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Executive Summary

This assessment report on community engagement and accountability (CEA) provides an analysis of refugees and host community information needs, access to and preference in using communication channels, community structure, social cohesion and behaviour, preferred mechanism to raise concerns or share feedback and staff and volunteers’ capacities of the community centres under the TRCS Community Based Migration Programme. The Community Centres provide information on registration and services, protection-related prevention activities, psychosocial support, vocational training and livelihood activities, social and harmonisation activities, language courses and health and hygiene activities.

The assessment was conducted in six locations of five cities: Hatay, Izmir, Istanbul (Bagcilar and Sultanbeyli), Ankara and Adana. It comprised of individual surveys and focus group discussions (FGDs) with targeted communities and FGDs with Community Centre staff and volunteers. The assessment used KOBO toolbox, which is a free open-source tool for mobile data collection. The assessment targeted refugees and host communities, beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries of the Community Centre.

The individual survey targeted 70 individuals per location, totalling 420 individuals in six locations. There were 258 female (61%) and 162 male (39%) respondents in the survey in total. 290 (70% of the) survey respondents were refugees from Syria, and 8 (1% of the) respondents belonged to other nationalities: Iraq, Morocco, Algeria and Moldova. Remaining 122 individuals were Turkish community members.

Three FGDs with refugees (women, men and children) were conducted separately in each location targeting 10 persons in each group discussion and totalling 18 FGDs. Six FGDs were conducted with local men, women and children in Adana and Sultanbeyli, Istanbul. The assessment was conducted between 16 April to 17 May 2018, for 4-5 days in each location.

The findings of the assessment highlight the importance of engaging with local communities in addition to the refugees and ensuring the participation of both throughout the programme cycle. Communities’ level of awareness and interaction with the TRCS Community Centre emphasises that there is room for improvement for TRCS to better communicate with communities about the services through various channels. The information needs of both local community and refugees include behavioural and protection issues, legal rights, employment and education and TRCS programmes. Around half of the respondents prefer to receive information through meeting individually or collectively at Community Centre. Other channels accessible and preferred include mobile phones, meetings at home and social media.

Around 23% of the respondents claim there are rumours within local and refugee community, which relate to cash programmes and government support to refugees, deportation, employment, travel permits and education. Rumours against refugees are often generalized by the locals creating negative perception. Although such negative perceptions among local communities are changing gradually as they interact with refugees at the centre, both local and refugee communities stress the need for developing a systematic rumour tracking mechanism to provide communities with true information.

There is not a formal community structure among the refugees in most of the areas to take collective decisions. This is largely due to their scattered living patterns. Refugees meet or connect with each other through social media and mobile phones. Improving the effectiveness of the advisory committee and formation of a youth club at each centre will enable communities to interact better, build relationships and be well connected. Such community structures will support community mobilisation and ensure harmony within the society. Assessment findings show local communities and refugees rate relationships with each other differently, in different cities. Overall there is need to improve the relationship among these community members through social cohesion work, given the cultural difference and language barriers.

With prevalence of child marriage and child labour, delivering key messages through appropriate channels and conducting community dialogues are key to promoting positive behaviour. The assessment shows the engagement of other stakeholders such as Imam and Muhtar are vital in the programme to ensure information sharing but also to create a platform for communities to voice their concerns to the local authority. Peer bullying at school creates tension among refugee and local community children. Peer bullying is one reason why children do not want to go to school. Similar to the advisory committee, a youth club at each centre, comprising children from both local and refugee community, can provide a forum to share information about the TRCS services and raise issues affecting them. The youth club can collaborate with schools to organize anti-discrimination seminars, social activities and anti-bullying campaigns for children, parents and teachers.

Finally, communities’ preferred mechanism to share complaints or feedback with TRCS include meeting its staff individually at the centre or at home, meeting collectively with others at the centre, telephone and complaints box. With no formal feedback mechanism currently, there is lack of record of community’s feedback and how they are responded by TRCS, to guide programme decisions. Hence an effective complaints response mechanism needs to be set up in all the centres.

During the FGD with refugee children in Ankara, the participation of girls was limited to 3. To ensure that services provided at the centres are relevant to the needs of the community, an advisory committee is formed, comprising members of the local and displaced population, to share opinion about the centre with Turkish Red Crescent and suggest ways to improve their work.

1 To ensure that services provided at the centres are relevant to the needs of the community, an advisory committee is formed, comprising members of the local and displaced population, to share opinion about the centre with Turkish Red Crescent and suggest ways to improve their work.

2 Imam: It is most commonly used as the title of a worship leader of a mosque. In this context, Imams may lead Islamic worship services, serve as community leaders, and provide religious guidance.

3 Muhtar: is a Turkish term which means head of local government (local government chief).
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Introduction

Background

The conflict in Syria has resulted in a humanitarian crisis causing loss of life, infrastructure, internal and external displacement. Some 3.9 million registered refugees in Turkey (source Republic of Turkey, Ministry of Interior) have needs related to basic services such as shelter, food, water, sanitation and livelihood. As of 9 August 2018, over 90 per cent of the Syrian displaced population or 3.5 million (source Republic of Turkey Ministry of Interior Directorate General of Migration Management, DGMM) Syrians currently live in urban areas while some 204,288 (source DGMM) people are staying in 20 camps/temporary accommodation. Syrian nationals, as well as stateless persons and refugees, who arrived in Turkey due to events in Syria after 28 April 2011 are provided with temporary protection (TP) by the Government of Turkey. Poverty remains prevalent among the Syrian population due to the lack of access to regular income, and the high cost of living in urban settings.

Since the beginning of the Syrian conflict, Turkish Red Crescent Society (TRCS) has been providing response to the needs of the Syrian refugees, and immediately reacted to the increasing influx of Syrians by activating its staff and volunteers and organizing dedicated structures to receive and protect people in need all around Turkey. TRCS is currently focusing on cash support, community services and outreach programmes that also aim to assist members of host communities.

