

\*

%96

.1986

%80

%80

74315

%22 %11

:

) .

) (2010 ) (2009  
(Giovanni, 1999) (2001 ) (2000

1989

.( )

2009/12/23

.2010/8/11

\*

2001  
2006-2004  
2015-2006  
.2011 -2007

" : 2009

.(2009 )  
(John Nkum, 1998) ...

.(Meyer and Sullivan, 2005)

) ...  
(2008

" "

) "  
.(2009

(Ravallion, 2009) (Meyer, 2009), (The World Bank.  
2009, Using Poverty and Social Impact Analysis to  
Support Development Policy Operations).

:*Samuel Johnson*

*"A decent provision for the poor is the true test of  
civilization"* (Rosen, 2007)

2000 )  
.(2005 2003 2001

*"In general the art of government consists in taking  
as much money as possible from one class of citizens to  
give to the other"* (Rosen, 2007)

( )

(Feldstein, 1998)

.( )

2010 )  
36 .(

: 1986  
-

- :  
- :  
- :

) (2009 :  
" :

" :  
" :  
:

.( ) " :  
:

%96 :  
:

**2009**

-  
-

.(Recardo, 2005)

180 40

18 ) -

- (

( ) %96

...

- :

2006 67 -

:

•

- •

•

•

-

.(2008 ) .

:

.(2002) -1 %6.5 -

:

.(2008) -2

2.15

" : " : %36.9  
 .2003-2002  
 2006 %27.6  
 2008  
 -2002 1976 .(2010) -3  
 " 2007

**Meyer, Bruce. 2009. Five decades of consumption -6  
and income poverty**

**- Abu-Al- Sondos. 2008. Data flow mechanism -4  
for poverty monitoring in Jordan.**

2005-1960

" " " " "

-7

**2009**

%14

2006  
35

.2004

.(Kakwani, 2006)

**Gautam.2007. Poverty Alleviation in Nepal, Is -5  
Bureaucracy A Perfect Means to Deal With Poverty**

**Kakwani, Nanak. 2008. Executive Summary -8**

**United Nations. 2008. Development program, -10**  
**Millennium Development Goal**

2006 2004

46.3

) .%13

2007

%14.7 2005 -

42 2003 26 20

2005 )

%14 2006

2006 %31.9 %140 %1.1 2006-2002

109 2002 .9.5%

% 15.5

%36.5

%82 91 2006

2010 %12

.2015 %10

**Ministry of Planing and International -9**  
**Cooperation. 2005. National Strategy for Microfinance**

**Ricardo.2005. Poverty, Pro-Poor Growth and -11**  
**Simulated Inequality Reduction**

( )

" "

**Ravallion, Martin. 2005. Evaluating Anti- -12  
Poverty Programs**

(Ravallion, 2005) (The World Bank, 2008),

Input Indicators and

.Input-Output Relationship

:

(The Word Bank, 2008), (Andrea, 1999), (United Nations, 2008) (kakwani, 2006) (United Nations, 2008), (Andera, 1999).

:

(The World Bank, 2008), (Altman, 2004)

:

-1

-2

:

-3

( )

:

.2009

( )

:

.(Goatam, 2007)

:

-4

:

( )

:

-5

:

**Resluts**

:

:

**Indicators**





Poverty Depeath Index <sup>1</sup> : -4

=

Poverty Gap Index -5

-6

2

1986 36

<sup>1</sup>  $PD = 1/n \sum (z - y_i)z$

<sup>2</sup> Bourguignon, 2003: (GEP = % dPR/ % dY)

60 /

%33 (1)

2009

.%26  
%75

.%80

%80

.%10

18

%7

18

%9

%57

.%4

18

%17 (2)

%12 /

% 24 .

