Urban Refugee Research and Social Capital

A Roundtable Report and Literature Review

A Product of the IRC's and WRC's Urban Refugee Roundtable

February 19, 2013

Research. Rethink. Resolve

An Analytical Report

Urban Refugee Research

Lyytinen & Kullenberg[1]

Acknowledgements

[1] Eveliina Lyytinen is currently a DPhil (PhD) Student at Oxford University's Department of Geography. Her research focuses on Congolese refugees in Kampala, Uganda. She holds an MSc from the University of Turku (Finland) and an MSc from Oxford's Refugee Studies Centre. Eveliina has previously worked for the Finnish Migration Department and interned with UNHCR's Policy Development and Evaluation Service.

Janosch Kullenberg is an independent analyst and consultant. He holds a BA in Social Sciences from Humboldt University Berlin and Science Po Paris, as well as an MSc in Refugees Studies and Forced Migration from Oxford University. Janosch has programming experiences from working on Development and Humanitarian issues in Dar es Salaam (Tanzania) and various locations in eastern DRC.

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

On November 15, 2012, the International Rescue Committee (IRC) and the Women's Refugee Commission (WRC) convened a Roundtable discussion on urban refugee research. Four presenters shared their research around protection strategies, profiling, livelihood and advocacy for refugees in urban areas. During the discussions among the practitioners, policymakers and researchers, critical gaps regarding urban refugee programming and research were identified. In brief, seven main themes emerged: 1) challenges for programming in urban environments; 2) urban mindset; 3) advocacy; 4) data for programming; 5) livelihoods; 6) role of private sector and technology; 7) and communities, social capital and networks. The first part of the report gives a brief overview of the Roundtable's presentations and summarizes the discussions.

For the second part of the report, the issue of urban refugee communities and social networks, widely discussed at the Roundtable, was selected as the theme for a literature review. This analytical part of the report focuses on the possibilities and challenges of leveraging social capital and networks within urban refugee communities for improving advocacy, policy and programmatic efforts.

Firstly, the literature review focuses on the *conceptual, theoretical and content analysis* of refugee studies literature on urban refugee communities and social networks in the context of low- and middle-income countries. In some of the studies, refugee communities are defined as social networks, a position that this report adopts. The review of the existing literature also shows that refugees are part of a number of different community structures. Communities based on nationality, spatial identification and member characteristics are discussed in the literature. In addition, urban refugees are part of broken and mixed communities and refugee-initiated community structures.

With regard to social networks and capital, urban refugees possess bonding, bridging and linking social capitals. They are also supported by their "spiritual capital" and faith-based social networks. Yet, acquiring these different forms of capitals and their significance in refugees' everyday lives varies by nationality, gender and age, among other factors.

The analysis of origins, purposes and challenges of urban refugee communities concluded that the community structures that refugees are part of can be established in a number of different ways and the degree to which refugees have a role to play in this process varies. As the purposes of the community structures are many; urban refugee communities can provide different forms of support to their members. Community memberships can, however, also have negative consequences for refugees, for not all community-based activities are supportive. The main factors impacting communities' success, identified from the review of literature, are trust and the size of the community.

Secondly, the literature review provides a *policy and programming analysis,* which examines how programs with urban refugee communities have been designed and identifies the main implementation challenges. Even though policies on urban refugees often recommend working with refugee communities, there are a number of challenges to doing so: conceptual ambiguity, lack of recognition of existing structures, difficulty of defining what support should entail, lack of understanding of the nature of cities and urban communities, problems of representation and participation and, finally, the challenge of conducting community outreach in urban settings.

Thirdly, the *methodological* approaches taken in existing studies on urban refugee communities and social networks are discussed and assessed. Overall, most of the studies on "communities" have adopted qualitative, in-depth approaches, whereas research on social networks have typically relied on quantitative or mixed methods, sometimes involving large sample sizes. This methodological variation has to do with the generally diverging research questions asked in studies with an explicit focus on communities or social networks. Most of the studies have focused on refugees in one city, often investigating one refugee nationality or comparing the situation of different refugee nationalities. Few studies have taken a comparative approach between two or more cities. The majority of the studies on urban refugee communities and social networks have been conducted in a rather limited number of large cities, and this reflects the general trend in urban refugee research. Sampling is often based on snow-balling, and given the lack of general demographic data on cities, conducting research that would be generalizable poses challenges. Yet, not all research aims to be generalizable. Also, the extent to which studies discuss the role of the hosts and other stakeholders varies, as do the practical ways of data collection. Very few studies have used innovative participatory methods that engage refugee communities as research partners.

Based on the Roundtable discussion and the literature review, the following implications for programming and recommendations for future research with regard to urban refugee communities and social networks are made:

Implications for programming

- *Communities should be understood as social networks*. They are flexible, dynamic, and developing according to interests. Aid organizations should not assume that communities are homogeneous, predetermined and static.
- *Distinctions like nationality, age and gender should be considered when programs are planned and implemented*. Refugees' social networks and community structures can vary according to these distinctions. Attention should be paid to what characteristics of communities impact their functionality.
- *Recognize the positive and negative sides of urban refugees' community participation and social networks.* Programmers tend to have a naïve understanding of social networks often romanticizing "communities" as being democratic, fair and equal. Power-relations have to be understood in order to avoid reinforcing existing patterns of dominance and exclusion. Participative approaches can actually put refugees at risk. A balanced understanding of social networks is necessary for designing programs, which build on the positive elements and mitigate the negative effects.
- *Design sustainable community-based interventions.* Initiating and maintaining unsustainable community structures has to be avoided. If given, financial support should extend over longer time periods, or be channeled to initiate sustainable income-generating projects.
- *Create the right politico-legal conditions so that social networks can thrive*. Advocacy efforts should strive to enable refugees to form communities in their cities of exile. Efforts should also be made to support these communities to become part of the larger urban structures so that refugee communities can benefit the urban population at large, and vice versa.
- *Recognize that not all refugees are part of urban communities, and therefore, develop ways to reinforce other refugees' social networks*. Those unable or unwilling to take part in community activities should not be excluded from future programming efforts with urban refugees. Even though it is often best to tap into existing

community structures, when appropriate, particular types of community structures should be initiated by humanitarian agencies for those refugees who are not yet part of existing structures. These could include, for example, culturally appropriate forms of support groups where refugees with similar experiences or life situations could come together for mutual support.

- *Build social cohesion and trust in urban communities through providing meaningful ways of participation, conducting more effective outreach and organizing socio-cultural and recreational activities.* These measures have been found to reinforce communities without provoking unrealistic expectations towards the implementing organizations. The approach could also reinforce trust, which is often lacking, between refugees and humanitarian organizations.

- *Create places for meeting and mixing.* The importance of creating places where people can meet cannot be overstated in the context of mixed and broken communities of urban areas in low- and middle- income countries. Aid organizations should reflect on how to create and sustain such spaces (e.g., neighborhood centers).

- *Recognize that manageable community structures may provide more opportunities for regular interaction of its members.* Larger community structures risk being highly fractured and dysfunctional and should not be artificially sustained.

- *Capitalize on religious institutions and the organizations associated with them.* As many refugees are part of a faith-community or religious institution, innovative ways of working with and through the local faith-based organizations, churches and mosques are needed.

Recommendations for future research

- *Conduct more research on taken-for-granted concepts.* Rethinking and clarifying terms like "community" is necessary in order to strengthen programmatic interventions.

- *Direct more research towards understanding and measuring "trust."* The issue of "trust" is central to the development of communities and can function as an indicator of community strength and potential.

- *Investigate how social capital can be built and leveraged.* Practitioners want to know how social capital can be built strategically through urban interventions. This requires a better understanding of the different forms of social capital and their linkages. In particular the concepts of "linking" and "spiritual" capital remain under-researched in urban refugee contexts. There is also a need to conduct more research on the interface between social capital and human and financial capital and how these assets can be combined and built to yield the best outcomes.

- *Investigate refugees' access to and membership in wider community structures.* Very little is currently known about refugees' participation in local communities where they can engage with the hosts and other migrants. Yet, these mixed communities could provide refugees with a sustainable means of settling into the city. In terms of programming this could mean not only focusing on working with refugee communities exclusively but also including the wider urban communities that refugees are part of.

- *Investigate how the specific experiences of refugees impact their community structures.* The specific experiences and trauma of forced migrants emerging from experiences of violence, flight and exile shape their desires for and perception of social interaction and thus the types of communities and social capital they engage and develop.

- ***Build on previous research in other disciplines and contexts.*** The refugee studies literature needs to consider and capitalize on the advances of research, notably in the field of development, and particularly with regard to measuring and building social capital.

- ***Research the role of institutions in building refugees' social capital.*** Existing research on urban refugee communities focuses on the micro-level. More research is required on how the host state and the aid agencies influence social networks of urban refugees.

- ***Use mixed and participatory methods.*** When feasible, more studies using mixed methods should be conducted as both qualitative and quantitative data analysis are needed in order to improve the knowledge of urban refugee communities and social networks. Engaging refugees as partners in research leads to new perspectives, reduces cultural biases and increases acceptance of the results.

- ***Generate more comparable and generalizable data.*** Given the research questions asked in regards to "communities," many studies on urban refugees have a very contextual approach and concentrate on providing micro-level information on a particular setting. At the same time, there is a need for more generalizable theories and findings, and therefore larger-scale, mixed method studies could provide the most feasible methodological approach to generate and test theories of social capital among urban refugees.

Introduction

As almost half of the world's refugees reside in cities and towns of low- and middle-income countries, humanitarian agencies face the challenge of designing and adapting their policies and programs to urban settings. In response to these challenges, the International Rescue Committee (IRC) and the Women's Refugee Commission (WRC) have invested in research that aims to improve the quality and impact of policy and programming that target urban refugee populations. The aim of this analytical report is to inform the development of an urban refugee research agenda within the IRC and WRC. This report has two main objectives: firstly, to identify the critical questions and gaps in urban refugee research that were raised in the roundtable discussion, and secondly, to provide recommendations for future research investment based on a review of the relevant literature.

On November 15, 2012, the IRC and the WRC convened a Roundtable discussion on urban refugee research. Four selected presenters shared their research around protection strategies, profiling, livelihood and advocacy for refugees in urban areas. During the discussions among the practitioners, policymakers and researchers, critical gaps regarding urban refugee programming and research were identified. In brief, seven main themes categorizing the identified challenges and potentials emerged: 1)programming in urban areas; 2) urban mindset; 3) advocacy; 4) data for programming; 5) livelihoods; 6) role of private sector and technology; and 7) communities, social capital and networks.

The issue of urban refugee communities and social networks, widely discussed at the Roundtable, was selected as the theme for the literature review because of its unexploited potential for improving programming with urban refugees. This secondary research focuses on the possibilities and challenges of leveraging social capital and networks within urban refugee communities for improving advocacy, policy and programmatic efforts. It provides, firstly, an analytical discussion on the conceptual, theoretical and content analysis of refugee studies literature on urban refugee communities and social networks in the context of low- and middle-income countries. Secondly, the literature review addresses the issue of policymaking and programming. It examines the questions of how programs with urban refugee communities have been designed and what the main implementation challenges are. Thirdly, the methodological approaches taken in existing studies on urban refugee communities and social networks are discussed and assessed. The overall methodological approaches, city selection, sampling and research designs are examined.

At the end of this analytical report, implications for programming and recommendations for future research with regard to urban refugee communities and social networks are given based on the Roundtable discussion and the literature review.

Part I: ROUNDTABLE SUMMARY

1. The Presentations
The Roundtable discussions were based on four presentations on UNHCR's protection strategy, profiling, livelihoods and advocacy. This first part of the report will give a brief description of each presentation, outline the difficulties of working with refugees in urban contexts and subsequently summarize the Roundtable discussions into six recurring themes.

1.1. Evaluation of UNHCR's Urban Refugee Policy
Marybeth Morand of UNHCR's Policy Development and Evaluation Services (PDES) presented the results of the recent evaluation of UNHCR's 2009 urban refugee policy. The survey was conducted in June-July 2012 in those 24 low– and middle- income countries where the population of registered urban refugees exceeds 5,000.[2] The purpose of the investigation was to compare the rate of implementation of the policy against its 12 objectives,[3] capture good practices from UNHCR's different field offices and develop a basis for measuring progress in the future.

The evaluation has confirmed UNHCR's difficulties in receiving and registering asylum seekers and refugees. UNHCR offices are typically too small and far away from where refugees live. UNHCR has insufficient numbers of qualified staff and host governments are often either unwilling or unable to provide and/or recognize documentation[4] and refugee status. Although there are ways of improving reception facilities and staff qualifications, the steep rise in the number of urban refugees has demonstrated that new approaches to working in urban environments are needed. On the one hand, community approaches have to be developed and extended, on the other hand UNHCR counts on the increasing use of mobile and web-based technologies to increase and improve its assistance.

1.2. Profiling
Dr. Karen Jacobsen, Associate Research Professor at Tufts University and Academic Director of the Feinstein Center and its Refugees and Forced Migration Program, presented her profiling methodology. Profiling can be understood as "the collaborative process of identifying groups or individuals through data collection." The method provides comparative data on vulnerability of urban refugee, migrant and urban poor populations, disaggregated by age, sex and location. Using a random sample, the investigators neither depend on registration, nor do they ask for the legal status of participants. The qualitative part of the methodology also reveals information about displacement patterns, causes of flight and future intentions. For practitioners, profiling can essentially function as a needs assessment and monitoring tool, providing the basis for evidence-based programming.

Profiling diverges from other methods in so far as it does not target any group but investigates the entire population, thus surveying refugees, other migrants and locals. This allows for a comparison of their experiences and vulnerabilities. The produced mapping "gives a real sense of the city" and identifies areas of relative vulnerability with regard to

---

[2] The criteria of the study meant that countries with more but unregistered refugees were not considered.

[3] These are: Providing adequate reception facilities; improving registration, documentation and Refugee Status Determination processes; reaching out to the community; Fostering constructive relationships with refugees; Maintaining security; Promoting livelihoods and self-reliance; Ensuring access to health, education and other services; Meeting material needs; Finding durable solutions; Addressing the issue of movement.

[4] The term "documentation" was used in the discussions to refer to identification documents that can take different forms depending on the context.

income, health, housing and security. The collaborative profiling process strives to include all stakeholders and is therefore preceded by a long preparatory buy-in phase. However, profiling processes are costly, as they require significant time and resource investments.[5]

1.3. Urban Refugee Livelihoods

Dale Buscher, Senior Director of Programs at the Women's Refugee Commission (WRC) presented research findings on urban refugees' livelihoods in Johannesburg, South Africa, Kampala, Uganda, and New Delhi, India, from 2011, as well as studies from 2012 with a specific focus on refugee youth in Cairo, Egypt, Nairobi, Kenya, and Panama City, Panama.[6] With the goal of producing useful information and guidance for practitioners these qualitative[7] studies assessed economic coping strategies, protection risks and market opportunities. The livelihood assessments focused on three to four refugee nationalities per location[8] and targeted different wealth groups (very poor, poor, struggling and better off[9]).

The presentation stressed the importance of host government policies and practices for the lives of urban refugees. Specifically, the right to work, freedom of movement and provision of documentation can be influenced through advocacy efforts. However, these efforts are found to be insufficient and often even absent. The presentation also stated recommendations for creating livelihood opportunities for urban refugees particularly through mapping and creating pathways into existing programs and services, building social networks and capitalizing on refugees' existing skills.

