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INTRODUCTION

In February 2016, during the London Donor Conference, Jordan took an unprecedented step among Syrian refugee host countries and pledged to provide formal employment opportunities to Syrian refugees in return for concessionary rates on international loans, trade deals with the European Union, and investments from the international community to support the Jordanian economy.

Under this decision, the Ministry of Labour waived fees and some documentation requirements to enhance access for Syrian refugees to formal employment opportunities in professions open to non-Jordanian workers. Additionally, humanitarian and development actors in Jordan started implementing livelihoods projects as the issue of livelihoods for Syrian refugees became a focus area.

There was a need to share labour market information and assessments amongst the Livelihoods sector partners, and to streamline incentives offered to employers and trainees, in order to harmonize trainings, reduce duplication and inefficient resource utilization, and enhance labour market outcomes.

Most of the interventions were designed based on labour market or needs assessments. The majority of these considered both the beneficiaries’ preferences and the sectors open to Syrians. Some training providers provided on-the-job training which ends with employment, while others provided vocational training or apprentice models to enhance beneficiaries’ employability.

It has been noted that the number of Syrian refugees interested in training opportunities gets lower and lower. UNHCR’s Livelihoods unit has seen an increase in requests to support outreach to refugees aged 18-35. Refugee requests for training opportunities are constant but most are not looking for the available trainings or not under the available conditions. Hence a need for an assessment of refugee Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) needs became essential.

For non-Syrian refugees, this report focused on refugees from Iraq, Somalia, Sudan and Yemen. While in principle their children have access to basic education (with some challenges in providing documentation), there are very limited opportunities for TVET despite their strong interest in gaining these types of qualifications.

UNHCR seeks the support of different donors and stakeholders to provide accredited TVET opportunities to equip the refugee and Jordanian youths with the skills needed to enter the labour market and to bridge the gap between education and livelihood. These trainings are vital in order to empower youth, especially females, and support them to be more independent, self-reliant, and resilient, in addition to enhancing the ‘economic inclusion’. Moreover, these TVET opportunities are in line with the goal of the Refugee Education 2030 strategy to enrol 15% of refugees in TVET programmes.
METHODOLOGY OBJECTIVE: TO HELP REFUGEES REBUILD THEIR LIVES AND FIND SUSTAINABLE INCOME

A questionnaire was designed to assess refugee training needs and was administered to groups normally targeted by training providers, so mainly in the age bracket of 18-39, who are resident in urban areas in Jordan. Targeted locations were Amman from the middle of Jordan, Irbid from north governorates, and Karak from south governorates. The assessment was designed to target Syrian and non-Syrian refugees separately, and results were also separated to show male and female preferences.

Pre COVID-19, the assessment was done by face to face interviews followed by FGD in the community centres. During COVID-19, the same assessment was sent to refugees all over Jordan through their mobile phones.

DATA COLLECTION

Timeframe

The data was collected in two batches. The first batch, from 11 to 28 Feb 2020, was collected by UNHCR focal points from livelihoods and education units. The team was involved in both the design and the data collection in the field. The assessment happened in the community centers with the support of the Jordanian Hashemite Fund for Human Development (JOHUD) team to gather and target refugees from different locations. The second batch, from 30 April to 17 May 2020, was collected through the KOBO platform. In both batches, we were targeting refugees from different locations in the age bracket of 18-39.

Challenges

Due to the COVID-19 outbreak, the method of data collection needed to be amended. The decision was taken to continue the assessment through mobile devices choosing refugees, who matched the requested age criteria, randomly. The survey was sent via SMS and WhatsApp groups.

The Questionnaire

The vocational training questionnaire was organized to explore important training-related questions such as education level, previous trainings, preferred sectors, needs assessment to enroll in a new training, and the reasons to drop out of a training. Sample of the questionnaire is available in Annex 1 and 2.

SYRIAN REFUGEES

Sample Demographics

The number of refugees between 18 and 59 years registered in Jordan as residents in urban areas is 306,445\(^1\) individuals, 49% males and 51% females.

We started this assessment by meeting refugees in the community centres, at the targeted locations. Before the COVID-19 outbreak, 72 refugees were interviewed, of which 18 were males, and 54 were females, while 28 refugees were from Amman, 18 from Irbid, and 26 from Karak. A total of 275 refugees

\(^{1}\) As of 31 July 2020-UNHCR external reports
went through this assessment either through face to face interviews or through mobile assessment, of which 39% were males and 61% females. The age categories of the respondents varied as bellow.

