12-1-2017

Violence Against Children in Nyarugusu Refugees Camp: Reporting and Perceptions Across Generations

Erin K. Fletcher
erinkfletcher@gmail.com

Seth R. Gitter
sgitter@towson.edu

Savannah Wilhelm
swilhe2@students.towson.edu

Violence Against Children in Nyarugusu Refugees Camp: Reporting and Perceptions Across Generations [1]

Erin K. Fletcher*, Seth R. Gitter#, and Savannah Wilhelm#

Abstract

There are over two million displace children worldwide living in established refugee camps. Many of these children have escaped violent conflict in their country, but still are victims of violence within settlement camps. Little is known about the social norms around violence in these camps particularly in regards to reporting. We study this issue using a sample of over 300 child parent pairs in Nyarugusu camp in Tanzania. The camp consists of over 130,000 refugees mainly from Burundi and the Democratic Republic of Congo. We find that parents have limited acceptance of physical violence and essentially no acceptance of sexual violence against children. Parents are slightly more likely to report physical violence against their sons. Parents seem equal likely to report sexual abuse at school for boys and girls. We also use vignettes of hypothetical violent situations against children to measure social norms of parents and children's perceptions of when children will report violence. Characteristics of the situations are randomized. We find a strong relationship between parental and children's beliefs of when the hypothetical victim would report violence. We show that for both parents and children there is a belief adolescent victims will report violence in school. These results suggest that parental attitudes may influence children and that schools may be a good place for new interventions.

Key Words:
violence, children, refugees, Nyarugusu, refugee camp, Burundi, Democratic Republic of Congo

-

***** Independent e-mail: erinkfletcher@gmail.com
# Towson University: e-mail sgitter@towson.edu & swilhe2@students.towson.edu

[1] Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the International Rescue Committee (IRC) for funding the data collection for this research. The views expressed here are not necessarily those of the IRC. The protocol for this study was approved by the IRC's Institutional Review Board (IRB00009752). We would also like to thank the Towson University College of Business for Funding. All errors remain our responsibility.

Introduction

In 2015, war and persecution displaced an unparalleled 65 million people—numbers that have never been witnessed before. Over two million of these displaced persons are refugee children living in established camps. Though these children have escaped the worst of the violence, camps are not a complete safe haven as many children are vulnerable to violence from state and non-state actors as well as family members and other displaced persons. These children continue to be victims of violence, though violence tends to be less severe in refugee camps than in situations with no official protections in place for the displaced (Tyrer & Fazel 2014). Despite this assertion, there has been limited quantitative data collected on violence within these camps and even less is known about under what circumstances and to whom children are willing report violence.

To better understand the situations in which children report violence we estimate social norms, or perceived peer actions and beliefs, of parents and children using reactions to vignette based on violence typically committed against children in Nyarugusu Refugees Camp. The camp is located in Tanzania and has refugees mainly from Burundi and the Democratic Republic of Congo. At the time of the survey it housed over 130,000 refugees and was the third largest camp in the world. The survey is a broad-based survey on perceptions of violence against children of three hundred randomly selected Burundian and DRC child-parent pairs living in Nyarugusu Refugee camp.

We begin with a descriptive analysis we examine parent's responses to social norm indicators using questions about hypothetical children being hit or being the victims of mild sexual violence at school. We find that there is much more acceptance for physical punishment than sexual abuse. In particular we are interested in heterogeneity between males and females for

both adult respondent and the hypothetical adolescent victim. The literature suggests that both the gender of the adult and the adolescent victim may influence perceptions of the acceptability of violence, however our analysis does not find evidence of this for sexual abuse though there is evidence for physical abuse.

We also examine how adults and children perceive if an adolescent victim would respond to violence using vignettes. Specially, we measure the respondent's belief that the victim would report a variety of hypothetical acts of violence that are common in the camp. We use this analysis both to measure the relationship between parental and child norms and to test for differences between characteristics of the act of violence. We find a strong relationship between parental and child responses suggesting a set of shared norms.

Previous qualitative work on the Nyarugusu camp suggests that physical and sexual violence is unfortunately common (Norman and Niehaus 2015, Women's Refugee Commission 2012, and Mabuwa 2000). The International Rescue Committee operates programing in the camp that aims to prevent and respond to gender-based violence, which, coupled with other organizations, may be responsible for many residents feeling more secure than there were in their home country (Norman and Niehaus 2015). School-based violence is still relatively common with 59% of children in our sample report being hit by their peers at school, though most (80%) still feel safe at school. Evidence shows that school-based violence among Burundian children can have long-term effects, including reducing career aspirations (Jeusette et al. 2017).

Despite the clear importance of the issue we are not aware of any other quantitative surveys that measure reactions to violence within the camp. This is not surprising as collecting such sensitive data is difficult. Respondents may fear retaliation if they are asked about specific actual experiences with violence. Refugees are also less likely to report violence particularly due

to barriers such as language, familiarity with who to report to, fear of officials and being deported (Freedman 2016). In order to elicit information about norms without putting the respondent in danger or bringing up traumatic experiences we use situational vignettes. In a previous paper with the same data set (Fletcher et al. 2017) we find that children were more likely to believe that a hypothetical adolescent victim would report violence that took place in school. Interestingly we found no differences in beliefs on the probability of reporting violence based on the gender of the respondent or victim. This paper extends the previous paper by measuring parental norms and testing their relation to children's beliefs. Similar vignettes have been used to explore other sensitive topics such as domestic violence (Aviram & Persinger, 2012), stigmatized lifestyle choices (Velleman et al., 1993), electing corrupt officials (Bannerjee et al., 2014), and drug use (Hughes, 1998), though we are not aware of vignettes that link parent and child responses.

This paper makes three contributions that have the potential to influence policy particularly for the important job of maintaining child safety in refugee camps. Our first contribution is we quantitatively measure adults' perceptions about violence against children in and around schools. In this paper we find in our survey of parents greater tolerance for physical violence such as corporal punishment or bullying than sexual-based violence. Second, we demonstrate a strong link between parents' and their children's perception of norms around reporting. Finally, we show that both adult males and females have similar perceptions about the norms around reporting violence and these norms are not substantially influenced by the gender of the child. This result is consistent with our finding in the previous paper (Fletcher et al. 2017) for children though runs counter to the literature that suggests that men and women may have different norms around violence and further heterogeneity is found based on the victim's gender.

In the next section we discuss in further detail the literature related to violence and social norms. We then shift our focus in the third section to Nyarugusu camp and provide a brief summary of the conflicts that occurred in the refugee's home countries of Burundi and DRC. In the fourth section we describe the data of the 300 child-adult pairs and include a descriptive analysis. Section five describes our econometric approach and section six the results using the vignettes randomization to estimate the relationship between parent and child as well as gender. Finally, in the seventh and concluding section we discuss limitations of the study, provide policy recommendations focused on increasing school based reporting and potential areas for future research that measure program effectiveness at addressing these norms.

