

Housing Subsidies for Refugees: Experimental Evidence on Life Outcomes and Social Integration in Jordan

Last modified: January 14th, 2025

Contents

1	Appendix D: Midline Results	4
2	Appendix E: Endline Results	14
3	Appendix F: Follow-Up Results	31
4	Appendix G: Social Integration Results	39
4.1	Social Cohesion Heterogeneity	49
5	Appendix H: Ethics Appendix	53
6	Appendix I: Pooled Results	54
6.1	Pooled Results Heterogeneity	54

List of Tables

D1	Impacts of the Program on Dwelling Characteristics and Household Composition	5
D2	Impacts of the Program on Household Consumption and Expenditure	6
D3	Impacts of the Program on Migration	6
D4	Impacts of the Program on Physical Health	7
D5	Impacts of the Program on Mental Health	8
D6	Impacts of the Program on Household-Level Child Outcomes	8
D7	Impacts of the Program on COVID-19 Health-Related Outcomes	9
D8	Impacts of the Program on COVID-19 Labor-Related Outcomes	10
D9	Impacts of the Program on COVID-19 Credit-Related Outcomes	11
D10	Impacts of the Program on Household Composition	12
D11	Impacts of the Program on Individual Components of Indices	13
E1	Impacts of the Program on Primary Outcomes	14
E2	Impacts of the Program on Dwelling Characteristics and Household Composition	15
E3	Impacts of the Program on Consumption and Expenditures	16
E4	Impacts of the Program on Financial Participation	17
E5	Impacts of the Program on Transfers	18
E6	Impacts of the Program on Earnings, Labor, & Occupational Choice	19
E7	Impacts of the Program on Migration	20
E8	Impacts of the Program on Physical Health	21
E9	Impacts of the Program on Mental Health	22
E10	Impacts of the Program on Sleep	22
E11	Impacts of the Program on Marriage and Fertility	23
E12	Impacts of the Program on Individual Child Outcomes	24
E13	Impacts of the Program on Household-Level Child Outcomes	24
E14	Impacts of the Program on Social Capital	25
E15	Impacts of the Program on Political Attitudes	26
E16	Impacts of the Program on Time Use	26
E17	Impacts of the Program on Education and Cognition	27
E18	Impacts of the Program on Behavioral Games and Preferences	28
E19	Impacts of the Program on Additional Dwelling Characteristics and Household Composition	29
E20	Impacts of the Program on NGO Assistance	30
F1	Impacts of the Program on Primary Outcomes	31
F2	Impacts of the Program on Dwelling Characteristics and Household Composition	32
F3	Impacts of the Program on Food Consumption and Food Security	33
F4	Impacts of the Program on Financial Participation	34
F5	Impacts of the Program on Earnings, Labor, and Occupational Choice	34
F6	Impacts of the Program on Migration	35
F7	Impacts of the Program on Physical and Mental Health	35
F8	Impacts of the Program on Child Outcomes	36
F9	Impacts of the Program on Time Use	37
F10	Impacts of the Program on Relationships and MacArthur Ladder	38
F11	Impacts of the Program on Preferences towards it	38

G1	Impacts of the Program on Primary Outcomes	39
G2	Impacts of the Program on Assimilation Gap	40
G3	Impacts of the Program on Host Community Relations and Attitudes Towards Refugees	41
G4	Impacts of the Program on Altruism and Trust	42
G5	Impacts of the Program on Social Attitudes and Policy Preferences	43
G6	Impacts of the Program on Dwelling Characteristics	44
G7	Impacts of the Program on Household Consumption and Expenditures	45
G8	Impacts of the Program on Food Security	46
G9	Impacts of the Program on Earnings, Labor, and Occupational Choice	47
G10	Impacts of the Program on Savings and Loans	48
G11	Impacts of the Program on Physical and Mental Health	48
G12	Jordanian Neighbor Primary Outcomes Heterogeneity by: Marlowe-Crowne Score	49
G13	Jordanian Neighbor Primary Outcomes Heterogeneity by: Palestinian Grandparents	49
G14	Jordanian Neighbor Primary Outcomes Heterogeneity by: Grandparents Non-Native Jordanians	50
G15	Jordanian Neighbor Primary Outcomes Heterogeneity by: Proximity to Study Refugee Household	50
G16	Jordanian Neighbor Primary Outcomes Heterogeneity by: Gender	51
G17	Jordanian Neighbor Primary Outcomes Heterogeneity by: Age Group 18-25	51
G18	Jordanian Neighbor Primary Outcomes Heterogeneity by: Education Level	52
G19	Jordanian Neighbor Primary Outcomes Heterogeneity by: Socioeconomic Status	52
I1	Pooled Primary Outcomes Effects Heterogeneity by: Respondent Genderl	54

1 Appendix D: Midline Results

Table (D1) Impacts of the Program on Dwelling Characteristics and Household Composition

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Overall housing quality (Z-Score)	0.48*	(0.26)	[0.16]	-0.00	(1.00)	1,610
Housing-material quality (Score 0-2)	0.44**	(0.20)	[0.16]	1.39	(0.83)	1,610
Toilet (=1)	-0.14	(0.14)	[0.26]	0.23	(0.42)	1,610
Piped main water (=1)	0.01	(0.09)	[0.50]	0.24	(0.43)	1,610
Main water access (Scale 1-5)	0.35*	(0.19)	[0.16]	3.42	(1.15)	1,610
Clean water (=1)	0.21***	(0.06)	[0.01]	0.17	(0.38)	1,610
Safe drinking water (Scale 1-5)	0.20	(0.18)	[0.23]	3.46	(1.08)	1,610
Electricity (=1)	0.01**	(0.01)	[0.16]	0.99	(0.07)	1,610
Generator (=1)	-0.01	(0.01)	[0.23]	0.01	(0.08)	1,610
Shared dwelling (=1)	-0.02*	(0.01)	[0.16]	0.01	(0.09)	1,610
# Families per dwelling	-0.02	(0.01)	[0.18]	1.01	(0.11)	1,610
Rooms	0.44***	(0.18)	[0.12]	2.93	(1.08)	1,610
Occupied Rooms	0.51***	(0.17)	[0.04]	2.85	(1.05)	1,610
Total Monthly housing expenditures	41.35	(25.75)	[0.18]	164.59	(177.61)	1,545
Monthly housing expenditures (<i>per capita</i>)	8.73**	(4.17)	[0.16]	29.88	(34.75)	1,545
Monthly rent paid (USD PPP)	46.16*	(25.60)	[0.16]	168.43	(177.17)	1,505
Rent amount agreed on (USD PPP)	-25.58	(30.69)	[0.29]	327.76	(115.70)	1,445
Household size	0.29	(0.26)	[0.23]	5.96	(2.39)	1,610
Total ID cards	-0.22	(0.15)	[0.18]	4.20	(0.96)	1,610
Home ownership (=1)	-0.01	(0.02)	[0.45]	0.03	(0.16)	1,610
Respondent chores (Hours)	-1.58	(1.97)	[0.29]	17.40	(18.73)	1,603
Respondent childcare (Hours)	-6.26**	(3.10)	[0.16]	29.90	(27.94)	1,507
Respondent childcare & chores (Hours)	-5.62	(4.08)	[0.18]	45.05	(38.52)	1,607
Other members childcare & chores (Hours)	-0.87	(3.89)	[0.45]	42.05	(29.65)	1,151
Dwelling can be locked (=1)	0.14**	(0.07)	[0.16]	0.79	(0.41)	1,610

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified housing quality and housing-related finances using the phone survey midline data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- The independent variable of interest is the TOT treatment indicator, which is the predicted value from a first-stage regression of treatment implementation on treatment assignment.
- The outcomes that require definitions are: Overall housing quality is defined as a normalized housing quality index that includes indicators for quality floors and roofs, indicators for access to grid electricity and piped water, and the number of people per room. Housing-material quality is defined as the summation of three indicators for high-quality floors and roofs. Clean water is defined as an indicator for households having treated drinking water (such as by a filter). Total Monthly housing expenditures is defined as the sum of rent paid, mortgage, and upgrade cost. It includes the subsidy payments by the implementing organization. The *Per capita* housing expenditures is divided by household size. Total ID Cards is defined as the sum of the ID cards possessed by the respondent (MOI card, Passport, Residency permit, Work permit, Family book, Syrian ID, and UNHCR file). Hours spent on childcare and chores are measured over the last week.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age).
- In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 1 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (D2) Impacts of the Program on Household Consumption and Expenditure

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Food consumption (aid) USD PPP	-53.05**	(22.40)	[0.02]	218.51	(201.68)	1,569
Food consumption (aid) USD PPP (<i>Per capita</i>)	-9.73***	(3.44)	[0.01]	35.88	(29.19)	1,569
Number of meals consumed the day prior	-0.08	(0.09)	[0.13]	2.05	(0.59)	1,610

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified consumption outcomes using the phone survey midline data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- The independent variable of interest is the TOT treatment indicator, which is the predicted value from a first-stage regression of treatment implementation on treatment assignment.
- The outcomes that require definitions are: Food consumption measures are self-reported and are in USD PPP and are winsorized at the top 1% of values in order to limit the influence of outliers.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age).
- In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 2 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (D3) Impacts of the Program on Migration

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Respondent moved since October 2019 (=1)	0.07	(0.06)	[0.28]	0.10	(0.30)	1,609
Number of times the subject moved	0.19**	(0.10)	[0.11]	0.13	(0.48)	1,609
Respondent networks (s.d. units)	0.35**	(0.15)	[0.10]	0.00	(1.00)	1,610
Camp resident (=1)	-0.02	(0.02)	[0.30]	0.02	(0.15)	1,609
Moving plans (Scale 1-4)	0.14	(0.16)	[0.32]	3.67	(0.71)	862

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified migration outcomes using the phone survey midline data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- The independent variable of interest is the TOT treatment indicator, which is the predicted value from a first-stage regression of treatment implementation on treatment assignment.
- The outcomes that require definitions are: Respondent moved is asked about since October 2019 because October 2019 represents the earliest date of the shelter program implementation. Respondent networks corresponds to people (excl. household members) that the respondent knew who were already in their current neighborhood when they moved to their current residence and is coded as 1 if “0”, 2 if “1-5”, 3 if “6-10”, 4 if “11-20”, and 5 if “More than 20”. Moving plans is coded as 1 if moving on a specific date, 2 if looked for other residences, 3 if have not started looking for other residences, and 4 if do not have plans to change residences.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age).
- In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 5 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (D4) Impacts of the Program on Physical Health

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Subjective health (Scale 1-4)	-0.12	(0.11)	[0.32]	3.34	(0.70)	1,610
Disability level 1 (=1 if disabled)	0.10	(0.06)	[0.17]	0.61	(0.49)	1,610
Disability level 2 (=1 if disabled)	0.06	(0.08)	[0.37]	0.41	(0.49)	1,610
Disability level 3 (=1 if disabled)	-0.00	(0.06)	[0.71]	0.26	(0.44)	1,610
Disability level 4 (=1 if disabled)	0.04***	(0.01)	[0.01]	0.01	(0.08)	1,610
Respondent hunger last week (=1)	0.23***	(0.07)	[0.01]	0.35	(0.48)	1,604
Adults hunger last week (=1)	0.17***	(0.06)	[0.01]	0.38	(0.49)	1,610
Respondent hunger last week (Days)	0.65***	(0.22)	[0.01]	0.91	(1.46)	1,604
Adult hunger last week (Days)	0.55***	(0.21)	[0.01]	0.79	(1.36)	1,444

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified physical health outcomes using the phone survey midline data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- The independent variable of interest is the TOT treatment indicator, which is the predicted value from a first-stage regression of treatment implementation on treatment assignment.
- The outcomes that require definitions are: Disability is defined using the Washington Group Short Set on Functioning and equals 1 if the respondent is classified as disabled and 0 otherwise. Disability 3 is the recommended cutoff and as we move from Disability 1 to Disability 4, disability level becomes more extreme. Respondent (and adult) hunger equals 1 if the respondent went to bed hungry on at least one day in the last week and 0 otherwise.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age).
- In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 6 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (D5) Impacts of the Program on Mental Health

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
CESD score (higher is better)	0.13	(0.17)	[0.37]	0.00	(1.00)	1,607
Perceived stress scale (higher is better)	0.10	(0.15)	[0.38]	-0.00	(1.00)	1,607
Depression (=1 if depressed)	-0.09	(0.07)	[0.29]	0.56	(0.50)	1,607

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified mental health outcomes using the phone survey midline data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- The independent variable of interest is the TOT treatment indicator, which is the predicted value from a first-stage regression of treatment implementation on treatment assignment.
- The outcomes that require definitions are: Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D) is a measure for depressive symptoms and includes 10 items asking about the past week. It is defined as a mean-effect index of 10 items scored 0-3 in the past week (I was bothered by things that usually don't bother me, I had a problem in concentration on what I was doing, I felt depressed and troubled in my mind, I felt that everything that I did took up all my energy, I felt hopeful about the future (reversed), I felt afraid, I had difficulty in sleeping peacefully, I was happy (reversed), I felt lonely, I lacked the motivation to do anything). It is then normalized by subtracting the control group's mean and dividing by its standard deviation, and reversing again such that higher values correspond to better mental health. The Perceived Stress Scale (PSS-4) is a mean-effect index of four items measured over 1-5 in the last 30 days (how often have you felt that you were unable to control the important things in your life?, how often have you felt certain in your ability to overcome your own personal problems?, how often have you felt that things were going your way?, how often did you feel that the problems were too much for you to manage?). It is then normalized by subtracting the control group's mean and dividing by its standard deviation. Higher scores for CES-D and PSS indicate better outcomes. Depression equals 1 if the CESD score is at least 10 and 0 otherwise.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age).
- In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 6 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (D6) Impacts of the Program on Household-Level Child Outcomes

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Number of children under 18 years	0.30**	(0.15)	[0.03]	3.27	(1.97)	1,610
Total number of school days attended per child	-0.43*	(0.24)	[0.04]	2.33	(2.49)	1,031
Days any child had to sleep hungry	0.60***	(0.20)	[0.01]	0.57	(1.22)	1,469
Child hunger last week (=1)	0.24***	(0.07)	[0.00]	0.23	(0.42)	1,469

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified and not pre-specified child outcomes using the phone survey midline data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- The independent variable of interest is the TOT treatment indicator, which is the predicted value from a first-stage regression of treatment implementation on treatment assignment.
- The outcomes that require definitions are: Child hunger last week is defined as an indicator variable that equals 1 if any child in household had to go to bed hungry in the past week and 0 otherwise.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age).
- In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 8 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (D7) Impacts of the Program on COVID-19 Health-Related Outcomes

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Adults COVID-19 testing (=1 if any adult tested)	0.00	(0.04)	[0.83]	0.07	(0.25)	1,609
Number of adults tested for COVID-19	0.04	(0.05)	[0.54]	0.06	(0.37)	1,558
Children COVID-19 testing (=1)	0.00	(0.02)	[0.77]	0.01	(0.11)	1,604
Number of children tested for COVID-19	0.03	(0.03)	[0.54]	0.01	(0.13)	1,519
Unable to access testing (=1)	0.01	(0.02)	[0.78]	0.02	(0.14)	1,603
Total COVID-19 symptoms	0.84***	(0.19)	[0.00]	0.47	(1.22)	1,610
COVID-19 symptoms index (z-score)	0.69***	(0.14)	[0.00]	0.00	(1.00)	1,610
Number of people who are symptomatic	0.46***	(0.09)	[0.00]	0.29	(0.61)	1,581
Number of children who are symptomatic	0.17***	(0.05)	[0.01]	0.06	(0.32)	1,472
Days prior that these symptoms have appeared	1.10	(2.08)	[0.68]	7.62	(10.62)	372
Recovery (=1 if respondent recovered)	-0.10	(0.16)	[0.65]	0.74	(0.44)	403
Recovery (=1 if any member recovered)	-0.06	(0.15)	[0.77]	0.76	(0.43)	438
COVID-19 riskiness index	0.19	(0.13)	[0.31]	-0.00	(1.00)	1,609
Sum of six COVID-19-spreading activities	0.39	(0.27)	[0.31]	2.42	(2.06)	1,609
Number of visits to healthcare institutions	-0.56***	(0.23)	[0.04]	1.14	(2.03)	1,608
Seen by a health professional (=1)	-0.08	(0.05)	[0.31]	0.37	(0.48)	1,610
Healthcare expenditures since COVID-19 (USD PPP)	-77.66	(58.11)	[0.33]	130.23	(275.54)	583
Medicine expenditures since COVID-19 (USD PPP)	-30.75*	(18.72)	[0.24]	84.04	(141.52)	1,590
Number of foregone health visits	-1.19	(1.10)	[0.47]	2.65	(8.05)	1,607
Denied service because of refugee status (=1)	-0.04	(0.05)	[0.60]	0.16	(0.37)	1,609
Major health problems since October 2019 (=1)	0.01	(0.04)	[0.77]	0.07	(0.25)	1,610
Major health problems since October 2019 (#)	0.04	(0.04)	[0.54]	0.07	(0.26)	1,610
Change in overall food consumption (-1,0,1)	0.33***	(0.11)	[0.02]	-0.30	(0.79)	1,606
Change in cereal consumption (-1,0,1)	0.17	(0.11)	[0.31]	-0.17	(0.81)	1,603
Change in meat consumption (-1,0,1)	0.11	(0.09)	[0.40]	-0.61	(0.61)	1,606
Number of learning activities	0.19**	(0.09)	[0.08]	0.22	(0.56)	1,385
Learning activities (=1)	0.15***	(0.06)	[0.03]	0.17	(0.37)	1,385
Hours spent on learning activities (average)	0.07	(0.18)	[0.77]	0.43	(1.17)	1,248
Child happiness (Scale 1-7)	-0.22	(0.38)	[0.65]	5.07	(1.90)	974
Child alertness (s.d. units)	-0.73***	(0.20)	[0.00]	0.00	(1.00)	975