**Age Ranges**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Categories</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-39</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Education Levels**

Most of respondents can read and write in Arabic, with slight differences between males and females. However, the level of education varied substantially between men and women in the sample, where 4.5% of the males were illiterate and 30% started/completed university; while 9% of females were illiterate and 36% reached university.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Level</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical or Vocational</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OUTCOMES AND FINDINGS

Syrian refugees are aware of the vocational and technical training programmes being provided for them in Jordan and are very interested in such opportunities. The assessment revealed that females took trainings more than males while in Jordan, 54% of the female interviewed population took one or more trainings compared to 26% of males.

For females, those trainings were mainly in computer/IT (19%) and beauticians (19%), while for males the percentage was a little bit higher, 28% in computer/IT, followed by 21% in English. Of those trainings, 65% were accredited mainly from NGO’s/INGO’s (47%), while 41% of the training were accredited from Centre of Accreditation and Quality Assurance (CAQA), 4.4% from Ministry of Education (MoE), and 7.4% from Ministry of Higher Education (MoHE).

When asked why they hadn’t taken any training previously in Jordan, 14% of females answered ‘due to a lack of time (children’s, family obligations…etc.)’, 27% said they were not aware of trainings, 14.3% said they were not able to register due to age limitations, 4.3% said that the training would tie them to a specific job opportunity at the end of the training, 4% stated that the duration and timing of the training was not appropriate, 3% due to lack of accreditation, 6% due to training location, 17% had no specific reasons, and 10.4% mentioned other reasons such as lack of interest in the areas of the trainings.

For males, the main reason was lack of awareness (38.4%), while 8.2% reported that they didn’t take trainings because of the duration and timing of the training itself, 16.4% due to age limitations, 5.5% don’t have enough time to take a training, for 4.1% the location was an obstacle, 3% because the training was tied to a specific job opportunity, 21% gave no specific reason, and 3.4% gave other reasons (e.g. working, uninterested topics, and unaccredited certificates).

Important factors for Syrian refugees to enroll in a training were listed as: availability of transport, stipends, accredited certificates, and duration of the training. Some female refugees stated that they need childcare facilities in order to be able to enroll in addition to the location as refugees from distant governorates stated during the FGD that TVET opportunities are usually centralized in specific governorates.
The most desirable TVET programmes for female refugees were listed as beauty (21%), English training (20%), computer/IT trainings (18%), sweets making/cooking (12%), tailoring (11%), hairdressing (7%) and 11% suggested trainings in other sectors such as agriculture specifically the hydroponic, ICDL, HR, TOT, translation, marketing, HBB and media.

For male refugees: English training (19%), computer/IT (15%), mobile maintenance (IOS and Android) (12%), electrician (9.3%), barber and hair dressing (8%), conditioning and cooling system (7%), sweets making and cooking (6%), plumbing (5%), carpentry (4%), and 15% suggested training in other sectors such as renewable energy, construction, interior design, accounting, and steering calibration (wheel alignment).
60.6% of the full sample said they prefer on-the-job training, followed by 19.9% for blended learning, 14.5% for in-class training, and only 5% only prefers online training.

The assessment revealed that impediments to joining or completing trainings for females are very focused on the location (51% would be dissuaded if the location was far away), duration of training (24%), 10% indicated training material, 5% new job and 10% gave other reasons e.g. financial issues, if no stipend was provided and family obligations (if they have children). For males, 42.1% rated location as the biggest impediment to joining followed by gaining a new job, and the training content and 14.7% gave different reasons, such as the way staff treats them or financial reasons.

When we asked, ‘Is an end of training employment opportunity a key factor for you when you consider potential trainings?’ it was a key factor only for males.

Overall refugees preferred morning rather than afternoon trainings (72% vs. 28%) and weekends rather than weekdays (69% vs. 28%). Additionally, one third preferred trainings that lasted for a month and only 43% said 2 to 3 months.

62% of the sample stated that they prefer to be informed about available training opportunities through SMS, 20% through social media, 9% through UNHCR meetings, 2% through the CSCs, 3% through other refugee and colleagues and 4% others means e.g. leaflets.
NON-SYRIAN REFUGEES

Sample Demographics

For non-Syrian refugees, according to UNHCR published figures, the number of working age refugees registered in Jordan as residents in urban areas is 55,292 individuals, 60% of them are males and 40% females.

Prior to COVID, 53 refugees were interviewed at community centres, in the targeted locations. Of the 53, 35 were males, and 18 females, with 21 from Amman, 16 from Irbid and 16 from Karak.

