

## PROTOCOL

<b>Main title</b>	What is the evidence of the impact of employment creation on (a) stability and (b) poverty reduction in fragile states?
<b>Sub title</b>	-
<b>Review group</b>	
<b>Section</b>	PROCOTOL
<b>Authors IN ORDER OF CREDIT</b>	Rebecca Holmes, Dr Anna McCord, and Dr Jessica Hagen-Zanker with Gina Bergh and Franzisca Zanker. Social Protection Programme, ODI.
<b>EPPI-Centre reference number</b>	[To be completed by EPPI-Centre]
<b>Month/year of publication</b>	[To be completed by EPPI-Centre]
<b>This report should be cited as...</b>	The evidence on the impact of employment creation on stability and poverty reduction in fragile states
<b>Contact details (address, phone number, email)</b>	111 Westminster Bridge Road, London SE1 7JD a.mccord@odi.org.uk 020 7922 0300
<b>Institutional base</b>	Overseas Development Institute
<b>Review Group (with institutions)</b>	a) EPPI b) 3IE c) DFID
<b>Advisory group (with institutions)</b>	Ajay Sharma, DFID Economic Fragility and Growth Team, Christa Rottensteiner, DFID Growth Team Maxime Gasteen, DFID Research Team
<b>Conflicts of interest (if any)</b>	n/a
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	We thank Shaheen Akter, Francesca Booker and Elizabeth Molinari for their research inputs, Dr Chris Coles for his technical guidance and Alice Lemaitre for her work on information technology. We are grateful to Maxime Gasteen and reviewers at 3ie and EPPI for comments on an earlier draft of this protocol and to Jeff Brunton, Kelly Dickson and Claire Stanesfield for much help with EPPI reviewer.

# **1. Background**

## **1.1 Aims and rationale for review**

There is a widespread consensus that employment creation in fragile states has a positive impact on both stability and poverty reduction, a consensus which is driving much donor financing in both post conflict, (and financial crisis) affected contexts. This consensus was confirmed in 2008/9 by the adoption of the UN policy for post-conflict employment creation, income generation and reintegration. The policy argues that in post-conflict situations, employment has a critical role both at micro and macro levels to ensure stability, reintegration, socioeconomic growth and sustainable peace, while also providing the means for survival and recovery at household level. This policy was adopted as the result of a three-year consultation process which has contributed a range of grey materials on the subject in recent years. The policy aims to enhance the impact, coherence and efficiency of employment support to post-conflict countries and focuses on three types of interventions, i) those which provide short term employment with the objective of stabilizing income, ii) those which aim to promote local economic recovery in terms of livelihoods and reintegration, and iii) those which create decent work. In order to maintain a focus on promoting effective programming, this policy represents a key reference point for reviewing this topic. However, there are questions from key policy makers regarding the evidence or theoretical basis for the assumption that employment creation does have a significant impact on either stability or poverty.

Thus the aim of this review will identify and synthesise empirical evidence on the link between employment and i) stability and/or ii) poverty reduction. This will entail identifying two separate sets of literature, as well as any possible intersection between the two, relating to both i) employment creation and its impact on stability, and also ii) employment creation and its impact on poverty reduction in fragile states.

## **1.2 Definitional and conceptual issues**

Key concepts in the review include:

### ***Fragile states***

The population has been agreed with DFID as being defined a fragile state by OECD-DAC definitions (2006-2010), states scoring less than 3.2 on the World Bank CPIA Fragile States Index (2006-2010), and the states included in the Failed States Index (2006-2010).

In order to be included as a fragile state, states must be seen fragile by at least two of the sources (but must be either OECD-DAC or World Bank CPIA (because OECD-DAC draws from WB CPIA) AND Failed States index over the course of the time period 2006-2010 (see Annex 1 for details).

In addition, we have included Iraq and Sri Lanka for their relevance and potential contribution to generating knowledge for this study. In total, 33 fragile states identified using a combination of OECD-DAC, CPIA and Failed States Index criteria are considered relevant:

Afghanistan	Bangladesh	Burma	Burundi
Cameroon	Central African Republic	Chad	Congo, Democratic Republic of
Congo, Republic of	Cote D'Ivoire	East Timor	Eritrea
Ethiopia	Guinea	Guinea-Bissau	Haiti
Iraq	Liberia	Kenya	Kyrgyzstan
Nepal	Niger	Nigeria	Pakistan
Sierra Leone	Somalia	Sri Lanka	Sudan
Tajikistan	Uganda	Uzbekistan	Yemen, Republic of
Zimbabwe			

### ***Intervention - Employment creation***

The interventions will include those which create employment or jobs, in an attempt to include state employment creation, public works programmes, government employment schemes, demobilisation and reintegration programmes, labour-intensive infrastructure programmes, active labour market policies or any others which result in increased employment. The critical factor here is an exploration of the relationship between the creation of employment (rather than the means by which it is achieved) and stability and poverty outcomes.