7

.(kakwani, 2006)

(1)

%97	%8	%9	%4	%33	%26	%10	%7
%3	491	481	142	685		258	879

(2)

%17.0	34083	34084	1
%12.3	86248	12434	2
%10.7	21642	7214	3
%11.2	22596	5649	4
%14.4	29010	5802	5
%10.7	85215	3593	6
%8.5	17010	2430	7
%6.0	12272	1534	8
%8.9	17961	1575	9

2 1

%175

%37

(3)

%61

%22

3

(3)

2009-2007

2009	%	2009			2008			2007		
		%	( )		%	( )		%	( )	
%20	4.9	9.1	43322	2316	1.9	42255	2265	1.5	32638	2216
%61	10	1.6	9107	150	6.6	9563	146	5.9	8417	143
%37	7.12	5.4	00348	1064	4.5	46372	1041	3.8	38274	1018
%45	7.12	8.5	6626	114	5.9	6585	111	5.6	6072	108
%19	14.9	9.2	86725	891	2.8	24044	872	2.2	19036	852
%25	15.3	8.3	15223	401	3.8	14958	392	3.4	12926	383
%21	5.15	2.3	4204	130	3.3	4188	128	2.9	3545	124
%28	1.16	5.4	8186	179	4.7	8319	176	4.2	7214	171
%25	7.17	5.4	6205	137	4.3	5832	135	4.4	5700	131
%22	9.19	3.4	3675	84	4.5	3699	82	4.4	3513	80
%24	7.21	4.5	12703	233	5.6	12798	228	4.9	10960	223
%27	3.23	3.6	17582	281	6.4	17577	275	5.8	15477	269

(4)

( )

2009	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	
5980	5850	5723	5600	5473	5350	5480	5329	(1)
%14.7	%14.7	%14.7	%14.7	%14.7	%14.3	%14.2	%14.2	
879	860	841	823	804	760	778	756	
%30	%25.6	%24.2	%23.3	%21.9	%21	%20.5	%20	
1794	1498	1385	1299	1198	1124	1123	1066	
2001	196	163	164	180	178	169	166	
%22.7	22.8%	19%	20%	22%	23%	21.7%	%22	%
%11	%13	%11.7	%12.6	%15	%16	%15	%15	%
%82	%80	%100	%100	%100	%100	%100	%100	(2)

: (1)

/

/ 2009

: (2)

.(%80)

(

:

2011 %90

2009

(4)

) 2008

46.3  
2006

2340

2009-2006

" " 59.7=1.59\*46.3  
%67-%25

(4)

2006 " -

65 " %2

.2008

2006 2008

2009 /12

" " " (Kakwan, 2006)

.% 61 %23 " "

6 5 4 %22

%14.7 %14.2

(2009 )

%11

% 80

2002

.2006 %80

(Kakwani, 2006 poverty rate in rea figures  
(Meyer, 2009)

:

(5)

( ÷ )

:

: 2002 -1  
2002

32.6

: 2009 " "

47.6 = 1.46 \*32.6  
%84-%31

5

%84-%31

2006 %67-%25 2002 : 2006 -

2006 %61-%23  
 %13 %14.7 .(  
 %9.5 (5 )  
 .(Kakwani, 2006) %1.1 %2.7  
 (5)

2006 2009	2006 2009	2006	2002 2009	+				
65	6.59	46.3	6.47	45	40	40	34084	<b>1</b>
65	6.59	46.3	6.47	50	45	90	24868	<b>2</b>
65	6.59	46.3	6.47	48	43	130	21642	<b>3</b>
65	6.59	46.3	6.47	45	40	160	22596	<b>4</b>
65	6.59	46.3	6.47	41	36	180	29010	<b>5</b>
65	6.59	46.3	6.47	35	30	180	21558	<b>6</b>
65	6.59	46.3	6.47	31	26	180	17010	<b>7</b>
65	6.59	46.3	6.47	28	23	180	12272	<b>8</b>
65	6.59	46.3	6.47	25	20	180	7713	<b>9</b>
65	6.59	46.3	6.47	23	18	180	4360	<b>10</b>
65	6.59	46.3	6.47	21	16	180	2354	<b>11</b>
65	6.59	46.3	6.47	20	15	180	3644	<b>-12</b>