A total of 126 refugees went through this assessment either through face to face interviews or through the post COVID mobile assessment of which 61% males and 39% females. The age categories of the respondents varied as below.

Education Levels

Most of respondents can read and write in Arabic, with slight differences between males and females. However, the level of education varied substantially between men and women in the sample, where 3.9% of interviewed males were illiterate, 35% of them had started/completed university level and 5.2% reached post university level. For interviewed females, 2% were illiterate, while 45% had started/reached university level, and 2% reached post university level.

Only 16 males reported that they are working, and only 5 of them have work permits. Six of them work in cooking, three in wholesale, retail and trade, and the remaining in water supply and plumbing, agriculture, tailoring, gas stations, car maintenance, and web developing. Two females said they were working.

58% of the full sample responded that employment opportunity is a key factor for them when considering potential trainings.

---

\(^2\) UNHCR reporting as of 9 August 2020
OUTCOMES AND FINDINGS

Whilst non-Syrian refugees are overall not aware of the vocational and technical training programmes provided in Jordan, they indicate a high interest in such opportunities. The assessment revealed that females took trainings more than males while in Jordan, with 39% of the females interviewed having taken one or more trainings, compared to 19% of males.

Those trainings were mainly in English (42%) and in computer and IT (21%) for females. Whilst the same trainings were popular for males, the number who had taken these trainings were less than for women (37% in English, 16% in computer/IT). Of trainings taken, 60% were accredited with certificates from different service providers.

In response to ‘why haven’t you taken any training previously in Jordan?’, 62% of males answered that they weren’t aware of opportunities, 18% said because of age restrictions, 12% said they had work commitments, and 8% stated other reasons e.g. financial costs for enrolment. In answering the same question, 61.5% of females reported that they weren’t aware of opportunities, 11.5% expressed concern from potential withdrawal penalties, 7.7% said they didn’t have the time because of other obligations, 3.9 % stated age limitations, 3.9 % said lack of accreditation was a concern and 7.7% didn’t provide specific reasons.

Amongst non-Syrian refugees, females said they were most interested in English training (24.2%), computer/IT trainings (19.7%), tailoring (13.6%), sweets making/cooking (13.6%), beauty (12%) and hair dressing (7.6%). 9.3% suggested trainings in other sectors such as in graphic design, medical sector, and human resources.
Of the males surveyed, 21.7% noted preference in English trainings, 17% in computer/IT, 13.7% in mobile maintenance (IOS and Android), 13.7% in electrician trainings, 9% in conditioning and cooling system, 5% in tailoring, sweets making/cooking, and plumbing, while 9.9% noted preference in other sectors such as renewable energy, hybrid cars, car maintenance.

50% of the full sample said they preferred on-the-job training, followed by blended learning (21%), in class training (18%), and online training (11%).

Due to the very limited availability of current TVET opportunities for non-Syrian refugees, they were not clear on real obstacles to enrolment but imagined that some would face age limitations, limited availability of slots in comparison to the demand, and potential restrictions on locations.

Stipend provision, accreditation of the training, and availability of transportation were listed as important factors for enrolment. Overall females were more concerned about accreditation than males.
The assessment revealed that 52% of females might drop out of training if the location was far away from their homes and 26% might drop out because of training duration, compared to 43.5% of males who indicated location as a dropout factor. 14.5% of males indicated they may drop out of training if they found work and 10% indicated that training content could be a factor. Other factors reported often focused on financial considerations.

Overall, the refugees interviewed indicated that they preferred morning training (57%) more than afternoon (43%), weekdays (69%) more than weekends (31%). In contrast to Syrian refugees, non-Syrian refugees were more interested in trainings that ran for 3 or plus months.

62% of the sample stated they prefer to be informed about training opportunities through SMS, 19% through social media, 8% through UNHCR meetings, and 6% through the CSCs while 5% suggested other ways e.g. to build mobile application that can share updates with refugees via their mobile devices.
RECOMMENDATIONS

