

The Impact of Refugee Presence on Host Populations in Tanzania

A Desk Review

April 2018

The Impact of Refugee Presence on Host Populations in Tanzania

A Desk Review

April 2018

Helidah Ogude, The World Bank

Copyright © World Bank, 2018

All rights reserved.

This publication is a product of the staff of the World Bank Group and the United Nations. The findings, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in this report are entirely those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of The World Bank, its Board of Executive Directors, or the governments they represent, or those of the United Nations. The World Bank and the United Nations do not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this work. The boundaries, colors, denominations, and other information shown on any map in this work do not imply any judgement on the part of The World Bank or the United Nations concerning the legal status of any territory or the endorsement or acceptance of such boundaries. Nothing therein shall constitute or be considered to be a limitation upon or waiver of the privileges and immunities of The World Bank or the United Nations, all of which are specifically reserved.

Contents

Acknowledgements..... vii

Acronyms viii

Introduction..... 1

Background..... 3

Scope..... 6

Overview of the Impacts..... 8

 Pre-existing Livelihood Strategies in Host Communities.....8

 Refugee Policymaking and its Impact on Host Communities8

 Labor Market Outcomes: Jobs and Wages9

 Labor Market Outcomes: A Gendered Perspective 10

 Labor Market Outcomes: Age and Gender..... 11

 Labor Market Outcomes: Casual Labor..... 12

 The Local Economy and Food Prices..... 13

 Food Security and Prices: Refugee and Humanitarian Impact 14

 Local Infrastructure and Services..... 14

 Infrastructure and services 14

 Health outcomes..... 15

 Environmental Impacts..... 16

 Security and Social Cohesion..... 17

 Long-run Impacts on Welfare..... 18

Lessons Learned and Policy/ Practice Recommendations 19

Table of Lessons Learned and Policy/Practice Recommendations..... 20

Future Research..... 24

Bibliography 26

Acknowledgements

This review was jointly prepared by the World Bank and UNHCR to enhance the evidence base on forced displacement given global commitments made at the New York Declaration on Refugees and Migrants in September 2016.

The report was authored by Helidah Refiloe Ogude (Social Development Specialist, World Bank). Valuable guidance and comments were received from Joanna de Berry (Senior Social Development Specialist, World Bank) and Trine Lunde (Senior Development Economist, UNHCR). The review also benefited from being formally peer reviewed by Laura Bailey (Lead Social Development Specialist, World Bank), Theresa Beltramo (Senior Economist, UNHCR) and Beth Whitaker (Associate Professor, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, NC, USA).

Funding for the review was provided by the UNHCR-World Bank 'Just in Time' trust fund for technical assistance.

Acronyms

CCM	Chama Cha Mapinduzi Party
CRRF	Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework
GoT	Government of Tanzania
IDP	Internally Displaced Persons
TCRS	Tanganyika Christian Refugee Services
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

Introduction

It is widely understood that host populations are affected by a sudden and large influx of refugees (World Bank, 2016). Precisely how they are affected, however, remains under-researched and often ill-communicated. Several quantitative studies have been carried out on the impact of forced displacement on host populations, mainly in Colombia, the Great Lakes and increasingly in the Middle East and Europe. However, until recently, this area of study has largely been neglected by economists in particular (Ruiz et al, 2013 and Oxford Refugees Center, 2011). Only a few studies rely on empirical data, and they are typically focused on short-term impacts (Kreibaum, 2016 and Ruiz et al, 2013).

Tanzania, however, is an exception in this regard, partly because of its location (surrounded by countries periodically affected by conflict) and its decades-long history in welcoming and assisting large numbers of refugees. Unlike several other hosting countries, there exists a considerable body of qualitative, mixed-methods and empirical literature, mostly analyzing the impact of refugee inflows from Burundi (1993) and Rwanda (1994) on host districts in northwestern Tanzania. This literature covers a range of impacts including on the labor market, environment, health and other areas.

The formulation of the forthcoming Global Compact on Refugees and implementation of a Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF)¹ in countries such as Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Somalia and Uganda all stress the inclusion of host communities in efforts to extend refugee protection and to bring

development responses to situations of forced displacement. Therefore, an imperative exists to review what is known about previous experiences of refugee arrival and response and the impacts on host communities. Given the depth and breadth of evidence that can be drawn from the Tanzanian experience, it serves an insightful case study from which policy lessons can be learned from and applied in a range of contemporary displacement contexts.

This desk review was conducted against this backdrop of the new global commitment to protecting refugees and better supporting the countries and communities that host them. It is hoped that the evidence and analysis presented here will inform policy responses for the various governments across the world faced with significant refugee and Internally Displaced Persons (IDP) populations, as well as the humanitarian and development actors involved in supporting them. Although critical analysis on its own cannot lead to sound and well-evidence policies, which rely on political will and available resources, it can however work to dispel myths that may otherwise be used to mobilize ill-formed practices and policies. Instead, this kind of analysis can redirect attention toward people, places and processes that warrant attention and that may otherwise be misunderstood or neglected (Landau & Achiume, 2017).

As such, this review will provide:

- A brief history of refugee policy and practice in Tanzania;
- An overview of the impacts/outcomes along different variables (e.g., jobs, health, etc.);


¹ CRRF is a multi-stakeholder approach that aims at linking humanitarian and development efforts during the early stages of an emergency while strengthening

investments in the resilience of both refugees and local communities.

- A list of lessons and policy/practice options that can be gleaned from an analysis of the studies' findings both in terms of refugee impact and humanitarian/development impact/response; and
- A brief taxonomy of areas for possible further research and understanding.

Since the primary focus of this review is an analysis of the impact of refugee presence on host communities in Tanzania, the following historical background section is not intended to be comprehensive. Rather, it seeks to provide a summary overview of changes in Tanzania's policy and practice toward refugees by highlighting some of the most significant documented socio-political and economic factors that led to these changes.

Figure 1. Refugees and Asylum-seekers Hosted in Tanzania from 1973 to 2015



Source: UNHCR Online Population Statistics Database (accessed on March 1, 2018). Note: In 1972 approximately 160,000 Burundian refugees fled to Tanzania but UNHCR data only records 90,000. It was common for Burundians to cross the border into Tanzania.

Background

Tanzania's experience of accommodating refugees dates back to the colonial era. Thousands of Africans fled their countries and predominantly settled in the "less populated and more fertile western borderlands" of Tanganyika (Buscher et al., 2009) (figure 1). Since independence in 1962, Tanzania was considered one of the most hospitable countries in the world (Rutinwa, 1996 and Milner, 2013). Largely credited to its first President, Julius Nyerere, it promoted an Open-Door Policy toward thousands of refugees fleeing wars, as well as liberation movements, including countries like Angola, Cape Verde, Comoro, Ethiopia, Kenya, Mozambique, Namibia, Somalia, Seychelles, South Africa, Uganda, Zaire and even people as far afield as Serbia (Chaulia, 2003 and Rutinwa, 1996).


Critically, Nyerere's Open-Door Policy was guided by domestic economic incentives and the political formations of the time. Nyerere's vision for Tanzania's development was guided by the principles of *ujamaa na kujitegemea* (socialism and self-reliance), principles that were nationally adopted in 1967 through the Arusha Declaration (Milner, 2013 and Coulson, 1982). A significant element of the Declaration necessitated the establishment of "farming collectives to encourage self-reliance" (Milner, 2003). Within the context of the Declaration, several scholars have argued that refugees were seen as a critical means to the economic development of especially peripheral regions in Tanzania. For instance, Daley (1992) argues that refugee settlements were instrumental in the development of remote regions of the country both in terms of subsistence crops and export-earning crops that provided the Tanzanian government with invaluable foreign currency (Daley, 1992 and Milner, 2003).

Aside from the economic incentives for refugee accommodation at the time, external financial and technical resources are also considered to be key motivations for the establishment and sustainability of the settlements. The Tripartite Partnership Model—an agreement between the Government of Tanzania, the UNHCR and the Tanganyika Christian Refugee Services (TCRS)—institutionalized the TCRS assuming responsibility for managing the settlements, while the UNHCR provided the financial and technical support; "between 1963 and 1979, 13 settlements were managed through such tripartite agreements, hosting an estimated 182,000 refugees" (Milner, 2003).

However, the 1990s ushered in a significant shift in Tanzania's posture toward refugees, from one of "self-sufficiency and local settlement" to one focused on repatriation (Milner, 2003). Factors that account for this change can be summarized as follows:

1. changing international trends toward refugee policy and protection standards;
2. the threat of a regional conflict and domestic insecurity;
3. local party politics and the concurrent change of the GoT's foreign policy;
4. declining international financial support;
5. the unprecedented magnitude of refugee presence and the accompanying stresses it placed on host populations; and
6. the perceived failure of the Open-Door Policy (Milner, 2003, Rutinwa, 1996 and Whitaker, 2002b).


Figure 2. Burundian Refugees in Tanzania



Source: UNHCR Online Population Statistics Database (accessed on March 6, 2017), UNHCR Burundi Situation Regional Update #32 December 2016, UNHCR Burundi Operational Portal (accessed on May 5, 2017)

Note: The naturalization of about 162,000 Burundian refugees accounts for the sharp decrease in the number of Burundian refugees in 2009.

