

Youth Perceptions of Women's Empowerment and Gender Equality in Algeria

تصوّرات الشباب في الجزائر بشأن تمكين
المرأة والمساواة بين الجنسين

Les perceptions des jeunes en Algérie à l'égard de l'autonomisation des
femmes et de l'égalité entre les sexes

MEDJOUB RAZIKA ET NACER-EDDINE HAMMOUDA

Center for Research in Applied Economics for Development (CREAD)

Rue Djamel Eddine El-Afghani - El Hammadia BP.197, Rostomia, Bouzaréah
Alger

medjoubrazika@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0009—0009—8650—1490>

nacreddinehammouda@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0000—0002—2076—4820>

Date de réception	Publication numérique	Archivage ASJP
27/10/2023	20/04/2026	05/05/2026

Référence électronique

Medjoub Razika et Nacer-Eddine Hammouda, “ Youth Perceptions of Women's Empowerment and Gender Equality in Algeria ”, Aleph [En ligne], Vol 13 (2) | 2026, mis en ligne le 20 avril 2026. URL: <https://aleph.edinum.org/16613>

Référence papier (archivage Asjp)

Medjoub Razika et Nacer-Eddine Hammouda, “ Youth Perceptions of Women's Empowerment and Gender Equality in Algeria ”, Aleph, Vol 13 (2) | 2026, 229—254.

© Auteur(s), 2026. Les auteurs conservent leurs droits.

Article diffusé en accès ouvert sous licence Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International—CC BY 4.0, sauf mention contraire portée sur la page de publication.

Résumé

This article examines Algerian youths' perceptions of women's empowerment and gender equality in access to education, employment, economic decision-making, and inheritance. Drawing on data from the Sahwa 2015/2016 national survey of Algerian youth, the study estimates ordinal regression models in order to identify the individual characteristics associated with more egalitarian or less egalitarian opinions. The findings show broad support for equal education for girls and boys, but they also reveal the persistence of powerful gender stereotypes, especially with regard to paid work, household authority, and the gendered distribution of economic responsibilities. Male respondents are systematically less supportive of equality across the domains examined, making gender the most robust predictor of unequal attitudes. Lower levels of education, disadvantaged social background, parental illiteracy, younger age, and rural residence are also associated with less egalitarian views in specific areas. By contrast, university attendance appears to foster more open attitudes toward women's employment and equal opportunities. Opinions on inheritance point to the continued normative weight of religious representations: most respondents support women's right to inherit, yet reject parity in inheritance shares. Overall, the article argues that higher education constitutes an important space of socialization capable of weakening inherited prejudices and promoting more egalitarian gender norms in contemporary Algeria.

Mots-clés

women's empowerment, gender equality, labor market, youth, education, economic decision-making, inheritance, Algeria

الملخص

تحلّل هذه المقالة آراء الشباب بشأن تمكين المرأة والمساواة بين الجنسين في مجالات الولوج إلى التعليم، وسوق العمل، واتخاذ القرار الاقتصادي، والميراث. وعلى الرغم من وفرة الأدبيات التي تناولت هذه القضية، فإن أصالة هذه الدراسة تكمن في تركيزها على فئة الشباب الذين تتراوح أعمارهم بين 15 و29 سنة. وتعتمد المقالة على نتائج المسح الوطني حول الشباب الجزائري "سحوة 2016/2015". ولهذا الغرض، أُجريت تحليلات انحدار رتبي لقياس أثر الخصائص الفردية للشباب في آرائهم. وتُظهر النتائج استمرار الصور النمطية الجندرية، ولا سيما في ما يتعلق بالعمل المأجور،

والسلطة داخل الأسرة، وتوزيع المسؤوليات الاقتصادية. كما يتبين أن الالتحاق بالتعليم الجامعي يسهم في ترسيخ مواقف أكثر انفتاحاً إزاء المساواة، في حين تكشف المواقف المرتبطة بالميراث عن استمرار الثقل المعياري للتمثيلات الدينية. وتبرز الدراسة، في المحصلة، الدور الحاسم للتنشئة الاجتماعية، ولمستوى التعليم، وللأصل الاجتماعي في تشكيل تصوّرات الشباب عن النوع الاجتماعي في الجزائر.

الكلمات المفتاحية

تمكين المرأة، المساواة بين الجنسين، سوق العمل، الشباب، التعليم، اتخاذ القرار الاقتصادي، الميراث، الجزائر

Résumé

Cet article analyse les opinions des jeunes concernant l'autonomisation des femmes et l'égalité entre les sexes dans l'accès à l'éducation, au marché du travail, à la prise de décision économique et à l'héritage. Si la littérature sur cette question est abondante, l'originalité de cette étude réside dans le ciblage spécifique des jeunes âgés de 15 à 29 ans. L'article s'appuie sur l'enquête nationale Sahwa 2015/2016 consacrée à la jeunesse algérienne. À cette fin, des régressions ordinales ont été menées afin d'identifier l'effet des caractéristiques individuelles des jeunes sur leurs opinions. Les résultats montrent la persistance de stéréotypes de genre fortement ancrés, notamment en matière d'emploi, de pouvoir économique et de responsabilités familiales, tandis que la fréquentation universitaire apparaît comme un facteur d'ouverture aux normes égalitaires. Les attitudes relatives à l'héritage soulignent, pour leur part, le poids persistant des représentations religieuses. L'étude met ainsi en évidence le rôle décisif de la socialisation, du niveau d'instruction et de l'origine sociale dans la formation des représentations juvéniles du genre en Algérie.

Mots-clés

autonomisation des femmes, égalité entre les sexes, marché du travail, jeunesse, éducation, prise de décision économique, héritage, Algérie

Introduction

Gender inequalities and women's empowerment in domains such as education, employment, and family decision-making remain central issues in the analysis of gender relations. These inequalities are socially constructed and are sustained by norms and stereotypes governing the division of labour and the roles attributed to each sex; they define, in each sphere of life, what is deemed acceptable or unacceptable for women (Poggi & Waltmann, 2019; Ricard, 2016).

