M. D'Errico, R.D. Mariani, R. Pietrelli and F.C. Rosati

Refugee-Host Proximity and Market Creation in Uganda

UNIVERSITY OF ROME TOR VERGATA





Refugee-Host Proximity and Market Creation in Uganda

Marco d'Errico § Rama Dasi Mariani *‡ Rebecca Pietrelli § Furio Camillo Rosati *‡

DRAFT. This version August 2020

Marco d'Errico: <u>marco.derrico@fao.org</u> Rama Dasi Mariani: <u>mariani@economia.uniroma2.it</u> Rebecca Pietrelli: <u>rebecca.pietrelli@fao.org</u> Furio Camillo Rosati: <u>f.rosati@economia.uniroma2.it</u>

\$ Agricultural Development Economics Division, FAO
*University of Rome "Tor Vergata"
‡CEIS (Centre for Economic and International Studies)

Refugee-Host Proximity and Market Creation in Uganda

Marco d'Errico¹ Rama Dasi Mariani² Rebecca Pietrelli¹ Furio Camillo Rosati²

¹ Agricultural Development Economics Division, FAO ² Centre for Economic and International Studies (CEIS) and the University of Rome "Tor Vergata"

Abstract

Many refugees remain for long time in hosts countries: to assess their impact on the welfare of local communities is essential for policy design. We focus on Uganda, a country that hosts the largest number of refugees in SSA. We analyse whether and to what extent the proximity to refugees increases the welfare and the level of economic activity of hosting-community households by generating incentives for economic exchanges. An issue that has not been addressed in the literature. We use the distance between refugee and host communities to measure the potential of interaction. To deal with potential endogeneity issues, we adopt an instrumental variable approach and carry out several robustness tests. The results indicate that, beyond the possible effects due to the benefits provided by the agencies caring for refugees, the direct interaction between them and the hosts generates an increase in both the level and the characteristics of the economic activity carried out by the hosts. However, the market creation is limited to a radius of approximately 5 kilometres.

Keywords: Forced Migration, Refugees, Household data, Distance, Market creation. **JEL codes**: 012 015 R23.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank FAO Uganda, the Uganda and Bureau of Statistics (UBOS), the United Nations Refugee Agency (UNHCR), for their support on data collection. A special thanks to Ugo Leonardi from FAO Somalia for his technical support on the calculation of the distances and on the maps. We thank also Phil Priestly, Ed Taylor, Silvio Daidone and Tiziano Arduini for valuable comments and inputs.

1. Introduction

Worldwide, the number of refugees has substantially increased in the recent past, reaching almost 26 million in 2019. The majority of the refugees stay in low- and middle-income countries and remains in the host communities for a long period. Uganda hosts one of the biggest refugee community, currently more than 1.4 million (UNHCR, 2020), in 13 districts¹ within 31 settlements².

In low- and middle-income countries, the impact of refugees – concentrated mainly in deprived areas – on local communities is open to question. They may compete with host communities for the use of scarce resources like land or water, contribute to the depletion of the environment, and may cause price increases, especially for staple goods. Nevertheless, the presence of refugee settlements can improve the economic situation of host communities in two interrelated ways. First, benefits and services provided to the refugees may spill over to local communities as national and international assistance may in fact target both. Second, refugee communities may create job and market opportunities for the host communities because of the increased demand for goods and services and because of the economic activities carried out by refugees.

Several papers have addressed the issue of the impact of refugee presence on agricultural prices, but only Alix-Garcia et al. (2018) and Kreibaum (2016) have looked at the impact on host consumption with a non-descriptive approach.³ Alix-Garcia et al. (2018) find that proximity to the Kakuma camp in Kenya exerts a positive effect on economic activity and consumption. In the case of three Southern districts of Uganda, Kreibaum (2016) shows that the presence of refugees tends to increase the consumption of the host communities and their access to private primary schools.

Our paper aims to contribute to this strand of the literature focusing on the response of the Uganda's host households to the proximity of refugees. In particular, we try to assess whether and to what extent the proximity to refugees increases the welfare and the level of economic activity of hosting-community households by generating incentives for economic exchanges. An issue that, as it will be discussed in more details in the next section, has not been addressed

¹ Adjumani, Arua, Isingiro, Kampala, Kamwenge, Kikuube, Kiryandongo, Kyegegwa, Koboko, Lamwo, Madi-Okollo, Obongi and Yumbe.

² Adjumani's settlements, Bidibidi, Imvepi, Kiryandongo, Kyaka II, Kyangwali, Lobule, Nakivale, Oruchinga, Palabek, Parlorinya, Rhino Camp, Rwamanja plus the urban refugees in Kampala.

³ For recent surveys the reader can refer to Maystadt et al. (2019) and Verme and Schuettler (2019).

in the literature. Because of the high transport costs in the rural areas where host households live, exchanges are severely limited by distance and might by favoured by an increase in the proximity to other households. Agglomeration externalities are well documented in the spatial economics literature, both in developed (see e.g. Hanson, 2001) and in developing (see e.g. Fafchamps, 2012) economies. Furthermore, there is evidence that improving access to markets positively affects the economic outcomes of concerned communities (e.g. Emran and Hou, 2013). We contribute to this literature by looking at the creation of market opportunities in the proximity of the settlements.

The Uganda case is particularly interesting for several reasons. The country hosts the largest refugee community of Africa. The influx of refugees is not expected to end in the near future due to the political instability in the neighbouring countries. The Uganda political framework is one of the most progressive in the world toward refugees. Therefore, the sustainability of the presence of the refugees and its impact on the host community, beyond that due to the direct assistance, is of particular policy relevance.

The unique data we use in this paper contains rich information on both refugee and host households within and in the proximity to settlements and details about their exact location⁴. This allows us to identify how agglomeration affects exchanges opportunities through direct interaction between hosts and refugees. Therefore, we contribute to the existing literature by assessing whether direct interactions with refugees can improve the economic circumstances of the host communities through "market creation". In particular, we use the minimum distance between each host household to all the refugee households in the area surrounding the settlements. In this way, we capture the *exposure* of every single household to potential economic contacts with refugees.

We include a large set of refugee settlements that host a very large number of South-Sudanese refugees, mainly located in the North West of the Country, as well as the refugees from the Democratic Republic of the Congo living in the Southwest Uganda. Our analysis is based on a set of geo-referenced individual and household level information and extends the outcome variables beyond aggregates like consumption (e.g. Kreibaum, 2016 and Alix-Garcia et al., 2018) to include labourmarket opportunities, changes in the sources of income, and entrepreneurial activities.

⁴ The studies present in the literature rely only on aggregate measures of the presence of refugees. One exception is represented by Alloush et al. (2017) that, however, carry out a mainly descriptive analysis focussing on the refugee community.

The allocation of refugees to the different settlements is determined by the Government of Uganda in collaboration with the United Nations Refugee Agency (UNHCR) – according to criteria like the county of origin, ethnicity, needs' assessment, and service availability. Nonetheless, refugees are relatively free to move⁵, and, therefore, they could locate themselves to make economic exchanges with the host community easier. For this reason, and to correct for possible errors in the measurement of distance, we adopt an IV strategy, using as an instrument the distance between each host household to the administrative centre of the nearest settlement. Of course, also host households could change their place of living for reasons correlated with the outcome of interest. For example, more entrepreneurial hosts could move closer to the settlement area to exploit the trade potential, thus making our estimates biased. Most of the households in our sample did not move their residence and very few moved following the larger inflows of refugees. However, we run a series of robustness tests excluding from the sample households who moved to their current location after the larger inflows of refugees in the area begun.

