphasis on the latter given COVID-19 restrictions. For example, the 2018 Fragility Forum provided a means to engage successfully with policy makers and country counterparts, and a panel discussion featuring the Emerging Findings on the Impacts of Forced Displacement: Africa, Middle East and South Asia featuring presentations from FCDO -sponsored Young Fellows was scheduled for the (postponed) Fragility Forum 2020. The World Bank Annual and Spring also provide useful platforms for disseminating research findings to government stakeholders and civil society.

A series of virtual workshops in 2020 will be organized in collaboration with relevant internal and external stakeholders. Communications and online dissemination will be coordinated across WBG-UNHCR-FCDO channels.

Bermudez, M.S., Cunial, L., & Farmer, K. (2014). Life can change: Securing housing, land and property rights for displaced women. Norwegian Refugee Council. Retrieved from: <http://womenshlp.nrc.no/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/GlobalReportWHL.Pdf>

Buvinic, M., Gupta, M.D., Casabonne, U., & Verwimp, P. (2013) "Violent Conflict and Gender Inequality: An overview" The World Bank Group Policy Research Working Paper 6371

Chukwuma A. and Ekhaton-Mobayode U. E (2019). Armed conflict and maternal health care utilization: Evidence from the book haram insurgency in Nigeria. *Social Science and Medicine* 226:104-112. doi: 10.1016

Ekhaton-Mobayode, U. E, Hanmer, L., Matulevich, E.R. and Arango, D. (2020). Effect of Armed Conflict on Intimate Partner Violence: Evidence from the Boko Haram Insurgency in Nigeria. World Bank Group. <https://doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-9168>

Forced Migration Review (2018) Syrians in Displacement. Forced Migration Review. <http://www.fmreview.org/syria2018.html>

Hanmer, L., Matulevich, E.R., Santamaria, J., and Arango, D (2020) How does poverty differ among refugees? Taking a gender lens to the data on Syrian refugees in Jordan, *Middle East Development Journal*, DOI: 10.1080/17938120.2020.1753995

Justino, P. (2018) "Violent Conflict and Changes in Gender Economic Roles: Implications for Post-conflict Economic Recovery." *The Oxford Handbook of Gender and Conflict*. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199300983.013.7

Justino, P., Tranchant, J., Salardi, P., and Poeschl, C. (2015) "The Effect of Gender Equality Programming on Humanitarian Outcomes: Synthesis and Case Studies in Kenya, Nepal and the Philippines", UN Women. <https://www.unwomen.org/en/digital-library/publications/2015/7/the-effect-of-gender-equality-programming-on-humanitarian-outcomes>

Justino, P., Aghajanian, A., Amuzu, A., Asante, E., Leone, M., Mills, E., Minkah-Premo, S., Mitchell, R., Müller, C., Nyarko, P., Oosterhoff, P. and Tranchant, J. (2016) "Domestic Violence in Ghana: Incidence, Attitudes, Determinants and Consequences". UK Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO)

Kabeer N. (2015) Gender, poverty, and inequality: a brief history of feminist contributions in the field of international development, *Gender & Development*, 23:2,189-205, DOI:10.1080/13552074.2015.1062300

Kabeer N. and Sweetman C. (2015) Introduction: Gender and Inequalities, *Gender & Development*, 23:2,185-188, DOI:10.1080/13552074.2015.1067965;

ODI (2016) Health, migration and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development <https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/resource-documents/10761.pdf>

Pape, J.U. and Sharma, A. (2019) Using Micro-Data to Inform Durable Solutions for IDPs: Volume A: Executive Summary (English). Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group.

Rohwerder, B. (2016). Women and Girls in Forced and Protracted Displacement. GSDRC Helpdesk research Report. Retrieved from: <https://gsdrc.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/HDQ1364.pdf>

Sieverding, M., Krafft, C., Berrie, M. and Keo, C. (2019) "Persistence and change in marriage practices among Syrian Refugees in Jordan." *Economic Research Forum Working Paper No 1281*, January; Giza, Egypt: ERF.