Since 2015, TRCS has established 15 Community Centres (CC) in 14 cities (two in Istanbul), and, by 2019, a total of 16 Community Centers in 15 cities are planned to be set up across Turkey. The Community Centres provide information on registration and services, protection-related prevention activities, psychosocial support, vocational training and livelihood activities, social and harmonisation activities, language courses and health and hygiene activities. 11 of these Community Centres are supported by IFRC and funded by EU MADAD Trust Fund. 3 Community Centres are supported by German Red Cross and 1 by Norwegian Red Cross. DG ECHO has been supporting all TRCS Community Centres for protection activities through ‘Responding to Protection Needs of Refugees in Turkey’ project. TRCS works in partnership with World Food Programme (WFP) in the Emergency Social Safety Network (ESSN) programme, a social assistance programme, and with UNICEF in the Conditional Cash Transfer for Education (CCTE) programme, aiming to enable poor refugee families to send their children to school regularly. The protection cases identified through these programmes are referred to the CC case management teams, hence maintaining synergy with the services of CC.

Under the CCTE programme, Turkish Red Crescent and UNICEF created collective access teams to identify families which meet the criteria to benefit from the CCTE programme. These outreach teams ensured that child protection issues, including domestic violence, child labour and child marriage, are identified and referred to relevant services. Turkish Red Crescent has also been providing humanitarian assistance in the cross border through the ‘Syrian Crisis Humanitarian Relief Operation’, which was launched in 2011. 14 border relief points in Hatay, Kilis, Gaziantep, Şanlıurfa and Mardin are currently existing, of which five are actively being used.
Rationale

In addition to physical assistance, refugees need timely, accurate and life-saving information to reduce the factors contributing to their vulnerability and safety. It is also equally important to maintain two-way communication, to ensure that the needs, complaints and suggestions of people are timely and regularly listened to and acted on. An effective community-based approach is also critical in building social cohesion among host communities and refugees.

In reference to the International Appeal Plan of Action under Output 6.1 ‘Community Engagement and Accountability is integrated in all the programmes as a cross cutting approach’, a CEA assessment is planned to strategize and integrate the CEA approach into the ongoing operation. The MADAD baseline report in 2017 recommends community development activities including information-sharing on the TRCS CC services, raising awareness through promoting key messages on protection and health, and improving community dialogue and conducting cultural activities to promote social cohesion between host communities and refugees. However, there is need for a comprehensive understanding of the community engagement approach, which includes community information needs, access to and preference in using communication channels, community structures and preferred mechanisms to raise concerns or share feedback.

Goal and Objectives

The goal of the CEA assessment is to understand the broader situation of the refugee and host communities and ensure CEA approaches and activities at the community centres are feasible and culturally appropriate, as part of the Community Based Migration Programme.

The key objectives of the assessment are to understand:

- Community’s information needs
- Access to and preference in using communication channels
- Community structure, social cohesion and behaviour
- Preferred mechanism to raise concerns or share feedback
- TRCS staff and volunteer capacities

The findings of the assessment will guide adjustments to ongoing interventions, determine baseline values that can be measured at the end of the operation and support the setup of an effective feedback mechanism. The setup of the feedback mechanism will use Ground Truth Solution (GTS) methodology “How to Establish and Manage a Systematic Community Feedback Mechanism” as a reference. This is a step-by-step guide aimed at supporting staff who establish and manage a systematic feedback mechanism with refugee communities using the Red Cross and Red Crescent community feedback approach based on Ground Truth Solutions’ Constituent Voice methodology. The guidance provided here complements the Red Cross Red Crescent Guide to Community Engagement and Accountability and the Monitoring and Evaluation Guide that describes how to use community feedback to improve Red Cross and Red Crescent work.

Method

The assessment was conducted in six locations of five cities: Hatay, Izmir, Istanbul (Bagcilar and Sultanbeyli), Ankara and Adana and comprised of individual surveys and focus group discussions (FGDs) with targeted communities. The methodology and questionnaire of the assessment were finalised through consultation with TRCS CEA and PMER departments as well as IFRC CEA and PMER delegates from the Regional Office for Europe in Budapest.

The assessment used the KOBO toolbox, which is a free open-source tool for mobile data collection. The KOBO toolbox was tested by the TRCS staff in Ankara prior to the orientation of the assessment team. Before conducting the assessment in the field, an orientation meeting on the questionnaire and use of the KOBO tool was organized for headquarters staff in Ankara and later for the field assessment teams in each of the six locations. The assessment was conducted between 16 April to 17 May 2018, for 4-5 days in each location. The duration of the CEA assessment took longer than planned due to shortage of available trained staff, and hence was completed over four weeks.

Target Groups

The assessment targeted refugees and host communities, beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries of Community Centre services.

Individual Survey and Focussed Group Discussion (FGD): Sample size

The individual survey targeted 70 individuals per location, totalling 420 individuals in six locations. Three FGDs with refugees (women, men and children) were conducted separately in each location targeting 10 persons in each group discussion and totalling eighteen FGDs. Six FGDs were conducted with local men, women and
children in Adana and Sultanbeyli, Istanbul. To respect the ‘do no harm’ approach, while selecting the participants for FGDs, considerations were made to include elderly, disable, and single heads of households.

Out of 70 individuals in each location, 50 were refugees (30 beneficiaries and 20 non-beneficiaries) while 20 were local community members (5 beneficiaries and 15 non-beneficiaries). The individual survey used opportunity sampling⁴ and snowball technique⁵ sampling and aimed to cover 60:40 female to male individuals.

**FGDs with staff/volunteers**

FGDs were held with the TRCS Community Centre managers, project staff and volunteers in each of the six Community Centres.

---

4 *Opportunity Sampling* consists of taking the sample from people who are available at the time the study is carried out and fit the criteria. 35 beneficiaries from each of six Community Centres were selected through opportunity sampling technique, who received and accessed various services at the centre such as language courses, vocational courses, PSS counselling, etc.

5 *Snow ball technique* sampling is a nonprobability sampling technique where existing study subjects recruit future subjects from among their acquaintances. 35 non-beneficiaries from each of six Community Centres were selected through snowball technique sampling, where individuals surveyed at the households select other individuals near their residence.