Figure 3. DRC Refugees in Tanzania



Source: UNHCR Online Population Statistics Database (accessed on March 6, 2017), UNHCR DRC Regional Refugee Response Information Sharing Portal (accessed on May 6, 2017)

Whitaker (2002b) asserts that to understand the shift in Tanzania’s policies in the 1990s, one should situate these changes in broader international developments that tended toward “more restrictive refugee policies and declining protection standards.” For instance, according to a 1997 UNHCR publication, in 1996 more than 20 countries ejected refugees from their countries (UNHCR, 1997). Whitaker (2002b) argues that the easing of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States ushered in a change in the nature of conflicts and more importantly, how asylum-seekers were perceived in this changing geopolitical context. Wars perpetuated by the Cold War were now replaced with conflicts that were entangled with issues of “identity [and] nationalism” (Whitaker, 2002b). As a result, “refugees were no longer perceived as victim of broader geopolitical conflicts but rather actors in the conflicts. As support for Western allies declined, host countries in the developing world increasingly viewed refugees as a source of instability and an economic burden” (Whitaker, 2002b). Relatedly, there was a narrowing of durable solutions after the Cold War. Whereas integration and third-party resettlement were common place during the Cold War, these options were less favorable in a climate where refugee flows increased significantly and thus the motives for their movements were met with more suspicion (Whitaker, 2002b).

Further, Rutinwa (1996) proposes that the influence of international precedents influenced the Tanzanian Government’s move toward restrictive policies. Notably, the Haitian refugees as well as the Cuban exodus—the so called “boat people”—were cited by senior Tanzanian officials at the time as a justification for their change in policy. They noted that it was unfair to expect poorer countries to uphold their international obligations, while major powers—such as the United States—failed to when “their own national rights and interests were at stake” (Rutinwa, 1996).

Significantly, the nature of refugee populations and the association of them with threats to domestic and regional insecurity were instrumental in justifying a change in policy. The perception and reality that some among refugee flows from Rwanda and Burundi were armed, heightened domestic insecurity and threatened tensions between countries of origin and host countries (Whitaker, 2002b). In 1995, the Minister of Foreign Affairs noted:

The presence of the refugees is a source of tension in the relations between Tanzania and Burundi and to a certain extent Rwanda, arising from the suspicion that the refugees are regrouping and training in warfare for attacking the countries of origin (Rwegasira, 1995).

Within the context of growing regional insecurity, as well as the view by the Tanzanian government that the security situation in Rwanda had improved, the decision to repatriate Rwandan refugees was made; the GoT believed this decision would protect it from being drawn into a regional conflict (Whitaker, 2002b).

An often-underestimated factor in understanding refugee policy changes at the time was the change to a multi-party system of government in 1992 and the impending elections in October of 1995 (Milner, 2003). In their campaigns, parties claimed they had the solutions to the refugee crisis, while Mkapa claimed he “could prevent the spread of violence from Rwanda and Burundi” (Milner, 2003). The post-election era saw the instituting of a new foreign policy regime which moved away from Pan-Africanism and in “support [of] liberation movements” (Milner, 2003) toward “an active policy of maintaining good relations with all neighbors”, despite their ideologies or actions, as long as they did not harm Tanzania’s interests (Rutinwa, 1996).

Notably, although there was significant international assistance at the beginning of the Rwandan influx, over time, this assistance diminished. In part, much of the humanitarian attention shifted to Bosnia and elsewhere, and as such, by 1996 the UNHCR was struggling to fund the refugee response in the Great Lakes Region (Whitaker, 2002b and Milner, 2003). Some scholars claim, in fact, that “failures of the international community to give adequate assistance to Tanzania was the main reason for the closure of the border” with Burundi, and that this border closure signified a shift in the GoT’s policy toward refugees (Rutinwa, 1996).

Finally, the unprecedented magnitude of refugees arriving in Tanzania in the 1990s and some of the detrimental impacts it had on the environment, infrastructure and services, as well as a belief by the government that the Open-Door Policy had not achieved its intended objective—to provide interim relief, while more long-term and permanent solutions are determined in the country of origin – also facilitated a move toward more restrictive policies (Rutinwa, 1996). The Foreign Minister in his Arusha speech echoed these sentiments:

Experience has proved that such measures as granting of permanent refugee status, permanent settlement are not a formula for a permanent solution to the refugee crisis. The solution indeed lies in the countries of origin rather than in the countries of asylum which are burdened with obligations [from] the refugees (Rwegasira, 1995).

Ultimately, the interplay of these multiple factors resulted in the 1998 Refugees Act, which Kamanga (2005) argues had two objectives:

1. to “signal disengagement from the Open-Door Policy of the Nyerere administration” and
2. to “assure the populace” that the GoT was “determined to address the problem

of seemingly endless refugee influxes” (Kamanga, 2005).

Furthermore, restrictions after the passing of the Act deepened. For instance, refugees were prohibited from travelling more than 4kms from the camps. Significantly, the 2003 National Refugee Policy institutionalized many of these restrictions, including controls on freedom of movement and economic activity, while rejecting citizenship as a viable durable solution, and asserting voluntary repatriation as the “best solution for the refugee problem” (GoT, 2003).

Scope

Most studies of impacts on host communities in Tanzania focus on the large exodus of people fleeing Burundi and Rwanda in the 1990s. These studies were therefore conducted within the context of an encampment policy with restrictions on refugee movements and with repatriation as the preferred durable solution as noted in the Background. Over one million people sought refuge in western Tanzania during this period, and in some regions, refugees outnumbered natives five to one (Whitaker, 2002). The outflow of refugees from Rwanda was concentrated mainly during the 1994–1996 period, while in the case of Burundi, which experienced a longer conflict, there was a more gradual but steady outflow of refugees throughout the 1990s.

Kagera is the northern most region that borders Burundi and Rwanda in western Tanzania, while Kigoma lies south of Kagera, bordering only Burundi. These regions were the main locations in which refugees settled in the 1990s and as such have been the focal point of most of the studies covering impacts on Tanzanian host communities. Several reasons account for the

higher concentration of refugees in these regions (Maystadt and Verwimp, 2014):

1. proximity—there were higher concentrations of refugees in the western part of Kagera compared to the eastern part given proximity to Burundi and Rwanda;
2. government practice—authorities decided to situate refugees closer to the border; and
3. natural topographic boundaries such as mountains prevented the mobility of refugees.



Kagera provides an especially useful case as refugees were not evenly spread across the region. A series of mountains separated east and west Kagera, and there are also a series of natural reserves (mostly inhabited) that reinforce the geographical barrier between the two areas (Ruiz & Vargas-Silva, 2015). These geographical characteristics, government policies and proximity, resulted in a 'natural experiment' in which an area (i.e., west) was much more affected by the refugee inflow in comparison to the other area (i.e., east).

The following section captures the main findings of several studies that examined the presence of refugees in these regions. It covers the impact that refugees, and in some cases the humanitarian community, had on local communities in Tanzania. It starts by covering a brief overview of some mediating factors that influenced impacts, including pre-existing livelihood strategies in various refugee-hosting districts and immediate policy responses to the refugee influx, such as camp locations. The section then covers areas of research that have been more comprehensively analyzed:

1. labor market outcomes, with some studies placing more emphasis on the gendered dynamics, as well as the distinct impact on causal labor;
2. the local economy and food prices;
3. food security and prices in terms of the humanitarian impact;
4. local infrastructure and services;
5. environmental impacts;
6. security and social cohesion; and
7. long-run welfare impacts.

Notably the variables covered here are not mutually exclusive in the way they affect hosts; they mediate impacts simultaneously. As such, there are cases where related impacts, such as the local economy and food prices, are discussed

concurrently, since these variables are closely related and therefore cannot be neatly disentangled. In fact, the review is intentionally framed in a manner that enables policy makers to recognize the interdependences of variables that affect hosts. Needless to say, hosts are affected by numerous variables simultaneously and make subsequent livelihood choices on that basis.

Overview of the Impacts

Before refugees arrive in any given context, there are pre-existing factors that will mediate the livelihood strategies that hosts pursue and their resultant short-term livelihood outcomes when refugees arrive (World Bank, 2016). These factors, in addition to government policies, both at a national and sub-national level, as well as NGO and aid agency policies mediate impacts on hosts. This paper begins with a brief review of these factors and their impacts in Tanzania before addressing literature that covers labor market outcomes.

Pre-existing Livelihood Strategies in Host Communities

Whitaker (2002) explores how different pre-existing factors within host populations influenced the impact of the refugee situation. She notes how differences in poverty, education and capacity for agricultural production led to varied capacity for hosts to take advantage of refugee presence in Karagwe and Kibondo districts.