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified COVID-19-related outcomes using the phone survey midline data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- The independent variable of interest is the TOT treatment indicator, which is the predicted value from a first-stage regression of treatment implementation on treatment assignment.
- The outcomes that require definitions are: The COVID symptoms index is a mean effect index of an indicator for any household member testing positive for COVID and the summation of total symptoms experienced by the respondent. The COVID Riskiness index is a mean effect index of indicators that increase the likelihood of COVID contraction by the respondent including leaving the house, attending social gatherings, not keeping distance from others, going to mosque or other religious institutions, going to grocery store or market, and leaving village/neighborhood. The change in consumption is obtained from asking “Please tick below the changes in your family’s consumption in the past 30 days compared to before the COVID-19 outbreak began: Increase, No change, Decrease.” Then, increase is coded as +1, no change as 0, and decrease as -1. Learning activities are done in the last 24 hours and include homework, e-learning, educational programs and videos, and reading. Child alertness is the respondent’s answer to “On a scale of 1-7, with 1 being tired and 7 being alert, how does (child name) feel right now? ” and is normalized by deducting the control group’s mean and then dividing the result by the standard deviation of the control group.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age).
- In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 14 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (D8) Impacts of the Program on COVID-19 Labor-Related Outcomes

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Weekly adult hours worked (before first lockdown)	1.73	(4.93)	[0.77]	29.99	(31.33)	1,604
Weekly adult hours worked (during first lockdown)	0.46	(0.74)	[0.65]	1.33	(6.39)	1,610
Weekly adult hours worked (after first lockdown)	0.55	(3.67)	[0.81]	24.11	(28.87)	1,606
Weekly adult income (before first lockdown)	-21.60	(15.83)	[0.33]	117.16	(112.22)	1,606
Weekly adult income (during first lockdown)	-20.07***	(7.19)	[0.02]	30.22	(66.86)	1,609
Weekly adult income (after first lockdown)	-3.27	(12.47)	[0.77]	99.37	(100.70)	1,605
Assets sold [before lockdown] (=1)	0.10	(0.08)	[0.34]	0.25	(0.43)	1,600
Assets sold [during lockdown] (=1)	0.04	(0.07)	[0.65]	0.28	(0.45)	1,602
Assets sold [after lockdown] (=1)	-0.02	(0.04)	[0.69]	0.11	(0.32)	1,608
Days of work/housework/school missed	0.47	(1.55)	[0.77]	4.48	(11.67)	1,407
Lost job (=1)	0.00	(0.06)	[0.83]	0.66	(0.48)	1,606

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified COVID-19-related outcomes using the phone survey midline data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- The independent variable of interest is the TOT treatment indicator, which is the predicted value from a first-stage regression of treatment implementation on treatment assignment.
- The periods referred to in the tables are before lockdown: (January 15 - March 15, 2020); during lockdown: (March 15 - May 15, 2020); and after lockdown: (May 15 - interview date). Monetary values are in USD PPP and are winsorized at the top 1% of values in order to limit the influence of outliers.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age).
- In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 14 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (D9) Impacts of the Program on COVID-19 Credit-Related Outcomes

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Loans taken pre-first-lockdown (=1)	-0.20***	(0.07)	[0.01]	0.61	(0.49)	1,608
Log loans taken pre-first-lockdown	-0.39**	(0.16)	[0.04]	5.48	(0.85)	923
Loans taken during first lockdown (=1)	-0.34***	(0.07)	[0.00]	0.78	(0.41)	1,608
Log loans taken during first lockdown	-0.28*	(0.16)	[0.19]	5.55	(0.77)	1,167
Loans taken after first lockdown (=1)	-0.33***	(0.07)	[0.00]	0.42	(0.49)	1,607
Log loans taken after first lockdown	-0.80***	(0.19)	[0.00]	5.08	(0.86)	586
Loans given pre-first-lockdown (=1)	0.02*	(0.01)	[0.21]	0.00	(0.06)	1,610
Loans given during first lockdown (=1)	0.00	(0.00)	[0.40]	0.00	(0.00)	1,610
Loans given after first lockdown (=1)	0.00	(0.00)	[0.77]	0.00	(0.04)	1,610

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified COVID-19-related outcomes using the phone survey midline data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- The independent variable of interest is the TOT treatment indicator, which is the predicted value from a first-stage regression of treatment implementation on treatment assignment.
- The periods referred to in the tables are before lockdown: (January 15 - March 15, 2020); during lockdown: (March 15 - May 15, 2020); and after lockdown: (May 15 - interview date). Monetary values are in USD PPP and are winsorized at the top 1% of values in order to limit the influence of outliers.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age).
- In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 14 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (D10) Impacts of the Program on Household Composition

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Number of adults in household	-0.02	(0.17)	[1.00]	2.69	(1.38)	1,610
Number of girls under 18 years in household	0.05	(0.15)	[1.00]	1.60	(1.40)	1,610
Number of boys under 18 years in household	0.25*	(0.13)	[0.33]	1.68	(1.34)	1,610
Number of children under 12 years in household	0.08	(0.16)	[1.00]	2.49	(1.71)	1,610
Number of girls under 12 years in household	-0.00	(0.12)	[1.00]	1.21	(1.23)	1,610
Number of boys under 12 years in household	0.08	(0.12)	[1.00]	1.28	(1.15)	1,610
Number of children aged 13-17 years in household	0.22*	(0.13)	[0.33]	0.79	(0.98)	1,610
Number of girls aged 13-17 years in household	0.06	(0.10)	[1.00]	0.39	(0.65)	1,610
Number of boys aged 13-17 years in household	0.16**	(0.07)	[0.33]	0.40	(0.66)	1,610

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on not pre-specified household composition outcomes using the phone survey midline data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- The independent variable of interest is the TOT treatment indicator, which is the predicted value from a first-stage regression of treatment implementation on treatment assignment.
- The outcomes that require definitions are: Child hunger last week is defined as an indicator variable that equals 1 if any child in household had to go to bed hungry in the past week and 0 otherwise. Learning activities are done in the last 24 hours and include homework, e-learning, educational programs and videos, and reading. Child alertness is the respondent’s answer to “On a scale of 1-7, with 1 being tired and 7 being alert, how does (child name) feel right now? ” and is normalized by deducting the control group’s mean and then dividing the result by the standard deviation of the control group.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age).
- In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 8 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (D11) Impacts of the Program on Individual Components of Indices

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
<i>Overall Housing Quality (Z-Score):</i>	0.48*	(0.26)	[0.24]	-0.00	(1.00)	1,610
Quality Floor (=1)	0.20*	(0.12)	[0.24]	0.68	(0.47)	1,610
Quality Roof (=1)	0.24***	(0.09)	[0.08]	0.71	(0.45)	1,610
Grid Electricity (=1)	0.15*	(0.09)	[0.24]	0.78	(0.41)	1,610
Piped Drinking Water (=1)	0.01	(0.09)	[0.94]	0.24	(0.43)	1,610
# People per Room	-0.32*	(0.19)	[0.24]	2.37	(1.42)	1,610
<i>Disability level 3 (=1 if disabled):</i>	-0.00	(0.06)	[0.99]	0.26	(0.44)	1,610
Vision (Higher is more disability)	0.06	(0.08)	[0.52]	1.32	(0.59)	1,610
Hearing (Higher is more disability)	-0.04	(0.06)	[0.52]	1.12	(0.37)	1,610
Mobility (Higher is more disability)	0.04	(0.10)	[0.71]	1.60	(0.78)	1,610
Cognition (Higher is more disability)	0.20*	(0.11)	[0.24]	1.39	(0.64)	1,610
Difficulty with self-care (z-score)	0.38***	(0.14)	[0.08]	-0.00	(1.00)	1,610
Communication (Higher is more disability)	0.02	(0.04)	[0.71]	1.05	(0.25)	1,609
<i>CESD score (Higher better):</i>	0.13	(0.17)	[0.52]	0.00	(1.00)	1,607
felt hopeful about the future	0.27	(0.18)	[0.31]	1.47	(1.30)	1,601
was happy	-0.06	(0.13)	[0.71]	1.10	(1.02)	1,606
bothered by things that don't bother me (reversed)	0.21	(0.15)	[0.31]	2.14	(0.97)	1,603
had a problem in concentration (reversed)	0.25*	(0.14)	[0.24]	2.33	(0.92)	1,605
felt depressed and troubled in my mind (reversed)	-0.01	(0.20)	[0.99]	1.76	(1.13)	1,606
felt everything that I did took up my energy (reversed)	0.05	(0.17)	[0.80]	1.89	(1.11)	1,603
felt afraid (reversed)	0.15	(0.17)	[0.52]	2.18	(1.09)	1,605
had difficulty in sleeping peacefully (reversed)	0.14	(0.19)	[0.52]	2.01	(1.08)	1,605
felt lonely (reversed)	-0.30*	(0.18)	[0.24]	1.92	(1.18)	1,606
lacked the motivation to do anything (reversed)	0.04	(0.12)	[0.72]	2.17	(1.04)	1,602
<i>COVID-19 symptoms Index:</i>	0.69***	(0.14)	[0.00]	0.00	(1.00)	1,610
COVID-19-positive (=1)	0.15**	(0.08)	[0.24]	0.02	(0.13)	105
Total COVID-19 symptoms	0.84***	(0.19)	[0.00]	0.47	(1.22)	1,610
<i>COVID-19 Riskiness Index:</i>	0.19	(0.13)	[0.31]	-0.00	(1.00)	1,609
Left home (=1)	0.06	(0.07)	[0.52]	0.62	(0.48)	1,609
Attended social gatherings (=1)	0.05	(0.07)	[0.52]	0.36	(0.48)	1,609
Did not keep distance (=1)	0.16***	(0.06)	[0.08]	0.51	(0.50)	1,609
Attended mosque (=1)	0.09**	(0.04)	[0.19]	0.25	(0.43)	1,609
Went to market (=1)	0.01	(0.06)	[0.93]	0.46	(0.50)	1,609
Left village (=1)	0.03	(0.06)	[0.71]	0.22	(0.41)	1,609

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on index items using the phone survey midline data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- The independent variable of interest is the TOT treatment indicator, which is the predicted value from a first-stage regression of treatment implementation on treatment assignment.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age).
- In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to all indices components.

2 Appendix E: Endline Results

Table (E1) Impacts of the Program on Primary Outcomes

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Overall Housing Quality (Z-Score)	0.24	(0.23)	[0.99]	0.00	(1.00)	1,422
Total Monthly Housing Expenditures (USD PPP)	-84.71***	(33.10)	[0.06]	227.72	(208.45)	1,421
Total Household Consumption (Log USD PPP)	-0.03	(0.08)	[1.00]	8.73	(0.55)	1,422
CESD Score (Higher: Less Depression)	-0.07	(0.16)	[1.00]	0.00	(1.00)	1,396
SDQ Score (Higher: Better Child Wellbelling)	-0.16	(0.18)	[0.99]	0.00	(1.00)	905

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified main outcomes using the 2021 in-person data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- Overall Housing Quality is defined as a normalized housing quality index that includes indicators for quality floors, roofs, and walls, indicators for access to grid electricity and piped water, and the number of people per room.
- Total Monthly Housing Expenditures is the sum of rent paid, mortgage, and housing upgrade costs paid in the last month.
- Total Consumption is log of the sum of food consumed in last seven days (Cereals and cereal products, Live animals, meat, and other parts of slaughtered land animals; Fish and other seafood; Milk, other dairy products, and eggs; Oils and fats; Fruits and nuts; Vegetables, tubers, pulses; Sugar and desserts; Ready-made food and other food products (baby food, spices)) multiplied by number of months consumed in last 12 months, home-produced goods multiplied by months produced, annualized food received as gifts and annualized non-food purchases (utilities; water; infant needs; household and hygiene items; linens; clothing and footwear; basic household items; and school costs).
- Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D) is a measure for depressive symptoms and includes 10 items asking about the past week. It is defined as a mean-effect index of 10 items scored 0-3 in the past week (I was bothered by things that usually don't bother me, I had a problem in concentration on what I was doing, I felt depressed and troubled in my mind, I felt that everything that I did took up all my energy, I felt hopeful about the future (reversed), I felt afraid, I had difficulty in sleeping peacefully, I was happy (reversed), I felt lonely, I lacked the motivation to do anything). It is then normalized by subtracting the control group's mean and dividing by its standard deviation.
- Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) is a screening questionnaire administered to a randomly selected child aged three to eight years old and covers emotional, conduct, hyperactivity, peer, and prosocial problems. Both CES-D and SDQ are standardized by subtracting the control group's mean and dividing by its standard deviation.
- Higher scores for CES-D and SDQ indicate better outcomes.
- Monetary values are in USD PPP.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age). In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 1 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (E2) Impacts of the Program on Dwelling Characteristics and Household Composition

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Overall Housing Quality (Z-Score)	0.24	(0.23)	[1.00]	0.00	(1.00)	1,422
Housing-Material Quality (Score 0-3)	0.30	(0.25)	[1.00]	2.27	(1.09)	1,422
Toilet (=1)	0.04*	(0.02)	[0.61]	0.97	(0.17)	1,422
Piped Drinking Water (=1)	-0.02	(0.07)	[1.00]	0.27	(0.44)	1,422
Piped Main Water (=1)	-0.11	(0.12)	[1.00]	0.72	(0.45)	1,422
Water Access (1-5)	-0.12	(0.21)	[1.00]	3.62	(1.09)	1,422
Clean Water (=1)	-0.02	(0.06)	[1.00]	0.22	(0.42)	1,422
Safe Drinking Water (1-5)	0.06	(0.14)	[1.00]	3.52	(1.06)	1,422
Electricity (=1)	0.00	(0.01)	[1.00]	0.98	(0.15)	1,422
Grid Electricity (=1)	0.06	(0.06)	[1.00]	0.85	(0.36)	1,422
Generator (=1)	-0.01	(0.02)	[1.00]	0.01	(0.11)	1,422
Shared Dwelling (=1)	0.03	(0.03)	[1.00]	0.93	(0.25)	1,422
Families per Dwelling Rooms	-0.01	(0.01)	[1.00]	1.01	(0.13)	1,343
Occupied Rooms	0.24	(0.30)	[1.00]	3.90	(1.49)	1,422
<i>Total Monthly Housing Expenditures (USD PPP)</i>	0.22	(0.28)	[1.00]	3.78	(1.46)	1,422
<i>Per capita Monthly Housing Expenditures (USD PPP)</i>	-84.71***	(33.10)	[0.15]	227.72	(208.45)	1,421
<i>Monthly Rent Paid (USD PPP)</i>	-8.01	(6.73)	[1.00]	43.76	(48.22)	1,421
Household Size	-67.81**	(30.30)	[0.25]	222.31	(178.94)	1,269
2011 Household Size	-0.21	(0.32)	[1.00]	5.94	(2.43)	1,422
Household Size Change	-0.32	(0.56)	[1.00]	5.88	(3.58)	1,422
Total ID Cards	0.11	(0.54)	[1.00]	0.07	(3.73)	1,422
Home Ownership (=1)	-0.09	(0.12)	[1.00]	3.61	(1.02)	1,422
Focus Respondent Childcare & Chores (Hours)	-0.00	(0.05)	[1.00]	0.06	(0.24)	1,421
Other Members Childcare & Chores (Hours)	-6.91***	(2.02)	[0.02]	17.76	(18.39)	1,418
Total Land Owned (Donum)	-0.50	(2.15)	[1.00]	18.54	(18.49)	1,390
	4.21	(9.55)	[1.00]	14.36	(80.11)	1,422

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified housing quality and housing-related finances using the 2021 in-person data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
 - The outcomes that require definitions are: Overall Housing Quality is defined as a normalized housing quality index that includes indicators for quality floors, roofs, and walls, indicators for access to grid electricity and piped water, and the number of people per room. Housing-Material Quality is defined as the summation of three indicators for high-quality floors, roofs, and walls. Water Access is defined on a scale from 1-5 where 1 is very inaccessible while 5 is very accessible. Clean Water is defined as an indicator for households having treated drinking water (such as by a filter). *Total Monthly Housing Expenditures* is defined as the total of Rent paid, mortgage, and upgrade cost, and *Per capita Housing Expenditures* is divided by household size. They do not include the subsidy payments by the implementing organization. Total ID Cards is defined as the sum of the ID cards possessed by the respondent (MOI card, Passport, Residency permit, Work permit, Family book, Syrian ID, and UNHCR file). Hours spent on childcare and chores are measured over the last week and are winsorized at the top 1% of values in order to limit the influence of outliers.
 - The independent variable of interest is the TOT treatment indicator, which is the predicted value from a first-stage regression of treatment implementation on treatment assignment.
 - Monetary values are in USD PPP.
 - The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age).
- In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 2 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (E3) Impacts of the Program on Consumption and Expenditures