In Algeria, profound social changes have occurred over the last decades, particularly with regard to women's access to education, their integration into the labour market, their access to positions of responsibility, and their participation in political and associative life. Women's visible entry into paid work and their growing capacity to generate income have also contributed to changes in family roles and to a reconfiguration of decision-making processes within households (Hammouda, 2003; Oussedik, 2012). Yet, despite these advances, the renegotiation of women's status and the effective reduction of gender inequalities remain incomplete.

Drawing on the Sahwa 2015/2016 national survey on Algerian youth, this article analyses young people's opinions on women's empowerment and gender equality in access to education, work and employment, economic decision-making, and inheritance rights. Although the literature on these issues is abundant, the originality of the study lies in its specific focus on young people aged 15 to 29. More precisely, the article seeks to determine the extent to which the traditional division of labour—structured around the opposition between women's domestic space and men's external space, and between male paid work and female unpaid work—continues to shape young people's representations, and to identify the individual characteristics most likely to promote or hinder support for equality between women and men.

1. Literature Review: Women's Empowerment in Algeria from Independence to the Present

In traditional patriarchal Algerian society, women's role was largely confined to the domestic sphere and closely tied to reproduction, especially to the birth of a son. Having a boy conferred symbolic protection and a stronger right to speak within the family, while also helping to reproduce the patriarchal order. Although Islamic law explicitly recognizes women's inheritance rights, these rights were often not effectively secured in practice; this helps explain why many women endured repeated pregnancies in the hope of giving birth to a son (Oufriha, 1998).

After independence, however, women's status began to change gradually, especially in relation to access to schooling and employment. This transformation was shaped by a combination of demographic, economic, and institutional factors.

Girls'schooling improved markedly, and the gap between the sexes progressively narrowed. The school attendance rate for girls aged 6 to 14 rose from 36.9% in 1966 to 97.1% in 2019. In secondary education, girls outnumbered boys, accounting for 57% of enrolments in 2020/2021 (Medjoub & Hammouda, 2022). Their academic success also explains their growing presence in higher education, where they represented 50.6% of graduates as early as the 1998/1999 academic year (Ministry of Higher Education, 2011).

The democratization and free provision of education clearly contributed to reducing gender disparities in access to schooling. Yet the mass schooling of girls also resulted from a change in women's aspirations and in their perception of daughters. Oufriha (1998) emphasizes that the real silent revolution lies in women's desires and strategies: many no longer wish their daughters to experience the same destiny as previous generations. They therefore actively encourage girls'schooling, all the more so because mothers and mothers-in-law historically played a central role in the social reproduction of patriarchal practices (Lacoste-Dujardin, 1985; Oufriha, 1998).

Economic transformations also played an important role. The crisis of 1986 and the effects of the structural adjustment plan in 1994—marked by the restructuring of public enterprises, massive layoffs, and rising unemployment—undermined the traditional economic role of men as sole providers. This context encouraged women's labour-market participation, both to support household needs and to secure personal resources (National Office of Statistics, 1989). The contraction of employment opportunities and the decline in living standards contributed to an increase in the supply of female labour, with female labour force growth surpassing the normal growth rate of the female working-age population (National Office of Statistics, 1989).

Women's trajectories nevertheless remained differentiated by educational attainment. Schooling challenged the traditional opposition between women in the private sphere and men in the public sphere by enabling more educated women to enter public space and gain access to paid employment, particularly in the public sector. This, in turn, increased their mobility relative to women who had failed at school or had never attended it (Oussedik, 2011; Talahite, 2008).

A second strategy developed within the domestic sphere itself, through the extension of domestic know-how into income-generating activities such as sewing and embroidery. Historically, this kind of work was especially common among women with little schooling or only vocational training. Today, home-based work remains an important form of female economic activity and includes services such as childcare or the preparation of traditional cakes for religious celebrations and weddings—activities once understood as unpaid social obligations within the family but now increasingly converted into sources of income.

Whatever its form, women's paid work constitutes a major factor of emancipation because it facilitates women's insertion into public spaces traditionally reserved for men. Access to paid employment and contribution to the household budget also allow women to renegotiate their position within the family and to gain greater influence in decision-making (Hammouda, 2003; Oussedik, 2012).

Despite these developments, persistent inequalities remain. Spatial disparities continue to hinder girls'schooling (Medjoub & Hammouda, 2022). Women face greater obstacles in accessing the labour market (Benhabib & Adair, 2017; Hammouda & Medjoub, 2016; Lassassi & Hammouda, 2012; Lassassi & Muller, 2013; Musette, 2013). Their labour-force participation rate remains among the lowest in the world, estimated at 13.8%, while unemployment affects young women and female university graduates particularly strongly, with an unemployment rate of 23.9% (National Office of Statistics, 2019). Marriage and motherhood also increase the likelihood of women's withdrawal from economic activity, especially after the birth of the first child (Lassassi & Hammouda, 2012).

2. Methodology

This article is based on the national survey on Algerian youth conducted by the Centre de Recherche en Économie Appliquée pour le Développement (CREAD) in 2015/2016 within the Sahwa project—Researching Arab Mediterranean Youth. To our knowledge, this remains the only national survey on Algerian youth that simultaneously addresses economic, social, cultural, and political dimensions.

Sahwa was a collaborative research programme led by the Barcelona Centre for International Affairs (CIDOB) and co-financed by the European Commission under its Seventh Framework Programme for Research. The project brought together fifteen partners from Europe and the Arab Mediterranean to investigate youth prospects and perceptions amid social, economic, and political transitions in five Arab countries: Algeria, Egypt, Lebanon, Morocco, and Tunisia (Sahwa Youth Survey, 2016). The authors were members of the Algerian Sahwa research team and participated in both the design and implementation of the survey.

The sample comprised 2,036 young people selected from 2,036 households. It covered 157 districts out of more than 41,000, 139 municipalities out of 1,541, and 32 wilayas out of 48.

Respondents were asked about gender equality in four main domains. In education, they were asked whether education is more important for boys than for girls and whether the same education should be provided to both sexes. In work, employment, and economic decision-making, they were asked whether a married woman should be able to work outside the home if she wishes, whether men and women should enjoy the same job opportunities and salaries, whether men should have priority when jobs are scarce, whether it would be fairer for men to participate in household chores and childcare, and whether men should

be the main economic providers. In inheritance, respondents were asked whether women should enjoy their inheritance rights and whether parity in inheritance is desirable.

