

# PARTICIPATORY RESEARCH ON SOCIAL COHESION

Teknaf – Ward 9, Hnila Union

There is dignity without quarrels



Anjumara (not her real name), a Rohingya refugee filling water pitchers for her Rohingya neighbours. Each family gets two pitchers each.

*“They used to line up their pitchers from midnight so they can get more water”, Anjumara said. People would quarrel all the time about who goes first and who gets how much water. To avoid quarrels especially among women in her community, Anjumara created a system together with her neighbours a few months ago. In their water point, each Rohingya family can get two pitchers first, and hosts are given priority in collecting water. If there is more water after, then each family can get an additional one pitcher each. Every day, Anjumara would give her valuable time to her community to avoid quarrels. She would fill water containers herself and a family member of each household would carry it to their homes. She said women tell her that they are happy about this system, as there have been no quarrels in their community since.*

**Oxfam Research Reports** are written to share research results, to contribute to public debate and to invite feedback on development and humanitarian policy and practice. They do not necessarily reflect Oxfam policy positions. The views expressed are those of the author and not necessarily those of Oxfam.

# Introduction

Almost two years into the Rohingya crisis, though the Government of Bangladesh (GoB) has been extremely generous in providing for refugees, durable solutions to displacement remain unavailable. Without safe and dignified conditions, repatriation is not an appropriate option, while options for integration and resettlement are not accepted by the Government of Bangladesh. Refugees and hosts feel a sense of growing uncertainty for their future. Moreover, the absence of a clear national framework to define the longer-term response remains a barrier in the search for solutions. The GoB and aid actors are now facing critical questions regarding how to sustain the response, and move forward in this crisis.

Meanwhile, tensions between hosts and refugees have continued to grow, fuelling blame, exclusion and discrimination. These tensions lead the two communities to think that separation from each other is the only solution to their struggles. Yet, they must live side by side for now. As the search for durable solutions continues, immediate actions to prevent isolation are needed. Oxfam believes that refugee and host communities' perceptions, lived experiences and expectations should be the building blocks of durable solutions, whereby freedom to make choices is a fundamental component of dignity.

To support the search for solutions, this study aims to describe the social cohesion context in Camp 27 or Ward 9, Hnila Union through host and refugees' perceptions, lived experiences and expectations of a safe and dignified life, and their relations with each other. It aims to provide an opportunity for refugees and host communities to make their voices heard regarding their experience of the crisis. From the trends, we identify possible immediate, temporary and durable solutions to displacement. Data presented in this study is descriptive, and will not produce a generalization or be fully representative of refugee and host communities. However, it illustrates the context in the areas of study, and may be indicative of similar contexts of this crisis.

This research used a mixed quantitative and qualitative methodology. Acknowledging that there is considerable 'assessment fatigue' amongst refugees and that many studies to date have been largely extractive, the research used a participatory approach in the design, data collection, analysis, and feedback. To provide an alternative method of expression, we used Photovoice, a process that allows people with limited power due to poverty, language barriers, race, class, ethnicity, gender culture or other circumstances to use photo and video images to capture aspects of their environment and experiences and share them with others to spur change<sup>1</sup>. The research was conducted with the participation of protection community groups in Camp 27 and in four villages of Ward 9, Hnila Union, Teknaf where host and refugee communities live together; with a few respondents from Wards 7 and 8. A total of 225 respondents (112 females and 113 males) were involved in this study, with 118 from host communities and 107 are refugees.

Social cohesion is a widely-used term, but it lacks a common definition. This study is guided by a combined working definition of social cohesion based on the Rohingya Joint Response Plan 2019 and several studies<sup>2</sup>:

“Social cohesion is a glue that bonds society together, essential for peace, democracy, and development. It is the nature and set of relationships between individuals and groups in a particular environment (horizontal social cohesion) and between individuals and groups and the institutions that govern them in a particular environment (vertical social cohesion). It has four

---

<sup>1</sup> Description taken from [www.partecepedia.net](http://www.partecepedia.net)

