Economic Growth and Kidnapping in Colombia:  
A Focus of Gender

Theoretical and empirical studies showing the relationship between economic growth and conflict have increased over time, but there are not studies between economic growth and gender, a lot less researches on the conflict from a gender perspective growth. This work focuses on analysing and quantifying the impact of conflicts through the variable kidnapping in Colombia’s economic growth from a gender perspective through panel data methodology and the ordinary least squares method. The overall conclusion is that the abduction of men and women negatively affects economic growth in each of the departments and the country at the aggregate level.
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Introduction

There are a number of theoretical and empirical studies showing the relationship between economic growth and conflict work but few studies linking economic growth with a focus on gender and there are no studies linking aspects of the conflict from a gender perspective on growth. This work is to analyse and quantify the impact of conflict through kidnapping variable on the Colombian economic growth from a gender perspective through the panel data methodology and through the ordinary least squares method. The work is divided into 5 sections. The first section is this introduction. The second part relates the conflict on economic growth from a gender perspective and present some background. The third part highlights the stylised facts of kidnapping and growth in Colombia for the period 1970-2010. In the fourth part the respective estimates between economic growth and kidnapping carried out through panel data and the methodology by OLS and the Granger causality test is also performed. Finally, in the fifth section, the main conclusions are presented.

Economic Growth, Conflict and Gender

Conflict and Economic Growth

Among the relatively recent studies between conflict and growth are those by Romer (1990) who identifies the social conflict and political instability originate low rates of economic growth and that this relationship is one that occurs regularly in all economies where there are conflicts. From a macroeconomic point of view, it is assumed that the channels through which the conflict affects negatively on the level of economic activity, are as follows:
Incidence of conflict about saving economies suffer from it. If the conflict is strong there be dissaving and vice versa.

Impact on the stock of capital. Conflict can cause damage to the country's infrastructure, target resources to illegal activities and finally, do not allow the accumulation of physical and human capital, leading to low levels of technology. Additionally, the continuous kidnapping activity of the conflict has a negative impact on production and productivity of men and women who directly or indirectly suffer from this scourge.

The negative impact on investment results in a tax for entrepreneurs, because the opportunity cost increases. In this context, a kidnapped businessman who is asked for ransom money or affected by armed groups can negatively impact their expectations and take them to reduce their levels of investment.

Negative impact on public spending and the fiscal deficit. There is a diversion of resources from social spending to finance war and thus increasing inequality and poverty.

Negative impact on the labour market. There is a deviation of human capital into the armed forces or migration of skilled labour to other countries. In addition, the conflict by kidnapping reduces the amount of male and female workers affecting production, labour productivity and total factor productivity.

Impact of kidnapping on economic activity. Brakes production capacity of labour and impacts on inventions and innovations, ie, drop in the generation of patents.

A macro level also suggests that there may be an inverse correlation between the number of kidnappings and share of profits in income. As expressed by the economists, Smith and Ricardo, distributive disputes and poor income distribution are the cause of the conflict among classes. Poverty and inequality are key elements of human confrontation and social conflict have been the subject of debate among theorists of social sciences since its inception. For example, for the classical economists there was a direct relationship between inequality, wealth and social confrontation. Smith argued that inequality was the main cause of poverty, but this inequity justified as an inherent foundation of the economic structure that guarantee the stability of the social order. By analysing the process of capital accumulation, Smith concludes that the division of labour drives the growth of wages but does not guarantee reduce inequity. For Ricardo, the accumulation of capital is a part of the distribution process, which fuels endless conflict among social classes. The main conflict is between wages and profits, but the landlords turn collide against capitalists and workers.

Addressing specifically to kidnapping, this can lead to reduce the rate of savings in an economy. This means that it is preferable for the agents consume and spend their income on goods and services have to deliver in exchange for freedom. It will be recalled that this behaviour is one of the stylised facts of the
conflict and growth, only that in this context, a lower savings rate generates more growth induced consumption on economic activity in general effects. But, if you consider for example, the guerrilla or paramilitary groups in Colombia kidnap civilians rather than members of the armed forces. It happens because these illegal armed groups have a trace of their wealth and their banking transactions. And if it is not the guerrilla or paramilitary groups who kidnaps, but common criminals, they may have the wealth of information who is kidnapped.