### ***Outcomes – stability and poverty***

“Stability” is broadly defined as political and social stability - it is seen as a dynamic context along a continuum. In other words, politically, stability can refer to processes towards the legitimisation of the state, reduction in conflict, and progress towards peace processes. It also refers to social aspects of stability including social cohesion and inclusion, reduction in civil unrest, and the reintegration of those involved in conflict back into society (and the economy).

The definition of “poverty” is broader than income poverty. Our definition includes reductions in household and individual income poverty, increases in human capital (e.g. health and education), increases in assets, increases in social capital and improvements in consumption and food security.

### **1.3 Research background**

While several overview internal studies have been carried out by DFID and the UN agencies, these have not been rigorous or provided a clear summary of the existing evidence, and DFID remains concerned that evidence based policy making is not occurring in this area, and that much documentation in this area is based on assumptions rather than a clear theoretical basis or evidence. This will be the first attempt to gain an overview and synthesis of the available evidence, and any theoretical basis for such work.

The impact of employment creation on poverty reduction may be affected through multiple vectors, (the wage, work experience and skills acquisition, and asset creation) (Subbarao, 2003; Ravallion 2003; McCord, 2009) and the literature relating to each of these will be interrogated. In addition there is a separate literature around impact of employment creation on stability. This can occur as both indirectly, as a consequence of poverty reduction (e.g. absorbing ex-combatants, offering legitimate means of acquiring income during labour market disruption and hence reducing incentives for a-social activities which may contribute to instability (Wade, 2004)), and also through the range of factors which may be grouped under the collective category of 'state legitimizing functions', entailing a range of symbolic and state-citizen compact-related affects. Both these sets of literature, relating to i) poverty and ii) stability will be relevant to addressing the aims of the review.

It is likely that there will be a significant amount of grey literature, for example materials developed during the UN policy development process, and those included in the PCEIR (Post-Conflict Employment Creation, Income Generation and Reintegration) Technical and Resource Platform to assist policy implementation, including case studies, as well as donor programme evaluations.

Even within the mainstream (non fragile) social protection literature, there are limited materials addressing the impact of employment creation programmes on poverty, which attempt to address the question quantitatively (see comments by Devereux and Solomon, 2006 and McCord and Slater, 2009, who highlight the lack of evaluation material on such programmes). The limited papers available for review are likely to comprise mostly qualitative and grey literature.

In terms of employment creation and stabilization, there is a yet more limited literature, with very few quantitative papers

### **1.4 Objectives**

The question under review is complex, with i) a range of different types of employment creation interventions (as discussed in section 1.2) ii) varied target populations in 33 different fragile states, and iii) two different outcomes to be examined.

This research is an attempt to address the following review question:

What is the evidence of the impact of employment creation on (a) stability and (b) poverty reduction in fragile states?

This review will attempt to review the literature in order to search for evidence linking employment and i) stability and ii) poverty reduction in the context of fragile states. This will entail identifying two separate sets of literature, as well as any possible intersection between the two, relating to both i) employment creation and its impact on stability, and also ii) employment creation and its impact on poverty reduction, both within fragile states and more broadly.

The research will examine a range of forms of employment creation in a search for impacts of employment on stability and poverty but in order to make the review manageable, it will only focus on the impacts of employment creation in general without attributing the outcomes (stability and/or poverty) to particular employment interventions unless there is sufficient material to inform a causal chain analysis.

## **2. Methods used in the review**

### **2.2 User involvement**

#### *2.2.1 Approach and rationale*

Review users (DFID) have been consulted regarding the core objective of the question – identifying an empirical basis for the assumed linkages between employment creation and stability and poverty in fragile states. The users have assisted in the identification of the desired populations (fragile states) and interventions.

### **2.2 Identifying and describing studies**

#### *2.2.1 Defining relevant studies: inclusion and exclusion criteria*

To be included in the review, studies need to be focused on the relevant population, interventions and outcomes (for full inclusion and exclusion criteria see Annex 2).