The results indicate that altogether the presence of a large number of refugees does not affect negatively the local communities. On the contrary, we identify some positive effects on food expenditure, mainly due to the larger participation of host households in paid employment and to the consequent increase in wage income. On average, the reduction of the distance to refugee households by about 1 kilometer generates an increase in hosts' wage income of about 25 percent. Wage employment increases mainly in the agricultural sector and the non-agricultural private sector. The results indicate that, beyond the possible effects of the benefits provided by the agencies caring for refugees, the direct interaction between them and the hosts generates an increase in both the level and the characteristics of the economic activity carried out by the hosts. However, the effects tend to be very localized: there is no impact on food expenditure and on wage employment if the distance exceeds about 5 kilometres and about 3 kilometres respectively.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides a review of the related literature. Section 3 depicts the Ugandan institutional setting and the dispersal policy of refugees. Section 4 describes the empirical analysis and the data used with it. Sections 5 and 6 show the main and further results. Section 7 tests the robustness of the analysis and Section 8 concludes.

⁵ According to the Refugee Act (2006-09), refugees in Uganda are free to move, reside, and work. Nonetheless, if they want to benefit from international assistance – namely UNHCR assistance – they have to live in the settlements.

2. Literature Review

The relationship between refugee and host communities is complex and potentially involves several aspects.⁶ Hosts can directly access to benefits and services (including direct employment by service providers) and to improved infrastructure that allows for better connection to markets. Furthermore, host communities can economically interact with refugee households.

Often, agencies caring for refugees provide support and services also to the host population, especially in deprived and rural areas. Moreover, the establishment of refugees' camps can cause improvements in infrastructure and communication with the rest of the country. Finally, as Governments and International Agencies tend to favour self-reliance of refugees, the livelihood activities carried out by the latter might affect the economic activity of the host households living nearby and create a new market for the exchange of goods and services and opportunities of employment.

The results of the economic impact of refugees' presence are far from being univocal, but the vast majority leans towards a positive or non-negative impact. The economic effects of refugees depend on the rules governing interactions between them and the host community, the structure of the receiving economy, and the characteristics of the refugee population. Simulations in Rwanda (Taylor et al., 2016) indicate that refugees – given the opportunity to interact with the economic habitat around them – can create positive income spillovers for hosting-community households. Taylor et al. (2016) find that the presence of refugees increases total real income within a 10-km radius by significantly more than the amount of the aids the refugees receive. Alix-Garcia et al. (2018) show that refugee inflows enhance economic activity in the areas very close to refugees' camps in Kenya. They also show an increase in food consumption of local communities. This could be the effect of a growth in local prices which will potentially impoverish consumers but provides earning opportunities for property owners and suppliers of non-tradable goods (Alix-Garcia et al., 2013). Maystadt and Verwimp (2014) find on average a positive impact on host households' welfare as

⁶ For a qualitative discussion of seeing Akuot (2003).

measured by per adult equivalent consumption, albeit with heterogeneous effects across population groups.

Other studies show less positive results. Morales (2018) finds that a conflict-induced increase in population in Colombia leads to a short-run negative impact on wages of low-skilled population, but subsequent out-migration from the main receiving municipalities helps to mitigate this effect. Alix-Garcia and Saah (2010) find a significant increase in the prices of some agricultural goods and a decrease in the price of aid-delivered goods in Tanzania. Depetris-Chauvin and Santos (2018) look at the impact of refugees on the real estate market in Colombia and find that low-income rental prices increase and high-income rental prices decrease.

All the aforementioned studies look at the impact of refugees' presence on some aggregate indicators of welfare, mainly consumption, and possible price effects. The impact on labourmarket outcomes has not been analysed, except for Fallah et al. (2019) that do not identify any significant impact of Syrian refugees on natives' labourmarket outcomes in Jordan.

In the case of Uganda the attention has focused mainly on consumption too. The work of Kreibaum (2016) indicates that in Southwestern districts – hosting refugees from the Democratic Republic of the Congo – the flows appear to have a positive effect on hosting-community households' consumption and primary school enrolment.

The literature on refugees' impact on hosting-communities is still tentative and the existing results can be improved in two ways. The coverage of the case-studies can be extended and – more importantly – the relevance of the different channels through which refugees' presence can affects host households' welfare can be further analysed.

The question of whether the different channels mentioned above are relevant and what is their relative impact remains open. Nonetheless, to ascertain whether and to what extent the presence of refugees increases directly the host households' level of economic activity has obvious policy implications. Should this not be the case, then the observed increase in consumption and other indicators could be attributed only to the assistance offered by the agencies, with obvious implications for sustainability.

3. The Institutional Setting and the Refugee Dispersal Policy

Uganda hosts the biggest refugee community in Sub-Saharan Africa, with more than one million refugees, mainly originating from South Sudan, Burundi, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo (UNHCR, 2020). The political uncertainty and the hostilities in the bordering countries have been the main push factors for refugees who arrived in Uganda during the past ten years. In particular, the conflict in Kivu – in the Eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo, started in 2009 – and the civil war in South Sudan – started at the end of 2013 – led to the arrival of unanticipated flows of Congolese and South Sudanese within a short period (UNHCR, 2020). In the most recent years, the number of refugees somehow declined from about two million to the current value (see **Errore. L'origine riferimento non è stata trovata.**).





Source: UNHCR (2020)

The political framework in Uganda is one of the most progressive and inclusive for refugees. The Uganda Refugee Policy (2006) and the Refugee Regulations (2010) grant the refugees wide-ranging rights – including allocation of land, freedom of movement and the possibility to seek employment and access to national services. Ugandan asylum policy and refugee

settlement approach is widely regarded as an exemplary model where refugees are integrated within the host communities and have access to the same services as nationals. Despite this, the majority of the refugees remain within or near the official settlements in order not to lose the benefits granted by national and international agencies.

The allocation of the refugees in the different settlements is managed by UNHCR in close collaboration with the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM). Upon arrival in Uganda, refugees are received by the UNHCR and they are registered to understand their ethnic and socioeconomic background and the kind of assistance they need. Then, they are allocated in the settlements administrated by OPM through the settlement Commandants and Assistant Commandants. Upon arrival in the settlement, the refugees receive a registration number, the allocated plot⁷ and an initial shelter package for building a temporary shelter, in addition to essential non-food items (e.g. bedding and cooking utensils). Each settlement is organized in zones (equivalent to a parish in the national governance structure), and each zone is composed of blocks, the equivalent of villages.

More specifically, the allocation of the refugees to a settlement depends on:

- Settlement assessed capacity based on available land, services and infrastructure determined in consultation with OPM, the Ministry of Land, Urban Development and Housing (MLUDH) and UNHCR;
- County of origin and ethnicity of the refugees;⁸
- Family reunification⁹.

As a result, the refugees from South Sudan and Democratic Republic of the Congo are mainly settled in the Northern and Southern districts respectively.

After the allocation, the refugees can be re-allocated to a different settlement because of the following reasons: (i) family reunification; (ii) request to UNHCR if they feel uncomfortable;

 $^{^{7}}$ The refugee response follows two approaches for land allocation. In one, land for shelter and agriculture is allocated in one single plot. In the other, refugee households are allocated separate plots for shelter and agriculture. Minimum standards require the allocation of at least a 30 m x 30 m agriculture plot with a separate 10 m x 10 m shelter plot. For combined plots, the total area should be at least 50 m x 50 m. However, the actual allocation might differ from these standards depending on the time of arrival and on characteristics of the specific settlement.

⁸ Bidibidi, Palorinya, Adjumani, Palabeck, Imvepi, Rhinocamp, Kiryandongo, and Omugo mainly host refugees from South Sudan, while Kyaka II, Rwamwanja, Nakivale, Kyangwali and Lobule from the Democratic Republic of the Congo. There is particular attention in keeping separated the ethnic groups Dinka and Nuer from South Sudan (between settlements or, if not possible, between zones in the same settlements).