Section II: Literature Review

Violence from civil wars including those in Burundi and the DRC has been shown to have negative long-term impacts on children's health and schooling. Bundervoet et al. (2009) and Verwimp & Van Bavel (2013) show that both children's health and schooling was reduced in areas with greater violence from the civil war in Burundi. Jeusette et al. (2017), using a sample of children in Burundi, shows domestic and school-based violence reduces children's aspirations to leave agriculture for better economic opportunities. In the DRC Kandala et al. (2011) and Lingskog (2016) show civil war increased malnutrition and child mortality. Refugees fleeing this violence likely face better conditions in camps like Nyarugusu. In an assessment of the camp using qualitative interviews Norman and Niehuus (2015) suggest that respondents report feeling safer than in their home country despite the fact that they face some violence in the camp.

One of the most valuable insights this study can potentially provide surrounds the impact of intergenerational transfer of violence and perceptions or attitudes. Intergenerational transmission refers to the transfer of individual abilities, traits, behaviors and outcomes from parents to their children (Lochner 2008). Family units are a primary socializing institution, providing guidance

or readily available “scripts” for how children should behave (Black, Sussman, & Unger 2009). A systematic review of the evidence, Thornberry et al (2012), found that child victims of violence, are more likely to perpetrate violence as adults and are more likely to be victims of violence though the causal link is often weak in studies. Crombach, A., & Bambonyé (2015) found mothers in Burundi who were victims of violence were more likely to also use violence on their own children. Because we do not observe direct victimization or perpetration of violence in this survey, we envision the evidence here for intergenerational transmission of trust—here defined in terms of willingness to trust officials enough to report to them—for which there is existing evidence (Dohem et al., 2011). This study focuses on the intergenerational transfer of beliefs and perceptions of violence from parent refugees to their children.

Perceptions of men and women around violence may differ due to experience with violence. Stark and Landis (2016) in a review of violence in conflict areas find that generally boys are more likely to experience physical violence and girls sexual violence. In the DRC one study found over one third of adolescent girls had been beaten and one in five had been sexually abused in the last year (Stark et al. 2017). Given the more recent nature of the civil war in Burundi parallel data is to our knowledge unavailable. Dijkman et al (2014) summarize two survey given in Burundi in 2002 and 2005 well before more recent violence described showing roughly one-quarter of women had experienced violence.

Across sub-Saharan African women have generally been more likely to be the victims of violence at school and in the home. Leach (2006) in a mixed-methods study of Zimbabwe, Ghana and Malawi found girls were much more likely to be victims of violence in schools. La Mattina (2017) found that women married after the 1994 genocide in Rwanda experienced more domestic violence, while Horn et al (2014) in focus groups found a link between civil war and

domestic violence in Sierra Leone and Liberia. In Uganda nearly half of women report being victims of domestic violence and 40% of husbands admit being a perpetrator this may be a result of social norms where three-quarters of women and half of men report having positive attitudes toward domestic violence (Speizer 2010).

Asking children and adults direct questions about the violence they have experienced and their likelihood to report is problematic. First, respondents could face fears of retaliation and may underreport their experiences. Second, this would only measure the perceptions of victims and not those of others. In this case we are interested in social norms of the entire population. In order to elicit these beliefs we use vignettes, which are short hypothetical stories about a violent situation that is realistic but non-threating. Vignettes have been used to examine a wide range of sensitive topics including domestic violence (Aviram & Persinger, 2012), stigmatized lifestyle choices (Velleman et al., 1993), electing corrupt officials (Bannerjee et al., 2014), and drug use (Hughes, 1998). Like Banerjee et al. (2014) we randomize parts of the scenario to explore relationships, in our case between the characteristics of the violence including the victim, location and perpetrator.

Section III: Nyarugusu Refugee Camp and Data Description

The data originate from Nyarugusu refugees camp in Tanzania, which in 2015 was the third largest refugee camp in the world (Lombardo & Wheeler, 2016). The camp is overcrowded, hosting nearly 130,000 refugees in 2015, double its intended capacity (UNHCR 2016). The camp consists primarily of refugees from the Democratic Republic of Congo and from Burundi. There are roughly equal numbers of refugees from both countries. Those from the DRC have been in

the camp on average over a decade, with many having spent up to twenty years in Tanzanian camps, in our sample, while those from Burundi came to the camp within a year of the survey.

Refugees from both the DRC and Burundi escaped extreme violence occurring in their home country. From 1998 to 2007 there were roughly half a million deaths per year in the DRC due to conflict (UNHCR, 2014). Many citizens of the DRC fled the country to escape the fighting, but have been unable to return home as the violence has subsided. There were two major surges of refugees from the DRC to Tanzania: the first in 1996; and the second one occurring from 2002-2005 (UNHCR, 2014).

The most recent conflict in Burundi is much newer relative to the DRC, though many refugees fleeing in 2015 were also witness to or subject to earlier civil conflicts and many Burundian refugees currently in Tanzania have earlier stints in camps (Schwartz 2017). Political violence began in 2015 as the head of state Pierre Nkurunziza announced his intention to stand for a controversial third term. In 2015, Nyarugusu's population doubled with record numbers fleeing violence in Burundi that included abduction, extrajudicial killings, and torture stemming from political uncertainty (International Rescue Committee, 2016). In September 2016, the number of refugees fleeing from human rights atrocities in Burundi surpassed 300,000 (UNHCR, 2016).

Though conditions are a substantial improvement in the camp over the countries the refugees have fled, focus group interviews conducted as part of qualitative work suggest violence is still present in the camp. Focus groups and key informant interviews conducted by the researchers working with IRC protection programs found high levels of gender-based and sexual violence (Norman and Niehaus 2015). Similarly, the Women's Refugee Commission (2012) found that refugees from the DRC faced problem such as sexual favors in exchange for grades,

and beatings from authority figures including teachers. Further back, Mabuwa (2000) found that women were at a high risk for sexual violence and lacked of reliable reporting mechanisms in camp.

Section IV: Data Description

The data used originate from an International Rescue Committee (IRC)-funded study where one of the paper's co-authors oversaw interviews of 316 parent-child combinations in the Nyarugusu refugee camp discussed in the previous section. Sampling was stratified by country origin, so roughly equal numbers of refugees from Burundi and DRC were sampled. These data represent a unique and novel wealth of information. First, there is a lack of quantitative data coming out of the collection site, which these data address. Second, we are able to link parent and child responses. And finally, we use vignettes to elicit perceptions on a wide variety of situations.

The sampling strategy involved trained enumerators using tablets to conduct surveys around violence and social norms within the 13 zones of the camp. Enumerators then went to households based on a random walk within one of 13 zones on a given day asking to speak with one available adult in the household. These adults were screened to see if they had a child in school within the age range of seven and twelve and were willing to be interviewed, and if so then enumerators began interviews with the adult participant. After adult interviews were completed, enumerators asked to speak to one of the adult respondent's children. Enumerators then proceeded through a similar survey where they presented situational violence vignettes to the child participant. Parents were encouraged to stay within sight of the child taking the survey but were asked to give the child privacy to answer the questions without his or her parent

hearing. One limitation is that the sample was not stratified by the adult's gender so roughly two-thirds of adult respondents are female.[2] In that sense our comparison by gender can be seen as comparing males and females who would be present for an interview. The gender of the children in the survey is balanced.

