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Syrian refugees in Jordan

• More than half of Syria’s pre-war population of 11 million has been displaced, either across borders or within the country.
• Jordan is ranked as the country with the seventh largest refugee population in the world in 2017 89 refugees per 1,000 inhabitants.
• 668,123 registered Syrian refugees, the majority of whom (83 percent) live outside refugee camps.
• Jordan opened schools and health services to refugees.
• Limited access to employment 2015, only 5,700 Syrian refugees were working legally in Jordan.
• Informal sector; estimates range from 42,000 to 150,000 (World Bank 2016).
• It is estimated that unemployment among the Syrian refugee community stood at 60 percent (ILO 2017).
Using a gender and age lens

• Purpose is to understand how gender inequality affects poverty experienced by refugees- focus on income poverty rates

• Examine relationship between gender of household head and household poverty

• Informed by a body of research that shows female headed households are extremely heterogenous

• Households are disaggregate by family type and gender of principal applicant
The data

The Data

• 54,408 Syrian refugee households, comprising 208,014 individuals
• Syrian Refugees who arrived in Jordan 2011-2014
• Data Sources: ProGres and Home Visits survey, round 3

The Poverty Line

• 50 Jordanian Dinars (JD) per capita per month

Humanitarian Assistance

• UNHCR per household per month
  • 1-2 members 50JD; 3-5 member 100JD; more than 5 members 120JD
• WFP vouchers - total value of JD 24 per person per month.

Using a gender and age lens

8 Household types: Different vulnerabilities

- **Unaccompanied children**: Person or group of people below the age of 18 without an accompanying adult (person over the age of 18)
- **Single person**: One person reporting no other dependents or cohabitees;
- **Single caregiver**: A household composed of only one adult caregiver who cares for children of his/her own below the age of 18, and/or for the children of others living in his/her household, and/or for the elderly and/or for the disabled
- **Couple without children**: Married couples (at least one of whom is over the age of 18) living without children or members of their extended family, including couples with adult sons and daughters
- **Couple with children**: Married couple (at least one of whom is over the age of 18) that provides care to children of their own or to separated children;
- **Siblings**: Group of brothers and sisters that share one or both parents including at least one adult;
- **Extended family and other households**: All other types of households that include extended family members.
- **Polygamous**: Families with one adult male who has registered more than one wife with or without children
Family types by Gender of Principal Applicant

Source: Own calculations based on ProGres and HV database.
Child Marriage

Pre Crisis Syria 13% marriages involved 15-17 year old girls
In Jordan 2014 31% marriages (UNICEF estimates)

Our data

788 child brides = 1.4% households

- Couples with children: 1.7%
- Couples without children: 7.0%

50% have children
42% are unaccompanied children

Male PA
Characteristics of Principal Applicants

Source: Own calculations based on ProGres and HV database.
Gender of Principal Applicant and household poverty rates before humanitarian assistance

53.1% of Syrian refugee households are poor

Source: Own calculations based on ProGres and HV database.
Gender of Principal Applicant and household poverty rates after humanitarian assistance

11% of Syrian refugee households are poor

Source: Own calculations based on ProGres and HV database. Dashed portion of the bars shows the reduction in poverty rates.
Gender poverty gap before and after cash assistance

Percentage difference

Source: Own calculations based on ProGres and HV database.

Note: Poverty gap = (Pf-Pm)/Pm *100 where Pf = poverty rate of female headed households, Pm = poverty rate of male headed households
Why are non traditional households with a female principal applicant poorer?

Our Model

\[ P_i = \beta_0 + X_i'\beta_1 + W_i'\beta_2 + \varepsilon_i \]

Where:
\( P_i = 1 \) if household \( i \) is below the poverty line; \( P_i = 0 \) if the household \( i \) is on or above the poverty line
\( X_i \) = vector of individual characteristics of principal applicant of household \( i \)
\( W_i \) = vector of household \( i \) characteristics
\( \varepsilon_i \) = normally distributed error term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual characteristics</th>
<th>Household characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age of the PA; education level (cat.); entry status (cat.); marital status (cat.)</td>
<td>Presence of children age 5 (dich.); presence of disabled people (dich.); elderly (dich.); expenditure; family type (cat.); household size; wage income (cat.); remittances (cat.); income per capita; number of male adults; proportion of females; location; camp (dich.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Protective factors: education and employment

Source: Own calculations based on ProGres and HV database.

Note: A negative sign (‐) indicates decreased likelihood of poverty. A positive sign (+) indicates increased likelihood of poverty. A hollow marker indicates that coefficient is not statistically significant. An asterisk (*) indicates that coefficients difference (male − female) is statistically significant.
Risk factors: household composition

Source: Own calculations based on ProGres and HV database.
Note: A negative sign (-) indicates decreased likelihood of poverty. A positive sign (+) indicates increased likelihood of poverty. A hollow marker indicates that coefficient is not statistically significant. An asterisk (*) indicates that coefficients difference (male – female) is statistically significant.
Risk factors: Family type

Source: Own calculations based on ProGres and HV database.

Note: A negative sign (‐) indicates decreased likelihood of poverty. A positive sign (+) indicates increased likelihood of poverty. A hollow marker indicates that coefficient is not statistically significant. An asterisk (*) indicates that coefficients difference (male – female) is statistically significant.
Comparing like with like (PSM): Female PA households are no more likely to be poor after assistance

Model specification:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model specification</th>
<th>Coefficient Before assistance</th>
<th>Coefficient After assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1 Female PA dummy</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2 Female PA dummy + # adult males</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own calculations based on ProGres and HV database.
Note: Models estimated using a matched sample. A negative sign (-) indicates decreased likelihood of poverty. A positive sign (+) indicates increased likelihood of poverty. A hollow marker indicates that coefficient is not statistically significant. Model spec. 1 controls for individual and household characteristics as well as family types. Model spec. 2 is the same as spec. 1 but includes number of adult males as additional control.
Findings: female principal applicants and poverty

- Single caregivers
- Unaccompanied children
- Siblings
- Couples without children
- Single person

Before Assistance

- 50% Poverty rate female PA
- 20% poverty rate male PA

Poverty Higher for Female Principal Applicant Households Before and After Assistance

Couples with children

Highest rates of poverty No difference between male and female PAs

68% poverty rate
Findings: female principal applicants and humanitarian assistance

- Single caregivers
- Unaccompanied children
- Siblings
- Couples without children
- Single person

Reduced poverty risk factors
- Disability
- Household size

Increased poverty risk factors
- Elderly
- Children under 5 (Female PA)

Significant difference in poverty rates between male and female Principal Applicant Households

After Assistance
Overall HH Poverty

13% Poverty rate female PA
11% poverty rate male PA

Female PA Households: no link between poverty risk and # adult males
Conclusions

Disruption that displacement causes to family structure has a gender specific impacts:

- Female headship is associated with greater vulnerability to poverty in non traditional family types
- Siblings and child headed households are very vulnerable groups even after assistance, especially if headed by a woman or a girl

Humanitarian assistance has greatly reduced gender disadvantage and been well targeted to the most vulnerable
Conclusions

• The association between female headship and household poverty is driven by gender disadvantage
  ➢ Female PA do as well as a male PA when given opportunities in the form of cash assistance or the “asset” of an adult male when households are similar.

• Policy responses need to increase women’s labor market access and replace the “asset effect” of adult males for female headed households.

• More data and research needed on impact of child marriage and other forms of Gender-based violence