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Lebanon's multi-layered and unprecedented political and socio-economic crisis, underpinned by a history of violence, corruption and discriminatory legal frameworks is deepening gender inequalities. Lebanon has one of the highest overall gender inequality in the world, ranking 119 out of 146 countries in the World Economic Forum Gender Gap report 2022.1 Economic collapse, high unemployment and increasing poverty are affecting all genders, but it is women, particularly refugee and low-income women, who are bearing the brunt of the social and economic consequences. Although almost all born in Lebanon, Palestine Refugees in Lebanon (PRL) lack legal protections, face high rates of poverty, and are barred from working in many fields. These realities impact the lives of all PRL, but women are particularly marginalized. PRL women and men with disabilities and older PRL are more likely to have specific vulnerabilities and needs such as health concerns and mobility issues, which are particularly challenging to manage in camp settings.

Given the gender inequalities underpinning the humanitarian needs situation in Lebanon and specific risks posed to marginalized identities such as PRL, it is necessary to produce high quality gender and social inclusion analysis of information guiding the humanitarian response to the ongoing crisis. For this reason, UN Women partnered with the United Nations (UN) Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) and REACH Initiative (REACH) to produce gender and social inclusion analysis on the country-wide Multi-Sector Needs Assessment (MSNA) data. ${ }^{3}$ The purpose of this factsheet is to provide humanitarian practitioners and stakeholders with full and transparent access to disaggregated gender, age, disability data to inform their humanitarian interventions.

## METHODOLOGY

Quantitative data was collected through a household-level survey assessing three population groups: Lebanese households (HHs), PRL HHs, and Migrant HHs. Data collection took place between 27 July and 26 November 2022. This factsheet is presenting the findings for in-camp PRL households specifically. The assessed PRL HHs were selected by means of a two-stage stratified sampling approach where the 12 PRL official camps in Lebanon were the primary sampling units and whose boundaries (comprehensive of the population living in the camps' immediate surroundings) were detected by means of remote sensing techniques. This allowed a total sample of 590 HHs representative of the in-camp PRL HHs population at a governorate level and at a national level with a $95 \%$ level of confidence and a $10 \%$ margin of error. ${ }^{4}$
The MSNA was designed so that some survey questions were posed at the household level (i.e. the head of household or any adult household member were asked questions regarding the entire household) while others were posed at the individual level per each household member, meaning individual level findings should be considered indicative. This means full gender disaggregation by male and female was available for some findings while disaggregation only by the gender of the head of household was available for others. Other categories of analysis included older individuals and individuals with disabilities as well as households with older members and households that included at least one person with a disability.

GEOGRAPHIC COVERAGE


SURVEY DEMOGRAPHICS

| Sample: | 590 households |
| :--- | :---: |
| Gender of survey respondents |  |
| Female | Male |
| $35 \%$ | $65 \%$ |


$1,943 \mathrm{HH}$ members were covered by the assessment.

Gender of the head of household

Female
20\%

A note on female-headed households
A female-headed household (FHH) is a household in which an adult female is the sole or main decision-maker, whereas a male-headed household $(\mathrm{MHH})$ is led by an adult male. The MSNA included an additional category of co-headed households, in which decisionmaking is shared. In the MSNA, the head of household is selfidentified, where enumerators ask the first person they encounter upon visiting the household to designate the main decision-maker of the household. If the head of the household is not available, information about this person is gathered and enumerators interview another adult in the family capable of conducting the interview. Hence in some cases, the sex of the head of household and that of the respondent is different.

## GENDER AND SOCIAL INCLUSION FACTSHEET

## SPECIFIC VULNERABILITIES

OLDER PEOPLE (60 years or above)
Female heads of household were more often 60 years old or older compared to male heads of household.
$\%$ of HH with HoH who is 60 or older

\% of HHs that included older members FHH

MHH
64\%
24\%

## DISABILITY ${ }^{5}$

Older people more often had disabilities, and more FHH included members with disabilities.
\% individuals with disabilities by gender and age Female individuals Age Male individuals

| $4 \%$ | $5-17$ | $7 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $9 \%$ | $18-59$ | $11 \%$ |
| $49 \%$ | $60+$ | $45 \%$ |
| $13 \%$ | All Ages | $14 \%$ |

\% of HHs that included at least one member with a disability

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{FHH} & \mathrm{MHH} \\
46 \% & 29 \%
\end{array}
$$

| $\mathbf{\%} \mathbf{6 0 +}$ individuals with disabilities by type of disability |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Demographic <br> group | Male <br> Individuals | Female <br> Individuals | Total |
| Seeing | $31 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $25 \%$ |
| Hearing | $9 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| Walking | $13 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| Selfcare | $16 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| Remembering | $14 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $11 \%$ |
| Communicating | $5 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $4 \%$ |

## YOUNG CHILDREN

MHH more often included young children.
\% HH with at least one small child (aged 0-5 years)
FHH
MHH
4\%
18\%
$16 \%$ of women were pregnant, lactating or had given birth in the last 2 years

## LIVELIHOOD AND EMPLOYMENT

Women were far less likely to be employed than men, especially women with disabilities.