In the latter district, she highlights how poverty limited the degree to which host communities could benefit. Kibondo's remoteness, its communities' dependence on subsistence agriculture, as well as few "local business ventures and limited economic opportunities", resulted in less favorable livelihood outcomes compared to Karagwe. In contrast, Karagwe district communities—where over 95% of residents sold coffee as a cash crop (Ndege et al., 1995)—benefitted from refugee presence because of their capacity to produce a surplus of food, and because of their "higher levels of education" (Whitaker, 2002).

Due to poverty levels in Kibondo, few residents had enough "up-front capital to start businesses and many could not afford to hire refugee labor", and as such, low levels of production meant that hosts could not take advantage of the new markets that the refugee presence brought (Whitaker, 2002).

There was also a marked difference in district officials' response to opportunities presented by aid agencies. In Kibondo, despite encouragement by agencies for district officials to submit proposals for grants for inclusive projects between refugees and hosts, little was done. In Kasulu, however, "donor encouragement led to regular government coordination meetings and project proposals by the district council" (Whitaker, 2002).

Whitaker (2002) further notes that the host population in Ngara was similar to that of Kibondo. Low levels of education, limited business and trade experience meant that locals could not take full advantage of the refugee presence, despite there being a large population of refugees in Ngara. Further, locals of Ngara experienced competition from Tanzanians from other parts of the country; "people flocked there from all over Tanzania to open businesses and exploit trading opportunities" (Whitaker, 2002). In 2006 when Rwandan refugees were repatriated, the same Tanzanians who had come to Ngara, moved to districts in Kigoma where Burundian refugees were still present. Ultimately, she notes that existing socio-economic conditions in the various districts influenced the extent to which hosts could benefit from the refugee presence.

Refugee Policymaking and its Impact on Host Communities

In terms of how policy-making and practice affected host communities, Whitaker (2002) asserts that government policies were particularly important in three ways:

1. camp locations;
2. restrictions on refugee-host interactions after 1996; and
3. limits imposed on refugees to engage in agricultural production.

The latter, she argues, led more locals to be exposed to “crop theft and banditry” since refugees had less options to engage in agricultural production. Camp locations had varying effects on livelihood outcomes, depending on host community proximity to the camps; nearby villagers were likely to benefit more than those further afield, if they had the capacity to do so. For example, the capacity to produce more crops that refugees prefer and did not have access to through aid. She also notes that the “government’s effort to enforce tighter controls on refugee-host interaction after 1996 influenced the opportunities available to Tanzanians”. Lastly, she argues that on the NGO side, “decisions to implement development projects in some locations and not in others—often based on the recommendations of government officials—also shaped host experiences” (Whitaker, 2002).

She concludes by asserting that overall, the policies of both the Tanzanian government as well as aid agencies implemented soon after the arrival of refugees, “had a significant impact on the extent to which host communities could benefit from the refugee response” (Whitaker, 2002).

Labor Market Outcomes: Jobs and Wages

In their study, Ruiz and Vargas-Silva (2015) exploit the ‘natural experiment’ of the 1990s in Kagera. Using panel data (pre- and post-refugee inflow) and making use of the Kagera Health and Development Survey (KHDS)—a longitudinal data set which contains information about Kagera residents before and after the refugee inflow or ‘shock’ of the early 1990s from Burundi

and Rwanda—they explore the implications of this shock for labor market outcomes of Tanzanians. Their results are consistent with immigration literature which shows that the arrival of refugees influences the economic activities in which locals engage.

Ruiz and Vargas-Silva (2015) find that “greater exposure to refugee presence resulted in Tanzanians having a higher likelihood of working in household shambas (farming) or caring for household livestock.” In other words, there was a positive correlation between the presence of refugees and an increase in farming and livestock activities among host populations. They found this result to be consistent across the different measures of the intensity of the refugee presence.

Their results also suggest that the influx of refugees did not affect the likelihood of having self-employment as the main economic activity. This result may seem surprising given significant anecdotal evidence that Tanzanians were opening numerous shops and starting different businesses to service the needs of refugees and employees of international organizations (Whitaker, 2002). However, this finding is consistent with the idea that Tanzanian farmers were rather expanding their farms in response to increased demand for their crops and in some cases with assistance from cheaper refugee labor (Maystadt and Verwimp, 2014). Ruiz and Vargas-Silva (2015) further argue that another possible explanation, which corresponds to previous literature, is that much of the new small business activity was initiated by Tanzanians moving from other regions of the country to Kagera (Maystadt and Verwimp, 2014).

Furthermore, Ruiz and Vargas-Silva (2015) found that greater exposure to the refugee population resulted in Tanzanians having a lower likelihood of working outside the household as employees. They were particularly

less likely to be agricultural employees, suggesting that refugees may have taken available agricultural job opportunities, hired by Tanzanian farmers. `

Similarly, Maystadt and Verwimp (2014) traced how households between 1991 and 2004 were affected by the refugee inflows originating from Burundi (1993) and Rwanda (1994) and argue that refugees provided cheap labor in sectors such as agriculture, construction, housekeeping and catering. Their results show that local hosts did not necessarily suffer from the refugee presence. The combination of increased demand for local produce and the availability of cheap labor resulted in an expansion of agricultural production. In some villages close to refugee camps agricultural production doubled (World Food Program and UNHCR, 1998),

Critically, constraints that were present prior to the arrival of refugees, such as “labor shortages and lack of markets,” affected agricultural production (Whitaker, 2002). Specifically, the significant number of refugees expanded both the number of laborers that hosts could hire and the size of the local market. According to Whitaker (2002), hosts promptly took advantage of refugee presence for farm expansion and to increase agricultural production. For instance, “in Karagwe district [...] famers on average doubled the size of their cultivated lands and doubled their production of bananas and beans between 1993 and 1996” (Whitaker, 2002).

However, the economic benefits appear to have been unevenly distributed among the refugee-hosting population. Casual laborers (meant here and onwards as locals that work for self-employed farmers) were likely to suffer the most from an increase in competition on the labor markets and the surging prices of several goods. In contrast, non-agricultural workers and self-employed farmers were in a better position to benefit from such a refugee inflow. Maystadt and Verwimp (2014) further argue that welfare

deterioration experienced by those involved in particularly small business could be explained as a selection effect resulting from the reported entry of larger-scale entrepreneurs from other regions, as opposed to the presence of the refugees themselves.

Whitaker’s (2002) study assesses, not only the refugee impact but also the humanitarian impact on jobs and wages. She finds that the refugee relief operation resulted in an increase in employment opportunities for hosts and higher wages but also some negative consequences. NGOs hired Tanzanians at all skill levels from “guards, drivers and maids to field staff, administrators and accountants” (Whitaker 2002). Waters’ (1996) research found that salaries linked to the relief operation were two to three times the salaries of comparable positions in other parts of Tanzania. However, although many locals in the refugee-hosting regions benefitted from these new jobs and inflated salaries, other institutions such as government departments were negatively affected. For instance, numerous employees from the public sector, including from “hospitals, schools, and government departments left their positions” for what were ostensibly better job opportunities in relief-related sectors (Whitaker, 2002). Whitaker’s (2002) study indicates that in Ngara, “more than 50 percent of health center staff and 35 percent of dispensary workers left their government posts to work with relief agencies.” Further, employees with fixed salaries suffered greatly from the general rise in the cost of living; “the salaries of civil servants, bank employees, and parastatal staff did not cover nearly as many expenses as they did” before refugee arrival (Whitaker, 1999).

Labor Market Outcomes: A Gendered Perspective

Gendered consequences of hosting refugees are significant for several reasons. For instance, the arrival of refugees in rural areas often leads to

greater demand for resources such as firewood and water. In rural Tanzania, household chores, including fetching firewood for cooking and drinking water, are typically the responsibility of women. Conducting these chores on a regular basis in turn limits their access to income-generating activities (Leavens and Anderson 2011 and Whitaker, 1999).

It is within this context that Ruiz and Vargas-Silva (2017) in a separate and more recent paper, expand on their previous study to examine whether the presence of refugees alters the intra-household allocation of tasks across genders in the hosting population. The focus of their study is on the impact of the refugee shock on three different groups of tasks: farming, outside employment and household chores (specifically fetching water and collecting firewood). Their overall findings show that the presence of refugees' results in differing impacts on time allocation and tasks for men and women, which is further influenced by skill levels and age.

They find that overall the increased exposure to refugees led to women being less likely to engage in employment outside the household and more likely to engage in household chores relative to men. This was ascribed to the increased time spent by women collecting firewood because of deforestation associated with the arrival of refugees, as well as the additional competition for natural resources such as wood and water (Ruiz and Vargas-Silva, 2017 and Jacobsen, 1997). Berry (2008) found that increases in tree felling was also related "to wind- and water-induced soil erosion" as well as the depletion of water resources. This is especially critical to note since the communities sampled by Ruiz and Vargas-Silva (2017) were highly dependent on natural resources, not only for cooking but for drinking water too. Further, women were often only capable of doing farming *or* fetching fire on any given day—not both (Whitaker, 1999).

In some cases, however, Whitaker (1999) found that firewood became a source of income for both host and refugee women as they would sell the firewood by the bundle. Further, some local women employed refugees for low wages to do household tasks such as fetching firewood and water (Ruiz and Vargas-Silva, 2017). This freed up time for local women to engage in income-generating activities. Ruiz and Vargas-Silva (2017) argue that where local women employed refugees to do household tasks, this increased their ability to engage in income-generating activities and, for some local women, may have resulted in greater independence and "control over household spending decisions."

