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Abstract

The purpose of this research was to understand how refugee and Jordanian adolescents perceive safety by answering the following three questions: 1) How do adolescents in host communities define safety? 2) How do they perceive the safety of their community? 3) What is being done, within their communities, to address the safety needs of adolescents? By answering these questions, this research aimed to increase the understanding of how safety should be defined, assessed, and addressed in regards to adolescents living in Jordanian host communities. Due to resources limitations, this research was only conducted with Syrian adolescents refugees. Four interviews were conducted at a housing community in Baqa’a and twenty surveys were conducted in a housing community run by Al Takaful Charity in Ramtha. This research resulted in a number of findings regarding participants’ experiences of safety within their community. The most notable are: many participants had poor access to extracurricular programming, felt
unsafe in their community or felt that their community was divided, and had little knowledge of or confidence in conflict prevention and resolution programs in their community. Additionally, while all participants gave a definition of safety that was focused on freedom from danger and and safe access to basic resources, a majority of participants agreed that social cohesion was a component of safety. This finding suggest that further research should be done to gain a better understanding of the role that social cohesion plays in individuals perceptions of safety and to determine whether a more comprehensive definition of safety needs to be use in safety and protection assessments conducted by humanitarian agencies working with adolescents in Jordan.

Key Words:
Peace & Social Justice, Mental Health, Public Health, Social Sciences: General, Psychology: General

Introduction
At the point of writing, the UNHCR has registered 654,141 refugees in Jordan, a population consisting primarily of Syrian refugees, but also including individuals of Iraqi, Sudanese, Somali, and other origins (UNHCR, 2015). This great number does not include the large number of unregistered refugees and people of concern also residing in Jordan, some of whom were interviewed for this study. The UNHCR states that it’s foremost priority in Jordan is ensuring “that Jordan's largely favorable protection environment is maintained in 2015” (UNHCR, 2015). In other words, the UNHCR and its partner organizations are primarily concerned with ensuring that refugees and non-refugees in Jordan can live free of fear and free of
want. Guaranteeing this human right, it essence, means ensuring that all individuals feel safe and truly are safe.

This research was designed after a review of assessments conducted by IOs and NGOs with both camp and non-camp refugees in Jordan indicated that holes may exist in the way that the humanitarian community is evaluating safety. In the assessments reviewed, safety (often referred to as protection) was often narrowly defined as freedom from physical or emotional harm, and only occasionally as freedom from want, a minimum standards definition of safety. Many of the assessments did not seem to assess refugees’ experiences with factors of social cohesion at all, while others only evaluated these topics as something separate from safety. This siloed evaluation neglects to recognize the role that social cohesion (i.e., membership, inclusion, and integration) plays in community safety.

Evidence shows that breakdowns in social cohesion are often both a cause and effect of increasing levels of community insecurity (Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery, 2009). Failing to recognize this intersectionality limits refugees, humanitarian workers, and governments from responding to safety needs in a comprehensive, efficient and effective manner. While this seems like a glaring hole, it is, of course, plausible that such a comprehensive definition is not warranted because, for one reason or another, social cohesion does not impact refugees’ perceptions of safety. This research, was subsequently designed to see if this is the case. It was also noted that few assessments specifically assessed adolescents’ perceptions of safety. Instead, adolescents were often considered “youth” or “young adults” despite their unique developmental stage that differentiates them from other members of these groups.

1 “Minimum standards of safety” is a term referring to a definition of safety focused on factors that present a direct and immediate threat to life or physical well-being. Refer to “Terms” on page 7 for a complete definition.
The purpose of this research, therefore, was to understand how refugee and Jordanian adolescents perceive safety. This was to be done by answering the following three questions: 1) How do adolescents in host communities define safety? 2) How do they perceive the safety of their community? 3) What is being done, within their communities, to address the safety needs of adolescents? By answering these questions, this research aimed to clarify whether a minimum standards of safety definition was sufficient for assessing the safety of adolescents living in Jordan.

While the topic of comprehensive safety is pertinent to refugee adolescents living in camps and living in host communities, this research exclusively focused on adolescents in host communities. This decision was made for two reasons. First, due to current security protocols, it is very difficult to gain access to refugee camps to conduct research, particularly within the short time period in which this research was conducted. Second, the presence of non-refugee individual in host communities introduces a number of additional variables to the safety of the community. The presence of non-refugee and refugee individuals (likely of different nationalities) means that social cohesion may be difficult and integration a greater concern. This, theoretically, would increase feelings of insecurity, which would impact both refugee and non-refugee populations, likely in differing ways. Because of the increased complexity of the safety situation in host communities, focusing on host communities seemed more pertinent.

Interviews and surveys were designed to be conducted with adolescent Jordanians and adolescent refugees living in Jordanian host communities. Due to various obstacles, data was only gathered from Syrian adolescents. Four interviews were conducted at a housing community
in Baqa’a and twenty surveys were conducted in Ramtha, at a housing community run by Al Takaful Charity.

Terms:

**Adolescents**: youth between the ages of 13 and 17.

**Minimum standards of safety (MSS)**: this is a basic definition which defines safety as freedom from physical danger and freedom from want. It can also be phrased as freedom from those things which create an immediate and direct threat to life (gunshots, inaccessible food and water, threats of physical assault, etc.). This definition was created by the researcher for its specific use in this project.

**Safety**: freedom from physical and emotional danger, freedom from persecution, bullying, and harassment, freedom from want, as well as having a strong, positive experience of social cohesion.

**Social cohesion**: the presence of the following within one’s community; bridging relationships, access to resources that reflect one’s culture, identity, and ethnicity; opportunities for empowerment and community participation; sense of community belonging.

**UNDP**: United Nations Development Program

**UNHCR**: United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

**UNICEF**: United Nation’s Children's Fund

**WFP**: United Nations World Food Programme

Literature Review
Intersectionality of safety and social cohesion

The UNDP identified “enhancing community security and social cohesion” as one of its outcomes under its 2008-2013 Strategic Plan, in recognition of the need to globally address these two concerns in an integrated faction. As part of their approach, the UNDP recognized that breakdowns in social cohesion can be both a cause and a consequence of increasing insecurity within communities. Social cohesion consists of two core dimensions; the reduction of social disparities, inequalities, and social exclusion and the strengthening of social relationships, specifically bridging relationships. Both of these dimensions play an integral role in the safety and security of communities. Income inequality is found to be strongly correlated to rates of violence, more so than absolute poverty rates. Inequitable opportunities for empowerment and voice have also been linked with increased insecurity, particularly in instances where alternative opportunities for empowerment, such as involvement with gangs, organized crime and extremist groups are available. Social exclusion and inequality increase the insecurity felt by disadvantaged populations, and subsequently may lead those disadvantaged groups, with few alternative means of recourse, to take action that may negatively impact the security of other populations within the community. (Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery, 2009)

Just as a lack of social equity and inclusion enhances community insecurity, so does a lack of social relationships and social capital. Factors of social capital include bridging social networks, opportunities for social empowerment, responsiveness of local institutions, social membership (including a sense of shared past, present, and future), and a tolerance and respect for diversity, both individually and institutionally. The more social capital that exists between community members and the more responsive institutions are to communities, the more likely
communities are to possess the mechanisms required to address conflict before it turns violent (Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery, 2009). A greater sense of community may also provide individuals with a stronger sense of control when addressing external threats (McMillan, 1986). Social cohesion, therefore, not only impacts absolute measures of safety, but also influences individuals’ subjective experiences and perceptions of community safety.

**Why adolescents?**

For this research, adolescents are considered those youth between the ages of 13 and 17. As codified by the Convention on the Rights of the Child, adolescents have the same rights as younger children. However, due to their more vulnerable and dependent nature, younger children are often given priority when it comes to allocating aid and development resources, both nationally and internationally. While this is understandable, it is important that a concerted effort is made to ensure that the needs of adolescents are being addressed and their rights are being upheld. Adolescence is a period in which social disparities often become more apparent and social inequalities are easily perpetuated across generations. Investing in adolescents, therefore, is an important step in addressing social inequities, which impact all ages groups (UNICEF, 2011).

Among the multitude of risks and needs specific to adolescents is adolescents’ increased likelihood to be impacted by violence. Males between 15 and 24 are the the most likely to be the victims and perpetrators of armed violence in most countries. This is particularly evident in societies where youth have little opportunity for personal empowerment in family and community settings, such as in strongly hierarchical or patriarchal societies, which could easily be argued are characteristics of Jordanian society. With limited opportunities for positive youth
empowerment, such as civic engagement, youth are more likely to turn to other sources of empowerment such as participation in gangs or fundamentalist activities. (Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery, 2009)

Article 12 of the Convention on the State of the World’s Children recognizes youths’ right to express their views in all matters pertaining to themselves and for their opinions to be given weight accordingly. Unfortunately, adolescents are often denied the ability to not only voice their opinion, but to have their opinion taken seriously. This occurs while government employees, humanitarian workers, teachers, parents (all otherwise referred to as adults) make decisions on topics that often specifically and exclusively affect youth. This neglect for adolescents’ right to participation partially results from the belief that adolescents are at at different developmental stage and are therefore not able or ready to be involved in such impactful decisions. However, this different developmental stage means that adolescents experience their daily lives in a manner very different from both adults and younger children.

Ideally, the daily life of an adolescent is structured differently than that of an adult because the youth spends a significant part of their day at school rather than at work or at home. Compounded with time spent with peers, in extracurricular programs, doing homework, and performing different household responsibilities, the structure of an adolescent’s day is typically very different than an adult's. However, between inaccessible education, child marriages, early pregnancies, participation in armed conflict, and part or full time employment, to name a few, many adolescents do have the daily responsibilities of adults. Even so, differences in hormone balances, risk-reward processing, social status, and life experience, among other things, means
that even those youth with adult responsibilities are still likely to experience their days differently than adults do.

Because of these innate differences in daily life, adolescents will experience those factors which affect their safety in a manner different than adults. Therefore, it cannot be assumed that adults’ experiences of safety are representative of adolescents’ experiences. In a similar vein, the developmental differences between younger children and adolescents means that youth experiences cannot be considered one collective experience. Despite their right to participation, the fact that they are more likely to be impacted by violence, their differing daily experiences, and the fact that investment in adolescents is such a key access point for addressing social inequities, few safety assessments seem to specifically consider the unique experience of adolescents. This lack of disaggregated data suggests a hole in the current understanding of safety perceptions among refugees and their Jordanian community members. This research was specifically designed to be conducted with adolescents in order to fill that hole.

**Evaluation of current assessments**

The assessments that have been conducted by humanitarian agencies until this point have undoubtedly contributed to the improvement of the status of refugees in Jordan. However, there is still room for improvement, both for refugees’ situations and for the assessments themselves. For example, of ten assessments reviewed, only three of them specifically disaggregated data for adolescents (UNHCR et. al, 2014; UNICEF, 2013; UNICEF et. al, 2014). Two of the assessments desegregated data by separating “boys and girls” from “women and men” (UNHCR, 2013; SGBV Sub-Working Group, 2014). One also referred to “youth” but did not specify the age cut-off between “youth” and “adults” (UNHCR, 2012). Two others distinguished “young
adults” as a unique demographic, one of which categorized a young adult as an individual under the age of 30, without providing a minimum age (Mercy Corp, 2013; REACH: Syrian Refugees, 2014).