UN DESA (2014) Guidelines for Producing Statistics on Violence Against Women, Statistical Surveys ST/ESA/STAT/SER.F/110 ISBN: 978-92-1-161567-8 United Nations publication Sales No. E.13.XVII.7, United Nations, available at: https://unstats.un.org/unsd/gender/docs/Guidelines_Statistics_VAW.pdf

UNHCR (1981), Note on Family Reunification, EC/SCP/17, available at: <https://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae68cd48.html> [accessed 27 April 2020]

UNHCR (2013), *The Future of Syria: Refugee Children in Crisis*, available at: <https://www.refworld.org/docid/529c3b4d4.html> [accessed 27 April 2020]

UNHCR (2018). From Commitment to Action: Highlights of Progress towards Comprehensive Refugee Response. <https://www.unhcr.org/5ba109ca2d>

UNHCR (2019). Stepping up: Refugee Education in Crisis. <https://www.unhcr.org/steppingup/>

WHO (2018). Reports on Situation Analysis and Practices in Addressing the Health Needs of Refugees and Migrants. <https://www.who.int/migrants/publications/situation-analysis-reports/en/>

World Bank (2016) Jordan - Economic Opportunities for Jordanians and Syrian Refugees Program for Results Project. Washington, DC: World Bank.

World Bank (2017) Forcibly Displaced: Toward a Development Approach Supporting Refugees, the Internally Displaced, and Their Hosts. Washington, DC: World Bank.

World Bank (2020) World Bank Group Strategy for Fragility, Conflict, and Violence 2020-2025 (English). Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/fragilityconflictviolence/publication/world-bank-group-strategy-for-fragility-conflict-and-violence-2020-2025>

Verme, P., Gigliarano, C., Wieser, C., Hedlund, K., Petzoldt, M., Santacroce, M. (2016) *The Welfare of Syrian Refugees: Evidence from Jordan and Lebanon*. Washington, DC: World Bank. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/23228>

Table 1: Long List of countries considered to examine the gendered effect of forced displacement on socioeconomic outcomes

DATA SOURCE	COUNTRY	SURVEY YEAR	SELECTION STATUS	REASON FOR EXCLUSION OR SELECTION	COMPARATOR GROUPS
HFS	ETHIOPIA	2017	Selected	Reasonable number of host community and refugee households and/or individuals in the data.	Host community and refugees.
HFS	NIGERIA	2018	Selected	Reasonable number of host community and IDP households and/or individuals in the data.	Host community and IDPs.
HFS	SOMALIA	2017	Selected	Reasonable number of camp IDP and non-camp IDP households and/or individuals in the data.	Camp-IDPs, Non-Camp IDPs, Host communities
HFS	SOUTH SUDAN	2017	Selected	Reasonable number of IDP and non-IDP households and/or individuals in the data.	IDPs and non-IDPs
HFS	SUDAN	2017	Selected	Reasonable number of IDP and non-IDP households and/or individuals in the data.	IDPs and non-IDPs
DHS	AFGHANISTAN	2010	Shortlisted	Reasonable number of displaced households and/or individuals in the data	FDPs vs. non-displaced.
DHS	AFGHANISTAN	2015	Excluded	Too few FDP households and/or individuals identified.	-
DHS	BENIN	2017-2018	Excluded	Too few FDP households and/or individuals identified.	-
DHS	BURUNDI	2016-2017	Excluded	Too few FDP households and/or individuals identified.	-
DHS	COLOMBIA	2000	Selected	Reasonable number of displaced households and/or individuals in the data	FDPs vs. non-displaced.
DHS	COLOMBIA	2005	Shortlisted	Reasonable number of displaced households and/or individuals in the data	FDPs vs. non-displaced.
DHS	COLOMBIA	2010	Selected	Reasonable number of displaced households and/or individuals in the data	FDPs vs. non-displaced.
DHS	COLOMBIA	2015	Shortlisted	Reasonable number of displaced households and/or individuals in the data	FDPs vs. non-displaced.