<sup>2</sup> Combined working definitions from: United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and Search for Common Ground (2015) Social Cohesion Framework: Social cohesion for stronger communities: knowledge, skills, understanding.; Joseph Guay (2015). Social Cohesion between Syrian Refugees and Urban host Communities in Lebanon and Jordan. World Vision; and United Nations Development Programme (2009) Community Security and Social Cohesion: Towards a UNDP Approach.

components, namely, social relationships, connectedness, orientation towards the common good, and equality and rights. Central to social cohesion is respect for human rights, respect for diversity and individual responsibility. The existence of social cohesion does not necessarily mean that conflict is entirely absent, but that communities have the capacity to effectively manage conflict and that they are able to “build on their commonalities” and thus “address conflict in a proactive and positive approach.”

To describe the social cohesion context, the study presents findings according to four key components of social cohesion: Part 1 ‘Equality and Rights’ presents aspirations and experiences of safety and dignity after the move to Bangladesh, Part 2 ‘Connectedness’ discusses the sense of shared identity and belongingness and perceptions of each other, Part 3 ‘Social Relationships’ discusses the existing ties and perception of host-refugee relations, Part 4 ‘Orientation towards the Common Good’ describes existing practices for solidarity and support. In Part 5 ‘Solutions’, we present immediate, temporary, and durable solutions foreseen by hosts and refugees, and conclude with recommendations for programming and advocacy.

## PART 1 – RIGHTS & EQUALITY: SAFE & DIGNIFIED LIFE

Safety and dignity are common aspirations for both refugees and host community members, and conceptions of what they mean are similar. They are about fundamental human rights, equal status, and equitable access to opportunities to facilitate self-reliance. Much of their expressions of a safe and dignified life are mirrors of their current experiences and priorities. Rohingya interpretations focused on being able to live with privacy, to live safely without threat to life, to be able to live like others or have equal rights and status and be treated with respect. For hosts, the emphasis was on self-reliance, livelihoods and equal access to aid. For both, safety and dignity are deeply gendered – for women, it is about maintaining *purdah* or screening women from men and strangers by using a curtain in the home or by way of clothing. For men, it is about being able to provide for one’s family and to have the capacity to be self-reliant.

Social cohesion is essential in conceptions of a safe and dignified life for both groups. Conceptions of both a safe and dignified life found their intersection in discussions around social cohesion. Across focus groups, the importance of building good relationships with mutual respect was emphasized as a way to attain safety and dignity. Hosts’ sense of safety and dignity is perceived to have decreased or have been lost and they attribute this loss to the Rohingya refugees. Their livelihoods were taken away - fishing, farming, shops, drop in labor wages – and the influx of new refugees increased market prices. Host community shops are said to have closed due to the massive selling of relief items at a very low cost. On the other hand, prices for essential needs, meat and fish have increased due to higher demand. Host women shared that gendered beliefs and practices – such as limiting access to education for women, polygamy and early marriage - have spread. These, too, are more likely to be attributed to the negative cultural influence of the Rohingya, despite the fact that these practices existed before the displacement. The physical sense of safety has decreased due to government-led drug crackdowns and the increased density of their communities. Traveling to other places is more difficult due to checkpoints and interrogation by authorities if one does not carry their ID cards.

Such perceptions and experiences result in negative stereotypes and discrimination against the Rohingya, which project them as a people with lower status compared to hosts. Refugees consistently shared that they want to be able to “live freely like others”, to have rights (*hok*) and gain justice (*bisar*). Although “to live freely like others” is not a direct translation of citizenship, it equates to having equal rights, status, and access to opportunities granted to citizens. For the Rohingya, this means being legally recognized as rightful citizens in Myanmar, and achieving equality in the context of other durable solutions. They equate this with being able to be safe and live peacefully, and to enjoy freedom of movement and equal status with others. This conception

of citizenship also translates into having access to productive assets such as land, houses and livelihoods, and to have equal opportunities for education – all of which will enable them to be self-reliant. In Bangladesh, refugees said they have found safety in its most basic sense: to be alive. They lacked even this basic sense of safety while living in Myanmar. Dignity is more elusive; refugees reported that they lack dignity in both countries. In this study, the Rohingya and host community attributed their perceptions and experiences of a reduced or lost sense of safety and dignity to one another. These perceptions influence their relationships negatively, and thereby contribute to lower social cohesion. Host communities did not express low expectations for achieving safety and dignity. Rohingya refugees' expectations were lower, especially for achieving dignity while in Bangladesh. Yet, for both groups, aspirations or what is needed to attain safety and dignity are clear.