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Total Consumption (Log USD PPP)	-0.03	(0.08)	[1.00]	8.73	(0.55)	1,422
Cereals Consumption (Months)	-0.27	(0.20)	[1.00]	11.72	(1.40)	1,410
Meat Consumption (Months)	-0.67	(0.45)	[1.00]	10.53	(3.05)	1,413
Fish and Seafood Consumption (Months)	0.04	(0.45)	[1.00]	1.88	(3.93)	1,419
Dairy Products Consumption (Months)	-0.27	(0.31)	[1.00]	11.31	(2.49)	1,417
Oils and Fats Consumption (Months)	-0.20	(0.15)	[1.00]	11.89	(0.84)	1,417
Fruits and Nuts Consumption (Months)	0.26	(0.66)	[1.00]	5.13	(5.17)	1,415
Vegetables Consumption(Months)	-0.19	(0.19)	[1.00]	11.72	(1.58)	1,415
Sugar and Desserts Consumption (Months)	0.09	(0.18)	[1.00]	11.76	(1.46)	1,417
Ready-Made Food & Other Consumption (Months)	-0.34	(0.71)	[1.00]	6.07	(5.77)	1,420
Cereals Consumption in Typical Week (USD PPP)	-0.95	(2.30)	[1.00]	23.52	(21.29)	1,385
Meat Consumption in Typical Week (USD PPP)	2.15	(1.90)	[1.00]	15.86	(13.55)	1,390
Fish and Seafood Consumption in Typical Week (USD PPP)	1.50	(0.95)	[1.00]	3.16	(7.50)	1,403
Dairy Products Consumption in Typical Week (USD PPP)	2.42	(1.67)	[1.00]	17.47	(14.11)	1,405
Oils and Fats Consumption in Typical Week (USD PPP)	1.62	(1.44)	[1.00]	10.99	(10.40)	1,398
Fruits and Nuts Consumption in Typical Week (USD PPP)	1.21	(1.11)	[1.00]	6.07	(8.48)	1,371
Vegetables Consumption in Typical Week (USD PPP)	3.23	(2.96)	[1.00]	24.81	(19.67)	1,407
Sugar and Desserts Consumption in Typical Week (USD PPP)	0.40	(0.87)	[1.00]	7.32	(6.93)	1,405
Ready-Made Food & Other Consumption in Typical Week (USD PPP)	0.38	(1.67)	[1.00]	7.00	(12.44)	1,410
Annualized Consumed Food Gifts and Assistance (USD PPP)	-9.16	(20.83)	[1.00]	20.57	(119.90)	1,417
Annual Own Food Production (USD PPP)	1.56	(1.20)	[1.00]	0.37	(4.50)	1,420
Overall Food Consumption Index (Last Week)	0.38	(0.24)	[1.00]	0.00	(1.01)	1,422
Overall Food Consumption Index (Typical Week)	0.10	(0.12)	[1.00]	0.02	(0.99)	1,422
# Meals Eaten by Respondent Yesterday	-0.09	(0.08)	[1.00]	2.04	(0.61)	1,421
Food Diversity	-0.04	(0.11)	[1.00]	7.34	(1.11)	1,422
Reduced Coping Strategy Index	-0.72	(1.52)	[1.00]	13.51	(11.98)	1,422
Infant Needs Expenditures in Last 30 Days (USD PPP)	-9.67	(6.54)	[1.00]	26.44	(42.40)	1,421
Water Expenditures in Last 30 Days (USD PPP)	6.29	(7.25)	[1.00]	42.50	(41.40)	1,415
Hygiene Items Expenditures in Last 30 Days (USD PPP)	-2.74	(3.72)	[1.00]	39.12	(26.11)	1,410
Linens Expenditures in Last 30 Days (USD PPP)	-0.29	(0.86)	[1.00]	0.72	(4.92)	1,418
Clothing Expenditures in Last 30 Days (USD PPP)	13.77*	(7.79)	[1.00]	25.16	(55.91)	1,414
Basic Items Expenditures in Last 30 Days (USD PPP)	-2.97*	(1.66)	[1.00]	4.01	(11.38)	1,417
School Expenditures in Last 30 Days (USD PPP)	-3.71	(5.87)	[1.00]	37.48	(39.93)	1,421
Winter Utilities Expenditures (USD PPP)	11.38	(13.91)	[1.00]	145.52	(82.94)	1,411
Summer Utilities Expenditures (USD PPP)	8.34	(10.19)	[1.00]	82.42	(64.10)	1,412
Non-Food Gifts (USD PPP)	0.32	(2.33)	[1.00]	3.20	(18.07)	1,422
Total Asset Value (USD PPP)	20.06	(311.88)	[1.00]	2,883.37	(1,831.70)	1,422
Durables (USD PPP)	160.01	(117.10)	[1.00]	703.61	(688.86)	1,422
Durable Gifts (USD PPP)	12.58**	(6.08)	[1.00]	5.61	(37.30)	1,422

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified consumption and expenditures using the 2021 in-person data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- The outcomes that require definitions are: Total Consumption is log of the sum of food consumed in last seven days (Cereals and cereal products, Live animals, meat, and other parts of slaughtered land animals; Fish and other seafood; Milk, other dairy products, and eggs; Oils and fats; Fruits and nuts; Vegetables, tubers, pulses; Sugar and desserts; Ready-made food and other food products (baby food, spices)) multiplied by number of months consumed in last 12 months, home-produced goods multiplied by months produced, annualized food received as gifts and annualized non-food purchases (utilities; water; infant needs; household and hygiene items; linens; clothing and footwear; basic household items; and school costs). Food Gifts and Assistance are annualized by multiplying the monthly estimate by 12 since total value of food consumed that was received as gift (from friends, neighbors) or in-kind assistance is asked in the past 30 days. Annual Own Food Production is defined as the food that the household grew or produced and consume in a typical week multiplied by number of months in which the household consumed food that the household grew or produced. Overall Food Consumption Index is defined a mean effects index of the sum of the aforementioned nine food types, home-produced goods, and assistance last week and then in a typical week. The index is standardized by subtracting the control group's mean and dividing by its standard deviation. Food Diversity is defined as the number of food categories consumed during the past 12 months. Reduced Coping Strategy Index is a measure of food insecurity and is defined following WFP's guidelines from the five coping strategies that the household may have used in the seven days prior to the interview (Rely on less preferred foods [weight 1]; Borrow food, or reply on help from a friend or relative [weight 2]; Limit portion size at meal-times [weight 1]; Restrict consumption by adults in order for small children to eat [weight 3]; Reduce number of meals eaten in a day [weight 1]) and its values vary between 0 and 56. Total Asset Value is defined as the sum of non-food expenses in last 12 months and expenses on durables, which is defined as money spent on cellular phones, televisions, motorized vehicles, air conditioners, refrigerators, propane heaters, water tanks, computers and tablets, livestock, and other durables in the last 12 months.
- The independent variable of interest is the TOT treatment indicator, which is the predicted value from a first-stage regression of treatment implementation on treatment assignment.
- Monetary values are in USD PPP and are winsorized at the top 1% of values in order to limit the influence of outliers; durables are winsorized at the top 10% as pre-specified.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age). In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 3 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (E4) Impacts of the Program on Financial Participation

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
At least 30 JD (95 USD PPP) in savings (=1)	0.14***	(0.05)	[0.02]	0.12	(0.32)	1,422
Loans Received (Annual, USD PPP)	30.76	(187.32)	[0.94]	364.33	(1,186.27)	1,422
Interest Rate on Last Loan Taken (percent/month)	82.01	(61.82)	[0.69]	14.13	(86.95)	242
Weighted Interest Rate on Last Loan Given (percent/month)	72.94	(59.93)	[0.69]	14.42	(71.21)	242
Loans Given (Annual, USD PPP)	5.71	(4.46)	[0.69]	1.24	(23.93)	1,422
Last Loan in Default	-0.07	(0.13)	[0.94]	0.70	(0.46)	254
Applied for Loan (=1)	0.11*	(0.07)	[0.56]	0.17	(0.37)	1,422
Applied and Took Loan (=1)	0.06	(0.07)	[0.94]	0.16	(0.36)	1,422
Applied but Did Not Take Loan (=1)	0.06***	(0.02)	[0.00]	0.01	(0.10)	1,422

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified financial participation outcomes using the 2021 in-person data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- The outcomes that require definitions are: 30 JD Saved? reports an indicator for whether the focus respondent had at least 30 JD in personal savings to draw from in case of an emergency, regardless of whether it is in a bank. Loans received reports the total quantity of formal and informal loans received by the FR in the past year. Interest rate on last loan taken reflects the self reported interest rate on the FR's most recent loan in the past 12 months. FRs were allowed to report interest as dinars/[day/week/month/year] or percent/[day/week/month/year] or as a flat rate (common in Islamic finance). Interest reported in dinars was translated to percent using the most recent loan principal. Interest reported as a flat rate was translated to percent by calculating $\frac{\text{flatinterestrate}}{\text{principal}}/\text{loan period}$. The loan period is calculated as repayment date of the loan minus the survey date. (Note that this is not ideal since we do not have the start date of the loan.) The loan period for individuals in default or those with a negative implied loan period is imputed using the median period among non-zero loan periods corresponding to non-defaulted, flat interest rate loans. Loan had flat rate interest (=1) is an indicator for taking a loan with a flat rate interest amount, and all else (including taking no loans) is zero. Loans Given reports the total quantity of formal and informal loans loaned to others by the FR in the past year. Last Loan in Default =1 the last loan the FR took is in default, and 0 is the FR has taken a loan in the past 12 months and the most recent loan is not in default. Applied for Loan = 1 if the FR applied for a loan in the past 12 months, and 0 otherwise. Applied and Took Loan = 1 if the FR applied for a loan in the past 12 months and took out a loan, and 0 otherwise. Applied but did not Take Loan = 1 if the FR applied for a loan in the past 12 months but did not take a loan, and 0 otherwise. This table departs from the PAP in several ways. First, we removed all questions about community savings groups from the survey since these are not common in this setting. Second, we added a question asking whether respondents have at least 30 JD. Applied for Loan and Applied and Took Loan were also not included in the PAP. Finally, we exclude quantity of bank transfers and interest charged on loans from the focus respondent to other individuals from the table since they are both identically zero in the sample population.
- The independent variable of interest is the TOT treatment indicator, which is the predicted value from a first-stage regression of treatment implementation on treatment assignment.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age). In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 3 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (E5) Impacts of the Program on Transfers

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
# Senders	0.02	(0.04)	[0.94]	0.06	(0.25)	1,422
Total Received Transfers (Annual, USD PPP)	22.08	(97.98)	[0.94]	75.73	(562.57)	1,421
# Recipients	-0.03	(0.04)	[0.94]	0.06	(0.25)	1,422
Total Transfers Sent (Annual, USD PPP)	51.94	(55.52)	[0.94]	25.61	(219.89)	1,422

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified transfers outcomes using the 2021 in-person data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- The outcomes that require definitions are: # Senders reports the number of households who have sent the focus respondent a cash or in-kind transfer in the past 12 months. Total received transfers indicates the total cash value of transfers received from these households. # Recipients reports the number of households to whom the focus respondent has sent a cash or in-kind transfer in the past 12 months. Total transfers sent indicates the total cash value of transfers received by these households. Total values are adjusted for 2020 PPP (2021 is not yet available from the world bank).
- The independent variable of interest is the TOT treatment indicator, which is the predicted value from a first-stage regression of treatment implementation on treatment assignment.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age). In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 3 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (E6) Impacts of the Program on Earnings, Labor, & Occupational Choice

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Self-Employment (=1)	-0.02	(0.02)	[0.45]	0.01	(0.12)	1,422
Wage-Employment (=1)	-0.05	(0.06)	[0.54]	0.25	(0.44)	1,422
Employment (=1)	-0.05	(0.06)	[0.54]	0.26	(0.44)	1,422
Total Earnings in Last 30 Days (PPP, IHS)	-0.51	(0.38)	[0.33]	1.59	(2.83)	1,422
Total Labor Hours Last Week	-3.29	(2.35)	[0.33]	7.72	(18.73)	1,422
Total Labor and Chores Hours Last Week	-10.62***	(3.24)	[0.01]	25.54	(23.39)	1,422
Total Labor Hours [Monthly Average]	-0.65	(8.20)	[0.78]	24.19	(67.80)	1,422
Wage-Employment Hours Last Week	-2.48	(2.34)	[0.49]	7.54	(18.45)	1,414
Self-Employment Hours Last Week	-0.64	(0.46)	[0.33]	0.22	(3.30)	1,422
Wage-Employment Adult Labor Hours Last Week	0.01	(4.53)	[0.78]	18.66	(29.85)	1,422
Net Wage-Employment Income Last Month (PPP,IHS)	-0.46	(0.37)	[0.40]	1.56	(2.81)	1,417
Any Seasonal Wage-Employment (=1)	-0.07*	(0.04)	[0.25]	0.07	(0.26)	1,422
Any Manufacturing Employment (=1)	0.05**	(0.02)	[0.21]	0.01	(0.08)	1,137
Any Construction Employment (=1)	-0.12***	(0.05)	[0.11]	0.09	(0.29)	1,150
Any Service Employment (=1)	-0.02	(0.04)	[0.67]	0.09	(0.28)	1,166
Any High-Skill Service Employment (=1)	-0.02	(0.04)	[0.67]	0.08	(0.27)	1,149
Any Low-Skill Service Employment (=1)	0.00	(0.02)	[0.78]	0.01	(0.11)	1,069
Any Trade Employment (=1)	-0.01	(0.01)	[0.52]	0.01	(0.10)	1,062
Any Formal Business (=1)	-0.02**	(0.01)	[0.23]	0.01	(0.08)	1,411
Self-Employment Revenues Last Year (PPP,IHS)	-0.15	(0.11)	[0.33]	0.08	(0.72)	1,419
Any Loss of Business Control (=1)	-0.01	(0.01)	[0.33]	0.00	(0.05)	1,407
Self-Employment Profits Last Year (USD PPP)	-82.56*	(43.83)	[0.25]	28.18	(374.36)	1,419
Job Search (Weeks)	-0.80	(2.69)	[0.67]	5.63	(8.68)	306
Focus Respondent Childcare & Chores (Hours)	-6.91***	(2.02)	[0.01]	17.76	(18.39)	1,418

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified labor market outcomes of the Focus Respondent using the 2021 in-person data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- The outcomes that require definitions are: Total Earnings is defined as the total of business profits and net wage salary in all jobs and is transformed using the inverse hyperbolic sine transformation. Total Labor Hours [Monthly Average] is defined as average weekly wage-employment hours multiplied by the numbers of months worked in last 12 months multiplied by 52/12 to obtain a monthly average of all jobs. Wage-Employment Adult Labor Hours Last Week is the sum of respondent hours and total hours where adults (other than respondent) in the household were working. Net Wage-Employment Income is defined as gross salary plus benefits minus taxes in all jobs. High-Skill Service Employment refers to employment in the sectors of Utilities, Transportation and warehousing, Health care and social assistance, Arts, entertainment, recreation, and Accommodation and food services. Low-Skill Service Employment refers to employment in the sectors of Wholesale or retail trade, Information, Finance and insurance, Real estate, Professional, scientific, and technical services, Management, Administrative support, and Education.
- The independent variable of interest is the TOT treatment indicator, which is the predicted value from a first-stage regression of treatment implementation on treatment assignment.
- Monetary values are in USD PPP. Total Earnings in Last 30 Days, Taxes Paid in Last 30 Days, Net Wage-Employment Income Last Month, Self-Employment Profits, Expenses, and Revenues Last Month and Year, Self-Employment Profits Last Year, Total Employees Last Month, Self-Employment Rent Last Month, and Total Labor Hours [Average] are winsorized at the top 1% of values in order to limit the influence of outliers.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age). In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 4 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (E7) Impacts of the Program on Migration

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
# Moves Since 2011	0.07	(0.20)	[1.00]	2.64	(1.35)	1,417
Stay Permanently in Jordan (=1)	-0.05	(0.06)	[1.00]	0.60	(0.49)	1,375
Plans to Leave MENA (=1)	0.01	(0.08)	[1.00]	0.27	(0.44)	1,415
Better off Now than Syria 2011 (=1)	0.03	(0.06)	[1.00]	0.50	(0.50)	1,419
Better off Now than Last Residence (=1)	0.05	(0.06)	[1.00]	0.78	(0.41)	1,419
Ppl Known in Jordan upon Arrival (SD)	-0.09	(0.17)	[1.00]	0.00	(1.00)	1,420
Ppl Travelled With (SD)	-0.01	(0.14)	[1.00]	-0.00	(1.00)	1,421
Plans to Move? (SD)	-0.16	(0.13)	[1.00]	-0.00	(1.00)	1,416
Prep Time before Flee (SD)	0.21	(0.17)	[1.00]	-0.00	(1.00)	1,416
Plan to Stay in Current Residence (SD)	-0.03	(0.15)	[1.00]	-0.00	(1.00)	808
Conflict End in 2 Years? (SD)	0.29**	(0.15)	[1.00]	0.00	(1.00)	1,209
Return in 2 Years? (SD)	0.12	(0.13)	[1.00]	-0.00	(1.00)	1,403
Return 2 Years After War End? (SD)	-0.02	(0.16)	[1.00]	-0.00	(1.00)	1,393