---

**Assessment Team**

The assessment team comprised of 3 field staff and 5 staff from Ankara.
- Field staff: 1 social worker and 2 translators in each of six locations
- Ankara staff: 3 PMER staff, 1 TRCS CEA focal point, 1 IFRC CEA delegate

A team of 4 members were deployed in each location (3 field staff and 1 staff from Ankara). The assessment team members from Ankara guided, facilitated and participated in the assessments in each location along with the Community Centre social worker and translators. While deploying and selecting team members (staff from Ankara, social worker and translators) for each location, two male and two females were ensured to maintain gender balance in the team.

**Limitations**

During the refugee children’s FGD in Ankara, the participation of girls was limited due to cultural issues.

No local male beneficiary could be found in Bağcılar, Istanbul due to their limited participation in the Community Centre activities and unavailability during working days.

Challenges were encountered in organizing the FGD with local men in Sultanbeyli, Istanbul due to their limited participation in the centre and unavailability during the day. The time of the FGD was postponed in the evening as it was convenient for local men.
Demographic data and trends

Analysis of the assessment is based on 420 survey responses, and FGDs with refugees, local community and TRCS Community Centre staff and volunteers. The survey is conducted in six locations with 70 individuals per location.

There were 258 female (61%) and 162 male (39%) respondents in the survey in total. The age distribution of respondents was 8% for 14-18-year-olds, 36% for 19-30, 51% for 31-59-year olds and 5% were over the age of 60. The FGDs were conducted with refugees and host community members disaggregated by gender and age.

### Sex-nationality-age structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>14 - 18</th>
<th>19 - 30</th>
<th>31 - 59</th>
<th>60 and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Male</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sex-nationality-status structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Refugee non registered</th>
<th>Refugee registered</th>
<th>Resident in the country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Syrian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Turkish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Syrian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Turkish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Sex-nationality-age structure of respondents

290 (70% of the) survey respondents were from Syria, and 8 (1% of the) respondents belonged to other nationalities: Iraq, Morocco, Algeria and Moldova. As much as 294 (99% of the) refugee respondents stated that they were registered and 4 (1%) were not registered.

The level of education of the respondents: 10% with no formal education, 3% post-graduation, 29% primary education, and 32% have completed secondary education, while 13% have completed university and 13% have received vocational/technical training. Hence, the highest number of respondents have completed secondary education. Of the total respondents, thirteen Syrian and two Turkish respondents were persons with disability.
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Key Findings

Information Needs

- While 38% of respondents say they know about the Turkish Red Crescent Society (TRCS) Community Centre (CC) and its services and 39% say they know nothing at all, these similar percentages hint that there is room for improvement in disseminating information about TRCS and its work. 23% of the respondents have moderate knowledge in this regard. The level of awareness varies among refugees and Turkish nationals, gender and age.

- The regular interaction with and use of Community Centres by respondents is high. 53% of all respondents among those who knew about the centre, visit and use the services regularly.

- The level of interaction and use of the centre varies among refugees and host community members and with gender and age. In general, more women (nearly 80.49% respondents) use the Community Centre than men (71.42% respondents) and overwhelmingly, more refugees (86% respondents) visit the centre compared to the local communities (43% respondents).

- Although refugee children participate in language and vocational courses and youth activities, the level of participation varies in different places and by gender. Survey results show 20% boys take part in youth activities compared to 13% girls. Participation of Turkish youth in similar activities is lower, mainly due to lack of knowledge about the centre and its activities.

- 50% respondents suggest meeting at the Community Centre either individually or collectively as this is the most preferred channel for receiving information. Other channels accessible and preferred include mobile phones (33%), meetings at home (29%) and social media (37%).

- Communities need information about health services and behavioural issues such as mother child care, pre and post-natal care, nutrition, personal and menstrual hygiene and HIV. This represents 50% response in the survey. 22% respondents ask for information/messages on protection issues such as gender-based violence, child marriage, trafficking and psycho social support. Nearly 39% of the respondents wanted to know more about the services of TRCS CCs and other programmes.

- Around 23% respondents inform there are rumours both among local and migrant communities. Rumours are related to cash programmes and government’s support to refugees, deportation, employment, travel permits and education.

Communication Channels

- 88% respondents have access to and use mobile phones, while 4% respondents do not own a phone, but their family has one. 4.26% female respondents have family members with a phone compared to 2.47% male respondents.

- Overwhelmingly, 84% respondents do not know and do not use Hello Hope or Merhaba Umut application. Only around 8% of the respondents have heard about it but they too do not use the application.

- 76% of the respondents are not familiar and have not visited the TRCS social media pages. Among those who visit the social media sites of the TRCS CC,
Facebook is most popular (88% respondents).

- Radio is not popular among the respondents. Only 12% respondents listen to the radio and 7% respondents used to listen back in their countries.

**Community Structure, Social Cohesion and Behaviour**

- Among the refugee community, there is not a strong collective decision-making process. 43% of the respondents inform that decisions are not made collectively or do not know how they are made. 14% of the respondents inform they make their own decisions through consulting with family members or the head of the household.

- Around 33% respondents inform that decisions are made through community meetings or community committees. While most of these meetings are held informally in the locality either in migrant’s homes (35% respondents) and the market place (6%), few respondents (2%) mention decisions are collectively made in formal settings such as advisory committee in Community Centres or NGO offices.

- 66% refugees live scattered6 in different parts of the cities, 34% live clustered7 and 11% merged8 within local community. The living patterns of refugees vary from one city to the other. The highest number of refugees live scattered in Adana, clustered in Ankara and merged within local community in Bagcilar, Istanbul.

- Although in most cases, only few local communities take part in advisory committee meetings, for those who participate, such as in Adana, tend to speak less as it is perceived that the forum is meant for the refugees only.

- 12% respondents inform there have been several conflicts between host community members and refugees in the last 3 months, which largely relate to cultural differences (56% respondents), peer bullying at schools (21% respondents) and less or unequal pay at work place (10% respondents). The conflicts were higher in Ankara compared to other cities where cultural difference appears to be the main reason for tension.

- Language and cultural differences impact the integration of refugees in the society. Except in Hatay, residents in Adana, Ankara, Izmir, Bagcilar and Sultanbeyli of Istanbul rate relationship with refugees as mostly poor. On the contrary, refugees in all cities rate relationship with locals as good or fair. Although the reasons behind this are not clear, this is something to take note of in future assessments.