## PART 2 – CONNECTEDNESS: SHARED IDENTITY & FEELING OF BELONGING

Hosts and refugees do have a sense of shared identity based on religion, origin and history, and the common experience of being refugees. Women are more likely to carry notions of similarities than men across both groups. Refugees believe that it is through these perceived similarities that hosts can sympathise with them, and refugees in return have consistently expressed gratitude to the hosts for extending humanity and solidarity. Prior to the displacement, familial or livelihood-related ties between the Rohingya and Bangladeshi had also been common, which also add to their sense of connectedness to each other.

Hosts are more likely to hold harmful stereotypes that further cement the perceived lower status of refugees. Some of these notions echo the narratives of the Myanmar government against the Rohingya, and are contributing to the risk of the formation of xenophobic beliefs. The Rohingya are perceived as being uneducated, overly conservative, lacking culture, violent, untrustworthy and criminal. A barrier against building better relations is the belief of host community members that the Rohingya are a threat to their self-reliance and to a safe and dignified life. On the other hand, refugees perceive hosts as people who use power over them, discriminate against and stereotype them.

## PART 3 - HORIZONTAL SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS & NETWORKS

The majority of hosts and refugees have some form of relation with one another, with 60% of respondents having two kinds of ties or more. Among the more neutral ties, 6 in 10 of respondents have neighbors, and about 3 in 10 have a renter-landowner relationship or do not have any close relationship. On the other hand, for those with closer ties, about 3 in 10 reported having friends and *fuaijia*<sup>3</sup>, and about 1 in 10 said they have relatives or family ties.

When comparing perceptions on the quality of relationships between host and refugee communities, we see a positive trend over time compared to the beginning of the influx in August 2017. A reason for this trend is the said increase in interaction which has allowed them to get to know each other better. When disaggregated by sex and group, the majority or 67% of women in both

---

<sup>3</sup> *Fuaijia* translates literally to “same age” and thus can be categorized as a neutral relationship. However, in the respondents' use of the term during the interviews and focus group discussions, it indicates a form of relationship among the same age group and also for same sex group whereby a form of interaction follows. Based on their use, we categorise it as a form of acquaintance among those with same age group and sex; they are not strangers nor do they have a deep relationship like friends. *Fuaijia* was translated as “like friends” or “acquaintance” by the translator.

communities, and 60% of refugee men, feel their relationship with the other has improved, while only 20% of host men feel it has. Like qualitative trends, 43% of male hosts are likely to think that relations have not improved or have even worsened, and 33% feel they have only gotten worse. Unequal power dynamics define the host and refugee relationship, with Rohingya having a lower status than hosts. Without these ties improving, the Rohingya refugees feel they are more exposed to discrimination. On the other hand, male hosts tend to perceive Rohingya as a threat to their lives and livelihoods.

Women and youth are more likely than men to engage and build ties across groups. Also, relationship-building trends are different according to age and sex. For instance, women are found to interact by visiting each other's homes with their children during leisure time, chatting and preparing food together, and interacting at water points, while men are more likely to meet in public spaces such as tea stalls and shops during leisure time, in mosques during prayers, and at markets.

If conflict does occur between the two groups, Rohingya refugees are more likely to be passive than hosts. Host men are more likely to take action by confrontation, seeking help from other people such as agencies and authorities. And while refugee men likewise do take action by asking for help from fellow Rohingya and a minority do seek confrontation, are less likely to ask for help from authorities and other agencies. Moreover, host and refugee women alike did not mention any action that required seeking authorities', NGOs' or other family members' support. Most or majority of women or 70% from both groups are said to do nothing when in conflict. On the other hand, refugees (46%) more than hosts (29%) seek to actively avoid conflict by engaging in dialogue with the other group. Similarly, 34% of refugees and hosts resort to doing nothing or tend to not talk to each other to avoid conflict with 21% hosts and 14% refugees who reported this.