For each statement, young people were invited to choose one of four response categories: “Yes, absolutely”, “Yes, somewhat”, “No, not at all”, or “Do not know”. We then estimated ordinal regression models using respondents’ characteristics as explanatory variables: sex, age, level of education, occupational status, marital status, father’s level of education, mother’s level of education, wealth quintile, and place of residence. For each opinion, the statistically significant variables were classified into two groups: characteristics associated with support for equality between women and men, and characteristics associated with resistance to such equality.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. How do young people perceive women’s empowerment and gender equality?

The descriptive analysis of the opinions expressed by young people aged 15 to 29 regarding equality between women and men in access to education, the labour market, decision-making, and inheritance reveals several major tendencies.

A large majority of respondents (85.6%) believe that boys and girls should receive the same education, and nearly two thirds reject the idea that education is more important for boys than for girls. Disaggregated by sex, the results show broad convergence between young women and young men on the principle of equal education. However, although girls defend their right to schooling more strongly than boys do, more than one third of young women still state that education is more important for boys, and more than 45% of young men share that opinion. This result suggests that, despite the growing legitimacy of girls’schooling as a path to social mobility and self-realization, gender stereotypes concerning the value of education remain deeply embedded in the representations of both sexes.

The survey also indicates that a large majority of young people continue to assign men the role of principal economic provider: 85.3% endorse this view. This opinion is shared by a very large majority of young men (87.0%) and by more than four fifths of young women (83.6%). This finding confirms the endurance of a normative model linking masculinity to economic responsibility and authority within the family.

At the same time, strong gender asymmetries appear in attitudes toward women’s employment. Only about two young women out of ten oppose equality between women and men in access to jobs and wages, whereas more than half of young men (54%) reject such equality. More than three quarters of all respondents—and more than 70% of young women—believe that men should

have priority when jobs are scarce. Moreover, 44% of young men oppose the idea that a married woman should be allowed to work outside the home if she wishes.

As regards domestic labour and childcare, nearly two thirds of young men agree that it would be fairer for men to contribute to household chores and care work. Yet almost one quarter of young women oppose this redistribution of domestic tasks and thus continue to defend a strongly gendered division of labour. Support for traditional arrangements is therefore not confined to men; it also informs a significant portion of women's own representations.

Finally, the overwhelming majority of young people of both sexes support women's right to inherit (90.8%). However, more than three quarters reject parity in inheritance shares, including 83.4% of young men and 71.8% of young women. Here, the findings point to the continuing influence of religious norms and interpretations in the formation of attitudes toward equality.

Table 1. Young people's opinions on education

	Young women		Young men		Total	
	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree
Education is more important for boys than for girls.	30.2	69.8	45.1	54.9	37.8	62.3
The same education should be provided to boys and girls.	90.0	10.0	81.4	18.9	85.6	14.4

Source: Sahwa survey on Algerian youth, 2015/2016.

Table 2. Young people's opinions on work, employment, and economic decision-making

	Young women		Young men		Total	
	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree
A married woman should have the opportunity to work outside the home if she wishes.	83.8	16.2	55.8	44.2	69.6	30.4
Men and women should have the same job opportunities and receive the same salaries.	79.5	20.5	46.1	53.9	62.6	37.4
When jobs are scarce, men should have greater access to jobs than women.	70.3	29.7	84.9	15.1	77.7	22.3
It would be fairer if men contributed to household chores and childcare.	75.6	24.4	58.3	41.7	66.8	33.2
Men should be the main economic providers in the family.	83.6	16.4	87.0	13.0	85.3	14.7

Source: Sahwa survey on Algerian youth, 2015/2016.

Table 3. Young people's opinions on inheritance

	Young women		Young men		Total	
	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree
A woman should enjoy her right to inheritance.	92.9	7.1	88.7	11.3	90.8	9.3
Parity in inheritance.	28.2	71.8	16.6	83.4	22.3	77.7

Source: Sahwa survey on Algerian youth, 2015/2016.

3.2. Which sociodemographic characteristics promote or hinder gender equality?

The ordinal regression results confirm the strong effect of two major characteristics on attitudes toward equality between women and men: sex and level of education.

First, being male emerges as a cross-cutting factor associated with resistance to gender equality in all the areas examined. This pattern reflects the persistence of a patriarchal social order that may be defined, following Bonte and Izard (1991), as a form of social and legal organization grounded in male authority. Gender relations remain structured by the economic role historically assigned to men, a point clearly corroborated by the present findings. Indeed, none of the explanatory variables introduced in the models significantly affects the view that men should be the principal economic providers, which suggests that this norm remains broadly shared across the surveyed population. Because the economic role of men continues to legitimize their primacy in access to work, education, and decision-making, young men's opposition to women's empowerment can be understood not only as the effect of patriarchal socialization, but also as a defence of their dominant position within gendered power relations. In this sense, the results support the idea that progress toward equality begins with women's economic empowerment, since access to resources destabilizes patriarchal values and redefines women's place in society (Cova et al., 2009).

Second, educational attainment plays a decisive role. When respondents have a middle level of education or less, or only secondary education, their opinions are more frequently opposed to equality between women and men. By contrast, students display more favourable attitudes toward women's status and rights. The higher the level of education, the more supportive respondents become of women's access to employment and of the rejection of stereotypes concerning the traditional division of labour. University therefore appears as a key site of socialization, capable of transmitting more tolerant values and of weakening inherited prejudices.

Other variables also intervene. Indicators of social origin—father's and mother's education, wealth quintile, and residential setting—help explain several attitudes toward gender equality. Young people from disadvantaged families are more resistant to women's empowerment and to women's access to employment,

especially when work opportunities are scarce; they are also more reluctant to endorse a more equal division of domestic labour.

Place of residence is significant above all for inheritance. Young people living in rural areas are more likely to oppose women's inheritance rights. This may be linked to the relationship to land and to the persistence of patrilineal logics through which property is kept within the male line by depriving women of their effective inheritance rights.

