

## FOCUS Deliverable 3.1: Research design and methodology

Project title: Forced displacement and refugee-host community solidarity (FOCUS)

Funding scheme: Research and Innovation Action (RIA)

Project ID: H2020 822401

Project period: 1.1.2019 – 31.12.2021

Coordinator: Martha Bird [mabir@rodekors.dk](mailto:mabir@rodekors.dk) phone +45 3169 6540

EC Project Officer: [Luis.GARCIA-DOMINGUEZ@ec.europa.eu](mailto:Luis.GARCIA-DOMINGUEZ@ec.europa.eu) phone +32 2 299 1111

Workpackage 3

Deliverable 3.1

Due date of deliverable 30.09.2019.

Actual submission date 23.09.2019.

Authors dr. sc. Dean Ajduković (FFZG)

Jana Kiralj, mag. psych (FFZG)

Version	Date	Remark
1	23.09.2019.	Final deliverable D3.1

Dissemination Level		
<b>PU</b>	Public	PU
<b>PP</b>	Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services)	
<b>RE</b>	Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission Services)	
<b>CO</b>	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Glossary .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>1. Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>2. Introduction .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3. Research questions, indicators and analysis .....</b>	<b>10</b>
3.1 Research questions .....	10
3.1.1 <i>Research questions on socio-economic integration of refugees .....</i>	<i>12</i>
3.1.2 <i>Research questions on impact of refugee migration and integration on host communities .....</i>	<i>14</i>
3.1.3 <i>Research questions on socio-psychological integration of refugees on host community members .....</i>	<i>15</i>
3.1.4 <i>Research questions combining the socio-economic and socio-psychological aspects of integration.....</i>	<i>17</i>
3.2 Indicators and variables .....	18
3.2.1 <i>Socio-economic indicators .....</i>	<i>18</i>
3.2.2 <i>Socio-psychological indicators .....</i>	<i>19</i>
3.2.3 <i>Socio-demographic variables .....</i>	<i>19</i>
<b>4. Study design .....</b>	<b>20</b>
4.1 About the study design .....	20
4.1.1 <i>Quantitative survey data .....</i>	<i>20</i>
4.1.2 <i>Quantitative secondary sources data .....</i>	<i>20</i>
4.1.3 <i>Qualitative data .....</i>	<i>21</i>
4.2 Field study sites .....	21
<b>5. Ethical considerations .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>6. Sampling design .....</b>	<b>27</b>
6.1 Target group definition.....	27
6.2 Sample size .....	28
6.3 Sampling strategy .....	29

6.3.1	<i>Survey</i>	29
6.3.2	<i>Quality assurance before data collection</i>	34
6.3.3	<i>Quality assurance during data collection</i>	35
6.4	<i>Focus groups</i>	36
6.5	<i>Incentives</i>	37
<b>7.</b>	<b>Instruments and measures for the field study</b>	<b>38</b>
7.1	<i>Survey questionnaires</i>	38
7.1.1	<i>Survey questionnaire on socio-economic integration</i>	39
7.1.2	<i>Survey questionnaire on socio-psychological integration</i>	40
<b>8.</b>	<b>Secondary data</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>9.</b>	<b>Focus groups</b>	<b>46</b>
9.1	<i>Theoretical Background</i>	46
9.1.1	<i>Groups and Composition of Groups</i>	46
9.1.2	<i>The Purpose of the Focus Group</i>	46
9.2	<i>Organizational Aspects</i>	47
9.2.1	<i>Location/ Amenities</i>	47
9.2.2	<i>Refreshments</i>	47
9.2.3	<i>Duration</i>	48
9.2.4	<i>Incentives</i>	48
<b>10.</b>	<b>Piloting the survey procedure</b>	<b>49</b>
10.1	<i>Purpose of the pilot study</i>	49
10.2	<i>Ethical considerations</i>	50
10.3	<i>Sampling strategy for the pilot</i>	50
10.4	<i>Data collection procedure</i>	51
10.4.1	<i>Time and place of collection of data on instruments</i>	51
10.4.2	<i>Data collectors (interviewers)</i>	52
10.4.3	<i>Instruments</i>	52
10.4.4	<i>Ensuring the understanding of the purpose of the pilot study</i>	53
10.4.5	<i>Procedure</i>	54
10.4.6	<i>Incentives</i>	57
10.5	<i>Data reporting template and analysis</i>	58
10.6	<i>Pilot study results</i>	58
<b>11.</b>	<b>Analytic strategy for the results of the field study</b>	<b>60</b>

11.1	Strategy analysis for indicators of socio-economic integration .....	60
11.2	Strategy analysis for indicators of socio-psychological integration .....	68
11.3	Strategy analysis for research questions combining the socio-economic and socio-psychological aspects of integration .....	71
<b>12.</b>	<b>Conclusions .....</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>13.</b>	<b>Bibliography .....</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>14.</b>	<b>Appendices .....</b>	<b>74</b>

## Glossary

---

**Forced migration** is not a legal concept, but a term that covers many different types of displacement or involuntary movement – both across international borders and inside a single country. The term has, for example, been used to refer to people who have been displaced by environmental disasters, conflict, famine, or large-scale development projects.<sup>1</sup>

A **refugee** is someone who has been forced to flee his or her country because of persecution, war, or violence. According to the 1951 *Convention relating to the Status of Refugees*, a refugee is a person who "owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group, or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality, and is unable to or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country..." All refugees are by definition also forced migrants.<sup>2</sup>

**Asylum seekers** are individuals who have sought international protection and whose claims for refugee status have not yet been determined.<sup>3</sup>

Individuals under **UNHCR's statelessness mandate** are defined under international law as those not considered as nationals by any State under the operation of its law. In other words, they do not possess the nationality of any State. UNHCR<sup>4</sup> has been given a global mandate by the United Nations General Assembly to contribute to the prevention and reduction of statelessness and the protection of stateless persons.

---

<sup>1</sup> UNHCR (2017): Global Trends: Forced Displacement in 2016. Retrieved from: <http://www.unhcr.org/5943e8a34>

<sup>2</sup> UNHCR (2017): Global Trends: Forced Displacement in 2016, p.56. Retrieved from: <http://www.unhcr.org/5943e8a34>

<sup>3</sup> UNHCR (2017): Global Trends: Forced Displacement in 2016, p.56. Retrieved from: <http://www.unhcr.org/5943e8a34>

<sup>4</sup> UNHCR (2017): Global Trends: Forced Displacement in 2016. Retrieved from: <http://www.unhcr.org/5943e8a34>

# 1. Executive Summary

---

The FOCUS project is based on a number of activities which will both improve understanding of integration and assist the implementation of effective practices. This report represents the completion of the preparatory phase of a significant research exercise in four countries with distinct patterns and experiences of both forced migration and integration. The research, to be conducted in Sweden, Germany, Croatia and Jordan, aims at answering questions on the status of socio-economic and socio-psychological integration of both refugees from Syria and host community members, as well as the inter-relationship of these two aspects of integration.

In preparation for the scientific field study and to ensure that it will provide relevant data and enable conclusions, a distinct Work Package (WP3) has focused on developing a detailed methodology covering both the quantitative and qualitative dimensions of the research in the four countries. The field study methodology is outlined in this report.

The report starts with the definition of research questions, indicators and variables that answer those questions. This is followed by important ethical considerations for the main field study in the four countries. The study design is then described, detailing a triangulation of data to be collected during the research (WP4). Instruments for the field study are described next, followed by the definition of secondary data and the focus group discussion structure.

To ensure the applicability of the instruments in the main study, a pilot study involving 118 participants was conducted, and the procedure and results are presented here. The instruments were adapted based on these results and are presented in the appendices.

In conclusion, the analytical strategy for future data collected is defined.

## 2. Introduction

---

The core objectives of the FOCUS project are twofold: to increase the understanding of forced migration and to provide effective, evidence-based solutions for the challenges of forced migration, aiming to contribute to positive outcomes of refugee integration into the host community. In order to ensure state-of-the-art knowledge and approaches to refugee integration, three major dimensions of FOCUS are defined – research, solutions and policy engagement. The research dimension includes several elaborate and inter-dependent phases: a comprehensive mapping of available evidence, policies and solutions of forced migration (WP2), the joint design of socio-economic and socio-psychological research methodology (WP3), an extensive field research programme in four countries (WP4) and the development and pilot testing of socio-economic and socio-psychological indicators of integration based on the results of previous theoretical and practical findings (WP5).

WP3 is directed at combining state-of-the-art knowledge on socio-economic and socio-psychological integration and well-established methodological principals of mixed-methods multi-site field study to insure the validity and relevance of field study findings. The objective is to develop a common research methodology to study socio-psychological dimensions of the host community and refugee relations and to analyse the socio-economic integration of refugees and the consequences of this in host societies.

This task serves as a foundation for later work. Particularly given the fact that solutions and policy recommendations are the end goal of FOCUS, they greatly depend on the field study results. Therefore, elaborated and theoretically grounded methodology is imperative, as the study implementation and results are directly influenced by the quality of the study design and methodology.

The basis for this work is an extensive literature review (conducted in WP2), summarizing valuable scientific and practice information on socio-economic and socio-psychological integration of migrants and host communities.<sup>5</sup>

In this report, the design of the field study is explained in detail, starting with the research questions and indicators based on the literature review of socio-

---

<sup>5</sup> D2.1 Mapping of host-community/refugee relations. WP leader: MAU



economic and socio-psychological integration of refugees into the host community (Task 3.1). The specification of the field study methodology is presented next (Task 3.2), with study and sampling design depicted in detail. A description of instruments and measures (Task 3.3) is presented next, followed by the results of the piloting of instruments. The report concludes with the analytical strategy for the results of the main study, linking WP3: Field research methodology with WP4: Field studies in Jordan, Croatia, Germany and Sweden.

### 3. Research questions, indicators and analysis

---

Within Task 3.1 we propose specific research questions and indicators that guide the further specification of methodology for the field studies (Task 3.2) and instruments and measurements for field study (Task 3.2) that will be used in four countries (WP4). These research questions and indicators are about socio-psychological integration of refugees as seen from host community members' and refugees' perspectives, assessing the socio-economic integration of refugees, its impact on host communities and the perception of this impact by host communities.

These research questions guide operationalisation of indicators of socio-economic and socio-psychological integration for both the quantitative survey and qualitative focus group part of the study, as well as analytical strategies of data that will be harvested (WP4).

The research indicators guide selection of the instruments included in the survey, data sets from secondary sources and development of the guides for focus group discussions.

The state-of-the-art knowledge presented in two systematic literature reviews on socio-economic integration (Task 2.1) and socio-psychological integration (Task 2.2) served to develop these research questions and indicators.

The first set of 7 research questions address the dimensions of socio-economic integration of refugees, its impact on host communities, as well as the perception of this impact by host communities.

The second set of 4 research questions looks at the process of socio-psychological integration of host community members and refugees from their respective perspectives.

The final two research questions bring together the socio-economic and socio-psychological aspects of integration.

#### 3.1 Research questions

In this section, all research questions are listed together with explanations for their definition.

### **FOCUS multi-site field study Research Questions**

**RQ 1:** What is the socio-economic situation of refugees from Syria in the four host countries as indicated by secondary and aggregate data?

**RQ 1.1:** Are there differences in the socio-economic situation of refugees from Syria by demographic, human capital and local characteristics, and in comparison with the host population and other immigrant population residing in the host country?

**RQ 2:** What is the socio-economic situation of refugees in the four host countries as indicated by newly collected survey data?

**RQ 2.1:** What are main factors correlating with the socio-economic status of refugees?

**RQ 3:** How do host community members perceive the socio-economic situation of refugees in the host communities?

**RQ 4:** How do host community members' perceptions of the socio-economic situation of refugees compare to the actual socio-economic situation of refugees?

**RQ 5:** What is the demographic and socio-economic impact of migration and socio-economic situation of refugees on host countries?

**RQ 6:** How do host community members perceive the socio-economic impact of refugee migration and integration on host communities?

**RQ 7:** How do host community members' perceptions of the socio-economic impact of refugee migration on their communities compare to the actual socio-economic impact of refugee migration?

**RQ 8:** What is the nature of intergroup relations between host community members and refugees in four study sites?

**RQ 9:** To what extent do host community members and refugees interact and what is the nature of these interactions?

**RQ 10:** What are the characteristics of host community members and refugees that hinder or facilitate the socio-psychological integration?

**RQ 11:** How does socio-psychological integration differ across local communities and participating countries?

**RQ 12:** How is the host community members' perception of socio-economic integration of refugees and their perception of the impact of refugee migration related to hosts' socio-psychological relations with refugees?

**RQ 13:** How is the socio-economic situation of refugees related to their socio-psychological integration?

### 3.1.1 Research questions on socio-economic integration of refugees

*RQ 1: What is the socio-economic situation of refugees from Syria in the four host countries as indicated by secondary and aggregate data?*

*RQ 1.1: Are there differences in the socio-economic situation of refugees from Syria by demographic, human capital and local characteristics, and in comparison with the host population and other immigrant population residing in the host country?*

This research question will provide the project with an overview of the socio-economic situation of refugees from Syria through analysis of available aggregate and secondary data in the four host countries. Analysis of extensive longitudinal and administrative data for Sweden will provide the possibility to validate the survey data that will be used for socio-economic status indicators not available in the Swedish administrative data. For Germany, using the SOEP panel on refugees, the project will establish what the socio-economic situation of refugees from Syria is in comparison to other refugees at one point in time. As in the case of Sweden, it will be used to validate the data provided by the survey of socio-economic indicators.

For Croatia and Jordan only aggregate data is available and comparison of these data with the survey data to be gathered by the project will be less in depth than in other two countries. However, for Croatia and Jordan the survey will provide information on the socio-economic situation of the refugees not available at the moment. Together the secondary data analysis and the survey data analysis on the socio-economic position of refugees the four countries will be unique and deliver a valuable contribution to the research on the socio-economic integration of refugees in these countries.

**RQ 2:** What is the socio-economic situation of refugees in the four host countries as indicated by newly collected survey data?

**RQ 2.1:** What are main factors correlating with the socio-economic status of refugees?

While secondary data offers information on a large scale, the survey will offer an in-depth insight of the current socio-economic situation of refugees from Syria in four study countries. The survey will offer recent and detailed information on the socio-economic integration of refugees, on the facilitating and hindering factors of this integration in each of the four countries and allow comparison across these countries. Additionally, the simultaneous collection of socio-economic and socio-psychological data will enable comparisons between these concepts, such as analysis of socio-economic position in relation to socio-psychological indicators of integration.

*RQ 3: How do host community members perceive the socio-economic situation of refugees in the host communities?*

The survey of host community members will provide information on how they perceive socio-economic integration of refugees. The data gathered will be analysed across various socio-demographic variables in the respective country. In RQ 12, this data will be related to the socio-psychological indicators of integration, thereby extending the knowledge on relations between socio-economic and socio-psychological integration of refugees and host community members and the impact of forced migration on the host communities.

*RQ 4: How do host community members' perceptions of the socio-economic situation of refugees compare to the actual socio-economic situation of refugees?*

This question connects RQ2 with RQ3 by comparing the actual figures on the socio-economic situation of refugees with the perceptions of host community members regarding the socio-economic situation of refugees. The comparison will allow for assessing how these perceptions may differ from reality.

### **3.1.2 Research questions on impact of refugee migration and integration on host communities**

*RQ 5: What is the demographic and socio-economic impact of migration and socio-economic situation of refugees on host countries?*

This research question needs extensive secondary and administrative statistical information in order to be answered convincingly. Since only Sweden has this statistical information, this analysis will only be conducted for Sweden. The analysis will contain a geographical mapping on where refugees from Syria are living, to what extent they have obtained work in so called shortage or surplus jobs, indicating being a complement or a supplement to the host workforce. Moreover, the data will allow studying the fiscal effects of socio-economic integration of refugees from Syria (per capita revenues minus per capita spending).

*RQ 6: How do host community members perceive the socio-economic impact of refugee migration and integration on host communities?*

The survey of host community members will provide information on how they perceive the impact of migration on the host communities regarding socio-economic issues. These data will be related to socio-psychological indicators of integration, thereby extending the knowledge on relations between socio-economic and socio-psychological integration of refugees and host community members.

*RQ 7: How do host community members' perceptions of the socio-economic impact of refugee migration on their communities compare to the actual socio-economic impact of refugee migration?*

The comparison of host community members' perceptions of the socio-economic impact of refugee migration on their communities with the actual socio-economic impact (established in RQ 5) will provide information on congruence of these perceptions with reality.

### **3.1.3 Research questions on socio-psychological integration of refugees on host community members**

*RQ 8: What is the nature of intergroup relations between host community members and refugees in four study sites?*

Relations between two groups are reflected in the way the members of one group think, feel and behave towards the members of the other group (“outgroup”). In that sense, the socio-psychological indicators of integration, such as intergroup attitudes, perception of intergroup threat, support for refugee’s entitlements, prosocial behaviours, intergroup contact, social networking and social proximity, support for integration as a form of acculturation, and intergroup discrimination, are indicative of the state of the socio-psychological integration process. Survey data for socio-psychological indicators will provide information on the nature of these relationships between the refugees and host community members, based on comparisons between host community members and refugees. Such comparisons will be done at each study site, and further explored in RQ11. Determining the current state of relations between refugees and host community members is a vital starting point towards the understanding of what facilitates or hinders socio-psychological integration addressed in RQ10.

*RQ 9: To what extent do host community members and refugees interact and what is the nature of these interactions?*

As integration of refugees and host community members presumes their interaction, measuring the characteristics of these interactions is crucial. Not only is it important to determine how often do the members of the two groups come into contact, but also where they are more likely to meet and what is the quality of such contacts. Survey data will allow for better understanding of the quantity and quality of contact between the groups, structure of social networks and the position of the outgroup members within these networks. The data will enable assessment of social proximity between the members of the two groups, as well as to the hosts’ perception of and refugees’ experience with discrimination. This research question will be answered in all four study sites while cross-country comparisons will be addressed in RQ11.

*RQ 10: What are the characteristics of host community members and refugees that hinder or facilitate the socio-psychological integration?*

Individual socio-demographic and socio-economic characteristics of participants that will be collected in the survey are presumed to be related to their socio-psychological integration. Relating selected socio-demographic (such as age, gender, family structure, education, length of stay in the host country, health status, completion of immersion programs, language proficiency, political orientation, religion) and socio-economic (such as employment, income, housing and neighbourhood quality) indicators with indicators of socio-psychological intergroup relations, will extend the understanding of factors and their interrelations that hinder or facilitate socio-psychological integration separately for the hosts and refugees. The most important predictors of socio-psychological integration for refugees and for host community members will be identified and compared. This knowledge will feed into the tools and solutions work package of the project.

The data on socio-economic and socio-psychological aspects of integration gathered in the same survey from both host community members and refugees has not been reported yet in the scientific literature. This approach provides a unique opportunity to study the combination of socio-economic and socio-psychological indicators of integration and learn about factors and their interactions that facilitate or hinder integration processes. Analyses aimed at answering this research question will be done in all study sites and compared in RQ11.

*RQ 11: How does socio-psychological integration differ across local communities and participating countries?*

The survey data gathered in several communities in each of the four countries will be compared within a country, and the same will be done across countries using descriptive statistics. In addition, structure of particular factors that are predictive of socio-psychological integration for host community members and for refugees (identified in RQ10) will be compared across countries with the attempt to identify those that are common in these very diverse settings. Therefore, answers to this research question will complement the findings from analysing the intergroup relations (RQ8) and the interactions between host community members and refugees (RQ9) through cross-country comparisons. Such comparison will add



to the validity of conclusions on common and potentially universal factors of socio-psychological integration.

### **3.1.4 Research questions combining the socio-economic and socio-psychological aspects of integration**

*RQ 12: How is the host community members' perception of socio-economic integration of refugees and their perception of the impact of refugee migration related to hosts' socio-psychological relations with refugees?*

Data from both socio-economic and socio-psychological parts of the survey of host community members will be used to relate their perceptions of socio-economic integration of refugees and of impact of refugee migration on host communities with indicators of their socio-psychological relations with refugees. The assumption is that hosts' perceptions about the refugees will be related to different indicators of relations of host community members towards the refugees.

*RQ 13: How is the socio-economic situation of refugees related to their socio-psychological integration?*

Survey data on socio-economic situation of refugees identified under RQ 2 will be correlated with indicators of their socio-psychological integration (RQ 8), thus providing insight into how socio-economic indicators are related with their socio-psychological integration.

## 3.2 Indicators and variables

### 3.2.1 Socio-economic indicators

#### Education:

- Highest level of education attained after immigration
- Participation and completion in civic integration/introduction programs
- Participation in unofficial integration programs
- Host country's language proficiency
- Recognition of qualifications

#### Employment:

- Employment situation
- Job income
- Permanent vs. temporary contracts
- Occupational level
- Education to job match
- Satisfaction with the job
- Working hours
- Access to employment

#### Welfare assistance:

- Financial assistance

#### Housing:

- Tenure status/ tenure insecurity
- Housing affordability (rental)
- Overcrowding rate
- Suitability of housing
- Neighbourhood quality: proximity of services, crime, proportion of ethnic minorities/ refugees in the neighbourhood

#### Host perceptions of socio-economic impact of migration:

- Host perception of refugee educational level
- Host perception of refugee employment level
- Host perception of welfare received by refugees

- Host perception of refugee living conditions
- Host perception of refugee employment effects
- Host perception of refugee impact on economic growth
- Host perception of refugee fiscal effects

### **3.2.2 Socio-psychological indicators**

- Attitudes between refugees and host community members
- Perception of intergroup threat
- Views regarding refugee rights and entitlements
- Pro-refugee assisting behaviours
- Quantity and quality of intergroup contact and social networking
- Social distance (proximity) between members of the two groups
- Support for forms of acculturation
- Perception of and experience with intergroup discrimination

### **3.2.3 Socio-demographic variables**

Apart from the above listed indicators and related variables, selected socio-demographic characteristics will be gathered and used in the analyses to answer research questions, such as age, gender, family structure, intermarriage, education, employment status before immigration, length of stay in the host country, health status, language proficiency, household income, access to mental health services, political orientation, religion, family reunion, unaccompanied minors, as well as institutional indicators gathered based on secondary data that entail employment/unemployment rates, number of immigrants/ethnic minorities in the neighbourhood, number of newly arrived refugees from Syria.

## 4. Study design

---

### 4.1 About the study design

The study will include both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods, as well as the analysis of secondary data. The survey of refugees from Syria and host community members will provide data for socio-economic and socio-psychological analyses on the relations and factors hindering and or facilitating integration between the groups, whereas data from secondary sources will serve to answer the research questions about the socio-economic impact of refugee migration on local communities. The qualitative part of the study will provide a deeper understanding of barriers, opportunities and solutions for integration from the perspectives of both refugees and host communities.

#### 4.1.1 Quantitative survey data

The survey data collection will use standard procedures that allow comparison among the study sites and that have been tested and validated in the pilot study phase in each country. The content of the survey is based on the research questions and indicators defined in Task 3.1, and will be highly similar for both host and refugee participants in order to allow comparative analysis reflecting the intergroup dynamics. The survey questionnaire will be administered in the mother tongue of the participants and the full language fidelity is ensured by back translation and alignment with native speakers. In all cases, data collection will be done by trained professional staff. The specific contents of the survey are presented later in section 7. Instruments and measures for the field study.

#### 4.1.2 Quantitative secondary sources data

Data from secondary sources relate to socio-economic research questions and indicators of costs and benefits of refugee social and labour integration as defined in Task 3.1. and socio-economic factors that facilitate or hinder integration of refugees from Syria. The secondary data sources will be accessed following the protocol in Sweden and Germany.

### **4.1.3 Qualitative data**

In order to provide illustrative and in-depth information of host community and refugee integration gaps, opportunities and solutions, qualitative data will be gathered by using focus group discussions of key informants among the host community members and refugees from Syria. The topics will address the same issues as in the survey, but using a different method, allowing for comparison and completion of data. The focus group method will be employed with five to eight persons in each group. In each country six focus groups are planned, but that number can differ depending on the criterion of reaching the information saturation level. Focus groups will be held in the mother tongue of the participants and, if necessary, with an interpreter.

The triangulation of data using different sources (survey, secondary sources and focus groups) will increase comprehension of integration challenges and opportunities faced by both host community members and refugees, and provide an in-depth view of the socio-economic and socio-psychological aspects of integration. It will increase credibility (internal validity), transferability (external validity) and dependability (reliability) of the findings within each study site and across them.

## **4.2 Field study sites**

The field study will take place in four countries: Jordan, Croatia, Germany and Sweden. These research sites were chosen based on three main considerations. First, these countries differ in their asylum roles: Jordan is the first country of asylum and together with Sweden and Germany it is also a destination country. Jordan and Croatia are transit countries, and Croatia is increasingly becoming a resettlement country. Second, Jordan, Germany and Sweden host many Syrian refugees, and Croatia is a much-used entry point into the European Union and many refugees who resettled in Germany and Sweden transited through Croatia. Lastly, a comparative analysis of integration among these four countries with different roles and experiences in the refugee resettlement will yield useful information for policies of managing refugee migration.

In each country, three study locations will be chosen based on the number of resettled refugees from Syria in the areas. It is important that the locations in each

country are ones in which refugees from Syria reside, therefore increasing the number of possible interactions with the host community members. As described in the former section, several of the socio-economic and all of socio-psychological integration indicators are related to the relationship between host community members and refugees and therefore the choice of study locations must enable the measurement of these relationships.

Differences between the study sites are most notable between the European sites (Sweden, Germany, Croatia) and Jordan. Therefore, an extensive report was prepared by CSS explaining the current situation of refugees from Syria in Jordan, as well as the need for adaptation of procedures and instruments to suit the Jordanian study site. This report is presented in Appendix 15.

## 5. Ethical considerations

---

In order to ensure an ethical approach to field research as well as data management in concordance with the GDPR, several sources of guidance on ethics were used in forming of study design, including the *Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct*<sup>6</sup>, *FOCUS Research Ethics Manual* (part of DMP, D1.2), the European Commission *Guidance Note on Research on refugees, asylum seekers & migrants*<sup>7</sup>, and recommendations of the Ethics Management Team and Ethics Advisory Board of FOCUS project.

As described in the *FOCUS Research Ethics Manual*, the general principles of FOCUS fieldwork are (i) respect for participants' dignity and integrity, (ii) honesty, objectivity and transparency, (iii) confidentiality, (iv) respect for participants' privacy and (v) avoidance of ethnocentricity by respecting participants' ethnicity, culture, language and religion (D1.2 Data Management Plan, pp. 109). In the field study, this is concretely achieved by:

- Conducting a data protection impact assessment for the proposed data collection (see D1.2)
- Developing a detailed *Information letter* that will be handed to the participant before the beginning of data collection
- Developing an *Informed consent* form that includes clear information on what the participant is agreeing to
- Developing the survey *Questionnaire* and *Focus group guide*
- Developing the *Interviewer manual* for interviewers and interpreters
- Developing the *Trainer manual* for the training of interviewers and interpreters
- *Piloting* the above listed instruments and adjusting them according to the feedback on comprehension and acceptability

---

<sup>6</sup> American Psychological Association. <https://www.apa.org/ethics/code/>

<sup>7</sup> DG Research and Innovation.

[https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/other/hi/guide\\_research-refugees-migrants\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/other/hi/guide_research-refugees-migrants_en.pdf)

## **Information letter for the survey / focus group discussion**

The information letter for the survey consists of ten short sections fully informing the participants of the purpose of the survey/focus group discussion, why was he/she approached and that there are no consequences for declining to participate or withdraw from the study. The letter also describes what is expected from the participant and what are the benefits of participation. It is also clearly explained that the study is of minimal risk for the participant, and what he/she can do if, for any reason, he/she feels distressed during or after participation.

In compliance with the GDPR, the letter also includes information on the type of personal information that will be collected and assures confidentiality of data. The use of results and the way the person can participate are described next. The letter concludes with contacts of the lead researcher of the study country, the Research Ethics Committee of the responsible institution and the Data Protection Officer.

Additionally, the terms “host community members”<sup>8</sup> and “refugees from Syria”<sup>9</sup> are explained to the participants at the beginning of any data collection process to ensure the understanding of key groups in the study. Information letters were developed for the quantitative and qualitative parts of the research, and for refugee and host community members. They are presented in appendices 1, 2 and 9.

## **Informed consent for the survey / focus group discussion**

Following the Information letter, participants will be presented with the Statement of informed consent to participation in a survey / focus group discussion.

It includes a list of six statements. By signing the informed consent, the participant declares that he/she:

- Has read and understood the *Information Letter*;
- Had the opportunity to ask questions about the research and have had those questions answered to his/her satisfaction;

---

<sup>8</sup> *Host community members*: persons who have citizenship or permanent residence in the respective country and have been living in the same host community for at least 7 years (at least since 2013.).

<sup>9</sup> *Refugees*: Forced migrants from Syria who have received the international protections status (asylum) and are living in respective host communities from year 2015 onward.



- Understands that he/she may withdraw himself/herself and his/her survey responses from the research at any time, for any reason, without negative consequences of any kind;
- Understands that if he/she chooses to end participation during the survey, any responses collected up to that point will be deleted; and that responses can be removed after the survey is completed if he/she so requests (using the unique code number written on top of the Information letter);
- Consents to participating in the survey; and
- Consents to the processing of his/her personal data for the purposes of this research.

The Informed consent forms are presented in appendices 3, 4 and 10. In case the participant does not wish to sign the form, but would still like to participate in the study (this can be for cultural reasons), they may give oral consent in presence of a witness.

## **Survey Questionnaire and Focus group guide**

Survey questionnaire and focus group guide are described in detail in sections 7. *Instruments and measures for the field study* and 9. *Focus groups*. Questionnaires are presented in appendices 5 and 6.

## **Interviewer and Trainers manual**

In order to prepare the interviewers and interpreters for the collection of survey data, an *Interviewer manual* was developed containing all relevant information for the periods prior, during and after survey data collection. As an introduction, it defines what the FOCUS project is and the purpose of multi-site field study. Instruments are described next, followed by details of the procedure of data collection. The manners in which quality of data collection will be assured is defined next. Finally, specifics of the instruments are listed to help the interviewer and interpreter answer the potential questions of participants'. The Interviewer Manual comes in two versions that differ only in the translation of parts that will be spoken out loud to the participants – the version for refugees from Syria has these parts translated into Arabic to ease the communication for the interpreters of Arabic and to ensure fidelity across sites. Both versions are presented in appendices 12 and 13.

A *trainers manual* was developed for the introduction and training of data collectors and will be used by the trainers before the start of survey data collection. Apart from information incorporated into the Interviewer manual, the Trainers Manual also answers any questions the interviewers and interpreters might have about the data collection process. It is presented in appendix 14.

As the field study is to be conducted in four sites and by four institutions, clearance from the Ethics Board of each of four institutions will be sought based on the design of the methodology for the field study. Before the beginning of the field study, approvals from relevant research Boards in Sweden, Germany, Croatia and Jordan will be collected. As part of the ethics management work in the project, a validation procedure will be completed by the Ethics Management Team within WP4 to ensure that all standards of research ethics and privacy protection were met.

## 6. Sampling design

---

### 6.1 Target group definition

The target group of **refugees from Syria** is operationally described as forced migrants from Syria who have been recognized as refugees by UNHCR from 2011. onward in Jordan, or have received the international protection status (asylum) from 2015. onward for European countries, and have been living in respective host communities from the point of receiving this status to date. The criteria of different years of being recognized as a refugee (in Jordan) or receiving asylum (in Europe) was chosen since the peak of influx of refugees from Syria to Jordan was in 2013., but the refugees from Syria started arriving in greater numbers in 2011./2012. The European Union experienced major increases in the arrival of refugees in 2015.

Differences in defining the target groups between European countries and Jordan are noted and justified in the report on Jordanian specific considerations attached in Appendix 15.

Qualifying criteria for refugees from Syria to be included in the survey:

- Age – respondents between 18 and 65 years.
- Refugee/asylum status – respondents who have received the decision regarding their status; if rejected the refugee/asylum status do not qualify for the study.
- Year of receiving refugee status – respondents who received their refugee/asylum status after 2015. (2011. in Jordan) qualify for the study. In Jordan the applicable criteria for acknowledging the refugee status will be used.
- Not living in a camp/shared accommodation for refugees – respondents who live in a camp or shared accommodation for refugees do not qualify for the study<sup>10</sup>.

---

<sup>10</sup> This is because the data necessary for answering research questions in this study should come from the respondents who have the chance to interact with the members of the other group. This chance of contact and interaction is significantly lower in camps and shared accommodation designated strictly for refugees.

**Host community members** are defined as persons who have citizenship or permanent residency in the respective European country and have been living in the same host community for at least 7 years (at least since 2013.). The criterion of length of stay in the same community has been chosen as a sum of two years prior to the beginning of the migration wave from Syria to Europe and the number of years passed since, making a total of 7 years. For Jordan, the host community members are defined as Jordanian citizens, as in Jordan foreigners cannot receive citizenship or permanent residence. It is important that the survey participants in the host communities are long-residing individuals in a respective community to have been able to develop profound experience of living in and attachment to the community.

The qualifying criteria for the host community members to be included in the survey:

- Age – participants between 18 and 65 years.
- Number of years living in the respective country – participants living in the host community more than 7 years.
- Citizenship or residence – participants who have country citizenship or permanent residence.

## 6.2 Sample size

The sample size for each study site is presented in Table 1.

*Table 1.* Sample size per country.

	Country			
	Jordan	Croatia	Germany	Sweden
Host community members	600	600	600	600
Refugees from Syria	600	200	600	600

In all countries 600 host community members will participate in the study. These numbers have been calculated using confidence level of 0,95 and margin of error +/- 4%. In Jordan, Germany and Sweden 600 refugees from Syria will also participate, calculated using 0,95 confidence level and margin of error +/- 4%, while in Croatia that number will be 200 as there is a comparatively lower number

of refugees from Syria residing in Croatia (yielding margin of error +/- 5%). The sampling will be gathered in three purposefully selected in-country communities with high concentration and number of refugees from Syria.

With 2400 host community participants and 2000 refugee participants, between-countries comparisons are feasible.

## **6.3 Sampling strategy**

### **6.3.1 Survey**

The probabilistic sampling design will be used to approach host community members in the target areas, yielding a representative sample for these selected in-country communities. To approach the refugees from Syria probabilistic sampling will be used in Sweden, while in Germany, Jordan and Croatia reaching out to this population will be done through NGOs and other stakeholders that maintain contact with refugees.

#### **Selecting target communities**

In each country, both host community members and refugees will be surveyed in the same three purposefully selected in-country areas (regions, cities) with a high concentration and number of refugees. In Jordan, four areas are defined.

Since the research questions focus on socio-economic and on socio-psychological aspects of integration, the areas where the two groups are most likely to interact are relevant for this study. Therefore, in each country the partners will select three areas (regions, cities) which have the highest proportion and number of refugees, thus increasing the likelihood that both host community members and refugees have first-hand experience of interacting with each other. However, the proportion of refugees in these areas should not be such that they represent the majority of the local population. If possible, the three selected areas should provide a diversity of overall economic status and population size to increase the heterogeneity of the overall sample per country.

There are no additional criteria for choosing sampling areas and each partner will purposefully select areas in which sampling will be done. The justification for the selection will be noted in each country report of results of the main study.

## Selecting host community participants

The survey of host community members will use two probabilistic sampling techniques to select the participants. Due to specific differences among the four study sites regarding access to registers of host community members, the Random Walk Technique (RWT) will be used in Germany, Jordan and Croatia. In Sweden citizen registries will be used for randomised selection of participants and the validated interviewing procedures will be followed as in other similar population based studies in Sweden.

In the selected target areas (regions, cities) the size of the sample will be proportional to the population of that target area (region, city), and participants will be selected by probability sampling which will ensure that the sample structure reflects the areas' population characteristics based on available statistics, such as the total male and female population in the 18 to 65 age group.

### Data collection using Random Walk Technique (RWT)

The consistent use of Random Walk Technique (RWT) will ensure probability sampling in countries where citizen registries are not readily accessible to the researchers. Such sampling will be ensured by randomly selecting clusters of sampling points in each area (region, city), randomly selecting the households, and by randomly selecting the potential participants in the selected households.

This will be done in the following steps:

1. In each target area (region, city) produce the list of smaller administrative units (neighbourhoods, quarters). This list of smaller administrative units defines the overall sampling frame for the target area (region, city).
2. From the list of smaller administrative units (neighbourhoods, quarters) randomly select 10 % to 15 % of them.
3. Within each selected neighbourhood produce a list of streets.
4. From the list of streets in each selected neighbourhood randomly select 3 to 4 streets and in each street randomly select a starting house number from the pool of all house numbers in that street. This is one starting sampling point for the survey in the target neighbourhood. There will be 3 to 4 sampling points in each target neighbourhood (depending on the number of selected streets) which will all be identified using the same protocol. At each sampling point a maximum of 10

interviews will be done (to ensure heterogeneity and wide catchment of different neighbourhoods).

In Sweden, a fully representative sample will be used by randomly approaching participants throughout three areas. In each city (area), 3000 surveys will be randomly sent to host community members and 3000 to refugees from Syria via post. Therefore, in each Swedish city involved in the study (Göteborg, Malmö, Stockholm), 6 000 surveys will be sent to potential participants. In total, 18 000 surveys will be sent randomly to members of each group which should result in a feedback exceeding 600 participants for each group, as defined in the sampling strategy.