In many of these assessments, safety was addressed under the topic of protection. What each report included in their protection assessment varied, but never extended beyond an MSS definition. In a joint assessment conducted by UNHCR, UNICEF, and WFP, the protection assessment addressed concerns relating to sexual and gender based violence, child protection, and access to essential services. The child protection section addressed child labor, unaccompanied and separated children, physical violence, recruitment to armed groups, and being tried in criminal court (UNHCR et. al, 2014). In a joint assessment conducted by the IMC and UNICEF, adolescents’ perceptions of safety were gauged by asking participants whether they felt scared of kidnapping, felt sacred walking alone, had witness hitting, had been bullied or teased, had seen looting, or had seen families fighting one another. While this assessment was at least specifically focusing on adolescents’ perceptions, safety was clearly defined from a very basic, MSS point of view. In their discussion of women and girl’s safe spaces, one report even stated that, “the word ‘safe’ in this context refers to the absence of of trauma, excessive stress, violence (or fear of violence) or abuse” (SGBV Sub-Working Group, 2014).

Under the protection section of their website, UNICEF specifically states states that “all children have the right to be protected from violence, exploitation, and abuse” (UNICEF, 2015). UNICEF addresses social inclusion as a separate topic. In their protection section, Save the Children explains that “an important part of all of Save the Children’s child protection work... is the participation and leadership of children themselves”, which they follow up by saying “we
actively support child clubs and other child-led activities to educate children on how to protect themselves, and empower them to call for action in their communities” (Save the Children, 2015). This hints at the link between youth empowerment and youth safety, but does not make the full connection between safety and social cohesion.

Another assessment conducted by UNICEF specified key challenges for protection as increased domestic violence, heightened fear of sexual harassment and sexual violence, separation of children from their families, and exclusion from services for female-headed households and Syrians with disabilities (UNICEF, 2013). This assessment did recognize specific challenges that adolescents face, such as access to age specific programing and exclusion from camp planning processes. However, no reference was made to a connection between these challenges and safety, and adolescents’ challenges were mentioned separately from protection concerns.

One assessment mentioned the “cross-cutting nature of social cohesion” (REACH: Understanding Social Cohesion, 2014) and another recognized the role that bridging communities could play in addressing underlying tensions that could escalate to violence (Mercy Corp, 2013). Outside of these two references, none of the articles indicated an awareness about the interconnected nature of social cohesion and safety.

**Argument against a purposefully narrow assessment of safety**

Without personally interviewing the designer of each assessment, it was difficult to conclude why an comprehensive approach to safety is lacking. It is possible that decisions were made to assess safety from such narrowed viewpoints based on previous knowledge that social cohesion based factors do not play a strong role in perception of safety among the populations.
interviewed. Because refugees are fleeing large sources of insecurity, such as persecution and severe physical and emotional harm, factors beyond an MSS definition may be seen as relatively less impactful or of less concern to refugees and thus are not evaluated.

Such an argument seems questionable for a number of reasons. First, no literature was found to support evaluating refugee safety with such a narrowed or MSS definition. Second, refugees’ presence in host countries impacts the non-refugee individuals who also live in those communities. If the argument posed above were true, safety concerns beyond MSS would still be of concern for non-refugee individuals living within these host communities. Therefore, these non-refugee individuals would still be impacted by a lack or breakdown of social cohesion. Social cohesion factors would therefore, continue to be in play, and should subsequently be included in assessments. Third, there are currently initiatives being made in Jordan to increase social cohesion, specifically because it is seen as a way to address tensions in host community which have potential for escalation (Mercy Corp, 2013). If this argument for a MSS definition was correct, it would question the need for such initiatives and invalidate the seemingly effective work being conducted by highly regarded organizations such as UNICEF and Mercy Corp.

One could argue that social cohesion factors are not included in safety specific assessments because they are addressed in assessments focused specially on social cohesion. As mentioned before, when social cohesion factors and safety are known to be linked, not assessing and addressing them in an integrated fashion is at best inefficient and at worst leaves room for significant oversights in response.

Methodology
This study was specifically designed to assess perceptions of safety within host communities, rather than safety within camp settings, due to easier accessibility to host communities and the more complicated nature of social cohesion within host communities. While this research intended to assess perceptions of safety among non-refugee individuals and refugees from different nationalities, time and resource limitations meant that this pilot study was only conducted with Syrian refugees.

Definition of safety

This research was inspired by the frequency with which a minimum standard of safety (MSS) definition has been used in safety assessments conducted by IOs and NGOs working with refugee populations in Jordan. This narrow definition focuses on safety factors which directly and immediately influence one’s life. This includes exposure to physical violence (including bombings, gunfire, torture, and physical assaults), persecution, and inaccessible resources (water, food, shelter, sanitation, health care). While these standards are incredibly important, they are by no means an exhaustive list of factors that impact an individual’s personal sense of safety.

This research was designed with three major components: 1) How do participants define safety? 2) How do they perceive the safety of their own communities? 3) What is being done to meet their safety needs within their community? The second and third component of this research were based on a comprehensive definition rather than a MSS definition. The compressive definition was made by compiling safety factors including MSS factors, factors used to describe “safe spaces”, and factors of social cohesion. Safety was subsequently defined as: freedom from physical and emotional danger, freedom from persecution, bullying, and
harassment, and freedom from want, as well as having a strong, positive experience of social cohesion. Social cohesion, for this research is defined as having: bridging relationships, access to resources that reflect one’s culture, identity, and ethnicity; opportunities for empowerment and community participation, and a sense of community membership, otherwise referred to as social belonging.

**Research tool development**

Interview guides and surveys were designed for use in this study. While the two research tools were designed to assess the same information, the interviews were intended to provide an opportunity for more in-depth, qualitative information to be gathered. The surveys enabled the research to reach a greater number of participants and enabled participants to quantify some of their experiences. The interviews and surveys were designed with four major concept components. The first component was assessing how the participant defined safety and whether they felt safe, according to their own definition, in their current community. The second component assessed whether participants had any experiences with physically aggression, bullying, or harassment within their current community. The third component assessed how the participant’s experience compared to a comprehensive definition of safety. This component assessed factors including access to resources that reflect one’s culture, ethnicity, and identity; perceptions of social cohesion and social belonging; and opportunities for community participation and empowerment. The fourth component focused on the role of third parties on community safety, including what measures are being done to prevent and address conflict and tensions. The interview guide and survey were designed in English, translated into Arabic, and
then reviewed once for cultural sensitivity and accuracy of meaning. The surveys were a combination of multiple choice and open-ended response questions.

**Data collection**

Four interviews were conducted in a small Syrian housing community in the governorate of Baqa’a. The specific location of the community within Baqa’a is being withheld to protect the participants and their families. This community consisted of single Syrian mothers and their children, the majority of whom had been living in Zaatari refugee camp but had left illegally. The School of International Training’s Health and Community Development program director, arranged access to this community. To find research participants, this research and the accompanying research tools were first explained to the supervisor of the housing center. With his approval, the research was then explained, in Arabic, to the women living in the center. The women were also read the interview guide. The women were given an opportunity to ask questions about the research. Those who felt comfortable and had children between the ages of 13 and 17 offered that their children could participate in interviews.

The adolescents who were interested in participating were interviewed over the next two days. In order to participate in the interview, written consent was required of the participants’ mothers. The participants were also requested to provide their verbal and written consent. Before the interview began, the purpose of the interview and the role of the translator and researcher were explained. The interviews each took approximately twenty minutes to conduct and were conducted privately, in the main office of the housing center. The interviews were conducted in Arabic by a native, Jordanian, Arabic speaker. The participants’ responses were translated into English during the interview and any clarifying or follow up questions from the researcher were
translated into Arabic during the interview. Permission was given by three of the four participants for their interviews to be audio recorded. The translation of these interviews was transcribed after the interview. The English translation of the fourth interview was transcribed during the interview.

Twenty survey questionnaires were conducted through Al Takaful Charity’s housing center in Ramtha. To gain access to these participants, the purpose of the study was first explained to the headmaster of the charity. The translator who was conducting the interview then met with the supervisor of one of the housing buildings to explain the project. The supervisor gathered all residents of the building who were between the ages of 13 and 17 and the study was explained to them. Twenty adolescents expressed interest in participating in the research and were subsequently asked to provide their written consent and the written consent of their parents in order to participate. 11 of the participants were hesitant about providing their written consent. To accommodate these participants, they were only required to provide their verbal consent. The translator then provided her written affirmation that the participants had verbally consented. The participants initially completely the surveys on their own and then later went over the survey with the translator. The answers to open-ended questions were recorded in Arabic and were later translated into English by a native Arabic speaker.

Results

Interviews conducted in Baqa’a

Four interviews were conducted with adolescent Syrian refugees living in a community in Baqa’a. The interviewees were all residents of a housing center established for single, Syrian
refugee women and their children. The majority of these women and their children had been living within Zaatari refugee camp, but left illegally to move elsewhere in Jordan. As a result, many of the individuals living in this housing community are unregistered. To protect the identities of the interviewees and their community, their district will simple be referred to as “A”. Three male adolescents and one female adolescent were interviewed from this community. They will be referred to as interviewees M1 (13 years old), M2 (15 years old), M3 (14 years old) and F1 (14 years old). Interviews were conducted in Arabic and participant responses were translated into English. These four participants all attend a private school which is comprised of Jordanian, Palestinian, and Syrian students. The school only offers a morning session, which all four interviewees attend.

M2 and M3 both said that they felt that there were no divisions within their community. F1 expressed that there were divisions, based on nationality, wealth, personal conflicts, and physical appearance (specifically beauty and facial features). However, F1 stated that these divisions did not affect her. M1 expressed that he liked his community because there was good religious comfortability.

M1 defined safety as being able to protect himself when he is outside of his home without anyone else being responsible for him. F1, M2 and M3 all defined safety as being free from physical danger, specifically war, gun shots, sabotage, bombs, grenades, and killing. M2 also defined safety as having access to safe housing and education. M3 additionally mentioned access to safe transportation and safe shopping, which he further explained as ensuring that they have the resources they need safely available to them.
All four interviewees from A explained that they feel they are safer living in Jordan than they would be in Syria now. They also all expressed that they felt safer in Syria before the revolution, than they do in Jordan. M1 explained that in Syria he could go outside by himself but he cannot in his current community because this family doesn’t know “exactly what his community is”. M3 added that he feels safer in his current housing situation that he did in Zaatari because in Zaatari there were just tents, not houses.

M2 explained that even though he feels safe going out alone in his community, he isn’t allowed to. If he does have company he will go out into his community, but that isn’t often. M1 explained that he does not feel safe in his current community because of physical and verbal harassment that he has experienced when traveling throughout his community. He expressed that he feels safer traveling with company (either his friends or his mother). He explained that there are some places where he doesn’t go because he feels less safe because there are “bad guys” there. He stated that he did feel safe at the libraries, supermarkets, and mini-markets in his community. He explained that he felt safer in these places because there are not “bad guys” there.