⁹ Arriving refugees with family members that have previously been settled may request to be settled in the same settlement as their family if they know it at the time of arrival.

(iii) tension/violence. Finally, the refugees (entire family or single household members) are free to decide to leave the settlement for migrating to the urban areas of Uganda or go back to the country of origin.

4. Data and Empirical Analysis

4.1 The Household Survey

We make use of a recent survey carried by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), in coordination with OPM, in Northern and Southwestern Uganda. The objective of the survey is to provide a comprehensive assessment of the living conditions of the refugees and the host communities to support policy design in the refugee-hosting districts (FAO and OPM, 2018, 2019). As mentioned, this is one of the few surveys that contains detailed information on both refugees and hosts households allowing to obtain causal inference. To carry out the survey several difficulties had to be overcome. First, when the survey design was prepared, the situation was very volatile with the refugee influx reaching its peak. Under time constraints, a strong collaboration between UN and the Government allowed the use of the most updated and reliable sampling frame with the refugees' figures changing on daily basis. Second, the logistical aspects of the data collection, conducted in a very fragile context, needed an intense preparation phase. For example, the enumerator teams' composition was designed to guarantee the necessary language skills (only the South Sudanese refugees can speak nine languages)¹⁰ and gender balance. Additionally, physical access to the refugee settlements was made possible by an intense collaboration with OPM. Third, attention to sensitive issues was essential in the development of the survey. The questionnaire was discussed, tailored to the context avoiding sensitive questions (such as refugee ethnicity that was excluded from the last version of the tool) and piloted. Furthermore, during the training of the enumerators, particular attention was dedicated, in collaboration with UNHCR, to how interact with refugee population to guarantee the safety of the enumerators but also to avoid the onset of conflict situations.

¹⁰ Acholi, Alur, Arabic, Avokaya, Bari, Kakwa, Lango, Luo and Madi.

The following map (**Errore. L'origine riferimento non è stata trovata.**) shows the location of the refugee camps in Uganda and their size. The survey covers the following settlements: Palabeck settlement in Lamwo district; Palorinya in Moyo; Bidibidi in Yumbe, the namesake settlements in Adjumani and Kiryandongo districts; Imvepi and Rhino in Arua, Kyaka II in Kyegegwa and Rwamwania in Kamwenge. The surveyed settlements host around 80 percent of the overall refugees.¹¹

The sample consists of 3 799 households, including both refugees (2 107 households) and host communities in the proximity of the settlements (1 632 households). In each district only one settlement and the closest host community are included in the sample, except for Arua district where two settlements (Imvepi and Rhino) are sampled. Households are selected using a stratified two-stage cluster sampling method. Within each district, the Primary Sampling Units (PSU) are the settlement blocks (for refugee households) or the villages close to the settlement (for host households), with the probability of selection proportional to the size of the settlement or sub-county. Households are the Second Sampling Unit (SSU) randomly selected from either a list of households provided by the local authority or by walking through the village or settlement blocks.¹²

¹¹ During March 2018, 1 378 111 refugees were living in Uganda. 1 048 823 of these in the nine settlements covered by the household survey (UNHCR, 2020).

¹² The sample is self-weighing.





Notes: Authors' elaboration with UNHCR data. Red circles correspond to sampled settlements. Circles are proportional to the population of the settlement in March 2018.

The fieldwork was implemented in December 2017 in the Northern districts and in March 2018 in the Southwestern ones. The data collection was carried out by employing Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI) technologies and digital tablets.

The same questionnaire was utilized in all phases of data collection. The survey collects information on the socio-demographic characteristics of the households, food security – including a detailed food consumption module, and well-being – shocks, assistance, perceived resilience capacity, coping strategies and aspirations, access to basic services, employment, and agricultural and livestock production.

The household data are geo-referenced¹³ and this allowed us to exploit the role of the distance between each host and refugee households living in the same district as discussed in the next paragraph.

4.2 The Empirical Strategy

As discussed in the previous sections, we rely on measures of proximity as proxies for the potential (economic) interaction between hosts and refugees. Since the focus of the analysis is the economic well-being of the hosting-community households, we make use of the distance of each host to all the refugee households living in the same district. The distance is calculated as the earth-arc distance between two points – based on GPS coordinates. **Errore. L'origine riferimento non è stata trovata.** presents different measures of the distance: minimum, mean, and median. The minimum distance refers to the distance with the closest refugee household, while mean and median distance is computed for all the refugee households in the district. In our preferred estimates we use the minimum distance, but results are robust also to the use of the other measures of distance (some of these results are presented in Section 8). In **Errore. L'origine riferimento non è stata trovata.**, we present the distance of the host households also to the administrative centre of the refugee settlement, that, as we will discuss, we use as an instrument in the IV estimates.

| | Mean | St. Deviation | Min | Max |
|-----------------------------|-------|---------------|------|-------|
| Distance to Refugees (km) | | | | |
| Min | 1.74 | 1.72 | 0.00 | 11.42 |
| Mean | 10.50 | 4.99 | 2.14 | 22.82 |
| Median | 10.65 | 5.58 | 2.00 | 29.08 |
| Distance to Settlement (km) | | | | |
| Min | 9.78 | 8.04 | 0.12 | 39.57 |
| Mean | 12.61 | 7.58 | 0.23 | 39.57 |
| Median | 12.78 | 7.72 | 0.23 | 39.57 |
| Observations | 1 572 | | | |

Table 1: Distance between Host and Refugee Households, in Kilometres

Notes: Authors' elaboration. Summary statistics are computed for hosting-community households. The distances to the settlement are computed with respect to administrative centre.

¹³ The geo-localization has been reported for 1 572 host households, the sample used in our main specifications.

On average, the hosting-community households have at least one refugee household at a distance of 1.7 kilometres, with a range that goes to the immediate proximity to about 11 kilometres. The (average) distance to all the refugee households in the district is of course higher, with a mean of 10 kilometres and a range from 2 to 22 kilometres. Similar values are obtained for the median distance. As discussed, previous research has shown that the effects of the refugees on the economic outcomes of the hosting communities, if any, tend to fade away rather quickly with the increase in distance. Therefore, the range of observed distance between the households in our sample looks well suited to identify any impact due to the proximity among communities.

To elicit the effect of the interaction with refugees on several hosting households' economic outcomes, we relate them to the distance to refugees using a linear regression model. Our baseline specification is the following:

$$Y_{i,j} = \alpha + \beta \cdot Dist_{i,j} + \gamma \cdot X_i + \delta_j + \varepsilon_{i,j}$$
(1)

where $Y_{i,j}$ is the observed outcome of interest (detailed below) of the hosting-community household (or individual belonging to household) *i* in district *j*. $Dist_{i,j}$ is the distance of household *i* to any refugee household living in district *j*. X_i is a vector of household or individual (as applicable) controls, including the number of male and female adults, a dummy for female household head, household head's age and education, or individual's sex, age, and education (summary statistics presented in Table A.1). δ_j is the district fixed effect and $\varepsilon_{i,j}$ is the idiosyncratic error term. Therefore, β measures the effect of being exposed to the presence of refugee households on the outcome of interest. Because the greater the distance the lesser the exposure, we expect β to be negative if proximity affects the outcomes of host households.

Estimating the effect of proximity to refugees on host households' economic outcomes by OLS can lead to some identification issues. Indeed, both hosting-community and refugee households can choose where to establish their dwellings, so that their proximity may be endogenously related to the outcomes of interest. For example, refugees can decide to settle as near as possible to the most propertied and productive households to benefit from interactions with them. Conversely, hosting-community households can move to approach the most populated part of the settlement for similar reasons.