This is illustrated in the table below:

**Table 1. Illustration of sampling steps in RWT for selected areas in each study country.**

	Croatia			Germany			Sweden			Jordan			
Area:	Zagreb	Zadar	Karlovac	Berlin	Hamburg	Leipzig	Göteborg	Malmö	Stockholm	Amman	Zarqa	Irbid	Mafraq
Population	900 000	75 000	55 000	3 613 495	1 834 823	581 980	572 779	316 588	965 232	4 327 800	1 474 000	1 911 600	539 900
Number of <i>Small administrative units</i> (neighbourhoods)*	218	33	52	448	104	63	/	/	/	215	144	155	119
Random selection of 10%-15% of <i>small administrative units</i>	22	5	8	44	10	6	/	/	/	28	19	21	15
Random selection of 2-4 streets** in each <i>small administrative unit</i> (total number of selected streets)	2 x 22 = 44	4x5=20	2x8 =16	2x44 = 88	2x10 =20	2x6=12	/	/	/	2x28 = 56	2x19=38	2x21=42	2x15=30
Random selection of one house number in each street from the pool of all house numbers in this street which is the <i>starting location within this sampling point</i>	44	20	16	88	20	12	/	/	/	56	38	42	30
Number of completed interviews per sampling point:	~10	~10	~10	~4	~9	~5	/	/	/	~8	~8	~8	~6
Total number of completed interviews per area (region, city)	350	150	100	360	180	60	/	/	/	310	106	138	50

\* Should be urban if this context is typical for meeting between host community members and refugees

\*\* The number of sampling points (streets) per small administrative unit should be between 2 and 4



5. At the starting sampling point (address) administer the first questionnaire to the qualifying participant in the household. If there is only one household at this address, administer it to this household. If there are two households at this address, select the second household. If there are three or more households at this address, administer the questionnaire to the third household on the right-hand side from the entrance which means also going to the next floor if necessary.

6. Interview the member of the household who last had a birthday. In each selected household the interviewer will interview only one household member, selected by the “last birthday” criterion. If the member of the household who had birthday last refuses to be interviewed or is unable to respond (due to a prolonged absence, mental or physical incapacity, lack of knowledge of the language, etc.), the interviewer will not interview another member of the same household. Instead, the interviewer will choose the next household following the selection protocol (i.e. the right-hand side, third household rule). If the person who had last birthday in the household was not present when the interviewer arrived or he/she preferred to be interviewed at another time and made appointment for such an interview, the interviewer will revisit the household two more times. If the participant in question was again absent when the interviewer came for the third time or if he/she refused to be interviewed upon the second visit, the interviewer will choose the next household instead (following the right-hand side, third household rule). One of the three visits will be made during the weekend, and the other two on a workday, typically after 4 p.m.

7. After leaving the household, whether with completed interview or with an agreed appointment for the next visit, the interviewer will proceed to the next household strictly following the RWT protocol. Each following household will be selected using the rule of every third household on the right-hand side as the interviewer leaves the house in which the survey was just done. Commercial and business establishments, public buildings etc. are not counted as house numbers in this procedure, only the residential units and buildings are counted.

To ensure heterogeneity of households in buildings with up to 4 floors, only one household will be selected in each such building following the right-hand side rule. If the building has more than 4 floors, another household in the same building will be surveyed following the RWT rules, but starting from three floors up from the previous household.

## Selecting refugee participants

The sampling design for the refugee survey will aim at achieving heterogeneity to reflect the refugee population parameters, but true probabilistic sampling is not expected at all study sites. RWT of sampling refugee respondents will be used if possible in Jordan, while random sampling of refugees based on registries will be used in Sweden. In Germany and Croatia refugee respondents will be approached through NGOs that maintain contact with them and if needed with advertisements and invitations to participate in the study that will be placed and published at locations frequented by refugees from Syria.

During the initial contact with potential refugee participants the Information Letter about the study and invitation to participate will be distributed through the NGO channels. If they are willing to participate, they will send message through the NGO intermediary and will then be contacted.

In order to minimise the potential self-selection and other referral biases, in each area (region, city) at least five different entry points into the target population (i.e. NGOs, locations for placing the advertisements and invitations to participate in the study) will be used.

### 6.3.2 Quality assurance before data collection

The interviewers will be trained specifically for this survey and required to have at least two months of interviewing experience. They will sign statements of compliance with the data collection procedures and guidelines, as well as the data confidentiality requirements. The interviewers will be prepared during the training workshop. As part of the training, the interviewers will receive written guidelines with information about the research purpose and goals, including a detailed description of how to gather data and motivate respondents for participation, how to determine starting sampling points and RWT routes and select households and participants, what to do in case of refusal to participate and how to choose a replacement household, how to assure the participants that their responses will be treated as confidential, how the interviewers' work will be monitored and what will be the consequences of their failure to adhere to the required procedures. As part of their training, the interviewers will receive detailed information about the structure and logic of the survey questionnaire as well as availability of support from the research team. Since CAPI (Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing) technique

will be used in the RWT, the interviewers will also practice using this mode of data collection until they master it.

In case of survey of refugees, the interviewers will have the same qualifications as for the host community member survey, will meet the same requirements and will be trained in the same manner (except using RWT where it will not be employed).

Unless the interviewers are native speakers of the Arabic language, they will be accompanied by interpreters. Interpreters will be trained together with the interviewers. They will assist the interviewer in data collection by administering the questionnaire and entering the data into the tablet computer under the supervision of the interviewer. However, the interviewer will lead the process, from explaining the study goals and procedures, over negotiating the informed consent, to providing clarifications if needed and concluding the interview.

### **6.3.3 Quality assurance during data collection**

While gathering data, the interviewers will maintain a separate “survey log” in paper format for each completed and attempted interview. In this log they will note the address, time, date and outcome of each completed or attempted interview, whether original or replacement household. At the end of the interview, the participants will be asked if they agree to be contacted by the survey supervisor for the purpose of monitoring the work of the interviewers. If the participant agrees, his/her phone number will be written in the survey log and the participant’s personal code will be noted. This will enable the survey supervisor to verify about 10% of the completed interviews for each interviewer. The telephone numbers will be randomly selected among the participants who have agreed to be called back. If selected for the follow-up call, the supervisor will ask the participant if he/she was interviewed during the previous three days at home (or in case of refugee participants possibly at other locations) by means of a tablet about the integration of host community members and refugees. The supervisor will not be able to identify the individual participant.

In case of irregularities, the personal code will serve to delete this participant’s data. In such a case, all other interviews done by the same interviewer will be also deleted. Such interviewer will be immediately dismissed and other interviewers will collect data from the replacement households and participants.

The survey logs will be kept separate from the participants' responses which will be entered into the tablet computer during the interview and in no way will they be linked to the data of an individual participant.

To avoid interviewer bias, none of the interviewers will interview more than 15% of the sample, i.e. a maximum of 90 participants from at least nine sampling points.

To uphold the standard interviewer-participant relationship procedure, each interviewer will interview a maximum of 7 participants per day.

Conducting interviews by using the CAPI technique (i.e. a tablet with a special software package) will facilitate the quality of data collection because for each survey question filters will be defined automatically leaving only minimal room for errors by the interviewer when entering the participant's responses. This technique will make it also possible to record the time and duration of interviews which can be used to monitor the standard performance of each interviewer.

At the beginning of the survey, the respondents will be asked screening questions to determine whether they are eligible to participate.

## **6.4 Focus groups**

For the qualitative part of the study using the focus groups, the participants will be selected based on their competence and experience in refugee-host community relations. About half of the focus groups will be held with the host community participants and half with the refugees from Syria. In Germany one focus group will be a mix of host community members and refugees.

The inclusion criteria for focus groups are age between 18 and 65 years, balance of both genders, while in any case aiming to have not more than 1/3 of one gender among the overall sample in focus groups, education from low to high. If applicable, some host community members should have refugee/migration background, and some should be active stakeholder of the integration process. The groups will be stratified using the above criteria to ensure heterogeneity of the participants.

The partners will define the way of reaching out to the participants of the focus groups in their study sites in line with the above criteria.

## **6.5 Incentives**

Each partner will make an independent decision on incentives for the participants in their respective country as envisioned in the project description and note this for the final report of WP4.

## 7. Instruments and measures for the field study

---

In this section, instruments for the field study are presented. Based on the literature review in WP2, research questions, indicators and variables (Task 3.1) and specification of methodology (Task 3.2), a set of survey instruments (questionnaires) and measures to assess the key indices regarding the socio-economic integration and intergroup relations between the host community members and refugees from Syria were identified and proposed. The questionnaires were developed separately for the participants from the host community members and refugees from Syria. Furthermore, the focus group discussion guides were developed for the qualitative part of the study. For assessment and analysis of secondary data on socio-economic integration of refugees the list of data to be gathered in each country was developed.

Certain differences were made in version of instruments used in European countries versus Jordan, with Jordanian versions being adapted to reflect the specifics of the study site. All differences are noted in the Jordanian specifics report in appendix 15.

### 7.1 Survey questionnaires

The survey questionnaire starts with demographic and individual data and then continues to tap indicators of socio-economic integration. The questions in the socio-economic part of the survey are proposed on the basis of the indicators identified in the literature review on socio-economic integration and the questions have been formulated based on already existing instruments and constructs used in similar surveys.

Instruments for the socio-psychological part of the survey are proposed based on four criteria: length of the questionnaire, its reported reliability in previous studies, frequency of use in the literature, and the European context of the previous use. Shorter, more reliable instruments, administered in the European Union with host community members and refugees, and used more often are considered more appropriate for the purpose of this study.

All survey questionnaires are translated and back translated into the languages of the targeted group of host community by the respective partners. The

instruments for refugees from Syria are translated by the translator appointed by DRC and reviewed by partners from Jordan.

### 7.1.1 Survey questionnaire on socio-economic integration

Questions on socio-economic integration to be administered with **refugees from Syria** include nine sections and are presented in appendix 6:

- 1) Screening questions (4 items)
- 2) Demographics (4 items)
- 3) Family (5 items)
- 4) Participation and completion of integration / introductory courses (8 items)
- 5) Language proficiency (2 items)
- 6) Educational level (2 items)
- 7) Recognition of qualification (5 items)
- 8) Employment (9 items)
- 9) Accommodation and household (5 items)
- 10) Residents in the neighbourhood (2 items)
- 11) Neighbourhood quality (5 items)
- 12) Social welfare (2 items)
- 13) Religious and political orientation (4 items)
- 14) Psychological wellbeing (10 items)
- 15) Access to mental health services (1 item)
- 16) Physical wellbeing (5 items)

Questions on socio-economic integration to be administered to **host community members** are presented in appendix 5 and include:

- 1) Screening questions (3 items)
- 2) Demographics (2 items)
- 3) Family situation and migration background (7 items)
- 4) Educational level (1 item)
- 5) Employment (3 items)
- 6) Neighbourhood quality (5 items)
- 7) Welfare (2 items)
- 8) Host perception of refugee community (11 items)
- 9) Religious and political orientation (4 items)
- 10) Psychological wellbeing (10 items)

## 11) Physical wellbeing (5 items)

### 7.1.2 Survey questionnaire on socio-psychological integration

The questions for the socio-psychological integration include 9 sections with specific scales and measures for each indicator presented in Task 3.2.

#### **Attitudes between refugees and hosts**

The *Attitudes towards refugees* (Ajduković et al., 2019) is a scale constructed to assess the attitudes of host community members towards refugees who have been granted asylum. Originally containing 19 items, 6 items were chosen for the sake of length of the overall survey instrument, retaining high reliability ( $\alpha = .88$ ).

#### **Perception of intergroup threat**

Realistic and symbolic threat theory is often studied and implemented for prediction of negative intergroup attitudes, as was concluded in the literature review in Task 2.2. Based on this theory, the *Realistic and symbolic threat* scale (Ajduković et al., 2019) with 9 items was developed showing very good reliability type Cronbach's alpha (from .78 to .83). The short form of 7 items presented here has high reliability for its length (.82). These items have been adapted to measure the refugees' attitudes towards host community members.

#### **Support for entitlements of refugees**

In order to explore the ways host community and refugees view entitlements provided by the government after a refugee receives asylum (or a similar status in Jordan), the *Support for entitlements of refugees* scale (Ajduković et al., 2019) is used. It consists of 13 items describing legal entitlements which the refugees who have been granted asylum in Croatia have. The scale is adapted for use in Sweden, Germany and Jordan according to entitlements refugees have in these countries. The scale has shown excellent reliability in previous study (Cronbach's alpha = .95; Ajduković et al., 2019). The host community participants indicate their agreement or disagreement with the entitlements of refugees. To ensure comparability of data from the refugee perspective, the scale was adapted to tap *knowledge* refugees have about their legal entitlements. The participants are asked to indicate if they are entitled to each of the listed rights in the host country or not.



Since the rights and entitlements of refugees differ among the countries, adaptation of this scale was needed based on the results of mapping of refugee integration policies done in the WP2 (Task 2.3. Comparative analysis of integration policies).

### **Readiness to assist refugees**

*Readiness to assist refugees* (Ajduković et al., 2019) is a measure of pro-refugee behaviours. Typical measures of pro-social behaviour towards the members of the out-group explore the willingness to sign a petition, write to the government regarding the refugees etc. (for example: Pehrson, 2009). Readiness to assist refugees scale places the emphasis on being in contact with refugees and actively helping them, that is, using personal resources such as attention, property, time and food to help the refugees. In that sense, this scale taps into personal prosocial relations in the community, rather than the overall intentions of prosocial behaviour which does not include contact with the group the help is aimed at. Consisting of 4 items, this scale has shown very good reliability (Cronbach alpha = .83).

This scale was adapted for use with the refugee participants by asking them to estimate the degree in which they believe host community members would be ready to assist refugees from Syria.

### **Quantity and quality of intergroup contacts**

Contact has proved to be an important predictor of intergroup attitudes in the literature review of socio-psychological integration (Task 2.2) and is therefore important to measure it reliably and delicately. Scale developed for used in this study contains 10 items exploring both quantity and quality of contact host community members and refugees have with each other in 5 specific places (public transport or on the street, in the neighbourhood, at work, at school, at public events).

### **Social networking with refugees / host community members**

Another measure developed for the purpose of this study is the Social networking with refugees / host community members. It contains three items, two measuring the number of acquaintances and friends participants have, as well as the proportion of the members of the outgroup in those relationship categories. The

last item regards the readiness to ask for help from other (trusted) people, and the proportion of the members of the outgroup the participant would ask help from.

### **Social distance (proximity) between members of the two groups**

Social distance scale is very often used measure to assess the willingness to engage in different types of relationship with the members of the out-group. Numerous variants have been derived from its original (Bogardus, 1933). For the use in the present study it is formatted to measure the preferred social distance (or proximity) with both host community members and refugees. The *Social proximity towards refugees scale* with 7 items showed high reliability type alpha of .89 (Ajduković et al., 2019). The scale was adapted to measure the social proximity of refugees towards the host community members with 5 items for the present study.

### **Support for the forms of acculturation**

Support for different forms of refugee acculturation is often explored in terms of preference of an acculturation process (integration, separation, assimilation). The measure *Support for the forms of acculturation* (Ajduković et al., 2019) is proposed for use in the present study which has been used with the host community members. This measure has only one item with three options among the participant chooses the preferred one. The measure was adapted for use with refugees.

### **Intergroup discrimination**

Intergroup discrimination can be described as behaviour by which members of one group deny a right, an opportunity or a service to members of another group simply because they belong to the out-group or they favour a member of the own group although this person may be less qualified or entitled to such a right or a service. The complexity in measuring intergroup discrimination is high social desirability of answers, as noted in research on attitudes towards refugees (for example, Schweitzer et al., 2005; Anderson, 2017). In other words, people are aware that discrimination is not a politically correct behaviour and that discrimination can be legally sanctioned. Moreover, discriminative practices are the privilege of the groups that hold the social power, so that minority groups typically do not have the opportunity to discriminate against the more powerful majority. Therefore, host community members are typically asked to self-report own discriminatory behavioural intentions vis-à-vis the refugees, while the refugees may be asked about

their experiences of being discriminated in the similar situations. The key challenge is to describe such situations in terms of behaviours which are clearly indicative of discrimination in order to ensure validity of the intergroup discrimination measure and to avoid overlapping with the intergroup attitudes and in-group positive bias with which discrimination is closely related. Another issue is that the participants need to understand what is precisely meant by discrimination by using the situational description to avoid over-inclusive interpretation.

Two comparable scales are presented – *Perception of discrimination of refugees* and *Perception of discrimination*. These scales were adapted from the Longitudinal survey of immigrants to Canada for the present study. Both scales contain 7 areas of life for which host community members have to estimate the frequency of discrimination refugees from Syria experience. Comparably, refugees estimate the frequency of discrimination they experience in these areas of life. These defined areas are: *In a store, bank, restaurant or a market; when applying for a job or promotion; when dealing with the police or courts; in school or classes; when looking for a place to live; in sports or recreational activities; in hospitals or by health care workers.*

Additionally, to deal with the second problem of measuring discrimination, the wording “unequal treatment in comparison to /Country nationals/” is used as a more appropriate measure than “discrimination” as it is more descriptive and doesn’t require additional explanation.

## 8. Secondary data

---

Survey and focus group discussion data are *primary data* as they are provided directly by the participants involved in the field study. In order to triangulate data, another source of information has to be employed, this one on a larger scale including information on the target groups in general.

*Secondary data* provides additional information to contextualise and triangulate the primary data collected, as it shows the overall socio-economic situation of refugees and host community members. Secondary data, as defined in this project, is statistical data collected during and after process of resettlement of refugees in host country, as well as national statistics on all residents of that country.

Having access to data that is well beyond the scope of primary data collected in the main field study will allow FOCUS to draw further conclusions on the socio-economic integration of refugees and host community members by relating the primary results with the secondary data.

As detailed secondary data is not available in all study sites, analysis will be conducted on Swedish and German statistics of interest to FOCUS.

*Statistics Sweden (SB)* is responsible for official and other government statistics and is the source of secondary data in Sweden. It provides data influencing decision-making, debate and research, as well as a wide range of reliable statistics on a number of socio-economic indicators of relevance to this research.

Secondary data in Germany will stem from the *IAB-BAMF-SOEP Survey of Refugees*, which is a representative longitudinal survey conducted jointly by the Institute for Employment Research (IAB) in Nuremberg, the Research Centre on Migration, Integration, and Asylum of the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (BAMF-FZ) and the German Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP) at the DIW Berlin. The first wave of the survey was implemented in 2016 and included 4.816 persons who have arrived in Germany since 2013. The IAB-BAMF-SOEP Survey of Refugees provides a database with information in the socio-economic conditions of individuals who sought protection in Germany in recent years.

A statistical method (described in section 11. Analytical strategy for the results of the field study) will be employed on the secondary datasets to assess:

- (i) the socio-economic *integration* of refugees in local communities, and
- (ii) the socio-economic *effects* of refugee migration and integration on the host communities.

Indicators and variables defined in Task 3.1 will also be retrieved from sources of secondary data and used for analysis of costs and benefits of refugee social and labour integration. Based on extensive data from Sweden, two outcome variables will be developed: (1) *impact on economic growth* and (2) *fiscal effects*. These variables will be related to a number of other socio-economic indicators, as well as demographic variables such as age, gender, education and family circumstances. Additionally, *long-term economic and fiscal effects* of integration of refugees from Syria will be estimated based on secondary data from Sweden.

## 9. Focus groups

---

### 9.1 Theoretical Background

Focus group discussions have been used in a variety of research over a long period. Stemming from opinion polling and market research, they have slowly also found their way into the social sciences. In order to design the *Focus Group Discussion Guide* a number of well-established sources were used, most are open access and might be of interest for the general preparation of the groups<sup>11</sup>.

#### 9.1.1 Groups and Composition of Groups

- (a) Host community
- (b) Refugee Community

In 3 different cities/areas with approximately 6 participants per group.

#### 9.1.2 The Purpose of the Focus Group

Using focus group discussion as an addition to a quantitative method of data collection comes with several advantages; a main one being that the explicit use of group interaction produces data and insights less accessible without the interaction found in a group.

Next to the interactional aspect of focus group discussions, another main benefit lays in the possibilities for participants to speak with their own words and elaborate on a topic whereas space and time is more restricted in a survey format.

Therefore, the group moderator and assistant can observe the processes bearing specific questions in mind:

---

<sup>11</sup> Krueger, R. A., & Casey, M. A. (2014). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research*. Sage publications.  
Wilkinson, S. (1998). Focus group methodology: a review. *International journal of social research methodology*, 1(3), 181-203.  
Morgan, D. L. (1995). 'Why things (sometimes) go wrong in focus groups.' *Qualitative health research*, 5(4), 516-523.  
Hughes, D. L., & DuMont, K. (2002). 'Using focus groups to facilitate culturally anchored research'. In *Ecological research to promote social change* (pp. 257-289). Springer, Boston, MA  
Kitzinger, J. (1994). The methodology of focus groups: the importance of interaction between research participants. *Sociology of health & illness*, 16(1), 103-121.

Groups (a) and (b),

- Who talks?
- About what?
- What is not being said?
- Which positions do exist in the group?<sup>12</sup>

Group (c) mixed host-refugee, to be held by Charite/HU in German study site,

- What do the participants say about each other (about host/ refugee community members)?
- How do the participants interact with each other concerning our research question (with host/ refugee community members)?

## 9.2 Organizational Aspects

For matters of comparability, all research sites will try to adhere to the following. This being said the following merely pose as suggestions; every research site can adjust according to specific needs/availabilities.

### 9.2.1 Location/ Amenities

A relatively neutral yet inviting location with a sense for privacy and undisturbedness but also easy access should be selected to host the discussion. A good example would be a big room with big windows at a university building. Rooms in refugee community centers could be an option for the refugee group. Bathroom facilities should be in close reach and easy to find. The setting of the group should be a circle of equal chairs.

### 9.2.2 Refreshments

A sufficient amount of refreshments (recommend for reasons of compatibility with different dietary restrictions: small bottles of water and juice, tea and coffee + little vegetarian/vegan snacks and sweets/ fruits) should be place on a table at a

---

<sup>12</sup> These questions already point towards our possible strategy of analysis, which we will propose at a later point in the project. This being said, we aim to also make us understand what topics might be avoided and for what reasons and what happens in the group process ‘psycho-dynamically’ so to say.

corner of the room where the group discussion takes place. Participants are welcomed to have a little snack and get a bottle of water and juice before the focus group takes place as it enhances a more relaxed atmosphere.

### **9.2.3 Duration**

The duration of each focus group will be 2 hours. As 2 hours is a long period, a break after 60 minutes should be incorporated into the schedule. This also helps to enhance comparability between groups. We suggest a 5-10 minute break after 60 minutes of focus group discussion during which participants are encouraged to get some tea / coffee. It is also possible to get everyone standing by asking them to rate how well certain aspects of integration are working on a board prepared by the assistant (with red, yellow and green dots e.g.).

### **9.2.4 Incentives**

The suggestion is to offer reimbursement for travel costs to and from the focus group, but no monetary incentive.

The detailed guide for the focus group discussion is presented in appendix 11.



## 10. Piloting the survey procedure

---

### 10.1 Purpose of the pilot study

The field research planned as a part of the FOCUS project has several characteristics:

- 1) It will be conducted in *four study sites*: Jordan, Croatia, Germany and Sweden.
- 2) It includes a *triangulation of data* using a survey to gather quantitative data on socio-economic integration of refugees from Syria and socio-psychological integration of refugees and host community members. Second type of data are the quantitative secondary data on socio-economic status of refugees from Syria, and the third are qualitative data gathered through focus groups with key informants from both groups.
- 3) All instruments are theoretically and methodologically grounded and either developed or adapted for the purpose of the main study. They are also translated into the respective languages of the study countries, with the versions for the refugees from Syria translated in Arabic.

Because in the focus of the field study are the socio-economic and socio-psychological integration together with their relation, it was imperative to pilot test the applicability of the instruments in the main study. Therefore, the purpose of the pilot study was to gather the information on the comprehension, feasibility and acceptability of the information letter, consent form, survey questionnaire and focus group invitation and information letters, the consent form and questions for the focus group discussion in the main study (further referred to as *instruments*). This was accomplished by administering the instruments to a convenience sample of host community members and refugees from Syria who will not take part in the main study. The primary aim was not to collect and analyse the answers to the survey questions, but rather to gain valuable insight into the way participants understood the instruments and into the process of survey completion. This information was crucial for the adaptation of the instruments for use in the main study. Therefore rigorous piloting procedures contributed to the highest methodological standards in the main study.

## 10.2 Ethical considerations

Since the purpose of the pilot study was to test the applicability of the instruments, survey data<sup>13</sup> was not analysed. Only the information *about the implementation of the instruments*<sup>14</sup> was analysed. As in the main study, the procedure was designed to be sensitive to the rights of the participants. During the introduction into the procedure (described latter in the text), participant's role and rights were made clear by the interviewer ("data collector"), and the procedure of handling and analysing data was explained. This pilot study was of minimal risk for the participant and no distress was expected during or after the procedure. Because of the nature of this study, a verbal consent to participate was considered adequate and no specific ethical clearance was sought by the participating partners.

## 10.3 Sampling strategy for the pilot

A convenience sample consisted of 20 host community members and 10 refugees from Syria in each country, making a total of 120 pilot study participants. Critical sample design was used based on the criterion of poorer reading and comprehension skills. The proxy for this were years of schooling<sup>15</sup>. Since the focus of piloting the instruments was on comprehensibility of the instruments, the majority of the participants were those with fewer years of schooling. The assumption was that they are more likely to have difficulty comprehending the tasks and contents of the instruments. The insights from this group were important for the adaptation of the instruments to be comprehensible to all participants. The quotas for each study site regarding the years of education were:

---

<sup>13</sup> Survey data – answers to the questions in the survey; data collected by the survey.

<sup>14</sup> Data on the instruments – feedback from the participants regarding comprehension, acceptability and feasibility of all instruments (informative letter and consent for survey, questionnaire, invitation letter for the focus group, information letter and consent to focus group participation and questions for the focus group discussion).

<sup>15</sup> The years of schooling do not equal the finished *level* of education, but are a continuous variable suitable for use as a participation criterion in this pilot study.

Host community members		Refugees from Syria	
Number of participants (n)	Criterion	Number of participants (n)	Criterion
12	Up to 11 finished years of schooling	5	Up to 11 finished years of schooling
6	Between 12 and 14 finished years of schooling	5	More than 12 finished years of schooling
2	15 and more finished years of schooling	Total n = 10	
Total n = 20			

The suggested cut-off years of schooling in the table above could have been adjusted by the partners to fewer schooling years, but not higher, depending on the specific circumstances in each country.

As for the gender, there were at least 1/3 of participants of one gender present in the total sample of one group. In other words, at least seven host community participants were of the same gender, and at least three refugee participants were of the same gender in each study site.

Host community participants were approached using the snowball technique from the interviewers' social network. Refugees from Syria were approached using the same technique with the help of the NGOs who are working with refugees.

## 10.4 Data collection procedure

### 10.4.1 Time and place of collection of data on instruments

All survey interviews were conducted in places where participants feel comfortable and safe, the risk of distractions is minimal and enough time could be ensured for the data collection. The data collection was conducted in July and August 2019.

### 10.4.2 Data collectors (interviewers)

The collection of data on the instruments was done by trained professionals, here referred to as *interviewers*. They were introduced in detail to the purpose of the pilot study, the procedure and each instrument.

In the refugee context of the study, if the interviewer was not a native speaker of Arabic, an interpreter assisted with the communication between the interviewer and the participant. The interpreter was be trained regarding the purpose of the pilot study to ensure that he/she conveys any and all questions and comments the participant may have about the instruments to the interviewer, and avoid directly discussing the meaning of questions/words/sentences with the participant.

The interviewers were sensitive to the behaviour of the participant during the process, observing the possible difficulties the participant might show. The interviewer noted these observations during the process on his/her paper copy of the instrument that was being applied at that time.

### 10.4.3 Instruments

All instruments were administered in a paper format. In a host community context, the participant and the interviewer had exact copies of the same instruments. In a refugee context, the refugee and the interpreter had the Arabic copies of the instruments, while the interviewer had the version in his/her respective language.

The instruments included in the pilot study are the following:

- Informative letter for survey questionnaire
- Consent form for survey questionnaire
- Survey questionnaire
- Invitation letter for the focus group
- Information letter for the focus group
- Consent form for the focus group
- Questions for the focus group discussion (retrieved from the Focus group discussion guide developed for the purpose of the main study)

All instruments were adapted for particular study sites in the following ways:

- Language – host community language and Arabic for refugees from Syria
- Information on the institution that is conducting the research in the respective country

- Contacts of the lead researcher, ethnical board of the institution, data protection officer.
- Particular items of the *Entitlements of refugees scale* in the socio-psychological questionnaire adapted for each country. This scale is sensitive to the context in which it is applied because different countries provide entitlements and rights to refugees within their respective legal framework. Therefore, only the rights of refugees in a respective country are included in appropriate questionnaire.
- In case of the instruments for Jordan, the term “integration” is substituted with the term “empowerment or “engagement”, and “culture” with “lifestyle”. These expressions are more suitable for the specific Jordanian context and are considered equivalent to the originals. Several other adaptations in the instruments for Jordan are also noted and presented in Appendix 15.

#### **10.4.4 Ensuring the understanding of the purpose of the pilot study**

Before administering the instruments, the interviewer clearly explained the purpose of the pilot study and the procedure to the participant. It was important that the participants understand that any questions, uncertainties and dilemmas they had about any part of the instruments is the valuable data we aimed to collect to be able to improve the instruments. It was also crucial to state that their opinions on the clarity of the instruments is highly valuable. This is particularly important as the target sample for the pilot study consists mainly of participants with fewer number of schooling years. When working with such a sample, there is a risk that the participants would be less likely to question the meaning of certain words or sentences. By assuring them that their feedback is crucial for the improvement of the instruments, we increased the chance of receiving detailed data on the clarity of the instruments.

The interviewer also explained to the participant the importance of recording time during the process, but in such a way not to provoke the participant to speed up answering or neglect any relevant comments. The interviewer made clear that the purpose of timing each segment of the procedure is to track how long the reading/completion of each instrument lasts, and that it was important for the participant to answer naturally and without time pressure.

## 10.4.5 Procedure

### Introduction:

After thanking the participant for agreeing to take part in the pilot study, the interviewer explained the purpose of the study and the rights to the participant. Then the interviewer explained the procedure which consisted of six parts:

- a) Reading the information letter and filling in the consent form for the survey
- b) Completing the questionnaire
- c) Reflecting on the information letter, consent form and the survey
- d) Reading the invitation letter, the informative letter and the consent form for the focus group participation
- e) Reflecting on the invitation, the informative letter and the consent form for the focus group participation
- f) Reflecting on the questions for the focus group discussion

The participant and the interviewer (and the interpreter in the refugee context where the interviewer was not a native speaker of Arabic) had the same instruments before them. Each of the study parts was recorded for time. This was particularly important for the survey, as the survey in the main study should not take more than an hour to complete.

- a) Reading the information letter and filling in the consent form for the survey

The information letter for the survey was administered to the participant first. The interviewer allowed sufficient time to the participant to carefully read the whole letter, and the interviewer asked the participant whether everything was clear. The point of this step was to ensure the participant understands the contents of the letter of invitation and his or her rights and tasks in completing the questionnaire.

The interviewer told the participant that they will go through the comments regarding the information letter after completing the survey.

Participant then read the consent form for the survey. Although the survey data in the pilot was neither processed nor analysed, the participant was asked if they would be willing to sign this consent form if they were participating in the main study, to test if this instrument is acceptable.

- b) Completing the survey

The survey was then administered to the participant. The participant was instructed to circle the number before the question they had difficulties understanding, or have a comment on.

In the host community context, the interviewer read out each question and asked the participant to choose an answer from the paper copy of the questionnaire in front of him or her. The interviewer recorded the response in the questionnaire in front of him or her.

In case of the refugee context, the interpreter read the questions in Arabic from his/her copy of the questionnaire and marked the responses of the participant. During this time the interviewer observed the process and recorded the time for the socio-economic and for the socio-psychological parts of the questionnaire.

In all situations the participant had a paper version of the questionnaire in front of her or him and followed the questions read by the interviewer and choose the answer and say it out loud. In fact, this is a simulation of the procedure that will be used in the main study when participant's responses will be recorded on a tablet (CAPI technique).

c) Reflecting on the information letter, consent form, questionnaire and providing feedback

After completing the survey, the interviewer sought participant's reflections on the information letter, consent form and the questionnaire, one at a time. The interviewer noted the feedback from the participant on the respective paper instrument.

The interviewer firstly asked the participant of the comprehensibility of the information letter:

*Let us now go over the information letter. Was there anything in the letter that was unclear, that might have been confusing?*

*Probe: Did you have any dilemmas about the meaning of any part of the information letter?*

*Please, allow me to write this down, your feedback is important.*

The interviewer then moved on to the consent form, asking the same type of questions on the clarity of the content of the form:

*What about the consent form? Was there anything that was not clear enough?*

Lastly, the interviewer asked about the comprehensibility of the survey questionnaire:

*Let us now talk about the survey questionnaire. Are there any questions you circled that were unclear, that you felt were confusing?*

The interviewer circled the same questions in his/her copy of the questionnaire and noted the exact issue the participant reports for these questions. He/she then asked the participant about feasibility of the questionnaire:

*Was it difficult for you to answer these questions?*

*Did you ever come across something similar – a test or a questionnaire?*

*Was the way the questions were presented difficult to follow?*

The collection of data on the survey finished by asking the participant about acceptability of the questionnaire:

*Was it acceptable for you to answer to these questions about the relations between you and the refugees?*

*How do you feel about this questionnaire?*

*Do you think that such studies make sense / are useful?*

g) Reading the invitation to the focus group, the information letter and consent form for the focus group

Participants were then presented with the invitation letter for the focus group and asked to read it. After reading the letter, the participants were asked to read the informative letter and the consent form for the focus group participation. They did not need to sign it.

h) Reflecting on the invitation to the focus group, the invitation letter and the consent form for the focus group and providing feedback

As before, the interviewer asked the participant about comprehensibility of the invitation letter, the informative letter and the consent form for the focus group:

*Was there anything in the invitation letter that was unclear, something that might have been confusing?*

*Probes: Did you have any dilemmas about the meaning of any part of the letter?*

*What about the informative letter? Were there any dilemmas or unclear parts?*

*Finally, let's talk about the consent form. Was there anything that was not clear enough?*



The feedback finished by asking the participant about the acceptability of these instruments and how likely would it be for her or him to take part in a focus group if invited.

*How acceptable is it for you to agree to sign the consent form for participating in the focus group?*

*How likely is it that you would take part in such a focus group if invited?*

#### i) Reflecting on the questions for the focus group discussion

The interviewer read out the questions prepared for the focus group discussion and asked the participant to give his/her feedback on the comprehension of these questions in the same way as for the invitation/information letters and consent form.

*Is there anything not clear enough in these questions?*

*Would it be acceptable for you to answer these questions if you were participating in a focus group discussion?*

After providing the feedback on the instruments related to the focus groups, the interviewer asked the participant whether he/she has any additional questions and comments on the procedure.

#### 4.1. Interpretation of feedback

When collecting data on the instruments from refugee participants, the interviewer asked the questions about the comprehensibility, feasibility and acceptability of the instruments, after which the interpreter translated them to the participant. The interpreter translated the answers of the participant back to the interviewer, who wrote them down.

### 10.4.6 Incentives

After gathering the feedback on the instruments, the interviewer thanked the participant and provide him/her with the incentive for the time and effort, if such incentive was foreseen by the researchers in that study site.

Every participant receiving incentives signed his/her name in an appropriate table as an evidence that the incentive was received. The full list of participants who received incentives are in no way be linkable to the answers to the survey or the feedback on the instruments. The physical form of the signature table is stored safely by the researchers, and no digital copy of such list has been made.

## 10.5 Data reporting template and analysis

All data on the instruments was written by the interviewer during the interview and then afterwards filled into a pre-defined template. This means that the pilot study at each study site concluded with 30 completed templates and questionnaires.

Interviewers made notes and entered data into the templates in the local language.

At each field study site a report was produced summarising the data from the 30 completed templates, with separate sections for each instrument, and for host community members and for refugees (making a total of 14 sections).

The frequency and content analysis of the feedback from the participants yielded information on the issues and items in the instruments that require clarification either in wording or the substance. The analysis of the templates was done by each study site and the summary with conclusions and recommendations was presented in two short reports in English, one for the feedback of host community participants, and the other for the refugees from Syria. Overall report and recommendations from the four reports was synthesized in a single report which served to assess the need for refining the instruments. This report is presented in Appendix 16.

Based on the feedback provided by the participants, the instruments were refined if needed, before use in the main study. It was pre-determined that, if some parts of the instruments prove not to be easily understandable or clear in the given context, the field researchers would work together to find the optimal solutions that would not endanger the substance of the instruments. If some parts of the instruments turned out not to be difficult to made comprehensible, feasible or acceptable across countries, they would have to be altered.

## 10.6 Pilot study results

The full report on the pilot study results is presented in Appendix 16.

In total, 78 host community and 40 refugee participants took part in the pilot study. Average age of all participants was 37 (range 19 to 76) and the average number of finished years of schooling was 12 (range 6 to 21).

The average duration of the whole interview for host community participants was around 40 minutes, while the same figure for refugee participants was around an hour.

The Information letter and Informed consent for the survey were overall comprehensible and the participants were comfortable signing the consent form.

Several types of issues were reported regarding the questionnaire:

- Host language translations
- Arabic translations
- Technical issues
- Content issues

Technical and content issues are reported in the pilot study report together with proposed solutions and are resolved in all study sites equally.

The questionnaire was overall comprehensible, the questions easy to follow and answer, and a number of participants reported such studies as useful.

Invitation and Information letter, as well as the Informed consent for the focus group were found comprehensible by most participants, as well as the Focus group guide.