F1 explained that there are no programs for her to participate in, neither in her community or at school, so there is no place for her to travel to. M3 also noted that there were generally no activities or programs to go to. However, if he was specifically invited to something by his relatives he felt comfortable going alone, anything else he needed an adult to go with him. M3 remarked that he felt safer when he was with adults and explained that he felt safer going to malls because adults would go with him.
When asked whether there are community or extracurricular programs available to them, all four interviewees said that the school occasionally held picnics at a nearby park, but otherwise there was nothing available for them to participate in. M1 also commented that he would only attend activities in his neighborhood if he was specifically invited to them, otherwise his family wouldn’t allow him to go.

F1 stated that bullying and physical aggression were not problems she faced. M2 said that he had not heard about any bullying taking place in his community. Both M1 and M3 had experiences with harassment in their community. M1 explained that he didn’t feel comfortable walking around his neighborhood because there were adults in his neighborhood who had hit him and bullied him and made him work for them, doing things like picking olives. He had also been hit and verbally harassed when walking to the store. He said he believed that these individuals harassed him because they were trying to show off, he said he did not feel that he was targeted because he was Syrian.

M3 said that once when he was heading to the supermarket, someone his age yelled at him. This individual yelled things such as, “you are Syrian, go back to your country.” M1 explained that he handled these experiences by ignoring his abusers and then informing the supervisor of the housing center. For the second incident, the supervisor had a talk with the individuals’ families and the harassment stopped. M3 explained that he hit his abuser and the problem stopped. When prompted, none of the participants expressed experiencing tension or conflict, even small scale conflicts, with their peers in the housing center or at school.

M1 explained that for small scale conflicts he usually just speaks with his family or the supervisor. He explained that he would rather that police handle more serious problems.
mentioned that he is afraid of the police because his family left Zaatari illegally. M2 similarly felt that police have more power and so it makes more sense for them to solve big problems. F1 explained that both her and the community agree that large problems should be solved by the police, who have more power, but small problems can be handled by community members.

M3 initially said he didn’t think there was any solution to bullying. He later said that if the bullies are kids, it may help if their parents talk to them, but that it would not make any difference for adults. He also said that the school can get involved to help stop bullying. M1 said that the housing center educated the youth there about how to deal with bullying and community problems and therefore they don’t face any large problems (specifically legal issues or exaggerated problems). He said that the problems they do have are small. M1 was asked what is done if kids within the housing community have problems and he explained that the parents sort it out with the supervisor acting as the communicator. M2 said that he was not aware of any proactive efforts taken to prevent conflict in his community.

M1 and F1 both felt like their school works to give them an opportunity to participate in decisions that affect them. M1 explained that if he is absent, the class waits to make a decision until he returns and can contribute his opinion. F1 said that her mother takes her opinion on topics that are related to her. M1 said that his mother does not take his opinion. In contrast, M2 feels that his mother takes his opinion but his school does not. M3 explained that that he does not feel valued at school because he believes his teacher treats him differently because he is Syrian. He specifically noted that his teacher gives other students extra credit points but not him. He explained that his grades were still good and so this was not impacting his ability to learn and do well in school.
M1 said his school and the housing community show him respect by making sure to take their opinions when planning parties and activities. M2 explained that he feels valued at the housing center because the people there ask for his help. He also explained that he feels valued at school because the community there shows respect for his personality and does not say bad things about him behind his back. F1 explained that she feels appreciated by her friends “because she has a strong personality”, by her mom because she listens to her, by her teacher because she gets good grades. She also explained that the supervisor makes her feel appreciated because he lets her attend picnics and trips that the center organizes and because he listens to her and makes her laugh.

**Survey questionnaires conducted in Ramtha through Al Takaful Charity**

**Definition of Safety**

Participants were asked to define safety in their own words. The response topics were subsequently coded based on commonalities in responses (Fig. 1). Participants were also asked the extent to which they agreed with certain definitions of safety (Fig. 2). 75% of participants agreed “somewhat”, “mostly”, or “completely” that safety is defined as freedom from physical danger. 35% of participants self-defined safety as freedom from things that threaten one’s life and 45% self-defined safety as freedom from war or bombs. 80% of participants agreed "somewhat", "mostly", or "completely" that safety is defined as freedom from bullying while 15% of participants self-defined safety as being protected from or able to protect oneself from bullies. 70% of participants agreed "somewhat", "mostly", or "completely" that safety is defined as feeling like a valued member of a community. 75% of participants agreed "somewhat", "mostly", or "completely" that safety is defined as feeling like your culture is valued by your
community. 75% also “somewhat”, “mostly”, or “completely” agreed that safety is defined as feeling like your personal identity is valued by your community. With 70% in complete agreement and 20% “somewhat” or “mostly” agreeing, the largest proportion of participants, 90%, agreed that safety is defined as having someone to go to when you feel unsafe. 10% and 15% of participants, respectively, included having access to all of the resources you need and access to adequate health resources as part of their self-definition of safety. 10% of participants defined safety as being protected.

Four of the seven definitions of safety presented to refugees were identified as definitions relating factors of social cohesion to the definition of safety (Appendix B1). 75% of participants “completely” agreed that safety was defined by one at least one these definitions, while 90% of participants “mostly” or “completely” agreed that safety was defined by at least one.

Sense of safety within their community

No participants expressed that they did not feel safe in their community and 40% of participants expressed that they felt “very safe” in their community (Fig. 3). 80% of participants said that they felt “mostly” or “very safe” traveling throughout their community (Fig. 3). 20% of participants said that they only felt “somewhat” or “a bit” safe traveling. 10% of participants participants said that they avoid certain places in their community because they feel less safe in those places. 50% of participants said that they avoid doing certain activities by themselves because they feel safer if done with others. Despite these answers, all of these participants expressed that their perception of safety only impacted their daily life “a bit” or “somewhat” (Fig. 4).
40% of participants felt that NGO workers define safety differently than they do. 75% of these participants explained that they felt that NGO workers knew more or had a more broad understanding of safety than they did. 50% of participants felt that police officers, military officials, and security personnel defined safety differently than they do, and 50% of these participants also felt that police officers knew more or had a more broad definition of safety than they did. 55% of participants also expressed that police officers are one group of people they would go to if they felt unsafe (Fig. 5).

85% of participants did not feel that there were places in their community where there was more tension than others. 25% participants answered that themselves or someone they know had experiences with physical violence or aggression in their communities. 35% of participants answered that themselves or someone they know had experiences of bullying in their communities. 10% of participants reported that their communities had systems in place to prevent conflict between community members and 55% of participants reported that their communities had systems in place to address conflict once it occurred. 69% of participants who remarked that there were programs of some sort, said that they were only “a bit” or “somewhat” confident in the effectiveness of these programs.

Social Cohesion

70% of participants said that their community was “not integrated at all” or “barely integrated” (Fig. 6). All of the participants who reported that their community was only “not integrated at all”, “barely integrated”, or “somewhat integrated” also answered that their community was divided by refugee status. 60% of participants felt that their school curriculum at
least "somewhat" reflected their culture, ethnicity, and identity. Only 20% of participants felt that their school curriculum "strongly" reflected these qualities (Fig. 7).

65% of participants felt that there were no programs or events or “hardly any” programs or events in their community geared toward their age group (Fig 8). Of these participants, 77% “somewhat”, “mostly” or “completely” agreed that safety is defined as feeling that your personal identity is valued by your community. 80% of participants felt that there were no programs or events or “hardly any” programs or events geared toward their gender and 81% of these participants “somewhat”, “mostly” or “completely” agreed that safety is defined as feeling that your personal identity is valued by your community.

65% of participants felt that there were no programs events or hardly any programs or events in their community geared toward their culture and of them, 62% “somewhat”, “mostly” or “completely” agreed that safety is defined as feeling that your culture is valued by your community (Fig. 8). Of the responses who said there were programs or events geared to their age group, gender, or culture only two participants expressed that those programs were “mostly” or “completely” accessible. These two participants felt that it was programs related to their culture which were accessible. No participants felt that there were programs or events geared toward their age or their gender that were “mostly” or “completely” accessible.

Only 35% of participants “mostly” or “strongly” felt that they were valued members of their community (Fig. 9). Of the other 65% of participants, 38% of them “mostly” or “completely” agreed that feeling like a valued member of a community defines safety. In other words, 25% of participants “mostly” or “strongly” agreed with defining safety as feeling like valued member of a community and felt that, at most, they were “somewhat” valued by their
community. 40% of participants felt that they had "a fair amount" or "lots of" participation in community decisions that affect their life (Fig. 10). However, 20% felt that they had only “a bit” of participation or no participation at all.

Conclusion

This purpose of this research was to investigate perceptions of safety amongst adolescent Jordanians and adolescent refugees living in Jordanian host communities. This research aimed to answer three questions: 1) How do participants define safety? 2) How do participants perceive the safety of their community? 3) What is being done to address adolescent’s safety concerns in their communities. Due to time and resource constraints, this research was conducted with a small sample population, gathered through convenience sampling. As a result, patterns that arose within participant responses cannot be considered representative of adolescents in Jordan, or even adolescents within these host communities. However, these patterns do represent these 24 participant’s lives and daily experiences and may be indicative of larger patterns within their communities.

Before discussing the conclusions drawn from this research data there is an inherent difficulty in this data analysis that is important to discuss. The survey designed for this research was designed to reflect each participant’s subjective experience with safety in their community. Many of the questions were designed to either directly or indirectly assess a participant's’ perception of safety within their community by asked participants to rank their experience on a scale of 1 to 5. For example, how safe do you feel traveling throughout your community (1 being not safe at all, 5 being completely safe)? Or, how much participation do you have in decisions
that affect your daily life (1 being no participation, 5 being lots of participation)? The data from these responses shows what percentage of participants identified with each response option (for example, 10% of participants remarked that they only felt a bit safe and 20% said that they had “some participation”). What this data does not show, however, is to what extent identifying with each response option affects an individual.

In an ideal setting, one would want every participant to respond that they felt “completely safe”, had “lots of participation”, or the equivalent, for every question. This was not the case in this data and so the question then becomes, to what extent is it okay the not every participant could answer 5 to every question? How tolerable is a 2, 3 or 4 in each instance? In other words, how low must an individual’s response be before we can assume that this experience is impacting their sense of safety within their community? This may be easier to answer for some questions than others. It is relatively easy to argue that feeling unsafe, to any extent, while traveling throughout your community, is a problem. However, it is more difficult to know exactly how an individual’s level of participation impacts their feeling of social cohesion and subsequently their sense of safety.

From the extent of agreement participants demonstrated with the social cohesion definitions of safety proposed to them, it is clear that for many of these participants, social cohesion factors and feelings of safety are related. But how strongly? Answering this question would likely require each question to have a research project unto itself. While this difficulty impedes the ability to fully understand the responses and experience of each participant, it is an indicator of the lack of research and understanding there is regarding the relationship between
individuals’ experiences of social cohesion and their perception of safety. The remainder of this
discussion will be structured based on the research questions at the root of this research.