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified migration outcomes using the 2021 in-person data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- The outcomes that require definitions are: Variables with (SD) are scaled with respect to the control population and (=1) represents indicators. # moves since 2011 reports the number of times the FR's household moved residences for at least 4 months at a time since January 2011. Stay permanently in Jordan is an indicator where 1 corresponds to the FR responding 'yes' to "Even when the conflict ends, would you like to stay in Jordan permanently?". Plans to leave MENA corresponds to "Have you taken any concrete steps towards moving to the US, Europe, Australia, or somewhere else outside of the region?". People known in Jordan upon arrival is a standardized categorical variable with 4 roughly equally populated bins: 0, 1-3, 4-10, 11+. People travelled with is a standardized categorical variable based on "When you first moved to Jordan, how many people travelled with you?" with 4 roughly equally populated bins: 0-3, 4-5, 6-10, 11+. Plans to move is a standardized categorical variable based on responses to "Do you have firm plans to change your residence from your current location within the next six months?" Prep time before flee is a standardized categorical variable based on responses to "How long before you left Syria for the first time did you start preparing to move?" Conflict end in 2 years is a standardized variable based on "How likely do you think the conflict will end within the next two years?" Return in 2 years is a standardized variable based on "How likely are you to return to Syria in the next two years if the conflict is unresolved?" Return in 2 years after war ends is a standardized variable based on "How likely are you to return to Syria within two years of the conflict resolving?"
- The independent variable of interest is the TOT treatment indicator, which is the predicted value from a first-stage regression of treatment implementation on treatment assignment.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age). In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 5 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (E8) Impacts of the Program on Physical Health

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
FR Normalized Symptom Index (Last 4 Weeks)	0.26	(0.18)	[0.44]	0.00	(1.00)	1,422
FR Subjective Health (Scale 1-4)	-0.21*	(0.11)	[0.38]	2.98	(0.73)	1,422
FR Major Health Problems since Jan 2011 (=1)	0.14**	(0.06)	[0.29]	0.22	(0.41)	1,422
FR Major Health Problems Persistence (=1)	-0.12	(0.09)	[0.61]	0.74	(0.44)	333
FR Washington Group Disability (=1)	-0.02	(0.06)	[1.00]	0.25	(0.43)	1,422
FR Hospital Visits, Last 4 Weeks	-0.08	(0.21)	[1.00]	0.86	(1.33)	1,422
FR Foregone Hospital Visits, Last 4 Weeks	1.08**	(0.54)	[0.38]	2.74	(3.83)	1,416
FR Health Expenditures (USD PPP), Last 4 Weeks	-10.17	(19.42)	[1.00]	65.77	(131.06)	1,422
FR Food Insecurity Last Week (=1)	0.11*	(0.07)	[0.38]	0.34	(0.47)	1,421
Adult Food Insecurity (Days)	0.05	(0.22)	[1.00]	0.78	(1.47)	1,391

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified physical health outcomes using the 2021 in-person data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- The outcomes that require definitions are: Normalized Symptom Index is defined as mean-effect index of common symptoms (Fever, Persistent cough, Always feeling tired, Muscle pain (myalgia), Headache/migraine, Stomach pain, Blood in stool, Rapid weight loss, Open sores/boils, Diarrhea/nausea/vomiting, Back pain or other muscle pain, Runny nose, Sore throat, Pneumonia, Loss of sense of smell/not being able to taste food, Frequent and excessive urination, Constant thirst/increased drinking of fluids, Skin rash or irritation, Difficulty swallowing, Fast or irregular heartbeat, Difficulty breathing/chest tightness). FR Subjective Health is based on the FR's description of his or her general health and is categorized as good (4), fair (3), poor (2), or very poor (1). FR Major Health Problems Persistence is an indicator variable that equals unity if the major health problems have not been resolved. FR Washington Group (WG) Disability is defined following the WG Short Set of questions to identify functional limitations on the levels of vision, hearing, mobility, cognition, self care, and communication. It uses the third disability level to classify people as having functional limitations or not. FR Health Expenditures is in USD PPP and is winsorized at the top 1% of values in order to limit the influence of outliers. FR Food Insecurity is defined as an indicator variable that equals unity if FR slept hungry because there was not enough food on at least one day the last 7 days and zero otherwise.
- The independent variable of interest is the TOT treatment indicator, which is the predicted value from a first-stage regression of treatment implementation on treatment assignment.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age). In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 6 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (E9) Impacts of the Program on Mental Health

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
FR Normalized CESD Scale (Last Week)	-0.07	(0.16)	[1.00]	0.00	(1.00)	1,396
FR Normalized PSS Scale (Last 30 days)	-0.10	(0.14)	[1.00]	-0.00	(1.00)	1,420
FR Life Satisfaction (Scale 1-10)	-0.64*	(0.37)	[0.38]	5.16	(2.81)	1,420
FR Predeterminsim (Scale 1-10)	0.53	(0.47)	[0.68]	4.22	(3.42)	1,412
FR Grit (Scale 1-5)	0.02	(0.13)	[1.00]	3.50	(0.89)	1,410
FR Happiness (Scale 1-7)	-0.12	(0.27)	[1.00]	3.41	(1.93)	1,421
FR Alertness (Scale 1-7)	-0.21	(0.36)	[1.00]	3.08	(1.99)	1,421

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified mental health outcomes using the 2021 in-person data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- The outcomes that require definitions are: Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D) is a measure for depressive symptoms and includes 10 items asking about the past week. It is defined as a mean-effect index of 10 items scored 0-3 in the past week (I was bothered by things that usually don't bother me, I had a problem in concentration on what I was doing, I felt depressed and troubled in my mind, I felt that everything that I did took up all my energy, I felt hopeful about the future (reversed), I felt afraid, I had difficulty in sleeping peacefully, I was happy (reversed), I felt lonely, I lacked the motivation to do anything). It is then normalized by subtracting the control group's mean and dividing by its standard deviation. The Perceived Stress Scale (PSS-4) is a mean-effect index of four items measured over 1-5 in the last 30 days (how often have you felt that you were unable to control the important things in your life?, how often have you felt certain in your ability to overcome your own personal problems?, how often have you felt that things were going your way?, how often did you feel that the problems were too much for you to manage?). It is then normalized by subtracting the control group's mean and dividing by its standard deviation. Higher scores for CES-D and PSS indicate better outcomes. Predeterminsim is measured over 1-10 where 1 means "everything in life is determined by fate" and 10 means "people shape their fate themselves". Grit is the average of "I am a hard worker" and "I often set a goal but later choose to pursue a different one" where both are measured over 1-5 and the latter is reversed to indicate higher grit.
- The independent variable of interest is the TOT treatment indicator, which is the predicted value from a first-stage regression of treatment implementation on treatment assignment.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age). In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 6 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (E10) Impacts of the Program on Sleep

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Sleep Time	-4.08***	(1.49)	[0.15]	15.74	(9.71)	1,414
Wake up Time	0.14	(0.33)	[1.00]	7.32	(2.00)	1,414
Sleep Duration (Hours)	-0.16	(0.30)	[1.00]	7.36	(2.15)	1,414
Sleep Quality (1-5)	-0.03	(0.18)	[1.00]	3.04	(1.03)	1,422

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified physical and mental health outcomes using the 2021 in-person data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- The independent variable of interest is the TOT treatment indicator, which is the predicted value from a first-stage regression of treatment implementation on treatment assignment.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age). In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 6 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (E11) Impacts of the Program on Marriage and Fertility

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Marriage quality	0.28**	(0.13)	[0.29]	-0.23	(1.06)	1,235
Index across household decisions	-0.02	(0.12)	[1.00]	0.08	(0.85)	1,194
Age at first marriage	-1.34**	(0.64)	[0.29]	21.27	(5.22)	1,372
Marriage registered (=1)	-0.00	(0.02)	[1.00]	0.98	(0.13)	1,235
Number of marriages (polyg. separate)	0.02	(0.05)	[1.00]	1.04	(0.36)	1,422
Number of marriages after first	-0.01	(0.04)	[1.00]	0.07	(0.30)	1,422
Wife received prompt dowry (=1)	0.01	(0.02)	[0.94]	0.98	(0.13)	1,182
Age gap between respondent and spouse	1.63*	(0.86)	[0.34]	0.38	(8.36)	1,225
Age at marriage end if divorced/widowed	5.78	(4.95)	[0.94]	36.81	(13.08)	142
Current marriage polygamous (=1)	0.03	(0.04)	[0.94]	0.07	(0.26)	1,245
Respondent selected current spouse (=1)	-0.01	(0.07)	[1.00]	0.78	(0.42)	1,226
Number of pregnancies	-0.45	(0.53)	[0.94]	5.29	(2.89)	813
Number of any partner's pregnancies	1.16***	(0.38)	[0.05]	5.16	(2.90)	606
Used modern birth control with current spouse (=1)	-0.09	(0.09)	[0.94]	0.60	(0.49)	1,231
Number of children died age 0-5	0.01	(0.06)	[1.00]	0.09	(0.35)	1,422
Age at menarche	-0.46	(0.30)	[0.55]	13.62	(1.22)	815
Number of miscarriages and stillbirths	-0.12	(0.15)	[0.94]	0.46	(1.00)	1,422
Number of terminated pregnancies	0.09	(0.12)	[0.94]	0.33	(0.81)	1,422
Number of births in hospital	0.37	(0.25)	[0.55]	3.49	(2.24)	1,422
Number of babies born preterm	0.05	(0.09)	[1.00]	0.19	(0.59)	1,422

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified financial participation outcomes using the 2021 in-person data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- The outcomes that require definitions are: Marriage quality is a index including spousal education and age gap between respondent and spouse. Index across household decisions is an index across various types of household decisions equalling 1 if the respondent has some decision making power. Age at first marriage is the age at which the respondent was first married. Marriage registered is an indicator equal to 1 if the marriage is registered in a court. Number of marriages reports the number of times the respondent has been married, where polygamous marriages count separately. Number of marriages after first reports the number of time the respondent has been remarried. Wife received prompt dowry is an indicator equal to 1 if the wife received a mahr muqaddam amount greater than zero. Number of pregnancies reports the number of pregnancies experienced by female respondents. Number of any partner's pregnancies reports the number of pregnancies experienced by partners of male respondents. Number of children who died reports the number of biological children of the respondent who passed away between the ages of 0-5. Age at menarche reports the age at which female respondents began menstruating. Number of miscarriages and stillbirths reports the number of pregnancies ending in stillbirth or miscarriage for both male and female respondents. Number of terminated pregnancies reports the number of pregnancies ending in abortion for both male and female respondents. Number of births in hospital reports the number of children delivered in a hospital (opposed to at home). Number of babies born preterm reports the number of biological children born preterm for both male and female respondents. Value of dowry paid is included in the pre-analysis plan but excluded here since the number of new marriages since 2019 was very small and adjusting Syrian Lira for purchasing power parity during this time is unreliable.
- The independent variable of interest is the TOT treatment indicator, which is the predicted value from a first-stage regression of treatment implementation on treatment assignment.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age). In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 3 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (E12) Impacts of the Program on Individual Child Outcomes

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (Z-Score)	-0.16	(0.18)	[1.00]	0.00	(1.00)	905
Child Happiness (Scale 1-7)	-0.16	(0.31)	[1.00]	5.73	(1.54)	951
Child Alertness (Scale 1-7)	0.04	(0.25)	[1.00]	5.72	(1.64)	951
Child Sleep Duration (Hours)	-0.13	(0.24)	[1.00]	9.79	(1.49)	939
Child Bed Time (Military)	2.02	(1.70)	[1.00]	17.26	(8.65)	948
Child Wake Up Time (Military)	-0.06	(0.33)	[1.00]	8.20	(1.61)	943

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified child outcomes using the 2021 in-person data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- The outcomes that require definitions are: Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) is a screening questionnaire administered to a randomly selected child aged three to eight years old and covers emotional, conduct, hyperactivity, peer, and prosocial problems. SDQ is standardized by subtracting the control group's mean and dividing by its standard deviation.
- The independent variable of interest is the TOT treatment indicator, which is the predicted value from a first-stage regression of treatment implementation on treatment assignment.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age). In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 8 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (E13) Impacts of the Program on Household-Level Child Outcomes

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Count of Non-Adult Dependents in Household	-0.07	(0.18)	[1.00]	3.30	(2.02)	1,422
Student Child School Attendance in Household (=1)	0.18	(0.12)	[1.00]	0.51	(0.50)	760
Student Child School Attendance in Household (0-5)	-0.13	(0.30)	[1.00]	3.80	(1.29)	760
Child Hunger in Household (Days Last Week)	0.12	(0.18)	[1.00]	0.47	(1.15)	1,269
Any Child Vaccinated (=1)	0.09	(0.12)	[1.00]	0.84	(0.37)	509

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified household-level child outcomes using the 2021 in-person data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- The outcomes that require definitions are: Child Hunger is defined as the number of days in the last 7 days on which any children in the household had to go to sleep hungry because there was not enough food.
- The independent variable of interest is the TOT treatment indicator, which is the predicted value from a first-stage regression of treatment implementation on treatment assignment.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age). In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 8 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (E14) Impacts of the Program on Social Capital

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Crime Index (Extensive Margin)	0.05	(0.16)	[1.00]	-0.00	(1.00)	1,422
Crime Index (Intensive Margin)	-0.06	(0.12)	[1.00]	0.00	(1.00)	1,422
Security Compared to 2011 (Z-Score)	-0.03	(0.13)	[1.00]	0.00	(1.00)	1,419
Arrested in Syria (=1)	-0.03	(0.04)	[1.00]	0.06	(0.24)	1,421
Imprisoned in Syria (=1)	-0.06**	(0.03)	[0.38]	0.05	(0.21)	1,422
Children Share Spaces with Jordanians (=1)	-0.07	(0.07)	[1.00]	0.50	(0.50)	1,345
Languages Spoken	0.04	(0.03)	[0.74]	1.01	(0.12)	1,422
Languages Learned	-0.01	(0.02)	[1.00]	0.08	(0.29)	1,422
Gender Equality Index (Z-Score)	-0.11	(0.12)	[1.00]	0.00	(1.00)	1,415
Religiosity Change in Community (Z-Score)	-0.13	(0.15)	[1.00]	0.00	(1.00)	1,378
Religion Importance (Z-Score)	0.11	(0.14)	[1.00]	0.00	(1.00)	1,422
Mosque Donations Last Month (=1)	-0.12**	(0.05)	[0.38]	0.12	(0.32)	1,418
Religious Identity Salience (=1)	-0.06	(0.05)	[0.74]	0.84	(0.37)	1,419
Attended Mosque Last Week (=1)	-0.06	(0.04)	[0.74]	0.34	(0.47)	1,422
Donated Time to Charities Last Month (=1)	-0.01	(0.02)	[1.00]	0.02	(0.13)	1,422
Economic Optimism (Z-Score)	-0.38**	(0.19)	[0.38]	0.00	(1.00)	995

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified social capital outcomes using the 2021 in-person data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- The outcomes that require definitions are: Crime Index (Extensive Margin) is defined as a normalized index from two indicators for having been stolen from or gone through an attempt to steal any cash, household items, or livestock from the FR and another indicator if someone physically assaulted the FR last 12 months. Crime Index (Intensive Margin) is defined the same as Crime Index (Extensive Margin) but the number of times if robbery and assault is used instead of the indicators. Security Compared to 2011 (Z-Score) is defined as a normalized index from FR's answer to whether the security better or same or worse for him/her now compared to January 2011 (referring to the place and circumstances of his/her life at that time). Gender Equality Index is defined as a normalized index constructed from four items in which the FR strongly agrees, agrees, disagrees, or strongly disagrees. The four items are "A married woman can work outside the home if she wishes", "Husbands should have final say in all decisions concerning the family", "A woman can be a president or prime minister of a Muslim country", and "Women and men should have equal rights in making the decision to divorce." Each item is normalized and then the resulting index is normalized again where higher values indicate views in accordance with more gender equality. Religiosity Change in Community (Z-Score) is defined as a normalized index from the FR's responses to whether he or she would say their community has become more religious, stayed the same or become less religious in the last 12 months, where higher values indicate increasing religiosity. Religion Importance (Z-Score) is defined as a normalized index from the FR's response to whether religion is very important, somewhat important or not very important to the lives of most of their neighbors, where higher values indicate more importance of religion. Religious Identity Salience is defined as an indicator variables that equals unity if the FR chooses "Above all I am a Muslim" among other identities that include Syrian, Arab, or Christian. Economic Optimism (Z-Score) is defined as an index of whether in two years from now, the FR things that their own personal economic situation will be the same, better, or worse, with higher values indicate better economic situation.
- The independent variable of interest is the TOT treatment indicator, which is the predicted value from a first-stage regression of treatment implementation on treatment assignment.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age). In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 9 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (E15) Impacts of the Program on Political Attitudes