Several important questions were raised by the participants:

- How to differentiate between Syrian and other refugees and how to think only about Syrian refugees while completing the questionnaire
- What is the purpose of mental and physical health scales in the questionnaire for the host community members
- Concern of Syrian refugee participants in Sweden about their data being sent to the authorities and misused

These questions were addressed during the adaptation of instruments with explanations to first and second question incorporated in the interviewer manual. Detailed and clear information letter and informed consent will help encourage the trust of participants.

## 11. Analytic strategy for the results of the field study

---

In this section, the strategy for data analysis is presented. For each research question a short description of statistical procedures is presented.

### 11.1 Strategy analysis for indicators of socio-economic integration

***RQ 1:** What is the socio-economic situation of refugees from Syria in the four host countries as indicated by secondary and aggregate data?*

***RQ 1.1:** Are there differences in the socio-economic situation of refugees from Syria by demographic, human capital and local characteristics, and in comparison with the host population and other immigrant population residing in the host country?*

Descriptive statistics of socio-economic integration variables collected via survey will be run to complement the secondary sources data and answer this research question in each country. Data analysis will be done by gender to answer the second part of the question about gender differences in socio-economic integration. The results of the data collected in each country will be compared in the final report of WP4.

***RQ 2:** What is the socio-economic situation of refugees in the four host countries as indicated by newly collected survey data?*

Descriptive statistics of socio-economic and socio-demographic variables collected via the survey will be run to answer this question in each country. Data analysis will be done by gender and results of the data collected in each country will be compared in the final report.

***RQ 2.1.** What are the main factors correlating with the socio-economic status of refugees?*

To be able to answer the research question which aims to identify the relevant factors correlating with integration in the domains of education, employment and housing and assess the potential statistical direction and level of the suggested independent variables on the integration of refugees from Syria,

different models of regression analysis will be conducted. The following table offers an overview of the various outcomes that will be examined in each domain.

<b>Socio-economic integration</b>	
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Outcomes</b>
1. Education	1.1 Educational attainment after immigration
	1.2 Completion of language integration course
	1.3 Host Country's language proficiency
2. Employment	2.1 Employment situation
	2.2 Occupational level
	2.3 Job income
	2.4 Education-job match
3. Housing	3.1 Type of housing
	3.2 Tenure status
	3.3 Housing affordability
	3.4 Housing quality
	3.5 Suitability/ conditions of housing
	3.6 Neighbourhood quality

For key indicators (variables), a regression analysis (binominal, multinomial or OLS regression) will be run separately. Pearson's correlations will be conducted as well to identify potential multicollinearity issues among the independent variables included in the models.

For the **education domain** the outcome variables will entail: Educational attainment after immigration, completion of language integration course and host country's language proficiency. Independent variables derived from the survey will include (with slight variation from one dependent variable to another): age, gender, marital status, number of children, educational level, employment status, working

hours, satisfaction with the job, intermarriage, intergroup social network, duration of residence, family reunion, unaccompanied minors, health and access to mental health and self-assessed discrimination.

For the **employment domain**, the outcome variables will entail: employment situation, occupational level, job income, temporary vs. permanent contract, education-job match. The variables occupational level and education-job match will be assessed and coded based on the information provided in the survey regarding the occupation and educational level of the interviewee. Independent variables derived from the survey will include (with slight variation from one dependent variable to another): age, gender, number of children, marital status, educational level, recognition of qualifications, access to employment, intermarriage, intergroup social network, duration of residence, family reunion, unaccompanied minors, language proficiency, participation and completion of official integration courses, participation in unofficial integration programs, employment status before immigration, working hours, welfare assistance, health, access to mental health, self-assessed discrimination. Independent variables derived from secondary data will include environmental factors such as employment rates in the municipality/ region, number of immigrants in the municipality/ region and number of newly arrived refugee in the municipality/ region.

As for the **housing domain**, the outcome variables will include tenure status, tenure insecurity, overcrowding rate, housing affordability, suitability of housing and neighborhood quality. Overcrowding rate will be calculated based on the information provided on the number of rooms and number of people living in the household. Housing affordability will be calculated based on household income and rental payment. A cut-off of 40% will be defined to assess whether rental is affordable or not. As for the neighborhood quality, an average score will be calculated based on the Likert scale related to the questions on neighbourhood quality in the survey. Independent variables derived from the survey will include (with slight variation from one dependent variable to another): age, gender, marital status, number of children, household income, self-assessed discrimination, intergroup social network, duration of residence, employment situation, occupational level, job income, welfare assistance, unaccompanied minors, family reunion. Independent variables derived from secondary data will include environmental factors such as number of immigrants in the municipality/ region, number of newly arrived refugees.

***RQ 3:** How do host community members perceive the socio-economic situation of refugees in the host communities?*

*Variables:*

- Host perception of refugee educational level
- Host perception of refugee employment level
- Host perception of welfare received by refugees
- Host perception of refugee living conditions

Descriptive statistics of these variables collected via the survey will be run to answer this research question in each country. Data analysis will be done by gender and other socio-demographic variables such as age, educational level, employment level, migration background, religious as well as political ideologies and household income. The results of the data collected in each country will be compared in the final report.

***RQ 4:** How do host community members' perception of the socio-economic situation of refugees compare to the actual socio-economic situation of refugees?*

This question will be answered qualitatively (narratively) based on the results of data analysis on RQ's 1 and 3 in order to compare the perceptions host community members have and the real-life data of socio-economic integration of refugees.

***RQ 5:** What is the demographic and socio-economic impact of migration and socio-economic situation of refugees in host countries?*

Socio-economic impact of migration and integration of refugees from Syria will be analysed based using secondary sources on five outcomes:

- Employment of local workers before and after migration
- Employment of refugees in occupations with a shortage versus a surplus of labour
- Impact on economic growth
- Fiscal effects
- Long term impact and fiscal effects

For each of these outcome variables, source of secondary data is proposed, together with analytic strategy.

#### 1. Employment of local workers before and after migration

Related variables:

- Employment effects
- Displacement of local workers
- Employment of local workers before and after migration

The following steps will be followed to analyse the data separately for male and female (1) natives, (2) long-term immigrants who arrived as refugees or their family members and (3) other long-term immigrant classes in each country:

(1) Descriptive statistics for people who remained employed versus those who did not before and after Syrian migration

(2) Pearson's correlations,

(3) Longitudinal Cox regression analyses

A comparative qualitative analysis of the results of secondary data analysis obtained in each country will also be included in the final report on the results of the study in WP4.

#### 2. Employment of refugees in occupations with a shortage versus a surplus of labour

*Related variables:*

- *Employment effects*
- *Displacement of local workers*
- *Employment of refugees in occupations with a shortage versus a surplus of labour*

The following steps will be followed to analyse the data separately for men and women in each country:

(1) Descriptive statistics for Syrian refugees classified under the following groups: employed in occupations with a shortage of labour, employed in occupations with a surplus of labour and unemployed;

(2) Pearson's correlations;

(3) Multinomial logistic regression analyses.



A comparative qualitative analysis of the results of secondary data analysis obtained in each country will also be included in the final report on the results of the study in WP4.

### 3. Impact on economic growth

*Related variables:*

- Individuals' annual labour income
- Individuals' annual received welfare benefits
- Individuals' annual savings/assets,
- Individuals' annual paid income taxes derived from the tax rate multiplied by annual labour income.

*Independent variables:*

- Immigration country (0 for Swedish native and 1 for Syrian)
- Age, gender, education, family circumstances, as well as other socio-economic and demographic characteristics

*The above variables are available in the Swedish registry data for all individuals residing in Sweden between 1990 and 2016.*

The following steps will be followed to analyse the data for the four countries included in the study:

(1) Regression analysis of labour income, welfare benefits, and savings on a set of independent variables, as described above.

(2) Calibrating parameter estimates from regression analysis to predict individuals' labour income, welfare benefits and savings, and deriving tax contribution by multiplying tax rate by annual labour income.

(3) Calculating the sum of labour income, welfare benefits, savings, and minus the tax contribution gives individuals' budget constraint, which may be a proxy for individuals' consumption possibility frontier.

(4) Aggregating individuals' consumption possibility frontier gives the aggregate consumption possibility for a closed economy, assuming there is no dynamic optimization over time.

(5) Redo step (2)-(4) by set all parameter estimates for Syrian refugee to zero; we will get a counterfactual estimate of aggregate consumption possibility, assuming that there are no Syrian refugees in the economy.

(6) Taking the difference between the aggregate consumption possibility calculated in (4) and that calculated in (5) gives the effect of Syrian refugee on aggregate consumption possibility (or consumption-based GDP)

A comparative qualitative analysis of the results of secondary data analysis obtained in each country will also be included in the final report on the results of the study in WP4.

#### 4. Fiscal effects

*Related variables:*

- Individuals' annual labour income,
- Individuals' annual received welfare benefits,
- Individuals' annual paid income taxes derived from the tax rate multiplied by annual labour income.

*Independent variables:*

- Immigration country (0 for Swedish native and 1 for Syrian)
- Age, gender, education, family circumstances, as well as other socio-economic and demographic characteristics

*The above variables are available in the Swedish registry data for all individuals residing in Sweden between 1990 and 2016.*

The following steps will be followed to analyse the data for the four countries included in the study:

(1) Regression analysis of labour income and welfare benefits on a set of independent variables, as described above

(2) Calibrating parameter estimates from regression analysis to predict individuals' labour income and welfare benefits, and deriving tax contribution by multiplying tax rate by annual labour income.

(3) Aggregating individuals' tax contribution and welfare benefits. The annual fiscal balance is assumed to be the difference between tax contribution and welfare benefits at the aggregate

(4) Redo step (2)-(3) by set all parameter estimates for Syrian refugee to zero, we will get a counterfactual estimate of aggregate tax contribution and welfare benefits, as well as the aggregate fiscal balance, assuming that there are no Syrian refugees in the economy.

(5) Taking the difference between the fiscal balance calculated in (3) and that calculated in (4) gives the effects of Syrian refugee on annual fiscal balance.

A comparative qualitative analysis of the results of secondary data analysis obtained in each country will also be included in the final report on the results of the study in WP4.

#### 5. Long-term economic and fiscal effects of Syrian refugees

The above described analyses can be extended by developing a micro-simulation model, which allows for simulating labour income, social benefits, savings, and tax contribution over individuals' life-cycle. The aggregation of individuals' life-cycle may be relevant for examining the long-term effects of Syrian refugees on the economy and fiscal system.

***RQ 6:** How do host community members perceive the socio-economic impact of refugee migration and integration on host communities?*

*Variables:*

- Host perception of refugee employment effects
- Host perception of refugee impact on economic growth
- Host perception of refugee fiscal effects

Descriptive statistics of these variables collected via the survey will be run to answer this research question in each country. Data analysis will be done by gender and other socio-demographic variables such as age, educational level, employment level, migration background, religious as well as political ideologies and household income. Results of the data collected in each country will be compared in the final report.

***RQ 7:** How do host community members' perceptions of the socio-economic impact of refugee migration on their communities compare to the actual socio-economic impact of refugee migration?*

This question will be answered qualitatively (narratively) based on the results of data analysis on RQ's 5 and 6 in order to compare the perceptions host community members have and the real-life data of socio-psychological impact of Syrian refugee migration and integration.

## 11.2 Strategy analysis for indicators of socio-psychological integration

Results on all socio-psychological indicators will be compared between study sites (within countries and cross-country comparison), between the groups (refugees – host community) and also by gender. Analysis of differences in the mean of results can be conducted between samples of respondents who have answered the same questions, meaning that the analysis of differences between means and variances (ANOVA) will be employed separately for host community samples and refugee samples. ANOVA is a statistical procedure that tests whether the means of results gathered in samples, in this case independent samples, differ from each other in a significant way with respect to the variations of results within the samples. In short, ANOVA is used to determine whether overall mean of results in one sample is significantly greater or lower than the mean of another sample. T-test is used to test the differences between the means of two samples, while ANOVA is used to test the differences between the means of three and more samples. In case of ANOVA, additional post-hoc tests, such as Scheffe's method, are used to determine the differences between each pair of means.

As the measures of the indicators of socio-psychological integration for hosts and for refugees are designed in such a way to allow comparison of frequency of responses, frequencies will be compared side by side for host and refugee samples within countries.

Quantitative measures (survey) of all variables will be analysed descriptively (frequencies, means and variances, distribution normality) and psychometrically where justified (item and scale reliability type Cronbach's alpha, exploratory factor analysis). Psychometric validation is important as instruments showing good metric characteristics result in trustworthy data.

Qualitative data (focus groups) will serve as illustrative and narrative description of results and enable data comparison between collection methods for all indicators.

*RQ 8: What is the nature of intergroup relations between host community members and refugees in four study sites?*

Overall scores will be calculated for each indicator. Correlations between all variables will be analysed within groups. Means will be compared between the groups using parametric t-tests (within country: between refugees and host community members) and ANOVA (between countries: separately for host communities and Syrian refugees) with post-hoc tests between each pair of countries. These analyses will allow for the conclusions regarding the differences between the overall scores of groups on a national and cross-country level. Similar analyses will be done regarding the gender.

To determine possible deviation of overall scores of host community participants and refugee participants on each indicator, frequencies will be compared in the terms of size between host and refugee samples in each country.

***RQ 9:** To what extent host community members and refugees interact and what is the nature of these interactions?*

Frequencies will be calculated on each indicator separately for each sample and will be compared in the terms of size between host community and refugee samples in each country. Overall scores will be calculated for the indicators of quantity and quality of contact, perception/experience of discrimination and readiness to assist refugees. Same indicators will be analysed for their mean and variance, allowing for use of parametric test ANOVA.

ANOVA will be used to test for differences between the samples of the same group within and between countries (so, separately for host samples and refugee samples) for the indicators with calculated overall scores.

In order to test the differences between the overall scores of host community participants within and between countries, non-parametric  $\chi^2$  test (chi-squared test) will be used. Similarly to the purpose of ANOVA but on another type of data,  $\chi^2$  is used to determine whether the frequencies of scores of participants in separate groups differ from the frequencies we would expect under a specific hypothesis (in this case, null-hypothesis<sup>16</sup>). The same analysis will be employed for the samples of refugee participants within and between countries. Similar analyses will be done regarding the gender.

---

<sup>16</sup> Null-hypothesis is stating that the results of groups do not differ significantly on a specific characteristic, such as interaction, level of perceived threat etc.

Inter-correlations among the overall scores of all indicators will be calculated for each group separately.

***RQ10:** What are the characteristics of host community members and refugees that hinder or facilitate the socio-psychological integration?*

An index variable best describing the dependant (criterion) variable “socio-psychological integration” will be developed and, if feasible, used in further analyses. Hierarchical regression analysis will be conducted for host community members and refugees separately to assess the relative contribution of individual features and group characteristics (predictor variables) to the dependant (criterion) variable of socio-psychological integration. In other words, hierarchical regression analysis answers the question of “how well can the result on this criterion (socio-psychological integration) be predicted using this specific set of predictors (indicators of socio-psychological integration) and how much does each individual predictor contribute (for example, the quality of contact)?”

For the host community members the criterion variables will at least be:

- (1) Readiness for social proximity with refugees and
- (2) pro-refugee assisting behaviours.

Predictor variables will include: demographic and socio-economic variables (age, gender, marital status, employment status, level of education, religious practice, importance of religion, political orientation), attitudes, threat perception, support for the forms of acculturation, perception of refugee discrimination, views regarding refugee entitlements, quality and quantity of contact with refugees from Syria, ratio of refugee-host community members in the country.

For the refugees from Syria criterion variables will include:

- (1) Readiness for social proximity with host community members and
- (2) refugee perception of host community members’ readiness to assist refugees.

Predictor variables will include: demographic and socio-economic variables (age, gender, marital status, employment status, level of education, religious practice, importance of religion, political orientation), attitudes, threat perception, support for the forms of acculturation, experience of being discriminated, views

regarding refugee entitlements, quality and quantity of contact with host community members, ratio of refugee-host community members in the country.

***RQ 11: How does socio-psychological integration differ across local communities and participating countries?***

Frequencies, means and variances will be compared within countries according to the data collection site and between the countries using parametric (ANOVA) and non-parametric statistic tests ( $\chi^2$  test) for group comparison as was described for RQ's 8 and 9.

### **11.3 Strategy analysis for research questions combining the socio-economic and socio-psychological aspects of integration**

***RQ 12: How is the host community members' perception of socio-economic integration of refugees and their perception of the impact of refugee migration related to hosts' socio-psychological relations with refugees?***

Answers to research questions 3 and 6 on refugee socioeconomic integration and its impact on host communities and research questions 1 and 2 on socio-psychological integration will be analysed qualitatively to answer this final question.

***RQ 13: How is the socio-economic situation of refugees related to their socio-psychological integration?***

The findings of research questions 1 and 5 (socio-economic integration) will be analysed in comparison to and research questions 8 and 9 (socio-psychological integration) to answer the integrative research question 13. Thematic analysis will be used to achieve this based on the findings of 1, 5, 8 and 9.

## 12. Conclusions

---

In this work package, the methodology of the field study was developed in detail based on established principles of social sciences and the output of a state of the art review of this field. All aspects of the methodology are defined and reported in this deliverable. Central to this has been the review of the research instruments in pilot testing in the four countries.

This study design will be implemented in WP4: Field study during 2020.



## 13. Bibliography

---

- Ajduković, D., Čorkalo Biruški, D., Gregurović, M., Matić Bojić, J., Župarić-Iljić, D. (2019). Challenges of integrating refugees into Croatian society: Attitudes of citizens and the readiness of local communities. Government of the Republic of Croatia. Office for Human Rights and rights of National Minorities.
- Anderson, J. R. (2017). 'The moderating role of socially desirable responding in implicit explicit attitudes toward asylum seekers'. *International Journal of Psychology*, 54(1), pp. 1-7.
- Bogardus, E. S. (1933). *A social distance scale*. Social research, 17, 265-271.
- Pehrson, S., Brown, R., & Zagefka, H. (2009). When does national identification lead to the rejection of immigrants? Cross-sectional and longitudinal evidence for the role of essentialist in-group definitions. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 48(1), pp. 61–76.
- Schweitzer, R., Perkoulidis, S., Krome, S., Ludlow, C., & Ryan, M. (2005). Attitudes towards refugees: The dark side of prejudice in Australia. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 57(3), pp. 170–179.
- UNHCR (2017): *Global Trends: Forced Displacement in 2016*. Retrieved from: <http://www.unhcr.org/5943e8a34>.

## 14. Appendices

---

List of appendices:

1. Information letter for the survey for host community members
2. Information letter for the survey for refugees from Syria
3. Informed consent for survey for host community members
4. Informed consent for survey for refugees from Syria
5. Survey questionnaire for host community members
6. Survey questionnaire for refugees from Syria
7. Invitation letter to the focus group discussion for host community members
8. Invitation letter to the focus group discussion for refugees from Syria
9. Information letter for the focus group discussion (universal for both groups)
10. Informed consent for the focus group discussion (universal for both groups)
11. Focus group guide (for both groups)
12. Interviewer manual for interviewers of host community members
13. Interviewer manual for interviewers of refugees from Syria
14. Training manual
15. Report on specifics of Jordanian study site
16. Report on the pilot study

All instruments have been translated into four languages (Swedish, German, Croatian and Arabic) for host community members and in Arabic for refugees from Syria, but only the English originals are presented here.



Logo of  
institution

Unique four-digit code number: \_\_\_\_\_

### **Information letter about the survey of opinions towards refugees from Syria in /Country/**

Thank you for your interest in taking part in this survey of opinions about refugees from Syria in /Country/. The survey is part of an international research project called FOCUS (full title: 'Forced displacement and refugee-host community solidarity'). FOCUS is funded by the EU through its Horizon 2020 programme. More information about the project is available at our website: [www.focus-refugees.eu](http://www.focus-refugees.eu). This research has been reviewed and approved by the Research Ethics Committee of /Insert name of the institution here/.

This letter provides information about the survey and explains your rights if you decide to participate. This will enable you to make an informed decision about participating.

#### **1. What is the purpose of this survey?**

Many people have left their countries over the last few years, fleeing persecution and war in order to find safety and a better life in European countries. They are called refugees. Some of them have received permission from the government to stay and live in /Country/, while some of them seek such protection in other countries. This survey concerns recent refugees from Syria, i.e. men or women who have fled Syria in the last few years and have been granted international protection in /Country/ from 2015 onward. The goal of the survey is to increase the understanding of opinions of people about recent refugees from Syria in /Country/

#### **2. Why have I been approached?**

You were approached randomly and not on the basis of any individual characteristic other than being a member of the /Country/ community.

#### **3. Do I have to take part in the survey?**

No. Your participation is completely voluntary. You may choose to stop participating, and withdraw your responses to the survey, at any time. You don't have to give a reason for withdrawing. There are no negative consequences of any kind to withdrawing.

#### **4. What am I expected to do?**

You will be asked to complete a survey. Some of the questions are about your background; some are about your life and experiences in /country/. Some questions require you to choose one of several possible answers. There are no right or wrong answers: you should select the answer closest to your opinion or experience.

We greatly appreciate your effort to answer all the questions. It takes approximately 35 minutes to complete the survey. We are aware that it is difficult within surveys to precisely capture the individual experience of each participant. You may sometimes feel that the suggested answers to a question do not entirely reflect the complexity of the topic addressed. This is a common issue in this kind of research. If you would like to add something that we should consider, you will have the opportunity to do so at the end of the questionnaire.

## **5. What are the benefits of my participation?**

By completing the survey, you will be contributing to research that aims to produce a better understanding of issues related to refugees from Syria in /country/. We expect that you will benefit from your participation by reflecting upon your opinions in a context you may not have considered before. On completing the survey, you will receive /describe the type of incentive and total amount/ as a thank you for your participation.

## **6. Will my participation have any unpleasant consequences for me?**

Participating in this survey should not be any more challenging or upsetting than a normal everyday discussion with people you know. However, if for any reason, you feel distressed during or after the survey, please let us know (contact details below) so that we can talk about it. We have prepared a short leaflet about what to do if you feel distressed. It will be provided to you if you would like so.

## **7. What type of personal information will you collect?**

The survey begins with questions about your background (e.g. the languages you speak, your profession, etc.), before moving on to questions about your opinions about refugees from Syria living in /country/. A small number of questions require you to reflect on your health, religion, or political opinions.

The survey is confidential: it does not record your name, contact details, or any other personal information that could identify you. Your responses will only ever be processed and analysed alongside several hundred other participants' responses; they will never be shared with any organisations outside the FOCUS research team.

The informed consent form you sign (see below) will be stored separately from your completed survey. It will be kept in a locked cabinet in the lead researcher's office. It will be kept for /number/ years, which is a standard administrative procedure approved by the Research Ethics Committee of /Insert the name of the institution here/. You can review the full details of how your personal data will be handled at /include specific url/.

This information letter has a unique four-digit code written on top of the first page. This code is the only link between you and your survey responses. You will need this code if you wish to withdraw your data from the research.

## **8. How will the results of the survey be used?**

Results from the research will be presented (on a general level, never mentioning individuals) in reports and recommendations to the European Commission, and in scientific articles. General information about project results will be available on the project's website.

## **9. How can I take part in the survey?**

To participate you need to sign an informed consent form. This form states that you understand what is involved in taking part and that you voluntarily agree to do so. If you have any questions about taking part, you can ask the interviewer now or contact the lead researcher (contact details below).

## **10. Who should I get in contact with for any questions or concerns?**

If you have any questions about the research, please contact the lead researcher in /Country/.

Name: /name/

Email: /email address/

Phone: /phone number/

If you have any complaints about your participation, you can contact either the lead researcher or the Research Ethics Committee of /Insert the name of the institution here/ at /e-mail here/.

You can find information about the protection of your personal data on the project website (/include url/). If you have further questions about your data, please contact the Data Protection Officer of /institution/, /full name/, at /e-mail/.



Logo of  
institution

Unique four-digit code number: \_\_\_\_\_

### **Information letter about the survey of opinions of refugees from Syria in /Country/**

Thank you for your interest in taking part in this survey of opinions of refugees from Syria in /Country/. The survey is part of an international research project called FOCUS (full title: 'Forced displacement and refugee-host community solidarity'). FOCUS is funded by the EU through its Horizon 2020 programme. More information about the project is available at our website: [www.focus-refugees.eu](http://www.focus-refugees.eu). This research has been reviewed and approved by the Research Ethics Committee of /Insert name of the institution here/.

This letter provides information about the survey and explains your rights if you decide to participate. This will enable you to make an informed decision about participating.

#### **1. What is the purpose of this survey?**

The goal of this survey is to increase our understanding of opinions of refugees from Syria about host community members and their experiences living in /Country/. By 'host community members' we mean people who have lived in /Country/ and the same community for at least seven years (since 2013). This term includes both men and women.

#### **2. Why have I been approached?**

You were approached randomly and not on the basis of any individual characteristic other than being a refugee from Syria.

#### **3. Do I have to take part in the survey?**

No. Your participation is completely voluntary. You may choose to stop participating, and withdraw your responses to the survey, at any time. You don't have to give a reason for withdrawing. There are no negative consequences of any kind to withdrawing.

#### **4. What am I expected to do?**

You will be asked to complete a survey. Some of the questions are about your background; some are about your life and experiences in /country/. Some questions require you to choose one of several possible answers. Often there are no right or wrong answers: you should select the answer closest to your opinion or experience.

We greatly appreciate your effort to answer all the questions. It takes approximately 40 minutes to complete the survey. We are aware that it is difficult within surveys to precisely capture the individual experience of each participant. You may sometimes feel that the suggested answers to a question do not entirely reflect the complexity of the topic addressed. This is a common issue in this kind of research. If you would like to add something that we should consider, you will have the opportunity to do so at the end of the questionnaire.

#### **5. What are the benefits of my participation?**

By completing the survey, you will be contributing to research that aims to produce a better understanding of issues related to refugees from Syria in /country/. We expect that you will benefit from your participation by reflecting upon your opinions in a context you may not have considered

before. On completing the survey, you will receive /describe the type of incentive and total amount/ as a thank you for your participation.

## **6. Will my participation have any unpleasant consequences for me?**

Participating in this survey should not be any more challenging or upsetting than a normal everyday discussion with people you know. However, if for any reason, you feel distressed during or after the survey, please let us know (contact details below) so that we can talk about it. We have prepared a short leaflet about what to do if you feel distressed. It will be provided to you if you would like so.

## **7. What type of personal information will you collect?**

The survey begins with questions about your background (e.g. when you arrived in /country/, your current status, the languages you speak, your profession, etc.), before moving on to your opinions about living in /country/. A small number of questions require you to reflect on your health, religion, or political opinions.

The survey is confidential: it does not record your name, contact details, or any other personal information that could identify you. Your responses will only ever be processed and analysed alongside several hundred other participants' responses; they will never be shared with any organisations outside the FOCUS research team.

The informed consent form you sign (see below) will be stored separately from your completed survey. It will be kept in a locked cabinet in the lead researcher's office. It will be kept for /number/ years, which is a standard administrative procedure approved by the Research Ethics Committee of /Insert the name of the institution here/. You can review the full details of how your personal data will be handled at /include specific url/.

This information letter has a unique four-digit code written on top of the first page. This code is the only link between you and your survey responses. You will need this code if you wish to withdraw your data from the research.

## **8. How will the results of the survey be used?**

Results from the research will be presented (on a general level, never mentioning individuals) in reports and recommendations to the European Commission, and in scientific articles. General information about project results will be available on the project's website.

## **9. How can I take part in the survey?**

To participate you need to sign an informed consent form. This form states that you understand what is involved in taking part and that you voluntarily agree to do so. If you have any questions about taking part, you can ask the interviewer now or contact the lead researcher (contact details below).

## **10. Who should I get in contact with for any questions or concerns?**

If you have any questions about the research, please contact the lead researcher in /Country/.

Name: /name/

Email: /email address/

Phone: /phone number/

If you have any complaints about your participation, you can contact either the lead researcher or the Research Ethics Committee of /Insert the name of the institution here/ at /e-mail here/.

You can find information about the protection of your personal data on the project website (/include url/). If you have further questions about your data, please contact the Data Protection Officer of /institution/, /full name/, at /e-mail/.



Logo of  
institution

### **Statement of informed consent to participation in a survey, within the scope of the FOCUS project, about people's opinions about refugees from Syria in /country/**

By signing this informed consent for I declare that:

- I have read and understood the Information Letter;
- I have had the opportunity to ask questions about the research and have had those questions answered to my satisfaction;
- I understand that I may withdraw myself and my survey responses from the research at any time, for any reason, without negative consequences of any kind;
- I understand that if I choose to end my participation during the survey, any responses collected up to that point will be deleted; and that my responses can be removed after the survey is completed if I so request (using the unique code number above);
- I consent to participating in the survey; and:
- I consent to the processing of my personal data for the purposes of this research.

---

Signature of participant

---

Date

---

Name and signature of researcher

---

Date





Logo of  
institution

### **Statement of informed consent to participation in a survey, within the scope of the FOCUS project, about opinions of refugees from Syria in /country/**

By signing this informed consent for I declare that:

- I have read and understood the Information Letter;
- I have had the opportunity to ask questions about the research and have had those questions answered to my satisfaction;
- I understand that I may withdraw myself and my survey responses from the research at any time, for any reason, without negative consequences of any kind;
- I understand that if I choose to end my participation during the survey, any responses collected up to that point will be deleted; and that my responses can be removed after the survey is completed if I so request (using the unique code number above);
- I consent to participating in the survey; and:
- I consent to the processing of my personal data for the purposes of this research.

---

Signature of participant

---

Date

---

Name and signature of researcher

---

Date



Logo of  
institution

## QUESTIONNAIRE

Target participant group: **Host community members (General, English)**

1.1 What year were you born?

Year \_\_\_\_\_

**(below 18 and above 65 → not qualify for the study)**

1.2 How long have you been living in /Country/?

No. of years \_\_\_\_\_

**(if less than 7 year → not qualify for the study)**

1.3 Do you have /Country/ citizenship?

☐<sub>1</sub> Yes

☐<sub>2</sub> No → **not qualify**

☐<sub>3</sub> No answer

2.1. Gender

☐<sub>1</sub> Female

☐<sub>2</sub> Male

☐<sub>3</sub> Diverse

2.2 In which city are you currently living?

City \_\_\_\_\_

3.1 What is your current marital status?

☐<sub>1</sub> Single → **proceed to question 3.3**

☐<sub>5</sub> No answer

☐<sub>2</sub> Married/ engaged to be married / in a registered relationship/ in a relationship

☐<sub>3</sub> Divorced/ Separated, but still married

☐<sub>4</sub> Widowed

3.2 Where was your spouse partner born?

Country: \_\_\_\_\_

☐<sub>2</sub> No answer

3.3 How many people live in your household? Please count yourself and every other person.

☐<sub>1</sub> One person → **proceed to question 3.5**

☐<sub>2</sub> Multiple: \_\_\_\_\_ (number)

☐<sub>3</sub> No answer

3.4 Please list the persons and the age of those living in your household.

**Example:**

Person	Age
1. Myself	35
2. Spouse	35
3. Son	10

*Now it is your turn.*

Person	Age
1. Myself	_____
2. _____	_____
3. _____	_____
4. _____	_____
5. _____	_____
6. _____	_____
7. _____	_____
8. _____	_____

3.5 Do you have /Country/ citizenship?

☐<sub>1</sub> Yes

☐<sub>2</sub> No, I have the following citizenship: \_\_\_\_\_ → **proceed to question 4.1**

3.6 Have you had /Country/ citizenship since birth or did you acquire it at a later date?

☐<sub>1</sub> Since birth

☐<sub>2</sub> At a later date → **proceed to question 4.1**

3.7 Were both of your parents born in /Country/?

☐<sub>1</sub> Yes

☐<sub>2</sub> No

☐<sub>3</sub> No answer

4.1 What is the highest education with certificate, diploma or education degree you have? Please include any vocational training.

☐<sub>1</sub> No formal education

☐<sub>5</sub> Short cycle tertiary education

☐<sub>2</sub> Primary education

☐<sub>6</sub> Bachelor's or equivalent level

☐<sub>3</sub> Lower secondary education

☐<sub>7</sub> Master's/ doctoral or equivalent level

☐<sub>4</sub> Upper secondary / post-secondary but non-tertiary education

☐<sub>8</sub> No answer

### 5.1 How would you define your current labor status?

- ☐ <sub>1</sub> Employed full time (35 and more hours per week)
- ☐ <sub>2</sub> Employed part time (less than 35 hours a week)
- ☐ <sub>3</sub> In marginal or irregular employment
- ☐ <sub>4</sub> Self-employed
- ☐ <sub>5</sub> Unemployed → **proceed to question 6.1**
- ☐ <sub>6</sub> Pupil, student, further training, unpaid work experience → **proceed to question 6.1**
- ☐ <sub>7</sub> Apprenticeship
- ☐ <sub>8</sub> Fulfilling domestic tasks → **proceed to question 6.1**
- ☐ <sub>9</sub> In maternity leave or on statutory paternal leave
- ☐ <sub>10</sub> In retirement or early retirement or has given up business → **proceed to question 6.1**
- ☐ <sub>11</sub> Subsidized employment (e.g. voluntary social/ecological year)
- ☐ <sub>12</sub> Other \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ <sub>13</sub> No answer

### 5.2 What is your current occupation?

*Please give the exact name of the job or work you do, e.g. "logistics manager" instead of "manager", etc*

Occupation \_\_\_\_\_

- ☐ <sub>2</sub> No answer

### 5.3 What are your net earnings for the past month, after deductions for tax, insurance contributions?

Net earnings: \_\_\_\_\_ Euros

*In case you are not willing to mention the exact salary, you can give us an approximate number based on the following categories:*

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>1</sub> below 500 euro per month | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>8</sub> 2000 – 2250 Euro                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>2</sub> 500 – 750 Euro           | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>9</sub> 2250 – 2500 Euro                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>3</sub> 750 – 1000 Euro          | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>10</sub> 2500 – 2750 Euro               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>4</sub> 1000 – 1250 Euro         | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>11</sub> 2750 – 3250 Euro               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>5</sub> 1250 – 1500 Euro         | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>12</sub> 3250 – 5000 Euro               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>6</sub> 1500 – 1750 Euro         | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>13</sub> 5000 – 10000 Euro              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>7</sub> 1750 – 2000 Euro         | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>14</sub> More than 10000 Euro per month |
|  | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>15</sub> No answer                      |

**Please rate the following statements regarding the quality of your neighborhood? Please give your answers on a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 means “Strongly disagree” and 5 means “Strongly agree”**

6.1 There are different options of schooling in close proximity to my home or they are easily accessible through public transport.

1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree	<input type="checkbox"/> 6 No answer

6.2 It is easy to walk to a bus stop, train, subway station from my home.

1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree	<input type="checkbox"/> 6 No answer

6.3 There are different options of doctors in close proximity of my home or they are easily accessible through public transport.

1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree	<input type="checkbox"/> 6 No answer

6. 4 There is at least one green space (park/ walking trail) in close proximity to my home.

1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree	<input type="checkbox"/> 6 No answer

6.5 The area I live in is safe from criminal activities.

1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree	<input type="checkbox"/> 6 No answer

7.1 Are you or another member of your household currently receiving any of the following types of government benefits?

Benefits (such as unemployment benefits, old-age and sickness benefits) ☐<sub>1</sub> Yes ☐<sub>2</sub> No ☐<sub>3</sub> No answer

Allowance (such as housing- and education related- allowance) ☐<sub>1</sub> Yes ☐<sub>2</sub> No ☐<sub>3</sub> No answer

7.2 If you look at the total income of all of the members of your household what is the monthly household income currently?