**How do participants define safety?**

All research participants were asked to define safety in their own words. Interview
participants responses were focused on freedom from threats to life, freedom from war and
violence, and safe access to basic resources, education, and transportation. Survey participants’
self-definitions were similar, with some participants also including access to health resources,
being protected, and freedom from bullying. These definitions can be summarized as freedom
from physical danger and safe access to essential resources. In other words, all participants
provided a minimum standard of safety definition when defining safety in their own words.
However, 90% of survey participants “mostly” or “completely” agreed that safety was defined
by at least one of the social cohesion-based definitions of safety.

This suggests, that, while participants self-define safety using a MSS definition, the
majority of them agree that social cohesion, in some manor, is a component of safety. This then
raises the question, if participants agree that social cohesion factors are part of safety, why don’t
they include them in their own definition? Are these factors less readily available in their minds
when they answer the question? Could this be a result of the way they were brought up to think
about safety, perhaps because of how individuals around them discuss safety or because of the
safety concerns that have been so prevalent in their lives as individuals who have fled
persecution? Or, are these participants aware that they define safety in such as way but actively
choose not to include these factors in their definition. Again, these results indicate that more
needs to be known about the relationship between safety and social cohesion, in this case specifically regarding how individuals define safety.

**How do participants experience safety within their community?**

40% of participants felt that their school “somewhat” reflects their culture, ethnicity, and identity and 30% of participants felt that their curriculum “mostly” or “completely” reflect these facts. As mentioned earlier, this is a question in which one must ask how important is it that school curriculums “completely” reflect an individual’s identity? While this cannot be answered here, it is clear that for the 30% of participants who feel that their curriculum only barely reflects these characteristics or doesn’t reflect them at all, the school curriculum needs improvement.

The interview participants all remarked that the only programming or events accessible to them were the picnics sometimes organized by their school. Similarly, when asked about programs geared toward their age, gender, or culture over 60% of survey participants said there were none at all or hardly any. This data indicates that over half of the participants are severely lacking opportunities to engage in programming or events that are relevant to them. While these responses cannot be used to assume a lack of programming for the other adolescents living in these communities, it does suggest that further investigation should be done as to whether a lack of programming and events, or just a lack of awareness about such opportunities, exists in these communities.

90% of the participants from Ramtha felt that their community was, at best, “somewhat integrated” and also felt that their community was divided by refugee status. Interview participants did not seem to feel that community divisions were as prevalent within their community. There were few other questions which survey participants has such similar, strong
responses for. This suggests that the community divisions resulting from differences in refugee status may play a significant role in these individuals’ daily lives and may also be a point of concern. Fortunately, 75% percent of participants felt “mostly” or “very” safe in their communities. 25% of participants had experienced physical violence in their community and 35% had experienced bullying. While one participant having these experiences is too many, the percentage being as low as it is suggests that these community divisions have not escalated to an extent that the majority of participants are experiencing physical violence, aggression, or bullying as a result. Of course, it is unclear whether participants are impacted by this division in ways not assessed by this survey.

All of the interviewees from A mentioned that they felt safer in Syria before the war than they do in their current community. They also indicated that safety concerns often result from parents being fearful of or unknowledgeable about their community. Their parents’ concerns, as well as their own, generally prevented them from feeling comfortable walking around their community on their own. While the extent to which social cohesion impacts these individuals is still up for discussion, these results do show that more work needs to be done so that these participants (and their parents) are no longer feeling fearful of their community and do not experiences anymore bullying, harassment, or physical aggression.

It was striking that 25% of participants mostly or strongly agreed with defining safety as feeling like valued member of a community and felt that, at most, they were only “somewhat” valued by their community. Additionally, over 40% of participants who felt that there were no programs or events geared toward their gender, age group, or culture and also “somewhat”, “mostly”, or “completely” agreed that safety is defined as feeling that your personal identity is
valued by your community. As discussed before, it is difficult to know how significant such dissonance is in an individual’s life, but such feelings may represent a safety concern for participants.

Finally, all of the interview participants reported that tensions or conflicts with peers were not a concern for them. These answers are surprising since it is so common for adolescents of that age (13-15) to have small scale conflict with peers. It is possible that these adolescents really don’t have any of these experiences. However, it is also possible that these participants don’t categorize small scale problems with peers as conflict and tension. Would they subsequently not consider small conflicts with peers to be something that impacts their safety? Again, this data highlights the lack of understanding that exists regarding how individuals define safety.

**What is being done to address safety concerns within participants’ communities?**

Participants seemed to have a generally positive view of NGO workers and security personnel working within their communities. Most survey participants felt that NGO workers and police officers either shared their definition of safety or had a more broad understanding of the topic than they did. Three of the interviewees from A expressed that they felt that it made the most sense for police to address larger conflicts and safety concerns. One participant did express that he was fearful of the police because his family left Zaatar illegally, however he did not report having any negative interactions with police.

The researcher was concerned by the lack of knowledge and confidence participants had regarding programs within their community designed to prevent or address tension and conflict between community members. 35% of survey participants and all of the interview participants
said that they did not know about these programs existing in their community. It is unclear whether these programs are present, but not known about by the majority of participants, or if they are not present at all. Of the participants that were aware of such programs, 69% were only “a bit” or “somewhat” confident in their effectiveness. For the purpose of giving adolescent participants agency, it is important they both have access to and can be confident in conflict prevention and conflict resolution resources. This gives individuals greater perceived control over problems they face, as well as the actual ability to address problems that arise.

**Summary of most important findings:**

Many conclusion and insights arose from this research, the most significant of these are summarized below:

- Many of the participants do not have easy access to programs that are geared towards their age group, gender, or culture.
- Some participants from both communities had experiences with physical aggression, harassment, and bullying.
- Interviewees in A did not feel comfortable walking around their communities by themselves.
- A majority of participants from Ramtha felt that their community was not well integrated and was divided by refugee status.
- All of the interviewees from A and many of the participants from Ramtha were unaware of or not confident in programs meant to prevent or address conflict within their community.
● The way participants self-defined safety was more narrow than the definition of safety that participants agreed with.

● A majority of participants indicated that social cohesion was a component of safety.

As mentioned previously, further research needs to be done to gain a more comprehensive understanding of many of these findings. This is perhaps most urgent in regards to findings which suggest that participants’ experiences of physical safety and social cohesion are less than optimal. While further research must be done before anything is implemented to address these concerns (to ensure that these interventions are both necessary and designed properly), some preliminary suggestions can be made. First, the protection programs that are currently conducted by organizations like UNICEF and Save the Children Jordan could be valuable for increasing participant’s awareness about their rights to safety and about the resources available to them to address safety concerns (particularly concerns about physical safety).

Both the population in A and in Ramtha could potentially benefit from programing that is geared towards building connections between Syrian and non-Syrian adolescents within their communities. This would provide programming and may help to form bridging relationships. These bridging relationships could help to address feelings of community divisions and as well as the fear that may result from being unfamiliar with the community. One element of this programming could be focused on identifying the cultural elements these communities share and learning to understand those cultural elements that are different. They could also exchange understanding about the difficulties both groups face as a result of political instability and unrest in the region, thereby hopeful increasing the empathy adolescents from different situations feel.
for one another's experiences. Finally, these groups can be used as a means to increase youth empowerment and participation.

Programs that are designed to teach adolescents conflict prevention and resolution techniques could also be useful. Teaching tangible skills, such as mediation, Non-Violent Communication, and Restorative Justice techniques would provide a number of positive benefits to adolescents in these communities. First, they would provide age appropriate programming. Second, they would provide adolescents with skills to address conflict they experience, giving them a sense of empowerment and perceived control over problems they face. Additionally, adolescents could use these skills to aid others in their community who are experiencing conflict, thereby benefiting their community and increasing their own sense of personal worth. Finally, these techniques can also be employed as community building tools, thereby assisting in relationship building and integration within their community.

The overarching goal of this research was to clarify whether a minimum standards of safety definition was sufficient for assessing the safety of adolescents living in Jordan. While this pilot study does not have the capacity to indicate one way or another, it has confirmed that there are some refugee adolescents living in Jordanian host communities who incorporate social cohesion in their definition of safety and whose experience of social cohesion are less than ideal. Therefore, this pilot study can conclude that further research into this topic is warranted.

**Study Limitations**

There were a number of limitations to this study. Research tool development, data collection, and data assessment for this research was conducted in approximately four weeks.
This short time frame had a number of impacts on this research. The ideal participants for this research were refugee and Jordanian adolescents living in Jordanian host communities. The short time frame meant that participants needed to be easily accessible within approximately two-and-a-half weeks. It was difficult to find and coordinate with organizations who could provide access to adolescent participants within the necessary time frame. The limited research period also guaranteed that the sample size for both the interviews and the surveys would have to be small and the population would have to be constructed through convenience sampling.

Ultimately, only four surveys and twenty interviews were able to be conducted for this research. This convenience sampling resulted in all of the participants being Syrian refugees. No Jordanians and no refugees of other nationalities participated in this research. Additionally, the gender ratio of participants was very skewed, particularly within the survey. 1 female and 3 male adolescents were interviewed while 17 female and 3 male adolescents participated in the survey. As a result, it was illogical to disaggregate any of the data by gender. Because convenience sampling was used, it was difficult to claim that the participants’ responses were representative of the adolescents in their own housing centers.

The language barrier between the researcher and the interviewees also limits the reliability of this research. While a trained translator was used to conduct the interviews, the researcher believes that the interviews would have been of a higher caliber had the language barrier not been present. This is in part because it was difficult for the researcher to ask probing and clarifying questions, to assess the connotation of the words the participants used in their answers, and to assess the inflection in the participants’ voices.
Because of travel warnings published by the United States’ State Department, the researcher, was unable to personally distribute the surveys in Ramtha. This prevented the researcher from asking any clarifying questions about the participant’s survey responses, which would have been particularly valuable for the questions which the researcher, upon later assessment of the data, found to be potentially confusing. This travel warning also meant that it was more difficult to gain access to potential participants in north of Jordan, where a significant portion of the refugee community, and therefore a significant proportion of Jordanian host communities, are located.

Due to the time limitations, there was not enough time to validate the survey and interview questions or to run pilot interviews and surveys. In addition, the fact that question were translated into Arabic (but were not checked for validity) meant that problems with some questions were either discovered after data collection was complete or are suspected but unconfirmed. For example, the English interview and survey asks participants to define their community. The intention of this question was to give the researcher a better understanding of the population that each participant was referring to when they answered questions about “their community”. Two problems arose with this question. First, the translation of this question prompted participants to explain characteristics of their community, not to define what composed their community.

Second, it became apparent that the notion of “community” does not appear to translate into a logical, well understood concept in Jordan. The word that most closely matches a western, sociological definition of community in Arabic, مجتمع, would not likely be well understood by participants due to their age and their educational level. As such it is unclear what setting or
group of individuals participants were referring to when they answered questions regarding their community. This would likely have been a problem if this research had been conducted in the United States as well, as many individuals are not used to discussing communities in such an abstract fashion. It is possible that conducting this research through group interviews would have addressed part of this problem. It is easier to discuss abstract concepts in these settings because participants can build off of their different knowledge bases to come to a collective understanding of the topic being discussed.