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Support for Democracy (Z-Score)	0.15	(0.17)	[0.84]	0.00	(1.00)	837
Support for Government (Z-Score)	0.16	(0.20)	[0.84]	-0.00	(1.00)	1,056
Justify Human Rights Violations (Z-Score)	0.19	(0.13)	[0.84]	0.00	(1.00)	1,084
Interest in Politics (Z-Score)	0.16	(0.18)	[0.84]	-0.00	(1.00)	1,413
Followed News Last Week (Days)	0.17	(0.50)	[0.84]	2.26	(2.87)	1,422
Missing Support for Democracy (=1)	0.09	(0.06)	[0.84]	0.39	(0.49)	1,422
Missing Support for Government (=1)	-0.06	(0.05)	[0.84]	0.26	(0.44)	1,422
Missing Justify Human Rights Violations (=1)	-0.08	(0.07)	[0.84]	0.25	(0.44)	1,422

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified political attitudes outcomes using the 2021 in-person data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- The outcomes that require definitions are: Support for Democracy (Z-Score) is defined as a z-score from whether the FR strongly agrees, agrees, disagrees, or strongly disagrees with "Democratic systems may have problems, yet they are better than other systems." Higher values indicate more support for democracy. Support for Government (Z-Score) is defined as a z-score from whether the FR strongly agrees, agrees, disagrees, or strongly disagrees with "Citizens must support the government's decisions, even if they disagree with them." Higher values indicate more support for the government. Justify Human Rights Violations (Z-Score) is defined as a z-score from whether the FR strongly agrees, agrees, disagrees, or strongly disagrees with "The violation of human rights in Syria is justifiable in the name of promoting security and stability." Higher values indicate more justification for human rights violations. Interest in Politics (Z-Score) is defined as a z-score from the extent to which the FR is interested in politics (very uninterested, uninterested, interested, very interested), with higher values indicating more interest in politics.
- The independent variable of interest is the TOT treatment indicator, which is the predicted value from a first-stage regression of treatment implementation on treatment assignment.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age). In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 10 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (E16) Impacts of the Program on Time Use

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
FR Childcare & Chores (Hours Last Week)	-6.91***	(2.02)	[0.00]	17.76	(18.39)	1,418
Others Childcare & Chores (Hours Last Week)	-0.50	(2.15)	[0.69]	18.54	(18.49)	1,390

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified time use outcomes using the 2021 in-person data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- The independent variable of interest is the TOT treatment indicator, which is the predicted value from a first-stage regression of treatment implementation on treatment assignment.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age). In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 11 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (E17) Impacts of the Program on Education and Cognition

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
FR Years of Schooling	0.39	(0.71)	[1.00]	6.49	(3.97)	1,422
FR Private Education (=1)	0.02	(0.02)	[1.00]	0.01	(0.11)	1,422
FR Religious Education (=1)	0.00	(0.01)	[1.00]	0.01	(0.09)	1,422
FR Fluid Intelligence (Z-Score)	-0.09	(0.37)	[1.00]	7.42	(2.94)	1,422

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified education and cognition outcomes using the 2021 in-person data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- The outcomes that require definitions are: FR Years of Schooling is calculated as follows: first, because few FRs reported total years of schooling rather than the marginal years at their latest stage, each stage is capped at its correct upper bound (10 years for primary in Jordan; 9 years for primary in other countries; 2 years for secondary in Jordan; 3 years for secondary in other countries; 3 years for college; 8 years for university). After that, those who never attended school are assigned zero years. As for those who indicated attending a religious institution, they are assigned zero years as well. FRs with Primary educational attainment are assigned the total years in which they attended primary school. FRs with secondary educational attainment in Jordan (non-Jordan) are assigned 10 (9) plus the total years in which they attended secondary school. FRs with a college degree are assigned 12 plus the total years in which they attended college. FRs with vocational training are assigned 10 plus the total years in which they attended vocational training. FRs with a university degree are assigned 12 plus the total years in which they attended university. FR Private Education is defined an indicator variable that equals unity if the FR attended a private school/university in his or her last year of study. FR Religious Education is defined an indicator variable that equals unity if the FR attended a religious school/university at any point in the past. FR Fluid Intelligence is defined as the sum of correct answers to 14 questions to Raven's Short form Standard Progressive Matrices (RSPM-SF). Then, the total score is normalized by the control group's mean and standard deviation such that the final score has a mean of zero and standard deviation of one in the control group.
- The independent variable of interest is the TOT treatment indicator, which is the predicted value from a first-stage regression of treatment implementation on treatment assignment.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age). In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 12 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (E18) Impacts of the Program on Behavioral Games and Preferences

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Risk Taking Preferences (Z-Score)	-0.14	(0.11)	[1.00]	0.00	(1.00)	1,401
Impatience Preferences (Z-Score)	-0.06	(0.16)	[1.00]	-0.00	(1.00)	1,415
Ambiguity Aversion (=1)	-0.01	(0.04)	[1.00]	0.87	(0.33)	1,403
\$ shared with a Syrian refugee living in Jordan	0.18	(0.40)	[1.00]	4.26	(2.84)	1,411
\$ shared with a non-Syrian refugee living in Jordan	0.40	(0.36)	[1.00]	3.73	(2.80)	1,404
\$ shared with a Jordanian citizen from same ethnicity	-0.25	(0.39)	[1.00]	4.06	(2.83)	1,411
\$ shared with a Jordanian citizen from different ethnicity	-0.20	(0.43)	[1.00]	3.70	(2.84)	1,406
\$ shared with a Jordanian soldier/police officer	-0.06	(0.49)	[1.00]	4.32	(3.23)	1,403
\$ shared with an employee of the Jordanian government	-0.11	(0.46)	[1.00]	3.37	(2.98)	1,406
\$ shared with an employee of an international NGO	0.37	(0.40)	[1.00]	3.00	(2.83)	1,402

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified behavioral outcomes using the 2021 in-person data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- The outcomes that require definitions are: Risk Taking Preferences is defined as in the Jordan version of the Global Preferences Survey. The quantitative measure consists of a series of five binary choices. Choices were between a fixed lottery, in which the individual could win a certain amount or zero, and varying sure payments. Choice of the lottery resulted in an increase of the sure amount being offered in the next question, and vice versa. The total score is normalized by the control group's mean and standard deviation such that the final score has a mean of zero and standard deviation of one in the control group. Higher values indicate a tendency to take more risks. Impatience Preferences is defined as in the Jordan version of the Global Preferences Survey. It includes a series of five interdependent hypothetical binary choices between immediate and delayed financial rewards. The total score is normalized by the control group's mean and standard deviation such that the final score has a mean of zero and standard deviation of one in the control group. Higher values indicate a tendency to be impatient. Ambiguity aversion is defined using a modified, hypothetical version of the standard ambiguity aversion game whereby the respondent selects either a bag with a specified probability of success or an unspecified probability. This measure is an indicator variable that equals unity if respondent selected from the bag of known ball colors and zero if selected from the bag of unknown colors. Trust outcomes are measured using a modified, hypothetical version of the standard trust game where respondent is given 10 JOD to share with members of 7 different social groups (or keep). The amount is doubled and members select how much to share back. The 0 - 10 scale varies between 0 denoting no trust and 10 denoting full trust. Individual outcomes derived for each social group. The independent variable of interest is the TOT treatment indicator, which is the predicted value from a first-stage regression of treatment implementation on treatment assignment.
- The independent variable of interest is the TOT treatment indicator, which is the predicted value from a first-stage regression of treatment implementation on treatment assignment.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age). In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 13 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (E19) Impacts of the Program on Additional Dwelling Characteristics and Household Composition

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Monthly Rent Agreed (USD PPP)	-28.15*	(16.82)	[0.96]	336.55	(117.73)	1,272
Housing Upgrade Costs Last Month (USD PPP)	-26.88**	(12.09)	[0.62]	31.83	(88.28)	1,417
Total Rental Debt (USD PPP)	-190.59	(129.13)	[1.00]	805.85	(861.00)	1,272
Land Owned in 2011 (Donum)	4.75	(11.96)	[1.00]	14.26	(78.61)	1,401
Land Owned in Jordan (Donum)	-1.07	(1.03)	[1.00]	0.70	(18.45)	1,420
Dwelling Upgraded by Landlord (=1)	0.01	(0.05)	[1.00]	0.09	(0.29)	1,383
Eviction (=1)	-0.00	(0.06)	[1.00]	0.15	(0.36)	1,422
Eviction (#)	0.07	(0.14)	[1.00]	0.27	(0.76)	1,422
Quality Floor (=1)	0.13**	(0.06)	[0.62]	0.66	(0.47)	1,421
Quality Roof (=1)	0.10*	(0.05)	[0.96]	0.75	(0.44)	1,421
Quality Walls (=1)	0.07*	(0.04)	[0.96]	0.86	(0.35)	1,422
People per Room	-0.22	(0.16)	[1.00]	1.88	(1.29)	1,422
Total Debt Waived Agreed > Paid (=1)	0.01	(0.09)	[1.00]	0.39	(0.49)	530
Total Debt Waived (=1)	0.04	(0.05)	[1.00]	0.16	(0.37)	1,239
Total Debt Waived Agreed > Paid (USD PPP)	-2.31	(31.50)	[1.00]	84.57	(142.73)	530
Total Debt Waived (USD PPP)	16.61	(15.19)	[1.00]	34.45	(98.95)	1,239
Adults	-0.14	(0.18)	[1.00]	2.65	(1.32)	1,422
Kids	-0.07	(0.18)	[1.00]	3.30	(2.02)	1,422
Men	-0.09	(0.12)	[1.00]	1.24	(0.87)	1,422
Women	-0.05	(0.12)	[1.00]	1.41	(0.81)	1,422
Kids Below 13	-0.05	(0.19)	[1.00]	2.43	(1.71)	1,422
Kids (13-17)	0.03	(0.11)	[1.00]	0.71	(0.90)	1,422
Boys	0.10	(0.17)	[1.00]	1.70	(1.34)	1,422
Boys Below 13	0.05	(0.16)	[1.00]	1.28	(1.13)	1,422
Boys (13-17)	0.04	(0.09)	[1.00]	0.35	(0.63)	1,422
Girls	-0.17	(0.19)	[1.00]	1.60	(1.45)	1,422
Girls Below 13	-0.10	(0.17)	[1.00]	1.16	(1.23)	1,422
Girls (13-17)	-0.02	(0.09)	[1.00]	0.36	(0.61)	1,422

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on housing quality and housing-related finances that were not pre-specified and on individual items of the indices reported in Table E2 using the 2021 in-person data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- The outcomes that require definitions are: Quality floor is defined as an indicator variables that equals unity if floors are made of tiles and zero otherwise. Quality roof is defined as an indicator variables that equals unity if the roof is made of finished concrete or tiles/standard bricks on roof and zero otherwise. Quality walls is defined as an indicator variables that equals unity if walls are made of cement or tiles and zero otherwise.
- The independent variable of interest is the TOT treatment indicator, which is the predicted value from a first-stage regression of treatment implementation on treatment assignment.
- Monetary values are in USD PPP. Eviction and monetary values are winsorized at the top 1% of values in order to limit the influence of outliers.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age). In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 2 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (E20) Impacts of the Program on NGO Assistance

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Government, Last 12 Months (=1)	-0.03	(0.05)	[0.40]	0.10	(0.30)	1,422
UNHCR, Last 12 Months (=1)	0.14*	(0.08)	[0.33]	0.64	(0.48)	1,422
WFP, Last 12 Months (=1)	-0.06	(0.04)	[0.33]	0.94	(0.24)	1,422
IP Assistance, Last 12 Months (=1)	0.08**	(0.03)	[0.14]	0.04	(0.19)	1,422
Community-Groups, Last 12 Months (=1)	-0.00	(0.03)	[0.51]	0.04	(0.20)	1,422
Other, Last 12 Months (=1)	0.06*	(0.04)	[0.33]	0.06	(0.24)	1,422
Total Cash, Last 12 Months (USD PPP)	706.91	(586.39)	[0.40]	4,431.51	(4,004.01)	1,422
Total In-Kind, Last 12 Months (USD PPP)	92.67	(67.83)	[0.33]	127.02	(481.35)	1,422
Total, Last 12 Months (USD PPP)	788.26	(562.86)	[0.33]	4,578.48	(4,020.73)	1,422
Government, Last 12 Months (USD PPP)	111.04	(96.21)	[0.40]	169.37	(792.44)	1,422
UNHCR, Last 12 Months (USD PPP)	420.89	(305.03)	[0.33]	1,655.25	(2,226.52)	1,422
WFP, Last 12 Months (USD PPP)	74.02	(293.95)	[0.51]	2,618.38	(2,404.40)	1,422
IP Assistance, Last 12 Months (USD PPP)	128.25***	(46.50)	[0.10]	28.74	(198.87)	1,422
Community-Groups, Last 12 Months (USD PPP)	-2.58	(10.47)	[0.51]	10.17	(70.04)	1,422
Other, Last 12 Months (USD PPP)	60.20*	(36.76)	[0.33]	44.94	(231.61)	1,422

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on financial assistance using the 2021 in-person data. Each row is its own dependent variable. These outcomes were not pre-specified as they were added after the first-wave phone survey data were collected. UNHCR refers to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees; WFP refers to the World Food Programme; IP refers to the implementing partner.
- The independent variable of interest is the TOT treatment indicator, which is the predicted value from a first-stage regression of treatment implementation on treatment assignment.
- All values are in USD PPP and are winsorized at the top 1% of values in order to limit the influence of outliers.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age). In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to the outcomes in the table.

3 Appendix F: Follow-Up Results

Table (F1) Impacts of the Program on Primary Outcomes

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Housing Quality Index	0.09	(0.19)	[0.47]	-0.01	(0.99)	1,321
Log total consumption (USD PPP)	-0.05	(0.10)	[0.47]	4.54	(0.78)	1,316
Depression (CESD, std)	0.26*	(0.15)	[0.13]	-0.01	(1.00)	1,285
Child SDQ score, std	-0.56***	(0.17)	[0.01]	-0.01	(1.00)	859

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified main outcomes using the 2022-2023 phone survey data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- Housing quality index is defined in table 2. Total Consumption is defined in table 3. Depression is defined in table 7 (higher here reflects more depression). Child SDQ score is defined in table 8 (higher here reflects more socioemotional difficulties).
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age). In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 1 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (F2) Impacts of the Program on Dwelling Characteristics and Household Composition

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Housing quality index	0.09	(0.19)	[1.00]	-0.01	(0.99)	1,321
Housing Material quality index	0.22	(0.22)	[1.00]	-0.14	(1.08)	1,321
Has access to electricity {0,1}	-0.02	(0.02)	[1.00]	0.94	(0.24)	1,321
Has access to grid (if electricity=1) {0,1}	0.02	(0.07)	[1.00]	0.77	(0.42)	1,321
Has access to generator (if electricity=1) {0,1}	0.01	(0.01)	[1.00]	0.01	(0.09)	1,321
Number of rooms in dwelling	-0.26	(0.16)	[1.00]	3.47	(1.06)	1,321
Number of occupied rooms	-0.19	(0.17)	[1.00]	3.37	(1.08)	1,321
Household size	-0.38	(0.29)	[1.00]	5.95	(2.30)	1,321
Owns house {0,1}	-0.00	(0.03)	[1.00]	0.04	(0.20)	1,321
Change in rental debt (JD, 30 days)	13.31	(14.15)	[1.00]	44.35	(89.54)	1,187
Outstanding rental debt (JD, 12 months)	-77.44*	(41.23)	[1.00]	315.20	(274.57)	1,208
Moved between dwellings ({0,1}, 12 months)	-0.03	(0.06)	[1.00]	0.19	(0.39)	1,321
Number of moves	-0.02	(0.10)	[1.00]	0.25	(0.62)	1,321
Evicted {0,1}	0.03	(0.04)	[1.00]	0.13	(0.34)	1,321
Number of evictions	0.21**	(0.10)	[1.00]	0.19	(0.57)	1,321
Shares dwelling {0,1}	0.00	(0.01)	[1.00]	0.00	(0.05)	1,321
Number of families (if shares dwelling=1)	0.00	(0.01)	[1.00]	0.00	(0.05)	1,321

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified main outcomes using the 2022-2023 phone survey data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- Housing quality index is an standardized index of the following: Indicator for high-quality floors, Indicator for high-quality roof, Indicator for high-quality walls, Indicator for reliable electricity, people per room. Housing material quality index is a standardized index of indicators for high quality floors, roof and walls. Has access to grid is an indicator for having access to grid electricity, zero if no electricity or from a generator, etc. Generator is an indicator equal to one if the household uses a generator for electricity, zero otherwise. Number of rooms in dwelling is the total number of separate rooms excluding toilets and store rooms, including rooms shared with other households if applicable. Number of occupied rooms only includes rooms occupied by the household. Household size is the number of individuals of any age in the household. Owns house is an indicator equal to one if the household owns their dwelling. Change in rental debt is the total amount of rental debt accumulated minus total amount of rental debt repaid in the past month. Outstanding rental debt is the total amount of unpaid rent from all months that the landlord expect to be repaid. Moved between dwellings is an indicator if the household has moved from one dwelling to another in the past 12 months. Evicted is an indicator if the household has been evicted in the past 12 months. Number of evictions is the number of evictions in the past 12 months, including zeroes. Shared dwelling is an indicator if the household shares the dwelling with another household. Number of families reports the number of extra families living in the household.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age). In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family xxx in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (F3) Impacts of the Program on Food Consumption and Food Security