**Population:** Fragile states (see list in section 1.2)

**Intervention:** Any intervention that leads to employment creation

**Outcomes:** a) Stability (any level e.g. community, sub-national, national, regional) b) Poverty (multi-dimensional indicators defined in section 1.2)

In terms of study design, studies will only be included if they are empirical impact studies, either from quantitative or qualitative research methodology, which offer empirical evidence of causal links between employment and stability or poverty reduction. Documents will be excluded if they are policy documents, descriptive, implementation reports, or only present outputs (e.g. 500 people were employed). For example, exclusion criteria will include:

- a. editorial, commentary, book review
- b. policy document
- c. resource, textbook
- d. bibliography
- e. position paper
- f. methodological paper
- g. theoretical paper

We will also apply quality criteria (see 2.2.5) and will exclude information deemed to be below a certain quality:

- a. anecdotal: e.g. must include a research methodology
- b. Poor sample selection: not clear how sample selected

### 2.2.2 Identification of potential studies: Search strategy

The search strategy will combine;

- i) Website searches (see Annex 3)
- ii) Databases searches (see Annex 3)
- iii) Internet and meta search engine searches (see Annex 3)
- iv) Hand searches of bibliographies of articles accepted at final stage full text level
- v) Hand search of grey literature and reference lists supplied by key informants
- vi) Direct requests to key informants  
(including Paul Collier, UN staff working on UN Policy for post-conflict employment creation, income generation and reintegration, DFID Fragile States' team members)

Given the limited material available on these topics all sources of data will be considered, (grey, narrative, analytical etc).

The review will be limited to English language only, given the limitations of the search team. The time limit will be set to all literature after 1995 due to the definition of fragile states (as described in Annex 1).

A database system – EPPI Reviewer 4 - will be used to manage and code studies found during the review. Titles and abstracts will be imported and entered manually into the first of these databases.

Strings have been developed to identify relevant studies. Given the complexity of the research questions, and the multiple countries defined as fragile by DFID, several strings are required (see Annex 4). Also, it is necessary to look at the question of stability separately from that of poverty, essentially splitting the study into two components.

The strings to be used may be summarised thus;

- i) String One Summary – Employment, Fragile States and Stability
- ii) String One Summary – Employment, X country and Stability
- iii) String Two Summary – Employment, Fragile States and Poverty
- iv) String Two Summary – Employment, X country and Poverty
- v)

While we attempt to use consistent search strings across databases, some databases and websites may require adjustments to the search strings due to a limited number of search strings or Boolean operators being allowed. For instance, country by country searches may be required in addition to searches using the terminology 'fragile' and synonyms. If the number of search hits for a certain database becomes

unmanageable (more than 2000) “not keywords”<sup>1</sup> will be used, to reduce the number of hits. Furthermore an iterative research process will be used in the piloting stage, with frequent discussions on the relevance of the results found, so search strings may be revised in the course of the process.

## Synonyms

As a result of testing a number of poverty, stability and fragile states synonyms, we have identified the following search terms for inclusion.

Employment creation: “Employ\*”, “job\*”. These search terms are appropriate to capture both the tool of employment creation through jobs, as well as the facilitating environment to support employment. Additional synonyms such as workfare, cash-for-work, inputs for work, were originally included, but have now been excluded on the basis of irrelevance – these terms will be captured in the two search terms above.

Poverty: “poverty”, “Asset\*”, “Wealth”, “Capital”, “income”, “consumption”. These search terms are deemed appropriate to illicit a range of impacts on poverty indicators - material, social and human capital related.

Stability: “stabil\*”, “cohesion”, “peace”, “legit\*”. These search terms are deemed broad enough to capture the impacts of employment on stability. Additional synonyms included social inclusion and integration, however, we have omitted them in our final search terms because they are intermediary outcomes.

### *2.2.3 Screening studies: applying inclusion and exclusion criteria*

Before screening starts, we may search all titles and abstracts - inclusion and exclusion criteria will be applied successively to

- titles
- if title sounds broadly relevant, then on abstracts
- if the abstract seems relevant, then on the full report

Full reports will be obtained for those studies where 1) title and 2) abstract appear meet the criteria, or where there is some uncertainty regarding relevance. The inclusion and exclusion criteria will be re-applied to the full reports and those that do not meet these initial criteria will be excluded. At this stage in particular, the quality of the evidence will be assessed. The full list of inclusion and exclusion criteria is listed in Annex 2.

---

<sup>1</sup>“Not keywords” can be applied in some databases to exclude articles containing keywords that will exclude non-relevant articles, e.g. banking in the case at hand.



#### 2.2.4 Characterising included studies

Studies included in the review will be coded on the following basis, the effect of employment creation on;

- a) Stability
- b) Poverty

If there is sufficient information we will include two more codings:

First, on four broad categories of fragile states (suggested by the OECD DAC and the World Bank):

1. **Deteriorating situations:** States where the ability (or willingness) of the state to perform its functions is in decline. These countries may be experiencing conflict or are highly vulnerable to conflict. It is difficult for donors to engage due to the very high risks.
2. **Arrested development / prolonged impasse:** States that fail to use their authority for pro-poor outcomes. Donors are typically unwilling to deal with the state directly for political reasons and may also face severe security risks.
3. **Early recovery / re-engaging / turnaround countries:** Countries which have been performing very poorly for a period, but where some effort is being made to improve, although that may be patchy and uncertain.
4. **Post-conflict transition:** Where countries have attained a reasonable degree of peace and stability, and now offer a window of opportunity for stakeholders to work together with government on a program of reform.