Parental education also matters. Young people whose fathers or mothers are uneducated are more likely to oppose equality between women and men, especially with regard to women's inheritance rights and equality in access to employment and salaries. These findings suggest that low parental schooling favours the intergenerational transmission of gender stereotypes. Conversely, having a mother with secondary education—already a relatively high level in the rural part of the sample—appears to distance young people from traditional norms, particularly on inheritance.

Marital status has a differentiated effect. Being single negatively affects support for the idea that boys and girls should receive the same education and for men's participation in household chores and childcare, but it has a positive effect on support for equality in access to employment and wages.

Age is also significant. The youngest respondents (15—19 years) are more marked by sexist prejudices, especially concerning women's inheritance rights. Respondents aged 20—24 are more likely to oppose a married woman's right to work outside the home if she wishes. Finally, occupational status has a positive effect on opinions regarding the importance of education for both sexes.

Table 4. Sociodemographic characteristics that promote or hinder gender equality

Young people's opinions	Characteristics promoting gender equality	Characteristics hindering gender equality
Education		
Education is more important for boys than for girls.	Worker	Man; middle level or less; secondary level
The same education should be provided to boys and girls.	Student	Man; middle level or less; single
Work and employment		
A married woman should have the opportunity to work outside the home if she wishes.	Student	Man; middle level or less; secondary level; age 20—24
Men and women should have the same job opportunities and receive the same salaries.	Student	Man; respondent with an uneducated mother; middle level of education or less
When jobs are scarce, men should have greater access to jobs than women.	Single	Man; poor

Young people's opinions	Characteristics promoting gender equality	Characteristics hindering gender equality
It would be fairer if men contributed to household chores and childcare.	Student	Man; single; poor
Economic decision-making		
In a family, men should make the decisions.	Respondent with a mother with primary or secondary education	Man; middle level or less; secondary level
Men should be the main economic providers in the family.	—	—
Inheritance		
A woman should enjoy her right to inheritance.	Respondent with a mother with secondary education	Man; respondent with an uneducated father; age 15—19; rural residence

Source: Constructed from the ordinal regression results, Sahwa survey on Algerian youth, 2015/2016.

Conclusion

The Sahwa survey on Algerian youth offers important insight into contemporary representations of equality between women and men in Algeria. The analysis of young people's opinions on women's access to education, the labour market, economic decision-making, and inheritance leads to several main conclusions.

First, gender stereotypes remain deeply rooted in young people's social imagination, especially in relation to economic questions and family authority. Young people of both sexes continue, to a large extent, to associate financial responsibility and headship of the household with men, and they grant men priority in access to employment and wages in times of crisis. Young men are particularly resistant to married women's paid work and to equality in access to jobs and salaries, although they are somewhat more open to men's participation in household chores and childcare. At the same time, a non-negligible proportion of young women also defend the traditional division of labour based on the opposition between women's domestic work and men's paid work. Such internalized norms may partly contribute to women's self-censorship in relation to employment.

Second, although most respondents agree that girls and boys should receive the same education, stereotypes concerning the relative importance of education for boys remain present among both sexes. Inheritance attitudes reveal another important line of tension: while the vast majority recognize women's right to inherit, most respondents reject parity in inheritance shares, highlighting the enduring weight of religiously grounded normative representations.

Third, the regression analyses show that sex and educational attainment are the most decisive explanatory variables. Being male consistently appears as a factor

of systemic inequality across the domains studied, whereas university education has a positive effect on support for gender equality. Higher education thus appears not merely as a channel of certification, but also as a socializing experience capable of fostering more tolerant values and weakening inherited prejudices.

Finally, disadvantaged social origin, parental illiteracy, younger age, and rural residence all tend to be associated with greater resistance to women's empowerment. Marital status and occupational status also shape attitudes in differentiated ways. Taken together, these findings underscore the need to understand gender equality not simply as a legal or policy issue, but as a question of socialization, symbolic order, and intergenerational transmission.

Bibliography

- Benhabib, L., & Adair, P. (2017). Inequalities and discrimination in hiring in the Algerian labor market. *Revue française d'économie*, 32(2), 107—134. <https://doi.org/10.3917/rfe.172.0107>
- Bonte, P., & Izard, M. (1991). *Dictionnaire de l'ethnologie et de l'anthropologie*. PUF.
- Cova, A., et al. (2009). *Histoire comparée des femmes: Nouvelles approches*. ENS Éditions.
- Lacoste-Dujardin, C. (1985). Mothers against women: Maternity and patriarchy in the Maghreb. *Revue de l'Occident musulman et de la Méditerranée*, 40, 180—181. https://www.persee.fr/doc/remmm_0035—1474_1985_num_40_1_2103_t1_0180_0000_2
- Hammouda, N. (2003). Test of a typology of Algerian households according to their activity behavior. In *Gender and Labor Market Conference*, Rabat. <http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/2.1.4027.5847>
- Hammouda, N., & Medjoub, R. (2016). Women with higher education qualifications facing unemployment. *Gouvernance et économie sociale*, 2(2), 25—46. <https://www.asjp.cerist.dz/en/downArticle/331/2/2/89997>
- Lassassi, M., & Hammouda, N. (2012). 50 years of independence: What evolution of the labor market situation in Algeria? *Les Cahiers du CREAD*, 100, 101—136. <https://www.asjp.cerist.dz/en/article/2052>
- Lassassi, M., & Muller, C. (2013). Social networks and integration into the labor market in Algeria. *Economic Research Forum Working Paper Series*, 756. <https://erf.org.eg/app/uploads/2014/07/756.pdf>
- Ministry of Higher Education. (2011). *Yearbook 40, 2010/2011*. Unpublished document.
- Musette, M. S. (2013). The labor market in Algeria: A new vision? *Algerian Business Days: Employment, Training and Employability*, Forum des chefs d'entreprise (FCE), CREAD, Algiers. https://old.adapt.it/adapt-index-a-z/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/musette_le_march%C3%A9_du_travail_en_alg%C3%A9rie_2013.pdf