In order to address our first research question on social perceptions of violence, we use adult responses to social norm markers that explored what parents believe in regards to physical and sexual violence. Adults were asked questions in regards to physical and sexual violence (See Table 1 below). The acceptance of physical violence is much higher in the community, though a majority do not believe physical violence is OK and nearly all adult respondents do not believe sexual violence is OK. One quarter of parents think a child hit by a teacher deserved it and a slightly higher percentage think it is OK. This compares to only 16% feeling the child deserved sexual assault and just 1% of women and 7% of men thinking sexual violence is OK.

Male and female adults have generally similar feelings about the social acceptability of beating and how they would respond to sexual violence against a child at school. There are some slight differences in reactions to children being beaten, with men being more likely to try to address the issue of the beating by reporting it to a school head master or dealing with it in their own family.

[2] Exact population numbers by gender in the camp are not known. Of biometrically registered refugees in March 2017, about half were male and half were female.

Table 1: Adult Responses to Violence Against Children by Adult's Gender

If a Teacher Hit a Child At School	Female Adult Respondent	Male Adult Respondent
Sad if Teacher Hit	43%	39%
Embarrassed if Teacher Hit	40%	40%
Okay if Teacher Hit	26%	32%*
Tell Police if Teacher Hit	10%	14%
Tell Headmaster if Teacher Hit	22%	34%***
Deserved if Teacher Hit	25%	25%
Handle in Family if Teacher Hit	20%	28%**
Handle in Organizations if Teacher Hit	18%	26%**
Pursue Other if Teacher Hit	13%	11%
Nothing happen if Teacher Hit	18%	20%
Sexual Abuse at School		
Sad if Sexually Abused	87%	88%
Embarrassed if Sexually Abused	64%	70%
Okay if Sexually Abused	1%	7%***
Tell Police if Sexually Abused	64%	70%
Tell Headmaster if Sexually Abused	35%	39%
Deserved if Sexually Abused	15%	17%
Handle in Family if Sexually Abused	28%	30%
Handle in Org if Sexually Abused	67%	69%
Pursue Other if Sexually Abused	14%	13%
Nothing happen if Sexually Abused	12%	12%

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1 for t-test for difference between males and females

Demographic variables such as age, education, nationality, number of children and time in camp of the respondents have the potential to influence views on violence. Given the focus of the respondent's gender and the responses we begin by comparing observable demographic characteristics of male and female adults responses (see Table 2 below). We later use these demographic variables as controls in the econometric analysis. There were two potentially

meaningful differences between the demographic aspects of 109 male and 197 female respondents 1. Adult males were 7 years older and were less likely to have only completed primary school reflecting higher levels of education. We have balance on the other observables including time in camp and number of children. It is worth noting that the time-in-camp-months variable applies only to Burundian nationals as they entered the camp within a year of the survey, while the years in camp applies only to DRC nationals, who have been in the camp on average almost nine years. We were also missing education data on roughly 10% of the sample there was no systematic difference between men and women on missing education.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics Adult Demographics

Variable	Female	Male
Age	35	42***
Burundi National	50%	50%
Did Non Complete Primary	29%	23%
Completed Primary	30%	15%***
Some Secondary	12%	13%
Secondary Completed	23%	33%
University Educated	6%	16%
Missing Education	9%	10%
Total Children	5.5	5.8
Boy Children	2.8	2.9
Girl Children	2.7	2.8
Months in Camp (If Burundi)	4.4	4.5
Years in Camp (If DRC)	8.8	9.1

T-test of difference *** p<0.01
Female n=197 Male n=109

Given the sensitive nature of questions regarding physical and sexual abuse we do no directly ask either adult or child respondents about their own or family's experience. We do know from focus groups and previous literature that both types of violence are present in the camp. In order to better understand how children may react to violence we gave both parents and children situational vignettes of violence with randomized characteristics including the victim's gender

[boy or girl] and age [6, 10 or 12], violence type [teased, hit or sexual], perpetrator [neighbor, teacher or other child] and location [school, on way to school or home] with a total of over 4,700 potential combinations. An example of a typical vignette would be “A ten year old girl was teased by a student on the way to school” or “A twelve year old boy was beaten at school by a teacher”. Each respondent received two unique, randomly selected vignettes. The child’s vignette was not necessarily the same as their parent’s.

Following the vignettes both children and adults are asked if they believe the victim would report the violence and to which particular people. We use this perception of beliefs of what other children would do as a measure of social norms. Specifically we focus on if the respondent believes victim would report the incident to an official (e.g. head master, medical professional, teacher, or police). We find that adults believe the adolescent victim of the violence would report to an official on average 77% of the time, compared to children that believe it would be reported to an official only 67% of the time.

One key research question is the relationship between parent and their child’s beliefs. We find that a positive relationship between the probability of a parent believing the vignette victim would report and the child’s beliefs. Roughly half (53%) of cases the parent believed the victim would report in both vignettes they received, in this case 77% of those children believed the victim would report in each vignette. In the 39% of cases where the adult only believed one out of the two vignettes the victim would report their children reported 60% of the time compared to 50% of the time for the 8% of cases where the adult said they did not believe the victim would report either time. The relationship between parental and child responses illuminate the possible intergenerational transmission of violence perceptions within the population. The ability to link parents’ responses to that of their children allows us to see how parents’ perceptions of violence

may be exerting an influence on their children's own tendencies. We further explore this relationship in an econometric analysis discussed in the next section. To preview the results we find that this result holds when control for observables of the child and adult as well as vignette characteristics.

One concern is in 26 cases out of the 306 parents and children could not be matched due to survey collection problems. Children were matched to their parents using parent first names, enumerator names, and time of survey. Child and parent surveys were to be given sequentially by a single enumerator in order to ensure matching. However, some children did not know their parent's first name, or the surveys were conducted on different days and so some pairs could not be matched. We find that on average parents who were matched to their children and those that did not had no meaningful difference in how they responded to the vignette. Those that did not match answered the victim would report on average 1.37 times compared to 1.34 for those where we could match.

We use the randomization of the characteristics of the vignettes to test relationships in our third research question between factors of the violent act and the likelihood of reporting. The vignette variables were the location of the violence, the type of perpetrator, the type of violence, the gender of the victim, if the victim and respondent were the same gender, the age of the victim, and the order of the vignettes. The descriptive statistics for the predictor variables and the dependent variables discussed below are presented below in Table 3. There are numerous ways in which these variables could impact reporting and several hypotheses are suggested below which may explain any findings in this study.

If the violence occurs at school (*Violence at School=1*), as opposed to other places in camp such as fetching water or in common areas, it may increase reporting levels as school may be

seen as a safe place due to the presence of teachers and head masters as well as being among peers. When examining the type of perpetrator, literature supports that if the perpetrator is an authority figure (*Authority Perpetrator* =1) it may deter reporting out of fear of retaliation or consequences while if the perpetrator is a child around the respondent's age (*Child Perpetrator* = 1), reporting is more common. The omitted category includes older children and adolsecnts.