Nonetheless, the socio-economic context in which the analysis is conducted admits little margin for such a dynamic to occur 70 percent of the sampled host households' heads never moved from their current residence and more than 95 percent did not move within the two years preceding the survey, i.e. following the large refugee inflows of 2015. Furthermore, as mentioned earlier, the Ugandan law allows refugees to freely move and work in the country, but if they want to continue receiving the support they must reside within an assigned area near the settlement. In other words, part of the distance between refugee and hosting-community households is exogenously determined by the institutions and depends on the distance to the centre of the settlement.

We can exploit this fact for our identification strategy. In particular, to capture only that part of distance due to the requirement for refugees of living in assigned areas around the centre of the settlement, we can use the distance to the settlement as an instrument for the distance to refugees.

Using IV can also alleviate any bias deriving from measurement error when collecting information about households' location. We cannot exclude that the data on households' location are collected with imprecision. When a *classical errors-in-variables problem* occurs – i.e. when a variable is measured with an additional error that is uncorrelated with its true value – the estimated coefficient is biased toward zero (see e.g. Klepper and Leamer, 1984). If this is the case, any instrument that is correlated with the true value of the variable, but uncorrelated with the error, will consistently estimate the regression coefficient. Since in our case the measurement error is due to potential technical imprecision, and so uncorrelated with the true value of the distance, it is possible to use IV also to alleviate the attenuation bias due to measurement error.

The instrument is defined as:

$$Z_{i,j} = Dist_{i,CAMP_j}$$
(2)

where $CAMP_j$ is the administrative centre of the refugee camp in district *j*. All the districts have one refugee camp only, but Arua and Adjumani. In the case of Arua and Adjumani, $Dist_{i, CAMP_j}$ is the same measure of distance (minimum, average, or median) used

in the OLS specification. Empirical results from the OLS and IV estimations of the model are presented in the following sections.

5. Impact of Proximity on Consumption and Labour Market Outcomes

To assess the possible impact of proximity to refugees on host households' welfare and economic activity, we consider a broad set of indicators (see **Errore. L'origine riferimento non è stata trovata.**). In presenting our empirical results, we first look at consumption expenditures (both food and other non-durable) then to different sources of income. We analyse both incomes from work (salaried and casual) and indicators of the level of agricultural activity. The latter is a proxy of the income from agriculture that represents the main source of livelihood for the households in our sample. The results of the first stage estimates are presented in Appendix D.

Table 2: Summary Statistics for Hosting-Community Households (Dependent Variables)

| | Mean | St. Dev. | Min | Max |
|------------------------------------------------|---------|-----------|-----|-----------|
| Monthly Food Expenditure Per Capita – ugx | 18 537 | 16 628 | 0 | 136 400 |
| Monthly Non-Food Expenditure Per Capita – ugx | 19 760 | 64 426 | 0 | 2 251 204 |
| Monthly Own-Food Consumption Per Capita - ugx | 30 532 | 35 702 | 0 | 470 578 |
| Monthly Income from Wage Employment – ugx | 45 571 | 138 037 | 0 | 1 450 000 |
| Monthly Income from Casual Employment – ugx | 41 685 | 73 812 | 0 | 700 000 |
| Formal Transfers – ugx | 34 723 | 125 773 | 0 | 1 500 000 |
| Annual Value of Crop Sales – ugx | 105 338 | 210 601.9 | 0 | 1 835 000 |
| Annual Value of Livestock Products Sales – ugx | 8 217 | 77 854.3 | 0 | 1 500 000 |
| Running Enterprise (Last Month) | 0.40 | 0.49 | 0 | 1 |
| Observations | 1 632 | | | |

Notes: Authors' elaboration. Summary statistics are computed for hosting-community households. In the following analysis, only households with available data on the distance are included. Furthermore, 1st and 99th percentiles of each variable's distribution are dropped in the regression estimations.

| | Mean | St. Deviation | Min | Max |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|---------------|-----|-----------|
| Monthly Food Expenditure Per Capita - | 9 792.00 | 17 594.52 | 0 | 304 400 |
| ugx | | | | |
| Monthly Non-Food Expenditure Per | 1 1158.96 | 24 424.44 | 0 | 819 550 |
| Capita - ugx | | | | |
| Monthly Own-Food Consumption Per | 10 950.25 | 26 501.64 | 0 | 466 666.7 |
| Capita - ugx | | | | |
| Monthly Moneraty Income from | 31 874.05 | 72 551.21 | 0 | 760 000 |
| LabourWaged and Casual - ugx | | | | |

Table 3: Summary Statistics for Refugee Households

| Monthly Monetary Wage from Salarie Job | 15 474.13 | 67 912.11 | 0 | 1 000 000 |
|-----------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|---|-----------|
| Monthly Monetary Wage from Casual Job | 17 173.05 | 36 440.85 | 0 | 310 000 |
| - ugx | | | | |
| Formal transfers - ugx | 74 586.1 | 93 244.97 | 0 | 900 000 |
| Annual Value of Crop Sales - ugx | 28 646.59 | 81 454.3 | 0 | 750 000 |
| Annual Value of Liveproduct Sales - ugx | 1 229.94 | 27 671.33 | 0 | 1 150 000 |
| Running Enterprise (Last Month) | 0.22 | 0.41 | 0 | 1 |
| Observations | 2 107 | | | |

Notes: Authors' elaboration. Summary statistics computed for refugee households.

Errore. L'origine riferimento non è stata trovata. presents the results relative to the monthly per capita household expenditures for food and non-food non-durable goods. The estimates indicate a significant impact of proximity to refugees on hosts' food expenditures, while non-food expenditures do not appear to be affected. The impact on food expenditures is economically significant as, at the mean, a decrease of 1 kilometres in the distance between host and refugee households implies an increase of food expenditures of about 12 percent of the variable mean.¹⁴

| | | OLS | | | IV | |
|----------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| | Food Expenditure | Non-Food Expenditure | Own. Food Consumption | Food Expenditure | Non-Food Expenditure | Own. Food Consumption |
| Dist. to Refugees (min) | -830.6*** | 430.3 | 291.4 | -2 219*** | -475.2 | 200.3 |
| Kerugees (IIIII) | (249.5) | (283.7) | (458.4) | (713.8) | (811.8) | (1,231) |
| Observations | 1 555 | 1 554 | 1 553 | 1 555 | 1 554 | 1 553 |
| R-squared | 0.117 | 0.094 | 0.092 | 0.098 | 0.087 | 0.092 |
| Controls | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| District FE | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| F Stat | | | | 107.79 | 110.90 | 110.30 |

 Table 4: Household Per Capita Food and Non-Food Expenditure, and Own-Produced Food

 Consumption

Notes: Authors' elaboration on the FAO dataset. Models in columns (1) (2) (4) and (5) refer to per capita expenditure in the last month. Model in column (3) and (6) refer to per capita own-produced food consumption. Controls include the number of male and female adult members, female household head, household head's age, and years of education. The reported F Stat is the Kleinbergen-Paap rk Wald F Statistics. Robust standard errors in parentheses.

* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

To ascertain the sources of the observed increase in food expenditure, we look at different components of the household income. Starting with the labourincome, we find that proximity

¹⁴ In our comments, we refer to the IV estimates, where not otherwise indicated.

to refugee households does increase a household's total labourincome.¹⁵ However, when we disaggregate total labourincome by casual and wage income, we find that the increase is mainly due to the change in wage income (see **Errore. L'origine riferimento non è stata trovata.**). In the context of the study, the difference between the two income sources can be explained by the formality of the working engagement. In the case of wage income, the working relationship is formal with payments received on a regular basis while the casual income is received in exchange for a desultory service. The effect on wage income is substantial as, at the mean, the reduction of the distance by about 1 kilometer generates an increase in waged income of about 25 percent. Unfortunately, we do not observe wage rates and, therefore, we cannot ascertain whether the observed increase is due (more) to changes in employment or wages (but see below for estimates of changes in individual employment).