And second, types of employment (Ellis et al., 2010), e.g.

- **Short term / emergency job creation** e.g. food and cash for work, public works programmes etc. which are usually funded and implemented by the public sector;
- **Private sector development to promote job creation on a more sustainable basis for the long run** e.g. market development studies, value chain analysis, competitiveness studies, investment climate reforms, and policies designed to promote micro-entrepreneurship such as microfinance programmes, rural livelihoods programmes, and business development services

#### 2.2.5 Identifying and describing studies: quality assurance process

The questions, strings and search terms have been piloted prior to protocol formulation in order to assess literature availability and the adequacy of the terms. This has resulted in a revision of both search terms and strings.

Application of the inclusion and exclusion criteria and the coding will be conducted by pairs of RG members working independently and then comparing their decisions and coming to a consensus.

The process of searching will be iterative, given the scarcity of literature on this topic, and search terms may be modified during the 12 week search period.

The researchers will be monitored daily by the Research Managers and the team will meet weekly to discuss and review findings.

## **2.3 Methods for synthesis**

### *2.3.1 Assessing quality of studies*

An assessment of the quality of the studies will be made on the basis of the technical rigour (e.g. methodological rigour, analysis) and quality of the data (sample size, collection method etc).

On this basis, quantitative studies will be graded by quality on a scale of 1-5.

1 = anecdotal

2 = qualitative/ descriptive

3 = secondary literature review

4 = basic econometric analysis

5 = advanced econometric analysis (e.g. Propensity Score Matching), with controls

6 = fully randomised control trial/ longitudinal analysis

Qualitative studies will be graded by quality on a scale of 1-6.

1 = anecdotal

2 = secondary literature review

3 = single research method used and small sample size (single community)

4 = multiple research method used (triangulated) and large sample size (more than one community)

5 = multiple research method used (triangulated), large sample size (more than one community) and control group

6 = multiple research method used (triangulated), large sample size (more than one community), control group and longitudinal

### *2.3.2 Overall approach to and process of synthesis*

There will be two discrete but interlinked synthesis processes:

- Framework analysis of impacts found using vote counting techniques
- Summary and analysis of qualitative impact

The most important objective of these syntheses will be to attempt to identify the empirical basis of the impact of employment on i) stability and ii) poverty.

### *2.3.2.1 Selection of studies for synthesis (if not all studies that are included in the synthesis)*

All relevant studies will be included in at least one of the two syntheses proposed, depending on content and quality rating as described above.

Studies will be selected on the basis of the search strategy set out in 2.2.2 above.

### *2.3.2.2 Selection of outcome data for synthesis*

Principles for selecting outcome data from primary studies in the review will be rigour of data collection approaches, use of established econometric analysis techniques, and the statistical significance of findings.

### *2.3.2.3 Process used to combine/ synthesise data*

This has been addressed in 2.3.2 above.

## **2.4 Deriving conclusions and implications**

The process used to derive implications and conclusions from the review results will be informed by discussion within review team, with review advisory group and with other users, working on fragile states.

The two synthesis methods outlined above should provide an answer to the question regarding the adequacy of the empirical basis for the assumed linkages between employment creation and stability and/or poverty.

These will be used to provide an initial narrative summary which will be discussed with the review team and review advisory group, and possibly also relevant UN colleagues.

## References

Devereux and Solomon, 2006. Employment Creation Programmes: The International Experience. Issues in Employment and Poverty. Discussion Paper No. 24. Geneva: Economic and Labour Market Analysis Department, International Labour Office, August 2006.

DFID Conceptual Framework for Expanding Economic Opportunities, unpublished.

Ellis, K., Harvey, P., Lemma, A. and K. Higgins (2010) Job Creation in Fragile States. Overseas Development Institute, London.

Failed States Index (2009). Accessed here:  
[http://www.fundforpeace.org/web/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=99&Itemid=140](http://www.fundforpeace.org/web/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=99&Itemid=140)

McCord, 2009. The Anatomy of Public Works: An exploration of the social protection function of public works programmes in contexts of chronic poverty. Thesis Presented for the Degree of DPhil. School of Economics, Department of Commerce, University of Cape Town. April 2009. Unpublished.

McCord and Slater, 2009. 'Overview of Public Works Programmes in Sub-Saharan Africa', Overseas Development Institute, London.

OECD / DAC, 2005. Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, Ownership, Harmonisation, Alignment, Results and Mutual Accountability, High Level Forum, Paris.