We also include a measure of the severity of the violence where the severity is *Low Severity* = 1 for violence such as (teasing), the omitted medium severity includes things like rapping the knuckles with a stick, while high severity violence *High Severity* = 1 for punching or beating severely with a stick. Finally, *Sexual Violence* = 1 for sexual abuse including being teased or touched sexually scenarios. The age of the victim may also play a role in reporting as older children may feel the need to handle situations on their own while younger children may seek help from others so we use controls for victim age, which can be six (Victim age 6 = 1) or ten (omitted category) or twelve (Victim age =12). The gender of the victim in the vignette may also influence perceptions of reporting as gender stereotypes suggest boys may desire to be viewed as tough and feel embarrassed to seek help, while girls may feel more comfortable confiding in others and seeking support (Hamby and Jackson 2010). We include both *Female Victim =1* for a female victim and an interaction of female victim and if the respondent is female to test if women or perceive that there are different social norms for girls *Female Respondent & Victim = 1*. Differences in this interaction between adults and children reflect a higher proportion of adult females (two-thirds) sampled compared to the fifty percent of children. Another possible influence on the perception of reporting is the order of the vignettes, where *Vignette Number =1* for the first vignette.

Table 3: Vignette Descriptive Statistics

	Adults	Children
Told Officials	76%	67%
Parent Report Once	NA	39%
Parent Report Twice	NA	53%
Respondent Male	36%	49%
Vignette Characteristics		
Violence at School	57%	57%
Child Perpetrator	29%	35%
Authority Perpetrator	49%	41%
Low Severity	20%	20%
High Severity	49%	48%
Sexual Violence	12%	11%
Victim age 6	33%	33%
Victim age 12	32%	35%
Female Victim	49%	48%
Female Respondent and Victim	31%	24%
Vignette Number (1 if first vignette, 0 if second)	0.5	0.5

Section VI: Econometric Framework

There are two sets of regressions in the analysis. The first examines the perceived social norms of adults related to physical beating and sexual abuse of children. Each adult was asked a series of 10 questions for each type of violence separately if the victim was a boy or a girl resulting in a sample of 612 (see table 1 for a list of questions). We estimate using equation #1 below the probability of their responding "YES" to a statement about the violence for each adult "*i*". The two variables of most interest are the gender of the adult respondent *Female adult* is a binary variable that equals 1 for female respondents and the gender of the victim, where *Girl*

Victim = 1 if the victim was an adolescent female. As mentioned above we find observable differences on age and schooling between men and women. Additional controls help estimate if nationality or time in camp influences responses. As discussed above, the "present months" variable only applies to Burundian respondents while the years in camp only to DRC nationals.

$$
\begin{aligned}
(1)\ Pr(Y_{it} = 1) = {} & \beta_0 + \gamma_1 Girl\ Victim_{it} + \beta_1 Female\ Adult_i + \beta_2 Age_i + \beta_3 Burundi_i \\
& + \beta_4 Total\ children_i + \beta_5 Completed\ Primary_i + \beta_6 Some\ Secondary_i \\
& + \beta_7 Completed\ Secondary_i + \beta_8 University\ Educated_i \\
& + \beta_9 Missing\ Education + \beta_{10} Present\ months_i * Burundi \\
& + \beta_{11} Present\ years_i * (1 - Burundi)
\end{aligned}
$$

The next set of regression equations examines the vignettes. As mentioned above these vignettes are hypothetical stories about a scenario where a child is the victim of violence. The respondent is asked if they believe that the victim would report the violence. We code the outcome variable as one if the respondent believes that the victim would report the violence to an official. We estimate the probability of an affirmative response for adult "i" for vignette "t" [t = 1, 2] using both characteristics of the respondents demographics and the vignette whose coefficients are denoted with β and γ, respectively. The full model is detailed below in equation 2.

$$(2) Pr(Y_{it} = 1) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Female\ Adult_i + \beta_2 Age_i + \beta_3 Burundi_i + \beta_4 Total\ children_i$$
$$+ \beta_5 Completed\ Primary_i + \beta_6 Some\ Secondary_i + \beta_7 Completed\ Secondary_i$$
$$+ \beta_8 University\ Educated_i + \beta_9 Missing\ Education + \beta_{10} Present\ months_i$$
$$* Burundi + \beta_{10} Present\ years_i * (1 - Burundi) + \gamma_1 Location\ School_{it}$$
$$+ \gamma_2 Perp\ Child_{it} + \gamma_3 Perp\ Authority_{it} + \gamma_4 Low\ Violence_{it} + \gamma_5 High\ Violence_{it}$$
$$+ \gamma_6 Sexual\ Violence_{it} + \gamma_7 Victim\ Female_{it} + \gamma_8 Respondent\ Victim\ Female_{it}$$
$$+ \gamma_9 VictimAge\ 6_{it} + \gamma_{10} VictimAge\ 12_{it} + \gamma_{11} Vignette\ Number_{it}$$

The regression for children's responses to vignettes parallels the adult equation discussed above. In this case we are predicting the probability that child "c" believes the victim would report the violence to an official (Y = 1). The response is estimated based on their parent's observable characteristics responses to other vignettes and the characteristics of the vignette the child received. It is worth emphasizing that parents and children received unique vignettes and the characteristics were random for both and not correlated between parent and adult.

The key measure for the relationship between parents and children are two binary variables Parent Told Once = 1 if the adult believed in one of two vignettes the victim would report and Parent Told Twice =1 if the adult believes in both vignettes the victim would report, with parent not believing in either vignette the child would report being the omitted category. We also include child demographics, though we elect to use a series of binary variables to measure each of the ages from seven to eleven with twelve being the omitted category. Finally we include characteristics of the parents. As additional analysis we remove the adult characteristics that change the interpretation of the Parent Told variables. Once the demographics are removed the parents' responses include the influence of the parent's observable characteristics.

$$Pr(Y_{ct} = 1) = \beta_0 + \propto_1 Parent\ Told\ Once_i + \propto_2 Parent\ Told\ Twice_i \quad + \beta_1 Female_c$$
$$+ \beta_2 Age_c \ + \beta_3 Burundi_c + \beta_4 Total\ children_i$$
$$+ \ \beta_5 Completed\ Primary_i + \ \beta_6 Some\ Secondary_i$$
$$+ \ \beta_7 Completed\ Secondary_i + \ \beta_8 University\ Educated_i$$
$$+ \ \beta_9 Burundi * Present\ months_i + \ \beta_{10}(1 - Burundi) * Present\ years_i$$
$$+ \gamma_1 Location\ School_{ct} + \gamma_2 Perp\ Child_{ct} + \gamma_3 Perp\ Authority_{ct}$$
$$+ \gamma_4 Low\ Violence_{ct} + \gamma_5 High\ Violence_{ct} + \gamma_6 Sexual\ Violence_{ct}$$
$$+ \gamma_7 Victim\ Female_{ct} + \gamma_8 Respondent\ Victim\ Female_{ct}$$
$$+ \gamma_9 VictimAge\ 6_{ct} + \gamma_{10} VictimAge\ 12_{ct} + \gamma_{11} Vignette\ Number_{ct}$$

We conduct two sets of analysis on sub sample: by nationality and respondent's gender. These sub-analyses help us examine systematic differences between Burundi and DRC nationals as well as men and women. We performed a similar analysis on children in a previous paper Fletcher et al. (2017) and discuss the results and across gender and nationality the results were consistent.