1.4. Improving Policies for the Urban Displaced

Dr. Loren Landau, Associate Professor and Director of the African Centre for Migration and Society at the University of Witwatersrand, presented on advocacy efforts and policy-making for achieving an environment that promotes and sustains the well-being of urban refugees. Dr. Landau stated that a realistic perspective of what policy can achieve and an awareness of the context are essential for successfully influencing policy-making. For that purpose, he highlighted the general limitations of displacement policy and concluded that creating incentives for local elites and framing refugee issues as part of the broader urban development agenda are necessary. This requires paying more attention to cities and their specific policy environments and underlines the potential for drawing on the existing urban development experience and literature to do so.

2. Main Themes

This section summarizes the recurring seven themes from the discussion among researchers, practitioners and policy-makers. The difficulties of working in urban environments and specifically with urban refugees were present, to different degrees, in all of the Roundtable sessions. To reduce repetition, the main difficulties are summarized in the first subsection.

---

5 For more information on Profiling see: http://sites.tufts.edu/feinstein/2012/developing-a-profiling-methodology-for-displaced-people-in-urban-areas

6 The cities were chosen because they are geographically dispersed and offer distinctive market conditions to different refugee populations.

7 Qualitative methodology used in most of the WRC's studies includes in-depth and semi-structured interviews, focus groups, participant observation and project site visits.

8 The WRC studies are thus specifically different from the profiling methodology as they explicitly concentrate on the most important refugee groups and do not engage with refugees from all nationalities or other city residents.

9 Refugees themselves defined the indicators for these wealth categories. The degree of poverty was, for example, assessed through the following indicators: large families sharing a single room, unable to provide three meals a day, children often not going to school, irregular employment and income.

Following this, the remaining six themes will be discussed: urban mindset; advocacy; data for programming; livelihoods; role of the private sector and technology; and communities, social capital and networks.

2.1. Challenges of Programming in Urban Environments

The economic and political environment in low- and middle- income countries poses several challenges for refugees and those trying to work on their behalf. Many governments have reservations towards articles within the 1951 Convention on the Status of Refugees, specifically towards aspects like freedom of movement and access to employment.[10] Only 37 percent of all signatory countries meet the international protection standards for refugees. In most cases, host country populations and governments have negative perceptions of and hostile attitudes towards forced migrants. Xenophobia and discrimination frequently impact the lives of refugees and the working conditions of the aid organizations trying to assist them. Refugees are often perceived as contributing to rising crime rates, environmental degradation and the over-burdening of state services. Host populations are often concerned about increased competition for resources and limited livelihood opportunities and can therefore become anxious about potential local integration of migrants and refugees. In many countries, refugees are thus confined to camp settlements and are only allowed to leave for cities on exception.

Status-specific assistance requires refugees to expose themselves in this hostile environment. Many urban refugees thus choose not to seek assistance and prefer to blend in and integrate into the urban environment, which makes working with them particularly difficult. Involving the host country population through participatory measures can be equally problematic, because it may result in political challenges, if host populations clearly express their preference for anti-refugee policies.

WRC's research indicates that current approaches to subsistence allowance, subsidized education and health programming in urban areas are ineffective. Limited resources that are meant to provide relief for the most vulnerable are claimed by many over extended time periods. As a result, services tend to be overstretched and of low quality. In many cases, beneficiaries receive cash payments and similar forms of direct assistance (e.g., payments for medical services), which are barely sufficient to meet their needs and do not promote self-reliance. Vulnerability is, furthermore, incentivized, because assistance is extended to those that are most able to demonstrate their need and impoverishment.

Besides being ineffective, cash assistance and the provision of direct services are unsustainable. The sheer length of an individual's displacement is estimated to be on average 17 years. In addition, the rise in urban refugee numbers dramatically exceeds a parallel growth in donor funding. The urban refugee population of Kampala has, for example, tripled in three years. Instead of just thinking about hiring more staff, aid organizations thus have to develop ways to better choose and qualify staff. In this regard participants also discussed if specifically qualified staff like social workers might be better suited than generalists to work with urban refugees.

2.2. Urban Mindset

Donors, humanitarian organizations and their staff are used to the unique conditions of working with refugees in camps. This "camp mentality" still influences the practices and

---

10 For more information see: http://www.unhcr.org/pages/49da0e466.html.

reflections of policy-making and programming even when a majority of refugees are now living in urban settings.[11] The Roundtable discussion indicated that the adaptive process of informally but permanently settling in urban areas might have to be considered as an addition to the traditional "three durable solutions" (integration, resettlement, repatriation). It seems therefore necessary to advance from a "camp mentality" to an urban mindset. It is, however, unclear what this mindset would look like. The Roundtable participants identified two important elements: understanding the new environment and developing ways of appropriately acting within it.

Roundtable participants agreed on the importance of paying more attention to the wider environment of the city instead of only concentrating on refugees, their activities and relations. In the past, this narrow focus seems to have stood in the way of considering and properly investigating the dynamics of cities and the way assistance can be provided in them. As a result, the institutions, policy-making processes and other populations in urban environments remain relatively foreign to refugee scholars and practitioners. Reversing this predisposition and paying more attention to urban policy in particular seem to be necessary for developing an urban mindset. Urban settlement, sanitation and infrastructure are, among others, specific policy domains of urban planning in which humanitarians typically have little expertise. Considering the available information from other disciplines (e.g., economics, public health, development studies, etc.) could be an important basis for clarifying what established concepts like protection mean in urban settings.

2.3. Advocacy
Host governments do not always see improving the conditions for refugees as a priority. In fact, local elites are not particularly interested in poor and powerless populations and, as everywhere else, have a tendency to push the disadvantaged out of cities. Rights-based approaches to refugee protection tend to be inadequate, especially in contexts where the rights of the poor are not upheld and where regulatory and legal frameworks are weak. Pressures from Western governments and donors on host country governments have often been ineffective, ignored or have only resulted in superficial change. In many countries, there exists a high sensitivity to interferences in domestic politics and policies. To avoid possible backlashes, legitimate voices to express advocacy have to be carefully identified and refugee interests should be framed as a part of broader domestic interests.

Elites have to be shown why they should care about refugees. A prerequisite is to identify the skills and contributions of urban refugees. Then clear arguments about the advantages of their presence can be made to provoke the enthusiasm to engage with them. Urban refugees can be legitimately seen as assets for the rent they pay, the labor they provide and the resource inflows they prompt through remittances and aid organizations. Roundtable participants stated that another way of making a rational appeal to different levels of government and administration is to argue that refugees are present and surviving and their struggle could be transformed into a win-win situation. However, in order to credibly make these arguments more data on the costs and benefits of refugees for their urban environment is needed. What costs do refugees actually inflict on their hosts and how do these relate to their contributions on different levels?

Advocacy is frequently too focused on the national level, but in many low- and middle-income countries formal law and policies do not translate into practice in predictable ways. The problem is often not the law as such, but the implementation process. Experience

---

[11] These numbers are given consistently, for example, by the WRC. See WRC 2011a, b, c.

indicates that policies are less likely to be implemented if they are passed down from the national level and pushed by UN agencies. Administrators frequently perceive these policies as obligations and collaborate only half-heartedly or purely for financial reasons. In addition, the international rewards and incentives often do not trickle down to the local level. But these neglected micro-level governance and administrative structures are very important for improving the conditions for refugees. Whether a refugee business is allowed to exist is, for example, often dependent on the interests of a local councilor. There are many opportunities to work with and influence local political officials. But this approach requires analyzing and engaging with the politics and incentives that shape decision-making and collaboration at different sub-national levels.

During the discussions, participants described different ways of using issue-linkage to enhance advocacy efforts. For example, drawing attention to urban security is likely to also improve the security situation of refugees. Similarly, the dramatic demographic change of recent years should be linked to refugee issues. The "youth bulge" is increasingly difficult to ignore and could be used in advocacy efforts for refugees. Roundtable participants recognized that the opportunities for youth development need to be maximized, instead of letting youths' time and energy be wasted and possibly channeled negatively. The correlation between building urban refugee youth business skills, their psychosocial development and levels of integration is intuitive but needs to be empirically validated.

2.4. Data for programming

The demand for knowledge and data on urban refugees has increased considerably in the last ten years. Research is often very context-specific and available anecdotal evidence has to be critically assessed and objectively verified. Aid organizations require information on specific vulnerabilities to write convincing proposals in order to acquire funding for their programming. They also need baseline studies to subsequently design, implement and evaluate their projects. Therefore, a quest has begun for appropriate tools and processes to gain contextual knowledge on how urban refugees, other migrants, host country nationals and local decision-makers interact.

Participants agreed on the advantages and methodological rigor of the profiling methodology. Profiling results allow for more appropriately designed programmatic interventions and increased accountability. In addition, profiling can also improve advocacy efforts as it permits making clearer and more objective arguments about distinct groups and their potentially unique needs. While the benefits of profiling are persuasive, the methodology also has a few disadvantages. Conducting a profiling exercise typically costs more than 100,000 U.S. dollars. While donors are persuaded that the information gained is worth this investment, the duration of the exercise (approximately eight months on average) poses additional challenges. This makes the profiling methodology unsuitable for reacting to emergencies. It also begs the question of how quickly the data of constantly fluctuating cities and populations may become outdated and how it could then be updated. Further reflection is additionally needed on how the methodology could be simplified for wider use, while ensuring a minimal standard of quality.

In addition to challenges in generating data, the available information on urban refugees is rarely taken advantage of. The UNHCR evaluation revealed that existing data from host governments' statistical offices are rarely utilized. Quite surprisingly, the existing profiling

data[12] has so far not been used as a basis for systematic program design and evaluation. This highlights the need to develop innovative partnerships between researchers and practitioners.[13] In many cases, aid agencies too readily state that there is no data available. One participant stated that organizations might expect to be fed with useful data. This indicates the need and potential to develop new ways of sharing data and managing the available information. Participants agreed that it would be helpful if a bigger organization, like UNHCR, would take the lead on this responsibility.

2.5. Livelihoods

The provision of identity documents and refugee status can reduce exploitation and harassment of urban refugees and therefore improve their livelihoods. Accordingly, increasing levels of documentation and legal status is one of the pillars of UNHCR's protection work and is specifically mentioned in the organization's policy for urban refugees. More recent research has, however, cast doubt on the role of refugee status, asserting that forced migrants remain marginalized irrespective of their status. Restrictive host government policies or practices frequently impede the access to the services that status theoretically entitles. Findings show that xenophobia and discrimination kept refugees' lives difficult. Officials simply ignore documents and force refugees to pay bribes. And because of their limited qualifications, foreign diplomas and the labor market conditions in low- and middle-income countries, most refugees are not accessing formal employment. Profiling results in Mae Sot, Thailand confirm that documents matter, but the main difference remains between migrants and nationals, not between documented and undocumented migrants.

Participants agreed that the ability of refugees to cope with their difficult conditions is dependent on their assets and skill sets—better educated and more skilled refugees are less vulnerable. The WRC therefore developed a framework[14] to continuously build refugees' capacities until they are self-reliant. The "graduated approach" aims to support individuals according to their specific needs. The poorest receive the most basic support and protection, while the better-off benefit from asset building and expansion of economic opportunities.[15] However, this framework may not be mainstreamed as it requires commitment to supporting individuals over extended time periods and therefore challenges established ways of conceptualizing and providing assistance.

Instead of targeting individuals and specific populations (such as refugees), Roundtable participants expressed the need for measures that promote the economic development of refugee-impacted neighborhoods or regions. Research indicates that urban refugees are not that different from (disadvantaged) host populations with regard to their assets, skill sets and vulnerabilities. The humanitarian imperative is thus to work with all urban poor. On a practical level, it was concluded that since the specific conditions of refugees cannot be improved in isolation, their whole urban environment should be developed. One participant suggested that this might actually be more efficient and possibly prevent further marginalization than specifically targeting refugees might provoke. While the participants

---

[12] Profiling exists on different population groups, done by various institutions and to different standards. Karen Jacobsen has conducted profiling exercises for Aden (Yemen), Polokwane (South Africa) and Mao Sot (Thailand).

[13] For example, Columbia University and the IRC have collaborated to conduct rigorous impact evaluations of Community-Driven Reconstruction programs in Liberia and the Democratic Republic of the Congo:

www.oecd.org/countries/democraticrepublicofthecongo/drc.pdf.

[14] The original model is from the CGAP-Ford Foundation Graduation Program. See http://graduation.cgap.org/about/.

[15] For details on the graduated approach see the WRC's publication "Dawn in the City" (2011).

agreed to the logic of the argument (need of holistically addressing urban poverty), they remained puzzled about what strategies for improving the environment for the urban poor would look like. Working with all urban poor is a huge challenge for governments and humanitarian agencies on which urban planners and developers have made little progress.

2.6. Role of the Private Sector and Technology

The role of the private sector and the use of technology were identified during the discussions as having great potential for addressing the resource and capacity gaps in official refugee assistance.[16]

Roundtable participants identified private interests as frequently being the most significant drivers of de facto governance. In situations of limited capacity and resources of governments and aid organizations, the dynamism of business could be channeled to the benefit of urban refugees. It is, however, important to recognize the private sector's motivation to make profit and therefore generate conditions where the interests of business and those of refugees are mutually reinforcing. Refugees do, for instance, often become active in niche markets because they possess unique skill sets or are particularly able to adapt to certain circumstances. Somali refugees are, for example, employed as teachers in Cairo because of their specific religious and cultural knowledge. In other contexts, refugees find work as guides and translators for wealthier landsmen or are particularly appreciated as hard workers by the host population. However, the ways of collaborating with the private sector and using these niche market opportunities remain under-explored. On a practical level, labor market analysis was identified as a relatively simple step to provide the contextual information for a given setting.

Participants also underlined the potential of mobile and online technology to improve the quality of services to urban refugees. Many refugees use cell phones and access the Internet on a regular basis. These communication opportunities could be used to address the problems with access to information and services. Refugees can, for example, be informed via text message about current legal or security developments. Likewise, technology could be used to better organize administrative processes related to documentation and registration. More research is needed on how urban refugees access and use technology and how organizations like UNHCR can better leverage these facilities in serving them.

2.7. Communities, Social Capital and Networks

All presenters emphasized the role that social capital plays for the well-being of urban refugees through providing access to information, money (credit), work or other types of advantages. Recent data even suggests that social capital is the most important factor in determining an individual's success or failure.[17]

Roundtable participants made the common distinction between bonding and bridging social capital. Connections between individuals of the same community, often referred to as bonding capital, were described as particularly helpful when refugee populations live under dire circumstances. The tight networks of Somalis have, for example, enabled them to cope with their marginalization in Kenya and Uganda. But bonding capital was said to be

---

[16] See Betts, Louise, Omata (2012) and Omata (2012) for more details on private sectors and *Forced Migration Review* #38, as well as Danielson (2012) on technology.
[17] Landau and Duponchel 2011.

potentially dangerous, because it may produce an isolated and further marginalized community. Bridging capital—connections between refugees of different nationalities and between refugee communities and host communities—was perceived by Roundtable participants as less common but potentially more beneficial.