*Please state the net monthly income, which means after deductions for taxes and social security. Please include regular income such as pensions, housing allowance, child benefits, grants for higher education, maintenance payments, etc.*

Income: \_\_\_\_\_ Euros

*In case you are not willing to mention the exact income, you can give us an approximate number based on the following categories:*

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>1</sub> below 500 euro per month | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>8</sub> 2000 – 2250 Euro                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>2</sub> 500 – 750 Euro           | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>9</sub> 2250 – 2500 Euro                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>3</sub> 750 – 1000 Euro          | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>10</sub> 2500 – 2750 Euro               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>4</sub> 1000 – 1250 Euro         | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>11</sub> 2750 – 3250 Euro               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>5</sub> 1250 – 1500 Euro         | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>12</sub> 3250 – 5000 Euro               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>6</sub> 1500 – 1750 Euro         | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>13</sub> 5000 – 10000 Euro              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>7</sub> 1750 – 2000 Euro         | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>14</sub> More than 10000 Euro per month |
|  | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>15</sub> No answer                      |

8.1 In your opinion, what is the overall/average education level of refugees in /Country/?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>1</sub> No formal education   | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>5</sub> Short cycle tertiary education         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>2</sub> Primary education   | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>6</sub> Bachelor's or equivalent level         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>3</sub> Lower secondary education                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>7</sub> Master's/ doctoral or equivalent level |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>4</sub> Upper secondary / post-secondary but non-tertiary education | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>8</sub> No answer                              |

8.2 In your opinion, what is the overall/ average employment situation of refugees in /Country/?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>1</sub> No employment                    | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>4</sub> Employment with unstable contract |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>2</sub> Marginal or irregular employment | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>5</sub> Employment with stable contract   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>3</sub> Self-employed                    | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>6</sub> No answer                         |

8.3 In your opinion, how many refugees in /Country/ receive welfare assistance?

- |             |                  |                    |                |            |   |
|-------------|------------------|--------------------|----------------|------------|---|
| 1           | 2                | 3                  | 4              | 5          | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>6</sub> No answer |
| Almost none | Few/ very little | About half of them | More than half | Almost all |   |

8.4 In your opinion, what is the overall/average living situation of refugees in /Country/?

1	2	3	4	
Very overcrowded housing	Quite overcrowded	Just enough space/ Not overcrowded	Under occupied/ spacious	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 No answer

8.5 In general, the refugees in /Country/ will increase the competition on the labor market.

1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree	<input type="checkbox"/> 6 No answer

8.6 In general, the refugees will reduce the shortages of labour in /Country/.

1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree	<input type="checkbox"/> 6 No answer

8.7 In general, the refugees will have a positive impact in economic growth in /Country/.

1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree	<input type="checkbox"/> 6 No answer

8.8 The refugees in /Country/ will bring more revenues than costs for the government.

1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree	<input type="checkbox"/> 6 No answer

8.9 Due to the government spending for refugees, my taxes will have to be increased

1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree	<input type="checkbox"/> 6 No answer

8.10 Due to the government spending for refugees there will be less government benefits for the other population.

1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Agree	Strongly agree	<input type="checkbox"/> 6 No answer

**Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).**

		Strongly disagree	Mostly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mostly agree	Strongly agree
9.1	I sympathize with refugees for problems they could experience in /Country/.	1	2	3	4	5
9.2	If a /national/ and a refugee do equal work, it is fair that they receive equal pay.	1	2	3	4	5
9.3	If I had the opportunity, I would help a refugee to better find his/her way in /Country/.	1	2	3	4	5
9.4	As members of the host society, we know too little about the problems encountered by refugees in /Country/.	1	2	3	4	5
9.5	I would enjoy learning about their culture through contacts with refugees.	1	2	3	4	5
9.6	Our country can benefit from the cultural diversity of population.	1	2	3	4	5
9.7	I fear that crime rates in /Country/ could increase due to refugees.	1	2	3	4	5
9.8	I fear terrorist attacks by refugees who live here.	1	2	3	4	5
9.9	Refugees take places at universities or jobs from /nationals/.	1	2	3	4	5
9.10	Refugees should adjust to the customs of our society if they wish to live here.	1	2	3	4	5
9.11	Refugees could endanger our values and our way of life.	1	2	3	4	5
9.12	Religious and moral beliefs of refugees oppose those of /nationals/.	1	2	3	4	5
9.13	The beliefs of refugees about how society should function oppose ours.	1	2	3	4	5
9.14	Refugees should by no means be returned to their country if this would endanger their lives or freedom.	1	2	3	4	5
9.15	Refugees who entered /Country/ illegally should not be prosecuted if they were persecuted in their countries	1	2	3	4	5
9.16	Families of refugees should be allowed to join them in /Country/.	1	2	3	4	5
9.17	The government should provide free accommodation for refugees who cannot afford it themselves.	1	2	3	4	5
9.18	Refugees in /Country/ should be allowed to get a job.	1	2	3	4	5
9.19	Refugees should have access to employment incentives (e.g. training or reskilling) just like /Country/ citizens.	1	2	3	4	5
9.20	Refugees should have access to free health care just like /Country/ citizens.	1	2	3	4	5



		Strongly disagree	Mostly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mostly agree	Strongly agree
9.21	Refugees and their families should be entitled to primary, secondary and higher education just like /Country/ citizens.	1	2	3	4	5
9.22	If refugees have no documents to confirm their education qualifications, these should be recognised if they meet the requirements by the relevant authority.	1	2	3	4	5
9.23	Refugees should be able to raise their children in accordance with their culture and beliefs.	1	2	3	4	5
9.24	If refugees cannot pay for the legal aid, they should be granted this service for free.	1	2	3	4	5
9.25	Refugees should be assisted in their integration into our society (e.g. learning the /Country/ language, learning about our culture, psychological and social support).	1	2	3	4	5
9.26	(GERMANY) Refugees should have the same welfare rights (e.g. unemployment benefit, sickness benefit) as German citizens.	1	2	3	4	5
9.27	(GERMANY) Refugees should be able to acquire German citizenship after fulfilling the formal requirement.	1	2	3	4	5

***Please indicate whether you are prepared to do any of the following by answering on the scale from 1 (definitely not) to 5 (definitely yes).***

		Definitely not	Probably not	I'm not sure	Probably yes	Definitely yes
10.1	I would be prepared to provide temporary care for an unaccompanied refugee child.	1	2	3	4	5
10.2	I would allow refugees to temporarily use my property that I don't need.	1	2	3	4	5
10.3	I would bring food and/or other supplies to refugees.	1	2	3	4	5
10.4	I would be prepared to dedicate some time to assist refugees become involved in our community's life.	1	2	3	4	5

***Please indicate how often do you meet refugees in following places?***

		Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Frequently	Very often	
11.1	In public transport, on the street, in the market	1	2	3	4	5	Does not apply to me
11.2	In the neighbourhood	1	2	3	4	5	Does not apply to me
11.3	At work	1	2	3	4	5	Does not apply to me
11.4	At school / university / educational facility	1	2	3	4	5	Does not apply to me
11.5	At public events	1	2	3	4	5	Does not apply to me

What are these encounters like? Please choose the answer which best describes your personal experience.

		Very negative	Negative	Neither positive nor negative	Positive	Very positive	
11.6	In public transport, on the street, in the market	1	2	3	4	5	Does not apply to me
11.7	In the neighbourhood	1	2	3	4	5	Does not apply to me
11.8	At work	1	2	3	4	5	Does not apply to me
11.9	At school / university / educational facility	1	2	3	4	5	Does not apply to me
11.10	At public events	1	2	3	4	5	Does not apply to me

***In the next section, please indicate the number of following people:***

12.1	In the city you live in, how many people do you consider to be your acquaintances with whom you would have a casual conversation or a cup of coffee at a café?	_____
	Out of these, how many are refugees?	
	a) All of them    b) Most of them    c) About a half of them    d) Few of them    e) None of them	
12.2	In the city you live in, how many people do you consider to be your close friends which you would invite for a home visit or have dinner with at a restaurant?	_____
	Out of these, how many are refugees?	
	a) All of them    b) Most of them    c) About a half of them    d) Few of them    e) None of them	
12.3	When you are going through a difficult situation in which you need help from another person, on how many people can you count on to help you?	_____

Out of these, how many are refugees?

- a) All of them    b) Most of them    c) About a half of them    d) Few of them    e) None of them

**Please choose Yes or No to answer whether you would accept the following relationships with a refugee.**

13.1	I would accept a refugee as a <i>family member</i> .	Yes	No
13.2	I would become involved in a <i>love relationship</i> with a refugee.	Yes	No
13.3	I would accept a refugee as a <i>friend</i> .	Yes	No
13.4	I would accept a refugee as a <i>neighbour</i> .	Yes	No
13.5	I would accept a refugee as a <i>fellow worker</i> .	Yes	No
13.6	I would accept a refugee only as a <i>person in transit through /Country/</i> .	Yes	No

**Please choose only one statement you most agree with.**

Refugees should maintain they original culture and not adopt the /Country/ culture. ☐

14. Refugees should maintain their original culture and also adopt the /Country/ culture. ☐

Refugees should relinquish their original culture and adopt the /Country/ culture. ☐

**Please indicate to what extent do you believe refugees experience unequal treatment in comparison to /nationals/ on a scale from 1 (never) to 5 (very often).**

		Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
15.1	In a store, bank or restaurant	1	2	3	4	5
15.2	When applying for a job or promotion	1	2	3	4	5
15.3	When dealing with the police or courts	1	2	3	4	5
15.4	In school or classes	1	2	3	4	5
15.5	When looking for a place to live	1	2	3	4	5
15.6	In sports or recreational activities	1	2	3	4	5
15.7	In hospitals or by health care workers	1	2	3	4	5

**16. How much do you feel refugees are a part of the /Country/ society?**

Not at all

Slightly

Moderately

Quite

Very much

1

2

3

4

5

**17.1 What is your religion?**

☐ Christianity

☐ Islam

☐ Other

☐ None → **proceed to question 16.4**

☐ No answer

**17.2 How often do you attend religious meetings?**

1

2

3

4

5

Never

Once every few  
months

Once a month

Once a week

Several times a  
week

☐ No answer

**17.3 How important is religion in your life?**

1

2

3

4

5

Not at all

Slightly

Moderately

Quite

Very

☐ No answer

**17.4 What is your political orientation?**

1

2

3

4

5

Left

Centre

Right

☐ I have  
no political  
orientation

☐ No  
answer

**Over the last 2 weeks, how often have you been bothered by any of the following problems?**

		Not at all	Several days	More than half the days	Nearly every day
18.1	Little interest or pleasure in doing things.	1	2	3	4
18.2	Feeling down, depressed, or hopeless.	1	2	3	4
18.3	Trouble falling or staying asleep, or sleeping too much.	1	2	3	4
18.4	Feeling tired or having little energy.	1	2	3	4
18.5	Poor appetite or overeating.	1	2	3	4
18.6	Feeling bad about yourself – or that you are a failure or have let yourself or your family down.	1	2	3	4
18.7	Trouble concentrating on things, such as reading the newspaper or watching television.	1	2	3	4

		Not at all	Several days	More than half the days	Nearly every day
18.8	Moving or speaking so slowly that other people could have noticed? Or the opposite – being so fidgety or restless that you have been moving around a lot more than usual.	1	2	3	4
18.9	Thoughts that you would be better off dead or of hurting yourself in some way.	1	2	3	4
18.10	If you checked off <i>any</i> problems, how <i>difficult</i> have these problems made it for you to do your work, take care of things at home, or get along with other people?				
		1	2	3	4
		Not difficult at all	Somewhat difficult	Very difficult	Extremely difficult

19.1 How is your health in general? Is it:

1	2	3	4	5	□ <sub>6</sub> No answer
Very good	Good	Fair	Bad	Very bad	

19.2 Do you have any longstanding illness/ chronic disease or health problems? *By longstanding/ chronic we mean illness or health problems, which have lasted, or are expected to last for 6 months or more. (Examples of chronic diseases: asthma, diabetes, chronic anxiety, heart diseases, chronic depression, etc.)*

- <sub>1</sub> Yes, condition(s): \_\_\_\_\_
- <sub>2</sub> No
- <sub>3</sub> No answer

19.3 For at least the past 6 months, to what extent have you been limited because of a health problem in activities people usually do? Would you say you have been:

- <sub>1</sub> Severely limited      □<sub>2</sub> Limited but not severely      □<sub>3</sub> Not limited at all      □<sub>4</sub> No answer

19.4 Was this condition diagnosed by a doctor?

- /Condition 1/      □<sub>1</sub> Yes      □<sub>2</sub> No      □<sub>3</sub> No answer
- /Condition 2/      □<sub>1</sub> Yes      □<sub>2</sub> No      □<sub>3</sub> No answer
- /Condition 3/      □<sub>1</sub> Yes      □<sub>2</sub> No      □<sub>3</sub> No answer

19.5 Have you had this disease/ condition in the past 12 months?

- /Condition 1/      □<sub>1</sub> Yes      □<sub>2</sub> No      □<sub>3</sub> No answer
- /Condition 2/      □<sub>1</sub> Yes      □<sub>2</sub> No      □<sub>3</sub> No answer
- /Condition 3/      □<sub>1</sub> Yes      □<sub>2</sub> No      □<sub>3</sub> No answer

**This is the end of the questionnaire. Thank you for your participation.**

If you have any comments or would like to add anything, feel free to do so here.

---



---



## QUESTIONNAIRE

### Target participant group: Refugees from Syria (General, English)

1.1 What year were you born?

Year \_\_\_\_\_

**(below 18 and above 65 → not qualify for the study)**

1.2 Has an official decision regarding your application for asylum been made yet by the /Responsible institution in Country/?

☐<sub>1</sub> No, I still haven't received a decision → **not qualify for the study**

☐<sub>2</sub> Yes, my application was rejected and I was granted a temporary suspension of deportation/asked to leave  
→ **not qualify for the study**

☐<sub>3</sub> Yes, I have been assigned refugee status

☐<sub>4</sub> Yes, I have been granted subsidiary protection

☐<sub>5</sub> Yes, my entitlement to asylum has been recognised

☐<sub>6</sub> No answer

1.3 When did you receive your refugee status?

Year \_\_\_\_\_ **(Before 2015 and after 2018 → not qualify for the study)** ☐<sub>2</sub> No answer

1.4 Do you currently live in a camp/shared accommodation for refugees?

☐<sub>1</sub> Yes → **not qualify for the study**

☐<sub>2</sub> No

☐<sub>3</sub> No answer

2.1 Gender

☐<sub>1</sub> Female

☐<sub>2</sub> Male

☐<sub>3</sub> Diverse

2.2 In which City are you currently living?

City \_\_\_\_\_

2.3 When did you arrive in /Country/?

MM/ YYYY

☐<sub>2</sub> No answer

2.4 Did you arrive in /Country/ alone or with family members or friends/ acquaintances?

☐<sub>1</sub> Alone

☐<sub>2</sub> With other family members/friends and acquaintances

☐<sub>3</sub> No answer

### 3.1 What is your current marital status?

☐<sub>1</sub> Single → **proceed to question 3.3**

☐<sub>5</sub> No answer

☐<sub>2</sub> Married/engaged to be married / in a registered relationship/in a relationship

☐<sub>3</sub> Divorced/ Separated, but still married

☐<sub>4</sub> Widowed

### 3.2 Where was your spouse/ partner born?

Country: \_\_\_\_\_

☐<sub>2</sub> No answer

### 3.3 How many people live in your household? Please count yourself and every other person.

☐<sub>1</sub> One person → **proceed to question 3.5**

☐<sub>2</sub> Multiple: \_\_\_\_\_

☐<sub>3</sub> No answer

### 3.4 Please list the persons and the age of those living in your household.

*Example:*

Person	Age
1. Myself	35
2. Spouse	35
3. Son	10

*Now it is your turn.*

Person	Age
1. <u>Myself</u>	_____
2. _____	_____
3. _____	_____
4. _____	_____
5. _____	_____
6. _____	_____
7. _____	_____
8. _____	_____

### 3.5 Are you planning to bring your family to /Country/?

☐<sub>1</sub> No

☐<sub>2</sub> Yes

☐<sub>3</sub> No answer

4.1 Have you attended a language integration course?

- ☐<sub>1</sub> I have attended  
☐<sub>2</sub> I am attending  
☐<sub>3</sub> No, I haven't → **proceed to question 4.5**  
☐<sub>4</sub> No answer

4.2 Who offered the course?

- ☐<sub>1</sub> State ☐<sub>2</sub> NGO ☐<sub>3</sub> Private ☐<sub>4</sub> No answer

4.3 Did you take a language test in order to complete the language integration course?

- ☐<sub>1</sub> Yes ☐<sub>2</sub> No → **proceed to question 4.5** ☐<sub>3</sub> No answer

4.4 Which language ability level certification did you get in the /Country/ integration course?

- ☐<sub>1</sub> Level A1 ☐<sub>6</sub> I received no certification  
☐<sub>2</sub> Level A2  
☐<sub>3</sub> Level B1  
☐<sub>4</sub> Level B2  
☐<sub>5</sub> Level C1

4.5 Have you attended any other course offered as part of the official introductory integration program (COUNTRY SPECIFIC EXAMPLES)?

- ☐<sub>1</sub> Yes ☐<sub>2</sub> No → **proceed to question 4.7** ☐<sub>3</sub> No answer

4.6 What elements did that course include? (multiple answers possible)

- ☐<sub>1</sub> Social orientation course  
☐<sub>2</sub> Work-related  
☐<sub>3</sub> Health related  
☐<sub>4</sub> Other  
☐<sub>5</sub> No answer

4.7 Have you participated in any projects or groups outside of the official introductory integration programme?

- ☐<sub>1</sub> Yes ☐<sub>2</sub> No → **proceed to question 5.1** ☐<sub>3</sub> No answer

4.8 What areas were covered by this activity? (multiple answers possible)

- ☐<sub>1</sub> Meeting people from the host community  
☐<sub>2</sub> Language  
☐<sub>3</sub> Sport  
☐<sub>4</sub> Meeting other refugees  
☐<sub>5</sub> Mentoring for employment  
☐<sub>6</sub> Family support groups  
☐<sub>7</sub> No answer



### 5.1 How do you assess your English proficiency?

	Very well	Well	Averagely	Poor	Very poor
Speaking	1	2	3	4	5
Writing	1	2	3	4	5
Reading	1	2	3	4	5

### 5.2 How do you assess your /Country/ proficiency?

	Very well	Well	Averagely	Poor	Very poor
Speaking	1	2	3	4	5
Writing	1	2	3	4	5
Reading	1	2	3	4	5

### 6.1 Have you pursued an educational qualification after immigration to /Country/?

☐<sub>1</sub> Yes ☐<sub>2</sub> No ☐<sub>3</sub> No answer

### 6.2 What is the highest qualification you have now?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>1</sub> No formal education                              | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>5</sub> Technical institute programmes/intermediate education |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>2</sub> Primary education                                | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>6</sub> Bachelor's or equivalent level                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>3</sub> Intermediate education                           | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>7</sub> Master's/doctoral or equivalent level                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>4</sub> General secondary/vocational secondary education | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>8</sub> No answer   |

### 7.1 Did you apply for recognition of your qualification in /Country/?

☐<sub>1</sub> Yes ☐<sub>2</sub> No → **proceed to question 8.1** ☐<sub>3</sub> No answer

### 7.2 For which profession/education did you apply for recognition of your qualification?

- ☐<sub>1</sub> Education \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐<sub>2</sub> Profession \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐<sub>3</sub> No answer

### 7.3 Have you already received notification of either recognition or rejection of your qualifications?

- ☐<sub>1</sub> Yes, the qualifications were recognized as equivalent
- ☐<sub>2</sub> Yes, the qualifications were recognized as partly equivalent
- ☐<sub>3</sub> Yes, but the qualifications were not recognized
- ☐<sub>4</sub> No, I haven't received any notification
- ☐<sub>5</sub> No answer

7.4 How long did it take to receive an answer regarding recognition of your qualification?

\_\_\_\_\_ months

☐\_2 No answer

8.1 What was your last occupation before immigrating to /Country/?

☐\_1 I didn't work before

☐\_2 Occupation \_\_\_\_\_

*(Please give the exact name of the job or work you did, e.g. "logistic manager" instead of "manager", etc.)*

☐\_3 No answer

8.2 Are you entitled to work in /Country/?

☐\_1 Yes

☐\_2 No

☐\_3 No answer

8.3 How would you define your current labor status?

☐\_1 Employed full time (35 and more hours per week)

☐\_2 Employed part time (less than 35 hours a week)

☐\_3 In marginal or irregular employment

☐\_4 Self-employed

☐\_5 Unemployed → **proceed to question 9.1**

☐\_6 Pupil, student, further training, unpaid work experience → **proceed to question 9.1**

☐\_7 Apprenticeship

☐\_8 Fulfilling domestic tasks → proceed to question 9.1

☐\_9 In maternity leave or on statutory paternal leave

☐\_10 In retirement or early retirement or has given up business → **proceed to question 9.1**

☐\_11 Subsidized employment (e.g. Voluntary social/ ecological year)

☐\_12 Other \_\_\_\_\_

☐\_13 No answer

8.4 What is your current occupation?

*Please give the exact name of the job or work you did, e.g. "logistics manager" instead of "manager", etc.*

Occupation \_\_\_\_\_

☐\_2 No answer

8.5 Do you have a fixed-term or permanent employment contract?

☐\_1 Permanent contract

☐\_2 Fixed contract

☐\_3 No answer

8.6 How many hours do you work per week?

No. of hours: \_\_\_\_\_

☐\_2 No answer

8.7 What are your net earnings for the past month, after deductions for tax and insurance contributions?

Net earnings: \_\_\_\_\_ Euro

*In case you are not willing to mention the exact salary, you can give us an approximate number based on the following categories:*

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>1</sub> below 500 euro per month | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>8</sub> 2000 – 2250 Euro                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>2</sub> 500 – 750 Euro           | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>9</sub> 2250 – 2500 Euro                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>3</sub> 750 – 1000 Euro          | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>10</sub> 2500 – 2750 Euro               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>4</sub> 1000 – 1250 Euro         | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>11</sub> 2750 – 3250 Euro               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>5</sub> 1250 – 1500 Euro         | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>12</sub> 3250 – 5000 Euro               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>6</sub> 1500 – 1750 Euro         | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>13</sub> 5000 – 10000 Euro              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>7</sub> 1750 – 2000 Euro         | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>14</sub> More than 10000 Euro per month |

8.8 On a scale from 1 (not satisfied at all) to 5 (totally satisfied), how satisfied are you currently with your job?

- |                      |                  |           |                     |                   |   |
|----------------------|------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------------|---|
| 1                    | 2                | 3         | 4                   | 5                 | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>6</sub> No answer |
| Not satisfied at all | Partly satisfied | Satisfied | More than satisfied | Totally satisfied |   |

8.9 Which of the following options have you used so far to find a job?

- ☐<sub>1</sub> Employment Agency, job centre, social welfare office
- ☐<sub>2</sub> Private job placement
- ☐<sub>3</sub> Job advert in the newspaper
- ☐<sub>4</sub> Job advertisement in the internet, social network
- ☐<sub>5</sub> Family members, friend acquaintances
- ☐<sub>6</sub> Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐<sub>7</sub> No answer

9.1 How many rooms are there your flat/house? This means rooms over 6 m<sup>2</sup> in size excluding kitchen and bathroom.

Number of rooms \_\_\_\_\_ ☐<sub>2</sub> No answer

9.2 Do you/your family rent or own this flat/house?

- ☐<sub>1</sub> Rent ☐<sub>2</sub> Own ☐<sub>3</sub> No answer

9.3 How much is the monthly rent at present?

\_\_\_\_\_ Euro ☐<sub>2</sub> No answer

9.4 For how long is your contract?

- ☐<sub>1</sub> I don't have a formal contract
- ☐<sub>2</sub> Until MM/YYYY \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐<sub>3</sub> Permanent contract
- ☐<sub>4</sub> No answer

9.5 Not including desirable remodeling or additions, is this housing in need of any repairs?

- ☐<sub>1</sub> No, only regular maintenance is needed such as painting, furnace cleaning, etc.
- ☐<sub>2</sub> Yes, minor repairs such as missing or loose floor tiles, bricks or shingles, defective steps, siding, etc.
- ☐<sub>3</sub> Yes, major repairs such as defective plumbing or electrical wiring, structural repairs to walls, floors or ceilings, etc.
- ☐<sub>4</sub> No answer

10.1 How many of your neighbors belong to the same ethnic or cultural group as you?

- ☐<sub>1</sub> All of them                      ☐<sub>3</sub> About half of them                      ☐<sub>5</sub> None of them
- ☐<sub>2</sub> Most of them                      ☐<sub>4</sub> Few of them                      ☐<sub>6</sub> No answer

10.2 How many are also recent refugees?

- ☐<sub>1</sub> All of them                      ☐<sub>3</sub> About half of them                      ☐<sub>5</sub> None of them
- ☐<sub>2</sub> Most of them                      ☐<sub>4</sub> Few of them                      ☐<sub>6</sub> No answer

***Please rate the following statements regarding the quality of your neighborhood? Please give your answers on a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 means “Strongly disagree” and 5 means “Strongly agree”***

11.1 There are different options of schooling in close proximity to my home or they are easily accessible through public transport.

- |                   |          |                               |       |                |   |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------------------|-------|----------------|---|
| 1                 | 2        | 3                             | 4     | 5              | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>6</sub> No answer |
| Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neither disagree<br>nor agree | Agree | Strongly agree |   |

11.2 It is easy to walk to a bus stop, train, subway station from my home.

- |                   |          |                               |       |                |   |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------------------|-------|----------------|---|
| 1                 | 2        | 3                             | 4     | 5              | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>6</sub> No answer |
| Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neither disagree<br>nor agree | Agree | Strongly agree |   |

11.3 There are different options of doctors in close proximity of my home or they are easily accessible through public transport.

- |                   |          |                               |       |                |   |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------------------|-------|----------------|---|
| 1                 | 2        | 3                             | 4     | 5              | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>6</sub> No answer |
| Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neither disagree<br>nor agree | Agree | Strongly agree |   |

11. 4 There is at least one green space (park/ walking trail) in close proximity to my home.

- |                   |          |                               |       |                |   |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------------------|-------|----------------|---|
| 1                 | 2        | 3                             | 4     | 5              | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>6</sub> No answer |
| Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neither disagree<br>nor agree | Agree | Strongly agree |   |

11.5 The area I live in is safe from criminal activities.

- |                   |          |                               |       |                |   |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------------------|-------|----------------|---|
| 1                 | 2        | 3                             | 4     | 5              | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>6</sub> No answer |
| Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neither disagree<br>nor agree | Agree | Strongly agree |   |

12.1 Are you or another member of your household currently receiving any of the following types of government benefits?

Benefits (such as unemployment benefits, old-age and sickness benefits) ☐<sub>1</sub> Yes ☐<sub>2</sub> No ☐<sub>3</sub> No answer

Allowance (such as housing- and education related- allowance) ☐<sub>1</sub> Yes ☐<sub>2</sub> No ☐<sub>3</sub> No answer

12.2 If you look at the total income of all of the members of your household what is the monthly household income currently?

*Please state the net monthly income, which means after deductions for taxes and social security. Please include regular income such as pensions, housing allowance, child benefits, grants for higher education, maintenance payments, etc.*

Income: \_\_\_\_\_ Euro

*In case you are not willing to mention the exact income, you can give us an approximate number based on the following categories:*

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>1</sub> below 500 euro per month | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>8</sub> 2000 – 2250 Euro                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>2</sub> 500 – 750 Euro           | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>9</sub> 2250 – 2500 Euro                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>3</sub> 750 – 1000 Euro          | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>10</sub> 2500 – 2750 Euro               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>4</sub> 1000 – 1250 Euro         | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>11</sub> 2750 – 3250 Euro               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>5</sub> 1250 – 1500 Euro         | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>12</sub> 3250 – 5000 Euro               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>6</sub> 1500 – 1750 Euro         | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>13</sub> 5000 – 10000 Euro              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>7</sub> 1750 – 2000 Euro         | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>14</sub> More than 10000 Euro per month |
|  | <input type="checkbox"/> <sub>15</sub> No answer                      |

***Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).***

		Strongly disagree	Mostly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mostly agree	Strongly agree
13.1	I sympathize with /Country nationals/ for problems they experience in /Country/.	1	2	3	4	5
13.2	If a refugee and a /Country national/ do equal work, it is fair that they receive equal pay.	1	2	3	4	5
13.3	If I had the opportunity, I would help a /Country national/.	1	2	3	4	5
13.4	As refugees, we know too little about the problems encountered by /Country nationals/.	1	2	3	4	5
13.5	I would enjoy learning about their culture through contacts with /Country nationals/.	1	2	3	4	5
13.6	/Country/ can benefit from the cultural diversity of population.	1	2	3	4	5
13.7	I fear that /Country nationals/ could accuse refugees for increased crime rates.	1	2	3	4	5
13.8	I fear that /Country nationals/ may attack us.	1	2	3	4	5

		Strongly disagree	Mostly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mostly agree	Strongly agree
13.9	/Country nationals/ may limit opportunities for refugees to enrol in universities or find jobs.	1	2	3	4	5
13.10	We are required to adjust to the customs of the /Country/ society if we wish to live here.	1	2	3	4	5
13.11	/Country nationals/ could endanger our values and our way of life.	1	2	3	4	5
13.12	Religious and moral beliefs of /Country nationals/ oppose those of refugees.	1	2	3	4	5
13.13	The beliefs of /Country nationals/ about how society should function oppose ours.	1	2	3	4	5

***Please indicate whether you think refugees have the following entitlements in /Country/ by choosing “Yes”, “No” or “I don’t know”.***

14.1	Refugees have the right to remain in /Country/ if their return to their country would endanger their lives or freedom.	Yes	No	I don’t know
14.2	Authorities do not have the right to prosecute refugees who entered /Country/ illegally if they were persecuted in their countries	Yes	No	I don’t know
14.3	Refugees have the right to bring their families to join them to /Country/.	Yes	No	I don’t know
14.4	Refugees who cannot afford it themselves have the right to be provided free accommodation by the government.	Yes	No	I don’t know
14.5	Refugees have the right to get a job.	Yes	No	I don’t know
14.6	Refugees have the right to use employment incentives (e.g. training or reskilling) just like /Country/ citizens.	Yes	No	I don’t know
14.7	Refugees have the right to access to free health care just like /Country/ citizens.	Yes	No	I don’t know
14.8	Refugees and their families have the right to primary, secondary and higher education just like /Country/ citizens.	Yes	No	I don’t know
14.9	If refugees have no documents to confirm their education qualifications, they have the right to have these qualifications recognised if they meet requirements of the relevant authority.	Yes	No	I don’t know
14.10	Refugees have the right to raise their children in accordance with their culture and beliefs.	Yes	No	I don’t know
14.11	If refugees cannot pay the legal aid, they have the right to be granted this service for free.	Yes	No	I don’t know
14.12	Refugees have the right to be assisted in their integration into /Country/ society (e.g. learning the /Country/ language, learning about /Country/ culture, psychological and social support).	Yes	No	I don’t know
14.13	(GERMANY) Refugees have the right to the same welfare rights (e.g. unemployment benefit, sickness benefit) as German citizens.	Yes	No	I don’t know
14.14	(GERMANY) Refugees have the right to acquire German citizenship after fulfilling the formal requirement.	Yes	No	I don’t know

**Please indicate whether you feel /Country nationals/ are prepared to do any of the following by answering on the scale from 1 (definitely not) to 5 (definitely yes).**

		Definitely not	Probably not	I'm not sure	Probably yes	Definitely yes
15.1	/Country nationals/ would be prepared to provide temporary care for an unaccompanied refugee child.	1	2	3	4	5
15.2	/Country nationals/ would allow refugees to temporarily use their property which they do not need.	1	2	3	4	5
15.3	/Country nationals/ would bring food and/or other supplies to refugees.	1	2	3	4	5
15.4	/Country nationals/ would be prepared to dedicate some time to assist refugees become involved in community's life.	1	2	3	4	5

**Please indicate:**

**How often do you meet host community members in following places?**

		Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Frequently	Very often	
16.1	In public transport, on the street, in the market	1	2	3	4	5	Does not apply to me
16.2	In the neighbourhood	1	2	3	4	5	Does not apply to me
16.3	At work	1	2	3	4	5	Does not apply to me
16.4	At school/university/educational facility	1	2	3	4	5	Does not apply to me
16.5	At public events	1	2	3	4	5	Does not apply to me

**What are these encounters like? Please choose the answer which best describes your personal experience.**

		Very negative	Negative	Neither positive nor negative	Positive	Very positive	
16.6	In public transport, on the street, in the market	1	2	3	4	5	Does not apply to me
16.7	In the neighbourhood	1	2	3	4	5	Does not apply to me
16.8	At work	1	2	3	4	5	Does not apply to me
16.8	At school	1	2	3	4	5	Does not apply to me
16.9	At public events	1	2	3	4	5	Does not apply to me

**In the next section, please indicate the number of following people:**

17.1	In your city, how many people do you consider to be your acquaintances with whom you would have a casual conversation or a cup of coffee at a café?	_____
	Out of these, how many are /Country nationals/?	
	a) All of them    b) Most of them    c) About a half of them    d) Few of them    e) None of them	
17.2	In your city, how many people do you consider to be your close friends which you would invite for a home visit or have dinner with at a restaurant?	_____
	Out of these, how many are /Country nationals/?	
	a) All of them    b) Most of them    c) About a half of them    d) Few of them    e) None of them	
17.3	When you are going through a difficult situation in which you need help from another person, on how many people can you count on to help you?	_____
	Out of these, how many are /Country nationals/?	
	a) All of them    b) Most of them    c) About a half of them    d) Few of them    e) None of them	

**Please choose Yes or No to answer whether you would accept the following relationships with a /Country national/.**

18.1	I would accept a /Country national/ as a <i>family member</i> .	Yes	No
18.2	I would become involved in a <i>marriage relationship</i> with a /Country national/.	Yes	No
18.3	I would accept a /Country national/ as a <i>friend</i> .	Yes	No
18.4	I would accept a /Country national/ as a <i>neighbour</i> .	Yes	No
18.5	I would accept a /Country national/ as a <i>fellow worker</i> .	Yes	No

**Please choose only one statement you most agree with.**

	We as refugees should maintain our original culture and not adopt the /Country/ culture.	<input type="checkbox"/>
19.	We as refugees should maintain our original culture and also adopt the /Country/ culture.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	We as refugees should relinquish our original culture and adopt the /Country/ culture.	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Please indicate to what extent you experience unequal treatment in comparison to /Country nationals/ on a scale from 1 (never) to 5 (very often).**

		Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
20.1	In a store, bank or restaurant	1	2	3	4	5
20.2	When applying for a job or promotion	1	2	3	4	5
20.3	When dealing with the police or courts	1	2	3	4	5
20.4	In school or classes	1	2	3	4	5



		Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
20.5	When looking for a place to live	1	2	3	4	5
20.6	In sports or recreational activities	1	2	3	4	5
20.7	In hospitals or by health care workers	1	2	3	4	5

21. How much do you feel part of the /Country/ society you live in?

Not at all	Slightly	Moderately	Quite	Very much
1	2	3	4	5

22.1 What is your religion?

☐<sub>1</sub> Christianity

☐<sub>2</sub> Islam

☐<sub>3</sub> Other

☐<sub>4</sub> None → proceed to question 22.4

☐<sub>5</sub> No answer

22.2 How often do you attend religious meetings?

1	2	3	4	5	<input type="checkbox"/> <sub>6</sub> No answer
Never	Once every few months	Once a month	Once a week	Several times a week	

22.3 How important is religion in your life?

1	2	3	4	5	<input type="checkbox"/> <sub>6</sub> No answer
Not at all	Slightly	Moderately	Quite	Very	

22.4 What is your political orientation?

1	2	3	4	5	<input type="checkbox"/> <sub>6</sub> I have no political orientation	<input type="checkbox"/> <sub>7</sub> No answer
Left		Centre		Right		

Over the **last 2 weeks**, how often have you been bothered by any of the following problems?

		Not at all	Several days	More than half the days	Nearly every day
23.1	Little interest or pleasure in doing things.	1	2	3	4
23.2	Feeling down, depressed, or hopeless.	1	2	3	4
23.3	Trouble falling or staying asleep, or sleeping too much.	1	2	3	4
23.4	Feeling tired or having little energy.	1	2	3	4
23.5	Poor appetite or overeating.	1	2	3	4
23.6	Feeling bad about yourself – or that you are a failure or have let yourself or your family down.	1	2	3	4
23.7	Trouble concentrating on things, such as reading the newspaper or watching television.	1	2	3	4
23.8	Moving or speaking so slowly that other people could have noticed? Or the opposite – being so fidgety or restless that you have been moving around a lot more than usual.	1	2	3	4
23.9	Thoughts that you would be better off dead or of hurting yourself in some way.	1	2	3	4
23.10	If you checked off <i>any</i> problems, how <i>difficult</i> have these problems made it for you to do your work, take care of things at home, or get along with other people?				

1	2	3	4
Not difficult at all	Somewhat difficult	Very difficult	Extremely difficult

24. Since your arrival to /Country/, have you received a psychiatric/psychological/psychotherapeutic treatment?

- ☐<sub>1</sub> No, I wanted but couldn't access any treatment
- ☐<sub>2</sub> No, there was no need for one
- ☐<sub>3</sub> Yes, I have been to a psychiatrist/ psychologist/ psychotherapist
- ☐<sub>4</sub> yes, I have been to other \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐<sub>5</sub> No answer

25.1 How is your health in general? Is it:

1	2	3	4	5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6 No answer
Very good	Good	Fair	Bad	Very bad	

25.2 Do you have any longstanding illness/ chronic disease or health problems? *By longstanding/ chronic we mean illness or health problems, which have lasted, or are expected to last for 6 months or more. (Examples of chronic diseases: asthma, diabetes, chronic anxiety, heart diseases, chronic depression, etc.)*

☐1 Yes, condition(s): \_\_\_\_\_

☐2 No

☐3 No answer

25.3 For at least the past 6 months, to what extent have you been limited because of a health problem in activities people usually do? Would you say you have been:

☐1 Severely limited      ☐2 Limited but not severely      ☐3 Not limited at all      ☐4 No answer

25.4 Was this condition diagnosed by a doctor?

/Condition 1/      ☐1 Yes      ☐2 No      ☐3 No answer

/Condition 2/      ☐1 Yes      ☐2 No      ☐3 No answer

/Condition 3/      ☐1 Yes      ☐2 No      ☐3 No answer

19.5 Have you had this disease/ condition in the past 12 months?

/Condition 1/      ☐1 Yes      ☐2 No      ☐3 No answer

/Condition 2/      ☐1 Yes      ☐2 No      ☐3 No answer

/Condition 3/      ☐1 Yes      ☐2 No      ☐3 No answer

This is the end of the questionnaire. Thank you for your participation.

If you have any comments or would like to add anything, feel free to do so here.

---

---



Logo of  
institution

/Insert name of lead researcher/

/Institution name, address, and contact details/

## **Invitation to a group discussion as part of the EU-funded study**

### **FOCUS – Forced Displacement and Refugee-Host Community Solidarity**

Dear \_\_\_\_\_,

I would like to invite you to take part in our study at /insert institution name/ by participating in a group discussion. The group will have a discussion between different members of a small group (around 6 members) on the topic of the overall integration of refugees from Syria in /Country/. More specifically, we are interested in gaining a better understanding of how you perceive the process of integration in your country. The discussion will cover an array of issues ranging from labour market integration to the extent and nature of interaction between host community members and refugees.