Section VII: Results

There are three sets of results presented in this section: social norm indicators (Table 5 and 6) vignettes for adults (Table 7) and children (Table 8). We find that in general there is little difference in how men in women respond to sexual violence. Furthermore, we find no variation in response based on the child's gender. Physical violence against boys elicits a greater response and male respondents are slightly more likely to report the violence to officials. In vignettes that measure the respondent's belief a hypothetical adolescent victim would report violence we do not find differences based on the gender of the respondent or victim. Adults are more likely to believe victims will report sexual abuse. Finally, we find a strong link between parental responses to the vignettes and children's responses to their own.

Below Table 5 shows the results of the social norm indicators regressions with adults' beliefs about sexual abuse and physical violence. We focus on differences by the gender of the potential child victim (*Girl Victim*) and the respondent (*Female Respondent*). In all nine of the sexual regressions we find no statistically significant difference between the gender of the victim or of the respondent. This result runs counter to some of the literature discussed above. Though we caution using the lack of evidence as evidence of no effect this does suggest that norms for boy and girl victims as well as men and women are similar.

Table 5: Adult Response to a Child Being Sexually Assaulted at School

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
VARIABLES	Would Feel Sad	Would Feel Embarrassed	Would Feel OK	Tell Police	Tell Head Teacher	Deserved It	Deal with it in Family	Use Organization	Nothing Would Happen
Girl Victim	-0.0390	-0.0476	0.00149	-0.0255	-0.0405	0.000882	0.0205	-0.00421	0.00582
	(0.0259)	(0.0384)	(0.00257)	(0.0387)	(0.0395)	(0.0218)	(0.0369)	(0.0383)	(0.0248)
Female Adult	-0.0141	-0.0437	-0.0106	-0.0225	-0.0443	0.00419	0.0435	-0.00750	0.0175
	(0.0307)	(0.0462)	(0.0129)	(0.0458)	(0.0477)	(0.0268)	(0.0436)	(0.0464)	(0.0290)
Respondent Age	-0.000839	0.00132	0.000186	0.00433	-0.00288	-0.00145	0.00850***	0.00101	0.00220
	(0.00178)	(0.00270)	(0.000263)	(0.00271)	(0.00278)	(0.00160)	(0.00257)	(0.00270)	(0.00161)
Total Children	-0.00825	0.00113	-0.000638	-0.0218**	0.0321***	0.0171***	-0.0217**	0.00377	0.0109*
	(0.00664)	(0.01000)	(0.000961)	(0.0102)	(0.0105)	(0.00588)	(0.00991)	(0.00985)	(0.00623)
Education Primary	0.0676**	0.0520	0.000111	0.101**	-0.0272	0.0328	0.267***	0.180***	0.0186
	(0.0278)	(0.0531)	(0.00258)	(0.0501)	(0.0570)	(0.0410)	(0.0601)	(0.0460)	(0.0406)
Education Some Secondary	0.102***	0.201***	-0.00234	0.159***	0.0678	0.000395	0.143**	0.0473	0.00816
	(0.0242)	(0.0504)	(0.00350)	(0.0527)	(0.0677)	(0.0431)	(0.0709)	(0.0604)	(0.0451)
Education Complete Secondary	0.0546*	0.0491	-0.00221	0.109**	0.122*	0.0786*	0.116*	0.191***	0.0314
	(0.0321)	(0.0567)	(0.00336)	(0.0554)	(0.0647)	(0.0436)	(0.0651)	(0.0466)	(0.0413)
Education University	0.0224	0.0878	-0.00119	0.0787	0.0649	0.109	0.260***	0.154***	0.0722
	(0.0442)	(0.0678)	(0.00235)	(0.0710)	(0.0827)	(0.0666)	(0.0845)	(0.0569)	(0.0632)
Education Missing	-0.0538	0.00891		0.245***	-0.259***	0.00705	-0.0648	0.0348	
	(0.0809)	(0.111)		(0.0629)	(0.0725)	(0.0836)	(0.107)	(0.108)	
Burundi	0.209*	0.0960	1.000***	-0.0962	0.744***	-0.0801	-0.226	0.426**	0.0635
	(0.125)	(0.195)	(8.04e-05)	(0.188)	(0.111)	(0.177)	(0.172)	(0.178)	(0.139)
Present Months (Burundi)	0.00462	0.00108	0.00105	0.0158	-0.0658***	-0.00450	-0.0121	-0.0287	-0.0107
	(0.0109)	(0.0170)	(0.00159)	(0.0155)	(0.0166)	(0.0180)	(0.0152)	(0.0188)	(0.0117)
Present Years DRC	0.0136***	-0.00251	0.00564	0.00907	0.0117	0.00562	-0.0194***	-0.00508	0.00519
	(0.00413)	(0.00704)	(0.00506)	(0.00731)	(0.00816)	(0.00369)	(0.00670)	(0.00686)	(0.00482)
Observations	612	612	592	612	612	612	612	612	592

Standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05,
* p<0.1

The results are different for a teacher hitting a child at school particularly when comparing boys and girls victims (see Table 6). The results are somewhat ambiguous in the potential conclusions though they suggest adults are more responsive when boys are the victims of physical violence. Adults were 45% more likely to report being sad if a boy was hit compared to a girl, though 30% more likely to think the boy deserved it. The adult is much more likely to attempt to report or address the situation with respondents being 6% and 24% more likely to report to the police or head master for boys and more likely to try to address the situation with the family (7%), an organization (5%) or other means (5%). This may reflect the parent's belief that if boys are the victim that it is 19% more likely there will be no community response.

Adult males seem slightly more likely to respond to a teacher hitting a child than women. They are 6% more likely to tell the police, 10% more likely to tell a head teacher and 9% more likely to deal with it using an organization. We do not show a difference between men and women in their beliefs that they would be sad or think it was OK if their child was the victim of physical violence.