There may also be impacts of conflict on economy and political outcomes. These effects can determine the election results for the election of representatives at any level, i.e., Presidents, governors, etc.

At the micro level, the relationship between conflict and economic date from many years but not so explicitly, and of course understanding the concept of conflict. For example, Vilfredo Pareto (1946), relates the conflict, it is understood as a distribution struggle in production towards productive activities. If the conflict is defined as a class struggle, then Marxism has much to say about the behaviour of the economy and the class struggle among landowners, capitalists and workers.

Gary Becker (1960-1980), was the one who explicitly involved the conflict within the economic analysis. His theoretical proposal on the economics of crime earned him the Nobel Prize in 1992. In general, there are many studies on economics and conflict, but very few on economic growth, conflict and gender.

Economic Growth and Gender

The study of the relationship between economic growth and gender have increased in recent times. The consensus is that the conflict generates lower growth as noted in the previous paragraphs that can destroy important human capital for developing. Undoubtedly, human capital represented by men and women with certain physical and intellectual abilities to perform any work. In this sense, the loss of human capital does not differentiate gender because, in fact, adversely affect the economic dynamics of a country or a specific region. The question that must be asked is to what extent does the loss of human capital by establishing gender difference contributes to the decline in economic growth. In this specific work, the question would be to what extent does the kidnapping of men and women in the country contributes to the decline in economic growth.

There are approaches that have been raised to establish the links between economic growth and gender. One approach suggests that women are not represented in the economic discipline and therefore it is necessary to begin to involve them in the different both empirical and theoretical studies. This type of approach has been called the “Participatory Action”.

Another approach suggests that the tools used by the economic discipline are not the problem but the disadvantage is basically their application. This
type of approach has been called “Feminist Empiricism”. Likewise, feminism differences focuses on strictly the difference between men and women in the theory and practice of discipline. Examples of this approach are the studies on the wage gap between men and women for the same positions in both the public sector and the private sector.

Another approach to the inclusion of gender in economic discipline is called “Feminist Postmodernism” which seeks to investigate whether this concept of gender is useful or not for the economic analysis. To that effect, it is indispensable to progress on empirical studies to validate the usefulness of the concept of gender. Finally, the focus on feminist constructionism which states that it is necessary to go new factors including gender but at the same time it should evaluate these inclusions as well as those which are left out of the analysis to pinpoint the enrichment of economic theoretical and empirical grounds. (Nelson 1993).

One approach raises the distinction between single mothers and against other traders in a growth model Ramsey-Kass-Koopmans. This model implies that single mothers obtained lower levels of consumption in the long term than men and that women without children and therefore a reduction would be seen in the growth rate of the economy. Similarly, this model implies that single mothers face a structural poverty problem because they have lower levels of consumption than other agents since it touches them to share part of their consumption or income with their children and that this poverty can only be resolved with a substantial increase in their salaries (Villegas 2012).

At the macro level, economic feminism focuses on the non-neutrality of macro policies. Macro policies to be added unknown gender classification and dealing with issues such as the stability of the price level, the growth of the economy, the balance of payments, unemployment rate, trade, finance, etc. Both theoretical and empirical grounds and the creation of macro policies gender classification is completely ignored. The focus of economic feminism tries to overcome these shortcomings.

At the micro-level, the inclusion of gender has been embodied in the different theoretical and empirical studies. Gender mainstreaming in the theoretical and empirical analysis of the labour market, as well as the analysis of the remuneration to labour or salary and their distribution within home have generated a large literature on these fronts. Also, work on wage differentials between men and women worldwide have been widely accepted and have oriented policies to reduce these gaps.

Complementing the above approach, economic feminism has also focused on involving the care economy into the economic analysis. This front analyses the unpaid domestic work and it is not visible in the formal economy. This activity was contemplated to include even within national accounting as an activity that in fact, affects the behaviour of gross domestic product in the economies. Thus, the care economy that deals with the most daily activities seeks to engage on economic analyses search to examine the generation of wealth within societies.
Some Background

There is an extensive literature on conflict and economic growth around the world.