Refugees benefit from transfers of various kinds that are in most cases also extended to local communities. Even if there are no reasons a priori to assume that proximity does affect the probability of receiving such transfers, we tested for this possibility. Transfers from Government and International Agencies (columns (3) and (6) of **Errore. L'origine riferimento non è stata trovata.**) do not appear to depend on the proximity between host and refugee and, therefore, are not associated with the observed increase in expenditure.

| | | OLS | | | IV | |
|----------------------------|-------------|---------------|------------------|-------------|---------------|------------------|
| | (1) Wage | (2) Casual | (3) Transfers | (4) Wage | (5) Casual | (6) Transfers |
| Dist. to Refugees (min) | -4 126** | 88.86 | -836.1 | -11 501** | -4 743* | 7 127 |
| Refugees (mm) | (1 744) | (880.5) | (988.8) | (5 842) | (2 820) | (4 911) |
| Observations | 1 541 | 1 538 | 1 543 | 1 541 | 1 538 | 1 543 |
| R-squared | 0.066 | 0.030 | 0.024 | 0.054 | 0.012 | 0.083 |
| Controls | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| District FE | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| F Stat | | | | 111.78 | 113.30 | 112.68 |

Notes: Authors' elaboration on the FAO dataset. Controls include the number of male and female adult members, female household head, household head's age, and years of education. The reported F Stat is the Kleinbergen-Paap rk Wald F Statistics. Robust standard errors in parentheses.

* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

¹⁵ The total labourincome is the sum of casual and wage income. Results are available upon request.

We could not identify any effect of proximity to refugees on the self-employment income of the host household both in agricultural and non-agricultural activities (results available on request).

In the context in which the study is carried out, the main source of subsistence is the agricultural activity. Therefore, in the following part of the empirical analysis we look at some indicators of household activity in this sector.

In Table 6 we present the results relative to the value of sales of crop and livestock products. The value of crop sales is significatively reduced by the proximity with the refugee households. As self-consumption is not increased by proximity to the refugee households (see Columns 3 and 6 in Table 4) this suggests a substitution in work activities away from work on own land towards wage employment. There are also indications that proximity to refugee household triggers a substitution from crop to livestock products (like eggs, honey, etc.) production, but the coefficient is only marginally significant.¹⁶

| | 0 | LS | Ι | V |
|-------------------------|---------|-----------------------|----------|-----------------------|
| - | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| _ | Crop | Livestock products | Crop | Livestock products |
| Dist. to Refugees (min) | 3 639 | -84.25 | 12 990** | -581.8* |
| () | (3,144) | (77.20) | (5,738) | (308.1) |
| Observations | 1 538 | 1 545 | 1 538 | 1 545 |
| R-squared | 0.216 | 0.010 | 0.208 | -0.006 |
| Controls | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| District FE | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| F Stat | | | 107.52 | 109.09 |

Table 6: Yearly Crop and Livestock Products Sales (Ugx)

Notes: Authors' elaboration on the FAO dataset. Models in (1) and (3) refer to the monetary value of crop sales in 2017. Models in columns (2) and (4) refer to the monetary value of livestock sales in 2017. Controls include the number of male and female adult members, female household head, household head's age, and years of education. The reported F Stat is the Kleinbergen-Paap rk Wald F Statistics. Robust standard errors in parentheses.

* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

The observed increase in household wage income appears to be generated by an increase in wage employment coupled with a reduction in casual employment. As shown in columns (1) and (2) of **Errore. L'origine riferimento non è stata trovata.**, where we make use of

¹⁶ For a detailed analysis of livestock assets of hosting-community households refer to Annex B.

individual data on work activities (see Annex C for the summary statistics), the closer the host household to the refugees the higher the probability that individuals belonging to it work as employees and lower the probability that they are involved in casual work. At the mean, a reduction of 1 kilometer in the distance to refugees decreases the probability of doing casual labourby 5 percent and increases the probability of doing waged labourby about 3 percent.

The latter effect is heterogeneous across industrial sectors. Indeed, wage employment increases in the agricultural sector and the non-agricultural private sector. The effect on public employment is only marginally significant (columns (3) to (5) in **Errore. L'origine riferimento non è stata trovata.**),¹⁷ indicating that the increase in wage employment is not due to the demand stemming, directly or indirectly, from the agencies supporting the refugees.

| Panel A: | | | OLS | | |
|----------------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| | Casual | Salaried | Public | Private | Agriculture |
| Dist. to Refugees (min) | 0.0186*** | -0.00942*** | -0.00501*** | 0.000356 | -0.00445*** |
| | (0.00579) | (0.00227) | (0.00151) | (0.00121) | (0.000982) |
| | | | | | |
| Observations | 5 856 | 5 856 | 5 856 | 5 856 | 5 856 |
| R-squared | 0.019 | 0.031 | 0.012 | 0.006 | 0.037 |
| Controls | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| District FE | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| Panel B: | | | IV | | |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| | Casual | Salaried | Public | Private | Agriculture |
| Dist. to Refugees (min) | 0.0516** | -0.0293*** | -0.0104* | -0.0106** | -0.0106*** |
| | (0.0217) | (0.00823) | (0.00585) | (0.00417) | (0.00326) |
| | | | | | |
| Observations | 5 856 | 5 856 | 5 856 | 5 856 | 5 856 |
| R-squared | 0.010 | 0.018 | 0.010 | -0.008 | 0.032 |
| Controls | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| District FE | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| F Stat | 79.46 | 79.46 | 79.46 | 79.46 | 79.46 |

| Table 7. | : Employment | t by Type | and Sector |
|----------|--------------|-----------|------------|
|----------|--------------|-----------|------------|

Notes: Authors' elaboration on the FAO dataset. Controls are gender, age, and years of education. Individuals under 14 years of age are excluded from the analysis. The reported F Stat is the Kleinbergen-

¹⁷ Sectors are classified according to NACE (rev. 1.1). The public sector encompasses public administration and defense; compulsory social security; education; health and social work; other community, social and personal services activities; extraterritorial organizations and bodies. The private sector encompasses mining and quarrying; manufacturing; electricity, gas and water supply; construction; wholesale and retail trade; hotels and restaurants; transport, storage, and communications; financial intermediation; real estate, renting and business activities. Agriculture encompasses agriculture, hunting, and forestry; fishing.

Paap rk Wald F Statistics. Errors are clustered at the household level. Robust standard errors in parentheses. * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

To identify the source of the increase of wage employment in the private sector, we looked at the probability of both host and refugee households to run an enterprise.¹⁸ The results are presented in **Errore. L'origine riferimento non è stata trovata.** Proximity does not affect the probability that hosts run a non-agricultural enterprise, but it is positively correlated to the probability that refugees have an enterprise. Therefore, it appears that the additional wage employment of the host household members may be generated by small enterprises run by refugee households and that proximity increases the probability of being employed in them. This confirms the anecdotal evidence on job creation for Ugandan nationals through refugee enterprises (WB, 2019).