Table 6: Adult Reactions to a Child Being Hit By a Teacher at School

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	-9
	Sad	Embarrassed	OK	Tell Police	Tell Head Teacher	Deserved It	Deal with it in Family	Use Organization	Nothing Would Happen
Girl Victim	-0.450***	-0.0569	-0.0154	-0.0592**	-0.239***	-0.302***	-0.0707**	-0.0522*	-0.188***
	(0.0369)	(0.0415)	(0.0367)	(0.0230)	(0.0344)	(0.0328)	(0.0331)	(0.0317)	(0.0298)
Female Adult	0.00363	0.0148	-0.0317	-0.0601**	-0.0995**	0.0183	-0.0454	-0.0917**	0.0111
	(0.0524)	(0.0509)	(0.0446)	(0.0305)	(0.0441)	(0.0397)	(0.0407)	(0.0405)	(0.0350)
Respondent Age	-0.00495	-0.000661	0.00532**	-0.00155	0.000613	-0.000891	0.00192	0.00136	0.00384*
	(0.00305)	(0.00290)	(0.00256)	(0.00159)	(0.00247)	(0.00238)	(0.00228)	(0.00210)	(0.00199)
Total Children	0.0231**	0.0211**	-0.0370***	-0.00438	0.00916	0.0177**	0.00834	-0.0140*	0.00957
	(0.0113)	(0.0108)	(0.00981)	(0.00590)	(0.00915)	(0.00884)	(0.00862)	(0.00818)	(0.00761)
Education Primary	-0.193***	0.0788	0.0772	-0.00919	0.0499	0.129**	0.0413	-0.0178	0.0799
	(0.0546)	(0.0626)	(0.0576)	(0.0328)	(0.0567)	(0.0582)	(0.0547)	(0.0464)	(0.0496)
Education Some Secondary	-0.215***	0.0889	0.0781	0.0570	0.132*	0.0420	0.117*	0.0688	-0.0350
	(0.0589)	(0.0737)	(0.0665)	(0.0485)	(0.0699)	(0.0617)	(0.0680)	(0.0609)	(0.0465)
Education Complete Secondary	-0.0734	0.121*	-0.00349	-0.0363	0.131**	0.225***	0.158**	-0.0552	0.0446
	(0.0648)	(0.0655)	(0.0587)	(0.0276)	(0.0623)	(0.0709)	(0.0625)	(0.0424)	(0.0521)
Education University	-0.178**	0.274***	-0.0488	-0.0294	0.158*	0.164*	0.169**	-0.0312	0.0734
	(0.0719)	(0.0815)	(0.0686)	(0.0338)	(0.0823)	(0.0920)	(0.0840)	(0.0543)	(0.0723)
Education Missing	-0.0629	-0.0220	-0.0229	-0.00858	-0.0149	0.0833	0.0921	0.0424	-0.0728
	(0.117)	(0.118)	(0.115)	(0.0674)	(0.115)	(0.124)	(0.115)	(0.108)	(0.0680)
Burundi	0.370*	0.778***	-0.679***	0.0700	0.549***	0.510***	0.192	0.165	0.520***
	(0.194)	(0.109)	(0.141)	(0.107)	(0.167)	(0.177)	(0.155)	(0.152)	(0.151)
Present Months (Burundi)	-0.0667***	-0.141***	0.118***	-0.0217**	-0.0163	0.00483	-0.0422***	-0.0296**	-0.0331***
	(0.0189)	(0.0214)	(0.0192)	(0.00935)	(0.0153)	(0.0136)	(0.0137)	(0.0131)	(0.0117)
Present Years (DRC)	0.00259	-0.00118	0.00707	0.00138	0.0301***	0.0177*	-0.00474	0.00719	0.0123*
	(0.00793)	(0.00730)	(0.00757)	(0.00370)	(0.00868)	(0.00926)	(0.00585)	(0.00564)	(0.00696)
Observations	612	612	612	612	612	612	612	612	612

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

The results from the vignettes also show that male and female respondents were generally similar in their beliefs about the likelihood that a child victim in a vignette would report violence (see Table 7 below). The main analysis shows no statistically significant difference between male and female adult respondents in their belief the victim would report. However, there is a statistically significant difference for the interaction of female adults and their belief about girl victims, which suggest women believe girls are less likely to report. A look at the descriptive statistics shows women think 82% of boys would report compared to 72% of girls. The difference for men is smaller 76% of boys and 74% of girls would report respectively.

Analyses of the subsamples suggest that the evidence that women think girls are less likely to report is being driven by the DRC subsample. As the coefficients are larger and of higher order statistical significance for the DRC subsample. One other systematic difference is that in Burundi both those with primary only (-16%) and secondary only (-32%) are less likely to believe that the victim would report compared to the no education control group. Across all subsamples adults believe children are more likely to report violence that occurs at school and sexual abuse.

Table 7: Marginal Effect (Probit) of Adult's Belief Vignette Victim Will Tell Official

Sample	All	Burundi Only	DRC Only	Female Only	Male Only
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	Told Official	Told Official	Told Official	Told Official	Told Official
Female Adult	0.104	0.0371	0.193*		
	(0.0641)	(0.0755)	(0.105)		
Age	0.00109	0.00180	0.00124	-0.00232	0.00533
	(0.00264)	(0.00327)	(0.00432)	(0.00388)	(0.00392)
Burundi	0.113			0.134	-0.0209
	(0.171)			(0.202)	(0.401)
Completed Primary	-0.113*	-0.153**	-0.0129	-0.143**	-0.0654
	(0.0615)	(0.0739)	(0.0992)	(0.0697)	(0.138)
Some Secondary	-0.0227	-0.0519	0.0623	-0.0101	-0.0478
	(0.0658)	(0.0767)	(0.109)	(0.0799)	(0.120)
Secondary Completed	-0.101	-0.327**	-0.0252	-0.127	-0.0244
	(0.0623)	(0.161)	(0.0836)	(0.0797)	(0.101)
University Education	-0.0517	-0.128	0.00761	-0.154	0.0527
	(0.0789)	(0.165)	(0.108)	(0.141)	(0.0960)
Missing Education	0.0739		-0.0218	0.0247	
	(0.104)		(0.233)	(0.129)	
Total Children	0.00559	-0.00738	0.0122	0.00260	0.0110
	(0.00948)	(0.0124)	(0.0154)	(0.0122)	(0.0167)
Months in Camp	0.00241	0.00379		0.00884	-0.00870
	(0.0152)	(0.0129)		(0.0194)	(0.0265)
Years in Camp	-0.000710		-0.00397	0.00407	-0.0168
	(0.00621)		(0.00769)	(0.00677)	(0.0167)
Violence Occurred at School	0.190***	0.128***	0.257***	0.162***	0.267***
	(0.0379)	(0.0456)	(0.0604)	(0.0462)	(0.0681)
Child Perpetrator	-0.0249	0.0392	-0.0970	-0.00964	-0.119
	(0.0538)	(0.0596)	(0.0876)	(0.0612)	(0.120)
Authority Perpetrator	-0.0700	-0.0247	-0.133*	-0.0243	-0.179**
	(0.0470)	(0.0571)	(0.0769)	(0.0546)	(0.0900)
Low Violence	0.0176	0.0427	-0.0262	0.0647	-0.0771
	(0.0518)	(0.0543)	(0.0911)	(0.0595)	(0.0992)
High Violence	0.0521	0.105**	-0.0305	0.0529	0.0476
	(0.0450)	(0.0525)	(0.0774)	(0.0554)	(0.0770)
Sexual Violence	0.185***	0.138***	0.241***	0.205***	0.158**
	(0.0346)	(0.0350)	(0.0645)	(0.0359)	(0.0623)
Victim Age 6	-0.117**	-0.0612	-0.146**	-0.0809	-0.151*
	(0.0471)	(0.0585)	(0.0729)	(0.0587)	(0.0825)
Victim Age 12	0.0159	-0.0459	0.111	-0.0365	0.0806
	(0.0446)	(0.0599)	(0.0692)	(0.0582)	(0.0704)
Female Victim	0.0264	-0.0259	0.113	-0.0972**	0.0460
	(0.0590)	(0.0730)	(0.0963)	(0.0443)	(0.0625)
Respondent and Victim Female	-0.142*	-0.0224	-0.299**		
	(0.0840)	(0.0947)	(0.130)		
Vignette Number	-0.0693**	-0.0724*	-0.0570	-0.0600	-0.0820
	(0.0351)	(0.0433)	(0.0563)	(0.0436)	(0.0596)
Observations	564	265	288	359	202

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Above we hypothesize that parental beliefs about who will report are likely connected to children's and this hypothesis is supported by the results of the analysis of the children's vignettes (see Table 8 below). The children's estimation includes their parent's responses to two vignettes that differed from their own. In the first set of regressions which include controls for parental demographics we find that when the parents reported they believed the child would report in both vignettes the child was 15% more likely to report they also believed that the victim would report the violence (significance at the 10% level). It is worth noting that we find no difference between the children whose parents believed that one or zero vignettes the child would report. Recall from the descriptive statistics that only 8% are in the omitted category to increase power we changed the omitted category to one or zero parental affirmative responses. The magnitude is similar and the level of significance increases to the 1% level.