Cook (2013), performed a study for Africa that relates the behaviour of ethnic violence and massive policy between 1870 and 1940 to economic activity, specifically to the generation of patents. The main conclusion reached by this study, is that the generation of patents or patent responds positively to the reduction of violence. The result implies that the conflict affects the direction and quality of the production, as well as the growth rate of the economy over time.

Valencia (2006), provides a synthesis of the literature between 1990 and 2006. The document highlights the work carried out in this period in which the conflict is related to the economic analysis, the economic and social costs of conflict are presented, the different actors and behaviours and resources spent on it. The report concludes that it has been developing a theoretical proposal to understand the misconduct of agents, these approaches are addressed from microeconomic theory. However, it is emphasised that this analysis should involve social and political as well as economic aspects for a better understanding of the conflict and its implications at national and international levels.

Hodler and Raschky (2014), carry out a study in which they examine the relationship between economic shocks and their impact on social conflicts in some African countries between 1992 and 2010. Overall, the authors found that adverse chocks of the economy or significant drops in the growth rate of the economy raises the probability of generating major social conflicts. This relationship can be explained by the fall in the rate of employment, loss of income, increase in poverty etc. Although the text does not make it explicit.

Rodriguez (2008), makes a reflection on neutral macroeconomic policies and concludes that these policies do affect gender status, especially when the strand of economic feminism clearly argued this hypothesis. The focus of economic feminism for example, argues that neoliberal policies such as trade liberalisation, generates greater gender inequality, and this was evident throughout Latin America. The central argument is that as a result of trade liberalisation were installed in the countries that used different industries and fundamentally precarious female labour to meet the maquilas. Likewise, privatisation led to the displacement of labour whereby women had to extend their working day for twice as long. In general, the article argues that economic growth given by trade liberalisation affects and worsens gender inequalities and in this context, it is that macroeconomic policies are not neutral. While the article does not refer to the conflict and growth, these linkages can be explained through the conflict that arises from most unequal accumulation and if inequality is gender.

Ali (2011), conducts a research on the economic costs of the armed conflict in Darfur. He includes in his analysis the costs of the destruction of
infrastructure, costs on the sector of exports and capital formation, loss of lives
and the efforts of the military spending for the war. Without going into a
gender study, the author quantifies the income lost by the loss equivalent to 2.6
billion human lives, 10 billion spent by the government in the war and 7.2
billion in losses productivity by displaced within Darfur. In summary, for
Darfur war has cost nearly twice its GDP equivalent to 162% thereof, only
government spending for war annually allocates 24% of GDP.

Many papers, similar to Ali’s paper (2011) on the economic costs of the
armed conflict have been generated in the last two decades, Abadie, A. and
Gardeazabal, J. (2003), Bilmes, L. and Stiglitz, J. (2006), Bozzoli, C., Brück,
T. and De Groot, OJ (2009), Bozzoli, C., Brück, T., Drautzburg, T. and
J. (2010), FitzGerald, E. V. K. and Spalding, R. J., eds. (1987), Grobar, L. M.
(2001) Roux, A. (1996). All these works show enormous costs of social
conflicts and of course a negative impact on the level of economic activity,
precisely, due to those resources for war or the destruction of physical and
human capital and loss of productivity in the country.

However, in all these works, none of them has a gender, perhaps, because
the war or social conflict does not discriminate deaths of children, youth,
women and men, or the same violations of Human Rights or the violation of
International Humanitarian Law. In fact, there are few studies of economic
growth and gender.

Riveros (2013), in a work that he develops for Colombia, relates the
behaviour of the economy to the Colombian armed conflict. He proposes an
index of the Colombian armed conflict through the principal components
methodology and he finds that the conflict negatively affects economic growth
by way of the destruction of infrastructure and productivity falls. However, the
article does not develop a gender perspective to show the quantification of the
conflict, especially, kidnapping on the dynamics of the Colombian economy.

López (2011), evaluated the impact of defense spending on the Colombian
economic growth at the departmental level between 1990 and 2006 and
concluded that there is not a strong evidence that this expenditure has
generated positive effects on growth.