However, the results differ by (pre-shock) literacy and mathematical skills. For women who could read and perform simple written mathematical actions, the refugee shock resulted in a "higher likelihood of engaging in outside employment" (Ruiz and Vargas-Silva, 2017). In contrast, they find that when illiterate women were exposed to the refugee shock, they were more likely to participate in farming and household chores. Thus, their study indicates a differentiated impact on women with different literacy and mathematical skills. The presence of refugees, therefore, potentially benefitted those with the skills because they were "more likely to take advantage of the additional supply of cheap labor represented by refugees" Ruiz and Vargas-Silva's (2017).

Labor Market Outcomes: Age and Gender

The results of Ruiz and Vargas-Silva's (2017) study are substantially different across age cohorts too. Firstly, for those women that were 30 years of age or younger, refugee presence resulted in them being less likely to engage in outside employment and more likely to engage in "farming and fetching water/collecting firewood than men". In contrast, for those over 30, refugee presence did not have much of a

gender-specific effect. This finding is in line with what Ruiz and Vargas-Silva (2017) hypothesize in their paper, in part based on other literature: “younger individuals, who are more flexible in the labor market, would be more likely to make adjustments for the presence of refugees than older ones.” In justifying this assertion, they cite literature on the labor market impacts of immigration in high-income countries, which intimates that younger local workers are more likely to compete with migrants in the labor market and more so than their older counterparts (Angrist and Kugler 2003).

In terms of the impact of the refugee shock by household activities of those who were children (7 to 14 years of age), “higher household exposure to the refugee shock was associated with girls dedicating more time to outside employment and collecting firewood/fetching water than boys” (Ruiz and Vargas-Silva, 2017). These results suggest that hosting refugees increase girl’s participation in household chores and might lead to worse future outcomes. Interestingly, the refugee shock had no impact on school attendance, which suggests that the increase in time dedicated to other activities did not come at the expense of school attendance. It is unknown, however, if girls’ outcomes at school were affected, as this issue was not explored in the study.

Labor Market Outcomes: Casual Labor

Tanzania also has a long history of casual labor (Mbilinyi, 1986). Casual workers are typically hired daily to do basic jobs with low degrees of responsibility for which they receive relatively low payment. Refugees were generally willing and crucially able to engage in casual labor for even lower payment (because of support they received from the relief operation in terms of non-food assistance, food rations, etc.). This could have led to a substitution of casual local workers for casual refugee workers, as was seen

with women in Ruiz and Vargas-Silva’s (2017) study.

A study by Whitaker (2002) explores data captured between 1996 and 1998 in a total of 15 villages and 5 districts, including in Ngara, Kibondo, Kasulu and Kigoma on the impacts on casual labor and access to basic resources. Whitaker (2002) notes that refugees represented a source of cheap labor for Tanzanian villagers. Her findings show that given a significant drop in acceptable wages—in some areas up to 50%—local farmers generally hired refugees to do agricultural work but also to build houses, tend livestock and fetch water or firewood. Furthermore, wages varied depending on the farms distance from the camps and the type of work. In camp areas, where there was a larger supply of casual labor, local workers earned significantly less than in other areas (Whitaker, 1999). In fact, nearly three quarters of the time, refugees were paid with food instead of money (Kibreab, 1985). However, wages were higher during the agricultural season when labor demand was higher, nevertheless, some concerned Tanzanians still hired refugees in the low season even if their labor was not required (Whitaker, 2002 and Maruku Agricultural Research Institute, 1997).

Critically, many of the locals who were casual workers before the arrival of refugees changed to other activities, including self-employment in the post-shock period (Ruiz and Vargas-Silva, 2015). These local casual workers were the most likely to have competed with refugees for jobs. Ruiz and Vargas-Silva (2015) note that these results are, in general, “consistent with the evidence from the ‘voluntary’ migration literature in developed countries which suggests that natives adjust to immigration flows by changing economic activities.” Given the dearth of evidence on this type of adjustment of local population in low-income countries, Ruiz and Vargas-Silva (2015) emphasize that this finding is an important contribution to the literature.

Overall, both the sharp decline in day labor wages as well as the rise in food prices resulted in the welfare of local casual laborers becoming precarious (FAO, 1995).

The Local Economy and Food Prices

The arrival of the displaced usually results in the growth of local economies (de Montclos, M.-A. P. and Kagwanja, P. M., 2000). As consumers who in some cases receive remittances, their purchasing power benefits local business owners and traders. However, increased demand for certain products can result in increased prices which adversely affects local consumers (World Bank, 2016). Informal trade has also been noted as a source of social tension when the displaced and hosts trade the same goods or in the same location. Further, depending on the nature of food-aid provision, local producers and consumers can be negatively or positively affected (Mabiso et al., 2014).

Whitaker (1999) found that the presence of refugees, as well as the resources associated with their arrival, changed economic opportunities for hosts. The arrival of refugees resulted in the growth of some local markets and with that came a sharp increase in the participation in business activities of both hosts and refugees. Critically, Mabiso et al. (2014) note that “land availability in [...] northwestern Tanzania facilitated the expansion of agricultural production.” Local farmers traded and sold a variety of products to both expatriate and refugee communities, including “sweet potatoes, cassava, pineapples, palm oil, vegetables, bananas, and local brew” (Whitaker, 1999). Refugees themselves took advantage of the food items they would be provided by relief agencies. Some agencies claimed that refugees traded up to 75% of their food, including “vegetables, soy beans, flour, plastic tarps, soap, and even farming hoes” (Whitaker, 1999).

Further, the boom in the local market was not limited to refugee-hosting areas; “entrepreneurs and aid agencies conducted considerable business at supply centers in Bukoba, Mwanza, Kigoma and Dar es Salaam” (Whitaker, 1999). Critically, prior to the influx of refugees, Ndege et al (1995) found that local markets were insufficient for their harvest and as such, they often traded across the border in Rwanda and Burundi. However, in the wake of the refugee crisis, trade increased at a village level; the arrival of refugees effectively moved markets closer to villagers. Both the instability in Rwanda and Burundi, as well as the sudden arrival of refugees, had negative consequences for border traders and communities from border trading towns. The new population centers were now refugee camps, which were typically 20-40 km away from the border (Whitaker, 1999). This meant that towns that were once economic centers “were negatively affected by this abrupt collapse of local [border] markets” (Whitaker, 1999).

Mabiso et al. (2014) contend that the large-scale arrival of refugees can improve market efficiency and trade dynamism, in part because of road investments made by international organizations—“given the strong link between road accessibility and economic development” (Mabiso et al., 2014 and Jacobsen, 2002). This market efficiency and trade dynamism was also observed in Tanzania. Refugees also sold non-food items such as blankets and plastic sheets. Such trading activities were easy to observe and even institutionalized by the aid community and the Ministry of Home Affairs (MHA) through the creation of a “common market” around each refugee camp, where refugees and local people were invited to trade. For example, Maystadt and Verwimp (1999) note that the “common market of Lukole—opened between 1994 and 2003 close to one of the largest Rwandan refugee camps—is estimated to have been the biggest market of the Kagera region, after the one in the capital town (Bukoba).”

Food Security and Prices: Refugee and Humanitarian Impact

The sudden population increase affected food security in local villages, particularly at the beginning of the influx in 1994 (Whitaker, 2002). Despite receiving rations, refugees remained dependent on local crops and livestock. Out of a need to diversify their diets, refugees looked to food from local farmers, whose produce included “vegetables, cassava, cooking bananas, and sweet potatoes”, while in contrast their rations mainly consisted of “beans, maize, cooking oil, and salt” (Whitaker, 2002). To access these foods, refugees traded with, and purchased from, local farmers, and in some cases, stole from them.

Due to increased demand in certain local crops, particular food prices sharply increased. Bananas, for instance, were popular for both refugees and hosts, as such, prices for bananas skyrocketed (Whitaker 2002). In response to these market forces, many Tanzanian farmers sold high proportions of their own food stocks (FAO, 1995). Various relief organizations tried different strategies to avoid creating scarcity of supply. The WFP, for instance, “purchased beans and maize for refugee rations from other regions of Tanzania and neighboring countries” (Whitaker, 2002). Although this resulted in temporary relief in western Tanzania, it nevertheless resulted in the prices of these goods to sharply decline, as refugees sold their rations in order to purchase other items. “Tanzanian farmers who produced surplus beans and maize were thus unable to sell them for any profit at all” (Whitaker, 2002).

Similarly, Maystadt and Verwimp (2014) also found that the price of some goods sharply increased, threatening the food security of some households. The increase of prices resulted from an increasing demand from aid workers but also from the refugees themselves. The arrival of international organizations (UNHCR, NGOs,

etc.) and their staff (local and international) induced significant increases in demand from people with much higher purchasing power.