Table 8: Probability of Operating an Enterprise (OLS)

| | (1) | (2) | |
|-------------------------|-------------------|------------|--|
| | Hosting Community | Refugees | |
| | | | |
| Dist. to Refugees (min) | 0.00412 | | |
| | (0.00873) | | |
| Dist. to Hosts (min) | | -0.0197*** | |
| | | (0.00745) | |
| Observations | 1 570 | 2.019 | |
| Observations | 1 572 | 2018 | |
| R-squared | 0.047 | 0.059 | |
| Controls | YES | YES | |
| District FE | YES | YES | |

Notes: Authors' elaboration on the FAO dataset. Controls include the number of male and female adult members, female household head, household head's age, and years of education. Robust standard errors in parentheses. * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

6. How Close Is Close?

We have seen that proximity to refugee households exerts a positive effect on the host households' consumption and economic activity. To assess how far this effect goes, we have plotted the marginal effects for some of the outcome variables discussed above as a function

¹⁸ Since we do not have an instrument for the distance of refugee households to hosting-community households, we run only OLS regressions.

of the distance between host and refugee households. As shown in Figure 3, the effects tend to disappear once the distance exceeds about 5 kilometres on food expenditure and about 3 kilometres on wage income. This result confirms the estimates of the related literature and shows that the effects are substantially circumscribed, possibly because of the lack of well-organized market and because of high transportation costs.



Figure 3: Marginal Effect of Distance on Household Food Expenditures and Wage Income

Notes: Authors' elaboration on FAO data. The marginal effects are computed for IV estimates.

This finding is consistent also with the results on the probability of running an enterprise. As shown in **Errore. L'origine riferimento non è stata trovata.**, the positive effect of refugees' proximity to the hosting community is null after 6 kilometres. The constant marginal effect of the distance on hosts' probability of doing entrepreneurial activities, instead, is coherent with the non-significant effect reported in **Errore. L'origine riferimento non è stata trovata.** of the previous section.

Figure 4: Marginal Effect of Distance on the Probability of Running an Enterprise



Source: Authors' elaboration on the FAO dataset.

Notes: The marginal effects are computed for OLS estimates.

7. Robustness

In this section we present some robustness tests relative to the possibility of endogenous location choice by host households and different measures of distance.

As we discussed above, host households might have moved in response to the presence of refugees in the area and, possibly, chosen a residence closer to them to exploit the possibility

of the interchange. Should this be the case, our estimates could be biased. However, hosts' movements appear to be very limited: more than 70 percent of our sample never moved and more than 90 percent did not move in the five years preceding the survey.

Moreover, the refugee households present in our sample are in most cases relatively recent arrivals. As Figure 4 shows more than 80 percent of them arrived within two years from the date of the survey.

On this basis, to test the robustness of our results we have carried out the estimates presented above restricting the sample of host households to include only those who did not move in the 2 years or in the 5 years before the survey was carried out. The results for some of the main outcomes are presented in **Errore. L'origine riferimento non è stata trovata.**¹⁹ As it is possible to see, the results are robust to the restriction of the sample to households who moved only before the main flows of arrivals. The coefficients are fairly stable and so is their significance, except a couple of cases in which the standard errors become marginally larger.





Notes: Authors' elaboration on the FAO dataset. Years of household head's arrival in the current place of residence are plotted on the horizontal axis, density for the total refugee households is plotted on the vertical axis.

¹⁹ The results for the other outcomes are available upon request.

| Panel A: | | Food Expenditure | |
|---------------------------------------|------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| | All Sample | More than 2Y | More than 5Y |
| | | | |
| Dist. to Refugees (min) | -2 219*** | -1 944*** | -1 680** |
| | (713.8) | (710.5) | (699.4) |
| | | | |
| Observations | 1 555 | 1 505 | 1 446 |
| R-squared | 0.098 | 0.096 | 0.102 |
| Controls | YES | YES | YES |
| District FE | YES | YES | YES |
| F Stat | 107.79 | 105.58 | 103.70 |
| Panel B: | | Wage Income | |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| | All Sample | More than 2Y | More than 5Y |
| | - | | |
| Dist. to Refugees (min) | -11 501** | -10 726* | -10 699* |
| C X Y | (5 842) | (5 849) | (5 575) |
| | | | |
| Observations | 1 541 | 1 493 | 1 436 |
| R-squared | 0.054 | 0.061 | 0.059 |
| Controls | YES | YES | YES |
| District FE | YES | YES | YES |
| F Stat | 111.78 | 108.70 | 106.68 |
| Panel C: | | Wage LabourEmployment | |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| | All Sample | More than 2Y | More than 5Y |
| | I I | | |
| Dist. to Refugees (min) | -0.0293*** | -0.0279*** | -0.0280*** |
| , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | (0.00823) | (0.00819) | (0.00814) |
| | | (, | |
| Observations | 5 856 | 5 705 | 5 529 |
| R-squared | 0.018 | 0.022 | 0.025 |
| Controls | YES | YES | YES |
| District FE | YES | YES | YES |
| F Stat | 79.46 | 78.92 | 77.03 |

Table 9: Robustness Analysis. Estimation by Years of Household Head's Arrival (IV)

Notes: Authors' elaboration on the FAO dataset. Models in Panel A refer to monthly food expenditure per capita. Models in Panel B refer to the household's monthly income. Controls include the number of male and female adult members, female household head, household head's age, and years of education. Models in Panel C refer to the individual probability of being employed as a salaried worker. Controls include gender, age, and years of education. In the regressions with the individual dataset (Panel C) errors are clustered at the household level. The reported F Stat is the Kleinbergen-Paap rk Wald F Statistics. Robust standard errors in parentheses. * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

The main results show that the effect of living close to refugees on hosts' outcomes is statistically different from zero within 5 km of distance. Therefore, one can argue that households living close to refugees self-selected based on characteristics that are correlated with the outcomes of interest. As a further robustness test, we perform a balance test to compare the characteristics of hosts living within 5 km of distance to settlements' centres with those of hosts living farther away. Without data relative to the period preceding the arrival of the refugees, we used only hosts' characteristics that are unlikely to be affected by the refugee

presence: household head gender, age, and education. As shown in Annex A, in Table A1 there are no significant differences in the characteristics of the households living within and beyond the 5 kilometres radius from the centre of the settlement.

Finally, we check whether the different measures of distance between host and refugee households affect our results. In **Errore. L'origine riferimento non è stata trovata.** we use the average distance between each host household and all the refugee households in the district instead of the minimum distance to a refugee household as a regressor on a subset of the outcomes. The estimate shows that the results do not change substantially and are robust to a different measure of the distance.²⁰

| Panel A: | | OLS | |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|
| | (1) Food | (2) Wage | (3) Salaried |
| Dist to Pofugoos (magn) | 540 8*** | 2.067** | 0.00525*** |
| Dist. to Refugees (mean) | (129.9) | (1 025) | (0.00145) |
| Observations | 1 555 | 1 541 | 5 856 |
| R-squared | 0.119 | 0.065 | 0.031 |
| Controls | YES | YES | YES |
| District FE | YES | YES | YES |
| | | IV | |
| Panel B: | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| | Food | Wage | Salaried |
| Dist to Refugees (mean) | 621 7** | 3 878* | 0.00051*** |
| Dist. to Refugees (mean) | (278.5) | (2,306) | (0.00331) |
| Observations | 1 555 | 1 541 | 5 856 |
| R-squared | 0.119 | 0.063 | 0.029 |
| Controls | YES | YES | YES |
| District FE | YES | YES | YES |
| F Stat | 194.84 | 196.84 | 99.78 |

Table 10: Robustness Analysis. Estimations on Average Distance to Refugee Households

Notes: Authors' elaboration on the FAO dataset. Columns (1) and (2) of Panel A and Panel B controls include the number of male and female adult members, female household head, household head's age, and years of education. Column (3) of Panel A and Panel B controls include individual gender, age, and years of education. Individuals under 5 and over 14 are excluded. The reported F Stat is the Kleinbergen-Paap rk Wald F Statistics. Errors are clustered at the household level. Robust standard errors in parentheses. * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

²⁰ Results relative to the whole set of outcomes and other measures of distance are available on request

8. Conclusions

The high number of refugees living in low- and middle-income countries has raised the questions of the impact of their presence on the welfare of local communities. As often the refugees are located in deprived and rural areas of the countries, the issue is whether their presence can further harm the living conditions of the hosting communities.