OECD, 2007. Ensuring fragile states are not left behind. Factsheet, December 2007.

Ravallion, 2003. Assessing the Poverty Impact of an Assigned Program. In Bourguignon, F. and Da Silva, L. (eds) The Impact of Economic Policies on Poverty and Income Distribution. Washington, DC: Oxford University Press for the World Bank.

Subbarao, 2003. 'Systemic Shocks and Social Protection: Role and Effectiveness of Public Works Programs', Social Protection Discussion Paper Series no. 0302, World Bank, Washington.

United Nations Policy for Post-conflict Employment Creation and Income Generation, and Reintegration. ILO, Geneva 2009. Accessed here:  
[https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed\\_emp/---emp\\_ent/---ifp\\_crisis/documents/publication/wcms\\_117576.pdf](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_emp/---emp_ent/---ifp_crisis/documents/publication/wcms_117576.pdf)

World Bank (2009) IDA Country Performance Ratings 2009 (CPIA). Accessed here:  
<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/EXTABOUTUS/IDA/0,,contentMDK:20948754~menuPK:2607525~pagePK:51236175~piPK:437394~theSitePK:73154~isCURL:Y,00.html>

## Annex 1: List of Fragile States

In order to be included as a fragile state for Q22 of the systematic review, states must be seen fragile by at least two of the sources (but must be either OECD-DAC or World Bank CPIA (because OECD-DAC draws from WB CPIA) AND Failed States index.

OECD-DAC: OECD (2010). Ensuring fragile states are not left behind. Summary Report, February 2010; OECD (2007). Ensuring fragile states are not left behind. Factsheet, December 2007.

World Bank CPIA: Scores for IDA CPR (<3.2)

2009 [http://siteresources.worldbank.org/IDA/Resources/73153-1181752621336/3878278\\_1277851499224/ICPR\\_2009\\_Rank\\_Table2.pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/IDA/Resources/73153-1181752621336/3878278_1277851499224/ICPR_2009_Rank_Table2.pdf)

2006-8 [http://siteresources.worldbank.org/IDA/Resources/ICPRFY06\\_08.pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/IDA/Resources/ICPRFY06_08.pdf)

Failed States Index:

[http://www.fundforpeace.org/web/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=99&Itemid=140](http://www.fundforpeace.org/web/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=99&Itemid=140)

### Sources – Timeframe of available data

**OECD-DAC:** No permanent (or official DAC) list but 2010 Summary Report lists Fragile States derived from World Bank CPIA 2008, the Brookings Index of State Weakness in the Developing World 2009, and the Carleton University Country Indicators for Foreign Policy (CFIP) 2007 index.<sup>2</sup>

Since this is the only existing OECD-DAC list (apart from 2007 Factsheet), and has no official list status, the continuity of its sources will be checked:

*Brookings Index of State Weaknesses in the Developing World:* Index only available 2009, see [http://www.brookings.edu/reports/2008/02\\_weak\\_states\\_index.aspx](http://www.brookings.edu/reports/2008/02_weak_states_index.aspx)

*CFIP:* Index only available 2007

**World Bank CPIA:** Has been measured since 1977, but has changed over time, notably in 1998, the most important change relating to greater emphasis being placed on institutions.<sup>3</sup> Publicly available only 2005-2009, and only able to find IDA CPR Ratings 2006-2009<sup>4</sup>

**Failed States Index:** Available from 2005-2010

---

<sup>2</sup> Please note this is an update from 2007 Factsheet; the list now includes Nepal, Kenya, Pakistan, West Bank & Gaza, Rwanda, Dem. Rep. of Korea, Ethiopia, Iraq and; OECD (2010). Ensuring fragile states are not left behind. Summary Report, February 2010.

<sup>3</sup> Independent Evaluation Group (2009). The World Bank's Country Policy and Institutional Assessment: An Evaluation. June 30, 2009.

<sup>4</sup> <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/EXTABOUTUS/IDA/0,,contentMDK:20948754~menuPK:2625191~pagePK:51236175~piPK:437394~theSitePK:73154,00.html>

### List of Fragile States

By looking in more detail at the sources available to find data on fragile states, it has been found that no data is available before 2006. Furthermore, it has been noted that the concept of fragile states has in itself only emerged as a key priority and discussion in the international development community in the last 5 years or so.<sup>5</sup> In fact key definitions of fragile states were created in 2008 (DFID) and 2007 (OECD).<sup>6</sup>

An overview of fragile states for that period, looking at OECD-DAC (when available), CPIA and the Failed States Index, has been made in order to correctly identify the countries that should be included in the systematic review (see table below). States count as fragile when they appear in at least two of these Datasets<sup>7</sup>.