- There have also been conflicts within the refugee population (16% respondents). The main reasons behind this include personal and family issues and debt (34% respondents). Other reasons include living in crowded homes (29% respondents), competitive job markets (28% respondents) and poverty (10% respondents). Conflicts were higher in Ankara compared to other cities where competitive job markets and cultural difference happens to be the main reason for tension.

- Local community and refugees suggest that the relationship can improve through community dialogue (46% respondents), cultural activities (43% respondents), promoting non-discriminatory attitudes (18% respondents) and access to employment (6% respondents). Around 6% emphasize on joint interventions by locals and migrants at schools to stop peer bullying. Others (18% respondents) suggest opening more language courses, enhancing participation of host communities in the Community Centres and raising awareness on their legal rights.

- Girls who have dropped out of school are married off through Imams as Turkish law does not permit marriage for girls before 18. The reasons for child marriage, as informed by refugees in the FGD, are lack of income in the families, perception of security and prospects of a better life if the child was married. Others, however state, child marriage was common in certain regions of Syria and therefore it is cultural.

- Peer bullying among children at school result into conflicts because of cultural differences and language barriers. Peer bullying is one reason why children do not want to go to school. Syrian children experience bullying by local children, especially when local parents perceive refugees negatively.

- Due to poor economic conditions, refugee children drop out of school and work in the agricultural sector or factories.

**Participation and Feedback**

- 36% of the respondents inform that TRCS staff have asked for their feedback following all vocational training and language courses, group discussions and surveys in and advisory committee meetings. However, around 30% of the respondents say they were not asked their opinion or involved in any discussion related to programme design and 27% were asked sometimes.

- FGD with staff reports that there is no standard feedback mechanism. Communities share feedback with centre staff or the manager, which is often not recorded.

- 86% of the respondents are not aware and have not seen any complaints box in the centre. 4% respondents have seen the box but have not used it. Only 6% of the respondents have sometimes used the box.

- 54% of the respondents have called 168 call centre to ask questions or share feedback on ESSN card or to seek other information.

- Communities prefer to speak face-to-face privately in Community Centres to ask questions or share feedback (74% respondents) or to speak to TRCS representative at their homes (15% respondents). Others prefer telephone (15% respondents), community meetings (5% respondents) and complaints box (2% respondents).

- Communities prefer to use the similar channels to share sensitive complaints. 74% respondents prefer face-to-face privately in CCs, 14% privately at home, 8% by telephone and 3% through boxes.

6 Scattered meaning in different parts of the city and not necessarily living side by side to the local community. The choices for accommodation for refugees generally depend on the place of employment and low living costs.

7 Clustered meaning that refugee families living together or within the same location.

8 Merged meaning refugees living in close proximity with the local community.
• 48% respondents prefer not to make anonymous complaints. However, 26% of the respondents prefer to make complaints anonymously for all issues and 20% would like to make anonymous complaints only for sensitive issues.

• Communities would like to receive response from TRCS through face-to-face meetings (73% respondents), telephone (21% respondents) and community meetings (5% respondents). Others prefer through SMS, call centre, WhatsApp or outreach workers at home.

### Capacity Building

FGDs with staff suggest the need for an orientation/training for staff/volunteers on community engagement and understanding social cohesion and inclusion. Other trainings requested are for team building, first aid, and protection. Staff seek technical support for monitoring the effectiveness and quality of work and suggest organising debriefing sessions where they can express their opinions. Community Centres are interested in examples of Community Centre work from other National Societies.
Information Needs

While 38% of respondents say they know about the Turkish Red Crescent Society (TRCS) Community Centre (CC) and its services and 39% say they know nothing at all, these similar percentages hint that there is room for improvement in disseminating information about TRCS and its work. 23% of the respondents have moderate knowledge in this regard. The level of awareness varies among refugees and Turkish nationals, gender and age.

44.3% refugees have more knowledge regarding the centre compared to 21.32% local community members. The FGDs provide further information, where Turkish and refugee women report to have been more aware of the presence and services provided by the Community Centre. Knowledge about the centre is lower for Turkish men than for male refugees. This is similar for the youth group. Most of the Turkish respondents inform that initially they perceived the Community Centre to provide services only meant for refugees. It was only recently when they accompanied refugees to the centre or through attending vocational courses and from outreach workers at schools and homes that they learned the services were meant for all.

FGDs with respondent report that the perception about the work of TRCS is diverse between the local community members and refugees. Local community inform they are aware that TRCS is a humanitarian organization supporting disaster or crisis affected people. It has hospitals, blood donation programmes and works with un-accompanied children. Refugees knew about the Syrian Arab Red Crescent as they supported them during the war but did not hear about TRCS when they arrived in Turkey. It was only after they visited the centre they learned about its work. In Bağcılar and Adana, however, refugee children state that they were familiar with the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement. Some recall TRCS providing relief to refugees in the camps.

The Community Centre is popularly known for language courses, vocational training, Child Friendly Space (CFS) and psychosocial support. Overall, out of all the respondents that include refugees and host community members who knew about the centre, 67% inform that the centre provides language courses, 56% inform about vocational training, 38% about Child Friendly Spaces and 32% on psychosocial support. Others (nearly 73% respondents) inform the centre provides information on registration, health and hygiene, TRCS programmes like Conditional Cash Transfer for Education (CCTE) and other agencies. It provides services on restoring family links, supports refugees with Special Needs Fund (SNF), community clinic and conducts school activities for children and youth. Nearly 8% respondents still believe that the centre provides services meant only for refugees. Such perceptions are higher for local community members.

The regular interaction with and use of Community Centres by respondents is high. 53% of all respondents among those who knew about the centre, visit and use the services regularly. Nearly 24% have sometimes visited while 23% of the respondents have not visited or used the services at all. FGD with Turkish women reports, that they are content with the services of Community Centre and consider it a safe place for their children.