The Stylised Facts of Kidnapping and Economic Growth

The impact of the conflict in Colombia on the economy can be studied
from one of its edges such as kidnapping and specifically in terms of gender
kidnapping.

Between 1970 and 2010, the average growth rate was 3.9% and the total
number of kidnappings was 39,010, a statistic that exceeds the total population
of most Colombian municipalities. The dynamics of kidnapping increased
substantially in the early ’70s and late ’80s as shown in Figure 1. In the first 10
years the total number of kidnappings rose to 244 and for the next decade this
phenomenon was multiplied by 13 ascending to 3,125 kidnapings. This reflects a state's inability to cope with this phenomenon, which has strong economic implications.

**Figure 1.**

![Total numbers of kidnappings 1970-2010](image)

Source: CNMH. 2013. “Una sociedad Secuestrada”

From the early years of the ‘90s the scourge of kidnapping peaked dynamics. It fell from 3,125 in the ‘80s to a total of 17,891 in the ‘90s with an increase of 573%. It is not understood as that fact, violates the International Humanitarian Law is not a priority of the State. In a single year, (2000) the figure was scandalously increased by 3,546 of kidnappings more than the total number of kidnappings occurred in the previous two decades. The consequences of this fact are correlated with the average behaviour of the growth rate of the economy. In the ‘70s the average growth rate was 5.7% for 244 kidnappings, but by the ‘80s the average growth rate was 3.1% with an increase of 1,180% in the kidnapping rate and in the the ‘90s economic growth was about 2.5% consistent with an important role in the increase kidnapping rate of 573%. This behaviour of kidnapping took their cumulative effects on the Colombian economic growth.
In the 2000s the kidnapping was reduced but not significantly, either because there was a significant state intervention through the policy of democratic or security or because society is tired of this scourge and made possible a closer alliance between armed forces and the society to expose and prosecute those responsible. In the latter period or decade the total number of kidnappings rose from 17,891 kidnappings in the ‘90s to 15,328 its reduction is relatively low (14.3%) as it is known that defense spending was one of the largest in the whole history of the country justified by the policy of the national democratic security. Finally, in the 2000s the average growth rate of the Colombian economy was 3.9% also consistent with an incipient decline in the rate of kidnappings (-14.3%).
In conclusion, the kidnapping has had disastrous consequences on economic growth. In the first 20 years of analysis (between ‘70s-‘90s) the average rate of economic growth was 4.4% with a total of kidnappings of 3,369 while for the rest of the analysis period 1990-2010 the rate of economic growth country only reached 3.2% with a total of kidnappings of 35,641 with a growth over 900%. Undoubtedly there is a strong negative correlation between the number of kidnappings and economic growth.

As in the case of all kidnappings in Colombia, the dynamics of female abduction seems to follow the same behavior. A large number of abducted women on average in the ‘70s reaching a value of 5 abductions per year and a total of 50 throughout the decade. And for the ‘80s, kidnappings per female increased an average of 36 kidnappings per year throughout the decade to 355, i.e., an increase of kidnappings was multiplied by seven.

For the ‘90s this kind of kidnapping went from 355 to 2,268 i.e., this decade the growth rate of the abduction of women was 538%, the abduction of women by groups outside the law, guerrilla or paramilitaries went into sustained growth. The question that arises is, why is this significant increase in the abduction of women? Since then, to solve this question exceeds the dimensions of this research.

Female or women kidnaping was not reduced as it would have been expected in the 2000s but instead, it increased spending from 2,268 kidnappings to 5,738 i.e., it grew by 252% and reflecting an average of more than 500 kidnappings per year or more than 1 day kidnapping.

Looking at graphs 2 and 3 it is evident that the largest number of kidnappings in one year (1989) 3,351 and 658 of the total female correspond with the biggest drop in the growth rate of the economy (-5.6%). Likewise, the second highest number of abductions of men also corresponds to the same year a total of 2,693 kidnappings, the equivalent of the entire population of any of those small towns in Boyacá such as Corrales having 2,437 inhabitants just to cite one example. Isn’t it an aberrant act for the Colombian society?