Additionally, in hindsight, some questions (such as where the participants attended school, which school session they went to, etc.) were found to be unnecessary in this pilot study. Because all of the interview participants went to school together, as did most of the participants surveyed in Ramtha, these questions couldn’t be used to disaggregate the data and didn’t provide any information regarding the participants’ perceptions of safety. Removing these unnecessary questions, as well as altering the format of the survey, could have made the survey less cumbersome and improved the quality of survey responses.

Further Research

Further research from this pilot study could extend in two different directions. First, further research could be done to expand upon the data gathered from this research. This could be done by increasing the sample size and using random sampling so that the data is truly reflective of the intended population. Further research would ideally do a comparison of perceptions of safety amongst Jordanian adolescents and adolescents refugees with differing nationalities (Syrian, Palestinian, Iraqi) residing in host communities in Jordan. A larger study
would also seek to gain sufficiently sized, random samples from each of the host communities in Jordan so that the data can be disaggregated accordingly. Further research would also ensure that the research tools were validated, both in English and Arabic. It is also recommended that the survey is reformatted to ask the same questions but to be completed more easily and more quickly.

Additionally, restructuring the interview to be conducted in a group interview format (participatory assessments, focus groups, or community circles) would be valuable. Interviewees consistently had difficulty answering questions that asked them to define their community and to define safety. Interviews with youth, particularly when a language barrier exists, may be particularly uncomfortable for participants. In addition, it may be difficult for individuals of any age to give comprehensive answers to questions they might have little experience with prior (questions like, how do you define community and what do you think about the way your community handles conflict). The presence of other participants in group interviews provide participants with the opportunity to gain further understanding of the questions from one another and to ‘snowball’ off of each other’s responses. Such interviews could also easily transition into opportunities for adolescents to discuss and mobilize around potential strategies to address safety concerns, thereby benefiting the community and providing an opportunity for youth empowerment (which is the purpose of participatory assessments).

The second way to expand this research is to conduct further research based on one of the questions raised by the research conclusions. When providing their own definition of safety, participants defined safety from a very basic, MSS viewpoint, in much the same way as safety assessments by IOs and NGOs do. This was despite the fact that the majority of them agreed
with the social cohesion components of safety. As mentioned previously, it is difficult to know where this definition comes from. Is this their definition of safety because this is the manner in which the notion of safety has always been used around them? Or is it that physical danger and a lack of safe and accessible resources has been so real for them for that a definition of safety based in things like freedom from bullying and opportunities for empowerment is a luxury they don’t have?

Further research could aim to investigate where these different definitions come from. For example, are participants who have faced violence in their communities more likely to have an MSS definition? Are participants who come from a nonviolent community or a community that actively discusses topics like peace and community (like a Quaker or Baha’i community) more likely to have a comprehensive definition of safety? How do these factors affect how they define safety in their own words, as well as how strongly they agree with other definitions of safety?

Another question that arose was, at what point do certain safety indicators actually indicate an increased feeling of insecurity in participants? Does one start to feel less safe when they only have “some” participation in decisions that affect their lives or when they have none at all? Or does this need to be compounded by other factors in order to have a significant effect? Further research could be done to understand how “tolerant” adolescents are of living with different negative safety indicators.

Finally, very few of the participants knew about or were confident in programs to prevent or address conflict within their community. A further assessment of conflict prevention and resolution efforts being done in these communities, and perhaps throughout Jordanian host communities in general, is warranted.
Works Referenced


http://www.savethechildren.org/site/c.8rKLIXMGIpI4E/b.6191697/k.97D4/Child_Protection.htm


http://www.unhcr.org/pages/49e486566.html


Figure 1.

![Bar chart showing participants who self-defined safety as...]

- Freedom from danger or things that threaten one's life
- Being free from war or bombing
- Having access to all of the resources one needs
- Having access to adequate health care
- Being safe or being able to protect oneself from bullies
- Being protected

Figure 2.

![Bar chart showing how strongly participants feel that safety is defined as...]

- Freedom from physical danger
- Freedom from emotional danger
- Freedom from bullying
- Feeling like a valued member of a community
- Feeling like your culture is valued by your community
- Feeling like your personal identity is valued by your community
- Having people to go to when you feel unsafe
Figure 3.

How safe do you feel...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not safe</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A bit safe</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat safe</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly safe</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very safe</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.

How strongly does your perception of safety affect your daily life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A bit</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fair amount</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5.

Who would you go to if you felt unsafe?

- Parents: 38.6%
- Siblings: 25%
- Other family members: 18.2%
- Friends: 13.6%
- Community Members: 10.8%
- Police Officers: 4.8%

Figure 6.

How integrated do you feel your community is?

- Not integrated at all: 0%
- Barely integrated: 60%
- Somewhat integrated: 20%
- Mostly integrated: 10%
- Completely integrated: 10%
Figure 7.

How strongly does your school curriculum reflect your culture, ethnicity, and identity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A bit</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fair amount</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8.

Are there events and programs in your community geared toward your...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None at all</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardly any</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, a few</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, many</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Purple: Age group?
- Green: Gender?
- Orange: Culture?
Figure 9.

How strongly do you feel like you are a valued member of your community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fair amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10.

How much participation do you have in community decisions that affect your daily life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No participation at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A bit of participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fair amount of participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots of participation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perceptions of Safety Among Adolescents Living in Jordanian Host Communities

Marhaba! My name is Katie Stevenson. I am a student from Bates College in the United States. I am currently studying at the School of International Training in Amman through their program on Health and Community Development. For this program, I am conducting research on adolescents perceptions of safety in Jordanian host communities. I am hoping that the data from this research will provide a better understanding of how adolescents define safety and perceive the safety of their own communities. The information you provide in this survey will help to increase that understanding. I deeply appreciate your willingness to participate in this survey and to share your thoughts with me.

This survey is completely voluntary and completely anonymous. If at any point you would like to skip a question, take a break, or end the survey you can do so without penalty. If you would like to add any commentary to any of the questions, you may do so in the space below each question. If you have any questions or concerns, you may contact me at ksteven3@bates.edu or at 07 9801 2087. If you would like to receive a copy of the results of this research, please inform me.

Again, thank you for your willingness to share your story with me, your perspective and your opinions are greatly appreciated.

Katie Stevenson

Survey Questionnaire

Please write in or circle the answer(s) that best reflects your experience. If you’d like you may add additional commentary in the space below each question.

Part I) Demographic

1. How old are you?

2. What is your sex?
   1. Female
   2. Male

3. What is your nationality?

4. How long have you lived in the community you live in now?

5. Are you currently attending school?
   a. yes
   b. no

6. If you are currently attending school, what type of school are you currently attending?
   a. public
   b. private
   c. UNRWA

7. If your school is split into multiple sessions, which do you attend?
   a. morning
   b. afternoon
   c. my school only as 1 session

8. Do you currently work for a wage?
   a. yes, full time
   b. yes, part time
   c. no
Part 2) Community and Safety

9. In your own words, what would you describe as your community?

10. In your own words, how would you define safety?

11. On a scale of 1 to 5, how much do you define safety as freedom from physical danger?
   1 (not at all)
   2 (a bit)
   3 (somewhat)
   4 (mostly)
   5 (completely)

12. On a scale of 1 to 5, how much do you define safety as freedom from emotional danger?
   1 (not at all)
   2 (a bit)
   3 (somewhat)
   4 (mostly)
   5 (completely)

13. On a scale of 1 to 5, how much do you define safety as freedom from bullying?
   1 (not at all)
   2 (a bit)
   3 (somewhat)
   4 (mostly)
   5 (completely)

14. On a scale of 1 to 5, how much do you define safety as feeling like a valued member of a community?
   1 (not at all)
   2 (a bit)
   3 (somewhat)
   4 (mostly)
   5 (completely)

15. On a scale of 1 to 5, how much do you define safety as feeling that your culture is valued by your community?
   1 (not at all)
   2 (a bit)
   3 (somewhat)
   4 (mostly)
   5 (completely)

16. On a scale of 1 to 5, how much do you define safety as feeling that your personal identity is valued by your community?
   1 (not at all)
   2 (a bit)
   3 (somewhat)
   4 (mostly)
   5 (completely)
17. On a scale of 1 to 5, how much do you define safety as having people to go to when you feel unsafe?
   1 (not at all)  
   2 (a bit)  
   3 (somewhat)  
   4 (mostly)  
   5 (completely)  

18. On a scale of 1 to 5, how safe do you feel in your community?
   1 (not very safe)  
   2  
   3  
   4  
   5 (very safe)  

19. On a scale of 1 to 5, how safe do you feel traveling to and from your school or place of work?
   1 (not very safe)  
   2  
   3  
   4  
   5 (very safe)  

20. Are there parts of your community that feel safer than other? If yes, please write those places below.
   1. yes  
   2. no  

21. Does your perception of safety in your community affect how your spend your time?
   1. yes, I avoid certain places because they make me feel less safe  
   2. yes, I go to to some places at specific times because they feel safer then  
   3. yes, some activities I avoid doing by myself because they feel safer with others  
   4. no  

22. On a scale of 1 to 5, how strongly does your perception of the safety in your community affect your daily life?
   1 (not very strongly)  
   2  
   3  
   4  
   5 (very strongly)  

23. Where do you spend most of your time with your friends?
   a. at school  
   b. at youth safe spaces or other places for designed for youth and adolescents  
   c. public places  
   d. private residences (your or someone else’s home)  

24. Do you think that NGO workers in your community define safety in a different way than you do?
   a. yes (If yes, please explain how below)  
   b. no  

25. Do you think police officers, military officials, or security officers who work in your community define safety in a different way than you do?
   a. yes (If yes, please explain how below)  
   b. no
26. On a scale of 1 to 5, How strongly do you think your perception of the safety of your community represents the perceptions of safety felt by the rest of your community?
1 (not at all, I have a very different perception of the safety of my community than others do)
2
3
4
5 (very strongly, I have a very similar perception of the safety of my community as others do)

Part III) Community Integration and Tension
27. On a scale of 1 to 5, how integrated do you feel your community is?
1 (not integrated at all)
2 (barely integrated)
3 (somewhat integrated)
4 (mostly integrated)
5 (completely integrated)

28. Do you feel that your community is divided along any of the following lines? Check all that apply.
   ___ Tribe
   ___ Religion
   ___ Refugee status
   ___ Other: ____________
   ___ I do not feel that my community is divided NATIONALITY WASN’T ASKED

29. If you attend school, what is the makeup of the students in your class?
a. most students are like me (ex. mostly Syrian if you are Syrian)
b. many of the students are like me.
c. an equal balance of students like me and students from different backgrounds
d. some students like me, but mostly students from other backgrounds
e. all students are from different backgrounds than I am (ex. all Jordanian students if you are Syrian)

30. On a scale of 1-5, how much does your school curriculum reflect your culture, ethnicity, and identity?
   1 (doesn’t reflect at all)
   2
   3
   4
   5 (strongly reflects)

31. Are there places in your community where you feel there is more tension?
a. yes (If you answered yes, please specify where, below)
b. no