(0.27)

.%64

(United Nations Program, 2008)

180 :  
 ) 180 40 (6)  
 .(  
 " " 180 (0.75)  
 15  
 12

( 40-15)

(6)

2006	2006	2002	
132	120	91	
54	42	13	
%60	%65	%86	
42	30	1	
%68	%75	%98	
GINI COEFFICIENT = 0.27		GINI COEFFICIENT = 0.75	

%40

7

%86 %80

%40 %20

%11

.%50

(7)

2002	2006	2006	
.800	84.0	86.0	
20.0	34.0	40.0	
%68-	%52-	%53-	

(6)

(8)

%50 ( )

60

2006

2006

( 2006 )

%86 ( )

( 2002

%.65

%.60 (

567 238 :2009

%4 %1.5 2009

2009  
%7 2.6 :

(8)

**2009-2008**

2009	2009		2008	2008	
316440000	879000	%14.7	309600000	860000	<b>%14.7</b>
645840000	1794000	%30	539280000	1498000	<b>%25.6</b>

%1 :

(9)

%89

(10:9)

(9)

**2009-2004**

2009	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004	
78000	64223	56039	57659	59677	60788	( )
%22	%14.5	%1-	%3.4-	%1.8-	%8.8	:
%22	%0.0	%5 -	%20 -	%6 -	%6	:
%7	%20	%20	%7	%22		
%13	%18	%17	%11	%11		
3.1	5.6	6.6	10.1	8.1	8.6	(1)

.2009- 2000 : (1)

.2010 : (2)



(10 9)

%80

%8-%5

(Recardo, 2005)

(10)

		i	
0.20	312	1512	2004
0.19	312	1636	2005
0.16	312	1879	2006
0.19	396	2048	2007
0.19	480	2425	2008
0.13	480	3766	2009

(1)

(GEP = % dPR / % dY)

dy

dPR

(10)

(Bourguignon, 2003)

%13 2009  
2007

%19 %16

%.3

%1

%32

.(5 1.5)

.2002

2006

2002

%13 2008

14.7%

%14.2

(13-14.7=-1.7)

(1.7/14.7=0.12)

%.60

.(0.12/0.60=0.2)

.  
-  
%33  
.2006 %14.7 ( ) 1997 2350  
.2004  
-  
%11  
%33 .( )  
%14.7  
-  
.%16  
- %22 - %11  
%80  
.%25  
-  
-  
%2.7  
-  
-