These trends further illustrate the unequal power dynamics between the two groups. Hosts are more likely to exercise power over refugees, and refugees are likely to concede to the power of the hosts. Gender as a form of power can also be seen permeating the host-refugee relationship—gender differences can be seen in relations, response to conflict, and how gender practices influence harmful stereotypes of refugees.

With all these, two parallel trends are observed: for those who have closer ties, the relationship is more likely to be positive and contributes to stronger social cohesion; while for those who do not have closer ties, the relationship is likely to be negative and contributes to lower social cohesion. Building better host-refugee relations is a way to compensate and cope with the unequal power dynamics, especially for refugees. Trends suggest that refugees are more likely to actively build better relationships due to their vulnerability from their lower status, poor conditions and risk to power abuses. Building better ties increases the likelihood to receive better treatment and access to support, and overall to have a more respectful dignified experience of the relationship.

## PART 4 - ORIENTATION TOWARDS THE COMMON GOOD: SOLIDARITY & SUPPORT

After nearly two years, relationships are now being built between hosts and refugees. Getting to know each other has been key in forming closer ties with mutual respect. Closer relationships manifest in how they interact in the social, cultural and economic spheres. Apart from the obvious formal market exchanges between the groups, informal interactions occur as well. Hosts and refugees share family labor and care work, resources and goods, lend and borrow items, and provide gifts to one another. As many as 80% of hosts and 60% of refugees say that they lend and borrow money, tools and other items from and with each other. 63% of refugees and 66% of host community members, especially women, reported sharing care work or household work such as cooking, cleaning, fetching water, and watching over houses and children. Half of refugees and hosts likewise reported giving each other gifts in the form of food, goods and other items. These examples are ways in which they form social networks to address their basic needs. Such practices support their ability to be self-reliant as a network: an effort to survive the crisis together.



## PART 5 – IMMEDIATE, TEMPORARY & DURABLE SOLUTIONS

Conditions for safety and dignity: Fundamental rights, access to basic needs, equal status and self-reliance are urgent priorities even while the search for durable solutions continue. For Rohingya, any solution must enable them to “live freely like others” or have equal rights, status and opportunities. At the core of their aspirations is to be fully recognized as a people with equal human rights. Given their experience of persecution in Myanmar, they perceive the recognition of their identity as a Rohingya as a means to ensure them a safe life and access to opportunities to gain the capacity to be self-reliant.

Repatriation to Myanmar with no less than these conditions continue to be refugees' main aspiration. Temporary or permanent integration into Bangladesh is a secondary or tertiary option if repatriation is impossible. All respondents refused relocation to Bashan Char as an option, as it is seen as a threat to life. For some, a move to the island would indicate a loss of their chance of returning to Myanmar with rights and justice. If they are to move to another place in Bangladesh, it must at least be under the same conditions they live now. They assume that Bangladesh will not be able to grant them equal rights and status. If they stay, an expectation is they will continue to be discriminated and be called "Burmaya!", a derogatory term for the Rohingya.

Resettlement to a third country is likely to be an alternative option, if the same conditions are guaranteed. Unlike Bangladesh, many perceive that resettlement will grant them equal rights and status. Several refugees remarked positively that they will not be discriminated in other countries.

Hosts, on the other hand, prioritise separation from each other as a solution. This could be in isolated camps, in another place or in a third country. Integration in Bangladesh was rarely considered to be a solution. Knowing that conditions in Myanmar are unsafe, there is a common expectation that refugees are likely to stay for a long period. Hosts think that resettlement to a third country will bring refugees a better life.

As immediate solutions, both hosts and refugees pointed to the urgent need to access income and self-reliance. Hosts feel neglected without access to aid, while refugees frequently expressed their undignified reliance on food rations to survive. Youth across groups emphasized the primacy of access to education in their lives. Host youth highlighted this need for Rohingya; that they must have the same access as they do.