The discussion will take about 2 hours and will be facilitated by an experienced moderator/researcher of our team. The discussion will take place at

**Address:** /Exact address with directions in buildings if necessary, details how to reach the address by public transport/

**Date:**

**Time:**

The language of the discussion will be /insert language/.

/To be kept or removed depending on the study site:/

We can offer childcare for the duration of the group discussion for children starting from the age of 1. If you would like to make use of this, we kindly ask you to inform us beforehand and provide the age of your child/children.

It is possible to provide you with a reimbursement for your travel cost to and from the focus group discussion. If you would like to make use of this, please let us know in response to this letter.<sup>1</sup>

**OR**

To thank you for your time and efforts you will receive /incentive/.

At the location of the group discussion, we will offer refreshments and small snacks (vegetarian/vegan as well as dairy products) for your convenience.<sup>1</sup>

We are especially interested in your contribution, as we believe that the topic is of high public interest. The perspective of different members of the host community such as yours could help us to better understand the current situation. We would hence like to invite you to discuss possible solutions, challenges and overall sentiments related to the integration process in /Country/.

Of course, all data collected during the research process will be anonymized. This means that any personally identifiable information that can be linked to your person will be omitted. We have also attached an information letter and a consent form that would provide you with further information regarding the research and your rights as participants. We will ask you to fill out such form at the beginning of the group meeting.

We hope that the group discussion will allow you to meet other interested participants, engage in a discussion about an important topic and make yourself heard. As the discussion is part of a larger European research project, we expect that the general outcomes will find their way into recommendations on relevant migration and integration policies.

We are very much looking forward to welcome you here at /institution name, address, date, time of discussion/ and to hear your thoughts and experiences.

We kindly ask you to confirm your participation either via phone:

/Insert name of phone-holder, phone number and possible operating hours/

Alternatively, by filling out the section at the bottom of this page and sending it back to /insert institution name, address, and contact details/.

We are looking forward to hearing from you,

Best wishes,

/Insert name corresponding to head of letter/

☐-----I  
would like to participate in the f group discussion at \_\_\_\_\_ /address, date, time/.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Current profession: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone number: \_\_\_\_\_ (Optional)

E-mail Address: \_\_\_\_\_

I would like to make use of the reimbursement for travel costs Yes: /FOR SWEDEN/

In this case, we will contact you to give you further information on the reimbursement process.



Logo of  
institution

/Insert name of lead researcher/

/Institution name, address, and contact details/

### **Invitation to a group discussion as part of the EU-funded study**

#### **FOCUS – Forced Displacement and Refugee-Host Community Solidarity**

Dear \_\_\_\_\_,

I would like to invite you to take part in our study at /insert institution name/ by participating in a group discussion. The group will have a discussion between different members of a small group (around 6 members) on the topic of the overall integration of refugees from Syria in /Country/. More specifically, we are interested in gaining a better understanding of how you perceive the process of integration in /Country/. The discussion will cover an array of issues ranging from labour market integration to the extent and nature of interaction between host community members and refugees.

The discussion will take about 2 hours and will be facilitated by an experienced moderator/researcher of our team. The discussion will take place at

**Address:** /Exact address with directions in buildings if necessary, details how to reach the address by public transport/

**Date:**

**Time:**

The language of the discussion will be /insert language/.

/To be kept or removed depending on the study site:/

We can offer childcare for the duration of the group discussion for children starting from the age of 1. If you would like to make use of this, we kindly ask you to inform us beforehand and provide the age of your child/children.

It is possible to provide you with a reimbursement for your travel cost to and from the group discussion. If you would like to make use of this, please let us now in response to this letter.<sup>1</sup>

**OR**

To thank you for your time and efforts you will receive /incentive/.

At the location of the group discussion, we will offer refreshments and small snacks (vegetarian/vegan as well as dairy products) for your convenience.<sup>1</sup>

We are especially interested in your contribution, as we believe that the topic is of high public interest. The perspective of different refugees from Syria such as yours could help us to better understand the current situation. We would hence like to invite you to discuss possible solutions, challenges and over- all sentiments related to the integration process in /Country/.

Of course, all data collected during the research process will be anonymized. This means that any personally identifiable information that can be linked to your person will be omitted. We have also

attached an information letter and a consent form that would provide you with further information regarding the research and your rights as participants. We will ask you to fill out such form at the beginning of the group meeting.

We hope that the group discussion will allow you to meet other interested participants, engage in a discussion about an important topic and make yourself heard. As the discussion is part of a larger European research project, we expect that the general outcomes will find their way into recommendations on relevant migration and integration policies.

We are very much looking forward to welcome you here at /institution name, address, date, time of discussion/ and to hear your thoughts and experiences.

We kindly ask you to confirm your participation either via phone:

/Insert name of phone-holder, phone number and possible operating hours/

Alternatively, by filling out the section at the bottom of this page and sending it back to /insert institution name, address, and contact details/.

We are looking forward to hearing from you,

Best wishes,

/Insert name corresponding to head of letter/

☐-----I  
would like to participate in the group discussion at \_\_\_\_\_ /address, date, time/.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Current profession: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone number: \_\_\_\_\_ (Optional)

E-mail Address: \_\_\_\_\_

I would like to make use of the reimbursement for travel costs Yes: /FOR SWEDEN/

In this case, we will contact you to give you further information on the reimbursement process.



Logo of  
institution

Unique four-digit code number: \_\_\_\_\_

## **Information letter about the group discussions of opinions on integration of refugees from Syria in /Country/**

Thank you for your interest in taking part in this group discussion. The discussion group is part of an international research project called FOCUS (full title: ‘Forced displacement and refugee-host community solidarity’), which is funded by the EU through its Horizon 2020 programme. More information about the project is available at our website: [www.focus-refugees.eu](http://www.focus-refugees.eu). This research has been reviewed and approved by the Research Ethics Committee of /Insert name of the institution here/.

This letter provides information about the discussion groups and explains your rights if you decide to participate. It will enable you to make an informed decision about participating.

### **1. What is the purpose of the group discussions?**

The groups take the form of a discussion among a small group (around 6-8 people) on topics related to the integration of refugees from Syria in /Country/. The discussion will cover issues ranging from labour market integration to the extent and nature of interaction between host community members and refugees. We are interested in better understanding how you perceive these issues and the kinds of experiences you have had.

### **2. Why have I been approached?**

You were approached randomly and not on the basis of any individual characteristic other than being a refugee from Syria **OR** a member of the /Country/ community.

### **3. How will the group discussion be conducted?**

You will be part of a group of 6-8 individuals. A moderator will ask you and the other participants several questions while facilitating the discussion. Please note that there are no right or wrong answers in the focus group: we are interested in your opinion and would like you to share your thoughts and experiences openly. The discussion will be audio-recorded and later transcribed (written down) for further analysis. A note-taker will also be present. The discussion will not take longer than two hours.

### **4. What type of personal information will you collect?**

The group discussion will focus on topics related to the integration of refugees from Syria in /Country/. Your contributions to on this subject will be recorded and later transcribed (written down). After the transcription is completed, the audio recordings will be destroyed, and the transcript will be anonymized. This means that contributions to the discussion won't be attributable to particular participants (their names will be changed for code numbers), and any comments that could identify an individual participant will be completely removed.

Your participation is completely confidential. We need to know your name and some contact details to facilitate the meeting, neither your name, contact details, or any other information that



could identify you will be associated or stored with the discussion transcript. The transcripts will never be shared with any organisations outside the FOCUS research team.

The informed consent form you sign (see below) will be stored separately from the transcript, in a locked cabinet in the lead researcher's office. It will be kept for /number/ years, which is a standard administrative procedure approved by the Research Ethics Committee of /Insert the name of the institution here/. You can review the full details of how your personal data will be handled at /include specific url/.

This information letter has a unique four-digit code written on top of the first page. This code is the only link between you and your contributions to the discussion. You will need this code if you wish to withdraw your contributions from the research.

#### **5. Do I have to take part in the group discussion?**

No. Your participation is completely voluntary. You may choose to stop participating and withdraw from the group at any time. You don't have to give a reason for withdrawing. There are no negative consequences of any kind to withdrawing.

#### **6. What are the benefits of my participation?**

We hope that the group discussion will allow you to meet other interested participants, engage in a lively conversation about an important topic, and make yourself heard. As the discussion is part of a larger European research project, we hope that the general outcomes will find their way into recommendations on relevant migration and integration policies. After taking part, you will receive /describe the type of incentive and total amount/ as a thank you for your participation. (The amount received is taxable. It is your responsibility to report this amount for income tax purposes [delete this in all countries except Germany].)

#### **7. Will my participation have any unpleasant consequences for me?**

Participating in the group discussion should not be any more challenging or upsetting than a normal everyday discussion with people you know. Discussion will be led by experienced moderators who will do their best to lead a group discussion in a respectful manner considering the well-being of all participants. However, if you have any complaints about any aspect of the study, or if for any reason you feel distressed or upset during or after the discussion, please let us know. We have prepared a short leaflet about what to do if you feel distressed. It will be provided to you if you would like so.

#### **8. How will the results of the group discussion be used?**

Results from the research will be presented in reports and recommendations to the European Commission, and in scientific articles. General information about project results will be available on the project's website.

#### **9. How can I take part in the group discussion?**

To participate you need to sign an informed consent form. This form states that you understand what is involved in taking part and that you voluntarily agree to do so. If you have any questions about taking part, you can ask the person who gave you this letter, or contact the lead researcher (contact details below).

#### **10. Who should I get in contact with for any questions or concerns?**

If you have any questions about the research, please contact the lead researcher in /Country/.

Name: /name/

Email: /email address/

Phone: /phone number/

If you have any complaints about your participation, you can contact either the lead researcher or the Research Ethics Committee of /Insert the name of the institution here/ at /e-mail here/.

You can find information about the protection of your personal data on the project website (/include url/). If you have further questions about your data, please contact the Data Protection Officer of /institution/, /full name/, at /e-mail/.



Logo of  
institution

## Statement of informed consent

**to participation in a group discussion, within the scope of the FOCUS project, about integration of refugees from Syria in /country/**

By signing this informed consent for I declare that:

- I have read and understood the Information Letter;
- I have had the opportunity to ask questions about the research and have had those questions answered to my satisfaction;
- I understand that I may withdraw myself and my contributions from the research at any time, for any reason, without negative consequences of any kind;
- I understand that if I choose to end my participation during the group discussion, my contributions will be deleted from the transcript; and that my contributions can be removed after the transcriptions if I so request (using the unique code number above);
- I consent to participating in the group discussion; and:
- I consent to the processing of my personal data for the purposes of this research.

---

Signature of participant

---

Date

---

Name and signature of researcher

---

Date



## Focus Group Discussion Guide Draft (HU/Charité)

---

### Content

<b>1. Theoretical Background .....</b>	<b>117</b>
<b>2. Groups and Composition of Groups.....</b>	<b>117</b>
<b>3. The Purpose of the Focus Group .....</b>	<b>117</b>
<b>4. Organizational Aspects.....</b>	<b>118</b>
4.1 Location/ Amenities .....	118
4.2 Refreshments.....	118
4.3 Duration .....	119
4.4 Incentives .....	119
<b>5. Group Discussion Guide .....</b>	<b>119</b>
5.1 Welcome and Consent Process .....	119
5.2 Introduction .....	120
5.3 Ground Rules.....	121
5.4 Warm up questions all groups .....	122
5.5 Introductory questions.....	122
5.6 Guiding questions.....	123
5.7 Concluding questions .....	123
5.8 Conclusion .....	123
<b>6. Moderating / the moderator and assistant.....</b>	<b>124</b>
6.1 Basic principles.....	124
6.2 Two techniques.....	125
6.3 Possible difficulties.....	125
6.4 What to avoid .....	126

## 1. Theoretical Background

---

Focus group discussion have been used in a variety of research over the past decades. Stemming from opinion polling and market research, they slowly also found their way into the social sciences. In order to design the Focus Group Discussion Guide a few valuable sources were used, most are open access and might be of interest for the general preparation of the groups. Therefore, they are listed below:

- Krueger, R. A., & Casey, M. A. (2014). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research*. Sage publications.
- Wilkinson, S. (1998). Focus group methodology: a review. *International journal of social research methodology*, 1(3), 181-203.
- Morgan, D. L. (1995). Why things (sometimes) go wrong in focus groups. *Qualitative health research*, 5(4), 516-523.
- Hughes, D. L., & DuMont, K. (2002). Using focus groups to facilitate culturally anchored research. In *Ecological research to promote social change* (pp. 257-289). Springer, Boston, MA
- Kitzinger, J. (1994). The methodology of focus groups: the importance of interaction between research participants. *Sociology of health & illness*, 16(1), 103-121.

## 2. Groups and Composition of Groups

---

- (a) Host community
- (b) Refugee Community

In 3 different cities/areas with approximately 6 participants per group.

## 3. The Purpose of the Focus Group

---

Using focus group discussion as an addition to a quantitative method of data collection comes with several advantages; a main one being that the explicit use of group interaction produces data and insights less accessible without the interaction found in a group.

Next to the interactional aspect of focus group discussions, another main gain from it also lays in the possibilities of participants to speak with their own words and elaborate on a topic whereas space and time is more restricted in a survey format.

Therefore, the group moderator and assistant can observe the processes bearing two questions in mind:

Groups (a) and (b)

- Who talks?
- About what?

- What is not being said?
- Which positions do exist in the group?<sup>17</sup>

[Group (c) mixed host-refugee, to be held at Charite/HU]

- What do the participants say about each other (about host/ refugee community members)?
- How do the participants interact with each other concerning our research question (with host/ refugee community members)?]

## 4. Organizational Aspects

---

For matters of comparability, all research sites can try to adhere to the following. This being said the following merely pose as suggestions; every research site can adjust according to specific needs/availabilities.

### 4.1 Location/ Amenities

A relatively neutral yet inviting location with a sense for privacy and undisturbedness but also easy access should be selected to host the discussion. A good example would be a big room with big windows at a university building. Rooms in refugee community centers could be an option for the refugee group. Bathroom facilities should be in close reach and easy to find. The setting of the group should be a circle of equal chairs<sup>18</sup>.

### 4.2 Refreshments

A sufficient amount of refreshments (recommend for reasons of compatibility with different dietary restrictions: small bottles of each water and juice, tea and coffee + little vegetarian/vegan snacks and sweets/ fruits) should be place on a table at a corner of the room where the group discussion takes place. Participants are welcomed to have a little snack and get a bottle of water and juice before the focus group takes place as it enhances a more relaxed atmosphere.

---

<sup>17</sup> These questions already point towards our possible strategy of analysis, which we will propose at a later point in the project. This being said, we aim to also make us understand what topics might be avoided and for what reasons and what happens in the group process ‘psycho-dynamically’ so to say.

### **4.3 Duration**

The duration of the focus group is 2 hours. As 2 hours is a long period, a break after 60 minutes should be incorporated into the schedule. This also helps to enhance comparability between groups. We suggest a 5-10 minute break after 60 minutes of focus group discussion during which participants are encouraged to get some tea/coffee. It is also possible to get everyone standing by asking them to rate how well certain aspects of integration are working on a board prepared by the assistant (with red, yellow and green dots e.g.).

### **4.4 Incentives**

The suggestion is to offer reimbursement for travel costs to and from the focus group, but no monetary incentive.

## **5. Group Discussion Guide**

---

Another note on the following: This structure is merely an example and general guidance. Not every focus group at each study site needs to follow every question stubbornly. Every group process will be different from the other. What we can say from our experience is that it helps to memorize the structure and questions and have a pilot group/ trial session with colleagues to practice the flow of questions. However, it could be a great opportunity to enhance comparability if we insert a slot ‘Conducting Focus Groups’ into our next meeting in Berlin in September to have every partner on the same page.

### **5.1 Welcome and Consent Process**

The purpose of this part is thanking the participants for their willingness to contribute to research, introducing the moderator and assistant and informing the participants about confidentiality/ anonymity and getting consent to record and analyze the group discussion accordingly. For the participant’s information, a written consent form has been distributed with the invitation letter. However, the consent form only should be signed just before the beginning of the focus group. The

assistant offers copies and collects the signed forms after they again have been explained.

*“Good morning/afternoon/evening and welcome here at (name of institution)! Thank you very much for your willingness to take part in this group discussion. You therefore substantially contribute to current research and help us to better understand current problems and possible solutions. My name is (moderator name), and I am a researcher affiliated with (institution). This is my colleague (assistant’s name), who is also affiliated with (institution): He/she will be taking some notes during the discussion, which of course will be handled with greatest discretion and will be anonymized. Speaking of which, we would like to remind you that we would like to record the discussion with our tape recorder in order to not miss any of the discussion and for better handling in analyzing the discussion later on. The recorded discussion will later be transcribed, of course anonymized, and the recording will be deleted afterwards. And just to be completely clear, under no circumstance can anything you say be linked to you by anyone outside this room. This is a space where within the boundary of being respectful to each other, you are free to express your honest opinions. Do all of you agree to be recorded during this session, or are there any objections to it? Then with your consent we would like to start the group and start the recording.”*

Note: If a person refuses to be audio-recorded, obviously no audio recording will be made. In this case the assistant’s main role would be to minute the discussion, focusing on the most striking comments. To help keeping information, tools such as a blackboard could be used. In one part of the discussion, participants could be asked to write down their main ideas for enhancing the process of integration.

## **5.2 Introduction**

The purpose of this part is to introduce and give an overview of the topic of the focus group as well as the duration.

*“The topic of our research project and therefore also of this focus group discussion is the overall integration of refugees from Syria in (country name).*



*More specifically, our interest is how your perception of this process of integration is. We focus on aspects such as integration into the labor market, but also on how refugees from Syria and host community members interact and engage with each other. We are also interested in your thoughts on what conflict may arise around and with integration and your ideas and suggestions for bettering this process. We are equally interested in what you think works very well so far and what you may think is great about the process of integration (country name). There are no right and wrong comments and thoughts. We really do encourage you to be open and candid. Our group today is ought to be a safe space where you can give your thoughts, ideas and associations free rein.”*

### **5.3 Ground Rules**

Note to the assistant: A writing board with all the ground rules listed on it could be of great use. Alternative measures of making the ground rules visible at every point of the discussion of course can be taken.

The purpose of this part is to establish few ground rules for the group discussion on order to enhance to flow of the discussion and have everyone as an equal contributor.

*“In front of you, you see a cardboard and pen; we’d like to ask you to write your name on it and place it in front of you. That helps all of us remember names and make referring to comments easier. We would like to ask you to comment and discuss as open and free as possible. One of the most important points here are that we ask you to please try to not interrupt each other and keep in mind that only one person speaks at a time. Please just follow up on what someone said or raise a new comment without referring to (assistant’s name) or me. You may have a similar view or experience as someone else on this group, but it is perfectly all right to have a different view or experience. Different positions are valuable information for us. As we have agreed to a limited time for this group meeting, please be aware that other group members should have time to share their thoughts. Although I will be asking questions and commenting every once in a while, we would like you to engage in a group discussion with each other and not focus on us. We are interested in hearing from each of you; therefore, it could be that I address certain*

*members of the group, just to get everyone in on the discussion. We would like to ask you to refer to each other using the name everyone wrote on the cardboard in front of him or her. We would also like to ask everyone to refer to each other with respect and patience, and without using derogatory or offensive manner and words.”*

## **5.4 Warm up questions all groups**

The purpose of this part is to let everyone introduce himself/ herself and get to know each other and feel more comfortable.

*“Now please all introduce yourself with your name, how long you’ve been living in (city name) and maybe also say a few words about the things that best explain who you are! Let’s start from here and go round (point at person next to you)!”*

## **5.5 Introductory questions**

The purpose of this part is to get the discussion started on the topic. The first question should be as open as possible to enhance a smooth start and let as much ‘thought-space’ as possible.

Group a and c:

1. *“For you personally, how have things gone with the integration of host community and refugee community from Syria in (city name) and (country name)?”*
  - a. *“For you personally, how do you feel that the relation between host-community and refugee-community has developed?”*
  - b. *“In your own opinion, what do you think are the main sentiments currently present about each other?”*

Group b:

1. *“How integrated do you feel in (city name) and (country name)?”*
  - a. *“How do you feel the relation between host-community and refugee- community developed?”*
  - b. *“In your own opinion, what are the main sentiments currently present about each other?”*

## 5.6 Guiding questions

The purpose of this part is to keep the discussion. As a rule of thumb, the moderator should be as active as necessary but also as passive as possible to keep the discussion flowing while leaving enough space for spontaneous group interaction. It may be useful to place the question in the following order to keep moving in logical sequence.

1. *“To you, what does “integration” mean?*
  - a. *“What would it look like if it was working perfectly?”*
  - b. *“What do you think are the biggest barriers to this?”*
  - c. *“You can go ahead and elaborate on any ideas, even if they seem illusory.”*
2. *“For you personally and for the city/country as whole, what impact do you think that the integration of refugees from Syria will have?”*

## 5.7 Concluding questions

The purpose of this part is to give the participants a feeling for the time and slowly closing the group while letting room for last comments.

*“We’ve collected a lot of interesting insights and comments so far! Is there anything you feel like you need to add at this point where we are slowly coming to the end of the discussion?”*

## 5.8 Conclusion

The purpose of this part is to close the discussion in a way that all participants feel comfortable.

*“Well, again, thank you very much for this contribution to such an important topic of our times! It was a pleasure to be the group moderator. XY (assistant’s name) would you like to add something. (Assistant thanks). Sometimes it happens that participants have further thoughts and comments on the topic or the group process in general once they are at home – in that case please do not hesitate to contact us and write us your further thoughts. This can be anything ranging from your feelings about participating in this group, how you felt about the group and the discussion or if you just want to follow up on the research project. You can use the e-mail address given in the invitation letter, and we will try to be as quick as possible in replying to your mail. If you*

*happen to feel upset for any reason please also do not hesitate to contact us. We will do our best to offer our support. We also put a paper on the table here where you can fill in your contact details if you wish to receive a final report of our research study. Now please feel free to take some more of the refreshments on the table and I hope you all enjoyed the lively discussion! Thank you”*

## 6. Moderating / the moderator and assistant

---

### 6.1 Basic principles

The moderator should be a person who is knowledgeable in the field of the research topic and experienced with moderating a group setting. The assistant's role is mainly defined by actively listening and taking notes of especially striking comments as well as feeling responsible for the organizational part of the focus group (organizing room and catering, preparing setting with cardboards, pens, tape recorder, chairs). Note that the moderator and assistant also are people with a certain ethnic background, educational level, social/human capital gender and age. It is vital to take the possible influence of this on the group atmosphere into account whereas we do not necessarily suggest matching moderator(s) and participants regarding to social status/ethnicity/gender for reasons of not reproducing separations and rather fostering inclusion and integration.

It could however be a way to overcome some possible challenges due to cultural differences by having cultural mediators attend (to be adapted for other countries: possibly translators/mediators) the refugee group.

The most basic 'skill' a moderator needs is an attitude of respect for, interest in and care for the participants of the group discussion. The moderator needs to hold an attitude, which reflects that he/she thinks of every participant as an expert on the topic and is interested in every comment a person makes. The moderator cares for and empathizes with the participants, meaning he/she cares about their opinion and takes care that the participants feel valued and comfortable during the discussion. The only case where the moderator and/or assistant actively interrupt the group process should be when participants are being attacked, discriminated against, devalued or offended. In this case, the moderator interrupts the offensive speaker referring to the ground rules and asks if everyone feels they can continue the group sticking to the ground rules of politeness and respectful behavior. Actively protecting

all participants from such occurrences is an important task of the group moderator. Generally speaking the moderator and assistant should be attentive and proactive at any time during the group process and also closely perceive body language and all signs of discomfort and stress.

Active listening, addressing and referring to participants with their name and an open body language help getting this across. The moderator and assistant also casually interact with the participants before and after the group discussion.

## 6.2 Two techniques

### 1. The Pause

A useful technique to avoid cutting off stream of thoughts and interrupting a process is to wait for 5 seconds before engaging in placing follow-up questions or interventions.

### 2. The Probe

The probe refers to a request for additional information. To foster comprehensive elaboration on a topic, the moderator may ask questions such as:

- *Would you say more?*
- *Tell us more.*
- *Would you explain further?*
- *Please describe what you mean.*
- *Is there anything else?*
- *This is one point of view - does anyone see it differently?*
- *This is one point of view - has anyone had a different experience?*

## 6.3 Possible difficulties

In order to keep the discussion flowing and have everyone contribute to it, there are a few possible difficulties which could occur due to the difference in participants' talking personality. There could be e.g. dominant talkers, shy talkers, and rambling talkers. With a little preparation and some intervention questions in mind, the moderator can still influence the discussion flow.

- Dominant talkers: When pausing, place a question e.g. *“This is one point of view – does anybody else have a different experience?”*
- Shy talkers: Try to engage in eye contact and supportive body language, if possible/necessary address participant nicely with their name *“XY, I don’t want to leave you out of the discussion, do you have anything to say to that, is there something in that sparks or resonates with you?”* On a side note: It could be very well possible that a participant keeps quiet for a reason and might feel to pushed by being addressed directly. Again, moderator skills are crucial in getting a feeling for the specific needs.
- Rambling talkers: When pausing, try to place a follow up question.
- Leaving the topic: it may happen that participants leave the topic (e.g. start talking about violence during the war, situation in home country). In that case the moderator can intervene showing empathy towards the expressed feelings and thoughts but directing back towards the topic: *“This must have been a very difficult experience for you/ I can see that the worries about the situation in Syria are very present here, but maybe if we look again at the situation in (country name), what do you think about that?”*
- There is the possibility that a group needs further prompting towards the end of it, especially if discussions have been leaning more to one side. Possible questions could be:
  - *Are there things, which you have found to be especially helpful to you in feeling more at home here or making it easier for you?* (group b - refugees)
  - *Are there things, which you have found to be especially helpful to you in being more understanding of refugees/ improving how you view refugees?* (group c - host)
  - *Are there organisation, programmes or activities, which you would point to and say 'they are helpful and make things better'?*

## 6.4 What to avoid

There are certain things the moderator and assistant should try to avoid in order to keep the discussion flowing and to stick to the neutral role.

- Try to avoid nodding. If not done continuously throughout the whole discussion, it may come across as approval of a statement. However, nodding might also encourage participants to keep going. If possible, try to develop a ‘continuous, encouraging nod’ rather than an ‘exclusive, approval nod’.
- Avoid giving own opinions or perceptions. Try to stick to the role of a neutral yet empathetic and engaging moderator.
- Avoid any comments (“*Correct*”, “*That’s right*”), which could seem as approval or disapproval.
- Avoid completely missing one section because of time running out.



Logo of  
institution

### INTERVIEWER MANUAL

---

Survey of socio-economic situation of host community members and their opinions  
of refugees from Syria

#### 1. What is FOCUS project

The FOCUS project, fully named *Forced Displacement and Refugee-Host community Solidarity* is an international project gathering nine partners from seven European countries and Jordan. The project is funded by the European Commission as a part of Horizon 2020 Program for Research and Innovation on the topic of MIGRATION-o8-2018: Addressing the challenge of forced displacement.

The project has **three objectives**:

- 1) *Research*: to contribute to the evidence base on understanding refugee-host community relations through addressing the central research question: *How do different patterns of the socio-economic integration of refugees influence the socio psychological dimensions of refugee and host community relations, and vice versa?*
- 2) *Solutions*: to develop and pilot test solutions to foster peaceful coexistence between refugees and host communities.
- 3) *Policy engagement*: to provide an overall framework for policy makers to adopt and adapt the solutions and recommendations for the adoption of effective policies and practices in diverse settings.

The project also incorporates **three components of methodology**:

- 1) Joint socio-economic and socio-psychological multi-site field research in four countries: Jordan, Croatia, Sweden and Germany.
- 2) Development and pilot testing of solutions in Denmark, Austria, United Kingdom, Sweden and Germany.
- 3) Dissemination of results and policy engagement propositions.



## 2. Purpose of the multi-site field study

One objective of the FOCUS project is to conduct a multi-site research answering the main research question regarding the socio-economic integration of refugees and socio-psychological integration of refugees and host community members, together with the relation of these dimensions of integration. The field study has several characteristics:

- a) It will be conducted in *four country sites*: Jordan, Croatia, Germany and Sweden.
- b) It includes a *triangulation of data* using three sources of data: survey data, focus group discussion data and secondary socio-economic data.
- c) All instruments are theoretically and methodologically grounded and either developed or adapted for the purpose of the main study and translated into the respective languages of the study countries, with the versions for the refugees from Syria translated into Arabic.

## 3. Purpose of this manual

This Interviewer manual is a detailed guide for trained professionals, collectors of survey data (here addressed as *interviewers*) on the instruments used in the study, approach to the participants, data collection and additional specificities of the instruments. It serves as an essential tool in the training of the interviewer as well as a support tool for referencing before and during the survey interview.

## 4. Instruments

For the purpose of the survey interview, the Information letter, Informed consent form and Questionnaire were developed. The purpose and form of these documents will briefly be described here.

- **Informative letter for the survey** – this document provides the information on the study and rights of a participant. It serves as a source of information and motivation for the participation in the survey and precedes the signing of the Informed consent form. It is presented to the participant in a paper format and contains a designated box in which a four-digit number, which is a dedicated code, is written for each participant.

The letter stays with the participant after the survey.

- **Informed consent form for the survey** – states that the participant has read and understood the Informative letter, is familiar with his/her rights as a

participant and consents to taking part in the survey interview. It is presented to the participant in a paper format which the participant is asked to sign.

It is retrieved by the interviewer after the survey.

- **Survey questionnaire** – consists of questions on socio-economic and socio-psychological integration. It is adapted for administration using CAPI technique (i.e. using a tablet with special software package for collection of survey data). The interviewer will note the answers using a tablet, while the questionnaire is presented to the participant in a paper format to allow him/her to follow the questions asked by the interviewer.

The paper version is retrieved by the interviewer after the study.

## 5. Procedure of data collection

### 5.1. Materials

Every interviewer approaching the potential host community participant has to have the following materials in respective host community language:

- Identification tag (name, organization, FOCUS logo and the logo of European Union)
- Tablet computer with the CAPI software containing the questionnaire
- For each participant:
  - Informative letter for survey with a noted one-of-a-kind, personal four-digit number (code)
  - Informed consent form
  - Paper form of the “survey log”<sup>19</sup> for every completed or attempted interview
- Paper form of the questionnaire
- Paper form of the table for a follow-up call<sup>20</sup>
- Paper forms of each of the scales with numbers from the questionnaire (6 scales on 3 A4 sheets of paper)<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> Presented in the Appendix A

<sup>20</sup> Presented in the Appendix B

<sup>21</sup> Presented in the Appendix C

When approaching the refugees, the interviewer who is not a native speaker of Arabic will be accompanied by an interpreter<sup>22</sup>. The interviewer and the interpreter have to have the following materials:

- Identification tags (name, organization, FOCUS logo and the logo of European Union)
- Tablet computer with CAPI software containing the questionnaire in Arabic
- For each participant:
  - Informative letter for survey with a noted one-of-a-kind, personal four-digit number (code), in Arabic
  - Informed consent form, in Arabic
  - Paper form of the “survey log” for every completed or attempted interview (to be completed by the interviewer in host community language)
- For the interviewer:
  - Paper form of the Informative letter, in host community language
  - Paper form of the Informed consent, in host community language
  - Paper form of the questionnaire, in host community language
- Paper form of the questionnaire in Arabic
- Paper form of the table for a follow-up call
- Paper forms of each of the scales with numbers from the questionnaire (6 scales on 3 A4 sheets of paper) in Arabic

**It is necessary that the interviewer carries several paper copies of the questionnaire in case of a CAPI software or the tablet computer malfunction during the data collection.** The interviewer (or interpreter) is then to proceed with the data collection using a paper form of the questionnaire. Note that in the case of using the paper questionnaire, the four-digit code has to be listed on the interviewer’s copy on which the answers are noted.

## *5.2. Where to approach the participants*

The participants will be approached using the Random Walk Technique. Each interviewer will be provided with a list of streets and a house number in which the

---

<sup>22</sup> The RWT procedure with refugees will be used where possible, otherwise the refugee participants will be approached through the community based NGOs who maintain contacts with them.

participants will be approached. Student and worker dormitories are excluded from the study.

In each street, a maximum of 10 interviews will be done.
--

4) At the starting sampling point (address), administer the first questionnaire to the qualifying participant in the household.

- If there is only one household at this address, administer it to this household.
- If there are two households at this address, select the second household.
- If there are three or more households at this address, administer the questionnaire to the third household on the right-hand side from the entrance which means also going to the next floor if necessary.

After leaving the household, whether with completed interview or with an agreed appointment for the next visit (see the next section), the interviewer will proceed to the third household on the right hand side after leaving the house, strictly following the RWT protocol.

Each following household will be selected using the rule of every third household on the right-hand side as the interviewer leaves the house in which the survey was just done.
---

Commercial and business establishments, public buildings etc. are not counted as house numbers in this procedure, only the residential units and buildings are counted.

To ensure heterogeneity of households in buildings with up to 4 floors, only one household will be selected in each such building following the right-hand side rule. If the building has more than 4 floors, one more household in the same building will be surveyed following the RWT rules, but starting from three floors up from the previous household.

### 5.3. *Who to approach*

Interview the member of the household who last had the birthday. In each selected household the interviewer will interview only one household member, selected by the “last birthday” criterion.

If the member of the household who had birthday last refuses to be interviewed or is unable to respond (due to a prolonged absence, mental or physical incapacity, lack of knowledge of the language, etc.), the interviewer will not interview another member of the same household.

Instead, the interviewer will choose the next household following the RWT rules (i.e. the right-hand side, third household rule).

If the person who had last birthday in the household was not present when the interviewer arrived or he/she preferred to be interviewed at another time and agreed to make an appointment for such an interview, the interviewer will revisit the household **two more times**. If the participant in question was again absent when the interviewer came for the third time or if he/she refused to be interviewed upon the second visit, the interviewer will choose the next household instead (following the right-hand side, third household rule). One of the three visits will be made during the weekend, and the other two on a workday, typically after 4 p.m.

#### *5.4. How to approach the participant*

When approaching the participant, the interviewer should firstly present him/herself and the purpose of the visit. He/she should also have an *identification tag visibly attached to the clothes at all times*.

The member of the household who opens the door should be approached in this manner:

*Good day/afternoon, my name is (name of the interviewer) and I am an interviewer working on a project funded by the European Commission called FOCUS.*

*We are currently conducting a field study which includes a survey interview.*

*Participation in this study is completely voluntary and the potential participant can make the decision to take part after reading the Informative letter. This letter describes in detail the purpose of the study and the rights of the participant, and I would like to present it to the potential participant in your household.*

*Would the members of your household be interested to take part in the study?*

When allowed to enter the household, the interviewer should ask for the person who had the birthday last (the “last birthday” criterion) for the willingness to read the Informative letter and then decide on participation.

#### 5.5. *Obtaining informed consent*

In case the qualifying participant chosen based on the last birthday criterion is not the person who opened the door, the interviewer should introduce him/herself again. He/she should then explain the purpose of the field study and the rights of the participant.

*Thank you for taking interest in this field study. This study is a part of the project entitled FOCUS which is funded by the European Commission. We are conducting a survey on opinions about integration of refugees from Syria in our country.*

*This Informative letter describes your rights as a participant in the study. I would like to emphasize that your participation is completely voluntary and the survey is completely anonymous. I will never record your name. I would like to present you the Informative letter so that you can make a decision on taking part in the survey.*

The interviewer should then present the potential participant the Informative letter and allow him/her to read it. The potential participant should then be asked if he/she has any questions regarding the letter.

*If you are willing to take part in this survey, I will now ask you to sign this Informed consent form. It will be kept apart from other data to ensure anonymity of your answers.*

When the participant signs the Informed consent, it should be safely stored.

#### 5.6. *Survey interview procedure*

The interviewer will firstly input the one-of-a-kind personal four-digit number (code) written on the Informative letter presented to the participant.

*I will now input the code that is written on the top of the Informative letter into my database. This letter will stay with you. If at any moment now or after the survey you would like to redraw and have your data deleted, you can contact the e-mail addresses written at the end of this Informative letter. When you provide us*

*with this number, we can use it to identify your data and delete it without knowing who you are.*

After noting the code in the database, the interviewer will explain the process of answering the questionnaire:

*I will now give you a paper form of the questionnaire. I will read out the questions and note the answers you are giving me. I would like to ask you to follow the questions in your paper copy. If any question is unclear, please feel free to ask me about it. I will also present you with these scales (show the paper scales) – they are the same ones as in the questionnaire. I will change them as the scales in the questionnaire change.*

The interviewer will then proceed to read out questions and note the answers in his/her tablet computer. In case of refugees, the interpreter will read out questions and enter the answers into the tablet and the interviewer will follow using a paper copy of the questionnaire in his/her respective language.

Each time a numbered scale is presented in the questionnaire, the interviewer will take out a respective scale and put it in front of the participant so that the answering process is easier.

Screening questions are presented first and, in case the participant is not eligible to participate, the interviewer will thank the participant in a following manner:

*Thank you for answering these questions. These questions serve us to make sure that we are following the protocol for accessing eligible participants. As you are under 18 years of age (state the reason for exclusion from the study), we will not be continuing the survey. Thank you very much for your effort and time.*

## 5.7. Closure

After completing the data collection, the interviewer will ask:

*Would you agree to be contacted by the survey supervisor for the purpose of monitoring my work? If you agree, your phone number will be written together with your personal code on the Informative letter. The supervisor will randomly select numbers of some the participants. If you are selected for a follow-up call, you will only be called to confirm I have interviewed you. Your identity, your name and*

*address, will not be known to the supervisor and he/she will never ask you your personal information, only if you have taken part in the survey.*

If the participant agrees to the possible follow-up call, the interviewer will write down the phone number and the personal code in another paper-format table. The interviewer will then thank the participant and leave.