- National Office of Statistics. (1989). Analysis of the active population in Algeria, project ALG/1989/013. Unpublished document.
- National Office of Statistics. (2019). Activity, employment and unemployment in May 2019 (No. 879). https://www.ons.dz/IMG/pdf/emploi_chom_mai_2019.pdf
- Oufriha, F.-Z. (1998). Les femmes algériennes: La révolution silencieuse? *Monde arabe*, 162, 57—68. <https://doi.org/10.3917/machr1.162.0057>
- Oussedik, F. (Ed.). (2012). *Projet national de recherche 31/2012: Mutations familiales en milieu urbain*. DGRSDT & CRASC. <https://pnr.crasc.dz/index.php/fr/les-pnr/32-attitudes,-comportements,-et-family-mutations>
- Oussedik, F. (2011). Postcolonie et rapports de genre en Algérie. *Tumultes*, 37, 81—98. <https://doi.org/10.3917/tumu.037.0081>
- Poggi, C., & Waltmann, J. (2019). The (re)production of gender inequalities in the world of work: From legal discrimination to empowerment. In C. Poggi & J. Waltmann (Eds.), *The (re)production of gender inequalities in the world of work: From legal discrimination to empowerment* (pp. 1—36). Éditions AFD. <https://doi.org/10.3917/afd.poggi.2019.02.0001>
- Medjoub, R., & Hammouda, N. E. (2022). Educational system and social and spatial inequalities in Algeria sixty years after independence. *Les Cahiers du CREAD*, 38(3), 555—582. <https://www.asjp.cerist.dz/en/article/197250>
- Ricard, J. (2016). The essentials on gender and development issues—Pause Genre. <https://www.afd.fr/fr/essentiel-entreprises-genre-et-developpement-pause-genre>
- Sahwa Youth Survey. (2016). Researching Arab Mediterranean youth: Survey documentation and project overview. SAHWA Project / CIDOB.
- Talahite, F. (2008). Algeria: Women's employment in transition. <https://shs.hal.science/halshs-00203648/documentAppendices>

Appendix

The appendix reproduces the main sampling information and the detailed ordinal regression outputs used in the analysis. For reasons of readability and editorial balance, these large statistical tables are kept in the appendix, while the main text retains only the synthetic tables strictly necessary to follow the argument. The appended tables have been reformatted for readability while preserving the underlying values reported in the source manuscript.

The sampling frame for the Algerian Youth Survey consisted of 1,120 districts together with updated household lists initially prepared for the Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS4), conducted by the Ministry of Health, Population, and Hospital Reform between December 2012 and January 2013. This frame was itself drawn from a broader database of more than 41,000 districts established during the 2008 General Population and Housing Census.

CREAD updated the frame in 2012 by selecting a subsample of districts from the MICS4 survey. The final youth survey sample comprised 2,036 households distributed across the national territory.

The survey used a two-stage probability sample without replacement. In the first stage, 157 clusters were drawn from the 1,120 clusters included in MICS4. In the second stage, 13 households were selected in each cluster, for an initial total of 2,041 households. Within these households, 2,036 young people aged 15 to 29 constituted the target population; five cases were excluded after fieldwork because the respondents were outside the age range selected for the survey.

The sampled clusters were stratified by Territorial Programming Area (TPA) and by place of residence (urban versus rural). TPAs are territorial planning zones defined within the framework of the Algerian National Land Use Plan (Schéma national d'aménagement du territoire).

The same proportions observed in the universe were used to determine the number of sampled clusters. Sampled clusters were then drawn by place of residence within each territorial programming area. Finally, households were selected with equal probabilities within each sampled cluster. Households without any young person aged 15 to 29 were not surveyed and were replaced directly in the field.

Appendix Table A1. Proportion of clusters in the universe and in the sample by place of residence

TPA	Universe			Sample		
	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural	Total
North-Center	19.1	12.6	31.7	18.5	12.1	30.6
North-East	9.3	5.4	14.7	10.8	5.7	16.6

TPA	Universe			Sample		
	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural	Total
North-West	9.8	5.2	15.0	8.9	5.7	14.6
Central Highlands	4.7	2.8	7.5	4.5	2.5	7.0
Eastern Highlands	8.3	6.2	14.6	8.3	6.4	14.6
Western Highlands	3.7	2.2	5.8	3.8	2.5	6.4
Southern Highlands	7.3	3.4	10.7	7.0	3.2	10.2
Total	62.2	37.8	100.0	61.8	38.2	100.0

Appendix Table A2. Ordinal regression output: Education is more important for boys than for girls

		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.		
		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Lower bound	Upper bound
Threshold	1 Agree strongly	-2.394	0.273	76.783	1	0.000	-2.930	-1.859
Threshold	2 Agree	-1.097	0.269	16.688	1	0.000	-1.624	-0.571
Threshold	3 Disagree	0.485	0.268	3.280	1	0.070	-0.040	1.009
Location	Male	-0.761	0.089	73.647	1	0.000	-0.935	-0.587
Location	Female	0a			0			
Location	No education (father)	-0.095	0.187	0.258	1	0.612	-0.462	0.272
Location	Primary	-0.016	0.188	0.007	1	0.934	-0.385	0.354
Location	Middle	-0.110	0.181	0.369	1	0.543	-0.464	0.244
Location	Secondary	-0.256	0.182	1.968	1	0.161	-0.613	0.102
Location	Higher	0a			0			
Location	No education (mother)	0.097	0.248	0.154	1	0.695	-0.388	0.583
Location	Primary	0.368	0.253	2.112	1	0.146	-0.128	0.865
Location	Middle	0.032	0.251	0.017	1	0.898	-0.460	0.524
Location	Secondary	0.333	0.245	1.847	1	0.174	-0.147	0.813
Location	Higher	0a			0			
Location	employed	0.242	0.107	5.168	1	0.023	0.033	0.451
Location	student	0.000	0.123	0.000	1	0.998	-0.240	0.241

		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.		
		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Lower bound	Upper bound
Location	NEET	0a			0			
Location	Middle or less (young)	-0.448	0.123	13.160	1	0.000	-0.689	-0.206
Location	secondary	-0.308	0.118	6.736	1	0.009	-0.540	-0.075
Location	Higher	0a			0			
Location	Single	-0.103	0.145	0.503	1	0.478	-0.387	0.181
Location	Married	0a			0			
Location	1 < = 19	0.230	0.131	3.110	1	0.078	-0.026	0.486
Location	2 20—24	0.059	0.104	0.320	1	0.572	-0.144	0.261
Location	3 25+	0a			0			

Note. The notation 0a indicates the reference category used in the model output.