➢ Plan and implement TVET programmes across Jordan, rather than only in specific locations.
➢ Expand the age categories to include refugees above 35, but not at the overall expense of youth.
➢ Transportation, stipends, short duration of the training and accreditation of the certificates are important factors to consider for increasing refugee enrolment in trainings.
➢ Increase outreach to refugees regarding training opportunities via SMS and social media.
➢ TVET programmes should be inclusive of the whole refugee community, in line with UNHCR’s “One Refugee” approach.
➢ Planned trainings should reflect the interest and preferences of refugees, irrespective of the Ministry of Labour’s open and closed profession criteria.
➢ Offer TVET trainings in different new and innovative areas, such as renewable energy, coding, advanced agricultural methods, and more, rather than saturated fields.
➢ Offer accredited blended learning TVET courses, and conduct face-to-face sessions over the weekend.
➢ Provide childcare services and centres to promote female enrolment in TVET trainings.
Annex 1: The Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education level
- Illiterate
- Elementary
- Intermediate
- Secondary
- University level
- Post university level
- Technical or vocational

The Assessment

Q1: Did you take any training since you came to Jordan? - Yes - No

Q2: [if No] Why haven’t you taken any training previously in Jordan?
- Didn’t hear about it
- Age limitation
- Not interested in the topic
- Duration/ timing
- I’m working
- Location
- Not accredited
- Tied me with specific job at the end of the programme
- Penalties if withdrawal
- I don’t have time
- No specific reason
- Other-------

Q3: [if yes] In which areas did you take trainings:
- Computer
- English
- Electrician
- Plumbing
- Tailoring
- Barbers /hairdressing
- Sweet making/cooking
- Carpentry
- Beauticians
- Conditioning and cooling system
- Mobile maintenance
- Other (please specify) ......

Q4- [If yes] How many trainings did you attend?
- One
- Two
- Three
- More than three

Q5- [If yes] Are those training accredited / certified?
- Yes
- No

Q6- From where?
- CAQA
- MOE
- MOHE
- Others ........

Q7- Are you currently working?
- Yes
- No

Q8- [If yes] With WP?
- Yes
- No

Q9- [If yes] In which sector?
- Agriculture
- Manufacturing
- Water supply, plumbing, waste management
- Construction
- Wholesale, retail, trade
- Accommodation, food services (hotelier/hospitality)
- Support services
- Domestic work
- Carpentry
- Cooking/catering
- Tailoring
- Barber/hairdresser
- Mechanics
- I have my own home-based business
- Other please specify..........................

Q10- Is an end of training employment opportunity a key factor for you when you consider potential trainings? - Yes
- No

Q11- What trainings would be of interest to you?
- Computer
| - English  
| - Electrician  
| - Plumbing  
| - Tailoring  
| - Barbers/hairdresser  
| - Sweet making/cooking  
| - Painting  
| - Carpenter  
| - Beauticians  
| - Conditioning and cooling system  
| - Mobile maintenance  
| - Other (please specify) ..... |

Q12- I prefer this type of trainings?  
- On the job trainings  
- In class trainings  
- Online trainings  
- Blended learning  

Q13- Which factors are of importance to you when deciding? (you can choose more than one option)  
- Transportations  
- Short duration  
- Certificates (accreditation)  
- Stipend  
- Others  

Q14- The reason for dropping out of a training is?  
- Location  
- Duration  
- Start working  
- Training material  
- Others  

Q15- Do you prefer trainings to be conducted during?  
- Morning  
- Afternoon  

Q16- Do you prefer trainings to be conducted during?  
- Weekdays
-Weekends

Q17- Do you prefer trainings to be conducted within?
- One month
- Two months
- Three months
- More than that

Q18- The best channel I prefer to announce about training opportunity is via?
- Social media
- UNHCR SMS
- UNHCR meetings
- Leaflets
- Other refugees & colleagues
- CSC’s
- Others ......

Additional comments

Annex 2: Focus Group Discussions’ Questions

With regards to vocational and technical training: What are the (specializations) that the females & males are interested in?

بما يتعلق بالتدريب المهني والتقني: ما هي اهتمامات (التخصصات) الطلاب الإناث واهتمامات الطلاب الذكور؟

What do you think is the appropriate training period for a student to join the technical training programme (one year, two years, or four)?

يرأيك ما هي المدة التدريبية المناسبة للطالب للإلتقاء برامج التدريب التقني (سنة أو سنتين أو أربع سنوات)؟

What are the biggest challenges that face you when applying for the technical training programme?

ما هي أكبر التحديات التي تواجهك للتقديم ببرامج التدريب التقني؟

What are the biggest challenges you face when applying for a scholarship?

ما هي أكبر التحديات التي تواجهك للتقديم لمنحة دراسية؟

What are the reasons that compel you to withdraw from the scholarship?

ما هي الأسباب التي تجبرك على الإستيلاء من المنحة الدراسية؟
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