Whether interview was completed or not, the interviewer fill in the survey log. The interviewer notes the address, time, date and outcome of the interview and whether the interview was conducted in an original or a replacement household.

## **6. Quality assurance**

To ensure the quality of field study data collection, a supervisor will contact a certain number of participants who provided their phone number at the end of the survey. The procedure for assuring quality of data collection is as follows:

- If the participant agrees, his/her phone number will be written in the survey log and the participant's personal code will be noted.
- The survey supervisor will verify about 10% of the completed interviews per each interviewer. The telephone numbers will be randomly selected among the participants who have agreed to be called back. If selected for the follow-up call, the supervisor will ask the participant if he/she was interviewed during the previous three days at home (or in case of refugee participants possibly at other locations) by means of a tablet computer about the integration of host community members and refugees. The supervisor will not be able to identify the individual participant.
- In case of irregularities, the four-digit personal code will serve to delete this participant's data. In such a case, all other interviews done by the same interviewer will be also deleted. Such interviewer will be immediately dismissed and other interviewers will collect data from the replacement households and participants.
- To avoid interviewer bias, none of the interviewers will interview more than 15% of the sample, i.e. a maximum of 90 participants from at least nine sampling points.

To uphold the standard interviewer-participant relationship procedure, each interviewer will interview a maximum of 7 participants per day.
---



## 7. Specificities of the instruments

In this section, answers to potential questions the participants might have during data collection are presented. Some of them are general while others are related to particular questions in the questionnaire. Also presented here are the comparison between educational categories based on the ISCED categorization and the list of diseases.

Section	Question	Explanation
General	“Are questions always related to refugees from Syria?”	Yes, the questions presented in the questionnaire are always in regard specifically to refugees from Syria, as is stated in the Information letter.
3. Family and migration background	3.3 How many people live in your <b>household</b> ? Please count yourself and every other person.	A household includes either one person living alone or a group of people, not necessarily related, living at the same address (1) sharing expenses and at (2) least one meal per day or sharing a living or sitting room.
5. Employment	5.1 How would you define your <b>current</b> labour status?	In case a person has two or more jobs at the same time, the question should be answered about the main job.
8. Host community perceptions of refugees	“How can I answer these questions without knowledge of the facts?”	These questions regard your own personal opinion and perception and you do not need to know the facts to be able to answer any of the questions in this questionnaire.
9.	9.16 <b>Families</b> of refugees should be allowed to join them in /Country/.	Family is defined as parents and their children.
11.	11. How often do you meet <b>refugees</b> in following places?	The question regards those people for which the participant knows are recent refugees from Syria.

	“How would I know who the refugees are?”	
12.	12.1 In the city you live in, how <b>many people</b> do you consider to be your acquaintances with whom you would have a casual conversation or a cup of coffee at a café?	The participant should pick the first number that comes to their mind.
18. Psychological wellbeing	“What does my psychological wellbeing have to do with refugees?”	With our research, we try to grasp your personal situation as fully as possible while of course always assuring anonymity of the data. As mental and physical well-being have such a huge impact on a person's life, we included these short scales to get an idea of how our participants feel about it for themselves.
19. Physical wellbeing	“What does my physical wellbeing have to do with refugees?”	

## **Education**

**Question**      ***What is the highest education/qualification you have?***

ISCED educational levels and comparison in each study country					
<b>Answer</b>	<b>Sweden</b>	<b>Germany</b>	<b>Croatia</b>	<b>Jordan</b>	<b>Syria</b>
<b>No formal education</b>		Did not attend school.	Not finished elementary school.	Did not attend any kind of school education	Did not attend school
<b>Primary education</b>		Grade 1 – 4 at school	Grade 1 – 4 in elementary school	Finished 10 years at schools	Intermediate education Grade 1-6 at school
<b>Lower secondary education</b>		Grade 5 – 9/ 10 at school. It also includes lower secondary evening schools). This programme (of one to two years of duration) is intended for adults with no or low ISCED level 2 qualifications	Grade 5 – 8 in elementary school	Started but did not finish secondary school	Intermediate education Grade 7-9
<b>Upper secondary / post secondary but not tertiary education</b>		These are three-year upper secondary general programmes (Gymnasiale Oberstufe), comprising Grades 10 to 12. These include Berufliches Gymnasium, Integrierte Gesamtschule or Freie Waldorfschule  Berufsschulen (Duales	Finished three and four-year high school.	Finished 12 years at school	General secondary education Grade 10-12 Vocational secondary education Grade 10-12 Technical institute programmes

		<p>System) Erstausbildung (Vocational Schools (Dual System) Training). This is a 2-, 3- or 3.5-year special form of apprenticeship which comprises education and training both at a vocational school and in an enterprise. In the majority of cases the duration is three years.</p> <p>Training for Civil Servants (medium level</p> <p>Berufsoberschule (Upper secondary vocational schools)</p>			
<b>Short cycle tertiary education</b>		Master craftsman training (very short preparation courses only that last less than 880 hours) <sup>3</sup>	2 years after upper secondary school.	Diploma (2 year after upper secondary education)	Technical institute programmes, intermediate education
<b>Bachelor's or equivalent level</b>		<p>Bachelor's programme at Universities, Universities of applied sciences, Colleges of public administration, vocational academics</p> <p>Diplom Degree</p> <p>Trade and technical schools (excluding health care and social professions and educator training) including master</p>	Bachelor's degree.	Bachelor's degree 4-5 years at university	<p>Bachelor's programmes</p> <p>Higher institute of administration</p> <p>Engineering and medicine programmes</p> <p>Diploma qualification and specialization</p>

		<p>craftsman training (preparation courses lasting 880 hours or more), business economist, business administrator.</p> <p>-Training institutions/schools for educators</p> <p>-Specialised academies (Bavaria)</p>			
<b>Master's / doctoral or equivalent level</b>		<p>Diplom degree programme at university (including teacher training, state examination, Magister programme, artistic and comparable programmes)</p> <p>Master's programme at Universities, Universities of applied sciences, Colleges of public administration, vocational academics</p> <p>Doctoral studies</p>	Master's / doctoral degree	2 – 5 years after Bachelor's	<p>Master's programmes</p> <p>National institute for administration</p> <p>Doctorate programmes</p>

## **List of diseases**

Illness (A - L)	Illness (M - Z)
Allergy, such as rhinitis, eye inflammation, dermatitis, food allergy or other (allergic asthma excluded)	Myocardial infraction
Asthma	Neck disorder or other chronic neck defect
Bipolar disorder	Osteoarthritis (arthrosis, joint degeneration)
Cancer (malignant tumor, also including leukemia and lymphoma)	Other mental health problems
Chronic anxiety	Permanent injury or defect caused by an accident
Chronic bronchitis, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, emphysema	Psychosis
Chronic depression	Rheumatoid arthritis (inflammation of the joints)
Cirrhosis of the liver, liver dysfunction	Severe headache such as migraine
Coronary heart disease (angina pectoris)	Stomach ulcer (gastric or duodenal ulcer)
Diabetes	Stroke (cerebral hemorrhage, cerebral thrombosis)
High blood pressure (hypertension)	Urinary incontinence, problems in controlling the bladder
Low back disorder or other chronic back defect	

## APPENDIX A

### Survey log

<b>Interviewer name:</b>	
<b>Address:</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	
<b>Time:</b>	
<b>Outcome:</b>	
<b>Original or replacement household:</b>	

---

### Survey log

<b>Interviewer name:</b>	
<b>Address:</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	
<b>Time:</b>	
<b>Outcome:</b>	
<b>Original or replacement household:</b>	

---

### Survey log

<b>Interviewer name:</b>	
<b>Address:</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	
<b>Time:</b>	
<b>Outcome:</b>	
<b>Original or replacement household:</b>	

## APPENDIX B

### Phone numbers for the follow-up call

**Interviewer name:**

[illegible]



APPENDIX C

Very well	Well	Average	Poor	Very poor
1	2	3	4	5
<hr/>				
5	4	3	2	1
Strongly agree	Agree	Neither disagree nor agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree

	Definitely yes	Probably yes	I'm not sure	Probably not	Definitely not
5	4	3	2	1	
<hr/>					
1	2	3	4		
Not at all	Several days	More than half of the days	Nearly every day		

NeverRarelySometimesFrequentlyVery often

12345

54321

Generally  
negative

Negative

Neither  
positive nor  
negative

Positive

Generally  
positive



### INTERVIEWER MANUAL

---

Survey of socio-economic integration of refugees from Syria and their opinions of host community members

#### 1. What is FOCUS project

The FOCUS project, fully named *Forced Displacement and Refugee-Host community Solidarity* is an international project gathering nine partners from seven European countries and Jordan. The project is funded by the European Commission as a part of Horizon 2020 Program for Research and Innovation on the topic of MIGRATION-o8-2018: Addressing the challenge of forced displacement.

The project has **three objectives**:

- 5) *Research*: to contribute to the evidence base on understanding refugee-host community relations through addressing the central research question: *How do different patterns of the socio-economic integration of refugees influence the socio psychological dimensions of refugee and host community relations, and vice versa?*
- 6) *Solutions*: to develop and pilot test solutions to foster peaceful coexistence between refugees and host communities.
- 7) *Policy engagement*: to provide an overall framework for policy makers to adopt and adapt the solutions and recommendations for the adoption of effective policies and practices in diverse settings.

The project also incorporates **three components of methodology**:

- 4) Joint socio-economic and socio-psychological multi-site field research in four countries: Jordan, Croatia, Sweden and Germany.
- 5) Development and pilot testing of solutions in Denmark, Austria, United Kingdom, Sweden and Germany.
- 6) Dissemination of results and policy engagement propositions.

## 2. Purpose of the multi-site field study

One objective of the FOCUS project is to conduct a multi-site research answering the main research question regarding the socio-economic integration of refugees and socio-psychological integration of refugees and host community members, together with the relation of these dimensions of integration. The field study has several characteristics:

- d) It will be conducted in *four country sites*: Jordan, Croatia, Germany and Sweden.
- e) It includes a *triangulation of data* using three sources of data: survey data, focus group discussion data and secondary socio-economic data.
- f) All instruments are theoretically and methodologically grounded and either developed or adapted for the purpose of the main study and translated into the respective languages of the study countries, with the versions for the refugees from Syria translated into Arabic.

## 3. Purpose of this Manual

This Interviewer manual is a detailed guide for trained professionals, collectors of survey data (here addressed as *interviewers*) on the instruments used in the study, approach to the participants, data collection and additional specificities of the instruments. It serves as an essential tool in the training of the interviewer as well as a support tool for referencing before and during the survey interview.

## 4. Instruments

For the purpose of the survey interview, the Information letter, Informed consent form and Questionnaire were developed. The purpose and form of these documents will briefly be described here.

- **Informative letter for the survey**– this document provides the information on the study and rights of a participant. It serves as a source of information and motivation for the participation in the survey and precedes the signing of the Informed consent form. It is presented to the participant in a paper format and contains a designated box in which a four-digit number which is a dedicated code is written for each participant. The letter stays with the participant after the survey.
- **Informed consent form for the survey**– states that the participant has read and understood the Informative letter, is familiar with his/her rights as a

participant and consents to taking part in the survey interview. It is presented to the participant in a paper format which the participant is asked to sign and is retrieved by the interviewer after the survey.

- **Survey questionnaire** – consists of questions on socio-economic and socio-psychological integration. It is adapted for administration using CAPI technique (i.e. using a tablet with special software package for collection of survey data). The interviewer will note the answers using a tablet, while the questionnaire is presented to the participant in a paper format to allow him/her to follow the questions asked by the interviewer. The paper version is retrieved by the interviewer after the study.

## 5. Procedure of data collection

### 5.1. Materials

Every interviewer approaching the potential host community participant has to have the following materials in respective host community language:

- Identification tag (name, organization, FOCUS logo and the logo of European Union)
- Tablet computer with the CAPI software containing the questionnaire
- For each participant:
  - Informative letter for survey with a noted one-of-a-kind, personal four-digit number (code)
  - Informed consent form
  - Paper form of the “survey log”<sup>23</sup> for every completed or attempted interview
- Paper form of the questionnaire
- Paper form of the table for a follow-up call<sup>24</sup>
- Paper forms of each of the scales with numbers from the questionnaire (6 scales on 3 A4 sheets of paper)<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Presented in the Appendix A

<sup>24</sup> Presented in the Appendix B

<sup>25</sup> Presented in the Appendix C

When approaching the refugees, the interviewer who is not a native speaker of Arabic will be accompanied by an interpreter<sup>26</sup>. The interviewer and the interpreter have to have the following materials:

- Identification tags (name, organization, FOCUS logo and the logo of European Union)
- Tablet computer with CAPI software containing the questionnaire in Arabic
- For each participant:
  - Informative letter for survey with a noted one-of-a-kind, personal four-digit number (code), in Arabic
  - Informed consent form, in Arabic
  - Paper form of the “survey log” for every completed or attempted interview (to be completed by the interviewer in host community language)
- For the interviewer:
  - Paper form of the Informative letter, in host community language
  - Paper form of the Informed consent, in host community language
  - Paper form of the questionnaire, in host community language
- Paper form of the questionnaire in Arabic
- Paper form of the table for a follow-up call
- Paper forms of each of the scales with numbers from the questionnaire (6 scales on 3 A4 sheets of paper) in Arabic

**It is necessary that the interviewer carries several paper copies of the questionnaire in case of a CAPI software or the tablet computer malfunction during the data collection.** The interviewer (or interpreter) is then to proceed with the data collection using a paper form of the questionnaire. Note that in the case of using the paper questionnaire, the four-digit code has to be listed on the interviewer’s copy on which the answers are noted.

## *5.2. Where to approach the participants*

The participants will be approached using the Random Walk Technique. Each interviewer will be provided with a list of streets and a house number in which the

---

<sup>26</sup> The RWT procedure with refugees will be used where possible, otherwise the refugee participants will be approached through the community based NGOs who maintain contacts with them

participants will be approached. Student and worker dormitories are excluded from the study.

In each street, a maximum of 10 interviews will be done.
--

6. At the starting sampling point (address), administer the first questionnaire to the qualifying participant in the household.

- If there is only one household at this address, administer it to this household.
- If there are two households at this address, select the second household.
- If there are three or more households at this address, administer the questionnaire to the third household on the right-hand side from the entrance which means also going to the next floor if necessary.

After leaving the household, whether with completed interview or with an agreed appointment for the next visit (see the next section), the interviewer will proceed to the third household on the right hand side after leaving the house, strictly following the RWT protocol.

Each following household will be selected using the rule of every third household on the right-hand side as the interviewer leaves the house in which the survey was just done.
---

Commercial and business establishments, public buildings etc. are not counted as house numbers in this procedure, only the residential units and buildings are counted.

To ensure heterogeneity of households in buildings with up to 4 floors, only one household will be selected in each such building following the right-hand side rule. If the building has more than 4 floors, one more household in the same building will be surveyed following the RWT rules, but starting from three floors up from the previous household.

### 6.1. *Who to approach*

Interview the member of the household who last had the birthday. In each selected household the interviewer will interview only one household member, selected by the “last birthday” criterion.



If the member of the household who had birthday last refuses to be interviewed or is unable to respond (due to a prolonged absence, mental or physical incapacity, lack of knowledge of the language, etc.), the interviewer will not interview another member of the same household.

Instead, the interviewer will choose the next household following the RWT rules (i.e. the right-hand side, third household rule).

If the person who had last birthday in the household was not present when the interviewer arrived or he/she preferred to be interviewed at another time and agreed to make an appointment for such an interview, the interviewer will revisit the household **two more times**. If the participant in question was again absent when the interviewer came for the third time or if he/she refused to be interviewed upon the second visit, the interviewer will choose the next household instead (following the right-hand side, third household rule). One of the three visits will be made during the weekend, and the other two on a workday, typically after 4 p.m.

#### 6.2. *How to approach the participant*

When approaching the participant, the interviewer should firstly present him/herself and the purpose of the visit. He/she should also have an *identification tag visibly attached to the clothes at all times*. When approaching the refugees, and the interviewer is not a native speaker of Arabic, the interpreter will translate between the interviewer and the potential participant at all times.

The member of the household who opens the door should be approached in this manner:

*Good day/afternoon, my name is (name of the interviewer) and I am an interviewer working on a project funded by the European Commission called FOCUS. This is (name of the interpreter) and is an interpreter of Arabic.*

*We are currently conducting a field study which includes a survey interview.*

*Participation in this study is completely voluntary and the potential participant can make the decision to take part after reading the Informative letter. This letter describes in detail the purpose of the study and the rights of the participant, and I would like to present it to the potential participant in your household.*

*Would the members of your household be interested to take part in the study?*

***/TRANSLATED TO ARABIC/<sup>27</sup>***

When allowed to enter the household, the interviewer should ask for the person who had the birthday last (the “last birthday” criterion) for the willingness to read the Informative letter and then decide on participation.

### **6.3. Obtaining informed consent**

In case the qualifying participant chosen based on the last birthday criterion is not the person who opened the door, the interviewer should introduce him/herself again. He/she should then explain the purpose of the field study and the rights of the participant.

*Thank you for taking interest in this field study. This study is a part of the project entitled FOCUS which is funded by the European Commission. We are conducting a survey on opinions about integration of refugees from Syria in our country.*

*This Informative letter describes your rights as a participant in the study. I would like to emphasize that your participation is completely voluntary and the survey is completely anonymous. I will never record your name . I would like to present you the Informative letter so that you can make a decision on taking part in the survey.*

***/TRANSLATED TO ARABIC/***

The interviewer should then present the potential participant the Informative letter and allow him/her to read it. The potential participant should then be asked if he/she has any questions regarding the letter.

*If you are willing to take part in this survey, I will now ask you to sign this Informed consent form. It will be kept apart from other data to ensure anonymity of your answers.*

***/TRANSLATED TO ARABIC/***

When the participant signs the Informed consent, it should be safely stored.

---

<sup>27</sup> Will be translated to Arabic for the main study in WP4.

#### 6.4. Survey interview procedure

The interviewer will firstly input the one-of-a-kind personal four-digit number (code) written on the Informative letter presented to the participant.

*I will now input the code that is written on the top of the Informative letter into my database. This letter will stay with you. If at any moment now or after the survey you would like to redraw and have your data deleted, you can contact the e-mail addresses written at the end of this Informative letter. When you provide us with this number, we can use it to identify your data and delete it without knowing who you are.*

***/TRANSLATED TO ARABIC/***

After noting the code in the database, the interviewer will explain the process of answering the questionnaire:

*I will now give you a paper form of the questionnaire. I will read out the questions and note the answers you are giving me. I would like to ask you to follow the questions in your paper copy. If any question is unclear, please feel free to ask me about it. I will also present you with these scales (show the paper scales) – they are the same ones as in the questionnaire. I will change them as the scales in the questionnaire change.*

***/TRANSLATED TO ARABIC/***

The interviewer will then proceed to read out questions and note the answers in his/her tablet computer. In case of refugees, the interpreter will read out questions and enter the answers into the tablet and the interviewer will follow using a paper copy of the questionnaire in his/her respective language.

Each time a numbered scale is presented in the questionnaire, the interviewer will take out a respective scale and put it in front of the participant so that the answering process is easier.

Screening questions are presented first and, in case the participant is not eligible to participate, the interviewer will thank the participant in a following manner:

*Thank you for answering these questions. These questions serve us to make sure that we are following the protocol for accessing eligible participants. As you are under 18 years of age (state the reason for exclusion from the study), we will not be continuing the survey. Thank you very much for your effort and time.*

***/TRANSLATED TO ARABIC/***

## **6.5. Closure**

After completing the data collection, the interviewer will ask:

*Would you agree to be contacted by the survey supervisor for the purpose of monitoring my work? If you agree, your phone number will be written together with your personal code on the Informative letter. The supervisor will randomly select numbers of some the participants. If you are selected for a follow-up call, you will only be called to confirm I have interviewed you. Your identity, your name and address, will not be known to the supervisor and he/she will never ask you your personal information, only if you have taken part in the survey.*

***/TRANSLATED TO ARABIC/***

If the participant agrees to the possible follow-up call, the interviewer will write down the phone number and the personal code in another paper-format table. The interviewer will then thank the participant and leave.

Whether interview was completed or not, the interviewer fill in the survey log. The interviewer notes the address, time, date and outcome of the interview and whether the interview was conducted in an original or a replacement household.

## **7. Quality assurance**

To ensure the quality of field study data collection, a supervisor will contact a certain number of participants who provided their phone number at the end of the survey. The procedure for assuring quality of data collection is as follows:

- If the participant agrees, his/her phone number will be written in the survey log and the participant's personal code will be noted.
- The survey supervisor will verify about 10% of the completed interviews per each interviewer. The telephone numbers will be randomly selected among the participants who have agreed to be called back. If selected for the follow-up call,

the supervisor will ask the participant if he/she was interviewed during the previous three days at home (or in case of refugee participants possibly at other locations) by means of a tablet computer about the integration of host community members and refugees. The supervisor will not be able to identify the individual participant.

- In case of irregularities, the four-digit personal code will serve to delete this participant's data. In such a case, all other interviews done by the same interviewer will be also deleted. Such interviewer will be immediately dismissed and other interviewers will collect data from the replacement households and participants.
- To avoid interviewer bias, none of the interviewers will interview more than 15% of the sample, i.e. a maximum of 90 participants from at least nine sampling points.

To uphold the standard interviewer-participant relationship procedure, each interviewer will interview a maximum of 7 participants per day.
---

## 8. Specificities of the instruments

In this section, answers to potential questions the participants might have during data collection are presented. Some of them are general while others are related to particular questions in the questionnaire. Also presented here are the short descriptions of language proficiency levels, comparison between educational categories based on the ISCED categorization and the list of diseases.

Section	Question	Explanation
3. Family and migration background	3.3 How many people live in your <b>household</b> ? Please count yourself and every other person.	A household includes either one person living alone or a group of people, not necessarily related, living at the same address (1) sharing expenses and at (2) least one meal per day or sharing a living or sitting room.
3. Family and migration background	3.5 Are you planning to bring your <b>family</b> to /Country/?	Family is defined as parents and their children.
4. Introductory courses	4.4 Which <b>language ability level certification</b> did you get in the /Country/ integration course?	A1 – Beginner A2 – Elementary B1 – Intermediate B2 – Upper intermediate C1 – Advanced (see table below for explanations)
6. Education	6.2. What is the highest <b>qualification</b> you have now?	The highest qualification at the moment, irrespective if achieved in Syria or in the host country.
8. Employment	8.3 Define your <b>current</b> labour status.	In case a person has two or more jobs at the same time, the question should be answered about the main job.
9. Housing and education	9.1 How many <b>rooms</b> are there your flat/house? This means rooms over 6 m <sup>2</sup> in size excluding kitchen and bathroom.	In shared accommodation, the number of rooms should refer to those rooms the participant can use/access (not the total number of rooms).
	9.2 Do you/your family <b>rent or own</b>	If the government is paying the rent for the flat/house, the

	this house?	answer should be “rent”.
10. Neighbourhood	10.1 How many of your <b>neighbours</b> belong to the same ethnic or cultural group as you?	Neighbours are residents who live in the neighbourhood.

### Language proficiency

A Basic user	A1 Beginner	<p>Can understand and use familiar everyday expressions and very basic phrases aimed at the satisfaction of needs of a concrete type.</p> <p>Can introduce themselves and others and can ask and answer questions about personal details such as where they live, people they know and things they have.</p> <p>Can interact in a simple way provided the other person talks slowly and clearly and is prepared to help.</p>
	A2 Elementary	<p>Can understand sentences and frequently used expressions related to areas of most immediate relevance (e.g. very basic personal and family information, shopping, local geography, employment).</p> <p>Can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on familiar and routine matters.</p> <p>Can describe in simple terms aspects of their background, immediate environment and matters in areas of immediate need.</p>
B Independent user	B1 Intermediate	<p>Can understand the main points of clear standard input on familiar matters regularly encountered in work, school, leisure, etc.</p> <p>Can deal with most situations likely to arise while travelling in an area where the language is spoken.</p> <p>Can produce simple connected text on topics that are familiar or of personal interest.</p>

		Can describe experiences and events, dreams, hopes and ambitions and briefly give reasons and explanations for opinions and plans.
	B2 Upper intermediate	<p>Can understand the main ideas of complex text on both concrete and abstract topics, including technical discussions in their field of specialization.</p> <p>Can interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes regular interaction with native speakers quite possible without strain for either party.</p> <p>Can produce clear, detailed text on a wide range of subjects and explain a viewpoint on a topical issue giving the advantages and disadvantages of various options.</p>
C Proficient user	C1 Advanced	<p>Can understand a wide range of demanding, longer clauses, and recognize implicit meaning.</p> <p>Can express ideas fluently and spontaneously without much obvious searching for expressions.</p> <p>Can use language flexibly and effectively for social, academic and professional purposes.</p> <p>Can produce clear, well-structured, detailed text on complex subjects, showing controlled use of organizational patterns, connectors and cohesive devices.</p>



## **Education**

Question *What is the highest education/qualification you have?*

ISCED educational levels and comparison in each study country					
<b>Answer</b>	<b>Sweden</b>	<b>Germany</b>	<b>Croatia</b>	<b>Jordan</b>	<b>Syria</b>
<b>No formal education</b>		Did not attend school.	Not finished elementary school.	Did not attend any kind of school education	Did not attend school
<b>Primary education</b>		Grade 1 – 4 at school	Grade 1 – 4 in elementary school	Finished 10 years at schools	Intermediate education Grade 1-6 at school
<b>Lower secondary education</b>		Grade 5 – 9/ 10 at school. It also includes lower secondary evening schools). This programme (of one to two years of duration) is intended for adults with no or low ISCED level 2 qualifications	Grade 5 – 8 in elementary school	Started but did not finish secondary school	Intermediate education Grade 7-9
<b>Upper secondary / post secondary but not tertiary education</b>		These are three-year upper secondary general programmes (Gymnasiale Oberstufe), comprising Grades 10 to 12. These	Finished three and four-year high school.	Finished 12 years at school	General secondary education Grade 10-12 Vocational secondary education Grade 10-12 Technical institute

		<p>include Berufliches Gymnasium, Integrierte Gesamtschule or Freie Waldorfschule</p> <p>Berufsschulen (Duales System) Erstausbildung (Vocational Schools (Dual System) Training). This is a 2-, 3- or 3.5-year special form of apprenticeship which comprises education and training both at a vocational school and in an enterprise. In the majority of cases the duration is three years. Training for Civil Servants (medium level Berufsoberschule (Upper secondary vocational schools)</p>			programmes
<b>Short cycle tertiary education</b>		Master craftsman training (very short preparation courses	2 years after upper secondary school.	Diploma (2 year after upper secondary	Technical institute programmes, intermediate

		only that last less than 880 hours) <sup>3</sup>		education)	education
<b>Bachelor's or equivalent level</b>		Bachelor's programme at Universities, Universities of applied sciences, Colleges of public administration, vocational academics Diplom Degree Trade and technical schools (excluding health care and social professions and educator training) including master craftsman training (preparation courses lasting 880 hours or more), business economist, business administrator. -Training institutions/schools for educators -Specialised academies (Bavaria)	Bachelor's degree.	Bachelor's degree 4-5 years at university	Bachelor's programmes Higher institute of administration Engineering and medicine programmes Diploma qualification and specialization
<b>Master's / doctoral or</b>		Diplom degree programme at	Master's / doctoral degree	2 – 5 years after Bachelor's	Master's programmes

<b>equivalent level</b>		university (including teacher training, state examination, Magister programme, artistic and comparable programmes) Master's programme at Universities, Universities of applied sciences, Colleges of public administration, vocational academics Doctoral studies			National institute for administration Doctorate programmes
-----------------------------	--	--	--	--	---

## **List of diseases**

### **Illness (A-Z)**

Allergy, such as rhinitis, eye inflammation, dermatitis, food allergy or other (allergic asthma excluded)

Asthma

Bipolar disorder

Cancer (malignant tumor, also including leukemia and lymphoma)

Chronic anxiety

Chronic bronchitis, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, emphysema

Chronic depression

Cirrhosis of the liver, liver dysfunction

Coronary heart disease (angina pectoris)

Diabetes

High blood pressure (hypertension)

Low back disorder or other chronic back defect

Myocardial infarction

Neck disorder or other chronic neck defect

Osteoarthritis (arthrosis, joint degeneration)

Other mental health problems

Permanent injury or defect caused by an accident

Psychosis

Rheumatoid arthritis (inflammation of the joints)

Severe headache such as migraine

Stomach ulcer (gastric or duodenal ulcer)

Stroke (cerebral hemorrhage, cerebral thrombosis)

Urinary incontinence, problems in controlling the bladder

## APPENDIX A

### Survey log

<b>Interviewer name:</b>	
<b>Address:</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	
<b>Time:</b>	
<b>Outcome:</b>	
<b>Original or replacement household:</b>	

---

### Survey log

<b>Interviewer name:</b>	
<b>Address:</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	
<b>Time:</b>	
<b>Outcome:</b>	
<b>Original or replacement household:</b>	

---

### Survey log

<b>Interviewer name:</b>	
<b>Address:</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	
<b>Time:</b>	
<b>Outcome:</b>	
<b>Original or replacement household:</b>	

## APPENDIX B

### Phone numbers for the follow-up call

**Interviewer name:**

[illegible]

Very well	Well	Average	Poor	Very poor
1	2	3	4	5
<hr/>				
5	4	3	2	1
Strongly agree	Agree	Neither disagree nor agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree



Not at all	Several days	More than half of the days	Nearly every day
1	2	3	4
<hr/>			
5	4	3	2
1			
Definitely not	Probably not	I'm not sure	Probably yes
Definitely yes	Probably yes		

Never                      Rarely                      Sometimes                      Frequently                      Very often

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

5                      4                      3                      2                      1

Generally  
negative                      Negative                      Neither  
positive nor  
negative                      Positive                      Generally  
positive



## TRAINING MANUAL

---

### Purpose of this Manual

This Manual serves as guidance for training of the professional data collectors (here addressed as *interviewers* and *interpreters*) and is envisioned as a guide through a training workshop for the interviewers and Arabic language interpreters before the beginning of data gathering in study sites.

This Manual is a guide for the trainers (researchers) who train interviewers and interpreters. Therefore, it includes information presented in the Interviewer manual, as well as additional information that should be presented to the interviewers and interpreters during the training workshop.

### The need for the training of interviewers

One objective of the FOCUS project is to conduct a multi-site research answering the main research question regarding the socio-economic integration of refugees and socio-psychological integration of refugees and host community members, together with the relation of these dimensions of integration. The field study has several characteristics:

- g) It will be conducted in *four country sites*: Jordan, Croatia, Germany and Sweden.
- h) It includes a *triangulation of data* using three sources of data: survey data, focus group discussion data and secondary socio-economic data.
- i) All instruments are theoretically and methodologically grounded and either developed or adapted for the purpose of the main study and translated into the respective languages of the study countries, with the versions for the refugees from Syria translated into Arabic.

Because of the nature of the research question, the multi-site methodology and the importance of unified data collection process, the interviewers and interpreters have to be well acquainted with the procedures of approaching the participants and conducting the survey interview. Interviewers and interpreters should also practice the collaborative data collection process.

## Workshop details

The workshop is meant as an introduction to the FOCUS project, the goals of the field research, the procedure of approaching the potential participants, data collection and procedures after the data collection.

It is estimated to last about 4 hours and all interviewers and interpreters have to take part before the start of field study data collection.

### Materials needed for the workshop:

- Trainer manual (one for each trainer/assistant trainer)
- Interviewer manual (one for each interviewer and interpreter)
- Power-point presentation
- Paper copies (one for each interviewer and interpreter) of:
  - Informative letter
  - Informed consent form
  - Survey questionnaire
- Tablet computers with CAPI software (one for each pair of workshop participants)

In the following sections, workshop content is described in the order in which it should be presented to the workshop participants (interviewers and interpreters).

## What is FOCUS project

In 2015 and 2016, the EU experienced an unparalleled influx of refugees and migrants from Syria and other countries. The same was present in Jordan since 2011, with a peak rising in 2013. This situation poses multiple challenges for social- and health services and labour markets in host communities as well as for the lives of the refugees.

The FOCUS project, fully named *Forced Displacement and Refugee-Host community Solidarity* is an international project gathering nine partners from seven European countries and Jordan. It aims to significantly increase understanding of key dynamics in refugee/host community relations and to develop and test innovative solutions for social and labour market integration.

The project is funded by the European Commission as a part of Horizon 2020 Program for Research and Innovation on the topic of MIGRATION-08-2018: Addressing the challenge of forced displacement.

The project has **three objectives**:

- 8) *Research*: to contribute to the evidence base on understanding refugee-host community relations through addressing the central research question: *How do different patterns of the socio-economic integration of refugees influence the socio psychological dimensions of refugee and host community relations, and vice versa?*
- 9) *Solutions*: to develop and pilot test solutions to foster peaceful coexistence between refugees and host communities.
- 10) *Policy engagement*: to provide an overall framework for policy makers to adopt and adapt the solutions and recommendations for the adoption of effective policies and practices in diverse settings.

The project also incorporates **three components of methodology**:

- 7) Joint socio-economic and socio-psychological multi-site field research in four countries: Jordan, Croatia, Sweden and Germany.
- 8) Development and pilot testing of solutions in Denmark, Austria, United Kingdom, Sweden and Germany.
- 9) Dissemination of results and policy engagement propositions.

## **The role of interviewers and interpreters in the field study**

The interviewers and interpreters are engaged to conduct survey interviews with the members of the host community and refugees from Syria. Interpreters are needed in case the interviewer is collecting data from refugee participants and is not a native speaker of Arabic. In such a case, the role of the interpreter is to be a mediator and convey any and all communication back and forth between the participant and the interviewer.

### ***Interviewers***

The interviewers will be trained specifically for this survey and required to have at least two months of interviewing experience. They will sign statements of compliance with the data collection procedures and guidelines, as well as the data

confidentiality requirements. The interviewers will be prepared during the training workshop.

As part of the training, the interviewers will receive written guidelines with information about the research purpose and goals (incorporated into the Interviewers manual), including detailed descriptions of:

- How to gather data and motivate respondents for participation
- How to determine starting sampling points and Random Walk Technique routes and select households and participants
- What to do in case of refusal to participate and how to choose a replacement household
- How to assure the participants that their responses will be treated as confidential
- How the interviewers' work will be monitored and what will be the consequences of their failure to adhere to the required procedures

As part of their training, the interviewers will receive detailed information about the structure and logic of the survey questionnaire as well as availability of support from the research team. Since CAPI (Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing) technique will be used for data collection, the interviewers will also practice using it until they master it.

In case of survey of refugees, the interviewers will have the same qualifications as for the host community member survey, will meet the same requirements and will be trained in the same manner (except using Random Walk Technique where it will not be employed).

### ***Interpreters***

Unless the interviewers are native speakers of Arabic language, they will be accompanied by such interpreters. Interpreters will be trained together with the interviewers. They will assist the interviewer in data collection by administering the questionnaire and entering the data into the tablet computer under the supervision of the interviewer. However, the interviewer will lead the process, from explaining the study goals and procedures, over negotiating the informed consent, to providing clarifications if needed and concluding the interview.

## Study participants

The target group of **refugees from Syria** is described as forced migrants from Syria who have been recognized as refugees by UNHCR from 2011 onward in Jordan, or have received the international protection status (asylum) from 2015 onward for European countries, and have been living in respective host communities from the point of receiving this status to date. The criteria of different years of being recognized as a refugee (in Jordan) or receiving asylum (in Europe) was chosen since the peak of influx of refugees from Syria to Jordan was in 2013., but the refugees from Syria started arriving in greater numbers in 2011./2012. The European Union experienced massive increases in influx of refugees in 2015.

Qualifying criteria for refugee from Syria participants to be included in the survey:

- Age – respondents between 18 and 65 years.
- Refugee/asylum status – respondents who have received the decision regarding their status; if rejected the refugee/asylum status do not qualify for the study.
- Year of receiving refugee status – respondents who received their refugee/asylum status after 2015. (2011. in Jordan) qualify for the study. In Jordan the applicable criteria for acknowledging the refugee status will be used.
- Not living in a camp/shared accommodation for refugees – respondents who live in a camp or shared accommodation for refugees do not qualify for the study<sup>28</sup>.

The eligibility of a potential participant to take part in the study will be determined based on the screening questions presented first in the questionnaire.

**Host community members** are defined as persons who have citizenship or permanent residency in the respective European country and have been living in the same host community for at least 7 years (at least since 2013.). The criterion of length of stay in the same community has been chosen as a sum of two years prior

---

<sup>28</sup> This is because the data necessary for answering research questions in this study should come from the respondents who have the chance to interact with the members of the other group. This chance of contact and interaction is significantly lower in camps and shared accommodation designated strictly for refugees.

to the beginning of the migration wave from Syria to Europe and the number of years passed since, making a total of 7 years. For Jordan, the host community members are defined as Jordanians, as in Jordan foreigners cannot receive citizenship or permanent residence. It is important that the survey participants in the host communities are long-residing individuals in a respective community to have been able to develop profound experience of living in and attachment to the community.

The qualifying criteria for the host community members to be included in the survey:

- Age – participants between 18 and 65 years.
- Number of years living in the respective country – participants living in the host community more than 7 years.
- Citizenship or residence – participants who have country citizenship or permanent residence.

The eligibility of a potential participant to take part in the study will be determined based on the screening questions presented first in the questionnaire.

The sample size for each study site is presented in Table 1.

*Table 1.* Sample size per country.