| Labour Force Participation ${ }^{6}$ rates by age and gender |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Demographic group | Male <br> Individuals | Female <br> Individuals | Total |
| Working-aged (15+ <br> years) | $49 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $32 \%$ |
| Persons with <br> disabilities | $26 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| Youth (15 - 30 years <br> old) | $54 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $37 \%$ |
| Adults (31 -59 years | $54 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $34 \%$ |
| old) |  |  |  |

## Unemployment Rates ${ }^{7}$

| Demographic group | Male <br> Individuals | Female <br> Individuals | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Working-aged (15+ <br> years) | $17 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $20 \%$ |
| Youth (15 - 30 years <br> old) | $19 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $27 \%$ |
| Adults (31 -59 years <br> old) | $14 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $15 \%$ |

## HH INCOME AND DEBTS

A larger proportion of MHH were in debt and had higher debt levels.
43\% of FHH reported being in debt with an average debt of 1,344,008 LBP. ${ }^{8}$

47\% of MHH reported being in debt with an average debt of 4,587,379 LBP.

FHH were more dependent on others for their income.
Top 4 most commonly reported main sources of income, by gender of HoH

FHH
31\%
26\%
29\%
42\%

| Income Type | MHH |
| :---: | :--- |
| Daily/intermittent work | $52 \%$ |
| International remittances | $24 \%$ |
| Savings | $22 \%$ |
| Support from family and friends | $13 \%$ |

## GENDER AND SOCIAL INCLUSION FACTSHEET

FHH had lower incomes than MHH, especially older FHH.
\% FHH and MHH with monthly incomes below 6,000,000 LBP

| FHH | MHH |
| :--- | :--- |
| $72 \%$ | $66 \%$ |

\% of 60+ FHH and MHH with monthly incomes below 6,000,000 LBP

| FHH | MHH |
| :--- | :--- |
| $74 \%$ | $62 \%$ |

FOOD SECURITY
FHH more often reported reducing their expenditures on non-food items.
\% of FHH and MHH adopting crisis or emergency livelihoods-based coping strategies

Coping strategy adopted
Reduced non-food expenditures on health
Reduced non-food
expenditures on education
Sold productive assets and/or means of transport
Accepted high risk, 3\% 3\% dangerous or exploitative work

FHH $\quad \mathrm{MHH}$
$36 \% \quad 23 \%$
$25 \% \quad 20 \%$
$3 \% \quad 3 \%$
\% HH that reported having asked for money from strangers (begged) by gender of HoH

| FHH | MHH |
| :---: | :---: |
| $9 \%$ | $5 \%$ |

## HYGIENE

29\% \% of HHs with female HH members of menstruating age ${ }^{9}(\mathrm{n}=292)$ reported struggling to access menstrual hygiene items

## EDUCATION

A larger proportion of boys were out of school than girls.
\% of school-aged children not enrolled in a formal school for the 2021-2022 school year by gender

| Girls | Boys |
| :--- | :--- |
| $3 \%$ | $13 \%$ |

\% of HHs with at least one child not enrolled in school, by gender of the HoH

| FHH | MHH |
| :--- | :--- |
| $6 \%$ | $13 \%$ |

## PROTECTION

One in three households reported protection concerns for women, particularly in Akkar.
$30 \%$ of HHs reported that women and girls avoided certain areas in their location because they felt unsafe there.

Top 3 governorates where HH reported women avoid certain areas out of concern for safety

| Akkar | $49 \%$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| North | $34 \%$ |  |
| Mount Lebanon | $30 \%$ |  |

One in ten 15-17 year old boys were working.
\% of individual boys and girls between the ages of 15 and 17 who were working

| Girls | Boys |
| :--- | :---: |
| $0 \%$ | $11 \%$ |

$<1 \%$ of girls under 18 were married at the time of the assessment
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## ENDNOTES

${ }^{1}$ World Economic Forum. 2022. Global Gender Gap Report. 2022. Benchmarks progress towards gender parity and compares countries' gender gaps across four dimensions: economic opportunities, education, health and political leadership.
${ }^{2}$ More information available here.
${ }^{3}$ The MSNA was funded by the European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations unit (DG-ECHO) and the Lebanese Humanitarian Fund (LHF)
${ }^{4}$ For more information on the methodology, please refer to the Terms of Reference.
${ }^{5}$ Disability is defined as someone who responded to any of the Washington Group Questions (seeing, hearing, walking, self-care, remembering and communicating) with 'a lot of difficulty' or 'cannot do at all' "WGQ".
${ }^{6}$ Labour Force Participation is calculated by looking at all individuals who reportedly had any type of job at the time of data collection (either working for someone else for pay, running their own business, supporting a family business, etc.) or who were looking for a job and available to start working in 7 days divided by the total number of working-aged individuals (15+years) in the population.
${ }^{7}$ Unemployment is calculated by dividing the number of individuals who were reportedly looking for work at the time of data collection by the number of individuals who either had a job (any type) or were looking for a job at the time of data collection.
${ }^{8}$ At the time of data collection, 1USD= circa 30.000 LBP, as per www.lirarate.org
${ }^{9} 15-49$ years old

