

Annex 1

Technical Annex

Methods

Due to the sensitivity of the subjects covered by this study and the consequent difficulty in obtaining statistical information on some subjects, a mixed methodology of quantitative and qualitative research was utilized.

Statistical survey Methods:

Sampling:

Stratified cluster sampling was used in eight of the twelve Palestinian refugee camps covered by the study¹. Information from the remaining four camps was obtained through the qualitative method of focus groups². The main inclusion criterion for the household is that the household main breadwinner (male or female) had Palestinian refugee documentation. The procedure used in the cluster sampling followed the guidelines of the World Health Survey³. SPSS 16.0 was used in the selection of clusters and the sample within each cluster.

The sampling unit is the household as defined by the United Nations, namely, "...a group of individuals who live under the same roof and share the cooking and eating facilities".

The randomly selected individual (RSI) within each household was chosen by the use of a table of random numbers. Interviewers were trained to perform this procedure in the pre-survey two-day training workshop. A special interview was conducted with the RSI.

Sampling clusters: Each camp had a sampling frame of numbered clusters of which the cluster(s) were randomly chosen. This stratification was used for seven out of the eight camps included in survey. The exception was Shatila Camp in

¹ The camps are Nahr el Bared, Baddawi, Burj Barajneh, Shatila, Ein el Hilweh, Bass, Rashidieh, Burj Shamali.

² Mar Elias, Debayeh, Miyeh w Miyeh and Wavel camp in Beqaa were surveyed using qualitative research methods. See the Qualitative Study Section.

³ See World Health Survey, Sampling Guidelines for Participating Countries.

view of its relative homogeneity (It is a mixed camp), and in view of the need to choose only one cluster from the camp.

Sampling Households within clusters: When a cluster was selected, a census was made of all households in the selected cluster. If the number of households exceeded 50 households - which is the designated number according to the WHS guidelines- a random sample of household was taken.

Since there are multiple clusters for each camp (except Shatila), 50 households were selected from each cluster according to the assigned numerical order of the cluster. This procedure was repeated for each cluster until the desired number of households in the camp is reached. The last cluster in numerical order has the residual number.

In Ein el Hilweh camp, however, sampled households in a given cluster were selected proportionate to the size of that cluster. This procedure was adopted for several reasons: (1) the large number of clusters to be chosen (11) compared to the other seven camps, and (2) in view of the large number of households per clusters selected, and (3) to eliminate the potential bias resulting from choosing too few households in clusters that contain large numbers of households thus losing representativeness, (see table 1 for details).

Table 1 Distribution of Study Sample - PARELECO Survey, 2008⁴

Camp	Estimated Number of Households*	Percentage in Sample	Sample size(Households)	Minimum total clusters	Maximum total clusters	Cluster sampling frame	Number of Clusters selected
Ein el Hilweh	9000	37	562	55	110	55	11
Rashidieh	2300	10	143	15	30	15	3
Al Bass	1100	5	69	10	20	10	2
Burj Shamali	2134	9	133	15	30	15	3
Bared (new camp)	1900	8	119	10	20	10	2
Baddawi	3149	13	196	20	40	20	4

⁴ see WHS methods p. 4

Shatila	800	3	50	5	10	5	1
Burj Barajneh	3659	15	228	25	50	25	5
Total	24042	99	1500	155	310	155	310

* Source: Data submitted by Najdeh community staff who collected population data from UNRWA sources in the camps and divided by 5 as the average family size.

Data Collection

Teams of interviewers from the various target communities were trained during a three day workshop, on April 3,4 and April7 2008. The first day targeted supervisors and the second two days focused on familiarizing interviewers with the questionnaires and conducting refinements as needed, group work consisting of role play was conducted.

Following the training data collection was conducted during the period from April 30th to July 30th, 2008. Allowances were made for the security conditions in Beirut, in Saida as well as in the North and in Beqaa during the data collection period. The survey teams adjusted accordingly while sustaining the flow of data collection.

Data were checked / edited and questionnaires were returned to the field as needed. Data was entered on SPSS 13.0 during the period from by a team of operators⁵ at a central location in Beirut.

Qualitative Survey methods

Selection of Camps and gatherings:

Three in-depth interviews with resource people and twenty one focus group discussions were conducted. FGDs covered four camps (Bared, Debayeh, Mar Elias, Mieh w Mieh, and Wavel), and three gatherings in Beqaa (Bar Elias, Saadnayel and Ghor). The FGDs were conducted from May 28th to September 3rd.

Venues for FGDs were mostly at NGO centers. However, some FGDs were conducted in individual homes (in two cases of women in Mieh & Mieh, Mar Elias Camps and for women and men at Ghor gathering in Beqaa) or in the workplace itself (for Mar Elias Camp men). The criterion was convenience to the participants. In places where there were elderly centers like Wavel camp and Debayeh camp it was relatively easy to access the population, even there was a mixed men and women FGD for elderly at Debayeh camp in view of the openness of the community norms (Debayeh camp is almost exclusively Christian Palestinians).

The FGDs covered camps located in Beirut city, and northern suburb (Debayeh camp) as well as Beqaa and the Saida area. The Tyre area was covered by an in-depth interview with a labor union resource person. The general situation was

⁵ See survey team for more details

also covered by another in-depth interview with a senior labor union activist located in Beirut.