Based on Figures 1, 3 and 4 can be set the same behavior of kidnappings, i.e., in the years 1989 and 1990 the highest points of the curve of kidnapping and in turn is observed, Figure 2 shows the behavior but conversely the rate of economic growth.

Figure 4 shows the dynamics of the kidnapping of the male gender in the past 40 years. Low relative constancy of kidnappings of men by armed groups in the ‘70s reaching an average of 20 kidnappings a year, for a total of nearly 200 kidnappings in the entire decade is observed. In the ‘80s this average is multiplied by 8 and reaching an outrageous number of kidnappings throughout the period in 1,650 abducted men, that is, the percentage growth of men between the two decades was 800%. Also, this type of kidnapping was intensified in the decade of the ‘90s. From 1,650 kidnappings occurred in the ‘80s went to 12,078 kidnappings, the percentage increase by 632%, number of kidnappings equivalent for example to the entire population such as Jericho town in Antioquia, Colombia. In fact, there are many municipalities with about 12 thousand inhabitants.
In the 2000s the number of kidnappings also increased exorbitantly. It went from 12,078 to 16,678 an increase by 39%, which meant 4,600 kidnappings over the previous decade.

Figure 4.
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Estimates

Methodology

This work is based on estimates of the growth rate of the provincial economy and kidnapping in Colombia by department through the method with fixed effects panel data for the period 1980-2010. Additionally, estimates are made by the method of least ordinary least squares between economic growth and the number of kidnappings nationwide, ie, consolidating all the information at the country level for both economic growth rate and total kidnappings of men and women.

The variables used are the percentage change in GDP at national and regional level as well as the total percentage growth abduction or kidnapping each year or in terms of logarithm of kidnapping.

Model proposed

The proposed for each estimation model is linear and can be represented by the following equations:

\[
GY = \beta_0 + \beta_1 * DLST + e \tag{1}
\]

\[
GY = \mu_0 + \mu_1 * DLGM + \mu_2 * DLGF + e \tag{2}
\]
Where \( GY \) represents the growth rate of the departmental economy if the estimates are through the panel data approach or methodology is by the method of ordinary least squares represents the growth rate of the economy at the aggregate level. \( \beta_0 \) and \( \mu_0 \) are constants estimates and may be lower, higher or equal to nought. \( \beta_1 = \mu_1 = \mu_2 < 0 \), that increases the growth rate of total kidnappings \( DLST \), or increases in the growth rate of male kidnappings \( DLGM \) and the Female \( DLGF \) lead to decreases in the rate is then expected growth of the economy either at the departmental level or aggregate level.

**Results Panel Data Estimates**

The following equation shows the estimates of the growth rate of the departmental economy of the method presented through panel data for the period 1980-2010.

\[
GY = 3.90 - 0.42 \times DLST \\
R^2 = 0.16 \quad DW = 1.9 \quad Prob F = 0.00
\]

The estimate of the rate of economic growth compared to the percentage change in the total number of kidnappings in the country through the method data panel shows an inverse relationship, i.e., the higher the growth in the number of kidnappings in the country the lower the growth rate of the economy in the departments of Colombia. The estimate shows that the increase in 1% of total kidnapping men and women reduces the growth rate of the economy at 0.41%. The results also show that the growth rate of kidnappings explains 16% of changes in the growth rate of the economy. Also to show, if there is a two-way causality between kidnapping rate and the growth rate of the economy Granger causality test is performed. The results are as follows:

**Table 1. Granger Causality Test for Growth of all Abductions and Growth of the Colombian Economy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null Hypothesis</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DLST does not Granger Cause GY</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>2.44734</td>
<td>0.0874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GY does not Granger Cause DLST</td>
<td>1.07554</td>
<td>0.3418</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The causality test Granger shown in Table 2 that the hypothesis that the growth rate of kidnapping does not cause the growth rate of the economy,
namely the growth rate of kidnappings if it causes rejecting behaviour of a
Colombian economy with a probability of 99%. In turn, the test shows that the
growth rate of the economy does not cause growth rate of kidnappings in the
country.