32. Have you, or anyone you know, experienced physical violence in your community?
a. yes
b. no

33. If yes, on a scale of 1-5 how strongly has this experience affected your perception of safety in your community?
   1 (not at all)
   2
   3
   4
   5 (very strongly)
34. Does your community have systems in place to prevent or deal with conflict between community members? Circle all that apply.
   a. yes, we have programs to prevent conflict
   b. yes, we have programs to address conflict once it happens
   d. no

35. If yes, on a scale of 1 to 5, how confident are you in the effectiveness of these programs?
   1 (not very confident that they are effective)
   2
   3
   4
   5 (very confident that they are effective)

36. Have you, or anyone you know been affected by bullying or harassment?
   1. yes
   2. no

37. If yes, on a scale of 1-5 how strongly has this experience affect your perception of safety in your community?
   1 (not at all)
   2
   3
   4
   5 (very strongly)

Part IV) Community Connectedness
38. On a scale of 1 to 5, how strongly do you feel like you are a valued member of your community?
   1 (not very strongly)
   2
   3
   4
   5 (very strongly)

39. Are there events and programs in your community that are geared toward your age group?
   a. none at all (1)
   b. hardly any (2)
   c. yes, a few
   d. yes, many

40. On a scale of 1 to 5, how easily accessible are these programs to you?
   1 (not very accessible)
   2
   3
   4
   5 (very accessible)

41. Are there events and programs in your community that are geared toward your gender?
   a. none at all
   b. hardly any
   c. yes, a few
   d. yes, many
42. On a scale of 1 to 5, how easily accessible are these programs to you?
   1 (not very accessible)
   2
   3
   4
   5 (very accessible)

43. Are there events and program in your community that are geared toward your culture?
   a. none at all
   b. hardly any
   c. yes, a few
   d. yes, many

44. On a scale of 1 to 5, how easily accessible are these programs to you?
   1 (not very accessible)
   2
   3
   4
   5 (very accessible)

45. On a scale of 1 to 5, how much participation do you have in community decisions that affect your daily life?
   1 (no participation)
   2
   3
   4
   5 (lots of participation)

46. Do your expectations for your future match your community's expectations for your future?
   1. Yes
   2. No, I expect more of myself than my community does
   3. No, my community expects more of me than I do.

47. On a scale of 1 to 5, how well does your community provide you with access to the resources you need to reach your goals?
   1 (I don't have access to any of the resources I need)
   2
   3
   4
   5 (I have access to everything I need)

48. Who makes up that support network (select all that apply)
   a. parents
   b. other family members
   c. teachers
   d. friends
   e. community members
   f. others
49. Who would you go to if you felt unsafe? (select all that apply)
a. parents
b. siblings
c. grandparents
d. other family members
e. friends
f. community members
g. police officers
h. others____

50. On a scale of 1 to 5, how strong do you feel your support network is?
1 (not strong at all)
2
3
4
5 (very strongly)

Thank you for your participation! Please return this survey to the researcher.
نصوص السلامة في المجتمع بين الشباب الأردني و المراهقين اللاجئين الذين يعيشون في المجتمعات الأردنية المضيفة

أنا اسمي كاتي ستيفنسون . أنا طالبة من كلية بيت في الولايات المتحدة، أنا أدرس حاليا في مؤسسة التعليم العالمية في عمان، في برنامج المناهج بأمور تنمية الصحة والمجتمع . أنا أقوم بإجراء البحوث على تصورات المراهقين للسلامة في المجتمعات الأردنية . وأمل أن نتائج هذه البحوث سوف تقدم فهما أعمقاً لكيفية تعريف المراهقين لمناهج السلامة العامة وكيف هي رؤيتهم للوضع العام للسلامة المجتمعات و المعلومات التي تقدمها هذه المقابلة سوف تساعد على زيادة هذا الفهم، وأنا أقدر بعمق استعدادكم للمشاركة في هذا اللقاء وتبادل أفكاركم معني.

هذه المقابلة هي طوعية تماما ومعلومات الشخصية ستكون مجهولة الهوية تماما . إذا كان هناك أي نقطة تريد أن تستفسر عنها، فإنه ارجوك أن لا تتردد بذلك و يمكنك أيضًا إنهاء المقابلة متي شئت، إذا كنت ترغب في الحصول على نسخة من نتائج هذا البحث ، فإنه يمكنك إبلاغي خلال فترة المقابلة. إذا كان لديك أي أسئلة أو استفسارات بعد المقابلة، يمكنك الاتصال بي عن طريق 0798012087 أو عن طريق ksteven3@bates.edu

مرة أخرى، أشكركم على استعدادكم لمشاركتي قصتك ، وأي فوائد أقدر بشكل كبير وجهة نظركم وألفank.

كاتي ستيفنسون
الاستبيان
يرجى الكتابة أو وضع دلالة حول الإجابة التي تعكس أنطاباك و حالتك لتجربتك الخاصة بشكل أفضل. إذا كنت ترغب بمكتئ إضافي تعلق إضافي في المكان المخصص أدناه لكل سؤال.

الجزء الأول (الديمغرافي)

1. كم عمرك؟

2. ما هو جنسك؟
   ا. أنثى
   ب. ذكر

3. ما هي جنسيتك؟

4. منذ متى وأنتم تعيش في المجتمع الذي تعيش فيه الآن؟

5. هل أنتم مشترك حالياً في المدرسة؟
   ا. نعم فعلاً
   ب. لا

6. إذا كنت مشارك حالياً بالمدرسة، ما الجهء التي تتبعها مدرستك؟
   ا. عامة
   ب. خاص
   ج. الأولروا

7. إذا مدرستك تتبع النظام الصباحي والمسمى للدوام، متى في أي نظام؟
   ا. صباحي
   ب. مسائي
   ج. مدرستي تتبع نظام واحد فقط للدوام

8. هل تعمل حالياً مقابل أجر؟
   ا. نعم، دوام كامل
   ب. نعم، دوام جزئي
   ج. لا

الجزء 2 (المجتمع والسلامة العامة)

9. باستخدام الكلمات الخاصة بك، يرأى كيف تصف مجتمعك؟

10. بكلماتك الخاصة، كيف تعني السلامة العامة؟
11. على مقياس من 1-5، هل السلامة العامة تعني السلامة من الخطر الجسدي؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>رقم</th>
<th>(أبداً)</th>
<th>1 (فقط)</th>
<th>2 (قليلًا)</th>
<th>3 (نوعًا ما)</th>
<th>4 (غالبًا)</th>
<th>5 (تمامًا)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. على مقياس من 1-5، هل السلامة العامة تعني السلامة من خطر العاطفي؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>رقم</th>
<th>(أبداً)</th>
<th>1 (فقط)</th>
<th>2 (قليلًا)</th>
<th>3 (نوعًا ما)</th>
<th>4 (غالبًا)</th>
<th>5 (تمامًا)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. على مقياس من 1-5، هل السلامة العامة تعني السلامة من الاعتداءات؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>رقم</th>
<th>(أبداً)</th>
<th>1 (فقط)</th>
<th>2 (قليلًا)</th>
<th>3 (نوعًا ما)</th>
<th>4 (غالبًا)</th>
<th>5 (تمامًا)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. على مقياس من 1-5، هل السلامة العامة تعني الشعور بالأهمية داخل المجتمع؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>رقم</th>
<th>(أبداً)</th>
<th>1 (فقط)</th>
<th>2 (قليلًا)</th>
<th>3 (نوعًا ما)</th>
<th>4 (غالبًا)</th>
<th>5 (تمامًا)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. على مقياس من 1-5، هل السلامة العامة مرتبطة بعده احترام المجتمع الذي تسكن فيه ثقافتك الخاصة؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>رقم</th>
<th>(أبداً)</th>
<th>1 (فقط)</th>
<th>2 (قليلًا)</th>
<th>3 (نوعًا ما)</th>
<th>4 (غالبًا)</th>
<th>5 (تمامًا)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. على مقياس من 1-5، هل السلامة العامة مرتبطة بعده احترام المجتمع الذي تسكن فيه شخصيتك؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>رقم</th>
<th>(أبداً)</th>
<th>1 (فقط)</th>
<th>2 (قليلًا)</th>
<th>3 (نوعًا ما)</th>
<th>4 (غالبًا)</th>
<th>5 (تمامًا)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. على مقياس من 1-5، هل السلامة العامة مرتبطة بوجود شخص تلجأ إليه عندما تحس بعدم الأمان؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>رقم</th>
<th>(أبداً)</th>
<th>1 (فقط)</th>
<th>2 (قليلًا)</th>
<th>3 (نوعًا ما)</th>
<th>4 (غالبًا)</th>
<th>5 (تمامًا)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. على مقياس من 1-5، كيف هو شعورك بالأمان العام داخل المجتمع؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>رقم</th>
<th>(أبداً)</th>
<th>1 (فقط)</th>
<th>2 (قليلًا)</th>
<th>3 (نوعًا ما)</th>
<th>4 (غالبًا)</th>
<th>5 (تمامًا)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. على مقياس من 1-5، كيف هو شعورك بالأمن خلال التنقل من و إلى المدرسة أو مكان العمل؟

1 (غير آمن، أيد) 2 (قليلًا) 3 (بوعام) 4 (غالباً) 5 (أمان جدًا)

20. هل هناك أماكن في مجتمعك تشعر أنها أكثر أمانًا من غيرها؟ إذا كانت الإجابة بنعم، يرجى كتابة تلك الأماكن أدناه.

ا. فعلاً
ب. لا

21. هل التصور الخاص بك عن السلام العالم في مجتمعك يؤثر على كيفية قضاء الوقت الخاص بك؟

ا. نعم، أنا أتجنب أماكن معينة لأنها تجعلني أشعر بأمن أقل.
ب. نعم، أنا أذهب إلى بعض الأماكن في أوقات معينة لأنها تكون أكثر أمانًا.
ج. نعم، أتجنب القيام ببعض الأنشطة بمفردي لأنني أشعر بالأمن أكثر مع الأشخاص.
د. لا

22. على مقياس من 1-5، كم نسبة من سكنتها من مسؤوليات السلام العالم داخل مجتمعك الذي تشعر فيه تأثر على حياتك اليومية؟

1 (ليس بأي شيء) 2 (أقل) 3 (بوعام) 4 (غالباً) 5 (أي شيء)

23. أين كنت تقضي معظم وقتك مع أصدقائك؟

ا. في المدرسة
ب. في أماكن مخصصة للشباب والمهوبين
ج. أماكن عامة
د. المسكن الخاصة (منزلك أو منزل أي شخص آخر)

24. هل تعتقد أن موظفي المنظمات غير الحكومية في مجتمعك يعرفون مفهوم السلام العام بطريقة مختلفة عن تعريفك أنت؟

ا. نعم (إذا كانت الإجابة بنعم، يرجى الشرح أدناه)
ب. لا

25. هل تعتقد أن ضباط الشرطة والضباط المسؤولين العسكريين، أو الأمن الذين يعملون في مجتمعك يعرفون مفهوم السلام العام بطريقة مختلفة عن تعريفك أنت؟

ا. نعم (إذا كانت الإجابة بنعم، يرجى الشرح أدناه)
ب. لا
1. على مقياس من 1-5، ما هي نسبة التوافق بين تصوّرك لمفهوم السلمة العامة لمجتمعك ومفهوم السلمة العامة لمجتمعك لدى أفراد المجتمع الآخرين؟

2. ليس في كل شيء، ولديك تصوّر مختلف للغاية لمفهوم السلمة العامة في مجتمعك عن الآخرين.