The few non-descriptive studies point to a positive impact of refugees on the economic conditions of local communities. In this paper, we have extended the previous literature by analysing not only the impact of refugees on hosts' consumption but also by looking at the possible channels through which the change in consumption is generated. Moreover, we have extended the evidence relative to Uganda, the country with the highest number of refugees in Africa, to consider the impact of refugees in most of the districts where they are hosted.

We have used the distance between host and refugee households as a proxy for the potential economic interaction among them. To take into consideration the possibility of endogenous location choices by the refugees, we have used an IV approach using the distance between each host household and the administrative centre of the nearest refugee settlement as an instrument.

Our results indicate that proximity to refugees increases hosts' consumption, especially of food. This appears to be linked to an increase in wage income as host households' members are more likely to be employed the closer they are to refugee households. The increase in employment seems to have taken place mainly in the private – both agricultural and non-agricultural – sectors, likely correlated to the creation of small enterprises by the refugees themselves. Indeed, the probability that refugee households run an enterprise is positively correlated with the proximity to the hosting community.

The effects of market creation are, however, very localized. They tend to fade out when the distance between hosts and refugees become larger than about 5 kilometres, confirming that the positive impact of the presence of refugees through direct market creation appears non-negligible but limited to household living close to each other. However, this does not exhaust the possible positive impacts as there might be spillover effects of the assistance to refugees, like, for example, improved access to far-away markets thanks to infrastructure improvements, provision of social protection, and the enhanced resilience to shocks. Of course, as funds are fungible, the benefits accruing to host households living close to refugees' settlements should be weighed against the benefits deriving from their alternative use.

9. References

Alix-Garcia, J., & Saah, D. (2010). The effect of refugee inflows on host communities: Evidence from Tanzania. *The World Bank Economic Review*, 24(1), 148-170.

Alix-Garcia, J., Walker, S., Bartlett, A., Onder, H., & Sanghi, A. (2018). Do refugee camps help or hurt hosts? The case of Kakuma, Kenya. *Journal of Development Economics*, 130, 66-83.

Alix-Garcia, J., Bartlett, A., & Saah, D. (2013). The landscape of conflict: IDPs, aid, and land-use change in Darfur. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 13(4), 589-617.

Alloush, M., Taylor, J. E., Gupta, A., Valdes, R. I. R., & Gonzalez-Estrada, E. (2017). Economic life in refugee camps. *World Development*, *95*, 334-347.

Aukot, E. (2003). "It Is Better to Be a Refugee Than a Turkana in Kakuma": Revisiting the Relationship between Hosts and Refugees in Kenya. Refuge: *Canada's Journal on Refugees*, 73-83.

Depetris-Chauvin, E., & Santos, R. J. (2018). Unexpected guests: The impact of internal displacement inflows on rental prices in Colombian host cities. *Journal of Development Economics*, 134, 289-309.

Emran, M. S., & Hou, Z. (2013). Access to markets and rural poverty: evidence from household consumption in China. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 95(2), 682-697.

Fafchamps, M. (2012). Reprint of development, agglomeration, and the organization of work. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 42(5), 765-778.

Fallah, B., Krafft, C., & Wahba, J. (2019). The impact of refugees on employment and wages in Jordan. *Journal of Development Economics*, 139, 203-216.

FAO and OPM (2018). Food security, resilience, and well-being analysis of refugees and host communities in Northern Uganda. FAO Resilience Analysis Report 12. FAO Publication available at http://www.fao.org/resilience/resources/resources-detail/en/c/1143820/

FAO and OPM (2019). Food security, resilience, and well-being analysis of refugees and host communities in Southwest Uganda. FAO Resilience Analysis Report 19. FAO Publication available at <u>http://www.fao.org/resilience/resources/resources-detail/en/c/1234011/</u>

Hanson, G. H. (2001). Scale economies and the geographic concentration of industry. *Journal* of *Economic Geography*, 1(3), 255-276.

Jones, L., & d'Errico, M. (2019). Resilient, but from whose perspective?: like-for-like comparisons of objective and subjective measures of resilience. *World Development*.

Klepper, S., & Leamer, E. E. (1984). Consistent sets of estimates for regressions with errors in all variables. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, 163-183.

Kreibaum, M. (2016). Their suffering, our burden? How Congolese refugees affect the Ugandan population. *World Development*, 78, 262-287.

Maystadt, J. F., Hirvonen, K., Mabiso, A., & Vandercasteelen, J. (2019). Impacts of Hosting Forced Migrants in Poor Countries. *Annual Review of Resource Economics*, 11, 439-459.

Maystadt, J. F., & Verwimp, P. (2014). Winners and losers among a refugee-hosting population. *Economic development and cultural change*, 62(4), 769-809.

Morales, J. S. (2018). The impact of internal displacement on destination communities: Evidence from the Colombian conflict. *Journal of Development Economics*, 131, 132-150.

Taylor, J. E., Filipski, M. J., Alloush, M., Gupta, A., Valdes, R. I. R., & Gonzalez-Estrada, E. (2016). The economic impact of refugees. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(27), 7449-7453.

UNHCR. 2020. Uganda Comprehensive Refugee Response Portal. Available at: https://data2.unhcr.org/en/country/uga

Verme, P. & Schuettler, K. (2019). The Impact of Forced Displacement on Host Communities: A Review of the Empirical Literature in Economics (English). Policy Research working paper; no. WPS 8727. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group.

WB (2019). Informing the Refugee Policy Response in Uganda: Results from the Uganda Refugee and Host Communities 2018 Household Survey. Washington, DC: World Bank. http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/571081569598919068/Informing-the-Refugee-Policy-Response-in-Uganda-Results-from-the-Uganda-Refugee-and-Host-Communities-2018-Household-Survey

Annex A

Table A.1: Balance Test

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
|-------------------------------------------|------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | All sample | Host households living less than 5km far from the settlement | Host households living more than 5km far from the settlement | bifference between living less than and more than 5Km far |
| Household members' characteristics | | | | |
| Number of female adults | 1.765 | 1.787 | 1.701 | 0.0854 |
| | (1.298) | (1.316) | (1.242) | (0.0727) |
| Number of male adults | 1.766 | 1.781 | 1.721 | 0.0605 |
| | (1.164) | (1.188) | (1.094) | (0.0645) |
| Years of education of adults | 5.534 | 5.490 | 5.663 | -0.173 |
| | (2.787) | (2.716) | (2.984) | (0.168) |
| Years of education of female adults | 5.574 | 5.572 | 5.577 | -0.00433 |
| | (3.414) | (3.348) | (3.599) | (0.209) |
| Years of education of male adults | 5.522 | 5.485 | 5.628 | -0.144 |
| | (3.652) | (3.612) | (3.768) | (0.222) |
| Household head's characteristics | | | | |
| Female household head | 0.300 | 0.298 | 0.306 | -0.00797 |
| | (0.459) | (0.458) | (0.461) | (0.0266) |
| Household's head age | 44.26 | 44.64 | 43.18 | 1.461 |
| | (14.73) | (14.95) | (14.03) | (0.823) |
| De iure (divorced, separated) female head | 0.292 | 0.292 | 0.291 | 0.000844 |
| | (0.455) | (0.455) | (0.455) | (0.0262) |
| Subjective resilience indicators | | | | |
| Subjective resilience to shock | 29.28 | 29.21 | 29.49 | -0.279 |
| | (6.434) | (6.417) | (6.487) | (0.373) |
| Subjective resilience to drought | 7.402 | 7.331 | 7.607 | -0.277 |
| | (2.498) | (2.451) | (2.619) | (0.149) |
| Observations | 1 572 | 1 167 | 405 | 1 572 |