The most relevant and that concern us the focus of this work is the impact
conclusions kidnapping by sex on the Colombian economic growth. The results
of this estimate can be seen below:

*Panel Data Estimates by Gender*

\[
GY = 3.70 - 1.15 * DLGM - 0.43 - DLGF
\]

\[R^2 = 0.14 \quad DW= 1.6 \quad Prob F = 0.00\]

The results of the panel data estimation of the growth rate of the economy
against kidnapping in Colombia each gender shows the following: first, an
inverse relationship between the economic growth rate is observed and the
growth rate of kidnappings of both male and female. A greater impact of the
growth of male kidnappings on the growth rate of the economy, ie, to an
increase of 1% in the abductions of men the Colombian economy is reduced by
1.15% is observed, whereas if gender kidnappings female increase the 1% then
the economic growth is reduced by 0.443%. These results have a confidence
level greater than 98% while the model explains 14% the relationship between
the growth rate of the economy and the number of kidnappings each gender.

Table 2, it can prove causality between growth rate to economy and
abductions of males. The result shows that the rate of male kidnappings if it
causes the growth rate of the economy, while the result is not given in reverse,
that is, the growth rate of the economy does not cause an increase in
 kidnappings of male.

**Table 2, Causality Economic Growth and Male Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null Hypothesis</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DLGM does not Granger Cause GY</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>3.17270</td>
<td>0.0426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GY does not Granger Cause DLGM</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.99380</td>
<td>0.3708</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The test Granger causality for the growth rate of the Colombian economy
to the growth rate of female abduction, Table 5, also shows that the relative
increase in abductions of women because the growth rate of the economy, ie, it
rejects the null hypothesis that the rate of female kidnappings causes the
growth of the Colombian economy. In this context, it can be concluded that
any abduction by gender if a negative impact on the rate of economic growth and of course is causing variations.

Table 3. Causality Economic Growth versus Female
Pairwise Granger Causality Tests
Date: 09/18/14  Time: 09:01
Sample: 1980 2010
Lags: 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null Hypothesis</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DLGF does not Granger Cause GY</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>3.08633</td>
<td>0.0468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GY does not Granger Cause DLGF</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.26279</td>
<td>0.7690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The estimate by ordinary least squares method for Colombia at the aggregate level the following results:

Estimated Nationwide

\[ GY = 3.90 - 0.42 \times \text{Dtotal} \]

\[ t-\text{Statistic} = 3.75 \quad -0.003 \]

R² = 0.29    DW= 1.7   Prob F = 0.00

It is seen in the before equation, that the growth rate of the Colombian economy is explained by 29% by changes in total kidnappings by armed outlaw groups. Similarly it is observed that to an increase in kidnapping, whether male or female, the growth rate of the economy is reduced by 0.003% with a significance level of 99.9%. These results highlight the inverse relationship between the growth of the economy and kidnapping in Colombia by illegal armed groups and even by common criminals. In this sense, it would not weigh at all gender classification on economic growth.

Conclusions

One of the first conclusions that can be drawn from this work is that the kidnapping in Colombia of men and women had a great growth decade after decade from 1970 to today for a total of kidnappings of 39,010 of which 78% were men and 28% were female gender.

A second conclusion refers to the growth rate of the economy and its relation to the abduction of men and women. Estimates through fixed effects panel data show that there is a negative relationship between economic growth and kidnapping. In this respect an increase in kidnappings of male of 1% leads to a decrease in the rate of economic growth by about 1.13%, while an increase of 1% females leads to a decrease in the rate 0.43% growth. Gender impact on
the economy is different, precisely because there are more kidnappings of male
than female.
Thirdly, it is concluded that based on the Granger causality test states that
the rate of economic growth is caused by the number of kidnappings in
Colombia either men or women. In short, it is important to eradicate this
scourge in Colombia, not only because it is a blatant violation of the
International Humanitarian Law and the Human Rights but because their
impact on the Colombian economy is negative.
Finally, the production of both theoretical and empirical literature on the
relationship between economic growth and specifically conflict from a gender
perspective is needed. Works on this front are not found in the literature.
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