DATA SOURCE	COUNTRY	SURVEY YEAR	SELECTION STATUS	REASON FOR EXCLUSION OR SELECTION	COMPARATOR GROUPS
DHS	ERITREA	2002	Excluded	Data restricted. Request for restricted data unsuccessful.	-
DHS	ETHIOPIA	2000	Excluded	No direct or indirect questions allowing for identification of FDP households	-
DHS	ETHIOPIA	2005	Excluded	No direct or indirect questions allowing for identification of FDP households.	-
DHS	ETHIOPIA	2011	Excluded	No direct or indirect questions allowing for identification of FDP households.	-
DHS	ETHIOPIA	2016	Excluded	Too few FDP households and/or individuals identified.	-
DHS	INDONESIA	2002-2003	Excluded	No direct or indirect questions allowing for identification of FDP households.	-
DHS	INDONESIA	2007	Excluded	No direct or indirect questions allowing for identification of FDP households.	-
DHS	INDONESIA	2012	Excluded	No direct or indirect questions allowing for identification of FDP households.	-
DHS	INDONESIA	2017	Excluded	Too few FDP households and/or individuals identified.	-
DHS	JORDAN	2002	Excluded	Too few FDP households and/or individuals identified.	-
DHS	JORDAN	2007	Excluded	No direct or indirect questions allowing for identification of FDP households.	-
DHS	JORDAN	2012	Excluded	No direct or indirect questions allowing for identification of FDP households	-
DHS	JORDAN	2017-2018	Shortlisted	Reasonable number of displaced households and/or individuals in the data	FDPs vs. non-displaced.
DHS	KENYA	2003	Excluded	No direct or indirect questions allowing for identification of FDP household.	-

DATA SOURCE	COUNTRY	SURVEY YEAR	SELECTION STATUS	REASON FOR EXCLUSION OR SELECTION	COMPARATOR GROUPS
DHS	KENYA	2008-2009	Excluded	No direct or indirect questions allowing for identification of FDP households	-
DHS	KENYA	2014	Excluded	Too few FDP households and/or individuals identified.	-
DHS	LIBERIA	2007	Selected	Reasonable number of displaced households and/or individuals in the data.	FDPs vs. non-displaced.
DHS	MALI	2018	Excluded	Too few FDP households and/or individuals identified.	-
DHS	NEPAL	2001	Excluded	No direct or indirect questions allowing for identification of FDP households.	-
DHS	NEPAL	2006	Excluded	No direct or indirect questions allowing for identification of FDP households available.	-
DHS	NEPAL	2011	Excluded	Too few FDP households and/or individuals identified.	-
DHS	NEPAL	2016	Excluded	No direct or indirect questions allowing for identification of FDP households available.	-
DHS	NIGERIA	2018	Excluded	Too few FDP households and/or individuals identified.	-
DHS	PAKISTAN	2006-2007	Excluded	No direct or indirect questions allowing for identification of FDP households available.	-
DHS	PAKISTAN	2012	Shortlisted	Reasonable number of displaced households and/or individuals in the data	FDPs vs. non-displaced.
DHS	PAKISTAN	2017	Shortlisted	Reasonable number of displaced households and/or individuals in the data	FDPs vs. non-displaced.
DHS	PHILIPPINES	2017	Excluded	Too few FDP households and/or individuals identified.	-
DHS	TANZANIA	2015	Excluded	Too few FDP households and/or individuals identified.	-
DHS	TURKEY	2003	Shortlisted	Reasonable number of displaced households and/or individuals in the data	FDPs vs. nondisplaced.