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Total Consumption (Log USD PPP)	-0.05	(0.10)	[1.00]	4.54	(0.78)	1,316
Out-of-pocket Consumption (USD PPP)	-6.18	(11.63)	[1.00]	120.53	(87.30)	1,320
Assistance Consumption (USD PPP)	0.15	(0.53)	[1.00]	0.76	(2.85)	1,308
Home Production Consumption (USD PPP)	-0.65	(1.65)	[1.00]	2.34	(11.36)	1,321
Meat Consumption	0.08	(0.83)	[1.00]	3.38	(5.13)	1,286
# Meals Eaten by Respondent Yesterday	-0.18**	(0.08)	[0.12]	2.04	(0.61)	1,321
Respondent Hunger Last Week (Days)	0.59**	(0.28)	[0.12]	1.30	(1.72)	1,277
Adult Hunger Last Week (Days)	0.56**	(0.26)	[0.12]	1.06	(1.61)	1,233
Food Diversity	-0.03	(0.26)	[1.00]	5.35	(1.82)	1,313
Reduced Coping Strategy Index	0.04	(0.14)	[1.00]	-0.00	(0.99)	1,283

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified main outcomes using the 2022-2023 phone survey data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- Log total consumption is the log of the sum of the following weekly variables: total food consumption from purchases, total food consumption from home production, and total food consumption from assistance. The individual components are listed in the 3 rows below. Meat consumption reports the number of JD spent on meat, fish and other seafood in the last 7 days. Meal consumption reports the number of meals FR ate yesterday. Respondent hunger (days) reports the number of days in the past 7 days that the FR went to bed hungry because there wasn't enough food to eat. Adult hunger (days) reports the number of days in the past 7 days that other adults in the household went to bed hungry because there wasn't enough food to eat. Food diversity is the total number of food categories (out of 7) that the household spent any money on in the past 7 days. Reduced coping strategies index is the world food programme's reduced coping strategies index, defined as follows: 1*(days in last week relied on less preferred foods) + 2*(borrowed food) + 1*(limited portion size) + 3*(restrict adult consumption so children can eat) + 1*(reduce number of meals eat in a day)
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age). In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family xxx in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (F4) Impacts of the Program on Financial Participation

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Has savings \geq 30 JD	0.01	(0.04)	[1.00]	0.09	(0.28)	1,321
Lent informally last month {0,1}	0.03	(0.02)	[1.00]	0.02	(0.14)	1,321
Lent informally last month (JD)	0.16	(0.53)	[1.00]	0.43	(3.48)	1,321
Borrowed informally last month {0,1}	-0.00	(0.06)	[1.00]	0.72	(0.45)	1,321
Borrowed informally last month (JD)	-34.49	(46.00)	[1.00]	229.83	(359.22)	1,318
Borrowed or lent formally last year {0,1}	0.02	(0.04)	[1.00]	0.07	(0.25)	1,321

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified main outcomes using the 2022-2023 phone survey data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- Has savings \geq 30 JD is an indicator for whether the household has more than 30 JD saved (in a bank or otherwise). Lent informally last month is an indicator for whether FR lent assistance to someone outside the household in the form of money or goods with the expectation of being paid back in money, goods or favors. Lent informally (JD) is the amount of this informal lending in JD, including zeros. Borrowed informally in the past month is defined as above for borrowing, not lending. Borrowed or lent formally is an indicator for whether or not FR took out a formal loan (e.g. commercial bank, commercial lender mobile service provider, etc.) in the past 12 months.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age). In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family xxx in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (F5) Impacts of the Program on Earnings, Labor, and Occupational Choice

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Earnings (JD, 30 days, IHS transform)	-0.52	(0.33)	[0.30]	1.81	(2.38)	1,321
Earnings (JD, 30 days, log transform)	0.01	(0.25)	[0.64]	3.90	(1.25)	527
Had any income generating work ({0,1}, 30 days)	-0.14*	(0.07)	[0.30]	0.40	(0.49)	1,321
Hours worked in typical week (30 days)	-6.11*	(3.41)	[0.30]	12.84	(24.02)	1,320
Hours worked last week	-2.45	(2.06)	[0.30]	6.40	(14.23)	1,253
Was self employed ({0,1}, 30 days)	-0.06	(0.07)	[0.32]	0.25	(0.44)	1,075
Was informally employed ({0,1}, 30 days)	-0.09	(0.05)	[0.30]	0.19	(0.39)	1,321
Was formally employed ({0,1}, 30 days)	-0.01	(0.01)	[0.32]	0.01	(0.08)	1,321
Hours worked incl. chores last week	-4.73*	(2.63)	[0.30]	20.93	(18.07)	1,300
Hours spent on job search last week	0.52	(1.19)	[0.58]	4.67	(8.31)	1,259

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified main outcomes using the 2022-2023 phone survey data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- Earnings include all earnings in the past 30 days from any income-generating activity including wage work and self employment. IHS transform is the inverse hyperbolic sine transform which includes zeros; log drops zeros. Any income generating work is an indicator for whether the FR did any income generating work, even for an hour, in the past 30 days. Hours worked in a typical week in the past 30 days refers to the hours of any income generating activity in a typical week in the past month. Hours worked last week refers to the last 7 days. Was ... employed are indicators referring to the following question “Was this work primarily self-employment, informal employment without a written contract, or formal employment with a written contract?” People not working have zeros. Hours worked including chores is “hours worked last week” + hours spent on household chores. Hours spent on job search last week on “actively searching for jobs, applying for jobs, or in interviews?”
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age). In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family xxx in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (F6) Impacts of the Program on Migration

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Probability of conflict resolving in two years (index)	-0.00	(0.16)	[1.00]	0.02	(1.01)	1,130
Probability of returning to Syria w/ conflict unresolved (index)	0.10	(0.16)	[1.00]	-0.02	(0.96)	1,300
Probability of returning to Syria w/ conflict resolved (index)	0.08	(0.18)	[1.00]	0.01	(1.00)	1,294
Conflict more likely to increase in next three months {0,1}	0.07	(0.09)	[1.00]	0.54	(0.50)	1,073

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified main outcomes using the 2022-2023 phone survey data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- Probability of conflict resolving in 2 years is a standardized likert scale (1-4) from very unlikely to very likely. Probability of returning to Syria with conflict unresolved/resolved are standardized likert scales (1-4) from very unlikely to very likely. Conflict more likely to increase in the next 3 months is an indicator.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age). In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family xxx in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (F7) Impacts of the Program on Physical and Mental Health

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Recent symptoms (index)	0.11	(0.17)	[0.43]	-0.01	(1.01)	1,321
Current health conditions (index)	0.21	(0.16)	[0.25]	0.01	(1.01)	1,321
Diagnosis of (2) after Oct 2019 (index)	0.12	(0.19)	[0.43]	0.02	(1.03)	1,321
Subjective health (index)	-0.17	(0.15)	[0.25]	-0.00	(1.00)	1,321
Subjective happiness (index)	-0.36**	(0.16)	[0.19]	0.01	(1.00)	1,319
Depression (CESD, std)	0.26*	(0.15)	[0.21]	-0.01	(1.00)	1,285
Depressed {0,1}	0.11*	(0.07)	[0.21]	0.75	(0.43)	1,321

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified main outcomes using the 2022-2023 phone survey data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- Recent symptoms index includes the following: rapid weight loss, fast and irregular heart beat, difficulty breathing, stomach pain, headaches. Current health conditions is an index including diabetes, hypertension and cancer. Diagnosis of (2) after 2019 is an index of indicators equalling one if FR was diagnosed with one of the above conditions after Oct 2019, zero if before or if does not have diagnosis. Subjective health is a standardized likert scale (1-4) of self-reported health from good to very poor. Subjective happiness is a standardized likert scale (1-3) of self reported happiness. Depression reports the standardized CESD score where higher values report higher risk of depression. Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D) is a measure for depressive symptoms and includes 10 items asking about the past week. It is defined as a mean-effect index of 10 items scored 0-3 in the past week (I was bothered by things that usually don't bother me, I had a problem in concentration on what I was doing, I felt depressed and troubled in my mind, I felt that everything that I did took up all my energy, I felt hopeful about the future (reversed), I felt afraid, I had difficulty in sleeping peacefully, I was happy (reversed), I felt lonely, I lacked the motivation to do anything). It is then normalized by subtracting the control group's mean and dividing by its standard deviation. Depressed is an indicator for being above the CESD threshold of 10 out of 30.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age). In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family xxx in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (F8) Impacts of the Program on Child Outcomes

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Child SDQ score, std	0.56***	(0.17)	[0.01]	0.01	(1.00)	859
Count of non-adult dependents (under 18)	-0.22	(0.20)	[0.37]	3.44	(2.02)	1,321
Share of non-adults attended school all of last week	-0.02	(0.07)	[0.55]	0.78	(0.35)	981
Days child slept hungry last week	0.32	(0.23)	[0.31]	0.89	(1.50)	1,118

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified main outcomes using the 2022-2023 phone survey data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- Child SDQ score, std reports the standardized SDQ score where higher scores reports worse difficulties. Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) is a screening questionnaire administered to a randomly selected child aged three to eight years old and covers emotional, conduct, hyperactivity, peer, and prosocial problems. Count of non-adult dependents under 18 reports household members under 18. Share of non-adults attended school all of last week reports the share of children aged 6-17 who attended 5 days of school last week. Days child slept hungry last week reports the number of days any child under 18 went to bed hungry because there wasn't enough food to eat.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age). In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family xxx in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (F9) Impacts of the Program on Time Use

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Domestic work hours (Last week)	-2.82*	(1.72)	[0.46]	14.86	(14.85)	1,296
Childcare hours (Last week)	-5.76**	(2.81)	[0.46]	22.63	(20.75)	1,274
Hour spent outside the home (Last week)	-3.17	(2.56)	[0.46]	13.00	(17.69)	1,268
Hours children alone at home (Last week)	0.51	(0.60)	[0.51]	0.66	(2.75)	1,123
Hours childcare provided by friends/family (Last week)	-0.61	(0.49)	[0.46]	0.92	(4.68)	1,275
Hours w friends/family outside the home (Last week)	0.15	(1.08)	[0.51]	3.32	(6.44)	1,276
Non-family childcare by Jordanians (Last week)	-0.12	(0.10)	[0.46]	0.07	(0.85)	1,274
Non-family childcare by Syrians (Last week)	-0.44*	(0.24)	[0.46]	0.20	(1.68)	1,274
Any paid childcare in 2020	0.00	(0.02)	[0.51]	0.01	(0.10)	1,318
Months of paid childcare	-0.06	(0.11)	[0.51]	0.06	(0.72)	1,318
Hours spent outside the home w/o children (Last week)	-2.00	(2.46)	[0.51]	9.92	(15.95)	1,268
Childcare hours by other HH members (Last week)	-17.50*	(10.03)	[0.46]	21.06	(22.46)	243
Chore hours by other HH members (Last week)	-11.97	(8.42)	[0.46]	18.78	(20.30)	267
Paid childcare hours (Last week)	-0.25	(0.16)	[0.46]	0.06	(0.83)	1,123

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified main outcomes using the 2022-2023 phone survey data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- Domestic work hours reports the number of hours FR spent in the past 7 days on household chores like cooking and cleaning. Childcare hours including time spent taking care of children while not doing other chores. Hours spent outside the home is the sum of hours spent running errands or shopping, visiting friends or family, or working for pay. Hours children alone at home reports hours in the past 7 days children were at home without adults present. Hours of children by friends/family outside the home is the total hours cared by family or friends/neighbors (without pay). Non-family childcare by Jordanians/Syrians is the total non-family childcare weighted by whether they reported with was provided by a) jordanians, b) syrians or c) both. If both, the hours are split 50/50 between syrian and jordanian. Any paid childcare in 2020 is an indicator. (2020 is when the program was active). Months of paid childcare reports the number of months in 2020 paid childcare was used, including zeros. Hours spent outside the home without children report the number of hours spent running errands or visiting friends/family without bringing children. Childcare hours and chore hours report the number of hours spent by all other household members on these tasks, defined above. Paid childcare hours reports the number of hours of paid childcare the household used in the past 7 days.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age). In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family xxx in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (F10) Impacts of the Program on Relationships and MacArthur Ladder

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
No. of close Jordanian friends	-0.47	(0.51)	[0.56]	2.98	(3.66)	1,321
Met close Jordanian friend at child's school	-0.01	(0.01)	[0.56]	0.00	(0.07)	1,249
Met close Jordanian friend as neighbor	-0.13*	(0.07)	[0.56]	0.52	(0.50)	1,321
Overwhelmed by financial needs of others (index)	0.26	(0.17)	[0.56]	-0.02	(1.01)	936
Current Macarthur rung (index)	-0.01	(0.12)	[0.84]	-0.01	(0.98)	1,321
Aspired Macarthur rung (index)	0.03	(0.13)	[0.84]	0.00	(1.00)	1,321

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified main outcomes using the 2022-2023 phone survey data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- N. of close Jordanian friends reports the treatment effect on the number of close Jordanian friends the respondent reports. Met close Jordanian friend at ... reports an indicator for where the respondent met the most recent close Jordanian friend they made. Overwhelmed by financial needs of others is a standardized likert response to "Over the past week, I have felt overwhelmed or burdened by the financial needs of people outside my household". Current Macarthur rung is a standardized version of the following question: "Imagine a ladder with 10 rungs representing society. At the top of the ladder are the people who are the best off, those who have the most money, most education, and best jobs. At the bottom are the people who are the worst off, those who have the least money, least education, worst jobs, or no job. If the top of the ladder is the 10th rung and the bottom is the 1st. Which rung best represents where you think you stand?" Aspired macarthur rung is a standardized version of the 1-10 response on which rung they would like to achieve in their life.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age). In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family xxx in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (F11) Impacts of the Program on Preferences towards it

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Prefers transfer to landlord vs. cash	0.03	(0.07)	[1.00]	0.53	(0.50)	1,321
Prefers transfer to landlord vs. food vouchers	0.07	(0.07)	[1.00]	0.27	(0.44)	1,321
Expected Benefit from Program Index	-0.05	(0.12)	[1.00]	-0.01	(1.00)	1,297

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified main outcomes using the 2022-2023 phone survey data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- Prefers transfer to landlord vs cash is the treatment effect on an indicator for preferring a program that pays 75 JD to the landlord towards rent each month for 1 year over a program that gives cash worth [75, 65 or 55] JD, each month. (75, 65 and 55 were randomized with equal probability)
- Prefers transfer to landlord vs cash is the treatment effect on an indicator for preferring a program that pays 75 JD to the landlord towards rent each month for 1 year over a program that gives food voucher worth [75, 65 or 55] JD, each month (averaged). (75, 65 and 55 were randomized with equal probability)
- Expected benefit program index is a standardized index of the following outcomes: 1) would spend more on food consumption if they were receiving the program 2) would spend more on healthcare if they were receiving the program and 3) would be happier if they were receiving the program.
- The regressions also have assessment month-by-year fixed effects, enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), and household-level controls (vulnerability-assessment quartile, shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults, respondent gender, and respondent age). In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Regressions are weighted by the number of people interviewed in each household. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family xxx in the pre-analysis plan.