The participants established that to meet the challenges of providing assistance to urban refugees, aid organizations have to revolutionize (fundamentally change, develop and extend) the way they work with communities. Tapping into existing community structures could make programming more effective and reinforce the one factor researchers have found most relevant for refugees' success in urban settings—social capital. But what exactly are communities and how can they be engaged in programming? The Roundtable discussions showed that the term is used for different things in different contexts. It also remains unclear what social capital is and how it can be reinforced. So far, programming has concentrated on refugees' financial and human capital, while social capital has been neglected. Roundtable participants assumed that capacitating and supporting refugee-led structures such as informal savings and loan cooperatives or church groups could build their social capital, but there was no certainty about this. Because the potential to leverage social capital and networks within urban refugee communities for improving advocacy, policy and programming remains unexploited, the IRC and the WRC decided that this area is the most promising for a deeper analytical engagement. The following literature review thus engages with the academic and policy literature on refugee communities, social networks and social capital.

Part II: LITERATURE REVIEW

I. Introduction

1. Review Aim and Objectives

The aim of this literature review is to examine and critically engage with the existing academic and policy literature on urban communities and social networks that refugees are part of and the social capital they possess—the theme selected at the Roundtable discussion. In this review the notion of "community" is conceptualized as a form of a social network. Moreover, the term "urban refugee community" is used in this review to refer to both communities consisting exclusively refugees[18] and mixed communities with the refugees, hosts and other migrants.

This literature review focuses on low- and middle- income countries for two related reasons. Firstly, these countries host 80 percent of the world's refugee population. More than half of those live in cities that are already burdened by multi-dimensional challenges and are ill-equipped to extend protection and assistance to refugees (WRC 2011b). Secondly, and as a consequence, interest and programming efforts are concentrated on these cities in the low-and middle-income countries.

The review has four specific objectives:

- To discuss the key findings of studies on urban refugee communities and social networks conducted in the context of low- and middle-income countries
- To examine the theoretical and methodological frameworks used in previous studies for understanding urban refugee communities and social networks in low- and middle-income countries
- To address the question of how to work with and through these existing community structures that refugees are part of in urban environments in low- and middle-income countries
- To propose recommendations for future urban refugee research and programming with regard to refugee communities and social networks in the context of low- and middle-income countries

2. Review methodology

In order to conduct the review an extensive literature search was undertaken. The first step was using Oxford University Library search engine, SOLO (Search Oxford Libraries Online). It offers access to Oxford University's main library information resources regardless of type, format or location, including the Refugee Studies Centre's (RSC) grey literature collection. In order to conduct a more systematic literature research focusing on academic journal papers, the "Proquest" platform was utilized.[19] In addition, Google Scholar was used to triangulate the searches on the academic databases. In order to find documents on policies, evaluations and general reports on urban refugees, the UNHCR collection of refugee databases

---

18 The term "refugee" is understood in this review to include people who have a legal refugee status, asylum seekers and undocumented forced migrants. Often the undocumented forced migrants form the majority of refugees in a given city.

19 The Proquest search was limited to 22 social sciences databases given the nature of the review and the extensiveness of the entire Proquest platform. All of the major refugee studies journals (e.g., *Journal of Refugee Studies, International Journal of Refugee Law* and *Refugee Survey Quarterly*) are covered in this platform.

(Refworld) was used. The systematic keyword searches included combinations of the following terms: urban, refugee, community, social network and social capital.[20]

The search initially resulted in 175 items from SOLO, 201 from Proquest and several thousand from Refworld. From SOLO and Proquest all of the hits and from Refworld the first 100 hits were considered[21]: They were selected for the "review database" based on their title, abstract and/or full-text. The studies included in the review consist of quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods research conducted on urban refugee communities and social networks with the focus on low- and middle-income countries. The review covers studies from a range of disciplines and multidisciplinary literature. It includes book chapters, grey literature, dissertations/theses, journal articles, evaluations, working papers and more general reports on urban refugees.

For this review, 26 studies (Annex 1) were identified as the key sources. The criteria for inclusion in this key studies list were to be explicitly on the topic or otherwise provide significant input content-wise, and to be based on primary data collected with refugees/migrants. As some of the authors extensively cited in the review have published a number of papers on the basis of the same data, only the major publication was considered.[22]

In addition to these 26 key studies, over 70 papers (including evaluations, reports, policies and guidelines, etc.) from the review database were consulted and, when relevant, their content was synthesized to inform the analysis. Thus, in total the review database included nearly 100 items.

The analysis was conducted in a format of individual critical review of the exiting literature supplemented by a dialogue between the two analysts. An exemplary content analysis was conducted on the methodological approach and city selection from the 26 key studies (Annex 2).

II. The Conceptual, Theoretical and Content Analysis

This section addresses the question of how the key concepts of this review, that of "community,' "social network" and "social capital," have conceptually and theoretically been used in urban refugee studies. Theoretical input and discussions from other disciplines will be introduced in order to clarify the key concepts and their relationship with each other. Linking "social capital" and "spiritual capital," and their theorization in urban refugee studies, are, for example, briefly referred to as a background for the remaining analysis.

1. Urban refugees and social capital
The term "social capital" (Bourdieu 1986, Coleman 1988, Putnam 2000) has been independently developed by a variety of scholars over the last century, always in reference to more established forms of capital, notably financial and physical assets (Coleman 1988: 118).

---

20 A separate limited search was conducted on spiritual capital and faith.

21 For the order of hits, the function" "most relevant first" was used on the databases.

22 These include: Lammers 2006a, 2006b; Campbell 2005, 2006; Willems 2003, 2005; Sommers 2001a, 2001b. With regard to WRC publications, five of them were included in the key studies list; as the sixth one (WRC 2011b; on refugee's self-reliance) uses the findings from the other studies from 2011, it was excluded from the key studies list.

Disagreement among the different theorists has been less about the concept itself and rather with regard to the origins and implications of social capital. It is therefore safe to cite Putnam's (2000: 19) widely accepted definition: "Social capital refers to connections among individuals— social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them." The underlying idea that involvement and participation in groups can have advantages for individuals and groups is relatively simple and the appeal of the concept seems to come from its recognition that social ties should not only be legitimately seen as a resources, but are comparable with other forms of capital (Portes 1998).

In refugee studies, it has also been recognized that refugees use social networks to leverage other assets/capital. WRC's (2011a) findings have suggested that many of the challenges faced in acquiring financial, human, physical or natural capital, which would reinforce refugees'' abilities to become truly self-reliant, could be circumvented to a certain extent by reinforcing social capital.

The concepts of "social capital" and "social networks," and to some extent "community," are often treated interchangeably in refugee studies. Calhoun (2010b), in his study on participatory assessment on refugees' social capital in Jordan, has accepted Putnam's definition of social capital. According to this conceptualization, social capital is formed in a number of ways, such as through social networks and connectedness, through membership in more formalized groups, and through relationships of trust, reciprocity and exchanges. Like this definition has shown, much of the literature on migrant/refugee social networks has incorporated the concept of social capital to examine the value of networks (Madhavan and Landau 2011). Landau and Duponchel (2011) have also recognized that the concept of social capital is valuable for refugee studies. They present Portes' (1998) definition of the concept as actors' ability to access benefits and support by virtue of participation in social groups.

In some studies social capital has been equated with social networks (WRC 2011c: 57), whereas other times the theoretical discussion of social networks has had no resonance with the concept of social capital as social networks are seen more as interaction and not as capital/assets (Willems 2003: 9). Social capital has also been defined as "the status in a society, as well as access to social networks, for example, family, tribe and civic groups. It also includes relationships of trust and reciprocity that facilitate cooperation, reduce transaction costs and can provide the basis for informal safety nets (WRC 2011d: 14). Additionally, social capital has been used to refer to relational ties between actors which channel resources (broadly defined). The term refers to resources embedded in social networks accessed and used by actors for actions (Clark 2006). As seen from these different definitions of social capital used in refugee studies, social capital and social networks are typically understood as highly interlinked, if not nearly synonymous, concepts. Thus, this review discusses them jointly.

The review of existing literature on urban refugees' "social capital" and social networks reveals that the scale of analysis varies a lot. Clark has, for instance, examined young refugees' individual role in their families, households and "communities" (Clark 2006), whereas in other studies the focus has been on the social networks among different refugee nationalities (i.e., bonding social capital with thick trust) and between refugees and the hosts in a given city (i.e., bridging social capital with thin trust) (WRC 2011a; Calhoun 2010b). Yet, another analytical scale has been presented in the studies by Madhavan and Landau (2011) and Landau and Duponchel (2011). In their study on social capital among and between native-born locals/migrants and foreign-born migrants/natives in three Sub-Saharan African cities, Madhavan and Landau (2011) challenge many assumptions about urban social

ties, such as the clear distinction between migrant and hosts "communities." As Madhavan and Landau (2011) criticize the often assumed distinction between "host community" and "refugee community," they suggest that social capital can accordingly not be seen as something constant or static. Rather, the fluid and constantly changing character of cities influences the urban forms of social capital.

Many of the studies explicitly discussing urban refugees' social capital have reiterated the importance of social ties in refugees' lives. Amisi describes how social capital plays a crucial role in refugees' escape and travel from their country of origin. According to his findings, social networks of Congolese in Durban are active long before the move from the DRC, during the move and afterward as they can also constitute a remedy to social exclusion in the host country (2006: 48). Landau and Duponchel (2011: 1) conclude that "primary determinants of effective protection have considerably less to do with direct assistance than individuals' choices and positions in social and institutional networks." Their study found that individuals' capacities and social capital, rather than refugee status, make a difference in terms of well-being and protection (2011: 13). Researching Somali, Congolese and Zimbabwean urban refugees in Johannesburg, the WRC (2011c: 57) found that:

> Social capital, such as social networks, increases people's trust and ability to work together. Social networks serve as informal safety nets that draw support from kinship, neighbors and friends, based on reciprocity and solidarity, and include material and emotional support. They are particularly important given forced migrants' exclusion from formal safety nets, such as public services and government social assistance programs.

1.1. Bonding and bridging social capital

Generally, several sub-types of social capital have been explicitly or implicitly referred to. The most important distinction is made between intra (bonding) and inter (bridging) group relationships. According to Putnam (2000: 22) bonding capital is "inward" looking and tends to reinforce "exclusive identities and homogeneous groups." These tight networks of kinship and intimate friendship can provide solidarity and support for their members but are also limited through their self-focus. Bridging capital on the other hand, is "outward looking" and refers to the "weaker ties" that connect people across social cleavages. In his research about job placement, Granovetter (1973) found that the "weak ties" to more distant acquaintances from different social circles are more valuable precisely because of their potential to offer something unfamiliar to the individual. To summarize, "dense but segregated horizontal networks sustain cooperation within each group, but networks that cut across social cleavages nourish wider cooperation" (Putnam 1993: 175). Depending on their situational need, both forms of social capital can offer advantages to individuals. Simply put, "bonding social capital is good for getting by, while bridging social capital is crucial for getting ahead" (Briggs cited by Putnam 2000: 23).

In most of the refugee studies literature bonding and bridging social capital have been adopted. It is unsurprising that the interest in forms of social capital that enable individuals to jump social divides is particularly strong among refugee scholars. Revealingly, Landau and Duponchel (2011) refer to "ethnicity, nationality and religion" as exclusive characteristics of bonding networks and stress that bridging social capital can enable refugees to transcend these boundaries. Even though the often taken-for-granted distinction between "refugee communities" and "host communities" has been questioned by an increasing number of

scholars (Campbell 2006; Lammers 2006; Madhavan and Landau 2011; Landau and Duponchel 2011), the distinction between bonding and bridging social capital is often reiterated with the reference to the importance for refugees to reinforce their bridging capital with the "hosts." For instance, WRC (2011a) has noted the importance of making a distinction between bonding social capital, which according to them refers to social networks among refugees from the same country of origin, and bridging social capital, which refers to ties between refugees and the host community. WRC's (2011a: 11) findings in Kampala suggest that:

> Bridging social capital is particularly important for economic advancement, as people need these more distant ties to get new information about job opportunities or markets. For refugees, bridging social capital may have additional benefits, for example, in helping them to feel less foreign and isolated, giving them information about how to solve problems and access services in a new environment and providing protection in cases of exploitation by employers or landlords. Refugees rely on bonding social capital to access jobs, credit and protection.

Thus, even if clear-cut "communities" cannot necessarily be identified in cities and towns of the low- and middle-income countries, at the network level these different connections often do play a role. This observation is supported by Jacobsen (2006: 282-283), pointing out the importance of both bonding and bridging social capital:

> In pursuing livelihoods in this context of vulnerability, refugees are reliant on the support provided by their co-nationals already living in the city. This support, often called social capital, includes material and emotional support, advice, and connections with employment and financial networks. Refugee strategies to increase their social capital go beyond their national communities.

Yet, other researchers have challenged analysis based mostly on nationality-based social ties. Willems (2003, 2005), for instance, suggested that since the distinction between host and refugee "communities" is not clear cut, analyzing only/mostly the social ties based on nationality may not be the most appropriate analytical viewpoint in urban refugee contexts. Consequently, she works with the concepts of homophilous relationships (where the network members may share common characteristics, such as gender, age, nationality, marital status, child status, religion, professional activity, etc.) and heterophilous relationships. According to her, not only nationality but also gender, and to lesser extent age, are the most decisive factors in determining refugees social networks in Dar es Salaam. Her findings suggest, for instance, that on average refugees share their gender with the majority of their network members. However, women appear to count fewer women among their supportive network members than male refugees do men. Also, men establish a proportionally larger number of relationships with persons of the opposite sex in the situation of forced migration than do women.

In the case of refugees in Amman, Calhoun (2010b: 18-19) has also recognized the importance of gender and age in defining refugees' social capital. According to his findings, adult female refugees have more social capital than adult men. Female youth, however, have less social capital than adult women or male youth, and male youth have more social capital than adult men. Not only nationality, gender and age, but also the geographical location in the city impacts refugees' abilities to succeed and create their social capital (Calhoun 2010b; Landau and Duponchel 2011; Madhavan and Landau 2011).

To conclude, social capital and social networks are significant for urban refugees. Understanding not only refugees' bonding and bridging social capitals based on nationality, but also other factors, such as age and gender, are important. Also, besides bonding and bridging social capital, other sub-types of capitals may be important for urban refugees' well-being.

1.2. Linking Capital and Spiritual Capital

Besides bonding and bridging social capitals, some refugee researchers have referred to links that connect individuals to resources and support from formal institutions as "linking capital" (Madhavan and Landau 2011). This concept (originally developed by Woolcock 1998 as a critique of Putnam's conceptualization of social capital which ignores social and power inequalities; see Baker and Miles-Watson 2010: 26) refers to power relations between people and linking people who are perceived to have less power with the ones that do (Harriss 2002). Furthermore, it focuses on the importance of "weak ties" by referring to relationships with those in power and official bodies (Putnam 1993, cited in Zetter et al. 2005). These linking social networks are evident, for instance, in the relationships between poor and better-off refugees, and the relationships between refugees and other actors in the city (humanitarian agencies, municipal authorities, service providers, private sector, etc.). However, the review of urban refugee studies revealed that hardly any studies have focused on the issue of linking social capital in the context of low- and middle-income countries. Thus, the review is not focused on this sub-type of social capital, but rather it is suggested that there is both an empirical and theoretical knowledge gap in terms of urban refugees' linking social capital.

Besides the bonding, bridging and linking capitals, another sub-type of social capital was identified from the reading of refugee studies literature; that of "spiritual capital." In the next section, "spiritual capital" will be discussed in more detail given its implicit significance to the refugee studies literature.