Alix-Garcia and Saah (2010) found large increases in the prices of non-aid food items (e.g., plantains, legumes, milk and beans) and more modest prices effects for aid-related food items. Thus, they found that food aid ameliorated (although did not offset completely) the impact on prices of the population increase which resulted from the presence of refugees (World Bank, 2016). Their examination of household assets suggested positive wealth effects of refugee camps on nearby rural households and negative wealth effects on households in urban areas. This finding is consistent with a scenario where producer households benefit from higher prices for agricultural goods. Overall, Mabiso et al. (2014) note that in cases such as Tanzania, Kenya and Uganda prices are significantly affected by the arrival of refugees—however the “general equilibrium and long-term effects [...] depend on the extent of food aid inflows and the ability of households to adjust their production and consumption decisions to changes in prices.”

Local Infrastructure and Services

Infrastructure and services

Studies related to the impact of inflows on infrastructure and services in Tanzania have generally found that border area schools were damaged in the early weeks of the influx (refugees slept in classrooms and burned desks for firewood); local health facilities and referral hospitals became overstretched; and the criminal justice system was overburdened (Whitaker 1999).

Whitaker (1999) notes that social services were initially insufficient to meet demand but ultimately improved after the construction of infrastructure in the camps and the implementation of development projects in host

communities. Specifically, donors responded positively, and “throughout western Tanzania, more than 50 primary schools and 20 dispensaries were rehabilitated, 4 district hospitals expanded, 120 water systems were improved or installed, a community center was constructed, and several teacher resource centers were built” (Whitaker, 1999). Host communities proximate to the camps also benefitted from access to the health facilities within the camps. Women in particular found access to free health care—something they had to partially pay for before the arrival of refugees—as a significant gain due to the refugee presence.

Further, donors invested in road and transportation infrastructure. For example, Whitaker (1999) highlights that in Kagera “more than \$15 million went toward the rehabilitation of main and feeder roads, airstrips, and telecommunications infrastructure.” Further, donors pledged to improve the main Kibondo-Kasulu-Kigoma road in late 1998. These kinds of investments enabled travel for host communities, and as traffic increased, local businesspeople established bus services (Whitaker, 1999).

Health outcomes

More detailed studies related to services have focused on health and education outcomes of hosts. Baez (2010) argues that the health outcomes of host children are adversely affected by hosting displaced populations. Using the 1992 and 1996 Tanzania Demographic and Health Survey and the 1991-1994 and 2004 Kagera Health and Development Survey, Baez (2010) notes a 15-20% increase in the incidence of infectious diseases, a 7% increase in the mortality of children under the age of 5 and a reduction in height in early childhood by 1.2%. The study also found adverse impacts over a year after the shock: worsening of children’s anthropometrics, an increase in the incidence of

diseases (15-20%), an increase in mortality for children under five (7%); childhood exposure to refugee crisis reduced height in early childhood by 1.8 cm (1.2%), schooling by 7.1% and literacy by 8.6%.

Baez (2010) also found important human capital consequences for younger cohorts affected by the presence of refugees. He hypothesizes that poor childhood health can disrupt human capital accumulation and affect labor market outcomes in adulthood. That is, decrease the likelihood of doing jobs which require more human capital. Baez (2010) also hypothesized that this impact was due to an increase in the prevalence of infectious diseases and vector-borne illnesses or in the competition for various resources (labor, food, land and wood) caused by the arrival of refugees. One caveat in the Baez’s (2010) study, however, is that at the time he did not observe the final adult height of the children studied, only their height in puberty or just before onset of puberty. Recent studies in human biology, however, show that puberty offers an opportune window for recovering height growth losses experienced in early childhood (Mabiso et al. 2014).

It is within the context of these human biology studies that Mabiso et al. (2014) extended Baez’s (2010) study to several years after refugees repatriated, and they did not find evidence of long-lasting health impacts. Their findings suggest that the children whose growth, as measured by height, was hindered due to the arrival of refugees could catch up with the control group during puberty. In this same vein, Maystadt and Verwimp (2014) note that refugees had a limited impact on health outcomes, especially given the qualitative evidence reporting health services to have improved following the refugee inflows.

Generally, researchers have found that the host government’s ability to manage a sudden increase in demand for health services

determines the impact on healthcare provision. This is in turn dependent on its “financial and administrative capacity” (Mabiso, et al, 2014). For instance, “during the Rwandan refugee crisis, the Tanzanian government was much better equipped to handle the shock to its healthcare system than was its Zairean (now DRC) counterpart.” (Mabiso, et al, 2014).

Environmental Impacts

The initial arrival phase of refugee influxes is often accompanied by severe environmental impacts when the displaced move into, and through, an area to secure their immediate needs (World Bank, 2016). Negative impacts are most felt in terms of land, water, natural resources and slum growth. As the emergency period passes and refugees become settled, the nature of the environmental impact changes but can still be significant. Environmental impacts are closely associated with the type of refugee settlements and particularly the concentration of people in large camps/ settlements.

As explained by Berry (2008) in her study of environmental degradation and its impact on refugee-host relationships in Tanzania, the presence of refugees meant that it was necessary to “travel much greater distances to find firewood and wood for construction than was necessary 10 years [prior].” The environmental impacts of refugees indirectly affected the food security of the host community through deforestation, soil erosion and land degradation, unsustainable water extraction and water pollution, which had both short-run and long-run effects (Whitaker 2002; Martin, 2005). Although deforestation was a problem prior to the arrival of refugees, the presence of refugees in Tanzania accelerated deforestation rates and depletion of soil nutrient availability for agricultural crops, causing additional soil erosion and thereby affecting the host’s agricultural production and food security (Berry, 2008).

Whitaker (1999) also explains that refugees in Tanzania used more firewood per person than the locals; “refugees used an average 2.8 kg of wood per person per day, whereas locals used 1.7 kg” (UNHCR, 1999). Two reasons for this difference was that refugees were less likely to put out fires between meals because of a lack of matches and that they depended more on dried food, which took longer to cook than the fresh crops consumed by locals. UNHCR (2002) estimates that at the peak of the refugee crisis in Kagera, the camps consumed about 1,200 tons of firewood each day and that by 1996, 225 km² had been completely deforested and 470 km² partially deforested. UNHCR and other organizations did establish tree-planting programs later on in order to combat deforestation and soil erosion (Renner, 2007).

Other scholars, however, have provided an alternative interpretation for how refugees affected the environment and the discourses related to this. Bonne-Moreau (2012) studied Mtabila Camp in Kasulu district during the mid-1990s. In his paper, he contextualizes a shift in discourse and policy on the environmental impact of refugees in the run-up to the presidential elections of 1995 and the general adoption of “anti-refugee policies and actions” of the time. Bonne-Moreau (2012) notes that “concerns of the environment—deforestation and land degradation in particular—were put forward alongside human security issues by the Tanzanian government as a way to justify encampment policy interventions in a widely accepted narrative.” He goes on to note that state policies played a central role in human-environment interactions. In Kasulu district in particular, “environmental discourses [were] used to supplement, or perhaps, complement, [existing] political and security discourses in refugee contexts in order to justify continued demands for funding associated with the refugee’s operation in Tanzania.” Bonne-Moreau (2012) does not disagree that refugees did in fact contribute to a pre-existing context of

environmental degradation, but he argues that their depiction as 'exceptional resource degraders' was part of a larger narrative that failed to account for the fact that it was difficult to distinguish between potential refugee impacts and agricultural and land use practices of local communities in the borderland (Berry, 2008 and Bonne-Moreau 2012). He thus concludes that "as the [refugee] situation became protracted and insecurity decreased, claims of environmental concern gained momentum" and were thus instrumentalized to justify the further containment of refugees in camps.

Security and Social Cohesion

Little research has been conducted on the impact of refugees on social cohesion and security in Tanzania. One study, however, found that crime rates rose sharply, especially for murder, robbery and possession of illegal firearms (Lwehabura et al., 1995). However, despite officials attributing increased crime to refugees, Whitaker (2002) found that crimes were also committed by Tanzanians, and in some cases with Tanzanians; "refugees and locals would sometimes cooperate to rob local communities, and armed banditry was a problem prior to the arrival of the refugees" (Whitaker, 2002). Similarly, Rutinwa (2003) found that government officials acknowledged within their own reports that increases in crime were not fully attributed to the influx of refugees. Refugees had certainly been party to crimes, but the extent to which this affected local communities was in some cases minimal (Rutinwa, 2003).

Rutinwa (2003) studies the rate of criminal cases linked to refugees between the years 2000-2001. He finds that the rates of criminal cases linked to refugees were significantly higher in Kigoma. Nevertheless, Rutinwa (2003) shows that when considering the population ratio of refugees to locals, refugees did not commit more crimes than the general population. "As of 2002, Kigoma, the only region where refugees [were] spread

throughout all districts, had a total population of 1,739,183 of whom about 1,355,000 were Tanzanians and 384,183 were refugees. This meant refugees constituted 22% of the total population" (Rutinwa, 2003). The ratio of refugees in the population is parallel to the ratio of crimes committed, simply indicating that refugees did not necessarily have a greater propensity to commit crimes than their Tanzanian counterparts in the region (Rutinwa, 2003).