	Country			
	Jordan	Croatia	Germany	Sweden
Host community members	600	600	600	600
Refugees from Syria	600	200	600	600

Both host community members and refugees will be surveyed in the same three purposefully selected in-country areas (regions, cities) with high concentration and number of refugees.

### *8.1. Selecting host community participants*

Survey of host community members will use two probabilistic sampling techniques to select the participants. Due to specific differences among the four study sites regarding access to registers of host community members, the Random



Walk Technique (RWT) will be used in Germany, Jordan and Croatia. In Sweden citizen registries will be used for randomised selection of participants and the validated interviewing procedures will be followed as in other similar population based studies in Sweden.

In the selected target areas (regions, cities) the size of the sample will be proportional to the population of that target area (region, city), and participants will be selected by probability sampling which will ensure that the sample structure reflects the areas' population characteristics based on available statistics, such as the total male and female population in the 18 to 65 age group.

### *8.2. Selecting refugee participants*

The sampling design for the refugee survey will aim at achieving heterogeneity to reflect the refugee population parameters, but true probabilistic sampling is not expected at all study sites. RWT of sampling refugee respondents will be used if possible in Jordan, while random sampling of refugees based on registries will be used in Sweden. In Germany and Croatia refugee respondents will be approached through NGOs that maintain contact with them and if needed with advertisements and invitations to participate in the study that will be placed and published at locations frequented by refugees from Syria.

During the initial contact with potential refugee participants the Information Letter about the study and invitation to participate will be distributed through the NGO channels. If they are willing to participate, they will send message through the NGO intermediary and will then be contacted.

In order to minimise the potential self-selection and other referral biases, in each area (region, city) at least five different entry points into the target population (i.e. NGOs, locations for placing the advertisements and invitations to participate in the study) will be used.

## **Data collection using Random Walk Technique (RWT)**

The consistent use of Random Walk Technique (RWT) will ensure probability sampling in countries where citizen registries are not readily accessible to the researchers. Such sampling will be ensured by randomly selecting clusters of sampling points in each area (region, city), randomly selecting the households, and by randomly selecting the potential participants in the selected households.

This will be done in the following steps:

1. In each target area (region, city) produce the list of smaller administrative units (neighbourhoods, quarters). This list of smaller administrative units defines the overall sampling frame for the target area (region, city).
2. From the list of smaller administrative units (neighbourhoods, quarters) randomly select 10 % to 15 % of them.
3. Within each selected neighbourhood produce a list of streets.
4. From the list of streets in each selected neighbourhood randomly select 3 to 4 streets and in each street randomly select a starting house number from the pool of all house numbers in that street. This is one starting sampling point for the survey in the target neighbourhood. There will be 3 to 4 sampling points in each target neighbourhood (depending on the number of selected streets) which will all be identified using the same protocol. At each sampling point a maximum of 10 interviews will be done (to ensure heterogeneity and wide catchment of different neighbourhoods).

At the starting sampling point (address) administer the first questionnaire to the qualifying participant in the household. If there is only one household at this address, administer it to this household. If there are two households at this address, select the second household. If there are three or more households at this address, administer the questionnaire to the third household on the right-hand side from the entrance which means also going to the next floor if necessary.

5. Interview the member of the household who last had the birthday. In each selected household the interviewer will interview only one household member, selected by the “last birthday” criterion. If the member of the household who had birthday last refuses to be interviewed or is unable to respond (due to a prolonged absence, mental or physical incapacity, lack of knowledge of the language, etc.), the interviewer will not interview another member of the same household. Instead, the interviewer will choose the next household following the selection protocol (i.e. the right-hand side, third household rule). If the person who had last birthday in the household was not present when the interviewer arrived or he/she preferred to be interviewed at another time and made appointment for such an interview, the interviewer will revisit the household two more times. If the participant in question was again absent when the interviewer

came for the third time or if he/she refused to be interviewed upon the second visit, the interviewer will choose the next household instead (following the right-hand side, third household rule). One of the three visits will be made during the weekend, and the other two on a workday, typically after 4 p.m.

6. After leaving the household, whether with completed interview or with an agreed appointment for the next visit, the interviewer will proceed to the next household strictly following the RWT protocol. Each following household will be selected using the rule of every third household on the right-hand side as the interviewer leaves the house in which the survey was just done. Commercial and business establishments, public buildings etc. are not counted as house numbers in this procedure, only the residential units and buildings are counted.

To ensure heterogeneity of households in buildings with up to 4 floors, only one household will be selected in each such building following the right-hand side rule. If the building has more than 4 floors, another household in the same building will be surveyed following the RWT rules, but starting from three floors up from the previous household.

## Instruments

For the purpose of the survey interview, the Information letter, Informed consent form and Questionnaire were developed. The purpose and form of these documents are described here.

- **Informative letter for the survey** – this document provides the information on the study and rights of a participant. It serves as a source of information and motivation for the participation in the survey and precedes the signing of the Informed consent form. It is presented to the participant in a paper format and contains a designated box in which a four-digit number which is a dedicated code is written for each participant. The letter stays with the participant after the survey.
- **Informed consent form for the survey** – states that the participant has read and understood the Informative letter, is familiar with his/her rights as a participant and consents to taking part in the survey interview. It is presented to the participant in a paper format which the participant is asked to sign and is retrieved by the interviewer after the survey.
- **Survey questionnaire** – consists of questions on socio-economic and socio-psychological integration. It is adapted for administration using CAPI technique

(i.e. using a tablet with special software package for collection of survey data). The interviewer will note the answers using a tablet, while the questionnaire is presented to the participant in a paper format to allow him/her to follow the questions asked by the interviewer. The paper version is retrieved by the interviewer after the study.

### Survey questionnaire structure

The survey questionnaire consists of questions and statements with proposed answers the participant chooses from. It includes questions on socio-economic and socio-psychological integration of refugees and host community members, with the version for host community members being shorter due to a smaller number of scales.

The scales in the questionnaires are:

Target group: refugees from Syria	Target group: host community members
Screening questions	Screening questions
Demographics	Demographics
Family	Family and migration background
Participation and completion of integration/introductory courses or their analogy in Jordan	/
Language proficiency (except in Jordan)	/
Educational level	Educational level
Recognition of qualification	/
Employment	Employment
Accommodation and household	/
Residents in the neighbourhood	/
Neighbourhood quality	Neighbourhood quality
Welfare	Welfare
/	Host community members' perception of refugee community
Attitudes towards the host community members	Attitudes towards refugees from Syria
Perception of intergroup threat	Perception of intergroup threat
Knowledge of refugee entitlements	Support for refugee entitlements
Perception of readiness of host community members' pro-social behaviour	Readiness for pro-social behaviour
Contact quality and quantity	Contact quality and quantity
Social network	Social network
Social proximity	Social proximity
Support for the forms of acculturation	Support for the forms of acculturation

Perception of discrimination	Perception of discrimination of refugees
Religious and political orientation	Religious and political orientation
Psychological wellbeing	Psychological wellbeing
Access to mental health services	/
Physical wellbeing	Physical wellbeing

## Procedure of data collection

### *Materials*

Every interviewer approaching the potential host community participant has to have the following materials in respective host community language:

- Identification tag (name, organization, FOCUS logo and the logo of European Union)
- Tablet computer with the CAPI software containing the questionnaire
- For each participant:
  - Informative letter for survey with a noted one-of-a-kind, personal four-digit number (code)
  - Informed consent form
  - Paper form of the “survey log” for every completed or attempted interview
- Paper form of the questionnaire
- Paper form of the table for a follow-up call
- Paper forms of each of the scales with numbers from the questionnaire (6 scales on 3 A4 sheets of paper)

When approaching the refugees, the interviewer who is not a native speaker of Arabic will be accompanied by an interpreter<sup>29</sup>. The interviewer and the interpreter have to have the following materials:

- Identification tags (name, organization, FOCUS logo and the logo of European Union)
- Tablet computer with CAPI software containing the questionnaire in Arabic
- For each participant:
  - Informative letter for survey with a noted one-of-a-kind, personal four-digit number (code), in Arabic

---

<sup>29</sup> The RWT procedure with refugees will be used where possible, otherwise the refugee participants will be approached through the community based NGOs who maintain contacts with them

- Informed consent form, in Arabic
- Paper form of the “survey log” for every completed or attempted interview (to be completed by the interviewer in host community language)
- For the interviewer:
  - Paper form of the Informative letter, in host community language
  - Paper form of the Informed consent, in host community language
  - Paper form of the questionnaire, in host community language
- Paper form of the questionnaire in Arabic
- Paper form of the table for a follow-up call
- Paper forms of each of the scales with numbers from the questionnaire (6 scales on 3 A4 sheets of paper) in Arabic

**It is necessary that the interviewer carries several paper copies of the questionnaire in case of a CAPI software or the tablet computer malfunction during the data collection.** The interviewer (or interpreter) is then to proceed with the data collection using a paper form of the questionnaire. Note that in the case of using the paper questionnaire, the four-digit code has to be listed on the interviewer’s copy on which the answers are noted.

### ***Where to approach the participants?***

How to determine starting sampling points and Random Walk Technique routes and select households and participants?

The participants will be approached using the Random Walk Technique. Each interviewer will be provided with a list of streets and a house number in which the participants will be approached. Student and worker dormitories are excluded from the study.

In each street, a maximum of 10 interviews will be done.

At the starting sampling point (address), administer the first questionnaire to the qualifying participant in the household.

- If there is only one household at this address, administer it to this household.
- If there are two households at this address, select the second household.
- If there are three or more households at this address, administer the questionnaire to the third household on the right-hand side from the entrance which means also going to the next floor if necessary.

After leaving the household, whether with completed interview or with an agreed appointment for the next visit (see the next section), the interviewer will proceed to the third household on the right hand side after leaving the house, strictly following the RWT protocol.

Each following household will be selected using the rule of every third household on the right-hand side as the interviewer leaves the house in which the survey was just done.

Commercial and business establishments, public buildings etc. are not counted as house numbers in this procedure, only the residential units and buildings are counted.

To ensure heterogeneity of households in buildings with up to 4 floors, only one household will be selected in each such building following the right-hand side rule. If the building has more than 4 floors, one more household in the same building will be surveyed following the RWT rules, but starting from three floors up from the previous household.

### ***Who to approach?***

Interview the member of the household who last had the birthday. In each selected household the interviewer will interview only one household member, selected by the “last birthday” criterion.

If the member of the household who had birthday last refuses to be interviewed or is unable to respond (due to a prolonged absence, mental or physical incapacity, lack of knowledge of the language, etc.), the interviewer will not interview another member of the same household.

Instead, the interviewer will choose the next household following the RWT rules (i.e. the right-hand side, third household rule).

What to do in case of refusal to participate and how to choose a replacement household?

If the person who had last birthday in the household was not present when the interviewer arrived or he/she preferred to be interviewed at another time and agreed to make an appointment for such an interview, the interviewer will revisit the household **two more times**. If the participant in question was again absent

when the interviewer came for the third time or if he/she refused to be interviewed upon the second visit, the interviewer will choose the next household instead (following the right-hand side, third household rule). One of the three visits will be made during the weekend, and the other two on a workday, typically after 4 p.m.

### ***How to approach the participant?***

How to gather data and motivate respondents for participation and how to assure the participants that their responses will be treated as confidential?

When approaching the participant, the interviewer should firstly present him/herself and the purpose of the visit. He/she should also have an *identification tag visibly attached to the clothes at all times*. When approaching the refugees, and the interviewer is not a native speaker of Arabic, the interpreter will translate between the interviewer and the potential participant at all times.

The member of the household who opens the door should be approached in this manner:

*Good day/afternoon, my name is (name of the interviewer) and I am an interviewer working on a project funded by the European Commission called FOCUS. [This is (name of the interpreter) and is an interpreter of Arabic].*

*We are currently conducting a field study which includes a survey interview.*

*Participation in this study is completely voluntary and the potential participant can make the decision to take part after reading the Informative letter. This letter describes in detail the purpose of the study and the rights of the participant, and I would like to present it to the potential participant in your household.*

*Would the members of your household be interested to take part in the study?*

When allowed to enter the household, the interviewer should ask for the person who had the birthday last (the “last birthday” criterion) for the willingness to read the Informative letter and then decide on participation.

### ***Obtaining informed consent***

In case the qualifying participant chosen based on the last birthday criterion is not the person who opened the door, the interviewer should introduce him/herself



again. He/she should then explain the purpose of the field study and the rights of the participant.

*Thank you for taking interest in this field study. This study is a part of the project entitled FOCUS which is funded by the European Commission. We are conducting a survey on opinions about integration of refugees from Syria in our country.*

*This Informative letter describes your rights as a participant in the study. I would like to emphasize that your participation is completely voluntary and the survey is completely anonymous. I will never record your name. I would like to present you the Informative letter so that you can make a decision on taking part in the survey.*

The interviewer should then present the potential participant the Informative letter and allow him/her to read it. The potential participant should then be asked if he/she has any questions regarding the letter.

*If you are willing to take part in this survey, I will now ask you to sign this Informed consent form. It will be kept apart from other data to ensure anonymity of your answers.*

When the participant signs the Informed consent, it should be safely stored.

### **Survey interview procedure**

The interviewer will firstly input the one-of-a-kind personal four-digit number (code) written on the Informative letter presented to the participant.

*I will now input the code that is written on the top of the Informative letter into my database. This letter will stay with you. If at any moment now or after the survey you would like to redraw and have your data deleted, you can contact the e-mail addresses written at the end of this Informative letter. When you provide us with this number, we can use it to identify your data and delete it without knowing who you are.*

After noting the code in the database, the interviewer will explain the process of answering the questionnaire:

*I will now give you a paper form of the questionnaire. I will read out the questions and note the answers you are giving me. I would like to ask you to follow the questions in your paper copy. If any question is unclear, please feel free*

*to ask me about it. I will also present you with these scales (show the paper scales) – they are the same ones as in the questionnaire. I will change them as the scales in the questionnaire change.*

The interviewer will then proceed to read out questions and note the answers in his/her tablet computer. In case of refugees, the interpreter will read out questions and enter the answers into the tablet and the interviewer will follow using a paper copy of the questionnaire in his/her respective language.

Each time a numbered scale is presented in the questionnaire, the interviewer will take out a respective scale and put it in front of the participant so that the answering process is easier.

Screening questions are presented first and, in case the participant is not eligible to participate, the interviewer will thank the participant in a following manner:

*Thank you for answering these questions. These questions serve us to make sure that we are following the protocol for accessing eligible participants. As you are under 18 years of age (state the reason for exclusion from the study), we will not be continuing the survey. Thank you very much for your effort and time.*

## **Closure**

After completing the data collection, the interviewer will ask:

*Would you agree to be contacted by the survey supervisor for the purpose of monitoring my work? If you agree, your phone number will be written together with your personal code on the Informative letter. The supervisor will randomly select numbers of some the participants. If you are selected for a follow-up call, you will only be called to confirm I have interviewed you. Your identity, your name and address, will not be known to the supervisor and he/she will never ask you your personal information, only if you have taken part in the survey.*

If the participant agrees to the possible follow-up call, the interviewer will write down the phone number and the personal code in another paper-format table. The interviewer will then thank the participant and leave.

Whether the interview was completed or not, the interviewer fills in the survey log. The interviewer notes the address, time, date and outcome of the interview and whether the interview was conducted in an original or a replacement household.

## Quality assurance during data collection

How the interviewers' work will be monitored and what will be the consequences of their failure to adhere to the required procedures?

While gathering data, the interviewers will maintain a separate “survey log” in the paper format for each completed and attempted interview. In this log they will note the address, time, date and outcome of each completed or attempted interview, whether original or replacement household.

The example of the survey log is presented here:

### Survey log

Interviewer name:	
Address:	
Date:	
Time:	
Outcome:	
Original or replacement household:	

At the end of the interview, the participants will be asked if they agree to be contacted by the survey supervisor for the purpose of monitoring the work of the interviewers. If the participant agrees, his/her phone number will be written in the specific follow-up table together with the participant's personal code. This will enable the survey supervisor to verify about 10 % of the completed interviews per each interviewer. The telephone numbers will be randomly selected among the participants who have agreed to be called back. If selected for the follow-up call, the supervisor will ask the participant if he/she was interviewed during the previous three days at home (or in case of refugee participants possibly at other locations) by means of a tablet about the integration of host community members and refugees. The supervisor will not be able to identify the individual participant.

In case of irregularities, the personal code will serve to delete this participant's data. In such a case, all other interviews done by the same interviewer will be also deleted. Such interviewer will be immediately dismissed and other interviewers will collect data from the replacement households and participants.

The survey logs will be kept separate from the participants' responses which will be entered into the tablet computer during the interview and in no way will they be linked to the data of an individual participant.

To avoid interviewer bias, none of the interviewers will interview more than 15% of the sample, i.e. a maximum of 90 participants from at least nine sampling points.

To uphold the standard interviewer-participant relationship procedure, each interviewer will interview a maximum of 7 participants per day.

Conducting interviews by using the CAPI technique (i.e. a tablet with a special software package) will facilitate the quality of data collection because for each survey question filters will be defined automatically leaving only minimal room for errors by the interviewer when entering the participant's responses. This technique will make it also possible to record the time and duration of interviews which can be used to monitor the standard performance of each interviewer.

## **Practice of data collection procedure**

After the trainers, interviewers and interpreters go through the topics of what FOCUS project is, what are their roles, who are the study participants, and the procedure of data collection, the interviewers and interpreters will practice data collection using tablet computers with CAPI software in an exercise simulating the real interview situation in which each interviewer and interpreter will go through the whole procedure under the supervision of the trainer.

## METHODOLOGICAL SPECIFICITIES FOR JORDAN



Musa Shteivi  
Francesca Ruisi

### METHODOLOGICAL SPECIFICITIES FOR JORDAN

#### Contents

<b>1. Integration/Empowerment framework .....</b>	<b>190</b>
<b>2. Definitions of target groups as a part of the FOCUS methodology for the field study .....</b>	<b>196</b>
<b>3. Sampling strategy .....</b>	<b>196</b>
<b>4. Fieldwork instruments .....</b>	<b>198</b>
4.1 Survey .....	198
4.1.1 Questionnaire host community .....	198
4.1.2 Questionnaire refugee community .....	201
4.1.3 Letter of information and informed consent for Survey (host communities/refugees) .....	206
4.2 Focus Group .....	206
4.2.1 Invitation Letter for Focus Groups .....	206
4.2.2 Information Letter and Informed Consent for Focus Group ....	207
4.2.3 Focus Group Discussion Guide .....	207
<b>5. References .....</b>	<b>207</b>

## 1. Integration/Empowerment framework

This section explains to what extent the European integration framework crosses the Jordan policy framework. This is required in order to ensure and define commonalities in the approaches and for a reliable comparative data collection and analysis in the all sampled countries. In particular it is shown how the European integration framework and the Jordanian policy framework mutually fit and in certain cases diverge when it comes to comprehending the relationship between the host and refugee communities and the type of public intervention that each country aims to implement for responding to the refugees crisis.

In the case of the European countries (Germany, Sweden and Croatia) the definition of integration is defined as *a dynamic, two-way process of mutual accommodation by all immigrants and residents of Member States* (European Commission, 2004) and further refers to integration as *a dynamic two-way process on integration means not only expecting third-country nationals to embrace EU fundamental values and learn the host language but also offering them meaningful opportunities to participate in the economy and society of the Member State where they settle* (European Commission, 2016).

Intuitively, it can be understood how in case of the Jordan framework the policy approaches cannot be expected to *embrace EU fundamental values* since they are not necessarily and consistently part of the Jordanian legislation. Analogously, integration processes cannot take into consideration *learning the host language* since both Jordanians and Syrian refugee communities are Arabic native speakers.

Nevertheless, the European integration framework directly crosses the Jordanian policy framework when it comes to considering *offering them meaningful opportunities to participate in the economy and society of the Member State where they settle*. In fact, this is the definition where both approaches converge to the same direction even if with due distinctions.

In particular, it is now explained how the Hashemite Kingdom conceives and has conceived Syrian refugee response in the last decade. It is argued how the Jordanian framework can be considered an *empowerment* oriented framework in this sense and how the integration framework cannot be perfectly applied in the Jordanian context although communalities still exist. This is also based on the concept that integration in Jordan has strong political declinations due to historical reasons, while social and cultural aspects of this process are naturally unaccountable due to the cultural proximity and linguistic equivalence of both groups in the Hashemite Kingdom. Special attention should be paid when it comes to considering economic issues since, as it will be illustrated, Jordan launched economic inclusion policies only more recently and following the London Conference in 2016.

The first aspect to be accounted for lies on the legal framework underlying the Jordan refugee response.

Currently, the key document to be referred is the Jordan Response Platform for the Syria Crisis (JRPSC) constituting *the strategic partnership mechanism for the development of a comprehensive **refugee, resilience-strengthening and development response** to the impact of the Syria crisis on Jordan* (Jordanian Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation, 2019).

It is then clear how the Jordanian approach focuses in parallel on the host community and the refugee community in order to mitigate the impact of the crisis in the Hashemite Kingdom. Particularly, it emphasizes the impact on host community (infrastructures, services such as health and education, economy and this is because, differently from the European contexts, the ratio between the host and refugee community is particularly significant since the amount of refugees is very high compared to the host population. Unofficial sources refer the presence of 1 million Syrian refugees on a total population of 10.438.833 Jordanians (Jordanian Department of Statistics, 2019) and this clearly explains the amount of impact that such flows have on the country. At the time of writing UNHCR official registered refugees are estimated to be 664,330 (UNHCR, 2019).

Also to be noted should be the transition that the Jordan policy frameworks have traced in almost one decade of refugee arrivals. During the first waves of Syrian refugees started to migrate to the Hashemite Kingdom, the type of intervention that Jordan implemented was mainly humanitarian-oriented. It is only recently that the Hashemite Kingdom started to implement long term policies aimed at boosting Syrian refugee economic and social capacity in order to progressively turn them into self-sustaining actors.

In particular, the first phase (2011-2015) of Syrian refugee response was based on the regional framework of the Sixth Regional Response Plan (RRP6) promoted by UNHCR has been primarily intended to provide relief to Syrian refugees themselves (Shteiwi, Walsh, & Klassen, 2014). In parallel to the RRP6, the National Resilience Plan (NRP) has been implemented by the Jordanian Government's from 2013 to 2015 as own response to the Syrian refugee crisis intending to minimize the spillover effects of the Syrian refugee crisis on Jordanian host communities and harmonize the Syrian refugee response with Jordan's domestic development goals (*ibidem*). It appears clear how the NRP started to turn a humanitarian situation into a development potential opportunity more than aid-based approach. In fact the NRP is meant to reinforce medium- and long-term coping systems in the Hashemite Kingdom and this has been conceived due to potential prolonged stay of Syrian refugees in Jordan and consequently demographic changes that have been occurred in the years.

It is within this context that the Jordan Compact (Government of Jordan, 2016) has been established in 2016 in order to favouring resilience of the refugee community in the Hashemite Kingdom and mitigate tension in the country. The Jordan Compact is in fact an agreement between Jordan and the international community based on three actions: turning the Syrian refugee crisis in Jordan into a development opportunity, investing in Jordan's communities and sufficiently supplying Jordan with grants to meet the financial needs and sustain the economy over the next three years (Ruisi & Shteivi, 2016). The Jordan Compact creates a path forward toward long-term sustainability (*ibidem*) representing the base of the *empowerment* framework. In fact, it represents a milestone since it introduced long term oriented policies aimed to regulate protracted stay of Syrian refugees in the Hashemite Kingdom. In this sense, it introduces legal work permit for Syrian refugees but with due restrictions in terms of allowed sectors of employment. However, the main goal is to progressively build and promote self-sustainability in the short and long term of Syrian refugees in case of repatriation, protracted stay in Jordan or relocation in third countries.

As a result, it is clear which key interventions during the last five year period allowed Syrian refugees to progressively turn into self-sustainable actors also within the Jordanian context. Firstly, the Jordan Response Plan (JRP), adopted in 2015, implemented a set of policies aiming to include Syrian refugees in tertiary education and definitely facilitate their access to higher education in the Hashemite Kingdom. This is because empowering the younger generation of refugees by giving them access to higher education reduces their dependence on external assistance and, in the longer term, leads to the creation of economically self-sustainable actors (*ibidem*). However, barriers to access higher education still persist at distinct levels (Ruisi, 2019; Shteivi et al., 2018).

It is then clear how such type of approaches could not be intuitively conceived within a short and aid based intervention, but, on the contrary are based on the conception of *empowered included* actor within a certain social and economic context.

Secondly, the Jordan Compact (2016) that definitely regulated access to labour market through the introduction of legal work permit even with due restrictions to established sectors. The regulation has been launched also following a series of tense relationships emerging within the Jordanian host and Syrian refugee communities especially relating to the labour market (Shteivi, 2017b).

And it is within the same context that the Jordan framework can be nowadays defined as *empowerment* oriented (Shteivi, 2017a). The Jordan empowerment approach is in fact characterized by long-term response focused on economic and social empowerment so that Syrian refugee resilience and self-sustainability can be progressively supported whatever will be their final goals and life expectancies



(return to home country, prolonged stay in Jordan or relocation/migration to third country).

It is exactly in this sense that the European integration approach can fit and cross the Jordanian empowerment approach when it comes to frame the Syrian refugee response in the host countries.

Let us now consider more in details some of the key-concepts and features to take into account for considering those aspects where a comparative approach can be adopted and those ones that cannot be applied in the Jordanian context and, consequently, are not investigated in the Hashemite Kingdom fieldwork implementation.

### **Number of refugees/refugee population**

The first aspect to be considered is the difference between the host and hosted population. As previously mentioned, the proportion between the host and refugee communities is particularly relevant since almost the 10% of the currently settled in Jordan population is made up of refugees. This means that the likelihood of interacting with the refugee community is particularly high and, consequently, the relationship between both groups and related socio-economic impact are needed of investigation. This is not the case of the European countries, where the numerical presence is averagely less significant in terms of registered refugee population.

### **Language and culture host/refugee communities**

Conversely, investigations about linguistic or cultural differences are not accountable since no significant diversification exists between host and refugee communities in Jordan. Syrian refugees and Jordanian citizens are both Arabic native speakers and experience a similar cultural background.

### **Intervention and legal policy framework**

This point has been already explored in the first section. As said the Jordan refugee response approach is *empowerment*-based and cannot be completely considered *integration*-based as in the European Commission's definition. The main difference is based on the idea of empowering refugees in Jordan in order to build self-sustainable actors that can be economically resilient wherever they would be either Jordan, further host countries or even in the case of repatriation to Syria.

Conversely, the European approach is based on the idea of a progressive inclusion within the host contexts and countries. As a result, such inclusion cannot avoid also taking into consideration linguistic and cultural barriers that might deter the integration process also in terms of social and economic inclusion. The latter point is intrinsically related to the issue of granting citizenship through progressive naturalization procedures.

### **Citizenship**

The issue of the citizenship represents one of the core distinctive aspects when it comes to considering the European and Jordanian approaches in refugee response. Primarily, it should be said that there is no overall legal framework for refugees to become eligible for citizenship in Jordan (Frost & Shteivi, 2018) and this is mostly due to decades of political changes in the region that hardly impacted the Hashemite Kingdom. Namely, the progressive inclusion of refugees in Jordanian society cannot be accounted within a steeply given *citizens-building* framework, but, on the contrary, should be conceived within the idea of *empowering actors*-framework. Whilst economic and social rights are granted to the refugee community, this cannot be applied for political rights that are exclusive of Jordanian citizens in all their expressions, including political or civic representation at all levels (national, local). In addition, the issue of the citizenship is gender-based since Jordanian nationality is transferred only through marriage with a Jordanian man since women cannot transfer their passport to their non-Jordanian husband, nor to their children if the husband is non-Jordanian. Nevertheless, the new Investment Law (2018) introduced citizenship and permanent residency eligibility mechanisms for long term large-budget investors in the country. This cohort is statistically not significant and does not justify substantial interaction with the refugee community due to the only recent introduction of the new legal framework. Similar mechanism are applied in the case of permanent residency that at the time of writing exists only for investors and was introduced only in 2018 so that its inclusion in the fieldwork conceptualization cannot be justified.

As a result, the issue of citizenship and permanent residency cannot be included in the instruments.

Having defined what is meant by distinguishing between the European integration framework and the Jordanian empowerment one, the final section of this paper addresses ways of assimilating both approaches towards the same inclusive direction.

### **Access to health**

Firstly, access to health is guaranteed for refugee and host communities at the same time. This is because since the beginning of the conflict the Jordan Response has been humanitarian oriented and aimed to provide basic needs such as health and education. It is for this reason that both host and refugee communities have had free access to health services in the Hashemite Kingdom since the beginning of the Syrian conflict.

### **Housing**

The majority of refugees in Jordan live outside the camps. In details, only 19% of currently refugees in Jordan are accommodated in adequate camps, while 81% live in urban and rural areas by renting houses or in some cases owning their own properties. Since social or public housing does not exist in Jordan as a legal policy for anyone, this means that refugees are responsible for their housing in all cases

and rent expenses are on their charge by accessing the private housing market like all those in need including host community demanders. Some of them might receive some housing subsidiary from Humanitarian International Organizations and the International Community but this is not on the Jordanian Government budget. Consequently, a due distinction in the source of aids for housing has been accounted.

### **Education (primary, secondary and tertiary)**

Alongside health services, education has also been guaranteed to refugees since the beginning of the conflict. This is because averagely the age of the Syrian refugees who entered Jordan has been within the youngest cohorts. In details, in Jordan, young people (0-24) accounted for almost 65% of all the refugees in the country in 2016, while at the time the majority of Syrian refugees currently settled in Jordan consisting of almost the 50% of the population belongs to the 18-59 cohort, followed by almost 21% 5-11 aged. Attention to higher education has been paid just more recently due to the prolonged stay of Syrian refugees in the Hashemite Kingdom. Summarizing, basic education is assured so that grade 1-10 is mandatory and free. Secondary is not mandatory so that grades 11 and 12 are free but not mandatory. Higher Education is not free. As previously mentioned, barriers in accessing tertiary education persist and are worthy of being investigated.

### **Employment and training**

Refugee employment in Jordan is a key aspect of social and economic inclusion and should be also treated and considered always within the above mentioned *empowerment* approach. The legalization of the work permit for Syrian refugees was introduced only in 2016 following the Jordan Compact and is limited to restricted sectors and occupations to mitigate the possibility of crowding out Jordanians from the labour market. In parallel a series of initiatives have been and are aimed to empower through vocational training Syrian refugees that type of interventions is particularly encouraged so to provide job transferable skills that refugees can use in case of prolonged stay, repatriation or relocation to third countries.

It is due to this peculiar differentiation in the approaches and responses among the European fielded cases (Croatia, Germany and Sweden) and Jordan that the all research and related instruments has been based and formulated.

## 2. Definitions of target groups as a part of the FOCUS methodology for the field study

### ***Refugee***

The criteria of different years of being recognized as a refugee (in Jordan) or receiving asylum (in Europe) was chosen since the peak of influx of refugees from Syria to Jordan was in 2012/2013 (UNHCR, 2019), while the European Union experienced massive increases in influx of refugees in 2015. Refugees in fact started to enter Jordan since the beginning of the conflict in 2010/2011. Furthermore, in 2015 the Jordan-Syria border was closed for security reasons to be reopened in 2018.

### ***Host community***

For Jordan, the host community members are simply defined as Jordanians, as Jordan citizenship is transferred only through marriage with a Jordanian man since women cannot transfer their citizenship to their not-Jordanian husbands. Permanent residency does not exist as a consistently given legal status for foreigners. Nevertheless, the new Investment Law (2018) introduced citizenship and permanent residency eligibility mechanisms for long term high-budget investors in the country. This cohort is however statistically not significant.

## 3. Sampling strategy

### ***Survey***

The probabilistic sampling design will be used to approach host community members in the target areas in the Hashemite Kingdom, yielding a representative sample for these selected in-country communities. In Jordan refugees will be approached through Random Walk Technique (RWT) in the selected geographical areas. This choice is justified by the fact that no official register neither complete list of Syrian refugees currently hosted in Jordan exists. However, it is known how the concentration of the hosted community is larger in those Governorates listed below.

### ***Selecting target communities***

Both host community members and refugees will be surveyed in the same purposefully selected in-country areas (Governorates in Jordan) with high concentration and number of refugees. In the case of Jordan the number of areas is equal to four since they represent those Administration Units where the number of hosted refugees is consistently higher and significant for understanding mutual relationships between host and refugee communities.

Since the research questions focus on socio-economic and on socio-psychological aspects of such mutual relationship the areas where the two groups are most likely to interact are relevant for this study.

While in the other countries (Sweden, Croatia and Germany) three areas (regions, cities) which have the highest proportion and number of refugees are fielded, thus increasing the likelihood that both host community members and refugees have first-hand experience of interacting with each other, in the case of Jordan the selected areas consist in four Governorates (Amman, Irbid, Mafrq and Zarqa) all located in Northern and Central Jordan (Amman) due to their geographical proximity with the Syria border and to the fact that Amman is the capital city of the Hashemite Kingdom.

It is in these Northern Governorates that the percentage of refugees is higher compared to the other areas so to justify the choice of selecting all of them. In particular, the total distribution of Syrian refugees in those Governorates is equal to 89.2% (UNHCR, 2019) of the total hosted population so to justify the selection of four areas instead of three.

Also in the case of Jordanian Governorates the overall sample per country will reflect the diversity of overall economic status and population.

#### *Selecting host community participants*

The survey of host community members will use two probabilistic sampling techniques to select the participants. The Random Walk Technique (RWT) will be used also in the Hashemite Kingdom.

In the selected Governorates the size of the sample will be proportional to the population of that target area, and participants will be selected by probability sampling which will ensure that the sample structure reflects the areas' population characteristics based on available statistics, such as the total male and female population in the 18 to 65 age group.

## 4. Fieldwork instruments

Some of the instruments applied in Jordan differ from the European ones in some aspect.

The table below summarizes them.

### 4.1 Survey

		Target groups	
Instruments		Host Community (HC)	Refugee Community (RC)
Survey	Questionnaire	X	X
	Information Letter and Informed Consent for Survey	X	X
Focus Group	Invitation Letter	X	X
	Information Letter and Informed Consent for Focus Group	X	
	Focus Group Discussion Guide	X	X

#### 4.1.1 Questionnaire host community

The questionnaire targeting the host community differs from the ones to be used in the other countries with minor differences in some sections. The choice is justified bases on the context described in the previous sections and then operationalized in the questionnaire as follows. Particular attention is paid to different wording and rephrasing since they reflect the Jordanian context in all its features and peculiarities. All the differentiations are here listed and justified.

##### 1. Screening questions

They reflect the features and are based on the definition of host and refugee communities in Jordan previously described.

##### 2. Demographics

No differentiation.

##### 3. Family and migration background

No differentiation.

##### 4. Educational level

Items are listed based on the Jordanian education and Higher Education system

##### 5. Employment

The question

*5.1 How would you define your current labor status?* excluded the phrasing *or on statutory paternal leave* (9) since this is not foreseen within the Jordanian Law and consequently only maternity leave has been kept.

(11) *Subsidized employment (e.g. Voluntary social/ ecological year)* has been replaced with *Financial support (aids)* since the former does not exist in the Jordanian system, whilst some forms of welfare aid system is guaranteed for Jordanian citizens when in vulnerable conditions (i.e. poverty, disability).

The question

*5.3 What are your net earnings for the past month, after deductions for tax, insurance contributions?* lists values expressed in the local currency (Jordanian Dinar – JOD) and reports a total of 7 items including the income ranges as consistently distributed in Jordan.

## 6. Neighbourhood Quality

*6.2 It is easy to walk to a bus stop, train, subway station from my home* excluded *train, subway station* since are not present in Jordan in none city or area.

*6.3 There are different options of doctors in close proximity of my home or they are easily accessible through public transport* added also *or health care centres* as common in Jordan.

## 7. Welfare

*7.1 Are you or another member of your household currently receiving any of the following types of government benefits?* in the item *Benefits (such as unemployment benefits, old-age and sickness benefits)*, the words *unemployment benefits* are deleted because such aids are not foreseen in the Jordanian welfare system.

*7.2 If you look at the total income of all of the members of your household what is the monthly household income currently? Please state the net monthly income, which means after deductions for taxes and social security. Please include regular income such as pensions, housing allowance, child benefits, grants for higher education, maintenance payments, etc.* lists the same item of question 5.3.

## 8. Host perception of refugee community

*8.11 Due to the government spending for refugees there will be less government benefits for the other population* the word *benefits* has been

replaced by *services* due to the fact that Government benefits are not conceived within the Jordanian welfare system.

9. *Psychological Wellbeing*

No difference.

10. *Physical Wellbeing*

No difference.

11. *Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).*

(9) *Refugees take places at universities or jobs from Jordanians* has been slightly rephrased in *Refugees take opportunities such as places at universities or jobs from Jordanians*.

(11) *Refugees could endanger our values and our way of life* has been rephrased as *Refugees could negatively affect our values and our way of life* since the translation of the verb *endanger* in Arabic sounds stronger.

(12) *Religious and moral beliefs of refugees oppose those of Jordanians* has been rephrased as *Interpretation of religious and moral beliefs of refugees oppose those of Jordanians* since both are largely equal in both communities, both host both refugee community.

(13) *The beliefs of refugees about how society should function oppose ours* has been rephrased as *The interpretation of beliefs of refugees about how society should function oppose ours* following the same justification in (12).

(16) *The government should provide free accommodation for refugees who cannot afford it themselves* replaced the word *government* with *The international aids from NGOs, UN agencies etc.* since the refugee response is totally funded by International sources and the Government plays as implementing partner with lower direct financial participation.