The level of interaction and use of the centre varies among refugees and host community members and with gender and age. In general, more women (nearly 80.49% respondents) use the Community Centre than men (71.42% respondents) and overwhelmingly, more refugees (86% respondents) visit the centre compared to the local communities (43% respondents).
Among those using the centre, 55% respondents attend language courses and 51% attend vocational trainings. Others (nearly 51% respondents) participate in social and cultural activities, youth and health activities and receive psychosocial support. Only around 6% respondents use services such as protection, restoring family links, Special Needs Fund (SNF) and referrals.

FGDs with refugee and local women report that they attend vocational courses, use Child Friendly Spaces (CFS) and psychosocial support (PSS) services regularly. They inform vocational courses such as sewing courses and PSS consultation have been particularly useful for them and their children. Such training courses have helped local community to find livelihood and produce income.

FGDs with respondent report that the majority of the refugee men attend language courses in the evening while others attend vocational courses. Few Turkish men take part in vocational courses although most have not visited the centre. From the survey findings, it is only the vocational courses that is mostly used by local community (37% respondents) compared to other services.

FGDs with youth report refugee children participate in language and vocational courses and youth activities, although the level of participation varies in different places and by gender. Survey results show 20% boys take part in youth activities compared to 13% girls. This resembles the lower engagement of female youth due to cultural barriers. Participation of Turkish youth in similar activities is lower, mainly due to lack of knowledge about the centre and its activities.

For refugee men, the challenge remains for them to take part in Community Centre activities during the day as most are out to work. TRCS staff report challenges of engaging youth in Community Centre activities during or after school hours. Many Turkish children prefer to participate only during summer vacation, while others suggest TRCS to organise activities at schools.
Respondents receive various information directly from the centre about its services and other issues. The majority receive information about language and vocational courses, updates on the services by TRCS, registration processes and other agencies. Nearly 35% respondents inform about receiving life-saving messages on health and hygiene, children and pregnant mothers. In Adana, for example, refugees in FGDs mention about health seminars organised by health volunteers where brochures, visual materials and videos are used. Around 14% respondents receive other information about employment, legal rights, services to handicapped persons, SNF and protection issues and advisory committee meetings. Survey results also show 86% men seek information on language courses, registration services and employment compared to 67% women. Women seek more information on updates about Community Centre activities, vocational courses, hygiene, mother child care and advisory committee meetings. While respondents receive this information upon visiting the centre, staff also calls or sends SMS to provide updates.

Out of 255 respondents who informed that they were aware about the Community Centre, nearly 51% of respondents in the survey report that they heard about the centre from friends and neighbours, 22% from family members and 21% from TRCS CC, Red Crescent volunteers and outreach workers/staff. 7% learned about it from social media such as Facebook, Instagram, LinkedIn and Twitter and other sources like radio and SMS. This indicates that, despite the TRC CC social media pages, not many are using them, mainly due to lack of knowledge and language barriers. 12% respondents mention about mixed sources such as other agencies, teachers, children, hospitals and physically passing by the centre. Although brochures are distributed in metro stations and booths across the cities, in the survey, only 3% mentioned about it as a source of information.

Refugees suggest that having outreach workers visiting homes to share information is not enough and that multiple channels should be used. In Hatay for example, children did not hear about the centre at all. While local children in other cities learned about it from schools, they felt it was important that their parents were also informed. Nearly 74% respondents believe information about the centre is well communicated. Others, around 21% do not think the centre is clearly communicated or advertised. This is greatly felt by local community (39.28% respondents). FGDs with respondents suggest that there needs to be wider dissemination of information about the centre, especially in places like Provincial Migration Management Office and in the streets. Some recommend hanging signs in the streets to show directions to the Community Centre.
50% respondents suggest meeting at Community Centre either individually or collectively as the most preferred channel for receiving information. This is also supported by FGD reports. Other channels accessible and preferred include mobile phones (33%), meetings at home (29%) and social media (37%) such as Face book, WhatsApp, YouTube, Instagram, LinkedIn and websites. 26% respondents prefer SMS, brochures to be distributed in the centres and schools, videos, notice boards, call centre, TRCS staff/volunteers and religious leaders. The findings are similar for men and women respondents.

For those who cannot read or write, in addition to meeting at the centre or speaking to TRCS over phone, WhatsApp is a preferred choice to communicate as it can share recorded voice message. Children are interested to receive information from schools and social media. They are also interested in street drama/mobile cinema and radio programmes.

Refugees suggest for physically challenged persons, sign language or brochures in braille can be quite useful. Local Imams during the FGD in Adana inform that they can play an important role to share information about the centre in the mosques.

For respondents, among the most trusted sources of information are family and friends (56% respondents), TRCS Community Centre, its staff and volunteers (42% respondents). 16% respondents suggest government and 29% mention about social media, television, videos and brochures as the trusted sources of information. Around 5% do not trust any sources of information. The findings are similar for men and women respondents.

Communities need information about health services and behavioural issues such as mother child care, pre and post-natal care, nutrition, personal and menstrual hygiene and HIV. This represents 50% response in the survey. Regarding health, refugees need information on various health services and contacts to support physically challenged persons. They suggest TRCS to produce brochures with contact details for specific health issues and hospitals. Women would like to learn about female health issues and motherhood through seminars.

22% respondents ask for information/messages on protection issues such as gender-based violence, child marriage, trafficking and psycho social support. The need for such information are higher for female (60%) than male respondents (21%). Turkish female respondents emphasized on learning about raising children and child communication.
Nearly 39% of the respondents wanted to know more about the services of TRCS CCs and other programmes like Emergency Social Safety Net (ESSN), CCTE, first aid and feedback mechanisms. This data is supported by FGD reports in all the groups. Many suggest TRCS to open separate Instagram and Facebook accounts for the centre of the respective city.

Refugees in FGD inform that they need information about translation services; having no translators at the hospitals are a challenge. Children, particularly the locals, mentioned they would like to learn more about TRCS CC youth activities, counselling programmes, computer courses at the centre and how refugees live in Turkey.

Survey results and FGD reports show communities also need information on legal rights, humanitarian aid, family planning, employment, registration services, education facilities for children, awareness on drug abuse, housing, travel permits, social rights such as marriage and divorce. Legal procedures in Turkey are different and most respondents do not have information about issues such as divorce or house renting or employment. 4% respondents wanted to know about missing family members.