Next we drop the parental demographic controls. This slightly alters the interpretation of the parental variables. Now they indicate the combined effect of observable and unobservable parental characteristics. In this case, the children with parents who believed the victim would report were 22% more likely to believe themselves the child would report. This suggests that demographic observables of the parents have some effect on children's belief in reporting.

When comparing the adult responses and the children responses some similarities and several contrasts appear. In both cases respondents believe the victim is more likely to report if the violence took place at school (19% more likely). In both cases the gender of the victim and the respondent seems to have little effect on beliefs. One contrast with the children is that adults believe that victims are much more likely to report sexual violence (19% more likely) than physical violence, while children believe all forms are equally likely to be reported with some weak evidence that high severity violence is less likely to be reported. Children also believe that

when the perpetrator is a child the victim is more likely to report. Finally, children in Burundi and those whose parents completed secondary school are more likely to believe the victim would report while no differences are found for adults.

Table 7: Marginal Effect (Probit) of Children's Belief Vignette Victim Will Tell Official

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
VARIABLES	Told Officials	Told Officials	Told Officials	Told Officials
Female	0.0487	0.0476		
	(0.0643)	(0.0639)		
Age 7	0.109	0.110		
	(0.0709)	(0.0702)		
Age 8	-0.0262	-0.0266		
	(0.0732)	(0.0732)		
Age 9	0.0980	0.0976		
	(0.0763)	(0.0763)		
Age 10	-0.0512	-0.0514		
	(0.0665)	(0.0665)		
Age 11	0.0195	0.0193		
	(0.0778)	(0.0778)		
Burundi	0.317**	0.318**		
	(0.160)	(0.160)		
Completed Primary	0.0800	0.0804		
	(0.0615)	(0.0614)		
Some Secondary	0.0536	0.0537		
	(0.0692)	(0.0692)		
Secondary Completed	0.159***	0.159***		
	(0.0560)	(0.0560)		
University Educated	0.0440	0.0447		
	(0.0830)	(0.0828)		
Education Missing	-0.120	-0.119		
	(0.167)	(0.167)		
Total Siblings	0.0203*	0.0205*		
	(0.0105)	(0.0105)		
Present Months	0.0145	0.0144		
	(0.0159)	(0.0159)		
Present Years	0.0217**	0.0216**		
	(0.00906)	(0.00904)		
Violence Occurred at School	0.238***	0.237***	0.248***	0.247***
	(0.0455)	(0.0454)	(0.0435)	(0.0435)
Child Perpetrator	0.191***	0.192***	0.200***	0.204***
	(0.0539)	(0.0537)	(0.0519)	(0.0514)
Authority Perpetrator	0.00255	0.00304	-0.0104	-0.00775
	(0.0570)	(0.0569)	(0.0549)	(0.0547)
Low Violence	-0.0995	-0.0990	-0.0853	-0.0819
	(0.0748)	(0.0747)	(0.0725)	(0.0722)
High Violence	-0.107*	-0.107*	-0.0799	-0.0791
	(0.0594)	(0.0594)	(0.0576)	(0.0575)
Sexual Violence	-0.100	-0.0999	-0.0778	-0.0747
	(0.0895)	(0.0894)	(0.0855)	(0.0852)
Female Victim	0.0737	0.0732	0.0549	0.0550
	(0.0629)	(0.0628)	(0.0519)	(0.0519)
Female Respondent & Victim	-0.0244	-0.0231	0.0226	0.0243
	(0.0918)	(0.0913)	(0.0606)	(0.0604)
Victim Age 6	0.0534	0.0533	0.0488	0.0482
	(0.0537)	(0.0537)	(0.0523)	(0.0523)

Victim Age 12	0.0514	0.0516	0.0617	0.0626
	(0.0529)	(0.0529)	(0.0512)	(0.0511)
Vignette Number	-0.0464	-0.0463	-0.0447	-0.0448
	(0.0444)	(0.0444)	(0.0435)	(0.0435)
Report Once	0.0144		0.0535	
	(0.0867)		(0.0801)	
Report Twice	0.147*	0.135***	0.218***	0.173***
	(0.0877)	(0.0469)	(0.0797)	(0.0431)
Include Report Once	Yes	No	Yes	No
Include Demographic of Parents	Yes	Yes	No	No
Observations	502	502	502	502

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Section VIII: Conclusion

One of the first steps to improving support for the large number of child victims of violence in refugee camps is to better understand the beliefs of these children and their parents. Using a matched pair sample of over 300 children and their parents in one of the world's largest refugee camps, Nyarugusu, our results shed light on these beliefs. We find that sexual abuse is not condoned. Although there is more acceptance for physical violence (or resignation towards its existence), the majority still oppose it as punishment. We find some difference along gender lines for physical violence particularly that families are more responsive with the victim is a boy and that adult males are more likely to report than females. We do not find any of these differences for sexual abuse between either the respondent or adolescent victim's gender.

Next, in a series of randomized vignettes given separately to children and adults we find that adult male and females have roughly equal beliefs that adolescent victims will report violence. Adults are more likely than their children to believe that victims of sexual abuse will report violence compared to other types. Both adults and children believe that violence is more likely to be reported at school, though adults are more likely to believe sexual violence will be reported. Finally, we show a strong link between parental and child responses.

There are some inherent limitations to this study. First, the survey was not stratified on the gender of the adult so some bias may occur. We show small difference based on observables (age and education) for male and female adult respondents. As a robustness check we also rerun the regressions using weights to correct for the potential over representation of women and get essentially the same results (these results are available upon request). Second, the sample size is slightly small and we were not able to ask some questions directly to respondents. Both of these reflect the difficulty of doing survey work in refugee camps and the sensitivity of the subject.

The International Rescue Committee (IRC) and other organization run harm reduction programs in refugee camps like Nyarugusu. The social norm indicators potentially suggest their efforts have been successful at reducing the social acceptability of sexual abuse, though it is possible these norms were present before refugees arrived in camp. There is still some acceptance of physical punishment by teachers and this may suggest a new avenue for policy to reduce it. The vignettes and social indicators suggest that men and women have generally similar beliefs though men may be more willing to report physical violence against children and women believe boys slightly more likely to report. These similarities do not indicate that one gender is in particular need of intervention more than the other. Finally, the vignettes show a strong relationship between parental and child beliefs. This is potentially suggestive that a policy aimed at parents could have the added benefit of influencing children's norms. Finally, both children and adults see school as a place where children are likely to report violence. This suggests a potential for partnering with schools in harm reduction.