Initiatives to build better relations and challenge exclusion and discrimination must be a priority. Humanitarian aid must integrate a host-refugee lens and approach in designing, delivering and adapting services. Respondents frequently pointed to better management and approach in the design and delivery of aid. To respond to this, a community-based approach and consistent engagement for social cohesion are essential. Such as for instance, modelling good inter-group relations, and cross-cultural activities that promote understanding between host and refugees. To avoid tensions, common resources such as water must be managed through better systems and processes. For instance, a common cause of tensions is the lack of water committees that facilitate equitable access to water and maintenance of facilities.

## SOCIAL COHESION & POWER

**The relationship between hosts and refugees is unequal and contentious. Both groups use their power and agency to negotiate as they interact. This process results in parallel and evolving trends that both strengthen and weaken social cohesion.**

Rohingya refugees are endowed with a lower status by the hosts, and struggle with the experience of exclusion and discrimination. Regardless, they are capitalizing on their ‘power within’ (self-power), and ‘power to’ (capacity to act for themselves and others) to build better relations to maintain a conflict-free relationship at the least, and build closer ties at the most.

Hosts also invest in the relationship, though women and youth are more likely than men to do so. Hosts, especially men, believe that the Rohingya are a threat to their access to livelihoods. Since host men define their dignity in terms of their ability to provide for their families, a threat to their livelihood is seen as a threat to their dignity. With the inherent power they carry as Bangladeshi, they are more likely to use it negatively to control refugees – an exercise of power. This is done to gain benefits that they perceive to have been taken away from them. Rohingya on the other hand are likely to feel disempowered and build a sense of resentment. In this environment of perceived competition, such power dynamics are likely to prevail. This dynamic pushes refugees further into isolation and exposes both communities to increasing risks of violence and conflict. This process is contributing to weaker social cohesion.

Nonetheless, there are deeper and closer host-refugee relationships now compared to before – a result of their willingness to build ties. Both have said that it is in interactions or contact that relationships are honed. These relationships are contributing much to stronger social cohesion and must be cultivated. While notably both are beginning to integrate (though only at the individual level), still there is an exercise of power with others to address basic needs. Women and youth are more likely than men to be open to this. We conclude that despite limited options, power is exercised by both groups, especially refugees, to build a semblance of social cohesion.

**The host-refugee relationship is evolving. Within the geographical scope of the study, trends show that they are integrating socially, culturally and economically, and they do so to address each other's needs. Women and youth are more likely to engage with each other than men. This process is contributing to stronger social cohesion.**

Self-reliance is the main priority of both communities and this has an impact on the host-refugee relationship. The host community blames refugees for their struggles to find livelihoods. These bad feelings then promote discrimination against the Rohingya, and are an impediment to social cohesion.

Yet, the process of integration is somehow contributing to the ability to be self-reliant. As seen in trends of shared labor, borrowing and lending, and gifting, such exchanges are producing benefits for both communities. It has become a process for both to address specific needs.

To work towards host and refugees' aspirations towards a safe and dignified life requires that we build on the relationships that are already forming. The context calls us to respond with an integrated social, cultural and economic approach to achieve self-reliance. As the response shifts its approach to address a protracted crisis, building on their efforts to sustain themselves will be central.

All these experiences, perceptions and aspirations, taken together, demonstrate the paradox that exists in the evolving host-refugee relationship - one that is riddled with power dynamics, and at the same time a fertile ground for social cohesion. Given the limited options available, hosts and refugees are using what is within their power to build ties to survive.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

**Shift towards medium-term integrated programming with a strong community-based approach to facilitate social cohesion.** Social cohesion will have to be a cross-cutting component, as recommended by the JRP. Specifically, there are opportunities from the study to tie social cohesion to thematic issues such as:

**Gender and Care Work:** As shown in the results, relationship building is different among women, men, young and old. There is a specific opportunity to build on the practice of doing care work together, especially among women. By framing care work as a gender and age issue across both groups, there is an opportunity to build women's collective power. Engaging men and boys with care work as an entry point will be important to address this issue, coupled with livelihood and market-based interventions.