Staff discuss in FGDs that information boards and animations can be used at the centre to promote information about CC services. Information kiosks at different locations of the city or organising promotional events can be effective to inform large numbers of people. Beneficiaries often cannot tell the difference among various TRCS interventions such as relief, ESSN, CCTE and CC, and these should be discussed in community meetings.

65% respondents inform that they do not encounter challenges in receiving information. However, around 34% respondents admit the inability to read, the CCs being too far away, information received not in the language spoken and being dependent on family members to receive information. Respondents mention language barriers often make it difficult to access services from hospitals or police stations.
Regarding the preference of language to communicate and receive information from TRCS both in writing and speaking, nearly 69% respondents suggest Arabic and 45-46% Turkish. Around 7-8% would like to receive information in English, Kurdish and Farsi.

**In what language do you prefer to communicate and receive information - written?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>274 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>106 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>18 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not wish to answer</td>
<td>32 (7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**In what language do you prefer to communicate and receive information - spoken?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>118 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>20 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>11 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not wish to answer</td>
<td>47 (17%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the survey and FGD reports, the various types of rumours gathered from local community and refugees are listed below:

**Table 3 Types of rumours from refugees and host community**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Rumours by refugees and host community members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Cash programmes and government’s support to refugees | - Syrian families are receiving 100TL from the government and government pays the house rent for Syrians  
- Migrants are receiving money from the state  
- The Germans are giving money to TRCS and Syrian people  
- The European community supports the TRCS for assisting the migrants  
- ESSN project will phase out soon  
- Syrians are rich  
| TRCS CC                                      | - Community Centres grant cash to the participants of the courses  
- The Community Centre is meant for refugees only  
| Deportation                                  | - Syrians will be sent back to their countries, particularly those who do not have ID card  
- After Afrin operation, Syrians will be repatriated to Afrin  
- Border gates will be opened, and Syrians can go back  
| Employment                                   | - Migrants getting jobs even though the locals are unemployed  
| Travel permits                                | - Refugees need to bribe if they wanted to take travel permit from Provincial Migration Office  
| Education                                    | - Syrian children can enrol at university for free  
- Government is granting scholarships to migrants’ children which local children cannot avail  
- 300 Syrian students will go to university without exam  

FGDs with Turkish women inform that misperceptions among local community are changing gradually as they interact with refugees at the centre. Without a formal mechanism to debunk the rumours, refugees or local people check the internet or ask TRC CC outreach staff if the rumours were true. Rumours are one of the root causes of misperceptions among local and refugee communities that result in discrimination and conflict. Both locals and refugees emphasize the need for developing a systematic rumour tracking mechanism to provide communities with true information.

Staff at the centre inform it is challenging to respond to rumours given no formal mechanism. The rumours are not recorded or responded systematically. Refugees have also suggested that TRCS can respond to rumours through social media. Government should be involved, to prevent the spread of rumours as well. Rumours against refugees are often generalized by the locals creating negative perception.
Communication Channels

88% respondents have access to and use mobile phones, while 4% respondents do not own a phone, but their family has one. 4.26% female respondents have family members with a phone compared to 2.47% male respondents. Turkcell is the most widely used service provider by the community (70% respondents). Others use Turk Telecom (15% respondents) and Vodafone (12% respondents).

TRCS in partnership with Turkcell launched the application "Hello Hope" also known as Merhaba Umut to provide instant Turkish – Arabic translation and practical information about TRCS Community Centres and the ESSN programme. Refugees can learn the words used the most in Turkish both verbal and written. Users can benefit from simultaneous verbal translation apart from learning a language. The app offers an access to critical information and practical information in daily life such as how to access health services, how to register, where the nearest service points are located, etc. Moreover, users can call Turkcell Arabic call centre if they face any problems.
Overwhelmingly, 84% respondents do not know and do not use Hello Hope or Merhaba Umut application. Only around 8% of the respondents have heard about it but they too do not use the application. The lack of knowledge on the application is higher for Turkish (90.99%) respondents than refugees (81.82%). Although staff in the Sultanbeyli Community Centre inform that brochures regarding the application was advertised initially, awareness on the application needs to be further enhanced in all the centres. Brochures on the application should be distributed in schools and public places. FGDs with locals and refugees inform the application is useful but needs to be improved with more information on health. Additionally, the application should have more words and be able to translate sentences.

76% of the respondents are not familiar and have not visited the TRCS social media pages. Only 21% respondents have regularly or sometimes visited the pages. 87.39% of Turkish respondents compared to 70.91% refugees are not aware and have not visited the TRCS social media pages. Staff at the centre inform there are free standing boards with link to social media accounts. However, it is not clear how well they are communicated to communities. Local community and refugees are interested to learn more about these social media pages.

Among those who visit the social media sites of the TRCS CC, Facebook is most popular (88% respondents). General feedback regarding TRCS Facebook pages was to improve the site with regular updates of activities, information about the centre along with contact of a dedicated call line so that everyone is informed and able to contact TRCS when needed. The pages should also be translated into Arabic. Fewer respondents visit TRCS Instagram account (35% respondents), Twitter (7% respondents) and You Tube channels (11% respondents).

Radio is not popular among the respondents. Only 12% respondents listen to the radio and 7% respondents used to listen back in their countries. Radio is more popular among young children than adults. Channels such as TRT Arabic, Joy Turk, NR1 are popular. Hence, although there might have been a culture of listening to radio in Syria, the main reason for not listening in Turkey is the language barrier. This is also why survey results show more locals (20.72% respondents) listening to the radio compared to refugees (7.27% respondents).
Other communication channels used by respondents are television (73%) and computers (22%). 14% respondents use mobile phones which is recorded in the ‘others’ category. FGD reports inform that television channels such as TRT is popular among the refugees but most of them do not understand language.