In another study, the criminal justice system was found to be overburdened, with 75% of inmates being refugees (Lwehabura et al., 1995). This high rate of refugee inmates may have been influenced by the refugee policy of the time, which restricted movements outside camps, and as such, refugees were jailed for being outside camps without the requisite documents. Interestingly, Whitaker (2002) found that refugees were not necessarily blamed by villagers for increases in crimes, instead they "thought of it as an inevitability with such a drastic increase in population density."

In terms of social cohesion, Whitaker (2002) found that Tanzanians established extensive relationships with refugees, including attending social functions and intermarriage. Nevertheless, some negative perceptions and social relations were persistent. She notes in her research that "camps were perceived as places of drunkenness, prostitution and sexual promiscuity. The elderly perceived a breakdown of the traditional social structure" (Whitaker, 2002).

Interestingly, Whitaker (2002) finds that the varied backgrounds of the refugee populations impacted not only the nature of interactions between them and their hosts but also the opportunities that their hosts had. She notes that "Rwandan refugees in Karagwe were primarily farmers like their local hosts, while in the camps in Ngara included '*wanjanja wajanja*' (con artists)

who came from towns and cities in Rwanda.” In Ngara, villagers there asserted that Burundian refugees who arrived in 1993 “caused fewer problems than subsequent Rwandan refugees, in part because they were ‘peaceful farmers just like [them]’” (Whitaker, 2002).

In Kasulu, hosts claimed that Burundian refugees from cities, had a worse impact after their arrival in 1996. Further, farmers from the rural district of Kigoma criticized Congolese refugees for their attitudes; they “refused to work on Tanzanian farms and demanded food, places to stay, and other assistance when passing through local villages” Whitaker (2002). Although Whitaker (2002) admits that the research findings were based on anecdotal evidence from villager’s impressions, these findings nonetheless suggest that refugee’s nationality and previous locality of residence (city or rural dwellers and perhaps the accompanying preferred occupations), influenced hosts’ attitudes toward them and refugee opportunities.

Long-run Impacts on Welfare

A very limited number of studies have been conducted in many displacement contexts that address long-run impacts of any form. The need for long-term impact studies continues to be a significant research gap.

Maystadt and Duranton (2014), however, exploit a 1991–2010 Tanzanian household panel to assess the effects of the temporary refugee inflows originating from Burundi (1993) and Rwanda (1994). Their study is of significance because compared to other studies on impacts, theirs does not focus on short-run impacts but rather on consequences of hosting refugees almost ten years after they have left. They find that the refugee presence had a persistent and positive impact on the welfare of the local population. Interestingly, they found that the positive effects did not fade over time. On the

contrary, the effects became more positive between 2004 and 2010. They further investigate the possible channels of transmission, underscoring the importance of a decrease in transport costs (due to increased road provision) as a key driver of this persistent change in welfare. They interpret these findings as the ability of a “temporary shock to induce a persistent shift in the equilibrium through subsequent investments”, specifically, they argue that one of the channels through which refugee presence had a positive impact was through the investment in road infrastructure by the UNHCR and WFP (Maystadt and Duranton, 2014). They refer to Whitaker’s (1999) study in which she notes, “in Kagera, more than 15 million went toward the rehabilitation of main and feeder roads, airstrips and telecommunications infrastructure”, thus making “internal transportation for host communities cheaper and easier” (Whitaker, 1999). They note that improvements in transportation is especially important in areas where remoteness is a critical factor in hindering a community’s ability to fight poverty (De Weerd, 2006).

Furthermore, the expansion of transportation infrastructure, they find, also had an impact on prices of goods, which in turn had positive welfare outcomes. “The welfare-improving impact of road accessibility in high-refugee areas is further corroborated by the decreasing effect on goods prices” (Maystadt and Duranton, 2014). Particularly in remote rural areas like Kagera, improvements in road infrastructure has a decreasing effect on the prices of traded goods (Casaburi et al. 2013).

Their study also notes other reasons that may account for the persistence of positive, long-run effects of the refugee inflow. Critically, the refugee camps in particular, and the economic opportunities that arose from them, attracted economic migrants from other parts of Tanzania. This inflow of economic migrants followed the

inflow of humanitarian aid. Many of these economic migrants subsequently stayed after the refugees left. In this context, Maystadt and Duranton (2014) highlight several reasons that could explain the persistent positive impact of refugees, including (de Montclos and Kagwanja 2000; Buscher and Vlassenroot 2009; Alix-Garcia, Bartlett, and Saah 2013):

1. due to increase in population, labor markets were more efficient because of labor pooling;
2. more investments were made to further expand and maintain existing transport infrastructure; and
3. local authorities noted that there was increased tax revenue given a surge in activity around refugee camps—some of which may have been invested in growth-enhancing sectors such as education or health services. Maystadt and Duranton (2014) further substantiate their point by mentioning how “anecdotal evidence in other countries suggests that refugee inflows may strengthen the urbanization process in the regions of destination”.

Maystadt and Duranton (2015) go on to observe that the provision of local public goods could have also improved through subtler channels. Improved management skills and institutional efficiency were reported by local authorities, due to dealing extensively with international organizations. They argue that this engagement with international organizations could have enhanced local authority efficiencies with non-governmental organizations long after the initial arrival of refugees.

Interestingly, Maystadt and Duranton (2015) argue that another possible channel of transmission might have to do with the location

to which the refugees repatriated and the trade that continued with them and locals thereafter. Through interviews of Red Cross officers, they find that “refugees repatriated just beyond the border and continued to trade with the local population”. This anecdotal evidence is consistent with research conducted in other contexts in which economic exchanges continue between hosting communities and displaced people (after their return) (Burchardi and Hassan, 2013). However, despite the above anecdotal evidence, their empirical evidence shows no strong impact of the refugee inflows on trade flows with neighboring countries.

Lessons Learned and Policy/ Practice Recommendations

The evidence presented in this review, has important practice and policy implications, not only for those who work in the refugee-hosting regions of Tanzania, but in other displacement contexts that are faced with similar challenges. Opportunities abound for humanitarian, development and government authorities—in myriad refugee situations—to work more closely together to develop well-substantiated practices and policies that support the preparedness and resilience of host communities, as well as the inclusion and self-reliance of refugees.

The following are some lessons that can be learned from studies that have assessed host population impact and that could inform future responses. They are accompanied by related policy or practice recommendations.

Table of Lessons Learned and Policy/Practice Recommendations

Lesson		Policy/Practice	
L1	Lesson (L1): The developmental needs and challenges of a host country are instrumental in framing how the host government may understand the value of refugees. This was evident from the previous Open-Door Policy which was framed in a context where refugees were understood as critical to the development of peripheral regions in Tanzania.	P1	Policy/Practice (P1): To the extent possible, development actors should pragmatically, identify how refugee's socio-economic integration can contribute to, and align with, the host country's developmental objectives.
L2	The sustainability of development responses to protracted forced displacement situations are highly contingent on the political will of the government, sustained technical assistance and financial resources. The Tripartite Partnership Model between the UNHCR, GoT and TCRS is an example of this.	P2	Development and humanitarian actors, should to the extent possible, devise responses in collaboration with host governments, and ensure their local political backing. In the best cases, the responses should involve local actors (such as NGOs) and the use of government systems to ensure the sustainability of the interventions.
L3	Government policies targeted toward refugees, can inadvertently have negative implications for host communities. For instance, limitations on refugee engagement in agricultural production left some refugees with little choice but to engage in village crop theft.	P3	<p>Government policies devised in response to the arrival of refugees, should carefully consider the implications these may have for hosts, both positive and negative. Policies should be devised in a manner that benefits both groups, with consideration for short terms costs and long-term benefits.</p> <p>Some of these include:</p> <p>P3.a: If a camp policy exists, smaller camps that are relatively near to villages, allow for hosts to take social and economic advantage of their presence, with less negative effects, particularly in terms of the environment;</p> <p>P3.b: Common markets and freedom of movement can enable mutually beneficial trade and labor exchanges between hosts and refugees;</p> <p>P3.c: More deliberate and closer collaboration between local officials as well as local and international agencies, can</p>

			<p>mitigate against duplication of projects and funding wastage which allows for hosts to benefit more from development projects; and</p> <p>P3.d: The provision of refugees with small plots of land for agricultural production can enhance self-reliance and food security, and possibly reduce likelihood of petty crimes (like crop theft).</p>
L4	The most vulnerable in host communities are disproportionately affected by refugee presence, those tend to include women, the elderly, the disabled, the already poor and unskilled.	P4	Protect the most vulnerable with an emphasis on labor market outcomes, gender and youth since impacts have distributional effects.
L4a	Consequences of hosting refugees are not gender-neutral. Evidence showed that host women were less likely to engage in outside employment and more likely to engage in household chores (i.e., water fetching and firewood collection) relative to men. Further, literate women were more likely to engage in outside employment in response to the shock, while illiterate women were likely to engage in farming and collecting firewood/fetching water.	P4a	Programs and interventions should not only be tailored to consider the gendered impacts on the labor market and household tasks but also the differentiated impacts between higher skilled and lower skilled women.
L4b	Research indicates that poorer households will likely benefit from more public goods (e.g., hospitals/health centers) and services, however, they will likely not fare well in terms of market-related economic opportunities that arise from an increased number of refugees (Mabiso et al.). This differentiated effect in terms of social and economic impacts, will likely result in wealthier households being rewarded economically (e.g., new businesses or jobs in the humanitarian sector), while less off households will find themselves in precarious conditions (e.g., casual farm workers competing with the cheap labor of refugees).	P4b	Interventions should differentiate between “social and economic distributional effects” (Mabiso et al.). To protect vulnerable groups (e.g., poor households, casual workers) from the likely initial negative economic effects, actors should identify the groups who may require support, evaluate their vulnerabilities and <i>their coping strategies</i> , and develop responses accordingly. Targeted social safety nets can potentially have ameliorating impacts. Further, impact evaluations should be conducted to assess the effectiveness of the responses.