Appendix Table A3. Ordinal regression output: The same education should be provided to boys and girls

		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.		
		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Lower bound	Upper bound
Threshold	1 Agree strongly	1.006	0.291	11.965	1	0.001	0.436	1.576
Threshold	2 Agree	3.210	0.299	115.004	1	0.000	2.624	3.797
Threshold	3 Disagree	4.981	0.323	237.673	1	0.000	4.348	5.614
Location	Male	0.733	0.093	61.983	1	0.000	0.551	0.916
Location	Female	0a			0			
Location	No education (father)	0.128	0.199	0.411	1	0.522	-0.263	0.518
Location	Primary	-0.120	0.201	0.356	1	0.550	-0.514	0.274
Location	Middle	-0.053	0.192	0.075	1	0.784	-0.429	0.324
Location	Secondary	-0.025	0.194	0.017	1	0.898	-0.405	0.355
Location	Higher	0a			0			

		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.		
		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Lower bound	Upper bound
Location	No education (mother)	0.353	0.270	1.716	1	0.190	-0.175	0.881
Location	Primary	0.331	0.274	1.458	1	0.227	-0.206	0.868
Location	Middle	0.118	0.272	0.190	1	0.663	-0.414	0.651
Location	Secondary	0.139	0.265	0.276	1	0.599	-0.380	0.658
Location	Higher	0a			0			
Location	employed	-0.124	0.112	1.220	1	0.269	-0.343	0.096
Location	student	-0.317	0.130	5.998	1	0.014	-0.571	-0.063
Location	NEET	0a			0			
Location	Middle or less (young)	0.326	0.131	6.210	1	0.013	0.070	0.582
Location	secondary	0.217	0.126	2.980	1	0.084	-0.029	0.463
Location	Higher	0a			0			
Location	Single	0.548	0.157	12.197	1	0.000	0.240	0.855
Location	Married	0a			0			
Location	1 <= 19	0.202	0.137	2.164	1	0.141	-0.067	0.471
Location	2 20—24	0.100	0.109	0.838	1	0.360	-0.114	0.314
Location	3 25+	0a			0			
Location	Rural	0.071	0.096	0.547	1	0.460	-0.117	0.259
Location	Urban	0a			0			

Note. The notation 0a indicates the reference category used in the model output.

Appendix Table A4. Ordinal regression output: In a family, men should make the decisions

		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.		
		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Lower bound	Upper bound
Threshold	1 Agree strongly	-1.046	0.276	14.390	1	0.000	-1.586	-0.506
Threshold	2 Agree	0.539	0.275	3.852	1	0.050	0.001	1.078

		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.		
		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Lower bound	Upper bound
Threshold	3 Disagree	2.358	0.285	68.588	1	0.000	1.800	2.916
Location	Male	-1.165	0.092	159.959	1	0.000	-1.346	-0.985
Location	Female	0a			0			
Location	No education (father)	-0.196	0.191	1.054	1	0.305	-0.571	0.178
Location	Primary	-0.326	0.193	2.846	1	0.092	-0.704	0.053
Location	Middle	-0.126	0.184	0.474	1	0.491	-0.486	0.233
Location	Secondary	-0.296	0.186	2.525	1	0.112	-0.661	0.069
Location	Higher	0a			0			
Location	No education (mother)	0.491	0.259	3.593	1	0.058	-0.017	0.998
Location	Primary	0.720	0.263	7.507	1	0.006	0.205	1.236
Location	Middle	0.275	0.261	1.104	1	0.293	-0.238	0.787
Location	Secondary	0.558	0.254	4.816	1	0.028	0.060	1.056
Location	Higher	0a			0			
Location	employed	0.184	0.110	2.804	1	0.094	-0.031	0.400
Location	student	-0.042	0.126	0.114	1	0.736	-0.289	0.204
Location	NEET	0a			0			
Location	Middle or less (young)	-0.445	0.125	12.567	1	0.000	-0.691	-0.199
Location	secondary	-0.440	0.120	13.386	1	0.000	-0.676	-0.204
Location	Higher	0a			0			
Location	Single	-0.010	0.147	0.005	1	0.944	-0.299	0.278
Location	Married	0a			0			
Location	1 < = 19	0.172	0.134	1.647	1	0.199	-0.091	0.435
Location	2 20—24	0.116	0.106	1.181	1	0.277	-0.093	0.324
Location	3 25+	0a			0			
Location	Rural	0.020	0.093	0.045	1	0.832	-0.163	0.203
Location	Urban	0a			0			

Note. The notation 0a indicates the reference category used in the model output.

Appendix Table A5. Ordinal regression output: A married woman should have the opportunity to work outside the home if she wishes

		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.		
		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Lower bound	Upper bound
Threshold	1 Agree strongly	0.499	0.280	3.187	1	0.074	-0.049	1.048
Threshold	2 Agree	2.691	0.287	87.865	1	0.000	2.128	3.253
Threshold	3 Disagree	4.232	0.296	203.985	1	0.000	3.651	4.813
Location	Male	1.296	0.095	187.727	1	0.000	1.111	1.481
Location	Female	0a			0			
Location	No education (father)	0.374	0.195	3.688	1	0.055	-0.008	0.756
Location	Primary	0.132	0.197	0.449	1	0.503	-0.254	0.517
Location	Middle	0.150	0.188	0.640	1	0.424	-0.218	0.518
Location	Secondary	0.403	0.189	4.528	1	0.033	0.032	0.774
Location	Higher	0a			0			
Location	No education (mother)	0.366	0.261	1.975	1	0.160	-0.145	0.877
Location	Primary	0.080	0.265	0.090	1	0.764	-0.440	0.599
Location	Middle	0.216	0.263	0.678	1	0.410	-0.298	0.731
Location	Secondary	0.117	0.256	0.208	1	0.648	-0.385	0.619
Location	Higher	0a			0			
Location	employed	-0.127	0.109	1.362	1	0.243	-0.341	0.087
Location	student	-0.401	0.127	10.031	1	0.002	-0.649	-0.153
Location	NEET	0a			0			
Location	Middle or less (young)	0.684	0.128	28.658	1	0.000	0.434	0.934
Location	secondary	0.256	0.122	4.362	1	0.037	0.016	0.496
Location	Higher	0a			0			
Location	Single	0.235	0.150	2.453	1	0.117	-0.059	0.529
Location	Married	0a			0			
Location	1 < = 19	0.235	0.134	3.079	1	0.079	-0.028	0.498
Location	2 20—24	0.222	0.107	4.347	1	0.037	0.013	0.431
Location	3 25+	0a			0			
Location	Rural	0.029	0.094	0.099	1	0.753	-0.154	0.213
Location	Urban	0a			0			

Note. The notation 0a indicates the reference category used in the model output.