FGDs were conducted in Bared camp although it was covered by the statistical survey to under score the vulnerability of the population and in view of the sensitivity of their situation and the need to explore avenues not necessarily touched upon by the survey. Qualitative research offers the method of choice in sensitive situations. Moreover, initially the FGDs were scheduled for Bared displaced who are still in Baddawi but logistical constraints prevented that. However, the situation of the Bared displaced in Baddawi Camp was raised during the Bared FGDs.

Selection of Participants for FGDs:

Ideally, the survey team was aiming at receiving input from men and women – young adults, adults, and elderly, who are working and who are not working in separate groups. That varied according to camps and resources available to contact. In some area the team was successful to conduct separate sessions for each of the above mentioned categories, in others, the FGDs were mixed working and not working, also young and old some times were in the same focus group. Participants were selected on the basis of their ability to provide information.

FGD instrument:

A pamphlet in Arabic outlining the main requirement of FGDs was distributed to the areas involved. This identified the main materials needed, the space and its arrangement, number of participants, the tasks of the facilitator, documentation and proceedings.

In-depth interviews Selection of Participants & topics raised:

In-depth interviews were subject to availability of resource people and time available. Three in-depth interviews were conducted by the research consultant: one in Wavel camp (with a health professional and the focus was on his experience and the clandestine nature of employment of professionals in Beqaa in view of restrictions), one in Burj Shamali camp (with a seasoned labor union activist in the south and the focus was on issues of agricultural work), and one in Beirut (with a senior activist that covered a broad range of issues).

Response rates for the statistical survey

1500 households were selected in the eight camps. Number of consenting households is 1485. The response rate of households is 92.1 percent. Response rates among RSIs is 87.5 percent.

Table 2 Response Rate, Roster and General Household Questionnaire (Percent), PARELECO Survey, 2008

Accepted	92.1
Rejected	5.0
Not found	1.9
Did not meet study criteria	1.0
Total	100
Responses	1500

Table 3 Response Rate RSI (Percent), PARELECO Survey, 2008

Accepted	87.5
Rejected	5.2
Not found	6.3
Did not meet study criteria	1
Total	100.0
Responses	1500

Calculating Unemployment Rate based on search for work – PARELECO Survey

	men	
age	Searching for work	all men
15-19 yrs	25	378
20-24 yrs	27	286
25-29 yrs	19	229
30-34 yrs	10	184
35-39 yrs	14	222
40-44 yrs	15	216
45-49 yrs	7	183
50-54 yrs	5	82

55-59 yrs	6	52
60-64 yrs	3	58
Total	131	1890
unemployment rate men: 6.9		

	Women	
Age	Looking for work	all women
15-19 yrs	15	374
20-24 yrs	30	327
25-29 yrs	13	248
30-34 yrs	6	226
35-39 yrs	2	231
40-44 yrs	4	234
45-49 yrs	5	143
50-54 yrs	4	93
55-59 yrs	3	84
60-64 yrs	1	92
Total	83	2052
unemployment rate women: 4.0		

Men & women

	searching	all
15-19 yrs	40	752
20-24 yrs	57	613
25-29 yrs	32	477
30-34 yrs	16	410
35-39 yrs	16	453
40-44 yrs	19	450
45-49 yrs	12	326

50-54 yrs	9	175
55-59 yrs	9	136
60-64 yrs	4	150
Total	214	3942
Unemployment rate all: 5.4		

Technical Annex ----- Estimating Remittances

The estimate is based on the method stated in Maimbo, SM & Ratha, D. (Ed.) (2005) Remittances: Development Impact & Future Prospects, The International Bank for Reconstruction & Development - The World Bank p. 180

Value of remittances is defined as the average value of remittances of an economically active person working abroad multiplied by number working abroad.

Estimating remittances for 2007

- Total income from relatives 390146 USD
- for 160 households out of 1288 households 12.4 percent
- or an average 2438.4USD per household per year
- assuming one relative abroad is sending per household
- percent households having relatives abroad are 21 percent but 12.4 percent received remittances in 2007
- population estimate 250,000 Source: UNRWA - same as the one used for estimating the monetary contribution to economy.
- so 12.4 of the 250000 constitute the estimate of households receiving remittances
- 31000 households
- average per household is 2438.4 USD
- so total = the average *number of households receiving remittances
- 75590400 USD in 2007

Estimating Remittances for 2008

- for 141 households out of 1288 households 10.9 percent
- total income from relatives 125682USD for households for first half of 2008
- Estimated total all 2008 is 251364USD for households for 2008 - assuming uniform pattern following first part of the year
- or an average 1782.7 USD per household per year (estimated 2008 assuming uniform pattern throughout year)
- assuming one relative abroad is sending per household.
- percent households having relatives abroad are 21 percent but 10.9 percent received remittances in 2008.
- population estimate 250,000
- Source: UNRWA - same as the one used for estimating the monetary contribution to economy.
- so 10.9 percent of the 250000 constitute the estimate of households receiving remittances
- 27250 households
- average per household is 1782.7 USD
- so total = the average *number of households receiving remittances
- 48756845 USD in 2008.

Estimating Remittances on average (2007- 2008)

- averaging 2007 and 2008
- 75590400 USD in 2007
- 48756845 USD in 2008
- 62173622.5 USD average for 2007 and 2008

Average of 2007 & 2008 estimate is 62 million USD of remittances per year.