---

<sup>5</sup> Claire Mcloughlin (2010). Topic Guide on Fragile States. GSDRC, February 2010, pp.6

<sup>6</sup> Internal ODI Paper, Job Creation in Fragile States, 19<sup>th</sup> June 2010

<sup>7</sup> Note that OECD-DAC data is only available for 2007 and 2010, and CPIA only from 2006-2009





Djibouti		Djibouti		Djibouti		Djibouti	Djibouti		Djibouti	
East Timor	East Timor	East Timor	East Timor	East Timor	East Timor	East Timor	East Timor	East Timor	East Timor	
Ethiopia	Ethiopia		Ethiopia		Ethiopia			Ethiopia		Ethiopia
Eritrea	Eritrea	Eritrea		Eritrea	Eritrea	Eritrea	Eritrea		Eritrea	
Gambia, The		Gambia, The		Gambia, The		Gambia, The	Gambia, The		Gambia, The	
	Georgia		Georgia							
Guinea	Guinea	Guinea	Guinea	Guinea	Guinea	Guinea	Guinea	Guinea	Guinea	Guinea
Guinea- Bissau	Guinea- Bissau	Guinea- Bissau	Guinea- Bissau	Guinea- Bissau	Guinea- Bissau	Guinea- Bissau	Guinea- Bissau		Guinea- Bissau	
		Guyana				Guyana				
Haiti	Haiti	Haiti	Haiti	Haiti	Haiti	Haiti	Haiti	Haiti	Haiti	Haiti
	Iran		Iran		Iran					
Iraq	Iraq		Iraq		Iraq			Iraq		Iraq
Kenya	Kenya	Kenya	Kenya		Kenya			Kenya		
Kiribati		Kiribati		Kiribati		Kiribati	Kiribati		Kiribati	
Korea (DR)										
				Kyrgyzstan		Kyrgyzstan			Kyrgyzstan	Kyrgyzstan
Laos		Laos		Laos		Laos	Laos		Laos	
	Lebanon		Lebanon		Lebanon			Lebanon		
Liberia	Liberia	Liberia	Liberia		Liberia		Liberia	Liberia		Liberia
	Malawi		Malawi		Malawi			Malawi		
Mauritania		Mauritania		Mauritania		Mauritania	Mauritania		Mauritania	
Nepal	Nepal	Nepal	Nepal	Nepal	Nepal			Nepal		Nepal
Niger	Niger	Niger	Niger		Niger	Niger	Niger	Niger		
Nigeria	Nigeria	Nigeria	Nigeria	Nigeria	Nigeria	Nigeria	Nigeria	Nigeria	Nigeria	Nigeria
	North Korea		North Korea		North Korea			North Korea		North Korea
Pakistan	Pakistan	Pakistan	Pakistan	Pakistan	Pakistan			Pakistan		Pakistan

Papua New Guinea		Papua New Guinea		Papua New Guinea		Papua New Guinea	Papua New Guinea		Papua New Guinea	
Rwanda										Rwanda
Sao Tome and Principe		Sao Tome and Principe		Sao Tome and Principe		Sao Tome and Principe	Sao Tome and Principe		Sao Tome and Principe	
Sierra Leone	Sierra Leone	Sierra Leone	Sierra Leone	Sierra Leone	Sierra Leone	Sierra Leone	Sierra Leone	Sierra Leone	Sierra Leone	Sierra Leone
Solomon Islands				Solomon Islands		Solomon Islands	Solomon Islands		Solomon Islands	
Somalia	Somalia		Somalia		Somalia		Somalia	Somalia		
	Sri Lanka		Sri Lanka		Sri Lanka			Sri Lanka		Sri Lanka
Sudan	Sudan		Sudan		Sudan		Sudan	Sudan		Sudan
					Syria					
Tajikistan		Tajikistan	Tajikistan	Tajikistan		Tajikistan	Tajikistan		Tajikistan	
Togo		Togo		Togo		Togo	Togo		Togo	
Tonga						Tonga	Tonga			
Uganda	Uganda		Uganda		Uganda			Uganda		Uganda
Uzbekistan	Uzbekistan	Uzbekistan	Uzbekistan	Uzbekistan	Uzbekistan	Uzbekistan	Uzbekistan	Uzbekistan	Uzbekistan	Uzbekistan
Vanuatu						Vanuatu	Vanuatu		Vanuatu	
West Bank and Gaza										
Yemen, Republic of	Yemen, Republic of	Yemen, Republic of	Yemen, Republic of	Yemen, Republic of	Yemen, Republic of	Yemen, Republic of	Yemen, Republic of	Yemen, Republic of	Yemen, Republic of	Yemen, Republic of
Zimbabwe	Zimbabwe		Zimbabwe		Zimbabwe		Zimbabwe	Zimbabwe		Zimbabwe