4 Appendix G: Social Integration Results

Table (G1) Impacts of the Program on Primary Outcomes

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Social attitudes & perceptions (SD)	-0.33**	(0.14)	[0.08]	-0.00	(1.00)	1,102
Economic attitudes & perceptions (SD)	0.02	(0.16)	[0.56]	0.02	(1.02)	1,102
Policy preferences (SD)	0.17	(0.15)	[0.37]	-0.02	(1.00)	1,102
Altruism to Syrians	0.21	(0.18)	[0.37]	0.88	(1.18)	1,102

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified main outcomes using the 2022 neighbor survey data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- The outcomes that require definitions are: Social attitudes and perceptions is an index of the following outcomes: of the 3 people the respondent socializes most with, how many are Syrian; of the 3 people the respondent most often shares advice with, how many are Syrian; do children in the household have Syrian friends (binary); do children in the household share recreational space with Syrian children (binary); what is the net effect of Syrian refugees on Jordan’s society (positive-neutral-negative); do Syrian refugees tend to be lazy or hardworking? (1-7); To what degree would people feel comfortable accepting the marriage of their family member to a Syrian refugee? (1-5); To what degree would people feel comfortable accepting a Syrian refugee as a neighbor? (1-5, standardized). These outcomes are standardized with respect to the control group, averaged, then standardized with respect to the control group again.
Economic attitudes and perceptions is an index of the following outcomes: a binary variable equal to one if the respondent listed ‘hosting syrian refugees’ as one of the most important challenges facing Jordan; a 5-point likert scale on whether syrians or jordanians pay more in taxes; the net effect of refugees on the Jordanian economy (positive-neutral-negative). These outcomes are standardized with respect to the control group, averaged, then standardized with respect to the control group again.
Policy preferences is an index of outcomes which report the degree to which respondents agree with the following statements, each of which were asked using a 5-point likert scale: refugees should be relocated to refugee camps; refugees should have the right to work outside refugee camps; refugees should be allowed to become full citizens if they have lived in Jordan for a long time and would like to become a Jordanian; Syrian refugees should be given unrestricted work permits; Syrian refugee children should be allowed to be in classes with Jordanian children; Syrian refugees should be allowed to enter and leave camps freely; Syrian refugees should be given housing assistance through shelter programs that subsidize their rent; the international community should spend more money to support refugees. All outcomes are standardized with respect to the control group, averaged, then standardized with respect to the control group again.
Altruism to Syrians ranges from 0-5 JD and reports how much of a 5JD transfer was allocated to a charity serving Syrian refugees vs a charity serving vulnerable Jordanians vs kept for self. The altruism exercise was incentivized for one third of the sample, who were actually given 5 JD to allocate between the 3 choices. The rest of the sample was asked to make a hypothetical choice.
- The regressions also have enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), refugee household-level controls (shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults), the Marlowe–Crowne scale, and respondent gender, education, and age. In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 1 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (G2) Impacts of the Program on Assimilation Gap

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	Treatment *Refugee	(se)	Refugee	(se)	ctrl. mean	(sd)	N
Housing Expenditure (PC) PPP	30.02	(97.82)	-38.97	(93.38)	-31.25*	(18.05)	57.04	(274.59)	2,491
Log total consumption (PC) PPP	-0.13	(0.22)	0.17	(0.25)	-0.83***	(0.07)	7.76	(0.68)	1,482
CESD Score	-0.24	(0.16)	0.41	(0.30)	-0.05	(0.05)	0.02	(0.99)	2,471
Child Strengths and Difficulties	-0.24	(0.32)	0.59	(0.39)	-0.01	(0.11)	0.01	(1.00)	1,321

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified main outcomes using the 2022 neighbor survey data *and* 2021 refugee survey data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- This table reports estimates from the assimilation gap specification described in the pre-analysis plan amendment, which reports the degree to which treatment reduced the gap between Syrian refugees on 4/5 of the primary outcomes. Regrettably, housing quality is excluded due to data collection errors in the field.
- Housing expenditure includes total monthly rent payment, mortgage payment, and home upgrade costs, converted to USD PPP, then divided by household size. Log total consumption is the sum of the monetary value of goods consumed by households through purchase, gift and barter, excluding housing costs, converted to annual USD PPP, then divided by household size. Goods include food consumption, non-food consumption and durables purchases. CESD score is a standardized version of the Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression scores which measures depressive symptoms. 10 questions are scaled and summed according to the scoring guidelines, then standardized with respect to the control group. An increase corresponds to an increase in the CESD score which indicates increased symptoms of depression. Child strengths and difficulties is scored and summed according to the guidelines, then standardized with respect to the control group. An increase corresponds to an increase in the SDQ score, which indicates increased difficulties.
- The regressions also have enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), refugee household-level controls (shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults), the Marlowe–Crowne scale, and respondent gender, education, and age. In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 2 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (G3) Impacts of the Program on Host Community Relations and Attitudes Towards Refugees

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
List experiment; Syrian as neighbor	0.13	(0.11)	[0.40]	1.23	(0.86)	1,102
Share Friends Syrian	-0.15	(0.13)	[0.40]	0.51	(0.92)	1,102
Share Advice Syrian	-0.24**	(0.11)	[0.32]	0.34	(0.72)	1,102
Kids have Syrian Friends	-0.19*	(0.11)	[0.37]	0.40	(0.49)	704
Kids share rec space w Syrians	-0.10	(0.08)	[0.40]	0.48	(0.50)	707
Accept Syrian marriage	-0.23	(0.15)	[0.40]	0.01	(1.00)	1,099
Accept Syrian Neighbor	-0.15	(0.15)	[0.44]	-0.00	(1.01)	1,101
Syrians pay more in taxes	0.06	(0.14)	[0.49]	0.03	(1.01)	1,078

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified main outcomes using the 2022 neighbor survey data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- The first outcome titled “list experiment” uses a different specification specific to the list experiment. All respondents were asked how many of the listed groups they’d accept as a neighbor. Half saw a list that included Syrian refugees, and the other half saw a list that did not include Syrian refugees. (The other 3 groups were Persons with disabilities, People in poverty, and Someone who does not follow the law). The reported coefficient is the coefficient on an indicator for seeing the list including Syrian refugees.
- The other outcomes that require definitions are: Share friends Syrian is the share of the 3 friends they visit regularly who are Syrian refugees. Share advice Syrian is the share of the 3 people they seek and give advice to who are Syrian refugees. Kids have Syrian friends is an indicator equaling 1 if the children in the household have any Syrian friends, and is missing for households without children. Kids share rec space is an indicator equaling 1 if the children in the household share recreational space with Syrian refugee children. Accept Syrian marriage is a standardized 5-point likert scale regarding “To what degree would people in your community feel comfortable accepting the marriage of their son/daughter/sister/brother to a Syrian refugee?” Accept Syrian neighbor is a standardized 5-point likert scale regarding “To what degree would people in your community feel comfortable being neighbors with a Syrian refugee?” Syrians pay more in taxes is a standardized 5-point likert scale where an increase corresponds with a belief that Syrian refugees pay more in taxes than the average Jordanian in response to a short vignette.
- The regressions also have enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), refugee household-level controls (shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults), the Marlowe–Crowne scale, and respondent gender, education, and age. In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 3 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (G4) Impacts of the Program on Altruism and Trust

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Trust in Syrians	-0.45	(0.46)	[0.37]	4.75	(3.37)	1,102
Dictator game, Altruism to Jordanians	-0.51*	(0.28)	[0.37]	1.88	(1.77)	1,102
Dictator game, keep	0.30	(0.31)	[0.37]	2.24	(2.03)	1,102
Incentivized Dictator game, Altruism to Jordanians	-0.43	(0.53)	[0.37]	1.95	(1.98)	375
Incentivized Dictator game, keep	0.97	(0.60)	[0.37]	2.29	(2.26)	375

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified main outcomes using the 2022 neighbor survey data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- The outcomes that require definitions are: trust in Syrians reflects how much of the total endowment the respondent chooses to share with a Syrian refugee game partner in a hypothetical trust game. The respondent is told they (hypothetically) have 10 JD and can share as much of it or as little of it with their game partner as they want. Anything shared will be doubled, and the partner could choose to share or not share the proceeds with the respondent, so the amount shared with the game partner reveals a measure of trust. The subsequent outcomes correspond to a dictator game that was conducted as follows: the respondent was given 5 JD and told to distribute it between the following categories: keep for self, donate to a charity helping needy Jordanians, or donate to a charity helping needy Syrian refugees in Jordan. 2/3 of the sample did this hypothetically, and 1/3 actually received the 5 JD. “Altruism to Jordanians” reports how much of the 5 JD was allocated to the charity for Jordanians, and “keep” reports how much of the 5 JD was kept for self. Both these outcomes include the entire sample. The final two rows report these outcomes only for the incentivized sample. Altruism to Syrians is reported in table G1
- The regressions also have enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), refugee household-level controls (shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults), the Marlowe–Crowne scale, and respondent gender, education, and age. In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 4 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (G5) Impacts of the Program on Social Attitudes and Policy Preferences

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Attitude on refugee relocation	0.01	(0.16)	[1.00]	0.01	(0.99)	1,102
Attitude on refugee work	0.11	(0.15)	[0.91]	-0.01	(0.99)	1,102
Attitude on refugee citizenship	0.05	(0.14)	[1.00]	0.01	(1.01)	1,102
Refugee effect on economy	-0.23	(0.14)	[0.38]	-0.01	(1.00)	1,102
Refugee effect on society	0.02	(0.16)	[1.00]	-0.04	(0.97)	1,102
Positive effects of refugees	-0.13	(0.15)	[0.76]	-0.02	(0.98)	1,102
Negative effects of refugees	-0.23	(0.14)	[0.38]	0.03	(1.01)	1,074
Taxes best to reduce poverty	-0.01	(0.04)	[1.00]	0.06	(0.23)	1,042
Attitude on Syrian refugee work ethic	0.13	(0.30)	[1.00]	5.82	(1.75)	1,086
Support for work permits	-0.03	(0.16)	[1.00]	-0.01	(1.00)	1,102
Support for integrated schooling	0.19	(0.15)	[0.46]	-0.02	(1.01)	1,102
Support for freedom of movement	-0.02	(0.17)	[1.00]	-0.03	(1.00)	1,102
Support for housing assistance	0.24	(0.15)	[0.38]	-0.04	(1.01)	1,102
Support for intl refugee assistance	0.28*	(0.15)	[0.38]	-0.03	(1.02)	1,102
Support for integration index	0.08	(0.16)	[1.00]	-0.01	(0.98)	1,102
Primary identity - religion	-0.11	(0.07)	[0.38]	0.84	(0.36)	1,097
Primary identity - not national	-0.07	(0.06)	[0.50]	0.87	(0.33)	1,097
Days of media consumption	-1.08***	(0.40)	[0.08]	4.78	(2.78)	1,102
Refugees a top challenge	0.04	(0.04)	[0.76]	0.05	(0.22)	1,102
Perception of Jordanian economy	0.38**	(0.17)	[0.25]	-0.01	(0.95)	1,092
Share of Syrians receiving aid	-0.31	(3.87)	[1.00]	62.12	(32.13)	1,075
Avg aid amount (PPP)	-347.17***	(109.69)	[0.04]	630.84	(657.41)	685

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified main outcomes using the 2022 neighbor survey data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- Each of the following outcomes are standardized so that an increase corresponds with a more “pro-refugee” attitude. Refugee relocation is the response to “All refugees in Jordan should be relocated to live in the camps.” Refugee work corresponds to “Refugees who live in Jordan right now should be allowed to continue to work outside the camps.” Refugee citizenship corresponds to “Refugees should be allowed to become full citizens if they have lived in Jordan for a long time and would like to become a Jordanian. As citizens, they would have the right to vote in Jordan elections.” Effect on economy corresponds to “In your opinion, is the net effect of Syrian refugees on Jordan’s economy positive, neutral, or negative?” Effect on society corresponds to “In your opinion, is the net effect of Syrian refugees on Jordan’s society positive, neutral, or negative?” Positive effects corresponds to the number of positive effects on society listed by the respondent (options not read aloud). Negative effects corresponds to the number of negative effects on society listed by the respondent (options not read aloud). Taxes best to reduce poverty indicates support for “Statement 1: The best way to reduce poverty is to increase your taxes so the government can help the poor through social spending.” vs “Statement 2: The best way to reduce poverty is to encourage people like yourself to pay more sadaqa for charitable distribution.” Attitude on Syrian refugee work ethic corresponds to “Do Syrian refugees tend to be hardworking or lazy? On a scale of 1-7, with 1 being lazy and 7 being hardworking?” Work permits corresponds to “Do you think Syrian refugees should be given unrestricted work permits?” Integrated schooling corresponds to “Do you think Syrian refugee children should be allowed to be in classes with Jordanian children?” Freedom of movement corresponds to “Do you think Syrian refugees should be allowed to enter and leave camps freely?” Housing assistance corresponds to “Do you think Syrian refugees should be given housing assistance through shelter programs that subsidize their rent?” Intl refugee assistance corresponds to “Do you think the international community should spend more money to support refugees?” Support for integration index is an index composed of the the following attitude questions: relocation, work, citizenship, work permits, integrated schooling, freedom of movement, and housing assistance. Primary identity corresponds to the following question: “Which of the following best describes you?” (Read the options aloud.); Above all I am a Jordanian; Above all I am a Muslim; Above all I am an Arab; Above all I am a Christian. Days of media consumption corresponds to “In the past 7 days, how many days did you read or listen to the news from any source, including newspapers, online, WhatsApp, etc.?” Refugees a top challenge is an indicator equalling 1 if the respondent volunteered that refugees were one of the most important challenges facing Jordan (options not read aloud). Perception of Jordanian economy corresponds to “How would you evaluate the current economic situation in your country?” Share of Syrians receiving aid and average aid amount correspond to the following questions: “What percent of refugee households in your neighborhood do you think receive any assistance from any organizations in a typical month, in cash or in kind? Enumerator: Do not include assistance received from other households.” and “Of the refugee households in your neighborhood who receive assistance, what do you think is the average value in Dinar of the assistance (in cash or in kind) that they receive from organizations in a typical month?” The negative treatment effect stems from the control group being more likely than the treatment group to report outlandishly large numbers.
- The regressions also have enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), refugee household-level controls (shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults), the Marlowe–Crowne scale, and respondent gender, education, and age. In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 5 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (G6) Impacts of the Program on Dwelling Characteristics

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Housing expenditure (PPP PC)	158.54	(203.08)	[1.00]	96.06	(564.32)	1,096
Rent paid (PPP)	101.12	(94.99)	[1.00]	371.63	(169.40)	232
=1 if owns home	-0.10	(0.07)	[1.00]	0.80	(0.40)	1,102
Dwelling value (PPP)	9,320.34	(18,361.52)	[1.00]	46,908.00	(85,074.48)	566
=1 if hh paid for any improvements	0.06	(0.07)	[1.00]	0.40	(0.49)	1,102
=1 if NGO paid for any improvements	-0.00	(0.01)	[1.00]	0.00	(0.06)	1,102
Index of improvements	0.01	(0.04)	[1.00]	0.16	(0.23)	1,102
FR childcare and chore hours	-3.66	(2.86)	[1.00]	19.51	(18.70)	1,070
HH childcare and chore hours	1.25	(5.31)	[1.00]	32.70	(25.24)	681
Any domestic employees	0.01	(0.02)	[1.00]	0.02	(0.15)	1,102
N domestic employees	0.02	(0.03)	[1.00]	0.02	(0.15)	1,102
N Syrian domestic employees	-0.00	(0.01)	[1.00]	0.01	(0.07)	1,102

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified main outcomes using the 2022 neighbor survey data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- The outcomes that require definitions are: Housing expenditure is the sum of monthly rent paid, mortgage paid and money spent on housing upgrades, divided by household size. Rent paid corresponds to the monthly rent paid by households who rent. Dwelling value corresponds to “If you were to sell your house in the next month, how much money do you think it would sell for? In other words, what is the current market value of your home?” =1 if .. paid for any improvements corresponds to “Have you or an NGO made (or paid for) housing improvements where you live since October 2019?” Index of improvements is an index of structural, cosmetic, mold, insulation and utilities upgrades. FR/HH childcare and chores hours corresponds to the hours spent by the focus respondent/household in the last 7 days on childcare and chores. Any domestic employees is an indicator equal to 1 if the household currently employs any domestic employees, and N refers to the number of employees.
- The regressions also have enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), refugee household-level controls (shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults), the Marlowe–Crowne scale, and respondent gender, education, and age. In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 6 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (G7) Impacts of the Program on Household Consumption and Expenditures

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Diversity of food purchases	0.75**	(0.36)	[0.66]	-0.02	(1.03)	277
Food exp, typical week (USD PPP)	-6.56	(44.64)	[1.00]	277.97	(157.96)	287
Food exp, last week (USD PPP)	-14.50	(18.36)	[1.00]	189.65	(112.09)	1,090
Value of gifted food, last month (USD PPP)	9.60	(8.15)	[1.00]	2.09	(14.55)	297
Food consumption, last year	651.14	(2,517.53)	[1.00]	14,409.39	(9,974.92)	257
Non-food exp, last month (USD PPP)	13.49	(156.37)	[1.00]	831.77	(874.02)	1,016
Diversity of non-food purchases	-0.03	(0.15)	[1.00]	0.01	(1.01)	1,054
Value of gifted non-food, last yr (USD PPP)	-18.87	(19.03)	[1.00]	11.68	(186.07)	1,100
Value of all durables acquired, last yr (USD PPP)	752.90	(862.95)	[1.00]	354.88	(1,977.68)	296
Value of all durables gifted, last yr (USD PPP)	146.24	(179.81)	[1.00]	16.05	(174.57)	296

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified main outcomes using the 2022 neighbor survey data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- The outcomes that require definitions are: Diversity of food purchases is a standardized measure of the number of months per year the household consumes food from 9 different food groups. Food exp refers to the PPP adjusted amount of money spent in a typical week or last week. Value of gifted food is the value of food given to the household as formal or informal assistance in the past month. Food consumption, last year is an annualized measure of food consumption calculated from weekly food expenditure * 4.3 * months that food was consumed + annualized weekly food produced + annualized monthly food assistance. Non-food expenditure includes expenditures in the last 30 days from 9 different non-food expenditure categories. Diversity of non-food purchases is calculated in the same way as described above for food purchases. Value of gifted non-food includes all items from 9 non-food categories received as gifts in the past 12 months. Value of all durables acquired includes durables from 9 categories purchased or gifted to the household. Value of durables gifted includes all durables the household received as gifts.
- The regressions also have enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), refugee household-level controls (shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults), the Marlowe–Crowne scale, and respondent gender, education, and age. In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family xxx in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (G8) Impacts of the Program on Food Security

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
N meals yesterday	0.08	(0.10)	[0.71]	2.03	(0.71)	1,101
Food diversity	0.65**	(0.31)	[0.30]	8.12	(1.17)	296
Days last week FR went hungry	-0.13	(0.14)	[0.71]	0.28	(0.90)	1,102
Days last week adults went hungry	0.03	(0.11)	[1.00]	0.18	(0.70)	1,018
Days last week children went hungry	-0.16	(0.14)	[0.68]	0.22	(0.75)	707
women go hungry more often than men (SD)	0.09	(0.13)	[0.72]	0.04	(1.02)	962
girls go hungry more often than boys (SD)	-0.37*	(0.21)	[0.30]	0.04	(1.02)	425
elderly go hungry more often than young (SD)	-0.02	(0.28)	[1.00]	0.09	(1.06)	135
Reduced coping	-1.68*	(0.86)	[0.30]	3.10	(6.91)	1,102