**Youth and Education:** Education was highlighted as a need, especially for youth respondents, across hosts and refugees. An opportunity to design and implement joint youth and education programs can further strengthen ties between the two, and build on the common recognition for education as a need. It will also address the education gap among the refugee population and thereby increase chances to acquire skills and opportunities for the future.

**Language and Social Cohesion:** Although hosts and refugees claim to understand each other to some degree<sup>4</sup>, Rohingya, Chittagongian, and Bengali are different languages rooted in different cultures<sup>5</sup>. The language barrier was also cited as a reason for misunderstandings and so, too, is a site for social cohesion. This demonstrates that there is an opportunity to engage people in learning each other's language to be able to communicate better.

**Self-Reliance and Social Cohesion:** Build on the existing relations by developing an integrated host-refugee market-based livelihoods program. It can link the processes of production and consumption across communities to strengthen existing social, economic and cultural ties. As evidenced by similar initiatives in other contexts, this can demonstrate how cooperation can produce outcomes for both communities – and therefore counter narratives on competition. With improved access to resources, both groups are more likely to continue to support each other's needs. Therefore, programs must not only consist of in-kind distribution, but shift towards a market-based framework to build longer term capacity for self-reliance that is designed and delivered based on current host-refugee relations.

**Shift in modality of aid delivery:** Given the impacts of relief goods in the market, and consequent effect of this to the host-refugee relationship, there is a need to shift delivery of aid from in-kind to cash-based for more efficient response to differing needs of hosts and refugees.

**Management of shared resources:** Community-based processes and systems should be jointly established for the efficient and peaceful water collection of both communities. Furthermore, sites for shared water sources offer a place for contact interaction, which should be leveraged not only for mitigation of conflict, but for relationship building.

**Support inter-group and intra-group contact to mitigate discriminatory beliefs and practices and develop positive narratives of mutual support and benefit among hosts and refugees.** To counter narratives on competition, key messages on cooperation as a pathway to mutual benefit should be developed. As the Joint Response Plan 2019 asserts, more connections must be built between the two communities not only to mitigate conflict. The study suggests that future expectations of the inter-community relationship are projected to be better as they get to know each other more. Such is consistent with endorsement of the UN Secretary General<sup>6</sup> over the proven evidence that personal contact reduces prejudice in the context of forced migration and refugees. Therefore, adopting a community-based protection approach in facilitating small groups among hosts and refugees towards a common priority and goal are likely to build on existing sense of shared identity, and therefore contribute to social cohesion. Such efforts are important in mitigating the proliferation of harmful stereotypes against refugees and hosts and are in-line with the commitments under Global Compact on Refugees.<sup>7</sup>

**For the Government of Bangladesh to re-frame its approach to the Rohingya refugees from push-back policy to longer-term rights-based approach.** Given that conditions for repatriation are not currently available, the response to the Rohingya must consider the longevity of the crisis. Such would then warrant a longer-term approach with a priority to granting basic rights and access to both host and refugee communities. The context warrants an integrated approach in addressing their common issues to hosts and refugees to effectively address them. Among others, this shall translate to GoB's programming for expanded access to education, opportunities for livelihoods and capacity self-reliance, adequate shelter and freedom of movement. Moreover, it is argued that such approach will reduce pressure from the hosts, GoB, and aid, by enabling refugees to gain the capacity to provide for themselves. Such an approach has the potential to reduce the fears surrounding the relationship of refugees and hosts as it leverages the existing relations.

---

<sup>4</sup> Translators without Borders (TWB) research demonstrated only 64% of Rohingya (new arrival) were able to correctly replicate a basic sentence in Chittagonian. The Language Lesson: What We've Learned About Communicating with Rohingya Refugees. (November 2018) [https://translatorswithoutborders.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/TWB\\_Bangladesh\\_Comprehension\\_Study\\_Nov2018.pdf](https://translatorswithoutborders.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/TWB_Bangladesh_Comprehension_Study_Nov2018.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> Translators without Borders (TWB). Language Sensitivity for Managers Training in Cox's Bazar, 2018 by joint TWB-Oxfam-CARE initiative.