Appendix Table A6. Ordinal regression output: Men and women should have the same job opportunities and receive the same salaries

		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.		
		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Lower bound	Upper bound
Threshold	1 Agree strongly	-0.054	0.273	0.039	1	0.843	-0.590	0.481
Threshold	2 Agree	1.803	0.277	42.466	1	0.000	1.261	2.346
Threshold	3 Disagree	3.501	0.285	150.624	1	0.000	2.942	4.061
Location	Male	1.430	0.094	232.723	1	0.000	1.246	1.614
Location	Female	0a			0			
Location	No education (father)	-0.231	0.191	1.473	1	0.225	-0.605	0.142
Location	Primary	-0.234	0.192	1.482	1	0.223	-0.611	0.143
Location	Middle	-0.199	0.183	1.179	1	0.277	-0.559	0.160
Location	Secondary	0.105	0.185	0.320	1	0.571	-0.258	0.467
Location	Higher	0a			0			
Location	No education (mother)	0.540	0.255	4.477	1	0.034	0.040	1.041
Location	Primary	0.295	0.260	1.292	1	0.256	-0.214	0.804
Location	Middle	0.256	0.257	0.995	1	0.319	-0.248	0.760
Location	Secondary	0.165	0.251	0.434	1	0.510	-0.326	0.656
Location	Higher	0a			0			
Location	employed	0.010	0.108	0.009	1	0.926	-0.201	0.221
Location	student	-0.362	0.125	8.408	1	0.004	-0.607	-0.117
Location	NEET	0a			0			
Location	Middle or less (young)	0.445	0.125	12.625	1	0.000	0.200	0.691
Location	secondary	0.163	0.120	1.832	1	0.176	-0.073	0.399
Location	Higher	0a			0			
Location	Single	-0.005	0.147	0.001	1	0.975	-0.293	0.284
Location	Married	0a			0			
Location	1 < = 19	0.197	0.133	2.207	1	0.137	-0.063	0.457
Location	2 20—24	0.188	0.105	3.197	1	0.074	-0.018	0.394
Location	3 25+	0a			0			
Location	Rural	-0.014	0.092	0.022	1	0.881	-0.195	0.167
Location	Urban	0a			0			

Note. The notation 0a indicates the reference category used in the model output.

Appendix Table A7. Ordinal regression output: Men should be the primary economic providers in the family

		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.		
		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Lower bound	Upper bound
Threshold	1 Agree strongly	0.527	0.286	3.400	1	0.065	-0.033	1.087
Threshold	2 Agree	2.321	0.291	63.676	1	0.000	1.751	2.892
Threshold	3 Disagree	4.003	0.312	164.333	1	0.000	3.391	4.615
Location	Male	-0.046	0.091	0.254	1	0.615	-0.225	0.133
Location	Female	0a			0			
Location	No education (father)	0.199	0.197	1.012	1	0.314	-0.188	0.585
Location	Primary	0.044	0.199	0.050	1	0.823	-0.346	0.435
Location	Middle	0.142	0.190	0.562	1	0.453	-0.230	0.514
Location	Secondary	0.107	0.192	0.310	1	0.578	-0.269	0.483
Location	Higher	0a			0			
Location	No education (mother)	0.306	0.267	1.312	1	0.252	-0.217	0.829
Location	Primary	0.350	0.271	1.668	1	0.197	-0.181	0.882
Location	Middle	0.244	0.269	0.822	1	0.364	-0.283	0.771
Location	Secondary	0.280	0.262	1.136	1	0.286	-0.235	0.794
Location	Higher	0a			0			
Location	employed	0.011	0.112	0.010	1	0.922	-0.208	0.230
Location	student	0.060	0.128	0.216	1	0.642	-0.192	0.311
Location	NEET	0a			0			
Location	Middle or less (young)	-0.115	0.128	0.796	1	0.372	-0.366	0.137
Location	secondary	-0.104	0.123	0.714	1	0.398	-0.345	0.137
Location	Higher	0a			0			
Location	Single	0.264	0.154	2.945	1	0.086	-0.037	0.565
Location	Married	0a			0			
Location	1 <= 19	-0.080	0.137	0.342	1	0.559	-0.348	0.188
Location	2 20—24	0.020	0.108	0.033	1	0.856	-0.193	0.232
Location	3 25+	0a			0			
Location	Rural	0.019	0.095	0.039	1	0.844	-0.168	0.205

		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.		
		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Lower bound	Upper bound
Location	Urban	0a			0			

Note. The notation 0a indicates the reference category used in the model output.

Appendix Table A8. Ordinal regression output: Women should enjoy their right to inheritance

		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.		
		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Lower bound	Upper bound
Threshold	1 Agree strongly	0.629	0.290	4.711	1	0.030	0.061	1.197
Threshold	2 Agree	3.023	0.299	102.007	1	0.000	2.436	3.609
Threshold	3 Disagree	4.072	0.314	167.889	1	0.000	3.456	4.688
Location	Male	0.414	0.094	19.289	1	0.000	0.230	0.599
Location	Female	0a			0			
Location	No education (father)	0.527	0.207	6.487	1	0.011	0.122	0.933
Location	Primary	0.386	0.209	3.416	1	0.065	-0.023	0.796
Location	Middle	0.322	0.201	2.582	1	0.108	-0.071	0.716
Location	Secondary	0.286	0.202	2.000	1	0.157	-0.111	0.683
Location	Higher	0a			0			
Location	No education (mother)	0.017	0.270	0.004	1	0.951	-0.512	0.545
Location	Primary	-0.256	0.275	0.865	1	0.352	-0.795	0.283
Location	Middle	-0.569	0.274	4.306	1	0.038	-1.106	-0.032
Location	Secondary	-0.310	0.266	1.357	1	0.244	-0.831	0.211
Location	Higher	0a			0			
Location	employed	-0.117	0.114	1.043	1	0.307	-0.340	0.107
Location	student	-0.167	0.132	1.598	1	0.206	-0.425	0.092
Location	NEET	0a			0			
Location	Middle or less (young)	0.081	0.132	0.371	1	0.542	-0.179	0.340