Among the refugee community, there is not a strong collective decision-making process. 43% of the respondents inform that decisions are not made collectively or do not know how they are made. 14% of the respondents inform they make their own decisions through consulting with family members or the head of the household. Around 33% respondents inform that decisions are made through community meetings or community committees. While most of these meetings are held informally in the locality either in refugee’s homes (35% respondents) and the market place (6%), few respondents (2%) mention decisions are collectively made in formal settings such advisory committee in Community Centres or NGO offices. Decisions are also made through community leaders (5% respondents), who share information or updates among refugees.
FGDs with refugee women in Hatay, and in Sultanbeyli, Istanbul report that there are community committees and leaders. In Sultanbeyli, there are separate committees for men and women. The community leader is usually selected based on the seniority of age. The committee is responsible for discussing issues affecting them. Members of the committee share their opinions and the decisions are taken together with the leader. Although in other cities, refugees do not have a leader as such, they do feel the need of having one.

Within the families, decisions are made through consulting with the elders or head of the household. In Sultanbeyli, refugee women inform, men are usually decision makers at home.

In Turkish communities, the Muhtar is the head of the local community/municipality. Although the Turkish community attempts to resolve issues on their own, they generally approach the local municipality in case of larger problems. The Muhtar is responsible for listening and resolving issues affecting them.

The relationship between the Muhtar and refugees is not equally strong in all the cities. FGDs with staff in Adana inform they plan to invite the Muhtar in their advisory committee meetings to raise awareness and build rapport.
Social Cohesion

66% refugees live scattered\(^9\) in different parts of the cities, 34% live clustered\(^10\) and 11% merged\(^11\) within local community. The living patterns of refugees vary from one city to the other. The highest number of refugees live scattered in Adana, clustered in Ankara and merged within local community in Bagcilar, Istanbul.

40% respondents inform refugees and local community interact in shops and health centres, 40% at work places and 18% informed at TRCS Community Centre. Around 9% interact at schools, universities, neighbourhood, streets, homes, mosques, community projects, social and cultural events organised by the centres. The level of interaction varies in different cities.

In Hatay, for example, the level of interaction among refugees and host community members is highest, where 15-20% respondents inform they interact with each other in TRCS Community Centre, 75-80% interact at work and 86-95% in shops and health centres. On the contrary, 25-36% of the respondents in Ankara, inform that they do not interact with people from other nationalities.

Local community communicate with refugees through mobile phones, WhatsApp group and in advisory committee meetings. Although in most cases, only few local community members take part in advisory committee meetings, for those who participate, such as in Adana, tend to speak less as it is perceived that the forum is meant for the refugees only. The advisory committee meeting is also a feedback forum, where refugees and local community share information and opinion about the services of the centre. The topic for discussion at the centre is decided jointly together with TRCS. In the meeting, the limitations of TRCS is clearly explained to prevent false expectation.

Turkish women bring their children to various social events organised by the centre and meet refugee families. Such events and positive interaction among children have reduced bullying in the community. FGD reports show relationship among refugee and local children is better compared to adults. Local children are interested to organise events for refugees and are willing to learn about their culture and ways of life.

For Turkish women, attending vocational courses with refugees has changed negative perceptions about them. Religion happens to be an effective means for social cohesion. During Ramadan, iftar (or breaking fast) are attended by both refugees and local community together. Such interaction contributes to developing mutual trust.
Largely, however, locals perceive the refugees to be violent, dirty and polluting the environment. Language and cultural differences impact the integration of refugees in the society. Many hope the war in Syria to stop so that refugees can return.

Local men inform that refugee children are currently enrolled in the same school as their children. They suggest for refugee children to be enrolled into separate schools, although the reason for this was not very clear. They admit that refugees cannot find employment due to discrimination by local community. Local people are not fully aware of how humanitarian assistance is provided to refugees through cash programmes, and this again creates misperception.

Survey results show local communities and refugees rate relationships differently in different cities. Except in Hatay, residents in Adana, Ankara, İzmir, Bağcılar and Sultanbeyli of Istanbul rate relationship with refugees as mostly poor. On the contrary, refugees in all cities rate relationship with locals as good or fair. Although the reasons behind this are not clear, this is something to take note of in future assessments.

12% respondents inform there have been several conflicts between host community members and refugees in the last 3 months, which largely relate to cultural differences (56% respondents), peer bullying at schools (21% respondents) and less or unequal pay at work place (10% respondents). The conflicts were higher in Ankara compared to other cities where cultural difference appears to be the main reason for tension.
Figure 48 Reasons for conflicts among refugees and local community in last 3 months (# and % of answers), by location

There have also been conflicts within the refugee population (16% respondents). The main reasons behind this include personal and family issues and debt (34% respondents), other reasons include living in crowded homes (29% respondents), competitive job markets (28% respondents) and poverty (10% respondents). Again, the conflicts were higher in Ankara compared to other cities where competitive job markets and cultural difference happens to be the main reason for tension. FGD reports inform beneficiary criteria and competition of receiving humanitarian aid can cause conflict among refugees of the same nationality but also different nationality. The lack of equal access to humanitarian services among refugees of different nationality creates tension.

Figure 49 Conflicts among refugees in last 3 months (# and % of answers)

What are the reasons of the conflicts you are aware of?

multiple choice question, number of answers will not sum up to the number of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pivot Field Name, Location (City)</th>
<th>Adana</th>
<th>Ankara</th>
<th>Bagdat, Istanbul</th>
<th>Izmir</th>
<th>Sularbeyli, Istanbul</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural difference</td>
<td>8 (15%)</td>
<td>10 (19%)</td>
<td>5 (9%)</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not wish to answer</td>
<td>4 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers hire refugees for less pay</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer bullying at school among children</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 50 Conflicts among refugees in last 3 months (# and % of answers), by location and status

What are the reasons of the conflicts you are aware of?

multiple choice question, number of answers will not sum up to the number of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Acana</th>
<th>Ankara</th>
<th>Bagdat, Istanbul</th>
<th>Izmir</th>
<th>Sularbeyli, Istanbul</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>351 (84%)</td>
<td>12 (3%)</td>
<td>16 (3%)</td>
<td>20 (5%)</td>
<td>6 (16%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Acana</th>
<th>Ankara</th>
<th>Bagdat, Istanbul</th>
<th>Izmir</th>
<th>Sularbeyli, Istanbul</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68 (16%)</td>
<td>19 (4%)</td>
<td>12 (3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>5 (10%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do not wish to answer</th>
<th>Acana</th>
<th>Ankara</th>
<th>Bagdat, Istanbul</th>
<th>Izmir</th>
<th>Sularbeyli, Istanbul</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 51 Reasons for conflicts among refugees in last 3 months (# and % of answers)

Were there any conflicts here in this location among refugees in the last 3 months?

multiple choice question, number of answers will not sum up to the number of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Do not wish to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>68 (16%)</td>
<td>351 (84%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Picture 8 FGD with local men in Adana Community Centre
Such tensions are usually resolved by police (42% respondents), local people (24% respondents) or through conversation (22% respondents). A few mention (11% respondents) community leaders and committee members support in resolving tensions.