Religious and faith networks amongst refugees are often recognized as crucial for urban refugees' success and well-being (Pavanello, Elhawary and Pantuliano 2010: 30), and a number of urban refugee studies have addressed the issue of "spiritual capital" (Stawski 2012, cited in Pacitto 2012) or "religious capital" (Baker and Miles-Watson 2010), but only implicitly, not really discussing the issue on a theoretical level. Thus, there is a clear gap in theorizing the role of faith and religion as "spiritual/religious capital" in urban refugee studies literature. In other disciplines the term "spiritual/religious capital" has been defined as a subset of social capital, and sometimes referred to as "the social capital of faith based-organizations" (Montemaggi 2011), or as religious culture motivating social action (Baker and Miles-Watson 2010). However, as there is no agreed definition of the concept, Baker and Miles-Watson (2010: 63) have suggested that further research is needed on this "contested term." Others have also proposed that more critically engaging theorization on spiritual capital is needed because of some fundamental shortcomings, in particular, with regard to masking "the reality of power, in its positive and negative aspects" (Montemaggi 2010: 79) in relation to "spiritual capital."

The review of existing literature on urban refugees' communities and social ties suggests that religion and faith play a significant role in refugees' lives. Refugees derive support from networks in refugee-established churches, mosques and other places of worship, and in the places of worship dominated by the host society. Thus, faith and spiritual capital can have an

impact both on bonding and bridging social capitals. Spiritual capital can also be seen to reinforce refugees' human capital, as do education and work-related skills. Recognizing the importance of faith for refugees, Sommers (2001a, 2001b: 362), in the context of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, has pointed out that "probably no aspect of African refugee society and culture is as overlooked by researchers and most humanitarian relief agencies as their religious lives." Also, "the extent to which religious identity, belief and practice may provide the underpinnings for humanitarian responses to forced migration, has largely remained under-studied" (Fiddian-Quasmiyeh 2011: 429). As a response to these observations, UNHCR has recently paid attention to the connection between faith and refugee protection by organizing the High Commissioner's Dialogue on Protection Challenges in 2012 on this very theme.[23]

Despite the fact that faith, religion and spirituality are significant elements for many refugees, the extent to, and ways in which, faith impacts refugees' lives in their cities of exile is dependent on the religious environment in the host country/city. If the host society and refugees share the same religion, refugees may find more opportunities to build social ties with the hosts within shared places of worship. When refugees, however, form a faith minority or are associated with a particular minority denomination, they may be more likely to establish their own separated places of worship (Jackson 1987).

Overall, research findings indicate that attending a place of worship is important, as refugees derive "both individual and corporate spiritual strength from it" (Jackson 1987). Churches and mosques can also represent a place where refugees feel a sense of belonging. This belonging and security can be created not only through material and immaterial support among the members of the congregation but also through preaching on how "religion directly tackles the difficulties of the lost aspects of home in the refugees' lives" (Russell 2011: 301). Additionally, the sense of belonging is created among the members of the congregation and also between refugees and God.

However, Jackson's (1987) early findings in Khartoum indicate that "the greatest Christian associational contact between Sudanese and refugees lies not with the churches themselves, but with the so-called para-church organizations" (Jackson 1987: 66). These para-church organizations carry out instrumental development work aimed to help refugees survive and contribute to the host society. Thus, the organizations related to the church, not the church per se, can be a significant source of support. Other studies have also concluded that "immigrant congregations are no longer just sites for religious worship; they are also assuming multiple functions, including both religious and secular classes such as the provision of social services, recreational centers and social spaces for civic functions" (Nzayabino 2010: 2).

Churches and other centers of worship are, however, significant places to create social ties. Willems (2003), in the study on urban refugees' social networks in Dar es Salaam, discovered that churches and mosques were, after the location of neighborhood, the most important places where refugees created new social networks both in terms of bonding with their fellow nationals and bridging to the other residents of the city. Places of worship can also help to establish informal networks not only among the urban refugees, but also between refugees and their home country. Faith-based social ties can additionally create an avenue for refugees to escape their country of origin or to move from the refugee camps to the cities (Sommers 2001a, 2001b). Membership to a church or a mosque can further impact refugees' motivations to integrate into the city (Nzayabino 2010).

---

[23] For more information see: http://www.unhcr.org/pages/501a39ce6.html.

Yet, churches and other places of worship can be characterized by conflicts and rivalries from refugees' home countries can infiltrate the churches. According to Sommers (2001a: 179) refugees' church membership would not necessarily protect them, and it could even enhance suspicion and mistrust amongst the refugees and also between refugees and other members of the mixed congregation. These findings suggest that as in the case of other types of communities (discussed later in Section 3.3.), both the positive and negative aspects of spiritual capital have to be recognized (Montemaggi 2011) and further examined in urban refugee contexts.

2. Urban refugee communities as social networks

This section investigates the five types of urban refugee communities identified from the review of existing literature and the motivations behind community establishment. It also sheds light on the challenges that refugees typically face when organizing themselves into communities and accessing other forms of urban communities. Finally, the possible benefits and associated risks of community membership are examined.

2.1. Types of urban refugee communities

In some of urban refugee studies the concepts of "community" and "social networks" have been used interchangeably (Willems 2003; Clark 2006). Taking a network approach to community, Clark (2006) explores community structures which young urban refugees are part of. The network approach to communities allows Clark (2006) to emphasize the networks of human relationships and trust, and to challenge the often taken-for-granted homogenous perceptions of "communities" as it is not analytically useful to think community solely as a particular fixed space or as a shared identity. However, the concept of "community" has been treated in urban refugee studies in a number of ways—both empirically and theoretically. A case in point is Campbell's (2006) doctoral thesis in which she uses the notion of "community" at least in 19 different ways, ranging from "refugee community in Nairobi," "business community in Eastleigh," "host community" to "international community." In general, the term "community" has been used in urban refugee studies in a highly diverse and somewhat confusing manner. Given this ambiguity in the use of the term "community," this review identified five broad categories of "urban refugee communities" from the existing literature. These types of communities will be discussed in the following section.

Nationality is the most commonly used denominator to assign community membership to refugees. It is, for example, frequently stated that there are Congolese, Somali, Rwandan and Burundian communities in Kampala (WRC 2011). It is commonly assumed that when belonging to a certain nationality, individuals are automatically part of a national community. This is problematic because it reduces individuals' agency. In addition, the practice of automatically assuming one community of a particular nationality disguises the differences and nuances between people and groups of the same nationality. In fact, there are profound differences across nationalities and different nationality-based communities function differently and have various substructures within them. For instance, the community structures Willems (2003) identified in the context of refugees in Dar es Salaam varied in size and purpose between the Congolese, Rwandan and Burundian refugees. WRC's (2011c) research also indicated that refugees' nationality plays a key role in their capacities to establish social networks in their city of exile. In Johannesburg, the Somalis rely primarily on family, religious and tribal links, whereas Congolese generally rely on family networks and civil society organizations. Davis' (2012) research on urban refugees in Amman, Jordan

supports the findings that refugees' social networks and community forms differ between nationalities: among Iraqis there are high levels of bonding with their own community and bridging with other communities, while the Sudanese bond more strongly with their own and much less with others. The levels of vulnerability also differ by refugees' nationality (WRC 2011a), and refugees with more homogenous networks are less likely to seek formal support (Willems 2003).

Communities can also be *spatially defined* as **"**community" is often used to refer to people that live in a certain area. Even though some researchers have challenged the traditional territorial notion of urban refugee communities (Lammers 2006a, Willems 2003), many have recognized the importance of various spatial scales. The spatially defined conceptualizations of urban refugee community touch at least three different spatial scales: the micro-level, the neighborhood and the transnational scale. Firstly, the micro-scale can refer to particular places of the city where refugees feel a sense of belonging, such as a Congolese bar and at church (Russell (2011). Secondly, refugees may find a sense of "neighborhood-community" in areas where they live. With the focus on the neighborhood, the notion of "urban refugee community" becomes extended to include not only refugees but also the people, be it hosts or other migrants, with whom they live often in close physical proximity, and consequently it is difficult to find a "pure refugee community" (Campbell 2006; Davis 2012). Even though neighborhoods are important spaces to create social networks, the relations between refugees and other neighbors might not be strong (Willems 2003). On the one hand, this provides refugees a way to stay "hidden" and possibly integrate into the urban fabric. On the other hand, this indicates that the individual relationships are not necessarily intimate. Thirdly, the conceptualization of urban refugee community as "transnational community" expands the territorial boundaries of the notion of "community" (Campbell 2006, 2005). Thus, "urban refugee community" cannot be strictly limited to the geographical boundaries of one city or a given country.

The term community is often used to refer to people with *similar characteristics*. It is assumed that because these people belong to the same category (e.g., young people, women) they form a group or community (i.e. "the youth," "the women"). While this is problematic, findings have shown that similar characteristics do play an important role in social networking. Willems' (2005: 64) research in Dar es Salaam suggests that on average refugees share their gender with the majority of their network members. Research findings also show that young refugees, or even more specifically young refugee men, can create social networks amongst themselves providing them a sense of "community" in the absence of traditional kin support structures (Clark's 2006). Thus, social networks amongst young refugees are often essential (WRC 2012a, Newhouse 2012).

Other studies suggest that there are so-called *broken and mixed communities*. This can be because of the absence of clear-cut divisions between the "host community" and "refugee communities" (Campbell 2005, 2006; Lammers 2006a, 2006b). Madhavan and Landau (2011) suggest that a "community of strangers" is a typical form of an urban community, which not only refugees but also native residents and migrants create together. It is formed due to the increasing fluidity of cities and the high levels of deprivation in low- and middle-income countries which influence the urban forms of social capital. Moreover, as a result of conflict and flight, traditional community structures (often based on kinship or territorial definitions) can be broken creating a sense of "absent community" (Lammers 2006a).

Perhaps the most instrumental conceptualization of "urban refugee community" is that of *refugee-initiated communities*. These refer to associations, churches, community-based organizations and self-help groups, among other forms. For instance, in the context of non-formal education (NFE) in Kampala, Uganda, refugee-initiated communities may take the form of a refugee organization, a "working group," or a "support group" (Bonfiglio 2010). Moreover, refugee-initiated communities can be distinguished according to their purposes and motivations. In Khartoum, Jackson (1987), for instance, found out that there were "instrumental refugee associations" (e.g., political organizations, relief and development organizations, and non-political self-help associations) and "expressive refugee associations" (e.g., centers for worship, para-church organizations, recreation and associations). The community initiatives refugees have created in the low-and middle-income countries—not only recently, but for decades—are plenty. Yet, these structures have remained somewhat neglected by researchers and aid organizations alike.

2.2. Motivations and origins

In general, there seems to be a consensus that social networks and community structures are essential for refugees to cope with the conditions in cities and towns. Yet, reasons and ways in which refugees in cities and towns of the low—and middle-income countries become organized are varied. In the case of refugees in Cairo, Grabska (2006) noted that although numbers of informal refugee community groups have existed for a long time, they have become more formally organized in recent years. According to Grabska (2006: 303) there is a link between the lack of resettlement and limited assistance and the level of refugee organization in Cairo:

> One of the reasons for the recent mushrooming in refugee-based associations is the increased number of recognized refugees who are not eligible for resettlement and will be staying in Egypt for the foreseeable future. As the official assistance from UNHCR and service providers does not meet the increased demand, refugees resort to their community resources to address some of their urgent needs.

Her findings also suggest that another key element reinforcing refugee organization in Cairo has been the policies promoted by the local UNHCR office. Since UNHCR started implementing a more community-based services approach, reaching out to the refugee communities and providing limited funding, more refugee-established community-based organization have emerged. Willems' (2003) study on refugees in Dar es Salaam also suggested that the role of humanitarian agencies in the creation of certain types of refugee communities has been instrumental. In the case of Burundian refugees in Dar es Salaam, many of the women Willems interviewed had created their own women's associations because of UNIFEM and UNHCR encouragement and funding. Refugee communities are also often created and supported through membership fees and remittances of resettled refugees or local business people (Grabska 2006): "substantial amount of assistance provided to the refugees came from fellow-refugees, implying that refugees supported their fellow refugees whenever and however possible" (Willems 2005: 61).

Sometimes refugees, however, form community structures in a more organic manner. In the context of Durban, South Africa, Amisi (2006) noted that social networks among the Congolese may spontaneously appear between family members, friends and colleagues as a reaction to social exclusion. These networks often turn into organized communities in the form of "refugee associations, ethnic organizations, professional ties, students' or

neighborhood organizations for the common good" (Amisi 2006: 6). These communities are typically engaged in both formal and informal social networks in order to survive. This is supported by Jacobsen (2006), who has argued that refugees' social capital, in particular in urban areas, is created through local friendships, the presence of charitable organizations or charity-minded individuals who seek to assist refugees or particular national groups for personal reasons. According to her, social capital also includes political assets (i.e., organizational power and leadership, representation of groups, connections with powerful people in refugees' countries of origins, etc.), which are essential in accessing other resources.

2.3. The "Dark Side" of Communities

Despite the general consensus on the positive and supportive role of urban refugee communities, it has been recognized that "social networks may be based on hierarchical or exploitative relationships" (WRC 2011b: 7). This observation is linked to the wider recognition that "not all community-driven and -determined action is positive or protective" (Ferris 2011: 199), in particular, because "mutual support mechanisms and community structures are probably less effective in urban than in rural areas" (Ferris 2011: 254). Amisi (2006: 3) has, for example, recognized in his study on Congolese refugees in Durban, that:

> These social networks may be positive or negative. Social exclusion, exploitation and xenophobia are the main problems that Congolese refugees face on a daily basis. … Mistrust is an Achilles heel of this community for numerous reasons and represents a permanent threat and source of community fragmentation. The proliferation of small churches, ethnic political parties and self-help projects is symptomatic of this fragmentation.

Thus, it is important not to treat urban refugees' community structures as purely supportive and protective, and consequently see them as a "protection ideal." This argument is related to the broader discussion on social networks in which theorists have been divided roughly into two groups: network pessimists and network optimists (Meagher 2010). The pessimists focus on the dysfunctional cultural values and internal conflicts, whereas the optimists see social networks as embedded solutions to the problem of the state, and they emphasize the role of trust and communal solidarity (Meagher 2010).

In the development studies literature, the idealistic use of social capital as a "missing link" assumed to automatically bring people out of poverty has also been problematized and challenged (Harriss 2002). Harriss criticizes that the argument of social capital leading to positive outcomes in governance and wealth, as proposed by Putnam (1993), is circular as it might very well be conducive institutional conditions that lead to an increase in social capital. Concentrating on communities' efforts to build and maintain social capital, therefore, entails the risk of prescribing faulty policy conclusions. If the absence of social capital is, for example, the result of structural factors like politics and weak governance, then "policy makers who attack the lack of social capital by encouraging associations would be attacking the symptoms and not the causes of the problem" (Tarrow 1996: 396).

Thus, when urban refugees' community structures are under investigation, positive and negative implications should be considered. Previous refugee research on urban communities seems to support this approach and is realistic about the challenges internal and external to refugees' community structures. As already suggested by Jackson (1987: 2) "the practical and

policy implications of voluntary refugee associations are complex." This is because, on the one hand, they are:

> "potentially strong points of reference for participatory approach to resolving refugee problems," but on the other hand, "what is a community strength is also a kind of weakness. Refugee associations are at once signs of community solidarity and organization, but at the same time indications of the manifold divisions within the community" (Jackson 1987: 72).