The next step for research in this area is to identify ways to increase reporting of violence in order to get services to victims and potentially use social norms to reduce the acceptability of violence. One potential avenue is to provide education in refugee camp schools, though the

potential effectiveness for such a program is unknown. The vignettes used in this paper could potentially be applied to program evaluation of programs that aim to increase reporting of violence.

Works Cited

Aviram, H. and Persinger, A. (2012). "Perceiving and Reporting Domestic Violence Incidents in Unconventional Settings: A Vignette Survey Study". Hastings Women's LJ., 23: 159. Available from: http://repository.uchastings.edu/faculty_scholarship/9

Alexander, P. C., Moore, S., & Alexander III, E. R. (1991). What is transmitted in the intergenerational transmission of violence?. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 657-667.

Banerjee, A., Green, D.P., Mcmanus, J., and Pande, R. (2014). "Are Poor Voters Indifferent to Whether Elected Leaders Are Criminal or Corrupt? A Vignette Experiment in Rural India." *Political Commun.*, 31(3):391-407.

Black, D. S., Sussman, S., & Unger, J. B. (2010). A further look at the intergenerational transmission of violence: Witnessing interparental violence in emerging adulthood. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *25*(6), 1022-1042.

Bundervoet, T., Verwimp, P., & Akresh, R. (2009). Health and civil war in rural Burundi. *Journal of Human Resources*, *44*(2), 536-563.

Crombach, A., & Bambonyé, M. (2015). Intergenerational violence in Burundi: Experienced childhood maltreatment increases the risk of abusive child rearing and intimate partner violence. *European journal of psychotraumatology*, *6*(1), 26995.

Dijkman, N. E., Bijleveld, C., & Verwimp, P. (2014). Sexual Violence in Burundi: Victims, perpetrators, and the role of conflict. Violences sexuelles au Burundi: victimes, auteurs et rôle des conflits. *Households in Conflict Working Paper 172.*

Dohmen, Thomas, et al. "The intergenerational transmission of risk and trust attitudes." *The Review of Economic Studies* 79.2 (2011): 645-677.

Fletcher, E.K, Gitter, S.R. & Wilhelm (2017). Reporting Violence Against Children: Social Norms in Nyarugusu Refugees Camp. Unpublished mimeo

Freedman, J. (2016). Sexual and gender-based violence against refugee women: a hidden aspect of the refugee 'crisis'. *Reproductive Health Matters*,24: 18-26.

Jeusette, L., Verwimp, P., & Østby, G. (2017). Childhood aspirations, occupational outcomes and exposure to violence: Evidence from Burundi. *ECARES Working Papers*.

Hamby, S., & Jackson, A. (2010). Size does matter: The effects of gender on perceptions of dating violence. *Sex Roles*, *63*(5-6), 324-331.

Horn, R., Puffer, E. S., Roesch, E., & Lehmann, H. (2014). Women's perceptions of effects of war on intimate partner violence and gender roles in two post-conflict West African Countries: consequences and unexpected opportunities. *Conflict and health*, *8*(1), 12.

Hughes, R. (1998). "Considering the Vignette Technique and its Application to a Study of Drug Injecting and HIV Risk and Safer Behaviour." *Sociol. of Health & Illnes*s, 20:381-400.

Kandala, N. B., Madungu, T. P., Emina, J. B., Nzita, K. P., & Cappuccio, F. P. (2011). Malnutrition among children under the age of five in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC): does geographic location matter?. *BMC public health*, *11*(1), 261.

La Mattina, G. (2017). Civil Conflict, Domestic Violence and Intra-household Bargaining in Post-genocide Rwanda. *Journal of Development Economics*, 124, 168-198.

Leach, F. (2006). Researching gender violence in schools: Methodological and ethical considerations. *World Development*, *34*(6), 1129-1147.

Lindskog, E. E. (2016). The effect of war on infant mortality in the Democratic Republic of Congo. *BMC public health*, *16*(1), 1059.

Lochner, Lance (2008). "Intergenerational transmission." The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics. Second Edition. Eds. Steven N. Durlauf and Lawrence E. Blume. Palgrave Macmillan, 2008. The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics Online.

Lombardo, C. and Wheeler, S. (2016). "10 Stunning Nyarugusu Refugee Camp Facts and Statistics." *Vision Launch.* Available from: http://www.visionlaunch.com/10-stunning-nyarugusu-refugee-camp-facts-and-statistics/

Mabuwa, R. (2000). "Seeking protection: Addressing sexual and domestic violence in Tanzania's refugee camps." Human Rights Watch.

Norman, J. and Niehaus, R. (2016). "18 Years Displaced: An Anthropological Study of Protection Concerns Facing Congolese Refugees in Nyarugusu Refugee Camp, Tanzania." *IRC Working Paper*

Speizer, I. S. (2010). Intimate partner violence attitudes and experience among women and men in Uganda. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *25*(7), 1224-1241.

Schwartz, Stephanie. (2017). "You Can't Go Home: Return migration and conflict dynamics in Burundi." Working Paper.

Stark, L., & Landis, D. (2016). Violence against children in humanitarian settings: A literature review of population-based approaches. *Social Science & Medicine*, *152*, 125-137.

Stark, L., Asghar, K., Yu, G., Bora, C., Baysa, A. A., & Falb, K. L. (2017). Prevalence and associated risk factors of violence against conflict–affected female adolescents: a multi–country, cross–sectional study. *Journal of Global Health*, *7*(1).

Schwartz, Stephanie. (2017). "You Can't Go Home: Return migration and conflict dynamics in Burundi." Working Paper.

Thornberry, T. P., Knight, K. E., & Lovegrove, P. J. (2012). Does maltreatment beget maltreatment? A systematic review of the intergenerational literature. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, *13*(3), 135-152.

Tyrer, R.A. and Fazel, M. (2014). "School and Community-Based Interventions for Refugee and Asylum Seeking Children: A Systematic Review." *PLOS ONE* 9(5).

Velleman, R., Bennett, G., Miller, T., Orford, J.I.M., Rigby, K., and Tod, A. (1993). "The families of problem drug users: A study of 50 close relatives." *Addiction*, 88: 1281-1289.

Verwimp, Philip, and Jan Van Bavel. "Schooling, violent conflict, and gender in Burundi." *The World Bank Economic Review* 28.2 (2013): 384-411.

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (2014). Congolese Refugees- A Protracted Situation. Available from: http://www.unhcr.org/558c0e039.pdfways

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. (2016). Number fleeing Burundi to neighbouring countries tops 300, 000. Available from: http://www.unhcr.org/en-us/news/latest/2016/9/57e535d26/number-fleeing-burundi-neighbouring-countries-tops-300000.html

Women's Refugee Commission. (2012). "The Path to Hope: Congolese Refugee Adolescent Girls in Nyarugsu Refugee Camp, Tanzania." Available from: https://www.womensrefugeecommission.org/resources/document/868-the-path-to-hope-congolese-refugee-adolescent-girls-in-nyarugusu-refugee-camp-tanzania