<sup>6</sup> United Nations General Assembly (21 April 2016). In Report of the Secretary-General – Safety and dignity: Addressing large movements of refugees and migrants.

<sup>7</sup> Paragraph 84 in Global Compact on Refugees states that “as durable solutions are unavailable for the time being, countering all forms of discrimination is essential between the host and refugee communities, in adherence to national policies.”



**Support the Government of Bangladesh to develop a revised national framework for refugees to localise refugee rights in international treaties and outline actions towards the objectives of the Global Compact on Refugees.** The Government of Bangladesh needs the support of the international community to continue to provide for nearly a million refugees. The Government should re-focus on the opportunities that the GCR provides for responsibility sharing<sup>8</sup> in addition to fostering host-refugee relationships and self-reliance. To do this, a review of the national legal framework in relation to its commitments to international human rights treaties applicable to refugees must be taken. Such will allow Government of Bangladesh to systematically respond to the crisis as well as outline actions towards increased responsibility sharing to ease itself of the burden of solely being responsible for this crisis.<sup>9</sup>

### **Recommendations for further study**

**Social Cohesion in areas where refugees and hosts do not 'live side by side'.** Proximity may be a determinant of the variations in interaction and relations of hosts and refugees. For instance, a study by Ground Truth Solutions relating to social cohesion was telling of the difference of Ukhiya camps or camps that are separate from host communities indicate some difference in trends<sup>10</sup>. Comparison of the narratives and perceptions, as well as the relations for these two kinds of locations would be relevant for adapting interventions per area.

**Formal and Informal Access to Justice.** A potent barrier to social cohesion is inter-community conflict that is unresolved or remains unraised. As demonstrated by trends in how host and refugees respond to conflict, a larger range of response options were considered by the hosts. For instance, they were more likely to seek for NGOs and camp authorities; and women across groups tend to not seek for the support of others, but rely much more on authorities. Further study on how inter-community conflict and differential preferences and access of women and men to conflict resolution or justice is recommended.<sup>11</sup>

**Polygamy as gender-based violence:** For host women, polygamy without their consent and the consequent abuses are highlighted concerns. On the other hand, trends found in the study also suggest that Rohingya women are more likely to be married off to host men as a means to gain better opportunities. The intersection of identity, statelessness and gender in this issue require further study to inform programming for advocacy and community-based protection work.

**Stereotypes and Perceptions of Rohingya Refugees.** There is more scope for study over the proliferation of stereotypes through access to varied sources of information such as social media and mainstream news. In host and refugee communities, it is worth studying the possible correlation in the better access of information generally of host men and refugees compared to women, and the negative perceptions and stereotypes. In addition, given the localisation agenda of the response, it is worth assessing the process of forming narratives among Bangladeshi aid workers and its potential implications in aid delivery.

---

<sup>8</sup> Cindy Huang and Kate Gough (7 February 2019). Brief: Toward Medium-Term Solutions for Rohingya Refugees and Hosts in Bangladesh: Mapping Potential Responsibility-Sharing Contributions

<sup>9</sup> Recommendations for responsibility-sharing were outlined by Gayathri Venugopal (14 September 2018). Asia Refugee Policy Analysis. Xchange., and cited Yesmin S. (2016) Policy Towards Rohingya Refugees: A Comparative Analysis of Bangladesh, Malaysia and Thailand. Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bangladesh (61)1 pp.71-100.

<sup>10</sup> Ground Truth Solutions (January 2019). Bulletin: Rohingya and Host communities Social Cohesion. [https://groundtruthsolutions.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/Bangladesh\\_rohingya\\_host\\_socialcohesion\\_012019.pdf](https://groundtruthsolutions.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/Bangladesh_rohingya_host_socialcohesion_012019.pdf)

<sup>11</sup> Have also been articulated by International Rescue Committee (March 2019). Access to Justice for Rohingya and Host Community in Cox's Bazar.