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified main outcomes using the 2022 neighbor survey data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- The outcomes that require definitions are: N means yesterday reports the number of meals the respondent ate yesterday. “How many meals did you eat yesterday? Tea alone is not to be considered as a meal.” Food diversity reports the number of food categories out of 9 the respondent ate from in the past 12 months. Days last week FR/adults/children went hungry reports the number of nights in the past 7 days the respondent/adults in household/children in household went to bed hungry. Women/girls/elderly go hungry more often than men/boys/young reports agreement with the statement as a standardized 5-point likert scale. Reduced coping is the reduced Coping Strategies Index, where larger numbers correspond to more food insecurity.
- The regressions also have enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), refugee household-level controls (shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults), the Marlowe–Crowne scale, and respondent gender, education, and age. In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 8 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (G9) Impacts of the Program on Earnings, Labor, and Occupational Choice

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Total pre-tax earnings, 30 days IHS	0.08	(0.38)	[1.00]	1.20	(2.83)	1,090
Total labor supply, 7 days	-0.26	(4.34)	[1.00]	29.61	(29.98)	1,073
Total labor supply w/o chores, 7 days	2.53	(3.56)	[1.00]	8.55	(24.10)	1,091
Total labor supply, avg month	-2.22	(2.77)	[1.00]	8.09	(22.75)	1,091
Self-employed labor supply, typical week	-2.84	(2.30)	[1.00]	2.82	(14.13)	1,100
Wage employment labor supply, typical week	1.83	(3.24)	[1.00]	7.14	(22.31)	1,093
Net wage employment earnings, 30 days IHS	0.15	(0.36)	[1.00]	0.94	(2.48)	1,082
Manufacturing sector	0.01	(0.02)	[1.00]	0.01	(0.07)	1,102
Service sector	0.08	(0.05)	[1.00]	0.10	(0.30)	1,102
Retail sector	0.04	(0.03)	[1.00]	0.03	(0.18)	1,102
Agricultural sector	-0.00	(0.01)	[1.00]	0.01	(0.08)	1,102
Business revenue, 30 days	-36.48	(34.79)	[1.00]	25.97	(374.33)	1,101
Business revenue, 12 months	-442.81	(360.12)	[1.00]	278.07	(3,783.38)	1,101
N. employees	-0.07	(0.11)	[1.00]	0.04	(0.65)	1,102
Currently operating business	-0.02	(0.03)	[1.00]	0.03	(0.17)	1,102
Self-employment profit, 30 days	32.56	(41.14)	[1.00]	16.91	(192.12)	1,097
Self-employment profit, 12 months	99.60	(432.52)	[1.00]	176.99	(1,385.86)	1,095
Business expenses, 30 days	-26.01	(22.62)	[1.00]	21.75	(300.90)	1,101
Business expenses, 12 months	-306.58	(249.12)	[1.00]	217.15	(3,118.88)	1,101

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified main outcomes using the 2022 neighbor survey data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- The outcomes that require definitions are: total pre-tax earnings includes all earnings from wage work and profit from self employment in the last 30 days, winsorized then transformed using the inverse hyperbolic sine (prespecified). Total labor supply reports hours in wage work, self employment, and chores/childcare in the past 7 days. Total labor supply w/o chores only includes wage work and self employment. Total labor supply, avg month reports wage work + self employment hours in a typical month. Self-employed labor supply reports hours spent in self employment in a typical week. Wage employment labor supply reports hours spent in wage work in a typical week. Net wage employment earnings include earnings from wage work minus taxes plus value of benefits, winsorized then transformed with the inverse hyperbolic sine. Manufacturing/service/retail/agricultural sector is an indicator equal to one if the respondent has worked in that industry in wage work or self employment in the past 12 months. Business revenue reports total business revenue earned by the respondent in the past 30 days/12 months. N employees reports the number of people the respondent employs in all businesses in the past 30 days. Self-employment reports revenue less expenses for all businesses. Business expenses reports self employment costs.
- The regressions also have enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), refugee household-level controls (shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults), the Marlowe–Crowne scale, and respondent gender, education, and age. In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 9 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (G10) Impacts of the Program on Savings and Loans

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
At least 30 JD in savings	-0.12*	(0.07)	[0.34]	0.32	(0.47)	1,102
Value of loans taken in past year, USD PPP	-144.22	(1,980.97)	[1.00]	4,128.63	(12,492.84)	1,089
Value of loans given in past year, USD PPP	-113.90	(635.12)	[1.00]	613.62	(4,147.31)	1,084

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified main outcomes using the 2022 neighbor survey data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- The outcomes that require definitions are: At least 30 JD in savings is an indicator equal to 1 if the household has at least 30 JD in savings, in a bank or otherwise. Value of loans taken in the past year includes formal and informal loans taken out by the household. Value of loans given includes all formal and informal loans made by the household to other individuals.
- The regressions also have enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), refugee household-level controls (shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults), the Marlowe–Crowne scale, and respondent gender, education, and age. In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family 10 in the pre-analysis plan.

Table (G11) Impacts of the Program on Physical and Mental Health

Outcomes	Treatment	(se)	FDR q-values	Control mean	(sd)	N
Life Satisfaction (SD)	-0.32**	(0.15)	[0.06]	0.01	(0.98)	1,097
Subjective Health (SD)	-0.30*	(0.16)	[0.06]	0.02	(0.99)	1,102

Notes:

- The table shows the regression results on pre-specified main outcomes using the 2022 neighbor survey data. Each row is its own dependent variable.
- The outcomes that require definitions are: Life satisfaction corresponds to a standardized measure from “All things considered, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole these days on a scale of 1 to 10?” Subjective health is a standardized measure from “Would you describe your general health as good, fair, poor, or very poor?”
- The regressions also have enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), refugee household-level controls (shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults), the Marlowe–Crowne scale, and respondent gender, education, and age. In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%). Q-values are calculated per Anderson (2008) and correspond to Family xxx in the pre-analysis plan.

4.1 Social Cohesion Heterogeneity

Table (G12) Jordanian Neighbor Primary Outcomes Heterogeneity by: Marlowe-Crowne Score

	(1) Social Attitudes and Perceptions	(2) Economic Attitudes and Perceptions	(3) Policy Preferences	(4) Altruism to Syrians
Treat	-0.530** (0.216)	0.094 (0.228)	0.215 (0.184)	0.117 (0.284)
Treat*Above Median Marlow-Crowne	0.411 (0.297)	-0.161 (0.257)	-0.096 (0.266)	0.189 (0.467)
Above Median Marlow-Crowne	-0.048 (0.096)	0.101 (0.093)	0.015 (0.079)	0.053 (0.148)
p-value: T + T*Het	0.53	0.72	0.58	0.33
Control Mean	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.48
Control SD	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50
N	1102.00	1102.00	1102.00	1102.00

This table shows heterogeneity analysis of the primary outcomes for Jordanian neighbors, by whether the respondent's Marlowe-Crowne score is above or below the median score in the control group. The outcomes are as defined in table G1. The regressions have enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), refugee household-level controls (shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults), the Marlowe-Crowne scale, and respondent gender, education, and age. In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%).

Table (G13) Jordanian Neighbor Primary Outcomes Heterogeneity by: Palestinian Grandparents

	(1) Social Attitudes and Perceptions	(2) Economic Attitudes and Perceptions	(3) Policy Preferences	(4) Altruism to Syrians
Treat	-0.390*** (0.143)	0.085 (0.184)	0.156 (0.161)	0.233 (0.199)
Treat*Palestinian Grandparents	0.541 (0.453)	-0.558 (0.402)	0.164 (0.518)	-0.141 (0.659)
Palestinian Grandparents	-0.031 (0.101)	0.135 (0.095)	0.340** (0.133)	0.160 (0.141)
p-value: T + T*Het	0.73	0.18	0.51	0.88
Control Mean	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.12
Control SD	0.32	0.32	0.32	0.32
N	1102.00	1102.00	1102.00	1102.00

This table shows heterogeneity analysis of the primary outcomes for Jordanian neighbors, by whether any of the Jordanian neighbor respondent's grandparents are of Palestinian decent, indicating a likely family history of displacement. The outcomes are as defined in table G1. The regressions have enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), refugee household-level controls (shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults), the Marlowe-Crowne scale, and respondent gender, education, and age. In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%).

Table (G14) Jordanian Neighbor Primary Outcomes Heterogeneity by: Grandparents
Non-Native Jordanians

	(1) Social Attitudes and Perceptions	(2) Economic Attitudes and Perceptions	(3) Policy Preferences	(4) Altruism to Syrians
Treat	-0.385*** (0.135)	0.122 (0.192)	0.212 (0.163)	0.235 (0.199)
Treat*Non-Jordanian Grandparents	0.347 (0.449)	-0.627 (0.406)	-0.270 (0.445)	-0.139 (0.521)
Non-Jordanian Grandparents	0.161 (0.109)	0.135* (0.079)	0.414*** (0.118)	0.201* (0.115)
p-value: T + T*Het	0.93	0.14	0.89	0.84
Control Mean	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16
Control SD	0.37	0.37	0.37	0.37
N	1102.00	1102.00	1102.00	1102.00

This table shows heterogeneity analysis of the primary outcomes for Jordanian neighbors, by whether any of the Jordanian neighbor respondent's grandparents are of non-Jordanian decent, indicating a likely family history of migration or displacement. The outcomes are as defined in table G1. The regressions have enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), refugee household-level controls (shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults), the Marlowe–Crowne scale, and respondent gender, education, and age. In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%).

Table (G15) Jordanian Neighbor Primary Outcomes Heterogeneity by: Proximity to Study
Refugee Household

	(1) Social Attitudes and Perceptions	(2) Economic Attitudes and Perceptions	(3) Policy Preferences	(4) Altruism to Syrians
Treat	-0.427** (0.204)	-0.014 (0.191)	0.190 (0.215)	0.067 (0.285)
Treat*Above Median Distance	0.392 (0.282)	0.122 (0.280)	-0.018 (0.277)	0.283 (0.527)
Above Median Distance	-0.069 (0.076)	0.033 (0.071)	0.046 (0.071)	-0.036 (0.131)
p-value: T + T*Het	0.85	0.67	0.39	0.33
Control Mean	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50
Control SD	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50
N	1044.00	1044.00	1044.00	1044.00

This table shows heterogeneity analysis of the primary outcomes for Jordanian neighbors, by whether the distance (in meters) from the Jordanian neighbor respondent's home to the refugee household from the study is above or below the median distance of all neighbors in the control group. The outcomes are as defined in table G1. The regressions have enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), refugee household-level controls (shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults), the Marlowe–Crowne scale, and respondent gender, education, and age. In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%).

Table (G16) Jordanian Neighbor Primary Outcomes Heterogeneity by: Gender

	(1) Social Attitudes and Perceptions	(2) Economic Attitudes and Perceptions	(3) Policy Preferences	(4) Altruism to Syrians
Treat	-0.179 (0.253)	-0.105 (0.272)	0.240 (0.248)	0.144 (0.289)
Treat*Neighbor Female	-0.236 (0.360)	0.194 (0.371)	-0.117 (0.296)	0.110 (0.397)
Neighbor Female	0.145 (0.101)	-0.077 (0.071)	0.083 (0.062)	0.027 (0.093)
p-value: T + T*Het	0.04	0.69	0.50	0.31
Control Mean	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.60
Control SD	0.49	0.49	0.49	0.49
N	1102.00	1102.00	1102.00	1102.00

This table shows heterogeneity analysis of the primary outcomes for Jordanian neighbors, by whether the Jordanian neighbor respondent is female. The outcomes are as defined in table G1. The regressions have enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), refugee household-level controls (shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults), the Marlowe–Crowne scale, and respondent gender, education, and age. In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%).

Table (G17) Jordanian Neighbor Primary Outcomes Heterogeneity by: Age Group 18-25

	(1) Social Attitudes and Perceptions	(2) Economic Attitudes and Perceptions	(3) Policy Preferences	(4) Altruism to Syrians
Treat	-0.268* (0.138)	0.119 (0.168)	0.183 (0.165)	0.134 (0.183)
Treat*Neighbor 18-25	-0.716 (0.624)	-1.280* (0.713)	-0.208 (0.525)	0.927 (1.241)
Neighbor 18-25	0.094 (0.130)	0.153 (0.150)	0.181 (0.116)	0.169 (0.213)
p-value: T + T*Het	0.11	0.09	0.96	0.38
Control Mean	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09
Control SD	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.29
N	1102.00	1102.00	1102.00	1102.00

This table shows heterogeneity analysis of the primary outcomes for Jordanian neighbors, by whether the Jordanian neighbor respondent is in the age group 18-25. The outcomes are as defined in table G1. The regressions have enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), refugee household-level controls (shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults), the Marlowe–Crowne scale, and respondent gender, education, and age. In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%).

Table (G18) Jordanian Neighbor Primary Outcomes Heterogeneity by: Education Level

	(1) Social Attitudes and Perceptions	(2) Economic Attitudes and Perceptions	(3) Policy Preferences	(4) Altruism to Syrians
Treat	-0.222 (0.264)	0.396 (0.290)	0.232 (0.269)	-0.026 (0.335)
Treat*Neighbor Secondary School or More	-0.163 (0.340)	-0.596* (0.353)	-0.102 (0.353)	0.373 (0.417)
Neighbor Secondary School or More	0.184* (0.110)	0.093 (0.103)	0.142 (0.090)	-0.185 (0.151)
p-value: T + T*Het	0.03	0.32	0.51	0.13
Control Mean	0.67	0.67	0.67	0.67
Control SD	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.47
N	1102.00	1102.00	1102.00	1102.00

This table shows heterogeneity analysis of the primary outcomes for Jordanian neighbors, by whether the Jordanian neighbor respondent has secondary education or higher. The outcomes are as defined in table G1. The regressions have enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), refugee household-level controls (shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults), the Marlowe–Crowne scale, and respondent gender, education, and age. In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%).

Table (G19) Jordanian Neighbor Primary Outcomes Heterogeneity by: Socioeconomic Status

	(1) Social Attitudes and Perceptions	(2) Economic Attitudes and Perceptions	(3) Policy Preferences	(4) Altruism to Syrians
Treat	-0.382* (0.208)	0.048 (0.265)	-0.320 (0.215)	0.511 (0.328)
Treat*Above Median Expenditure	0.086 (0.270)	-0.017 (0.310)	0.832*** (0.288)	-0.401 (0.504)
Above Median Expenditure	-0.191*** (0.074)	-0.054 (0.074)	-0.266*** (0.067)	0.011 (0.114)
p-value: T + T*Het	0.12	0.87	0.02	0.71
Control Mean	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50
Control SD	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50
N	1016.00	1016.00	1016.00	1016.00

This table shows heterogeneity analysis of the primary outcomes for Jordanian neighbors, by whether the Jordanian neighbor respondent has above median non-food expenditure per capita. Non-food expenditure was selected as the measure of socioeconomic status since it was collected in the same way in both the abridged and non-abridged versions of the consumption module. It includes monthly expenditures on utilities, water, basic household items, debt repayment, linens, clothing, school fees, taxes, insurance, and phone bills. The outcomes are as defined in table G1. The regressions have enumerator fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), refugee household-level controls (shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults), the Marlowe–Crowne scale, and respondent gender, education, and age. In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%).

5 Appendix H: Ethics Appendix

To review the ethical considerations of this study, please review the comprehensive ethics appendix which is available on the [Open Science Framework](#).

6 Appendix I: Pooled Results

6.1 Pooled Results Heterogeneity

Table (I1) Pooled Primary Outcomes Effects Heterogeneity by: Respondent Gender¹

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Overall Housing Quality (Z-Score)	Total Monthly Housing Expenditures (USD PPP)	Food Consumption (Log USD PPP)	Log Total Consumption (Log USD PPP)	CESD Score (Higher: Less Depression)	SDQ Score (Higher: Better Child Wellbeing)
Treat	0.208 (0.217)	-32.083 (33.821)	0.053 (0.122)	0.011 (0.125)	-0.016 (0.171)	-0.294 (0.202)
Treat*Female	0.208 (0.210)	0.500 (48.234)	-0.145 (0.194)	-0.077 (0.212)	-0.172 (0.256)	-0.091 (0.302)
Female	0.118*** (0.039)	-5.136 (11.549)	-0.147*** (0.048)	-0.098* (0.052)	-0.308*** (0.055)	-0.153** (0.075)
p-value: T + T*Het	0.07	0.40	0.45	0.62	0.33	0.09
Control Mean	0.96	0.64	0.63	0.33	0.96	0.42
Control SD	0.19	0.48	0.48	0.47	0.20	0.49
N	4218.00	2812.00	2753.00	1422.00	4207.00	1782.00

This table shows heterogeneity analysis of the refugee primary outcomes by respondent gender. The outcomes are as defined in table ???. The regressions pool across all rounds of available data, and have enumerator fixed effects, round and year-month fixed effects, community-level controls (Irbid/Mafraq governorate and population quartile), refugee household-level controls (shelter program, baseline number of children, baseline number of children plus adults), the Marlowe–Crowne scale, and respondent gender, education, and age. In the parentheses are robust standard errors clustered at the locality level. Statistical significance represented by * (10%), ** (5%), and *** (1%).