Please note – we have still included Iraq and Sri Lanka for our relevance to our question. Final full list of countries:

Afghanistan	Bangladesh	Burma	Burundi
Cameroon	Central African Republic	Chad	Congo, Democratic Republic of
Congo, Republic of	Cote D'Ivoire	East Timor	Eritrea
Ethiopia	Guinea	Guinea-Bissau	Haiti
Iraq	Liberia	Kenya	Kyrgyzstan
Nepal	Niger	Nigeria	Pakistan
Sierra Leone	Somalia	Sri Lanka	Sudan
Tajikistan	Uganda	Uzbekistan	Yemen, Republic of
Zimbabwe			

## Annex 2: Full inclusion and exclusion criteria

### *Inclusion criteria*

- 1) **Language:** English
- 2) **Intervention:** Any intervention that leads to employment creation
- 3) **Geographical location:** Fragile states (see list)
- 4) **Population:**
- 5) **Aim of study:** Should be investigating **impact** of intervention. We are interested in OUTCOMES on:
  - a. Stability (any level e.g. community, sub-national, national, regional)
  - b. Poverty (multi-dimensional indicators)
- 6) **Study design:** Be high quality empirical research (quantitative or qualitative)
- 7) **Date:** post 1995

Therefore studies will be excluded if they do not

### *Exclusion criteria:*

- 1) **Language:** Not in English
- 2) **Title incomplete or missing**
- 3) **Date** – pre 1995
- 4) **Intervention:** Interventions which do not lead to employment creation
- 5) **Geographical location:** Not a fragile state (as per list defined below)
- 6) **Aim of study:** Not investigating **impact** of intervention, for example
  - a. Policy document, describing a new programme to be implemented
  - b. Implementation report, describing administrative issues (e.g. there was not enough qualified staff to implement programme properly) or OUTPUTS (e.g. 500 people were employed)
- 7) **Study design** Is either ‘non-empirical’ research Exclusion criteria will include articles which do not offer empirical or theoretical evidence of causal links between employment and stability or poverty reduction
  - h. editorial, commentary, book review
  - i. policy document
  - j. resource, textbook
  - k. bibliography
  - l. position paper
  - m. methodological paper
  - n. theoretical paper

or not high quality empirical research:

- o. anecdotal: e.g. must include a research methodology
- p. Poor sample selection: not clear how sample selected

### **Annex 3: Search strategy for electronic databases**

#### Subject-specific databases to be searched:

1. Econlit (Ebsco)
2. Francis (Ebsco)
3. Africa-Wide Information (Ebsco)
4. International Political Science Abstracts (IPSA) (Ebsco)
5. International Security & Counter-Terrorism Reference Center (ISCTRC) (Ebsco)
6. Middle Eastern & Central Asian Studies (MECAS) (Ebsco)
7. Peace Research Abstracts
8. Political Science Complete (Ebsco)
9. Public Administration Abstracts (Ebsco)
10. Public Affairs Index (Ebsco)
11. Social Sciences Abstracts (Ebsco)
12. Family & Society Studies Worldwide (FSSW) (Ebsco)
13. Social Science Citation Index (Web of Knowledge)

#### Publisher platforms to be searched:

1. Wiley Interscience (All Economic; All Development Studies; Social Policy & Welfare; All Political Science) (using short search string)
2. International Bibliography of the Social Sciences
3. Sage Journals (Public Administration, Economics and Development, Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution, Regional Studies, Politics & International Relations)
4. Jstor (African Studies, Population Studies, Public Policy and Administration, Asian Studies, Economics, Middle East Studies, Political Science)
5. Cab Direct

#### Institutional websites to be searched

1. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)
2. World Bank
3. UNDP's Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery
4. USAID
5. Human Security Gateway
6. Eldis
7. Governance Resource Centre
8. Research4DFID
9. ILO & UN (ILO developed UN policy)
10. CPRC
11. IDEAS
12. SSRN
13. Poverty Action Lab Evaluations
14. Adam Smith

#### (Meta) search engines to be searched

1. Google Scholar
2. Metacrawler

Journals to be searched:

1. Journal of Intervention and State-building
2. Conflict, Security and Development Journal
3. Survival
4. The Economics of Peace and Security Journal
5. Journal of International Relations and Development
6. Journal of Peacebuilding and Development