2.4. Factors impacting the outcomes

This section analyses the characteristics of communities that determine their functionality. Two factors stood out in explaining the success or the failure of urban refugee communities: the issue of trust and the size of the community.

Central to the discussion and unpacking of the reasons for the potentially positive or negative effects of community involvement is the *issue of trust*. In general, the notion of "trust" is important both in the studies of communities and social networks; often it is argued that without trust, social networks cannot flourish and communities cannot sustain themselves (Amisi 2006; Lammers 2006; Russell 2010; Madhavan and Landau 2011).

In urban refugee literature, it is typically noted that mistrust amongst the refugees (i.e., social mistrust, Hynes 2003, 2009) is, to some extent, rooted in the reasons for their flight. In the case of Cairo, Grabska's (2006: 301) findings indicate the problem of mistrust among the refugee population: "fragmentation and tribalization of Sudanese society, distinctive ethnic identities as well as the divides originating from the conflict in Sudan exacerbate the difficulties of integration in the host country." The conflict in Sudan, thus, impacts refugees' sense of trust and community in their city of exile. Jackson's (1987: 72) earlier study on refugees in Khartoum, Sudan also touches the issue of internal community conflicts and mistrust as a result of the conflicts which originally caused the refugees to flee: "these initiatives [refugee associations] inevitably reflect the divisions and power struggles integral to the situations of conflict with originally produced the refugee flows."

The lack of trust is not just limited to the refugee population, but potentially impacts refugees' relations with the host populations and the protection institutions (e.g., UNHCR, NGOs, government officials, police, etc.) (i.e., institutional trust, Hynes 2003, 2009). Often these various forms of mistrust (i.e., social and institutional trust) can be reinforcing. Amisi's (2006: 40) study with the Congolese in South Africa, for instance, describes how the manipulation by aid agencies and the consequent institutional mistrust can contribute to the mistrust amongst refugees:

> Well-established refugees, as well as those who have no socio-political status and strong social networks and ties within the refugee community and between the refugees and South Africans, are subject to manipulation from mainly South African NGOs in exchange for receiving some financial and material assistance. This practice increases the level of mistrust within the refugee communities.

With regard to measuring bonding and bridging social capital between foreigners and natives, Madhavan and Landau (2011: 474) establish trust as an indicator of the potential for the emergence or generation of social capital. They show that while the perception of trust is low both within and across all urban communities, differences exist across cities. These findings

"reflect a general sentiment of disenfranchisement and lack of collective solidarity not just between various groups but even among groups who share certain common attributes." Furthermore, these situations may discourage social and institutional arrangements that would generate bridging or bonding capital.

Sometimes refugees are able to overcome social mistrust by engaging in small community structures where they can build personal relationships with most, if not all, members of the community (Russell 2011; Amisi 2006). This indicates that the *size of the community* may impact on its functionality. Willems (2003) suggests that both large and small community structures have their distinct difficulties: larger ones often have internal challenges, whereas smaller ones face external difficulties. However, since the small communities are formed out of disunity in the larger community, they are assumed to provide a stronger sense of belonging for their members. In the context of forced migrants' participation in urban peacebuilding initiatives in South Africa, Anderson (2012: 16) also supports the idea of forming small-scale community structures:

> One successful approach to addressing urban realities is to break down "communities" into manageable pieces of people and groups who actually engage with one another on a regular basis. "Community" might need to be defined more specifically in this context. … Instead of trying to mobilize a highly fractured "community," these micro-communities are relatively manageable, conceivable groups of people who can respond with tangible action within their group (as opposed to broad rhetoric to reconcile insiders with outsiders). [sic]

To conclude, both the issue of trust and the size of the community play a significant role in defining the success of the "urban refugee community." As seen from the above review of existing literature on urban refugee communities, the use of the terms "community," "social networks" and "social capital" is varied and this has to some extent created confusion in working and conducting research with "urban refugee communities." Yet, it can also be argued that the different conceptualizations of these key terms in urban refugee research has created a highly interesting and varying body of literature which can contribute to a better understanding of what these terms mean for urban refugees in the low—and middle-income countries.

III. The Policymaking and Programming Analysis

This section of the analytical report will address the review objective of how to work with and through existing community structures that refugees are part of in urban environments of low—and middle-income countries. This discussion focuses on UNHCR because the organization is the key actor in refugee protection and much of the literature on community-based protection (Bakewell 2003, UNHCR 2008, UNHCR 2009, Calhoun 2010a) is accordingly produced by or focused on UNHCR. It is, however, assumed that the experiences and lessons learned by UNHCR can, at the very least, provide general orientation on these matters.

1. Community-based Policies

UNHCR's "Policy on Refugee Protection and Solutions in Urban Areas" (hereinafter the urban refugee policy) from 2009 states that one of the nine key principles of UNHCR's work with refugees and asylum seekers in towns and cities of low—and middle-income countries is "community orientation." It is stated in this widely adopted but highly context-specific policy that:

> UNHCR's approach in urban settings will be community-based. …The Office will strive to mobilize and capacitate the refugee population, so as to preserve and promote their dignity, self-esteem, productive and creative potential. … UNHCR will foster the development of harmonious relationships amongst the different refugee groups residing in the same city. Similarly, the Office will encourage refugees and their local hosts to interact in a positive manner (UNHCR 2009: 7).

A number of UNHCR policies establish "community" as a protection ideal and hold a rather romanticized idea of the role of a "community" providing protection for its members (UNHCR 2008, 2009). In these policies it is also, however, recognized that refugees in cities can find themselves without a "community" or support network (UNHCR 2008: 13), and that refugees may grow dissatisfied because their longing to form part of a community is not satisfied (UNHCR 1996: vii).

Consequently, the rationale for and success of UNCHR's community-based protection approach has been questioned (Bakewell 2003; Calhoun 2010a). Additionally, UNHCR has so far failed to conceptualize the relationship between community development and protection. It has not successfully measured the link between community development and effective programming. The organization, therefore, does not have a strong basis for investment in community development activities and is stuck in a "cycle of under-investment and under-performance in this area of work" (Calhoun 2010a: 2-3).

2. Main challenges for working with urban refugee communities

Since the majority of existing studies on urban refugees recommend humanitarian organizations to work more closely and in a better partnership with refugee communities, it can be asked: how should programming be designed and implemented in urban settings given the dynamic characteristics of cities and urban communities? In the following section, six main challenges of programming with urban refugee communities identified from the literature will be discussed. These include the 1) conceptual ambiguity, 2) lack of recognition of existing structures, 3) difficulty of defining what "support" should entail, 4) lack of understanding of the nature of cities and urban communities, 5) problems of representation and participation, and finally, 6) the challenge of conducting community outreach in urban settings. The "best practices" identified in the existing literature will be explored in relation to each challenge.

2.1. Conceptual ambiguity

Many of the challenges of working with urban refugee communities actually go back to the conceptual ambiguity of defining what a "community" in urban refugee contexts means. As seen from the earlier discussion on these conceptual challenges, academics have struggled to pin down the most suitable definitions of a "community" (Jackson 1987; Campbell 2005; Lammers 2006a, etc.).

With regard to policy-making and programming, similar conceptual challenges have risen. How UNHCR understands "community" in its urban refugee policy is particularly important, because the way in which and by whom "community" is defined affects its protection potential. The term "community" is officially defined by the UNHCR as "a group of people that recognizes itself or is recognized by outsiders as sharing common cultural, religious or other social features, backgrounds and interests, and that forms a collective identity with shared goals." Given the comprehensive nature of this definition, in its policy documents, UNHCR has referred to the concept of "community" in various ways ranging from territorial understandings of the term to nationality-based conceptualization. Because of the mixed conceptualizations and fluid use of the term "community," both in academia and in policymaking, conceptualizations of what a "community-based approach" might look like in urban contexts has been diverse. This, again, has led, in some cases, to confusion and inadequate programming.

2.2. Lack of recognition of existing structures

Often the refugee communities are perceived as "valuable" by humanitarian agencies, because of the idea that "the communities themselves provide as much of the needed social services as possible. This not only empowers the communities but also builds social capital within those communities, leading to the sustainable development of community structures" (WRC 2011d: 18). It is also recognized by humanitarian and development agencies that communities know best their needs and the most appropriate ways to address those needs and are therefore able to use resources more efficiently (Wong 2012).[24]

Yet, on the ground, humanitarian agencies do not always recognize the role of existing informal community structures and social networks (Gozdziak and Walter 2012). This may lead to a situation where humanitarian agencies initiate and establish parallel community structures (for programming purposes) which often marginalizes the organically created refugee-initiated community structures. For instance, in Nairobi where UNHCR has created an Urban Refugee Protection Network, which brings various humanitarian actors together, no community-based organizations are included in this coordination hub (Campbell, Crisp and Kiragu 2011: 34). A number of studies have, therefore, recommended that humanitarian agencies should concentrate more on reinforcing the existing informal refugee community structures. A study on Kampala recommended that humanitarian agencies and host governments should increase their engagement with refugee-initiated organizations and communities:

> The opportunity is ripe for UNHCR and host governments to work together to facilitate…the continued existence of successful refugee-initiated institutions. …If structures to help facilitate this kind of initiative were in place and effectively maintained, refugees would become social and economic assets to cities of the global South (Dryden-Peterson 2006: 391-392).

---

[24] This conviction has been the foundation for developing the Community Driven Development approach (CDD). See more on:
http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTSOCIALDEVELOPMENT/EXTCDD/0,,contentMDK:23013609~menuPK:8820441~pagePK:210058~piPK:210062~theSitePK:430161,00.html.

2.3. Difficulty of defining what "support" should entail

When humanitarian agencies have clearly recognized the need to work in cooperation with existing refugee communities and have garnered the willingness to do so, the question of what the "support" to the communities should entail emerges in practice. The nature of "support" in a given community-based approach gives rise to specific challenges and therefore impacts how the support should be delivered.

Overall, in previous studies and evaluations, it is realized that there is no one best approach to working with the urban refugee communities. Community-based approaches will have to be adapted according to the local contexts. In a number of the existing studies, it has been recommended that the humanitarian agencies, together with other actors such as government officials and NGOs, should support the existing refugee communities "structurally and institutionally, but not necessarily financially" (Dryden-Peterson 2006: 391; Jacobsen 2006) in order to avoid refugees' potential dependency. Thus, rather than financial support, agencies could, for example, conduct advocacy work for the rights of refugees to be upheld in a given city. These rights should include refugees' right to form communities in their cities of exile. According to Jacobsen (2006: 278) advocacy targeted to "enabling refugee initiatives can create an environment that increases the likelihood of refugees becoming social and economic assets to cities."

Other researchers have also supported this broader approach of "environment building," which differs in significant ways from the traditional work that humanitarian agencies have conducted in rural camp settings. This "environment building" approach in urban areas is advocated by Landau and Duponchel (2011: 17) because "UNHCR and host governments have little impact on the improvement of urban refugees' living conditions; instead informality and self-reliance are the empirical norm." Consequently, they have established that refugees need to be given political rights to achieve the environment where their rights, as part of the urban "community of strangers," can be upheld. In this "environment building" approach, it is realized that protection interventions cannot focus exclusively on refugees because this would mean creating parallel assistance structures and therefore potentially harming the refugee-host relations. The broader "environment building" will, in addition, enhance refugees initial settling into the city and also provide chances to find a de facto durable solution in urban areas.

The WRC has in numerous studies proposed to "tap into the existing community." Often these recommendations have been highly context specific according to the potential of and challenges for existing community structures and efforts. For Johannesburg (2011c), the WRC recommends that refugees' own advocacy efforts should be encouraged and more democratic means of representation should be developed. In the context of Cairo (2012b: 17), it has been suggested that humanitarian agencies initiate "inter-refugee CBO meetings to exchange information, learn from each other, identify common needs and opportunities and support each other." For Kampala, the WRC (2011a: 2) recommends that practitioners concentrate on efforts to build the capacity of and initiate income-generating activities with refugee-based associations and religious institutions. Humanitarian agencies are also advised to build linkages between Ugandan nationals and refugee communities, for example, by extending refugee services to the wider population. But existing Ugandan community-based organizations should also be encouraged by humanitarian agencies to reach out to urban refugees by extending services to them.

In order to create unity in urban contexts, supporting cooperation, typically through training and information sessions, between refugee-focused communities and local community

networks has also been recommended (Gozdziak and Walter 2012: 16). Furthermore, in contexts where refugees lack social networks, it has been proposed that humanitarian agencies and other actors could develop locally appropriate surrogates for these social networks. In practice, this may include various types of support which the network structures could provide to enhance refugees" survival and success (Landau and Duponchel 2011: 16).

2.4. Lack of understanding of the nature of cities and urban communities

Given the still prevalent "camp mentality," humanitarian agencies have struggled to adopt an "urban mindset" and to grasp the very realities of cities and urban communities in low—and middle-income countries. As demonstrated in previous studies, refugee communities, no matter how defined, are affected by "the urban characteristics of invisibility, mobility, diversity, and insecurity" (Anderson 2012: 1). Yet, the characteristics of cities and the refugee populations in them have a direct impact on how humanitarian agencies can work with the urban refugees at a community level.

For instance, Cooper (1993: 88) has come up with a rather skeptical conclusion of community-based approach not necessarily working at all given the transient nature of the refugee population in Cairo. Other studies have also shown how "business-as-usual" does not often work in the context of highly contested and fractured urban "communities" (Anderson 2012: 13). Thus, the nature of the urban setting can impact on refugees' willingness to take part in wider community action where they would be exposed to the host society and the local authorities. In many contexts, this may pose a security threat to them and refugees thus often prefer "hiding" (Landau and Duponchel 2011).

2.5. The problems of representation and participation

Another issue closely related to the very nature of urban refugee communities is the question of diversity and heterogeneity, and the need to not only address communities as such but also their members who have individual needs and aspirations. UNHCR has tried to tackle this dilemma by reinforcing its Age, Gender and Diversity Mainstreaming (AGDM) approach in urban areas. Work on this area in Nairobi has been instrumental as "UNHCR has significantly improved their relationships with the refugee community and has drawn upon resources within that community to strengthen protection" (Campbell 2010). One practical element which has led UNHCR to understand the diverse needs of and to target the most vulnerable of the refugee populations in urban settings has been the use of community-based outreach workers whose main task is to reinforce information sharing between the refugee communities and UNHCR (Campbell 2010; Crisp, Campbell and Kiragu 2010). However, the ability of a handful of outreach workers in a given city and also the potential misuse of their powerful position have been identified, among other things, as potential risks of this otherwise welcomed initiative.

The potential power-related risks associated with the use of community-based outreach workers, leads us to consider another major challenge in terms of working with the existing urban refugee communities: representation and participation. In existing scholarly literature on urban refugees, the fashionable use of terms such as "empowerment,' "community-based leadership" and "participation" by humanitarian actors, among others, has been problematized (Cooper 1993; Anderson 2012). This is because the very act of participation is often seen as a vital need in itself by the humanitarian agencies. Yet, the problems of representation and participation are often created because interventions only target "easy-to-

reach people, instead of the 'right' people." In addition, and despite their democratic appeal, participative processes face the risk of being appropriated by powerful interests. Additionally, institutions often target individuals and groups based on what they have previously done, an attitude that points to the "convenience syndrome" (Anderson 2012: 16). Those creating urban interventions also sometimes do not know how to get participants involved.