3. (بقوة جدا، ولديك تصوّر مشابه جداً للسلامة العامة في مجتمعك كما يفعل الآخرون).

الجزء الثالث: تكامل المجتمع والتوتر

27. على مقياس من 1-5، ما هو تقسيمك لدى اندماج وتواصل مجتمعك مع بعضه البعض؟

1. ليس متكاملاً على الإطلاق
2. (متكاملاً بالكامل)
3. (متكاملاً إلى حد ما)
4. (متكاملاً في الغالب)
5. (متكاملاً تماما)

28. هل تشعر أن الانقسامات في مجتمعك مبنية على أحد الخيارات التالية؟

1. المثلية
2. الدين
3. وضع اللاجئين
4. آخر
5. أنا لا أشعر أن مجتمع متكامل

29. إذا كنت مشترك جزئياً بالمدرسة، ما هي طبيعة الطلاب في صفك؟

ا. معظم الطلاب هم مثلي (مثلًا: بسحور بسحور)
ب. العديد من الطلاب هم مثلي.
ج. توازن مشايع حيث يوجد عدد من الطلاب مثلي وعدد من الطلاب من خلفيات مختلفة
د. بعض الطلاب مثلي، ولكن معظم الطلاب من خلفيات أخرى
ه. جميع الطلاب من خلفيات مختلفة (مثلًا: جميع الطلاب الأردنيين إذا كنت أنت مثلي)

30. على مقياس من 1-5 كيف يعكس المادة التعليمية ومنهجية الدراسة ثقافتك وعمرك وديك؟

1. لا يعكس إيداه
2. 3
3. 4
4. 5 (يعكس وقوئه)

31. هل هناك أماكن في مجتمعك حيث كنت تشعر أن هناك مزيد من التوتر فيها؟

نعم (إذا كانت الإجابة بنعم، يرجى تحديد المكان، أنتان)
لا.
32. هل، أنت أو شخص تعرفه، تعرضوا للعنف الجسدي في مجتمعك؟

نعم فعلاً
لا

33. إذا كانت الإجابة بنعم، على مقياس من 1-5 مدى قوة تأثير هذه التجربة على التصور الخاص للسلامة العامة في مجتمعك؟

1 (بدأ)
2 (قليلًا)
3 (لمعًاما)
4 (غالبًا)
5 (قوة)

34. هل لدى مجتمعك نظام معمولًا بها لمنع أو التعامل مع الصراع بين أفراد المجتمع؟ ضع دانة على كل ما يتعلق.

ا. نعم، لدينا برامج لمنع الصراعات
ب. نعم، لدينا برامج لمعالجة الصراع بمجرد أن يحدث
د. لا

35. إذا كانت الإجابة بنعم، على مقياس من 1-5، كم أنت واقع في فاعليّة هذه البرامج؟

1 (لا تذكر)
2 (بدأ)
3 (قليلًا)
4 (لمعًاما)
5 (قوة)

36. هل أنت أو أي شخص تعرفه تعرض للإعتداء أو التحرش؟

ا. نعم فعلاً
ب. لا

37. إذا كانت الإجابة بنعم، على مقياس من 1-5 ما مدى قوة تأثير هذه التجربة على مفهومك للسلامة العامة في مجتمعك؟

1 (بدأ)
2 (قليلًا)
3 (لمعًاما)
4 (غالبًا)
5 (قوة)

الجزء الرابع: ترابط المجتمع

38. على مقياس من 1-5، كم بقوة تشعر أنك عضوًا مهمًا في مجتمعك؟

1 (ليس بقوة)
2 (قليلًا)
3 (لمعًاما)
4 (غالبًا)
5 (قوة)

39. هل هناك فعاليات أو برامج في مجتمعك مخصصة للفتيّة العمرية؟

ا. لا شيء على الإطلاق
ب. لا يكاد يذكر
ج. نعم، وعدد قليل
د. نعم كثیر
40. على مقياس من 1-5، هل الوصول إلى هذه البرامج سهل بالنسبة لك؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>لا شيء على الإطلاق</th>
<th>ب لا يكاد يذكر</th>
<th>ج نعم، وعدد قليل</th>
<th>د نعم، كثير</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>لا يمكن الوصول إليها بسهولة</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(لا يمكن الوصول إليها بسهولة)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41. هل هناك فعاليات أو برامج في مجتمعك مخصصة لمجموع عتك من نفس جنسك؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>لا شيء على الإطلاق</th>
<th>ب لا يكاد يذكر</th>
<th>ج نعم، وعدد قليل</th>
<th>د نعم، كثير</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>لا يمكن الوصول إليها بسهولة</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(لا يمكن الوصول إليها بسهولة)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42. على مقياس من 1-5، هل الوصول لهذه البرامج سهل بالنسبة لك؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>لا يمكن الوصول إليها بسهولة</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>لا يمكن الوصول إليها بسهولة</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(لا يمكن الوصول إليها بسهولة)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43. هل هناك فعاليات أو برامج في مجتمعك مخصصة لمجموع عتك من نفس الثقافتك؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>لا شيء على الإطلاق</th>
<th>ب لا يكاد يذكر</th>
<th>ج نعم، وعدد قليل</th>
<th>د نعم، كثير</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>لا يمكن الوصول إليها بسهولة</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(لا يمكن الوصول إليها بسهولة)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44. على مقياس من 1-5، هل الوصول لهذه البرامج سهل بالنسبة لك؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>لا يمكن الوصول إليها بسهولة</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>لا يمكن الوصول إليها بسهولة</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(لا يمكن الوصول إليها بسهولة)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45. على مقياس من 1-5 ما مدى مشاركتك في القرارات اليومية التي تؤثر على مجتمعك

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>لا أشارك</th>
<th>2 (قليل)</th>
<th>3 (روعاً ما)</th>
<th>4 (غالباً)</th>
<th>5 (أشار بكفة)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

46. هل توقعاتك المستقبلية تطابق توقعات مجتمعك مستقبلاً؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>مجموعي يتوقع لي بنسبة أكبر مما أتوقعه أنا لنفسي</th>
<th>لا، مجتمعي يتوقع لي أكثر مما أشعر به</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>نعم</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>مجتمع يتوقع لي بنسبة أكبر مما أتوقعه أنا لنفسي</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47. على مقياس من 1-5، ما مدى توفير مجتمعك للوسائل التي تمكنك من الوصول إلى الموارد التي تحتاجها للوصول إلى أهدافك؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>لا أحصل على كل ما أسألاً</th>
<th>2 (قليل)</th>
<th>3 (روعاً ما)</th>
<th>4 (غالباً)</th>
<th>5 (أحصل على كل ما أحتاج)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>لا أحصل على كل ما أسألاً</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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48. من الذي تعتبره من ضمن مصادر الدعم الخاصة بك (اختير كل ما ينطبق)

. الآباء
ب. أفراد الأسرة الآخرين
. معلمو
. الأصدقاء
. أفراد المجتمع
. أخرون

49. من الذي يمكن أن تلجأ إليه إذا كنت لا تشعر بالأمان؟ (اختير كل ما ينطبق)

. الآباء
ب. الأخوات والأخوات
. أجداد
. أفراد الأسرة الآخرين
. الأصدقاء
. أفراد المجتمع
. ضباط الشرطة
. أخرون

50. على مقياس من 1-5، ما قوة شعورك بأنه يوجد لديك مصادر دعم خاصة بك؟

1 (ليست قوية على الإطلاق) 2 (قليلًا) 3 (نوعيًا) 4 (غالبًا) 5 (قوية جدا)

أشكركم على مشاركتكم.
Perceptions of Community Safety Among Jordanian and Refugee Teens Living in Jordanian Host Communities

Interview Guide

Part A: Demographic Data
- Please confirm that you have agreed to have this interview audio-recorded.
- Please confirm that you have read and understood the confidentiality agreement.
- Please tell me your age.
- Please tell me your gender.
- Please tell me your nationality.

Part B. Description of Daily Life and Community
- How do you spend most of your time?
  - Are you in school? Is your school split into sessions? If so, which session do you attend?
  - Are there any organizations in your community that you are a part of or that you spend most of your time with?
  - Do you work?
  - How do you spend most of your free time?
- Describe for me, what you think of as your community.
  - Is your community mostly individuals who are the same nationality as you?

Part C: Direct Perceptions of Safety
- How do you define safety?
- Does your definition of safety change based on where you are?
  - What makes you feel safe or unsafe?
    - Are there places or activities in your community that makes you feel more or less safe than others?
  - Do any of those change depending on what time it is or whether your are with other people or not?
  - Do any of those change based on whether you are alone or based on what people you are with?
    - Do you feel safe traveling throughout your community?
  - Do those feelings of safety impact how you spend your time?
    - Do you feel like your community is one cohesive unit or is it divided in some way
      - If you feel it is divided, how does that division impact you?
    - Are there places in your community where you feel there is more tension or conflict
      - If so, what do you think causes that?
  - Are there places in your community where you feel there is especially less tension or conflict?
  - If so, what do you think causes that?
- Have you yourself or anyone you know experienced physical aggression in your community?
- Would you be willing to tell me about it?
- What do you think was at the root of the conflict?
  - Have you or anyone you know experienced bullying in your community
- What do you think was at the route of the conflict?
  - How does your community usually handle conflict that arises in your community?
- What are your thoughts on how these conflicts are handled? Does your community have any programs designed to prevent conflict?
  - How do you think NGO personnel who work in your community define safety?
  - How do you think police in your community define safety?

Part D. Indirect Perceptions of Safety
- Do you feel like you are an integrated/valued member of your community?
  - Are there events and programs in your community (at school, in after school programs, social events) that are geared toward your age group?
  - Are there events and programs in your community that are geared toward your gender?
  - Are there events and program in your community that are geared toward your culture?
- Are there places in your community where you are able to spend time with your friends?
- What do you expect/hope for yourself in the future?
  - Do you think your community provides you with access to the to the things that will help you reach your goals?
  - Do you think that what your community hopes for you and what you hope for you are similar?
- Do you feel like you have a strong support network?
  - Where do the members of your support network come from? Are they your family, friends, teachers at school?
  - Who would you go to if you felt unsafe?
- What sort of opportunities do you have to voice your opinion or participate in community decisions that affect your life?

Part E: Concluding Questions
- Is there anything else you think it is important for me to know?
- Do you have any questions for me?
- Is there anything you said during the interview that you would like me to remove from the recording?
- Would you like to know the results of this study when it is finished?
مؤسسة التعلم العالمية، الأردن
برنامج الصحة وتنمية المجتمع
كاتي ستيغنسون

التصورات عن السرعة المجتمعية بين الشباب الأردني و المراهقين اللاجئين الذين يعيشون في المجتمع الأردني.

دليل المقابلة

جزء آ: البيانات الديموغرافية.