DATA SOURCE	COUNTRY	SURVEY YEAR	SELECTION STATUS	REASON FOR EXCLUSION OR SELECTION	COMPARATOR GROUPS
DHS	TURKEY	2008	Shortlisted	Reasonable number of displaced households and/or individuals in the data	FDPs vs. nondisplaced.
DHS	TURKEY	2013	Shortlisted	Reasonable number of displaced households and/or individuals in the data	FDPs vs. nondisplaced.
DHS	UGANDA	2000	Excluded	No direct or indirect questions allowing for identification of FDP households available.	-
DHS	UGANDA	2006	Excluded	Too few FDP households and/or individuals identified.	-
DHS	UGANDA	2011	Excluded	No direct or indirect questions allowing for identification of FDP households available.	-
DHS	UGANDA	2016	Excluded	Too few FDP households and/or individuals identified.	-
LSMS	IRAQ	2012	Shortlisted	Reasonable number of displaced households and/or individuals in the data	FDPs vs. non-displaced.
LSMS	NEPAL	2010–2011	Excluded	Too few FDP households and/or individuals identified.	-
LSMS	NIGERIA	2015–2016	Excluded	Too few FDP households and/or individuals identified.	-
LSMS	NIGERIA	2018–2019	Excluded	Too few FDP households and/or individuals identified.	-
LSMS	TIMOR-LESTE	2008	Shortlisted	Reasonable number of displaced households and/or individuals in the data	FDPs vs. non-displaced.
LSMS	UGANDA	2010–2011	Shortlisted	Reasonable number of displaced households and/or individuals in the data	FDPs vs. non-displaced.
LSMS	UGANDA	2011–2012	Shortlisted	Reasonable number of displaced households and/or individuals in the data	FDPs vs. non-displaced.
LSMS	UGANDA	2013–2014	Shortlisted	Reasonable number of displaced households and/or individuals in the data	FDPs vs. non-displaced.
LSMS	UGANDA	2015–2016	Shortlisted	Reasonable number of displaced households and/or individuals in the data	FDPs vs. non-displaced.

Table 1: Countries Eligible for GBV Outcomes Analysis

COUNTRY	DHS SURVEY YEAR WITH DOMESTIC VIOLENCE MODULE AND GPS	UCDP DATA RANGE (NUMBER OF EVENTS)
ANGOLA	2015-16 (GPS available)	1989-2018 (1978)
ARMENIA	2015-16 (GPS available)	1992-2018 (42)
BANGLADESH	2007 (GPS available)	1989-2018 (601)
BURUNDI	2016-17 (GPS available)	1990-2018 (1512)
CAMBODIA	2000, 2005 (GPS available)	1989-2012 (546)
CAMEROUN	2004, 2011 (GPS available)	1990-2018 (619)
CHAD	2014-2015 (GPS available)	1989-2018 (356)
COLOMBIA	2000,2005,2010 (GPS for 2010 only)	1989-2018 (4632)
CÔTE D'IVOIRE/ IVORY COAST	2011-2012 (GPS available)	1990-2016 (359)
EGYPT	2014 (GPS available)	1990-2018 (773)
ETHIOPIA	2016 (GPS available)	1989-2018 (1989)
GUATEMALA	2014-15 (GPS available)	1989-2015 (478)

COUNTRY	DHS SURVEY YEAR WITH DOMESTIC VIOLENCE MODULE AND GPS	UCDP DATA RANGE (NUMBER OF EVENTS)
KENYA	2003, 2008-09, 2014 (GPS available)	1989-2018 (916)
MOZAMBIQUE	2011-DHS, 2015 AIS (GPS available)	1989-2018 (338)
MYANMAR	2015-16 (GPS available)	1989-2018 (2593)
NEPAL	2011, 2016 (GPS available)	1990-2009 (5654)
PAKISTAN	2017-2018 (GPS available)	1989-2018 (5754)
PERU	2004-08, 2009, 2010, 2010, 2011, 2012 (GPS available for only 2004-08, 2009)	1989-2017 (878)
PHILIPPINES	2008, 2013, 2017 (GPS for 2008 and 2017 only)	1989-2018 (3608)
RWANDA	2005, 2010, 2014-15 (GPS available)	1990-2018 (653)
SOUTH AFRICA	2016 (GPS available)	1989-2016 (2814)
TAJIKISTAN	2012, 2017 (GPS available)	1992-2018 (290)
UGANDA	2006, 2011, 2016 (GPS available)	1989-2018 (1667)