The use of elected refugee representatives, community outreach volunteers, local refugee committees or refugee counselors could pose more challenges than advantages if implemented without a deep knowledge of the power dynamics within and beyond the refugee community structures (Cooper 1993; Crisp, Campbell and Kiragu 2010). Divisions that exist within the refugee populations, often as a consequence of war and conflicts, but also due to the increased competition over scarce aid in cities, may be exacerbated by the opportunities of participation for the selected few (Cooper 1993: 87). This is illustrated by the fact that in Durban, South Africa, the Congolese community has been unable to elect a representative due to the disunity and rivalry within the refugee population. Yet, the aid delivery structures of humanitarian agencies have been further exacerbating this conflict (Amisi 2006). These difficulties associated with representation have also been recognized in the Malaysian context where there is a risk that well-organized refugee communities will have better access to services and resources than those which have not been able to establish strong community structures. In addition, there is a risk that the leaders of such communities will not be representative of the entire community: the representatives can sometimes misuse their authority. Moreover, there is a danger that the most vulnerable refugees will not take part in these community structures at all. (Crisp, Obi and Umlas 2012: 3).

With regard to good practices, particularly in the contexts where humanitarian agencies aim to support refugee communities through the "environment building" approach, Anderson (2012: 15) has suggested that there is a need for highly local structures of participation: "more 'local' means more specific: By making action more local, it is also more likely that foreigners will become involved, and can meaningfully engage in community forums." Besides promoting participation at the very local level, it has been recommended that "relevant forms of participation should seek to promote 'vernacular' [traditional or common] power structures, instead of creating what are often redundant structures for interventions that can misinterpret local power structures and dynamics" (Anderson 2012: 20). Moreover, transformation of local institutions, such as building in refugee roles on the community police forums and neighborhood street committees, has been as useful ways to promote refugees participation in wider urban community structures.

2.6. The Challenge of Conducting Community Outreach in Urban Settings

Overcoming mistrust and improving relations with refugees is an important task for humanitarian agencies in urban areas and often this challenge is approached from the question of how to do "community outreach" with the refugees in a given city. In UNHCR evaluations, the challenge of making contact with refugees has been discussed (Crisp, Riera, Janz and Samy 2009: 27). Humanitarian agencies generally understand that, in particular in urban settings "there is a danger that a 'survival of the fittest' scenario might arise, whereby the refugees who have most contact with UNHCR are not the most vulnerable." Therefore, community outreach and communications activities are seen as central elements of working with the urban refugee communities. Yet, the function of "community outreach" has to be "reoriented to address the specific challenges associated with urban areas" (Crisp, Riera, Janz and Samy 2009: 28).

In more practical terms, there seems to be a need to introduce innovative community outreach and communication methods. In cases of Jordan, Syria and Lebanon, Crisp, Riera, Janz and Samy (2009) propose that besides recruiting outreach volunteers, community centers could be established to give refugees and the hosts an opportunity to interact. Conducting sample surveys in order to enforce refugee participation in identifying their needs is also recommended. In some cases, decentralizing UNHCR offices to various locations in large cities or expanding to smaller towns where a high number of refugees are known to be living might be needed. Moreover, the need to increase the level and the quality of community communications is recognized (UNHCR 2011). Often the use of information and communication technology (ICT) is seen as a potential way to do this (Danielson 2012). By using SMS messages, interactive websites and other ICT methods, UNHCR, among other humanitarian agencies, has been able to increase and improve its communication with urban refugees.

The review has so far examined research on urban refugee communities and social capital in low—and middle-income countries. The application of theoretical concepts by these studies has been analyzed and their findings presented. These studies have also been explored to see how to work with and through community structures in order to use resources more efficiently and at the same time reinforce social capital. However, to fully appreciate the presented content, it is also necessary to relate these studies to their methodological approaches. The following section discusses the methodological approaches taken in the 26 key studies and subsequently draws conclusions for the wider academic and policy literature on urban refugees.

IV. The Methodological Analysis

This section of the analytical report focuses on examining the methodological frameworks used in previous studies for understanding urban refugee communities and social networks in low—and middle-income countries. In particular, it asks what kind of methodological approaches previous studies have taken and what can we learn from the findings of each approach. The methodological analysis presented here is limited to the 26 key studies identified for this review of literature (Annex 1)[25] but similar observations could be made for most of the existing literature on urban refugee communities and social networks in low—and middle—income countries.

In terms of methodological approaches, studies on the refugee communities and social networks in low—and middle-income countries vary significantly. The number of studies that define "community" as a social network is limited (Clark 2006; Willems 2003) and the methodological approaches of studies focused only on refugee communities or social networks differ. Often studies on "communities" have adopted qualitative in-depth approaches, whereas research on social networks have typically relied on quantitative or mixed methods, sometimes involving large sample sizes. This might be connected to the generally diverging research questions: studies about social networks frequently investigate forms of capital and factors of success, whereas those investigating "communities" often are more interested in a "sense of belonging."

---

[25] See discussion on the selection criteria on page 17.

However, in this review, refugee communities are defined as social networks and the methodological analysis of the key studies referred to in this review will be discussed jointly. In the following section, a brief overview of the methodological approaches used in the key studies are discussed with regard to the 1) research design, 2) city selection, 3) sampling, 4) data collection methods, and 5) research implementation. Willems' (2003) doctoral thesis on refugees' social networks in Dar es Salaam will be discussed in a more detailed manner at the end of this section (See Text Box 1). Her study is given special attention because it is established to be, methodologically, one of the strongest studies included in this review.

1. Research Design

A systematic literature search and an assessment of the essential readings revealed that the majority of the studies on urban refugee communities and social networks use qualitative or mixed methods (combining qualitative and quantitative analysis). Among the 26 key studies (Annex 2) comprehensively examined in this review, two applied quantitative methods[26] and eight used mixed methods. A purely qualitative methodological approach was applied in 16 studies.

Since these studies on urban refugee communities and social networks have diverse objectives, the methodological approach adopted and their relevance can only be assessed in relation to the aims of the research. Even if it has been pointed out that "while qualitative methods yield important data and analysis, they are not aimed at being generalizable" (Jacobsen 2006: 284), it is good to remember that some research does not aim to be generalizable, but rather focuses on understanding refugees' individual experiences of establishing and negotiating social networks from multiple subject positions (Lammers 2006a). Therefore, both approaches have their value; quantitative methods are valuable in obtaining comparative data to describe macro-level dynamics, whereas qualitative approach can yield in-depth understanding of individual and collective experiences. Most forms of migration/refugee research are likely to require mixed-methods approaches (Castles 2012: 31). Especially with regard to social network analysis, the use of mixed methods has provided, arguably, some of the most interesting and reliable analysis.

2. City Selection

Urban refugees studies, in general, have focused on a rather limited number of large cities, namely Cairo, Nairobi and Johannesburg (Kobia and Granfield 2009: 14), and increasingly also on Kampala, New Delhi and Amman. Also, less research has been conducted on small towns, even though the protection needs and approaches are likely to be different from those in capital cities or other major urban areas. Based on the 26 key studies focused on urban refugee communities and social networks, these more general trends found in urban refugee research are confirmed. In total, the 26 studies included data collected from 17 cities: 10 from Africa, 4 from the Middle-East, 2 from Asia and 1 from Latin America. The majority of the studies were conducted in Kampala (17%), Johannesburg (11%), Cairo (11%) and Nairobi (11%) and Amman (8%). Most of the 26 key studies have focused on refugees in one city, but some have also incorporated data from two or more cities, sometimes adopting a comparative approach between cities. In most cases the studies did not reveal why the

---

[26] These studies include Landau and Duponcel (2011) and Madhavan and Landau (2011). Even if the data used in these studies were quantitative, the arguments presented in these studies are informed by authors' extensive (participant) observation on the issues (Personal communication with Dr. Landau, December 20, 2012).

particular city/cities had been chosen as the research sites. When the choice was explained, the reasons for choosing a particular city were related to the city's strategic location as a center of forced migration in the given area. In practice, having existing institutional linkages between research institutions and relative security, among other things, also play a role.

3. Sampling

Some qualitative studies have focused on a particular case study identified as a single refugee community organization or a set of particular types of "communities" whereas other studies had the intention of comparing the experiences of migrants and natives (not explicitly identifying refugees). Several studies have applied an approach focused on comparing the experiences of different refugee nationalities in a particular city, and others have researched refugees' social networks based on a particular nationality. Given the widespread lack of data on the size of urban refugee populations in the cities and towns in low—and middle-income countries (Jacobsen and Landau 2003; Jacobsen 2006; Landau and Duponchel 2011), there is often no meaningful sampling frame, and therefore it is impossible to obtain a representative sample. Thus, many have ended up using "snowball sampling" (i.e., nonprobability sample). The problem with simple snowball sampling is, however, that it

> draws subjects from a particular segment of the community, and they are likely to be similar in certain ways— the same religious group, for example, or those who are beneficiaries of an NGO… The sample will, almost by definition, exclude those who are not part of the organization (or their friends) (Jacobsen and Landau 2003: 196).

Therefore, the samples are not representative of the entire urban refugee populations in the cities or of the broader urban populations among whom they live.

4. Data Collection Methods

Most of the studies collected primary data with refugees at the individual or household level. Some studies also incorporated a "community" approach to data collection by conducting data collection with the leaders and members of a given "community." In addition, most of the research provided a stakeholder viewpoint by collecting data with government and city officials, aid workers, NGO staff and service providers, among others. Typically studies also collected data, to different degrees, with other residents of the city for the purpose of comparing the experiences of the refugees/migrants and natives. The lack of analysis on "host society's" perspective on urban refugees has previously been criticized by Kobia and Granfield (2009: 14). Yet, the focus on refugees also differs between the studies: some studies implemented a clear "participatory and beneficiary-focused approach" whereas others had refugees included in the sample only implicitly.

The most widely used data collection methods included (structured and semi-structured) surveys and (formal/informal, structured/semi-structured/unstructured) interviews. Some of the studies also utilized focus group discussions (typically disaggregated by age and gender) and (participant) observation (in places such as refugees' homes, religious institutions, work places, public spaces, community centers and project sites). In urban settings, it is important to note that the places where data is collected can have significant implications on the security and anonymity of the refugee respondents (Macchiavello 2003). Refugees' written statements and life histories were also used in the reviewed studies, likewise published secondary data. Most of the research combined two or more data collection methods and used

data triangulation to evaluate saturation. The amount and breath of primary data collected in these studies also varied significantly. In terms of purely qualitative studies, the sample size varied between a handful of interviews typically combined with observation to hundreds of qualitative interviews with refugees. Some studies also aimed at building long-term relationships with a limited number of refugees. The sample size generally depends on a variety of factors like the purpose of the study, the available time for data collection and possible constraints, for example, with regard to the security situation in a given city.

5. Research Implementation

Besides choosing the "right" data collection methods, the ways in which research is conducted can impact on the rigor and appropriateness of the research. In most of the cases research conducted on urban refugee communities and social networks has been carried out by individual researchers or research teams. Often local research assistants with the ground level knowledge of the city and language skills have been utilized. Few of the 26 key studies (Grabska 2006; Gozdziak and Walter 2012; Davis 2012) have, however, used particular types of participatory methods which might be useful for future research. Using participatory methods means conducting research, not only "on" but also "with" urban refugees and refugee communities. In practice this means that the researcher/research team trains refugees to conduct interviews within their own communities. Participatory methodology seems to be particularly valuable for studying urban refugee communities, because it not only aims to engage with members of the studied community as "equal partners," but it can also allow building a rigorous approach to urban refugee research (Brant and Kennedy 2004).

Text Box 1: An Exemplary Methodological Approach

Willems' (2003, 2005) methodological approach in her doctoral thesis on urban refugees' social networks and communities in Dar es Salaam is examined as an example of a refugee-focused study strongly combining quantitative and qualitative methods. With regard to data collection methods, Willems' research is strong because:

1. It includes large-scale surveys with refugees and **host country nationals** considering Congolese, Burundian and Rwandese (each 100, total of 300 respondents), but also local Tanzanians (216 respondents).

2. The study takes a rigorous qualitative approach to social networks by using interviews, (partial) life histories and published materials. This is needed in order to ensure the correct interpretation and contextualization of the quantitative data.

3. It has a clear sampling framework based on three criteria: minimum of one year, maximum of ten years of residence in Dar es Salaam; recollections of life at home as an adult, that is, older than 15 years of age at the time of leaving home; leaving the home country as a forced migrant.

4. It rejects the homogenizing approach to investigating refugees' social networks by adopting three demographic parameters (nationality, gender and age). In this way the study overcomes the common difficulty of adapting social network approaches from other disciplines to refugee studies. The major weakness of social network approach is the limitations posed by the structural emphasis of network theory, which tends to decontextualize experiences and focus on the relational data (i.e., contacts, ties). Consequently, actors risk being stripped of their individualism and might be conceived only in terms of their position in relation to others (see Clark 2006).

5. The study discusses possible biases and addresses them where possible. In particular, methodological approaches that heavily rely on Western concepts and instruments are criticized. In order to avoid problems emerging from cultural biases, a "name generating approach" (of asking respondents to name the ten most important people in their lives within clearly defined time limits) and use of appropriate Swahili words in the interview guide were adopted, among other things.

V. Implications and Recommendations

The aim of this final section is to outline the review's implications for programming and propose recommendations for future urban refugee research with regard to refugee communities and social networks in the context of the low—and middle-income countries.

Implications for programming

- ***Communities should be understood as social networks***. They are flexible, dynamic and developing according to diverse interests. Aid organizations should not assume that communities are homogeneous, predetermined and static.
- ***Distinctions like nationality, age and gender should be considered when programs are planned and implemented***. Refugees' social networks and community structures can vary according to these distinctions. Attention should be paid to what characteristics of communities impact their functionality.
- ***Recognize the positive and negative sides of urban refugees' community participation and social networks.*** Programmers tend to have a naïve understanding of social networks, often romanticizing "communities" as being democratic, fair and equal. Power relations have to be understood in order to avoid reinforcing existing patterns of dominance and exclusion. Participative approaches can actually put refugees at risk. A balanced understanding of social networks is necessary for designing programs that build on the positive elements and mitigate the negative effects.
- ***Design sustainable community-based interventions.*** Initiating and maintaining unsustainable community structures has to be avoided. If given, financial support should extend over longer time periods, or be channeled to initiate sustainable income-generating projects.
- ***Create the right politico-legal conditions so that social networks can thrive***. Advocacy efforts should strive to enable refugees to form communities in their cities of exile. Efforts should also be made to support these communities to become part of the larger urban structures so that refugee communities can benefit the urban population at large, and vice versa.
- ***Recognize that not all refugees are part of urban communities, and therefore, develop ways to reinforce other refugees' social networks***. Those unable or unwilling to take part in community activities should not be excluded from future programming efforts with urban refugees. Even though it is often best to tap into existing community structures, when appropriate, particular types of community structures could be initiated by humanitarian agencies for those refugees who are not yet part of existing structures. These could include, for example, culturally appropriate forms of support groups where refugees with similar experiences or life situations could come together for mutual support.
- ***Build social cohesion and trust in urban communities through providing meaningful ways of participation, conducting more effective outreach and organizing socio-cultural and recreational activities.*** These measures have been found to reinforce communities without provoking unrealistic expectations towards the implementing organizations. The approach could also reinforce trust, which is often lacking, between refugees and humanitarian organizations.
- ***Create places for meeting and mixing.*** The importance of creating places where people can meet cannot be overstated in the context of mixed and broken

communities of urban areas in low—and middle—income countries. Aid organizations should reflect on how to create and sustain such spaces (e.g., neighborhood centers).