180

- Flow Mechanism for Poverty Monitoring in Jordan, *European Journal of Social sciences*, 7 (1): 7-22.
- Altman, Miriam. 2004. Framework for evaluating the expanded public works program, Employment and Economic Policy Research Program, Human Sciences Research Council, 35-38. 2005
- Andrea, Giovanni.1999. Social Funds in Stabilization and Adjustment Programs. United Nation University, Helsinki. ISBN 952-455-127-6: 2-27. : .2008-1973 2003
- Bourguignon, Francois. 2003. The Growth Elasticity of Poverty Reduction: Explaining Heterogeneity across countries and Time Periods in Inequality and Growth. Delta and the World Bank, 4-10. : .2008-1973 2000 -1973 :
- Feldstein, Martin. 1998. Income Inequality and Poverty. *National Bureau of Economic Research, Working Paper 6770*, Cambridge, MA 02138. 1-11. : .2008 2001
- Fostar, Greeran, Thorbecke .1984. A Class of Decoposable Poverty Measures, *Econometrica, The World Bank Economic Review*, 6:1. : .2008-1973 :
- Gautam, Bharat, Raj. 2007. Poverty Alleviation in Nepal, Is Bureaucracy A Perfect Means To Deal With Poverty? Paper to be Presented at the Annual Conference of the Norwegian Association for Development Research. *Nepalese Journal of Public Policy and Governance*, 12-22. .2002 . : .2008-1973 -
- John, Nkum. 1998. Comparative Analysis of Poverty Allviation Action Plans in Ghana and Zimbabwe.GTZ, Poverty Reduction Project, 6-10. 2009 .6 36
- Jordan's Minister of Planning andInternational Cooperation. 2009. Challenges Facing country's Economy, *Asharq Alawsat*, 15/4/2006. 1 .1986 36 2009
- Kakwani, Nanak, Badran, Adnan and Razzaz, Susan. 2008. Executive Summary. Jordanian Department of Statistics and the World Bank, Amman, ii-25. 2007 2008
- Meyer, Bruce, D.Sullivan, James X. 2009. Five Decades of Consumption and Income Poverty. *National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, Working Paper 14827*: 1-55. .2009-2004 8
- Ravallion, Martin. 2005. Evaluating Anti-Poverty Programs. *Handbook of Development Economics*, 4:2-78. .1988
- Ricardo, Fuentes. 2005. Poverty, Pro-Poor Growth and Simulated Inequality Reduction. UNDP, *Human Development Report Office Occasional Paper*, (11). : .2010
- Rosen, Harvey, Gayer, Ted. 2008. Public Finance, *Income Redistribution*. Eight Edition, McGraw-Hill/Irwin, Ch 12: 258. .2010 -1973
- The Hashimate Kingdom of Jordan. 2004. Poverty Assessment: Abu- Alsondos, Jehad and Abu-Kharmeh, Suleiman. 2008. Data

- The World Bank. 2004. An Evaluation of World Bank Assistance for Poverty Reduction, Health, and Education: Poverty Assessment. Report No: 29366.
- The Scottish Government Statistics. 2007. Social Welfare- Income and Poverty-Main Analysis, Measuring Deprivation in Scotland: Final Report, 1-6.
- United Nations Development Program. 2008. Millennium Development Goals. Summary Report, Social and Economic Development Group, Middle East and North Africa Region.
- The Hashemite kingdom of Jordan, Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation. 2005. *National Strategy for Microfinance*: 1-23.
- The World Bank. 2008. *Good Practice Note: Using Poverty and Social Impact Analysis to Support Development Policy Operations*, 5-22.

## **The Effectiveness of the Monthly Cash Assistance Program Delivered by the National Aid Fund on Beneficiaries and Poverty Rate in Jordan**

*Adel Y. Shamaileh\**

### **ABSTRACT**

The monthly cash transfer program is the largest program administered by the National Aid Fund (NAF). Its annual budget represents 96% of NAF budget. NAF was founded in 1986 as the prime government instrument for combating poverty. The program sets its objective to eradicate poverty among 80 percent of households under poverty line.

The study evaluates the extent of the program's success in achieving this objective.

To a large extent, the success of the program depends upon the degree of political commitment, and sustainability of required financial support from the government. Therefore, the program's success or failure can be considered an assessment of the government policy.

Contrasting the beneficiaries' situations according to the prescribed measures, before assistance and after, indicates the real impact of this program and the policy in general. Using the database of (NAF), the results show, based on the poverty line, that only 11%-22% of the poor are receiving monthly cash assistance. In other words only one- seventh of the target set by NAF received aid. The results also show that none of the poor have been alleviated from their position below the poverty line, that the program has not reduced the number of poor, nor the poverty rate. Nevertheless, the program proved to be effective in reducing poverty depth, the poverty gap and income inequality among the beneficiaries.

The study was conducted using the whole database available at NAF. Data covers the beneficiaries as of June 2009 numbered 74315 families with 201000 individuals.

**Keywords:** Cash Assistance, Poverty line, Poverty Gap, Poverty Depth, Poverty Elasticity to Economic Growth, Gini Coefficient.

---

\* Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Business, University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan. Received on 23/12/2009 and Accepted for Publication on 11/8/2010.