## Annex 4: Search Strings

### Search string long

1.	Employ* OR job* AND stabil* OR cohesion OR peace OR legit* AND Afghanistan OR Bangladesh OR Burma OR Burundi OR Cameroon OR "Central African Republic" OR Chad OR Congo OR "Cote D'Ivoire" OR "Ivory Coast" OR "East Timor" OR "Timor Leste" OR Eritrea OR Ethiopia OR Guinea OR Guinea-Bissau OR Haiti OR Iraq OR Liberia OR Kenya OR Kyrgyzstan OR Nepal OR Niger OR Nigeria OR Pakistan OR "Sierra Leone" OR Somalia OR "Sri Lanka" OR Sudan OR Tajikistan OR Uganda OR Uzbekistan OR Yemen OR Zimbabwe
2.	Employ* OR job* AND poverty OR asset* OR wealth OR capital OR income OR consumption AND impact AND Afghanistan OR Bangladesh OR Burma OR Burundi OR Cameroon OR "Central African Republic" OR Chad OR Congo OR "Cote D'Ivoire" OR "Ivory Coast" OR "East Timor" OR "Timor Leste" OR Eritrea OR Ethiopia OR Guinea OR Guinea-Bissau OR Haiti OR Iraq OR Liberia OR Kenya OR Kyrgyzstan OR Nepal OR Niger OR Nigeria OR Pakistan OR "Sierra Leone" OR Somalia OR "Sri Lanka" OR Sudan OR Tajikistan OR Uganda OR Uzbekistan OR Yemen OR Zimbabwe

### Search string short

Search string short: employment stability country

3.1	Employ* stabil* Afghanistan
3.2	Employ* stabil* Bangladesh
3.3	Employ* stabil* Burma
3.4	Employ* stabil* Burundi
3.5	Employ* stabil* Cameroon
3.6	Employ* stabil* "Central African Republic"
3.7	Employ* stabil* Chad
3.8	Employ* stabil* Congo
3.9	Employ* stabil* "Cote D'Ivoire"
3.1 0	Employ* stabil* "Ivory Coast"
3.1 1	Employ* stabil* "East Timor"
3.1 2	Employ* stabil* "Timor Leste"
3.1 3	Employ* stabil* Eritrea
3.1	Employ* stabil* Ethiopia

4	
3.1 5	Employ* stabil* Guinea
3.1 6	Employ* stabil* Guinea-Bissau
3.1 7	Employ* stabil* Haiti
3.1 8	Employ* stabil* Iraq
3.1 9	Employ* stabil* Kenya
3.2 0	Employ* stabil* Kyrgyzstan
3.2 1	Employ* stabil* Liberia
3.22	Employ* stabil* Nepal
3.23	Employ* stabil* Niger
3.24	Employ* stabil* Nigeria
3.25	Employ* stabil* Pakistan
3.26	Employ* stabil* "Sierra Leone"
3.27	Employ* stabil* Somalia
3.28	Employ* stabil* Sri Lanka
3.29	Employ* stabil* Sudan
3.30	Employ* stabil* Tajikistan
3.31	Employ* stabil* Uganda
3.32	Employ* stabil* Uzbekistan
3.33	Employ* stabil* Yemen
3.34	Employ* stabil* Zimbabwe

Search string short: Employ\* poverty impact country

4.1	Employ* poverty impact Afghanistan
4.2	Employ* poverty impact Bangladesh
4.3	Employ* poverty impact Burma
4.4	Employ* poverty impact Burundi
4.5	Employ* poverty impact Cameroon
4.6	Employ* poverty impact "Central African Republic"
4.7	Employ* poverty impact Chad
4.8	Employ* poverty impact Congo
4.9	Employ* poverty impact "Cote D'Ivoire"
4.1 0	Employ* poverty impact "Ivory Coast"
4.1 1	Employ* poverty impact "East Timor"



4.1 2	Employ* poverty impact "Timor Leste"
4.1 3	Employ* poverty impact Eritrea
4.1 4	Employ* poverty impact Ethiopia
4.1 5	Employ* poverty impact Guinea
4.1 6	Employ* poverty impact Guinea-Bissau
4.1 7	Employ* poverty impact Haiti
4.1 8	Employ* poverty impact Iraq
4.1 9	Employ* poverty impact Kenya
4.2 0	Employ* poverty impact Kyrgyzstan
4.2 1	Employ* poverty impact Liberia
4.22	Employ* poverty impact Nepal
4.23	Employ* poverty impact Niger
4.24	Employ* poverty impact Nigeria
4.25	Employ* poverty impact Pakistan
4.26	Employ* poverty impact "Sierra Leone"
4.27	Employ* poverty impact Somalia
4.28	Employ* poverty impact "Sri Lanka"
4.29	Employ* poverty impact Sudan
4.30	Employ* poverty impact Tajikistan
4.31	Employ* poverty impact Uganda
4.32	Employ* poverty impact Uzbekistan
4.33	Employ* poverty impact Yemen
4.34	Employ* poverty impact Zimbabwe