- *Recognize that manageable community structures may provide more opportunities for regular interaction of its members.* Larger community structures risk being highly fractured and dysfunctional and should not be artificially sustained.
- *Capitalize on religious institutions and the organizations associated with them.* As many refugees are part of a faith community or religious institution, innovative ways of working with and through the local faith-based organizations, churches and mosques are needed.

Recommendations for future research

- *Conduct more research on taken-for-granted concepts.* Rethinking and clarifying terms like "community" is necessary in order to strengthen programmatic interventions.
- *Direct more research towards understanding and measuring "trust."* The issue of "trust" is central to the development of communities and can function as an indicator of community strength and potential.
- *Investigate how social capital can be built and leveraged.* Practitioners want to know how social capital can be built strategically through urban interventions. This requires a better understanding of the different forms of social capital and their linkages. In particular the concepts of "linking" and "spiritual" capital remain under-researched in urban refugee contexts. There is also a need to conduct more research on the interface between social capital and human and financial capital and how these assets can be combined and built to yield the best outcomes.
- *Investigate refugees" access to and membership in wider community structures.* Very little is currently known about refugees' participation in local communities where they can engage with the hosts and other migrants. Yet, these mixed communities could provide refugees with a sustainable means of settling into the city. In terms of programming this could mean not only focusing on working with refugee communities exclusively but also including the wider urban communities which refugees are part of.
- *Investigate how the specific experiences of refugees impact their community structures.* The specific experiences and trauma of forced migrants emerging from experiences of violence, flight and exile shape their desires for and perception of social interaction and thus the types of communities and social capital they engage and develop.
- *Build on previous research in other disciplines and contexts.* The refugee studies literature needs to consider and capitalize on the advances of research, notably in the field of development, and particularly with regard to measuring and building social capital.
- *Research the role of institutions in building refugees' social capital.* Existing research on urban refugee communities focuses on the micro-level. More research is required on how the host state and the aid agencies influence social networks of urban refugees.
- *Use mixed and participatory methods.* When feasible, more studies using mixed methods should be conducted as both qualitative and quantitative data analysis are needed in order to improve the knowledge of urban refugee communities and social

networks. Engaging refugees as partners in research leads to new perspectives, reduces cultural biases and increases acceptance of the results.

- *Generate more comparable and generalizable data.* Given the research questions asked in regards to "communities," many studies on urban refugees have a very contextual approach and concentrate on providing micro level information on a particular setting. At the same time, there is a need for more generalizable theories and findings, and therefore larger scale, mixed method studies could provide the most feasible methodological approach to generate and test theories of social capital among urban refugees.

References used

ANDERSON, J. (2012) Urban displacement and peacebuilding: an analysis of South African social cohesion interventions. *New Issues in Refugee Research*, Research Paper No. 243. UNHCR, Geneva.

AMISI B.B. (2006) An Exploration of the Livelihood Strategies of Durban Congolese Refugees. *New Issues in Refugee Research*. Working paper 123. UNHCR, Geneva.

BAKER, C. and MILES-WATSON, J. (2010) Faith and Traditional Capitals: Defining the Public Scope of Spiritual and Religious Capital—A Literature Review. *Implicit Religion*, 13 (1): 17-69.

BAKEWELL, O. (2003) Community services in refugee aid programmes: a critical analysis. *New Issues in Refugee Research*, Working Paper No. 82. UNHCR, Geneva.

BETTS, A., LUIS, B. and Omata, N. (2012) Humanitarian Innovation and refugee protection. *Refugee Studies Centre Working Paper Series,* No. 85. RSC, Oxford.

BONFIGLIO, A. (2010) Learning outside the classroom: non-formal refugee education in Uganda. *New Issues in Refugee Research*, Research Paper No. 193. UNHCR, Geneva.

BOURDIEU, P. (1986) *The forms of capital*. In J. Richardson (Ed.) Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education (New York, Greenwood), 241-258.

BRIANT, N. and KENNEDY, A. (2004) An Investigation of the Perceived Needs and Priorities Held by African Refugees in an Urban Setting in a First Country of Asylum. *Journal of Refugees Studies*, 17 (4): 437-459.

CALHOUN, N. (2010a) UNHCR and community development: a weak link in the chain of refugee protection? *New Issues in Refugee Research*, Research Paper No. 191. UNHCR, Geneva.

___ (2010b) With a little help from our friends: a participatory assessment of social capital among refugees in Jordan. *New Issues in Refugee Research*. Research Paper No. 189. UNHCR, Geneva.

CAMPBELL, E. (2005) Formalizing the informal economy: Somali refugee and migrant trade networks in Nairobi. *Global Migration Perspectives* No. 47. Global Commission on International Migration, Geneva.

___ (2006) *Refugee protection challenges in the era of globalization: The case of Nairobi.* Doctoral dissertation. State University of New York, New York.

___ (2010) *Age, Gender and Diversity Mainstreaming initiative key to urban protection*. Refugees International.

CAMPBELL, E., CRISP, J. and KIRAGU, E. (2011) *Navigating Nairobi. A review of the implementation of UNHCR's urban refugee policy in Kenya's capital city*. UNHCR, Geneva.

CASTLES, S. (2012) Methodology and Methods: Conceptual Issues, 15-36. In Berriane, M. and de Haas, H. (eds.) *African Migrations Research. Innovative Methods and Methodologies*. Africa World Press, London.

CLARK, C. (2006) *Beyond borders: political marginalisation of Congolese young people in Uganda*. D.Phil. Thesis, QEH, Department of International Development, University of Oxford, Oxford.

COLEMAN, J. S. (1988) Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital. *American Journal of Sociology,* 94: S95-S120.

COOPER, D. (1993) *A needs assessment of the Ethiopian and Eritrean refugee populations in Cairo*. Report to the Ford Foundation, Cairo. American University of Cairo, Cairo.

CRISP, J., OBI, N. and UMLAS, L. (2012) *But when will our turn come? A review of the implementation of UNHCR's urban refugee policy in Malaysia*. UNHCR, Geneva.

CRISP, J., RIERA, J., JANZ, J. and SAMY, S. (2009) Surviving in the city. A review of UNHCR's operation for Iraqi refugees in urban areas of Jordan, Lebanon and Syria. UNHCR, PDES, Geneva.

DANIELSON, N. (2012) Urban Refugee Protection in Cairo: the role of communication, information and technology. *New Issues in Refugee Research*. Research Paper No. 236. UNHCR, Geneva.

DAVIS, R. (2012) *Urban Refugees in Amman, Jordan*. ISIM, Georgetown University Press, Georgetown.

DRYDEN-PETERSON, S. (2006). "I Find Myself as Someone Who is in the Forest": Urban Refugees as Agents   of Social Change in Kampala, Uganda. *Journal of Refugee Studies* 19 (3): 381-395.

FERRIS, E.G., (2011) *The Politics of Protection. The limits of humanitarian action*. Bookings Institution Press, Washington, DC.

FORCED MIGRATION REVIEW (2011) *The Technology Issue* (38), FMR, Oxford.

GOZDZIAK, E. M. and WALTER, A. (2012*) Urban Refugees in Cairo*. ISIM, Georgetown University, Georgetown.

GRABSKA, K. (2006) Marginalization of Urban Spaces of the Global South: Urban Refugees in Cairo. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 19 (3): 287-307.

GRANOVETTER, M.S. (1973) The Strength of Weak Ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78 (6): 1360-1380.

HARRISS, J. (2002) *Depoliticising development: the World Bank and Social Capital*. Anthem Press, London.

HYNES, P. (2009) Contemporary Compulsory Dispersal and the Absence of Space for the Restoration of Trust. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 22 (1): 97-121.

HYNES, T. (2003) The Issue of "trust" or "mistrust" in research with refugees: choices, caveats and considerations for researchers. *New Issues in Refugee Research*. Working paper 98. UNHCR, Geneva.

JACKSON, B. (1987) *The Role of Associations in the Adaptation of Refugees in an Urban Environment. The Case of Ethiopians in Khartoum*. BA dissertation, School of Geography, University of Oxford.

JACOBSEN, K. (2006) Refugees and Asylum Seekers in Urban Areas: A Livelihood Perspective. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 19 (3): 273-286.

JACOBSEN, K. and LANDAU, L. (2003) The Dual Imperative in Refugee Research: Some Methodological and Ethical Considerations in Social Science Research on Forced Migration. *Disasters*, 27 (3): 185 206.

KOBIA, K. and GRANFIELD, L. (2009) Literature Review: Urban Refuges. Refugees Branch, Citizenship and Immigration Canada. Online at: <http://www.unhcr.org/4b0a528c9.pdf> (Accessed 28.11.2012).

LAMMERS, E. (2006a) *War, Refuge and Self. Solders, Students and Artists in Kampala, Uganda.* PhD thesis. Thela Thesis, Amsterdam.

___ (2006b). Community and Individual in the Aftermath of War: Perspectives from African Philosophy. *Social Identities*, 11 (6): 607-629.

LANDAU, L.B. and DUPONCHEL, M. (2011) Laws, Policies, or Social Position? Capabilities and the Determinants of Effective Protection in Four African Cities. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 24 (1): 1-22.

MACCHIAVELLO, M. (2003) *Urban Forced Migrants in Kampala: Methodologies and Ethical and Psychological issues*. Paper presented at the Workshop "Research on Refugees in Urban Settings: Methods and Ethics," American University of Cairo, Egypt.

MADHAVAN, S. and LANDAU, L. (2011) Bridges to Nowhere: Hosts, Migrants, and the Chimera of Social Capital in Three African Cities. *Population and Development Review*, 37 (3): 473-497.

MEAGHER, K. (2010) *Identity Economics. Social Networks and the Informal Economy in Nigeria*. African Issues. James Currey, New York.

MONTEMAGGI, F. (2011) The Enchanting Dream of "Spiritual Capital." *Implicit Religion*, 14 (1): 67-86.

NEWHOUSE, L. (2012) *Urban attractions: returnee youth, mobility, and the search for a future in South Sudan's regional towns*. New Issues in Refugee Research, Research Paper No. 22. UNHCR, Geneva.

NZAYABINO, V. (2010) The role of refugee-established churches in integrating forced migrants: a case study of World Life Assembly in Yeoville, Johannesburg. HTS Theological Studies, 66 (1): 1-9.

OMATA, N. (2012) *Refugee Livelihoods and the Private Sector: Ugandan case study*. Working Paper, Refugee Studies Centre, University of Oxford, Oxford.

PAVANELLO, S., ELHAWARY, S. and PANTULIANO, S. (2010) *Hidden and exposed: Urban refugees in Nairobi, Kenya*. Humanitarian Policy Group, Working Paper, March 2010. HGP, London.

PORTES, A. (1998) Social Capital: Its Origins and Application in Modern Sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24: 1-24.

PUTNAM, R. (2000) *Bowling Alone. The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. Simon & Schuster, New York

PUTNAM, R.D., LEONARDI, R. and NANETTI, R.Y. (1993) *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*, Princeton University Press.

RUSSELL, A. (2011) Home, music and memory for the Congolese in Kampala. *Journal of Eastern African Studies*, 5 (2): 294-312.

SOMMERS, M. (2001a) *Fear in Bongoland. Burundi Refugees in Urban Tanzania.* Refugee and Forced Migration Studies, Vol. 8, Berghahn Books, New York, Oxford.

___ (2001b) Young, Male and Pentecostal: Urban Refugees in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. *Journal of Refugee Studies* 14 (4): 347-370.

STAWSKI, H. (2012) South-South Faith-Based Humanitarianism: Understanding the Social and Spiritual Capital of Local Faith Communities. Workshop presentation. Summary included in Pacitto, J. (2012) *South-South humanitarianism in contexts of forced displacement.* 6th October 2012, Refugee Studies Centre, University of Oxford, Oxford.

TARROW, S. (1996) Making Social Science Work Across Space and Time: A Critical Reflection on Robert Putnam's Making Democracy Work. *American Political Science Review,* 90 (2):   389-396.

UNHCR (1996) *Urban Refugees. A Community-based Approach*. Community Service Guidelines. UNHCR, Geneva.

___ (2008) *A Community-Based Approach in UNHCR Operations*. UNHCR, Geneva.

___ (2009) *UNHCR policy on refugee protection and solutions in urban areas*. UNHCR, Geneva.

WILLEMS, R. (2003) *Embedding the refugee experience: Forced Migration and Social Networks in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Florida.

___ (2005) Coping with Displacement: Social Networking among Urban Refuges in an East African Context. In Ohta, I. and Gebre, Y. D. (eds.) *Displacement Risk in Africa. Refuges, Resettlers and Their Host Population*. Kyoto University Press, Kyoto.

WONG, S. (2012) *What have been the Impacts of World Bank Community-Driven Development Programs? CDD Impact Evaluation review and Operational and Research Implications*. The World Bank, Washington.

WRC (Women's Refugee Commission) (2011a) *The Living Ain´t Easy. Urban refugees in Kampala*. WRC, New York.

___ (2011b) *Dawn in the City. Guidance for Achieving Urban Refugee Self-reliance*. WRC, New York.

___ (2011c) *No Place to Go But Up. Urban Refugees in Johannesburg, South Africa.* WRC, New York.

___ (2011d) *Bright Lights, Big City. Urban Refugees Struggle to Make a Living in New Delhi.* WRC, New York.

___ (2012a) *Arrested Development: Colombian Youth in Panama*. WRC, New York.

___ (2012b) *Shifting Sands. Risk and Resilience among Refugee Youth in Cairo.* WRC, New York.

ZETTER, R., GRIFFITS, D. and SIGONA, N. (2005) Social Capital or Social Exclusion? The Impact of asylum seeker dispersal on UK refugee community organizations. *Community Development Journal*, 40 (2): 169-181.