• الرجاء التأكد من أنك قد وافقت على أن تكون هذه المقابلة مسجلة صوتياً.
• الرجاء التأكد من أنك قد قرأ وفهمت سريعة الاتفاقية "المقابلة".

من فضلك كم عمرك؟
من فضلك ما الجنس؟
من فضلك ما هي جنسيتك؟

جزء ب: وصف الحياة اليومية والمجتمعية.

• كيف كنت تقضي معظم وقتك؟
• هل أدت في المدرسة؟ هل المدرسة مقسمة إلى فترتين "صباحي مسائي"؟ إذا كان الأمر كذلك، أي فترة كنت تحضر؟
• هل تعمل؟
• كيف كنت تقضي معظم وقتك فراغك؟
• صف لي، ما تفكر به تجاه مجتمعك؟
• هل معظم الأفراد في مجتمعك من نفس جنسيتك؟

جزء ج: التصورات المباشرة عن السرعة

• كيف تعرف السرعة؟
هل تعريفك للسلامة يتغير بTên المكان؟

- ما الذي يجعلك تشعر بالأمان أو بدمه؟

هل هناك أماكن أو أنشطة في مجتمعك تجعلك تشعر أكثر أو أقل آمناً من غيرها؟

- هل أي من تلك التغيرات تعتمد على الوقت، أو على وجودك مع أشخاص آخرين؟

- هل أي من تلك التغيرات تعتمد على وجودك وحيداً أو تعتمد على الناس الذين كنت معهم؟

هل تشعر أن السفر آمن في جميع أنحاء منطقتك؟

هل تلك المشاعر بالأمان تؤثر على كيفية قضاء وقتك؟

هل تشعر أن مجتمعك وحدة واحدة متماسكة أم أنه مقسم بطريقة ما؟

- إذا كنت تشعر أنه مقسم، كيف يؤثر هذا التقسيم عليك؟

هل هناك أماكن في مجتمعك حيث كنت تشعر أن التوتر أو الصراع فيها أكثر؟

- إذا كان الأمر كذلك، في رأيك ما أسابيع ذلك؟

هل هناك أماكن في مجتمعك حيث كنت تشعر أن التوتر أو الصراع فيها أقل؟

- إذا كان الأمر كذلك، في رأيك ما أسابيع ذلك؟

هل تعرضت أنت أو أي شخص تعرفه لاعتداء جسدي في مجتمعك؟

- هل أنت على استعداد لتحدث عن ذلك؟

ماذا كان رأيك في مسار الصراع؟

هل اختبرت أنت أو أي شخص تعرفه مضاعفات "نفسية، كلامية" في مجتمعك؟

- ماذا كان رأيك في مسار الصراع؟

كيف يتعامل مجتمعك في العادة مع الصراع الذي ينشأ في منطقتك؟

- ما هي أفكارك حول كيفية التعامل مع هذه الصراعات؟ هل لدى مجتمعك أي برامج مصممة لمنع الصراع؟

كيف تفكر أن موظفي المنظمات غير الحكومية يعرفون السلامة في مجتمعك؟

- كيف تفكر أن الشرطة تعزف السلامة في مجتمعك؟
جزء D: التصورات غير المباشرة للسلامة

• هل تشعر بالتقدير والاندماج في مجتمعك؟
• هل هناك فعاليات وبرامج في مجتمعك (في المدرسة، في برامج ما بعد المدرسة، والمناسبات الاجتماعية) خاصة بنفسك العمرية؟

• هل هناك فعاليات أو برامج في مجتمعك خاصة بجنسك "ذكور، إناث"؟
• هل هناك فعاليات وبرامج في مجتمعك خاصة بثقافتك؟
• هل هناك أماكن في مجتمعك تكون فيها قادراً على قضاء بعض الوقت مع أصدقائك؟
• لماذا تتوقع، تأمل لنفسك في المستقبل؟

• هل تعتقد أن مجتمعك يوفر لك الأشياء التي ستساعدك في الوصول إلى تحقيق أهدافك في المستقبل؟
• هل تعتقد أن ما بتمناه مجتمعك لك، وتمناه لنفسك مشابه؟
• هل تشعر بأن لديك شبكة علاقات داعمة قوية؟
• من هم أعضاء شبكة علاقاتك؟ هل هم عائلتك، أصدقاءك، أم المعلمين في المدرسة؟
• إلى من ستذهب إذا شعرت بعدم الأمان؟

ما الفرص المتاحة لك للمشاركة في قرارات مجتمعك التي تؤثر على حياتك؟

جزء E: الأسئلة الختامية

• هل هناك أي شيء آخر تعتقد أنه من المهم أن أعرفه؟
• هل لديك أي أسئلة لي؟
• هل هناك أي شيء قلتني لي خلال مقابلة ترغب في حدفه من التسجيل؟
• هل ترغب في معرفة نتائج هذه الدراسة عندما يتم الانتهاء من ذلك.
Informed Consent Form

1. Information about research

The purpose of this research is to understand the way Jordanian and refugee adolescents define safety and perceive the safety of their community. The results of this study will hopefully provide a stronger understanding of how well the safety concerns of adolescents in Jordan are being met.

This research is being done as a requirement of the SIT Jordan: Health and Community Development study abroad program. The results of the research will be available on the Internet and may be used in the future for other research purposes.

2. Confidentiality and anonymity

The identity of participants will be protected in the reporting and analysis of the data. Participant’s responses will remain anonymous. Only the interpreter and Katie will have access to the raw data. Tape recordings will be stored for no more than one month until they are transcribed, and then the recordings will be destroyed. Completed surveys will similarly be destroyed once the data is input to the computer. All data will be stored on a password-protected computer.

3. Participant rights

Participation in this study should be completely voluntary. Absolutely no repercussions will result from an individual refusing to participate or a participant pulling their responses from the study. The success of the study relies heavily on the participant’s willingness to participate and the voluntary nature of participation.

Participants have the right to withdraw responses at any point in the analysis process. Participants have the right to refuse to answer any question asked in the in-depth interview. Participants also have the right to skip any questions in the questionnaire or terminate their participation at any time.

4. Statement on SIT official human subject policy

In an endeavor to uphold the ethical standards of all SIT ISP proposals, this study has been reviewed and approved by a Local Review Board or SIT Institutional Review Board. If at any time, you feel that you are at risk or exposed to unreasonable harm, you may terminate and stop the interview. Please take some time to carefully read the statements provided below.

a. **Privacy** - all information you present in this interview may be recorded and safeguarded. If you do not want the information recorded, you need to let the interviewer know.

b. **Anonymity** - all names in this study will be kept anonymous unless the participant chooses otherwise.

. **Confidentiality** - all names will remain completely confidential and fully protected by the interviewer. By signing below, you give the interviewer full responsibility to uphold this
contract and its contents. The interviewer will also sign a copy of this contract and give it to the participant.

5. Acknowledgement of informed consent

By signing below you are consenting to the use of your responses to in-depth interview and/or survey questions in a research study on adolescents perception of safety in Jordanian. You are also recognizing that data from this study may be used in future studies on similar topics. Furthermore, you are acknowledging full understanding of your rights while participating in this study.

Parent’s Signature:

Signature

Date

Participant Signature

Signature

Date

6. Acknowledgement of confidentiality

By signing below you are committing yourself to keeping the information provided by study participants confidential in all circumstances. This includes their identities, their responses to questions, and any other identifying information.

Signature of interview administrator

Date

Signature of translator

Date
نموذج موافقة على المشاركة في بحث

1. معلومات عن البحث

الهدف من هذا البحث هو فهم الطريقة التي يحدث فيها المراهقين مفهوم السلامة وما هو منظور السلامة في مجتمعهم. ونأمل أن تكون نتائج هذه الدراسة تساهم في توفير فهم أفضل عن مدى الاهتمام بسلامة المراهقين التي يتم توفيرها في الأردن.

هدف البحث:

يعتبر هذا البحث أحد متطلبات مؤسسة التعليم العالمية الأمريكية في الأردن: دراسات عامة حول الصحة وتنمية المجتمع.

نتائج هذا البحث ستكون متاحة على شبكة التواصل (الإنترنت)، ومن الممكن أن تستخدم هذه النتائج في المستقبل لأغراض بحثية أخرى.

2. الخصوصية والسرية:

كل المعلومات التي سيتم جمعها ستتعامل بسرية تامة من قبل الباحثة ولن يطلع على البيانات إلا الباحثة نفسها. بالإضافة إلى ذلك سيتم إخفاء البيانات لفتر الانتهاء من الدراسة وتحليل النتائج.

3. حقوق المشاركين:

المشتركة في البحث طوعية ومحترمة اختياراتك، لا يتطلب الاشتراك في البحث ذكر الاسم أو ما يدل عليه ومهمة كانت إجابتك أو رأيك فإن هذه الإجابات والأراء لن تؤثر بأي شكل كان على وضعك. كما أنه لديك الحق بعدم المشاركة في البحث إن شئت، وإذا ما غيرت رأيك وقرر الأنسحب بعد المشاركة يمكنك الانسحاب كذلك.

من حقك رفض السماح للباحثة باستخدام بيانات الدراسة في أي دراسات أخرى ستقوم بها الباحثة الرئيسية.

4. المعايير الأخلاقية لمؤسسة التعليم الأمريكية:

أ. الخصوصية - كل المعلومات ستجليها وحمايتها كما تتعامل بسرية تامة، من حقك رفض تسجيل المقابلة وذلك من خلال البحوث الرئيسي.

ب. عدم الكشف عن الهوية - لا يتطلب الاشتراك في البحث ذكر الاسم أو ما يدل عليه إلا إذا اختار المشاركون خلاف ذلك.

ج. السرية - إن جميع الأسماء ستبقى سرية تماما وحماية بالكامل من قبل الباحثة.

من خلال التوقيع أدناه، فإنك تعطي البحوث المسؤولية الكاملة لحفظ هذا العقد وتحويته. كما سيتم توقيع نسخة من هذا العقد وإعطائها للمشارك.

5. إقرار موافقة:
من خلال التوقيع أدناه، فإنك توافق على استخدام ردودك على أسئلة الاستطلاع في دراسة بحثية عنوان
(تصور المراهقين للسلامة في الأردن). كما أن توقيعك يعني أنك لا تمتع باستخدام ردودك على أسئلة
الاستطلاع خلال هذه الدراسة في دراسات مستقبلية على مواضيع مماثلة. وعلاوة على ذلك، توقيعك يعني
فهماك الكامل لحقوقك أثناء المشاركة في هذه الدراسة.

----- نعم ---- أوافق على تسجيل مقابلة علماً بأن المقابلة سيتم إتفاقها خلال شهر عند الانتهاء من تحليل
المعلومات.

توقيع ولي أمر المشترك---------- التاريخ:____________________________

توقيع المشترك -------------- التاريخ:____________________________

6. إقرار سرية:
من خلال التوقيع أدناه فإنك ملتزم بحفظ المعلومات المقدمة من قبل المشاركين في الدراسة بسرية في جميع
الأحوال. وهذا يشمل هوياتهم، أجوبتهم على الأسئلة، أو أي معلومات أخرى.

توقيع الباحثة -------------------------- التاريخ:________________________

توقيع المترجمة -------------------------- التاريخ:______________________