		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.		
		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Lower bound	Upper bound
Location	secondary	0.032	0.128	0.061	1	0.805	-0.219	0.282
Location	Higher	0a			0			
Location	Single	0.093	0.156	0.355	1	0.551	-0.213	0.399
Location	Married	0a			0			
Location	1 <= 19	0.319	0.140	5.217	1	0.022	0.045	0.594
Location	2 20—24	0.116	0.111	1.083	1	0.298	-0.102	0.334
Location	3 25+	0a			0			
Location	Rural	0.212	0.097	4.790	1	0.029	0.022	0.403
Location	Urban	0a			0			

Note. The notation 0a indicates the reference category used in the model output.

Appendix Table A9. Ordinal regression output: In times of job scarcity, men should have more employment rights than women

		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.		
		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Lower bound	Upper bound
Threshold	1 Agree strongly	-0.021	0.280	0.006	1	0.940	-0.569	0.527
Threshold	2 Agree	1.644	0.282	33.898	1	0.000	1.091	2.197
Threshold	3 Disagree	2.996	0.291	105.755	1	0.000	2.425	3.567
Location	Male	-0.736	0.092	64.501	1	0.000	-0.915	-0.556
Location	Female	0a			0			
Location	No education (father)	0.241	0.196	1.509	1	0.219	-0.143	0.625
Location	Primary	-0.066	0.198	0.110	1	0.740	-0.454	0.322
Location	Middle	0.250	0.188	1.776	1	0.183	-0.118	0.618
Location	Secondary	0.075	0.190	0.156	1	0.693	-0.297	0.447
Location	Higher	0a			0			
Location	No education (mother)	0.371	0.263	1.999	1	0.157	-0.143	0.886
Location	Primary	0.168	0.267	0.397	1	0.528	-0.355	0.692

		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.		
		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Lower bound	Upper bound
Location	Middle	0.268	0.263	1.037	1	0.308	-0.248	0.784
Location	Secondary	0.409	0.256	2.540	1	0.111	-0.094	0.911
Location	Higher	0a			0			
Location	employed	-0.184	0.112	2.692	1	0.101	-0.403	0.036
Location	student	0.022	0.127	0.030	1	0.863	-0.227	0.270
Location	NEET	0a			0			
Location	Middle or less (young)	0.065	0.128	0.263	1	0.608	-0.185	0.316
Location	secondary	-0.097	0.122	0.624	1	0.430	-0.336	0.143
Location	Higher	0a			0			
Location	Single	0.477	0.153	9.704	1	0.002	0.177	0.778
Location	Married	0a			0			
Location	1 < = 19	-0.061	0.136	0.200	1	0.655	-0.327	0.205
Location	2 20—24	0.025	0.108	0.054	1	0.817	-0.187	0.237
Location	3 25+	0a			0			
Location	Rural	0.044	0.096	0.209	1	0.647	-0.144	0.232
Location	Urban	0a			0			
Location	Poor	-0.287	0.110	6.836	1	0.009	-0.502	-0.072
Location	Middle	-0.153	0.115	1.790	1	0.181	-0.378	0.071
Location	Rich	0a			0			

Note. The notation 0a indicates the reference category used in the model output.

Appendix Table A10. Ordinal regression output: It would be more equitable if men participated in household chores and childcare

		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.		
		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Lower bound	Upper bound
Threshold	1 Agree strongly	0.110	0.275	0.160	1	0.690	-0.430	0.649
Threshold	2 Agree	2.126	0.280	57.602	1	0.000	1.577	2.675
Threshold	3 Disagree	3.410	0.286	141.715	1	0.000	2.849	3.972
Location	Male	0.759	0.091	69.172	1	0.000	0.580	0.937

		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.		
		Estimate	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Lower bound	Upper bound
Location	Female	0a			0			
Location	No education (father)	0.231	0.195	1.412	1	0.235	-0.150	0.613
Location	Primary	0.179	0.196	0.835	1	0.361	-0.205	0.563
Location	Middle	0.162	0.187	0.755	1	0.385	-0.203	0.528
Location	Secondary	0.054	0.188	0.082	1	0.774	-0.315	0.423
Location	Higher	0a			0			
Location	No education (mother)	0.132	0.258	0.262	1	0.609	-0.374	0.638
Location	Primary	0.110	0.262	0.176	1	0.675	-0.404	0.625
Location	Middle	0.174	0.259	0.449	1	0.503	-0.334	0.681
Location	Secondary	0.102	0.252	0.165	1	0.685	-0.392	0.597
Location	Higher	0a			0			
Location	employed	-0.013	0.110	0.014	1	0.906	-0.228	0.202
Location	student	-0.259	0.126	4.255	1	0.039	-0.506	-0.013
Location	NEET	0a			0			
Location	Middle or less (young)	0.237	0.127	3.494	1	0.062	-0.012	0.486
Location	secondary	0.111	0.122	0.834	1	0.361	-0.127	0.349
Location	Higher	0a			0			
Location	Single	0.435	0.151	8.316	1	0.004	0.139	0.730
Location	Married	0a			0			
Location	1 < = 19	0.239	0.134	3.176	1	0.075	-0.024	0.502
Location	2 20—24	0.096	0.107	0.808	1	0.369	-0.113	0.305
Location	3 25+	0a			0			
Location	Rural	0.144	0.095	2.317	1	0.128	-0.041	0.330
Location	Urban	0a			0			
Location	Poor	0.280	0.108	6.727	1	0.009	0.068	0.491
Location	Middle	0.087	0.113	0.587	1	0.444	-0.135	0.309
Location	Rich	0a			0			

Note. The notation 0a indicates the reference category used in the model output.