L5	Refugees also occupy other roles and identities, such as students, consumers, businesswomen etc. Therefore, their livelihoods are certainly shaped by protection policies and practices, but are not exclusively framed by protection concerns.	P5	Humanitarian and development actors should be as concerned with refugee policies and practices as they are with policies and practices that pertain to housing, health, education etc., particularly in contexts of non-encampment. It is also these policy areas that most intersect with the lives of host communities (Landau and Achuime, 2017).
L6	Humanitarian and development actors can deplete human capital from public institutions due to inflated salaries offered by these organizations.	P6	Humanitarian and development organizations should try to mitigate the depletion of labor from public institutions. This could be done, for instance, through labor and skills exchange agreements between public and humanitarian agencies to protect from the depletion of skills, and ensure skills transfers to public institutions that will be of use after the humanitarian organizations have left.
L7	Labor and goods markets as adaptation mechanisms are vital in refugee situations. These markets can provide mechanisms for positive outcomes on food security and in some cases, negative outcomes for some subgroups of the host community. These factors “depend on preexisting conditions such as infrastructure, labor skill levels, land availability, and agricultural potential, but likely also on refugee policy (for example, refugee work regulation, refugees’ access to land, restrictions on trade and refugee mobility, and so on)” (Mabiso et al., 2014).	P7a P7b	Investments and responses should be geared toward building the skills and capacity of local producers to respond to increased demand in food. Program design should consider pre-existing socio-economic conditions and policies that constrain and enable host adaptation mechanisms—such as road infrastructure and encampment policies.
L8	The “timing, source and type of aid, as well as where and to whom it is targeted, have significant implications for the food security and resilience of the host community, especially if food and other goods can be purchased at affordable prices from local markets” (Barrett and Maxwell, 2005 in Mabiso et al., 2014).	P8	Humanitarian actors, to the extent possible, should “substitute food aid for cash transfers or vouchers to both refugees and poor households in the host community” (Mabiso et al., 2014). However, assessments of their impact should be periodically conducted to ensure positive impacts.

L9	Environmental degradation is a critical mechanism through which refugees impact the food security of host communities, in both the short and the long run (Mabiso et al., 2014). Further, environmental degradation can be used as a political tool to justify restrictive policies on refugees, that are in fact contradictory with environmentally sustainable solutions in protracted situations.	P9a	Food security of host communities could be protected by 1) no encampment policies 2) using a settlement structure, 3) in the case of encampment policies, careful selection of camp location and 4) environmental programs such as reforestation and soil conservation (Mabiso et al., 2014).
		P9b	Development and humanitarian actors should carefully consider how they frame environmental challenges in the face of a refugee shock as this may have implications for wider protection needs of refugees.
L10	Interdependencies between refugees and their hosts, last beyond the period after refugees have left the host areas Therefore, households and communities may require time and support to adjust to not only population shocks associated with the sudden arrival of refugees but also with the gradual or sudden departure of refugees (Mabiso et al., 2014).	P10	Humanitarian and development actors should work together early in the event of refugee arrival. Humanitarian short-term assistance should then pave the way for development interventions that support hosts in the gradual or sudden departure of refugees. Further, socio-economic networks made during the refugee situation, should be fostered by development actors after refugees are repatriated and if back to their country of origin, possibly through regional infrastructure and trade enabling responses.
L11	Improvements in road infrastructure has a decreasing effect on the prices of traded goods (Casaburi et al. 2013). Improvements in transportation is especially important in areas where remoteness is a critical factor that hinders community's ability to escape poverty (De Weerd, 2006). Road infrastructure has been shown to be a key driver of <i>persistent</i> positive changes in hosts welfare (Maystadt and Duranton, 2014).	P11	Local governments and development actors should prioritize road provision and maintenance to support the reduction in the cost of traded goods and transport costs.

Future Research

<i>Factors</i>		<i>Areas for further research</i>
1. <i>Pre-existing livelihood strategies in host communities</i>	Pre-existing socio-economic conditions within host communities	<p>We know that levels of education, access to capital, skills, poverty levels etc., affect how various impacts are mediated, including jobs, wages, food security, the ability to reap the benefits of a growing local economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In what precise and varied ways do these pre-existing conditions mediate outcomes? ▪ What can be done by the various actors, early in an emergency, to ameliorate how these pre-existing conditions affect outcomes?
	The role of sub-national government	<p>There is little literature that looks at the role that local authorities play in addressing forced displacement and the impact this may have on host community and refugee/IDP livelihood outcomes, including the pre-existing capacity of local administrators.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In what ways do the pre-existing capacities of local government actors in refugee-hosting regions affect outcomes for hosts?
2. <i>Labor market outcomes</i>	Gender and age	<p>Recent literature on the gender-specific impacts of immigration is focused on high-income countries (Barone and Mocetti 2011; Cortes and Tessada 2011; Furtado 2015). This limits our understanding of the potential consequences of hosting refugees, since most refugees worldwide are in neighboring developing countries (UNHCR 2016). In this same vein, although it's known that young girls school attendance is likely to be affected by refugee presence, little is known about the impact this has on girl's educational outcomes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What are the differences and similarities in gender-specific labor market impacts in high and low incomes countries? ▪ What are the impacts on host women in the labor market across the informal vs. formal sector?

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How are girl's educational attainment and learning outcomes affected by refugee presence?
	Households and skills	<p>While there is a growing interest in estimating the economic impacts of hosting refugees (Azevedo et al. 2016; Balkan and Tumen 2016; Del Carpio and Wagner 2015; Ruiz and Vargas-Silva 2015 and 2017, 2016; Tumen 2016; among others), we know little about the consequences of refugee inflows on different household members and across skills levels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How are people within the same household and with varying skills affected by refugee presence? Some evidence shows that refugee presence affects the division of household chores (Ruiz and Vargas-Silva, 2017). However, little is known about how the change in household chores affects social relations within a household? How do female-headed and male-headed households differ in their ability to benefit from refugee presence? What differing challenges may these households endure in the face of a refugee shock?
3. <i>Food security and resilience</i>	Cash-based interventions	<p>The effects of different types and combinations of humanitarian aid on food security and resilience in host communities are not well understood. Little is known about the relative efficiency of cash-based interventions in refugee-contexts despite its growing use in responses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How should humanitarian actors consider issues such as program design, the magnitude of the transfers and the frequency of the transfers required when choosing cash-based interventions?
4. <i>Longitudinal studies</i>	Environment and health	<p>Generally, more quantitative and longitudinal studies need to be conducted in refugee settings, particularly related to environmental and health outcomes.</p>

Bibliography

Alix-García, J. (2007). "The Effects of Refugee Inflows on Host Country Populations: Evidence from Tanzania." University of Montana.

Alix-García, J. and D. Saah (2010). "The Effect of Refugee Inflows on Host Communities: Evidence from Tanzania." *The World Bank Economic Review* 24(1): 148-170.

Angrist, J. D. and Kugler, A.D. (2003) "Protective or Counter-Productive? Labour Market Institutions and the Effect of Immigration on EU Natives," *Economic Journal*, v113(488, Jun), F302-331.

Antman, F. (2014). "Spousal Employment and Intrahousehold Bargaining Power." *Applied Economics Letters*, 21(8): 560-63.

Baez, J. E. (2010). "Civil Wars beyond their Borders: The Human Capital and Health Consequences of Hosting Refugees." *Journal of Development Economics*.

Barrett, C.B., and Maxwell, D. (2005). "Food aid after Fifty Years: Recasting Its Role". New York: Routledge.

Berry, L. (2008). "The Impact of Environmental Degradation on Refugee-Host Relations: A Case Study from Tanzania." *New Issues in Refugee Research*, Research Paper 151.

Bonne-Moreau, M. (2012). "Cutting the Heart of Tanzania"? Refugee Policies, Livelihoods and Natural Resources in Kasulu District, Tanzania: a Political Ecology of Mtabila Camp." University of London.

Burchardi, K. and Hassan, T. (2013). "The Economic Impact of Social Ties: Evidence from German Reunification." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, pages 1219-1271.