Notes: Authors' elaboration on the FAO dataset. Subjective resilience indicators are constructed as in Jones & d'Errico (2019). A T-test on the differences of characteristics of households living 5 km far or close to the nearest settlement. Standard errors in parentheses. * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Annex B

Errore. L'origine riferimento non è stata trovata. looks in more detail at the livestock owned by the household. The results seem to indicate that proximity to refugees tends to raise the number of goats owned in the substitution of poultry.

| Panel A: | | | OLS | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| | Goats | Sheeps | Pigs | Cattle | Poultry |
| Dist. to Refugees (min) | -0.210** (0.0872) | -0.0474 (0.0462) | 0.0341 (0.0238) | -0.0830 (0.113) | 0.156 (0.141) |
| Observations | 1 210 | 1 210 | 1 210 | 1 210 | 1 210 |
| P squared | 0 170 | 0.053 | 0.081 | 0 175 | 0.088 |
| Controls | VES | VES | VES | VES | VES |
| District FE | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| Panel B: | 115 | 125 | IV | 125 | 125 |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| | Goats | Sheeps | Pigs | Cattle | Poultry |
| Dist. to Refugees (min) | -0.848** (0.339) | 0.136 (0.179) | -0.00217 (0.0558) | -0.0106 (0.437) | 0.995** (0.473) |
| Observations R squared | 1 219 | 1 219 | 1 219 | 1 219 | 1 219 |
| K-squared | 0.152 VES | 0.038 VES | 0.079 VES | VES | 0.002 VES |
| District FE F Stat | YES 69.00 | YES 69.00 | YES 69.00 | YES 69.00 | YES 69.00 |

Table B.1: Units of Livestock Owned

Notes: Authors' elaboration on the FAO dataset. Households that are not involved in any livestock production activities are excluded. Controls include the number of male and female adult members, female household head, household head's age, and years of education. Robust standard errors in parentheses.

* p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

Errore. L'origine riferimento non è stata trovata.

| | Mean | St. Dev. | Min | Max |
|------------------------|-------|----------|-----|-----|
| Units of Goats Owned | 3.11 | 4.19 | 0 | 30 |
| Units of Sheep Owned | 0.59 | 1.84 | 0 | 21 |
| Units of Pigs Owned | 0.27 | 0.89 | 0 | 9 |
| Units of Cattle Owned | 2.01 | 5.29 | 0 | 50 |
| Units of Poultry Owned | 5.09 | 6.72 | 0 | 50 |
| Observations | 1 632 | | | |

Notes: Authors' elaboration. Summary statistics are computed for hosting-community households.

Annex C

| Table C.1: Summary statistics for Employment (Individual Data | Table C.1. | Summary statist | ics for Employment | (Individual Data) |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------|
|---------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------|

| | Mean | St. Dev. | Min | Max |
|---------------------------------------|---------|----------|-----|-----|
| Employment in Casual Labour | .2862 | .452 | 0 | 1 |
| Employment in Wage Labour | .06009 | .238 | 0 | 1 |
| Employment in the Public Sector | .029 | .167 | 0 | 1 |
| Employment in the Private Sector | .016 | .124 | 0 | 1 |
| Employment in the Agricultural Sector | .014 | .116 | 0 | 1 |
| Observations | 6 0 5 8 | | | |

Notes: Authors' elaboration on the FAO dataset. Summary statistics are computed for individuals belonging to hosting-community households only.

Table C.2: OLS Regressions on the Distance to the Nearest Settlement

| | (1) | (2) | (3) |
|---------------------------|-----------|----------|-----------------|
| | Food | Wage | Salaried Labour |
| | | | |
| Dist. to Settlement (min) | -176.8*** | -961.1** | -0.00201*** |
| | (57.16) | (486.2) | (0.000563) |
| | | | |
| Observations | 1 555 | 1 541 | 5 856 |
| R-squared | 0.115 | 0.065 | 0.030 |
| Controls | YES | YES | YES |
| District FE | YES | YES | YES |

Notes: Authors' elaboration on the FAO dataset. Controls include the number of male and female adult members, female household head, household head's age, and years of education. The model in Column (3) refers to the individual probability of being employed as a salaried worker. Controls include gender, age, and years of education. In Column (3) errors are clustered at the household level. Robust standard errors in parentheses. * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01

Annex D

| Dependent variable | Host hhs' minimum distance to refugees |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| Dist. to Settlement (min) | 0.08*** |
| | (10.57) |
| Number of male adults (15+) | 0.02 |
| | (0.62) |
| Number of female adults (15+) | -0.01 |
| | (-0.44) |
| Female headed hh | 0.00 |
| | (0.04) |
| Age head of hh | 0.00 |
| | (0.46) |
| Adults' avg years of education | -0.02 |
| | (-1.55) |
| Adjumani | 0.22 |
| | (1.37) |
| Arua | -1.02*** |
| | (-8.08) |
| Kiryandongo | -1.71*** |
| | (-14.68) |
| Lamwo | -1.10*** |
| | (-8.09) |
| Моуо | -1.12*** |
| | (-8.51) |
| Yumbe | -2.18*** |
| | (-11.10) |
| Kamwenge | 2.17^{***} |
| | (8.59) |
| Constant | 1.76^{***} |
| | (9.13) |
| Observations | 1 541 |

Table D 1: First-Stage Estimation of Wage Income Regression

Annex E

| | Mean | St. Deviation | Min | Max | |
|------------------------|-------|---------------|------|-------|--|
| Distance to hosts (km) | | | | | |
| Minimum | 1.65 | 1.30 | 0 | 7.99 | |
| Mean | 10.30 | 4.83 | 2.87 | 22.70 | |
| Median | 10.33 | 5.12 | 1.52 | 24.84 | |
| Distance to Settlement | (km) | | | | |
| Minimum | 8.91 | 8.01 | .08 | 38.06 | |
| Mean | 12.01 | 7.55 | 0.12 | 38.06 | |
| Median | 12.20 | 7.79 | 0.12 | 38.06 | |
| Observations | 2 018 | | | | |

Table E 1: Distance between Refugee and Host Households, in Kilometres

Notes: Authors' elaboration. Summary statistics computed for refugee households. The distances to the settlement are computed with respect to administrative centre.

Table E 2: Summary Statistics of Livestock Asset for Refugee Households

| | Mean | St. Deviation | Min | Max |
|------------------------|-------|---------------|-----|-----|
| Units of Goats Owned | 0.39 | 1.39 | 0 | 16 |
| Units of Sheeps Owned | 0.03 | 0.45 | 0 | 13 |
| Units of Pigs Owned | 0.05 | 0.36 | 0 | 6 |
| Units of Cattle Owned | 0.08 | 0.94 | 0 | 25 |
| Units of Poultry Owned | 1.54 | 3.69 | 0 | 29 |
| Observations | 2 107 | | | |

Notes: Authors' elaboration. Summary statistics computed for refugee households.

| 1 u c c L J J J u u u u u v u u v u u c v u u c v u u c v u u u u |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|

| | Mean | St. Deviation | Min | Max | |
|---------------------------------|--------|---------------|-----|-----|--|
| Employed in Public Sector | 0.01 | 0.09 | 0 | 1 | |
| Employed in Private Sector | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0 | 1 | |
| Employed in Agricultural Sector | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0 | 1 | |
| Observations | 13 816 | | | | |

Notes: Authors' elaboration on the FAO dataset. Summary statistics are computed for individuals belonging to refugee households only.