Annexes

Annex 1. The 26 key Studies

1. **AMISI**, B.B. (2006) An Exploration of the Livelihood Strategies of Durban Congolese Refugees. *New Issue in Refugee Research*. Working paper 123. UNHCR, Geneva.
2. **BONFIGLIO**, A. (2010) Learning outside the classroom: non-formal refugee education in Uganda. *New Issues in Refugee Research*, Research Paper No. 193. UNHCR, Geneva.
3. **CALHOUN**, N. (2010b) With a little help from our friends: a participatory assessment of social capital among refugees in Jordan. *New Issues in Refugee Research*. Research Paper No. 189. UNHCR, Geneva.
4. **CAMPBELL**, E. (2006) *Refugee protection challenges in the era of globalization: The case of Nairobi.* Doctoral dissertation. State University of New York, New York.
5. **CAMPBELL, E., CRISP, J. and KIRAGU, E**. (2011) *Navigating Nairobi. A review of the implementation of UNHCR's urban refugee policy in Kenya's capital city*. UNHCR, Geneva.
6. **CLARK**, C. (2006) *Beyond borders: political marginalisation of Congolese young people in Uganda*. D.Phil. Thesis, QEH, Department of International Development, University of Oxford, Oxford.
7. **COOPER**, D. (1993) *A needs assessment of the Ethiopian and Eritrean refugee populations in Cairo*. Report to the Ford Foundation, Cairo. American University of Cairo, Cairo.
8. **CRISP, J., OBI, N. and UMLAS**, L. (2012) *But when will our turn come? A review of the implementation of UNHCR's urban refugee policy in Malaysia*. UNHCR, Geneva.
9. **CRISP, J., RIERA, J., JANZ, J. and SAMY, S**. (2009) Surviving in the city. A review of UNHCR's operation for Iraqi refugees in urban areas of Jordan, Lebanon and Syria. UNHCR, PDES, Geneva.
10. **DAVIS**, R. (2012) *Urban Refugees in Amman, Jordan*. ISIM, Georgetown University Press, Georgetown.
11. **DRYDEN**-**PETERSON**, S. (2006). "I Find Myself as Someone Who is in the Forest": Urban Refugees as Agents of Social Change in Kampala, Uganda. *Journal of Refugee Studies* 19 (3): 381-395.
12. **GOZDZIAK**, E. M. and **WALTER**, A. (2012*) Urban Refugees in Cairo*. ISIM, Georgetown University, Georgetown.
13. **GRABSKA**, K. (2006) Marginalization of Urban Spaces of the Global South: Urban Refugees in Cairo. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 19 (3): 287-307.
14. **JACKSON**, B. (1987) *The Role of Associations in the Adaptation of Refugees in an Urban Environment. The Case of Ethiopians in Khartoum*. BA dissertation, School of Geography, University of Oxford.
15. **LAMMERS**, E. (2006a) *War, Refuge and Self. Solders, Students and Artists in Kampala, Uganda.* PhD thesis. Thela Thesis, Amsterdam.
16. **LANDAU**, L.B. and **DUPONCHEL**, M. (2011) Laws, Policies, or Social Position? Capabilities and the Determinants of Effective Protection in Four African Cities. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 24 (1): 1-22.
17. **MADHAVAN**, S. and **LANDAU**, L. (2011) Bridges to Nowhere: Hosts, Migrants, and the Chimera of Social Capital in Three African Cities. *Population and Development Review*, 37 (3): 473-497.
18. **NZAYABINO**, V. (2010) The role of refugee-established churches in integrating forced migrants: a case study of World Life Assembly in Yeoville, Johannesburg. HTS Theological Studies, 66 (1): 1-9.
19. **RUSSELL**, A. (2011) Home, music and memory for the Congolese in Kampala. *Journal of Eastern African Studies*, 5 (2): 294-312.
20. **SOMMERS**, M (2001a) *Fear in Bongoland. Burundi Refugees in Urban Tanzania.* Refugee and Forced Migration Studies, Vol. 8, Berghahn Books, New York, Oxford.
21. **WILLEMS**, R. (2003) *Embedding the refugee experience: Forced migration and Social networks in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Florida.
22. **WRC (Women's Refugee Commission)** (2011a) *The Living Ain´t Easy. Urban refugees in Kampala*. WRC, New York.
23. ___ (2011c) *No Place to Go But Up. Urban Refugees in Johannesburg, South Africa.* WRC, New York.
24. ___ (2011d) *Bright Lights, Big City. Urban Refugees Struggles to Make a Living in New Delhi.* WRC, New York.
25. ___ (2012a) *Arrested Development: Colombian Youth in Panama.* WRC, New York.
26. ___ (2012b) *Shifting Sands. Risk and Resilience among Refugee Youth in Cairo.* WRC, New York.

Annex 2. The Methodological Approaches of the 26 Key Studies

Nr	City/Country	Author(s)	Informants	Data collection methods	Research design
1	Durban/ South Africa	**AMISI (2006)**	Congolese refugees	Participant observation, 30 structured and unstructured interviews, purposive sampling, descriptive analysis with socio-economic data	Qualitative
2	Two refugee settlements and Kampala/ Uganda	**BONFIGLIO (2010)**	Sudanese, Congolese, Rwandan, Burundian refugees, refugee-assisting organizations and government personnel	98 semi-structured interviews and 10 focus group discussions with refugees and 11 semi-structured interviews with refugee-assisting organizations and government personnel	Qualitative
3	Amman/ Jordan	**CALHOUN (2010)**	Iraqi, Somali and Sudanese refugees	Methodology is based upon the World Bank's Social Capital Assessment Tool (mixed methods), 31 focus groups discussions with 304 refugees, community visits, key informant interviews with 10 respected leaders/community activists	Mixed
4	Nairobi/ Kenya	**CAMPBELL (2006)**	Somali, Ethiopian, Congolese, Burundian, Rwandan, Ugandan and Sudanese refugees	150 formal, informal, structured and unstructured interviews with refugees, participant observation, semi-structured survey interviews, statistical data, institutional literature	Mixed
5	Nairobi/ Kenya	**CAMPBELL, CRISP and KIRAGU (2011)**	Refugees, asylum seekers and other residents in their local communities, UNHCR staff, other UN agencies, national and local government officials, the security services, judiciary and public service providers, as well as NGO and civil society representatives	Face-to-face and telephone interviews as well as e-mail exchanges with relevant staff in UNHCR headquarters and the field + 10-day mission to Nairobi, where discussions were held with a diverse range of stakeholders, review of program documents and other relevant literature	Qualitative
6	Kampala/ Uganda	**CLARK (2006)**	Congolese refugees	Observation, semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions, written statements and life histories with young Congolese refugees, research population of approximately 400, long-term relationships with 50 Congolese young people, about 15 of whom in each research location key research subjects, snowball sampling	Qualitative
7	Cairo/Egypt	**COOPER (1993)**	Ethiopian and Eritrean refugees	Survey of 500 refugees, interviews also with refugees and others (NGOs, officials, etc.)	Mixed
8	Kuala Lumpur, Klang Valley, Penang/ Malaysia	**CRISP, OBI and UMLAS (2012)**	Refugees and asylum seekers, UNHCR staff members, NGO and civil society representatives, the security services and other relevant stakeholders	Discussions, informal interviews and focus group discussions, visits to refugee schools, livelihoods programs, community centers, medical facilities and a detention center	Qualitative
9	Aleppo and Damascus/ Syria; Amman/ Jordan; Beirut/ Lebanon	**CRISP, RIERA, JANZ and SAMY (2009)**	Iraqi refugees, UNHCR, UN and NGO staff members, national and local government personnel, as well as representatives of the media and academia	Participatory and beneficiary-focused approach, based on the principle of age, gender and diversity mainstreaming (AGDM), large number of individual, household and focus group discussions with refugee women, men, boys and girls; visits to many refugee homes, neighborhoods and community centers	Qualitative
10	Amman/ Jordan	**DAVIS (2012)**	Iraqi refugees, locals, local NGOs, INGOs, UN employees and officials and employees of the Government of Jordan	A comparative study with other refugee and non-refugee populations in urban settings; 167 interviews, focus groups and discussions with refugees and stakeholders, site visits, review of secondary sources, 90 household interviews with Iraqi refugees, 10 interviews with other refugees, 30 interviews with Palestinians and Jordanian citizens and 6 interviews with Palestinians without Jordanian citizenship; trained refugees to be interviewers	Qualitative
11	Kampala/ Uganda	**DRYDEN-PETERSON (2006)**	Refugee and national community leaders, district-level and educational officials, refugee and national children, teachers,	Part of a multi-site, three-year longitudinal study; 37 interviews, classroom observations (23 lessons), household survey	Mixed

			families of all participant pupils		
12	Cairo and Alexandria/ Egypt	**GRABSKA (2006)**	Sudanese refugees (with and without status + small Egyptian sample), service providers, UNHCR staff	8 Sudanese research assistants, purposeful and snowball sampling; 270 households of Sudanese refugees in Cairo and Alexandria and 10 households of Egyptians living in one of the slum areas of Cairo were visited several times, both qualitative data (through observation and in-depth interviews) and quantitative data (questionnaires) was collected	Mixed
13	Cairo/ Egypt	**GOZDZIAK and WALTER (2012)**	Refugees, stakeholders, nationals	79 interviews, snowball sampling; community-based participatory research methodology, whereby the research team trained refugees to conduct interviews within their own communities	Qualitative
14	Khartoum/ Sudan	**JACKSON (1987)**	Ethiopian refugees (members and non-members of associations), representatives of associations, Sudanese officials, aid workers and UN staff, Sudanese Khartoum residents and Sudanese academic contacts	Questionnaire survey with 60 refugees, formal and informal interviews, published data	Mixed
15	Kampala/ Uganda	**LAMMERS (2006)**	Mostly Sudanese and Congolese young refugee men	Written notes, interview transcripts and testimonies from 110 refugees; eight individuals became the protagonists	Qualitative
16	Johannesburg/ South Africa, Maputo/ Mozambique, Nairobi/ Kenya, Lubumbashi /DRC	**LANDAU and DUPONCHEL (2011)**	Foreigners (some Mozambican, mostly Somalis, Rwandans, Sudanese and Congolese, nationals	Survey of 2,805 people (60 percent of whom were inter—national migrants) Excluded those that had lived on site for more than ten years which reduced the sample to 2,469 (67 percent non-nationals)	Quantitative
17	Johannesburg/ South Africa, Maputo/ Mozambique, Nairobi/Kenya	**MADHAVAN and LANDAU (2011)**	Various categories of migrants (some Mozambicans, mostly Congolese, Rwandans, Somalis, and Sudanese) and hosts	2,211 interviews, oversampling of the foreign-born population to compensate for their relative scarcity; measured trust	Quantitative
18	Johannesburg/ South Africa	**NZAYABINO (2010)**	Members of the church, including refugees from the DRC, Angola and Ivory Coast; South African citizens	20 unstructured, face-to-face, in-depth interviews	Qualitative
19	Kampala/ Uganda	**RUSSELL (2011)**	Congolese refugees	No explanation provided, except that the article based on his MSc thesis	Qualitative
20	Dar es Salaam/ Tanzania	**SOMMERS (2001a)**	Burundian refugee men and their families, Pentecostal pastors, young Tanzanian migrants, Burundi refugee leaders, missionaries, humanitarian agencies, government officials	Interviews, snowball sample, participant observation	Qualitative
21	Dar es Salaam/ Tanzania	**WILLEMS (2003)**	Congolese, Burundi and Rwandan refugees, nationals, government officials, UNHCR, national agencies	Refugee survey (300), national survey (216), interviews, secondary documents, narratives, interviews, life histories, focus groups and participant observation	Mixed
22	Kampala/ Uganda	**WRC (2011a)**	Congolese, Somali and Burundi refugees (individuals, households, businesses), urban poor, service providers, city officials,	Interviews and focus groups with 281 people, participant observations, semi-structured discussions, household interviews, project site visits; snowball sampling	Qualitative
23	Johannesburg/ South	**WRC (2011c)**	Forced migrants, poor black South Africans, service providers, private sector firms and advocacy	Interviews (240); two main sources of data: 1) Desk research and data collected from two extensive household surveys conducted by the African Centre	Mixed

	Africa		organizations, donors, representatives of NGOs, service providers, UN officials and community leaders	for Migration and Society (ACMS) at the University of the Witwatersrand, 2) qualitative data (focus groups, semi-structured discussions, individual interviews, key informant interviews, project site visits	
24	New Delhi/ India	**WRC (2011d)**	Burmese, Hindu Sikh Afghan, ethnic Afghan and Somali refugees; employers; service providers	Consultations with 356 refugees, 13 focus group discussions, 48 household interviews, 15 refugee-run businesses and 10 refugee employers visited, service provider interviews, programs visits	Qualitative
25	Panama City/ Panama	**WRC (2012a)**	Registered and unregistered young Colombian displaced persons, poor Panamanian youth, government officials, service providers, private sector firms and advocacy organizations, donors, representatives of NGOs, service providers	135 qualitative interviews, participant observations, focus groups, household interviews, key informant interview, project site visits	Qualitative
26	Cairo/ Egypt	**WRC (2012b)**	Sudanese, South Sudanese, Iraqi, Somali, Oromo from Ethiopia and Eritrean refugee youth; youth, parents, CBO leaders and psycho-social workers, representatives of organizations	42 individuals in one-on-one interviews, nine focus group discussions, a methodical review of the recent literature	Qualitative

Annex 3. Terms of Reference

Almost half of the world's 10.5 million refugees reside in urban areas, with only one-third in camps (UNHCR, 2009).[27] Urban refugees face a distinct set of challenges to their safety and livelihoods, necessitating a tailored response from governments and international agencies. However, many of the policies and interventions designed to help refugees are still based on past experiences of camp settings. As a result, much of the assistance provided to urban refugees to date has failed to adequately respond to the range of needs they face. Rising to the challenge posed by the shift to urban areas will require an improved understanding on the part of humanitarian actors and governments of the challenges facing urban refugees, their coping strategies, livelihood and survival mechanisms and their prospects for durable solutions.

In response to this challenge, the International Rescue Committee and the Women's Refugee Commission have invested in research that aims to improve the quality and impact of policy and programming that target urban refugee populations. To date, our efforts include profiling and assessment studies in Nairobi, Mae Sot and Kuala Lumpur as well as livelihoods and protection research in Kampala, Johannesburg and New Delhi. Discussing and disseminating the findings from these research initiatives is an integral part of the organizations' strategy of generating and promoting a systematic approach to continuing essential research and advocacy.

On November 15, 2012, the IRC and the WRC will convene select practitioners, technical experts and researchers for a Roundtable Discussion on Urban Refugee Research. Key participants will share their research around profiling, livelihood and protection strategies and advocacy for refugees in urban areas as distinct yet complementary ways of improving our programming and policy impact. The discussion will examine the research and its linkages to strategies for identifying and addressing the issues facing urban refugees and the urban poor and the challenges facing those who serve them. The discussion will also identify critical gaps in the broader academic and policy literature as well as opportunities and directions for future research.

Scope of Work

The purpose of this consultancy is to provide an analytical report of the key points emanating from the Roundtable discussion focusing on the most critical questions and gaps identified in urban refugee research. The report should highlight the motivations, tensions, challenges and opportunities around each of the identified points. The report will expand on these key questions, gaps or themes through a synthesis on the relevant available literature. This report will inform the development of an urban refugee research agenda within the IRC and WRC.

Objectives of the Consultancy

1. To identify the critical questions and gaps in urban refugee research that were raised in the Roundtable Discussion

---

[27] UNHCR. 2009. UNHCR policy on refugee protection and solutions in urban areas.

2. To provide recommendations for future research investment based on the identified questions/gaps and a review of the relevant literature.

Timeframe and Deliverables

1) A Roundtable Discussion Brief highlighting key questions, gaps, themes (no more than 2 pages). This will be reviewed by the consultant's supervisor(s). The brief should be based on the following questions:
   a. What are the most pertinent questions for policymakers and practitioners? Why?
   b. What are the challenges in putting policy into practice? That is, what are the gaps in implementation of existing knowledge?
   c. What are the most consistently identified gaps in knowledge on urban refugee policy or programming?
   d. What, if any, are the opportunities that have been identified for potential learning?

2) Proposal for literature review, including work plan, based on conversation with supervisor(s) to select the most promising question, gap or theme as the focus of the literature review.
   Inclusion/exclusion criteria will be defined once the area is specified. The review will focus on the following questions:
   a. What are the research hypotheses in this area?
   b. What is the current state of evidence?
   c. What should be the next steps given the needs identified in part (I) and the existing evidence?

3) An analytical report consisting of parts 1 and 2 above (no more than 30 pages).

4) A one page research brief based on the report.

The consultancy will start on November 15, 2012 and will end on December 22, 2012. After this time period only minor improvements and edits can be made.

Qualifications

1. Masters degree in Political Science or related Social Science; urban or refugee research or policy background a plus
2. Previous secondary research experience
3. Excellent written and verbal communication skills; writing sample required.