Buscher, K. and Vlassenroot, K. (2009). "Humanitarian Presence and Urban Development: New Opportunities and Contrasts in Goma, DRC." *Disasters*, 34(2):256-273.

Casaburi, L., Glennerster, R., and Suri, T. (2013). "Rural Roads and Intermediated Trade: Regression Discontinuity: Evidence from Sierra Leone." *Unpublished*.

Chaulia, S. S. (2003). "The politics of refugee hosting in Tanzania: From open door to unsustainability, insecurity and receding receptivity." *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 16(2), 147-166.

Clark, L. (1987). "Key issues in post-emergency refugee assistance in Eastern and Southern Africa." Washington, D.C., Refugee Policy Group.

Coulson, Andrew (1982). "Tanzania: A Political Economy." Oxford: Clarendon Press

Daley, P. (1992) "The politics of the refugee crisis in Tanzania", in H, Campbell and H, Stein (eds)

de Montclos, M.-A. P. and Kagwanja, P. M. (2000). "Refugee Camps or Cities? The Socio-economic Dynamics of the Dadaab and Kakuma Camps in Northern Kenya." *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 13(2):205-222.

De Weerd et al (2006) "Moving Out of Poverty in Tanzania's Kagera Region." World Bank.

Feldman, D. (1971). "Appraisal of the economic viability of four refugee settlements in Southern Tanzania." Typescript.

- Ellis, S., M. Blackden, J. Cutura, F. MacCulloch, and H. Seebens (2007). "Gender and Economic Growth in Tanzania: Creating Opportunities for Women." The World Bank.
- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). (1995). "Tanzania: Refugee Affected Areas Development Project: Identification/Formulation Mission Report (Final)."
- Fujita, M. and Thisse, J. (2002). "Economics of Agglomeration, Cities, Industrial Location and Regional Growth." Cambridge, MA, US: Cambridge University Press.
- Gentry, D. J. (2009). "Refugee impacts on host communities in Western Tanzania: A GIS and mixed-method geographic analysis." *Geography and Planning*, Appalachian State University.
- Green, R. H. and UNICEF (1994). "That they may be whole again: Off-setting the refugee influx burden on Ngara and Karagwe districts." *Executive summary: Report for UNICEF*, UNICEF.
- Government of the United Republic of Tanzania (2003), Ministry of Home Affairs "The National Refugee Policy", Dar es Salaam, September 7.
- Huisman, H. (2003). "Refugee Aid and its Impact on the Host Country 's Regional Economy. The Case of Ngara District, NW Tanzania." *Die Erde* 134(1): 65-80.
- Jacobsen, K. (1997). "Refugees' environmental impact: the effect of patterns of settlement." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 10(1): 19-36.
- Jacobsen, K. (2002). "Can Refugees Benefit the State? Refugee Resources and African State-building." *Journal of Modern African Studies* 40 (4): 577-596
- Kamanga, K. (1995) "The Genocide Convention in Its Application to Tanzania: Rusticated Legal Obligations? paper presented at the Arusha Refugee Crisis Workshop.
- Ketel, H. and UNHCR Programme and Technical Support Section. (1994). "Environmental assessment report of the Rwandese refugee camps and the affected local communities in Kagera Region, Tanzania." Dar Es Salaam, UNHCR/FAO Environmental Assessment Mission.
- Ketel, H. and UNHCR/FAO (1994). "Tanzania: Environmental Assessment Report of the Rwandese Refugee Camps and the Affected Local Communities in Kagera Region, 2-30 June 1994." Dar es Salaam, UNHCR/FAO Environmental Assessment Mission.
- Kibreab, G. (1985). "African Refugees: Reflections on African Refugee Problem. Trenton: African Word Press.
- Kreibaum, M. (2016). "Their Suffering, Our Burden? How Congolese Refugees Affect the Ugandan Population." *World Development* Vol. 78, pp. 262-287, 2016
- Landau, L. B. and Achieme, E.T. (2017). "Misreading Mobility? Bureaucratic Politics and Blindness in UN Migration Reports". *Development and Change* 48(5). International Institute of Social Studies
- Landau, L. B. (2003). "Beyond the Losers: Transforming Governmental Practice in Refugee-Affected Tanzania." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 16: 20-43.
- Landau, L. B. (2004). "Challenge without transformation: refugees, aid and trade in Western Tanzania." *Journal of Modern African Affairs* 42, 31-59.
- Leavens, K., and C.L. Anderson (2011). "Gender and Agriculture in Tanzania." Evans School Policy and Research Working Paper.

Lwehabura, J.M.K, et al. (1995) “A Short Brief on the Refugee Problem and Security along the Tanzania-Rwanda-Burundi Border.” Office of the Prime Minister and First Vice President. Dar es Salaam: United Republic of Tanzania.

Mabiso, A., Maystadt, J.-F., Hirvonen, K., and Vandercasteelen, J. (2014). “Refugees and Food Security in Host Communities: A Review of Impacts and Policy Options to Enhance Resilience.” *2020 Conference paper 2. Washington, DC: International food Policy Research Institute.*

Martin, Adrian. 2005. “Environmental Conflict Between Refugee Host Communities.” *Journal of Peace Research*, 42(3):329-346.

Maruku Agricultural Research Institute and Ngara District Agriculture and Livestock Development Office (1997) “Diagnostic Survey of Ngara District”, Working Paper No 21., February.

Maystadt, J.-F. and P. Verwimp. (2014). “Winners and Losers among a Refugee-Hosting Population.” International Association for Research and Teaching, ECORE, Belgium.

Maystadt, J.-F. and Duranton, G. (2014) “The Development Push of Refugees : Evidence from Tanzania.” Economics Working Paper Series, The Department of Economics

Lancaster University Management School

Mbilinyi, M. (1986) “Agribusiness and casual labor in Tanzania. African Economic History.” 15: 107–141.

Milner, J. (2003). “Two steps forward, one step back: understanding the shifting politics of refugee policy in Tanzania”. *New Issues in Refugee Research*, Research Paper no. 255

Musoke, I. K. (1995). “The impact of the refugee crisis in the Kagera region of Tanzania: local community responses and the Government's reaction.” *International Workshop on the Refugee Crisis in the Great Lakes Region.* Arusha.

Mwakasege, C. (1995). “Study report: impact of refugees on host communities, the case of Kasulu, Ngara and Karagwe Districts in Tanzania.” *International Workshop on the Refugee Crisis in the Great Lakes Region.* Arusha.

Ndege, L.J. et al. (1995) “Tanzania/Netherlands Farming Systems Research Project, Lake Zone: Diagnostic Survey of Karagwe District, Karagwe District Rural Development Programme, October.”

Ongpim, P. A. (2009). "Refugees: asset or burden?" *Forced Migration Review* 33.

Oxford Refugee Studies Centre (2011). “Study on Impacts and Costs of Forced Displacement – State of the Art Literature Review”.

Renner, M. (2007). “UN Refugee Agency Turns to Tree Planting”. *World Watch* 20(5): 7.

Ruiz, I. and Vargas-Silva, C. (2013). “The Economics of Forced Migration”, *The Journal of Development Studies*. Vol. 49, No. 6, 772–784, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2013.777707>

Ruiz, I. and Vargas-Silva, C. (2015) “The labour market consequences of hosting refugees.” *Journal of Economic Geography* (2015) pp. 1–28

Ruiz, I. and Vargas-Silva, C. (2017). “The impact of hosting refugees on the intra-household allocation of tasks: A gender perspective.” WIDER Working Paper 2017/66, United Nations University

Rutinwa, B. (1996). “The Tanzanian’s Government Response to the Rwandan Emergency” *Journal of Refugee Studies*, Vol 9. No. 3

- Rutinwa, B. and K. Kamanga (2003). "The Impact of the Presence of Refugees in Northwestern Tanzania." The Center for Study of Forced Migration, University of Dar es Salaam.
- Rwegasira, J., MP (1995) "Guest of Honour's Speech, delivered at the International Workshop on the Refugee Crisis in the Great Lakes Region", Arusha, Tanzania 16-19th August 1995
- Turner, S. (2004). "New Opportunities: Angry Young Men in a Tanzanian Refugee Camp." *Refugees and the Transformation of Societies: Agency, Policies, Ethics, and Politics*. P. Essed, G. Frerks and J. Schrijvers. Oxford and New York, Berghahn.
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). (1997). "The State of the World's Refugees: A Humanitarian Agenda." New York: Oxford University Press.
- Waters, T. (1996) "Emergency Assistance and Development, or what has a Cash Bath done for Western Tanzania's Wahangaza." unpublished manuscript.
- Whitaker, B.E. (2002). "Refugees in Western Tanzania: The Distribution of Burdens and Benefits among local hosts." *Journal of Refugee Studies*. Vol 15. No. 4, 2002.
- Whitaker, B.E. (2002b). "Changing priorities in refugee protection: the Rwandan repatriation from Tanzania", *New Issues in Refugee Research*, Working Paper no. 53
- Whitaker, B.E. (1999). "Changing Opportunities: Refugees and Host Communities in Western Tanzania." *New Issues in Refugee Research*, Working Paper no.11.