(24) *Refugees should be assisted in their engagement into our society (e.g. learning the local language, learning about our culture, psychological and social support)* excluded *learning the local language* since both communities are Arabic native speakers.

12. *Please indicate whether you are prepared to do any of the following by answering on the scale from 1 (definitely not) to 5 (definitely yes).*

No difference.

13. *Please indicate:*

No difference.

14. *In the next section, please indicate the number of following people:*

No difference.



15. Please choose Yes or No to answer whether you would accept the following relationships with a refugee  
 (43) *I would become involved in an intimate relationship with a refugee turned into a marriage relationship due to cultural conceptualization in Jordan*
16. Please choose only one statement you most agree with.  
 No difference.
17. Please indicate to what extent do you believe refugees experience unequal treatment in comparison to Jordanians on a scale from 1 (never) to 5 (very often).  
 No difference.
18. *Religious and Political Orientation*  
 (59) *What is your political orientation?* has been deleted since the variables *Left, Centre, Right* cannot be operationalized and fitly reflected in Jordan.

#### 4.1.2 Questionnaire refugee community

The questionnaire targeting the refugee community differs from the other ones targeting the other European fielded countries in several sections. The choice is justified based on the context described in the previous sections and then operationalized in the questionnaire as follows. Particular attention is paid to different wording and rephrasing since they reflect the Jordanian context in all its features and peculiarities. All the differentiations are here listed and justified.

##### 1. *Screening Questions*

1.2 *Has an official decision regarding your application for asylum been made yet by respective authority of Jordan?* the word *asylum* has been replaced by *refugee status* since asylum status is not granted in the Hashemite Kingdom. The *respective authority of Jordan* is UNHCR since it has the mandate in Jordan for granting the refugee status.

For the same reason the item (5) *Yes, my entitlement to asylum has been recognised* has been deleted.

##### 2. *Demographics*

No difference.

##### 3. *Family*

No difference.

4. *Participation and completion of integration/ introductory courses*  
This section has been completely deleted since such types of courses are not foreseen in Jordan. Cultural proximity makes such type of interventions not necessarily needed at least at linguistic or cultural level.
5. *Language Proficiency*  
No difference.
6. *Educational level*  
Items are listed based on the Jordanian education and Higher Education system
7. *Recognition of qualification*  
No difference.
8. *Employment*

8.1 *What was your last profession before immigrating to Jordan?* the word *immigrating* has been substituted with *coming* since the former refers more to prolonged stay that are not theoretically neither legally conceivable in the Jordan system

8.2 *Are you entitled to work in Jordan?* has been deleted and somehow reformulated in question 8.5 since the respondent cannot answer unless of already received the work permit. It should be distinguished between potential eligibility and factual eligibility, namely already received the work permit. In addition, it should be said that the Jordanian Law admits also cases with no written contract (just verbal contract) as in the informal economy. Furthermore, the concept is to firstly pose questions about current labour status (8.3), current profession (8.4) and only after ask about work permit (8.5).

8.3 *How would you define your current labor status?* excluded the phrasing *or on statutory paternal leave* (9) since this is not foreseen within the Jordanian Law and consequently only maternity leave has been kept.

(11) *Subsidized employment (e.g. Voluntary social/ ecological year)* has been replaced with *Financial support (aids)* since the former does not exist in the Jordanian system, whilst some forms of welfare aid system is guaranteed for Jordanian citizens when in vulnerable conditions (i.e. poverty, disability).

8.5 *Do you currently have work permit?* has been introduced in order to trace the presence of legalized work.

8.6 *Do you have a fixed-term or permanent employment contract?* included also a third item *Work without contract* as the Jordanian Law admits also cases with no written contract (just verbal contract) as in the informal economy.

8.7 *What are your net earnings for the past month, after deductions for tax and insurance contributions?* lists values expressed in the local currency (Jordanian Dinar – JOD) and reports a total of 7 items including the income ranges as consistently distributed in Jordan.

8.9 *Which of the following options have you used so far to find a job?* excluded the item (1) *Employment Agency, job centre, social welfare office* since they do not exist in Jordan and introduced another item *advertisement in the location itself (i.e. stores, restaurants, cafes)* since it is very significant in the case of job matching in Jordan and particularly for the refugee community.

9. *Accommodation and household*  
No difference.

10. *Residents in the neighbourhood*

10.1 *How many of your neighbours belong to the same ethnic or cultural group as you?* excluded the word *ethnic* due to same-ethnicity or proximity between both communities

11. *Neighbourhood Quality*

a. *It is easy to walk to a bus stop, train, subway station from my home* excluded *train, subway station* since are not present in Jordan in none city or area.

b. *There are different options of doctors in close proximity of my home or they are easily accessible through public transport* added also *or health care centres* as common in Jordan.

12. *Welfare*

7.1 *Are you or another member of your household currently receiving any of the following types of government benefits?* the word *government* has been replaced by *international aids from NGOs, UN agencies etc.* since they are the donors for the refugees in Jordan. Furthermore, in the item *Benefits (such as unemployment*

benefits, old-age and sickness benefits), the words *unemployment benefits* are deleted because such aids are not foreseen in the Jordanian welfare system.

7.2 If you look at the total income of all of the members of your household what is the monthly household income currently? Please state the net monthly income, which means after deductions for taxes and social security. Please include regular income such as pensions, housing allowance, child benefits, grants for higher education, maintenance payments, etc. lists values expressed in the local currently (Jordanian Dinar – JOD) and reports a total of 7 items including the income ranges as consistently distributed in Jordan.

13. *Psychological Wellbeing*  
No differentiation.
14. *Access to Mental health services*  
No differentiation.
15. *Physical Wellbeing*  
No differentiation.
16. *Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).*  
 (8) *I fear that Jordanians may attack us* has been replaced with *I fear that Jordanians might use violence against us* to reduce the axiological value of the verb *attack* that sounds too strong in Arabic.  
 (11) *Jordanians could endanger our values and our way of life* has been turned into *Jordanians could negatively affect our values and our way of life* to mitigate the meaning of *endanger* that might result too strong in the Arabic translation.  
 (12) *Religious and moral beliefs of Jordanians oppose those of refugees* has been replaced with *Interpretation of religious and moral beliefs of Jordanians oppose those of refugees* since both are very similar in both communities, both host both refugee community.  
 (13) *The beliefs of Jordanians about how society should function oppose ours* has been turned into *The interpretation of beliefs of Jordanians about how society should function oppose ours* following the same justification in (12).
17. *Please indicate whether you think refugees have the following entitlements in Jordan by choosing “Yes”, “No” or “I don’t know”*  
 (16) *Refugees who cannot afford it themselves have the right to be provided free accommodation by the government* has been changed into *Refugees who cannot afford it themselves have the right to be provided free accommodation by the international aids from NGOs, UN agencies*

*etc. since the refugee response is totally funded by International sources and the Government plays as implementing partner with lower direct financial participation.*

*(24) Refugees have the right to be assisted in their engagement into Jordanian society (e.g. learning the Jordanian language, learning about Jordanian culture, psychological and social support) excluded learning the Jordanian language since both communities are Arabic native speakers.*

18. *Please indicate whether you feel Jordanians are prepared to do any of the following by answering on the scale from 1 (definitely not) to 5 (definitely yes).*  
No difference.
19. *Please indicate:*  
No difference.
20. *In the next section, please indicate the number of following people:*  
No difference.
21. *Please choose Yes or No to answer whether you would accept the following relationships with a Jordanian*  
*(43) I would become involved in an intimate relationship with a Jordanian turned into a marriage relationship due to cultural conceptualization in Jordan.*
22. *Please choose only one statement you most agree with:*  
No difference.
23. *Please indicate to what extent you experience unequal treatment in comparison to Jordanians on a scale from 1 (never) to 5 (very often)*  
No difference.
24. *Religious and political orientation*  
*(60) What is your political orientation?* has been deleted since the variables Left, Centre, Right cannot be operationalized and fitly reflected in Jordan

### 4.1.3 Letter of information and informed consent for Survey (host communities/refugees)

The *Letter of information and informed consent for host communities in EU countries* differs from the *Letter of information and informed consent for host communities in Jordan* in the section no. 10

10. *Who should I get in contact with for any questions or concerns?* In case of concern and/or further clarification just the lead researcher contacts are kept (one contact only) instead of three potential contacts. This is due to the principle of simplification procedure for the target groups.

#### c. *Focus Group Guide*

The word *integration* has been replaced by *empowerment* where reported for the reason explained in the Section 1.

#### 5.5 *Introductory questions*

##### *Group b*

the question *How integrated do you feel in (city name) and (country name)?* has been replaced by *How included do you feel in (city name) and (country name)?* for the same reasons explained above.

## 4.2 Focus Group

### 4.2.1 Invitation Letter for Focus Groups

The sentence *The focus group will be a discussion between different members of a small group (around 6 members) on the topic of the overall integration situation of refugees from Syria* replaced the word *integration* with *situation*.

The sentence *More specifically, we are interested in gaining a better understanding of how you perceive the process of integration in your country* replaced the word *integration* with *empowerment*.

The sentence *The discussion will cover an array of issues ranging from labor market integration to the extent and nature of interaction between host community members and refugees* deleted the word *integration*.

The sentence *We would hence like to invite you to discuss possible solutions, challenges and over- all sentiments related to the integration process* the word *integration* has been replaced by *empowerment*.

The sentence *we expect that the general outcomes will find their way into recommendations on relevant migration and integration policies* turned the word *integration* into *refugees*.

#### **4.2.2 Information Letter and Informed Consent for Focus Group**

1. *What is the purpose of focus groups?* the sentence *The discussion will cover an array of issues ranging from labour market integration to the extent and nature of interaction between host community members and refugees* deleted the word *integration*.

2. *Why have I been approached?* the sentence *we are interested in exploring your views on issues related to integration in Jordan* replaced the word *integration* with *empowerment refugees*.

6. *What are the benefits from my participation?* the sentence *we hope that the general outcomes will find their way into recommendations on relevant migration and integration policies* deleted the word *integration* and replaced by *refugees*.

10. *Will I receive anything for participating in the study?* reflects the local currency value converted in Jordanian Dinar (JOD).

11. *Who should I get in contact with for any questions or concerns?* In case of concern and/or further clarification just the lead researcher contacts are kept (one contact only) instead of three potential contacts. This is due to the principle of simplification procedure for the target groups.

#### **4.2.3 Focus Group Discussion Guide**

The word *integration* has been replaced by *empowerment* in all occurrences.

### **5. References**

European Commission. Common Basic Principles for Immigrant Integration Policy in the EU (2004). Retrieved from <https://ec.europa.eu/migrant-integration/librarydoc/common-basic-principles-for-immigrant-integration-policy-in-the-eu>

European Commission. (2016). Action Plan on the integration of third country nationals. Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/els/mig/Indicators-of-Immigrant-Integration-2015.pdf>.

Frost, L. C., & Shteivi, M. M. (2018). Syrian refugees and citizenship. In *The Middle East in Transition* (pp. 292–315). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781788111133.00022>

Government of Jordan. (2016). The Jordan Compact: A New Holistic Approach between the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and the International Community to deal with the Syrian Refugee Crisis. Retrieved October 24, 2018, from <https://reliefweb.int/report/jordan/jordan-compact-new-holistic-approach-between-hashemite-kingdom-jordan-and>

Jordanian Department of Statistics. (2019). Jordan Census. Retrieved July 4, 2019, from <http://dosweb.dos.gov.jo/>

Jordanian Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation. (2019). Jordan Response Platform for the Syria Crisis. Retrieved July 4, 2019, from <http://www.jrpssc.org/>

Ruisi, F. (2019). Challenges Faced By Syrian Refugees In The Higher Education Systems Of Host Countries And How To Overcome Them. Lessons Learned From Jordan. EuroMesco Policy Brief. European Institute of the Mediterranean (IEMed) with the assistance of the European Union. Retrieved from [https://www.euromesco.net/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Brief92\\_Challenges-faced-by-Syrian-refugee-students-in-host-countries.pdf](https://www.euromesco.net/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Brief92_Challenges-faced-by-Syrian-refugee-students-in-host-countries.pdf)

Ruisi, F., & Shteivi, M. (2016). Economic and Social Integration of Migrants and Refugees in Jordan and Lebanon. In *Migrants and Refugees: Impact and Future Policies. Case studies of Jordan, Turkey, Lebanon, Italy, Spain, and Greece* (Shteivi ed., Pace R., Berta Fernandez B., Boluk G., Bayaner A., Erdem S., Bolani L. with the participation of Dokos T.). EuroMesco Joint Policy Study. European Institute of the Mediterranean with assistance of the European Union.

Shteivi, M. (2017a). From humanitarian assistance to empowerment in Jordan. *LOOKING AHEAD: CHARTING NEW PATHS FOR THE MEDITERRANEAN*, ISPI - Italian Institute for Political and International Studies, 118–120. Retrieved from [https://www.ispionline.it/sites/default/files/media/img/rapporto\\_med\\_ispi\\_2017.pdf](https://www.ispionline.it/sites/default/files/media/img/rapporto_med_ispi_2017.pdf)

Shteivi, M. (2017b). *Syrian Refugees and Jordanian Citizens : Perceptions and Trends*. Center for Strategic Studies (CSS) - University of Jordan. Amman, Jordan.

Shteivi, M., Ruisi, F., Alkhatib, W., Karadsheh, D., Saadedeen, A., & Bashayreh, I. (2018). *The Educational Challenge: identifying barriers and seizing opportunities*



*in Higher Education for Syrian refugees in Jordan: Policy recommendations and future strategies* (Center for). Amman: funded by the European Union's Regional Trust Fund in response to the Syrian crisis, the "Madad Fund" under the scope of the regional programme HOPES implemented by the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) in partnership with the British Council, Campu.

Shteivi, M., Walsh, J., & Klassen, C. (2014). *Coping with the Crisis: A Review of the Response to Syrian Refugees in Jordan*. Center for Strategic Studies (CSS) - University of Jordan.

UNHCR. (2019). Situation Syria Regional Refugee Response. Retrieved April 14, 2019, from <https://data2.unhcr.org/en/situations/syria/location/36>

### REPORT ON THE PILOT STUDY

---

#### Introduction

The pilot study was conducted in four study sites (Croatia, Jordan, Germany and Sweden) and the participants provided their feedback on the instruments during a structured interview led by trained professionals following the Piloting protocol.

In this report, general findings of the pilot study are presented in form of tables containing the information on participants and instruments and through a narrative description of feedback gained during the interviews. Feedback is separated into four relatively distinct categories:

- **Feedback on host language the instruments are presented in** – translation issues, wording, etc.
- **Feedback on Arabic translation of instruments** – translation issues, wording, phrases, etc.
- **Feedback on technical issues** – Arabic/Latin numbers, the continuation of one scale on two pages, missing directions to skip a question, changed sequence of questions, etc.
- **Feedback on contents of the instruments** – issues regarding the meaning of particular parts of the instruments and survey questions

The *host language issues* are related to specific study sites, and resolving them is a responsibility of each study partner by taking into consideration the aspects of the respective language and the contents of the original instruments in English to ensure that the translation and language adaptation of the instruments suits the originals.

*Issues with the Arabic translation* will be handled by the translators and overseen by DRC and CSS to ensure the consistency with the English original instruments.

*Technical issues* are discussed and resolved in a standardized way for all sites as they are likely to be repeated cross-sites.

The *content of the instruments* is universal, so the issues related to it are discussed between the partners and the solutions should be implemented into instruments regardless of the study site.

This report aims at technical and contents issues, as they are relevant to all partners.

Host language issues will be resolved by respective partners for their versions of instruments for the host community participants, while the Arabic translations for the refugee participants will be resolved by DRC and CSS and will not be noted here.

Feedback on comprehension, acceptability, feasibility and applicability of the instruments is presented for each instrument piloted:

- Informative letter for the survey
- Informed consent form for the survey
- Survey questionnaire
- Invitation letter to the focus group discussion
- Informative letter for the focus group discussion
- Informed consent for the focus group discussion
- Focus group guide

In total, 78 host community members and 40 refugees from Syria were interviewed. Summary of the characteristics of samples is presented in the Table 1.

**Table 1.** Summary of the samples in four study sites. N = number of participants, M = average, Min = minimum, Max = maximum, HC = host community members, REF = refugees from Syria

	Croatia		Germany		Jordan		Sweden	
	HC	REF	HC	REF	HC	REF	HC	REF
N(males)	10	5	6	7	10	5	8	6
N(females)	10	5	14	3	10	5	11	3
N(total)	20	10	19 (after 1 dropped out)	10	20	10	19	9
M(age)	42 (19 – 63)	37 (18 – 51)	40 (22 – 63)	28 (19 – 34)	40 (18 – 64)	42 (18 – 65)	38 (18 – 76)	28 (18 – 36)
M (finished years of schooling)	11,6 (8 – 19)	9,2 (8 – 12)	12 (6 – 17)	13 (6 – 17)	12,3 (8 – 19)	10,3 (8 – 17)	15 (11 – 21)	12 (6 – 17)

## General characteristics of the instruments

Average time needed to read and complete the instruments, together with the average time of whole interview completion is presented in Table 2 separately for two groups of participants (host community members and refugees) in four study countries.

In difference to other instruments, Focus group guide will be used as guidance for discussion by moderators in the main study, and will not directly be presented to the participants as other instruments. Therefore, time was not recorded while the participants read it, only the comprehension and acceptability of the Guide were noted.

**Table 2.** Comparison of time needed to complete individual instruments and overall interviews for host community and refugee participants in all four study sites. Min = minutes.

		Croatia		Germany		Jordan		Sweden		
		HC	REF	HC	REF	HC	REF	HC	REF	
Complete interview		38 min (24 – 57 min)	48 min (33 – 89 min)	29 min (20 – 38 min)	37 min (30 – 47 min)	36 min (25 – 45 min)	38 min (23 – 46 min)	Around 60 min	Around 90 min	
Survey	Informative letter		3 min	3:48 min	2:37	2:50 min	4 min	5 min	2:51	04:42
	Informed consent		0:44 min	1:05 min	0:59	0:25 min	0:54	0:56	0:25	0:41
	Questionnaire	SE part	10 min	19 min	11:52	10:30 min	11:30 min	13:00 min	9:45	16:10
		SP part	18 min	16 min	13:39	12 min	16:30 min	15:30 min	8:20	14:25
		Whole	28 min	35 min	25:27	22:30 min	26 min	28 min	26:53	43:07
Focus group	Invitation letter		1:25	2:07 min	2:03	2:25 min	3 min	?	2:20	2:40
	Information letter		2:07	2:27 min	2:08	03:25 min	4 min	3:30 min	2:41	3:50
	Informed consent		0:35	1:00 min	1:08	0:25 min	1:30	1:30 min	0:28	0:49
	Guide		/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/

The average duration of interview for host community members was around 40 minutes, with a minimum of 20 and a maximum of around 60 minutes.

For refugees from Syria, the average duration of interview was around 60 minutes, with a minimum of 30 and a maximum of around 90 minutes.

### **Informative letter (survey)**

For host community participants, the average reading time of the Informative letter for the survey was around three minutes. Most of the participants found the instrument clear with 70 (89%) reporting all parts of the letter comprehensible.

A question of anonymity was raised by one participant, while the *random-approach-to-participants* was difficult to understand to another. One participant had issues with the topic of the research while two felt the letter was too long. All other host community participants reported no content or technical issues regarding the Informative letter for the survey.

For refugee participants, the average reading time of the Informative letter for the survey was around four minutes. Most of the participants found the instrument clear with 39 (97%) reporting they fully understood all parts of the letter. One participant said that the letter took a long time to read. No other issues were reported by any participant.

### **Informed consent (survey)**

For host community participants, the average reading time of the Informed consent for the survey was less than a minute. Most of the participants found the instrument clear with 74 (95%) reporting all parts of the letter comprehensible and acceptable to sign.

Two participants found the guaranteed anonymity very positive. No specific concerns were raised by the host community participants.

For refugee participants, the average reading time for the Informed consent for the survey was around a minute. Most of the participants found the instrument clear with 39 (98%) reporting they fully understood all parts of the consent form.

In Sweden, one participant was reluctant to sign the Informed consent form, fearing his/her data would be passed on to authorities and misused.

No other issues were reported.

## **Questionnaire**

For host community participants, the average completion time of the whole questionnaire was around 30 minutes.

Average time needed to complete the scales measuring socio-economic integration was around 10 minutes, while socio-psychological scales took an average of 15 minutes to complete.

In Table 3, individual questions which the host community participants reported as unclear or problematic are listed, together with proposed changes for the final version which will be used in the main study.

**Table 3.** Questions/answering options found unclear or problematic by host community participants in the pilot study, together with their comments and changes proposed for the final version of the questionnaire.

Sentence/word/paragraph	Study site(s)	Comment	Proposed change								
General: “refugees”	Sweden	Is this always referred to Syrian refugees?	<u>Interviewer manual</u> : Explain that the questions of the survey are always in regard to refugees from Syria.								
General: layout	Croatia Sweden	Difficult to see where one question starts and another ends.	Make sure to “bold” headlines. Scale should be on one page or the answering options should be repeated on continuous page.								
General: “no details”	Sweden	Should be changed to “no answer”	Change to “no answer”.								
3.3 How many people live in your <b>household</b> ? Please count yourself and every other person.	Germany	How do you count a “WG” (student shared accommodation)?	<u>Interviewer manual</u> : Explain that student shared accommodation does not count as “household” with more than 1 person if income etc. is not shared.								
3.4. Please <b>name</b> the persons and the age of those living in your household.	Croatia Sweden	The example is confusing.	<div>Change: “Please <b>list</b> the persons living in your household and their age.”</div> <table><thead><tr><th>Person</th><th>Age</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>Myself</td><td>35</td></tr><tr><td>Spouse</td><td>35</td></tr><tr><td>Son</td><td>10</td></tr></tbody></table>	Person	Age	Myself	35	Spouse	35	Son	10
Person	Age										
Myself	35										
Spouse	35										
Son	10										
4.1. What is the highest education with certificate, diploma or education degree you have?	Croatia Germany Jordan	Education categories are not clear.	Change categories in accordance with the respective study site educational system, but so that they can be coded using the ISED 2011 categories.								



			➔ SAME NEEDS TO BE DONE FOR QUESTION 8.1
5.1 How would you define your <b>current</b> labour status?	Germany	What if I have 2 jobs at the same time?	<u>Interviewer manual</u> : Answer thinking about your main job.
5.2. What is your current <b>Profession</b> ?	Croatia	Does this refer to what I can do or what I'm currently doing? Is it profession gained through education or something I do for a living?	Change to "job" or "occupation" for clarity.
6.5. The area I live in is <b>safe</b> .	Croatia	What does "safe" mean?	Add "safe from criminal activities".
Section 8: Host community perception of refugees	Germany Sweden	I do not have enough information to answer this, how do I know which ones are refugees from Syria?	<u>Interviewer manual</u> : These questions regard your personal opinion and perception.
9. Psychological wellbeing scale	Croatia Jordan	What does this have to do with refugees?	To be explained in the Interviewer manual. Move the scale to the end of the questionnaire.
10. Physical wellbeing scale	Croatia Jordan	What does this have to do with refugees?	To be explained in the Interviewer manual. Move the scale to the end of the questionnaire.
11.16 <b>Families</b> of refugees should be allowed to join them in Germany.	Germany	It is not clear what is meant by family members. Does it also include the relatives? This will influence the answer.	<u>Interviewer manual</u> : Family is defined as parents and their children.
13. How often do you meet <b>refugees</b> in following places?	Croatia Germany Sweden	How would you know it's a refugee?  I don't go to school. How should I	<u>Interviewer manual</u> : Explain that the question is about those people for which the participant knows that they are refugees.

13.35. At school	Germany	respond to this?	Add “university/educational facility”.  Add option: “Does not apply to me.”
14.42 How <b>many people</b> do you consider to be your acquaintances with whom you would have a casual conversation or a cup of coffee at a café?	Croatia Germany	Difficult to name a concrete number.	Add “in the city you live in” in the question. <u>Interviewer manual:</u> Encourage the participants to pick the first number that comes to their mind.

Apart from the questions presented above, the majority of participants in Sweden, Germany and Croatia felt that the questionnaire was comprehensible. Fifty seven (98%) of these countries’ participants stated that the questions were not difficult to follow and answer. The questionnaire was overall considered acceptable and a number of participants felt that these kind of studies are useful. Data on comprehension was not received for Jordan.

The physical and mental wellbeing scales were found problematic by some participants questioning their relevance for the opinions about refugees as announced in the Information letter. Some participants had difficulty thinking only about Syrian refugees and wondered how to differentiate refugees in general.

For refugee participants, the average completion time of the whole questionnaire was around 40 minutes.

Average time needed to complete the socio-economic scales was around 15 minutes, while socio-psychological part of the questionnaire also took an average of 15 minutes to complete.

In Table 4, individual questions refugee participants reported as unclear or problematic are listed, together with proposed changes for the final version which will be used in the main study.

**Table 4.** Questions/answering options found unclear or problematic by refugee participants in the pilot study, together with their comments and changes proposed for the final version of the questionnaire.

Sentence/word/paragraph	Study site(s)	Comment	Proposed change
General: Numbering questions in the questionnaire	Sweden	Latin numbers - read the opposite way. When directed to a new question, it is unclear whether they should read from left to right or the opposite.	Write all numbers in Arabic with Latin numbers in brackets.
General: “no details”	Sweden	As participants will fill in the survey themselves, all questions including the option “no details” could be exchanged for “no comment”.	Change to: “no answer”.
General: layout	Sweden	Question 16 in the English survey is question 24 in the Arabic survey, making the numbers in the English and Arabic versions mismatch. Thus, in the Arabic version the question has also been moved from the SE part of survey to the SP part.	Review layout issues regarding the jumping over questions.
3.1. 3.1. What is your current marital status? Answer: <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Married/ <b>in a registered relationship</b> / in a relationship	Croatia	Would be better to state “engaged to be married”.	Change “in a registered relationship” to “engaged to be married or in a registered relationship”.
3.3 How many people live in your household? Please count yourself and every other person.	Germany	It was not clear whether those living in a shared accommodation (not designated for refugees) with other students/ colleagues, have to mention their relationship with the others living in the apartment.	<u>Interviewer manual</u> : Explain that this relates to those who live in homes / flats / collective accommodation for refugees

3.4. Please <b>name</b> the persons and the age of those living in your household.	Croatia Sweden Germany	The questions implies providing names of persons.	Change to “Please <b>list</b> the persons living in your household and their age.” <table><tr><th>Person</th><th>Age</th></tr><tr><td>Myself</td><td>35</td></tr><tr><td>Spouse</td><td>35</td></tr><tr><td>Son</td><td>10</td></tr></table>	Person	Age	Myself	35	Spouse	35	Son	10
Person	Age										
Myself	35										
Spouse	35										
Son	10										
3.5. Are you planning to bring your family to /Country/?	Sweden Germany	Uncertain in definition of family. Interpreted by participants as spouse and children	<b>Interviewer manual:</b> Define family as parents and children.								
4.4 Which language ability level certification did you get in the /Country/ integration course?	Croatia Sweden	The refugees often get confused when talking about their level of language comprehension. Another type of answers is proposed.	Provide options equivalent to Levels A1, A2; B1, B2; C1 and short (official) description of each level in the <u>Interviewer manual</u>								
4.5 Have you attended any other course offered as part of the official introductory integration program?	Germany Sweden	Several participants did not understand the question.	Add country specific examples to the question. Translate into Arabic.								
4.7 Have you participated in any projects or groups outside of the official introductory programme?	Germany	Not clear what is meant by the question.	Add “integration” → <i>...the official introductory integration programme.</i>								
4.8 What areas were covered by this activity?	Germany	It is not mentioned, whether a multiple choice is here available	Add that more than one answer to the question is possible.								
5. <i>Language proficiency</i> Answering options range from 1 (very well) to 5 (very poor)	Croatia	Would be better to change the sequence of answering options since this seems to be more appropriate for the Syrian culture 1 – Very poor 5 – Very well	Change answering options from 1 (very poor) to 5 (very well) are more culturally appropriate for the Syrians 1 – Very poor 2 – Poor								

			3 – Average 4 – Good 5 – Very well
6.2 What is the highest qualification you have now? <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Upper secondary / post-secondary but non-tertiary education</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Bachelor's</b> or equivalent level	Germany Sweden	In general the categories provided to this question are not comprehensible The participant found it problematic to have Upper secondary / post-secondary but non-tertiary education in one category  Does this concern studies attained in Syria or in Sweden?	Change to include educational categories from Syria and then later code them into ISCED 2011 categories. <u>Interviewer and Training manual</u> : Explain that this refers to the highest qualification irrespective if achieved in Syria or in the host country
7.3 When did you apply for recognition of your qualification? 7.5 When did you receive notification of either recognition or rejection of your qualification?	Germany	The participant knew how long the process of recognition took but couldn't say in which month she/ he applied and in which month she/he received the answer.	Change to: How long did it take to receive an answer? (months) Delete question 7.5
8.3 Define your current labour status	Sweden Germany	“If studies are paid by the Employment Agency - choose “student”? Several participants stated they would not fill in the “irregular work” box if they worked in these types of jobs, for fear of getting caught. “What is the difference between pupil and student? Further training and unpaid work experience?”	Adapt the explanation of “irregular work” to reflect the on/off work, instead of “legally irregular” work Every partner has to translate as needed. <u>Interviewer manual</u> : Explain that if the person has 2 positions/ or jobs, the main position (where most time is spent) should be stated.
9.2. Do you/your family rent or own this	Croatia	What if the government is paying the rent	<u>Interviewer manual</u> : The answer should

flat/house?		for the flat? Which answer to choose?	then be “rent”.
9.4 For how long is your contract? - I do not have an official contract - I have limited one until ----/----	Germany Sweden	Permanent contract is not available as an answer category.	Add answering option of permanent contract.
10.1 How many of your neighbours belong to the same ethnic or cultural group as you?	Sweden Germany	Participant did not understand what is meant by neighbours. Does it mean those living in the same building or rather those in the neighbourhood. This confusion is due to the title of the section, which is the residents of neighbourhood.	<u>Interviewer manual</u> : Explain that neighbours are the residents who live in the neighbourhood.
11. Neighbourhood quality	Croatia	The question and the answering options do not match. The questions states “How much is it to bus, train etc.” and the answering options are “fully agree, agree...” The translation needs to be altered.	Review the Arabic translation for the questions to match the answering options in the original questionnaire in English.
14. Access to Mental health services	Croatia	In Arabic, the translation states “cure” which is not the meaning in the English version.	Change the question to “Have you received any kind of psychological/mental help?” Review the meaning of the answering options in Arabic. Change the translation of “cure” to “mental help”.
15.3. For at least the past 6 months, to what extent have you been limited because of a health problem in <b>activities people usually do</b> ?	Croatia	What kind of activities are these?	Insert “everyday” before “activities” and add example “(shopping for groceries, doing housework, going to work or school, etc.)”
16.1. What is your religion?	Croatia	I would not answer this. It is offensive.	This is important information, should be

			retained as it is.
17.16 Refugees have the right to bring their families to join them to Germany.	Germany	The regulations for family reunion in Germany differ between refugees with subsidiary protection and those with refugee protection, The question can hence not be answered.	For Germany either separate two categories in answering or clarify that this refers only to those people with refugee status, but this can be problematic as the majority have subsidiary protection. For Germany, add the “(in contrast to subsidiary protection)”
SP Section 19, Q:37-41 What are these encounters like? Please choose the answer which best describes your personal experience. - Generally positive - Positive - Neither positive nor negative - Negative - Generally negative	Germany	Generally positive and positive are confusing. Generally positive is not usually used as an indication of higher satisfaction than positive. The same applies to negative and generally negative	Instead of <i>generally positive</i> , change to <i>very positive / very negative</i>
21. How <b>many people</b> do you consider to be your acquaintances with whom you would have a casual conversation or a cup of coffee at a café?	Sweden	Unclear that one has to write the amount on the line.	Add “persons” after the line.

Apart from the questions presented above, the majority of participants in Sweden, Germany and Croatia felt that the questionnaire was comprehensible. Twenty nine (96%) participants in these countries stated that the questions were not difficult to follow and answers. The questionnaire was overall considered acceptable and a number of participants felt that these kind of studies are useful. No data on comprehension was received from Jordan study site.

One participant had a problem with **SP Section 16**. “Why do we keep speaking of Germans instead of host community?” In the information letter we speak of host community and then all of a sudden, we only speak of Germans”.

Based on the feedback refugee participants in Sweden gave about their concern with their data being forwarded to the authorities and misused, it is proposed to add another question to the questionnaire. The survey is lacking questions regarding the meeting with authorities, whether one has experienced racism from a state employee or got the help that one expected from the authorities. This question is important in the integration. Therefore, it is proposed to add “Did you receive the guidance you had expected from the authorities to ease integration?”.



## **Invitation letter (focus group)**

For host community participants, the average reading time of the Invitation letter to the focus group discussion was two minutes. All participants found the instrument clear with 78 (100%) reporting all parts of the letter comprehensible.

A number of participants stated that they would be happy to participate if invited to this kind of discussion.

Two participants were confused about the meaning of term “focus group”. Some participants felt that they were not informed enough to participate and/or that the two hours of discussion would be too exhausting.

For refugee participants, the average reading time for the Invitation letter to the focus group discussion was two and a half minutes. All participants in Sweden, Germany and Croatia found the instrument clear with 30 reporting they fully understood all parts of the letter. No data on refugee comprehension of the Invitation letter for the focus group was received from Jordan.

A question of translation of the term “focus group” was raised by two participants. It is recommended to use instead “group discussion” or “group meeting”.

## **Changes made based on the results of the pilot study**

Replace the term “focus group” with “group discussion” or “group meeting”.

## **Information letter (focus group)**

For host community participants, the average reading time of the Information letter for the focus group discussion was two minutes. Most of the participants found the instrument clear with 56 (96%) participants from Sweden, Germany and Croatia reporting all parts of the letter comprehensible. In Jordan, majority of participants felt the letter was clear.

Two participants explicitly stated that a two-hour discussion is too long while two participants felt the Information letter for the focus group discussion was too detailed and contained too much information. One reported the language could be *easier*. One felt that the anonymity of participants is being well-preserved.

Several participants noted that the question on “Was I randomly selected” is not answered in the text and that it should be clarified.

For refugee participants, the average reading time for the Information letter for the focus group discussion was three minutes. All participants from Sweden, Germany and Croatia found the instrument clear with 30 reporting they fully understood all parts of the letter. Some participants in Jordan felt the letter was too detailed.

Several participants reported an issue with the translation of the term “focus group”.

In Sweden, three participants were concerned about their responses being connected to their migration cases.

## **Changes made based on the results of the pilot study**

Replace the term “focus group” with “group discussion”

## **Informed consent (focus group)**

For host community participants, the average reading time of the Informed consent form for the focus group discussion was less than a minute. All participants found the instrument clear with 78 (100%) reporting all parts of the form comprehensible.

The majority was comfortable with signing it.

No other technical or contents issues were raised.

For refugee participants, the average reading time for the Informed consent for the survey was around a minute. All participants found the instrument clear with 40 (100%) reporting they fully understood all parts of the consent form.

In Sweden, two participants were not comfortable with signing the Informed consent, concerned with their data being sent to the caseworkers at the Migration Agency.

## **Focus group discussion guide (focus group)**

Most of the host community participants found the Focus groups guide clear with 76 (97%) reporting all parts being comprehensible.

One participant felt the introductory questions are too complex to be asked first. Two were concerned about differentiating refugees from Syria from other refugees.

Most of the refugee participants found the Guide clear with 39 (98%) reporting they fully understood all parts of the instrument.

Several questions should be revised, separated and re-arranged to help enable the flow of discussion.

### **Changes made based on the results of the pilot study**

Proposed changes:

#### **Section 5.6 Question 3**

1. “To you, what do you think integration would look like if it was working perfectly and what do you think are the biggest barriers to this?”

It would be better to divide the questions into 2 sub-questions:

1. How would integration look like if it was working perfectly?
2. What are the biggest barriers to this?”

#### **Question 1.b group b**

“What are the main sentiments currently present about each other?”

*I do not feel personally addressed.*

The question is formulated in a way that does not address the participant’s personal emotions and thoughts

#### **Question 3 should come before question 2**

1. “For you personally and for the city/country as whole, what impact do you think the integration of refugees from Syria will have?”
2. “To you, what do you think integration would look like if it was working perfectly and what do you think are the biggest barriers to this?”

It is difficult to ask about the effects of integration if there is no discussion on what integration means. This has to be discussed first. Beside the question on how does a successful integration look like, there should be a question on what does integration means.

### **Conclusions**

The purpose of the pilot study was to detect any difficulties the participants might have while completing the instruments in the main study, as well as to ensure the instruments are applicable at all study sites.

The Information letter and narrative format of the Informed consent for the survey were overall comprehensible and the participants were comfortable signing the consent form.

Several types of issues were reported regarding the questionnaire: host language translations, Arabic translation, technical issues and content issues. Technical and content issues are reported here together with proposed solutions that should be implemented in all study sites equally. The questionnaire was overall comprehensible, the questions easy to follow and answer, and a number of participants considered such studies as useful.

Invitation and Information letter, as well as the Informed consent for the focus group were found comprehensible by most participants, as well as the Focus group guide.

Several important questions were raised by the participants:

- How to differentiate between Syrian and other refugees and how to think only about Syrian refugees while completing the questionnaire?
- What is the purpose of mental and physical wellbeing scales in the questionnaire for the host community members?
- Concern of Syrian refugee participants in Sweden about their data being sent to the authorities and misused.

These issues will be resolved before continuing to the main study as a part of WP4.