Local community and refugees suggest that the relationship can improve through community dialogue (46% respondents), cultural activities (43% respondents), promoting non-discriminatory attitudes (18% respondents) and access to employment (8% respondents). Around 6% emphasize on joint interventions by locals and migrants at schools to stop peer bullying. Others (18% respondents) suggest opening more language courses, enhancing participation of host communities in the Community Centres and raising awareness on their legal rights. Respondents in FGDs discuss the idea of organizing a fair in the city to exhibit life and work at Community Centres. This is also where they can share experience and showcase products produced by local community and refugees. This will promote visibility of TRCS and Community Centres.

Local children are interested in engaging in youth activities and organizing events at school for children and refugee communities. Organising events such as empathy seminars at school can reduce bullying and discrimination. Children suggest TRCS organise parent-teacher meetings at schools to raise awareness on the services by TRCS Community Centres, how children can participate in youth activities and thereby reduce bullying at schools. FGD with children inform that in future assessments, there is a need felt by locals and refugees to increase awareness among Turks and in the community towards the risk factors related to child marriage.

FGDs with local women report that there were child marriage cases earlier among the Turkish community. This is less prominent now and girls are not married before the age of 18. However, they mention cases where Turkish men marry girls as young as 14. Child marriage is higher among refugee communities living in Turkey. FGD in Adana with local women report few mixed marriages of Turkish men marrying Syrian women. Although the implications of such situations were not explored in depth in this assessment, this can be considered while conducting future assessments.

FGDs with refugee report to have mixed opinion regarding child marriage. According to them, the marriage age for girls is between 17 to 22 while for boys it is between 20 to 24. Youth groups inform many girls who have dropped out of school are married off through Imams as Turkish law does not permit marriage for girls before 18. This is also supported by outreach workers at the Community Centre. The reasons for child marriage, as informed by refugees in the FGD, are lack of income in the families, perception of security and prospects of a better life if the child was married. Others, however state, child marriage was common in certain regions of Syria and therefore it is cultural. Whichever the case, some in the FGD with refugees believe there are negative consequences of child marriage.

While TRCS refers such cases to Ministry of Family and Social Policy (MoFSP) when identified, there is a need felt by locals and refugees to increase awareness among 12 Khutbah serves as the primary formal occasion for public preaching in the Islamic tradition. Such sermons occur regularly, as prescribed by the teachings of all legal schools. The Islamic tradition can be done formally at the dhuhr (noon) congregation prayer on Friday.
communities on the issue of child marriage. The situation also indicates the importance to work with Imams and engaging them in discussions on child marriage either through community meetings or Friday prayer Khutbahs.

Many families have 2-3 children and find it hard to run large families. Families which have lost or left their male head of household in Syria, marry off their children for security reason. If a girl gets pregnant under 18, it can be a problem if she goes to hospital because marriageable age is not below 18 in Turkey. Wedding by Imams ‘solves’ the problem of teenage pregnancy as government does not recognize or accept the marriage option for those below 18. In the survey, respondents inform there were few seminars on child marriage at the centres, and no agency has discussed broadly on this matter. Staff seek technical support to raise awareness among communities on this issue. They suggest organising events on Girl Child day and developing videos/animations which can be useful for seminars.

Peer Bullying

FGD with local community and refugees report that peer bullying among children at school result into conflicts. The reasons behind peer bullying are again cultural differences and language barriers. Peer bullying is one reason why children do not want to go to school. Syrian children experience bullying by local children, especially when local parents perceive refugees negatively. FGDs with children, in Adana for example, suggest arranging a separate education system to prevent peer bullying.

Psychosocial support is important for children to address such issues. At the same time, organizing meetings/activities with children, parents and teachers are crucial. Refugees inform that social activities at the centre have helped children to socialise and interact.

Child Labour

Due to poor economic conditions, refugee children drop out of school and work in the agricultural sector or factories. FGD reports suggest that to prevent child labour, TRCS should raise awareness among family members through visiting homes, provide financial support to cover school expenses and psychosocial support. The education system in Turkey is different. In addition, unfriendly attitudes of some local teachers in certain schools discourage many refugee children from attending school. FGDs with refugees in Sultanbeyli, informs, while some schools are reluctant to admit Syrian children, rumour has it that Turkish people kidnap Syrian children from schools. Additionally, the amount paid through CCTE programme (55TL) must be increased.

Parents need more financial support to cover transportation costs to go to school. Additionally, the amount paid through CCTE programme (55TL) must be increased. Children without fathers or male heads of household should be prioritised for such service.

Children prefer to study over working. They mention the school hours are too long to be able to attend youth activities at the centre. Learning the Turkish language is crucial to be able to communicate effectively with local children.
60% respondents are aware that they can contact the TRCS Community Centre by physically visiting and 50% respondents inform through mobile phones. 8% respondents mention about the social media (WhatsApp, Facebook, Instagram), SMS and attending meetings at the centre. Around 11% of the respondents are not aware of how to contact the centre at all. These results complement with how communities contact the centre. 56% respondents contact the centre by physically visiting and 48% respondents contact through mobile phones. 10% respondents contact the centre through social media (WhatsApp), SMS, interpreters, TRCS call centre, complaints box and by attending meetings at the centre. Around 13% of the respondents do not contact the centre at all.

FGD with staff reports that there is no standard feedback mechanism. Communities share feedback with centre staff or the manager, which is often not recorded. In Adana, for example, staff develop an ‘Information Note’ which is shared with centre managers, for necessary response. Many share their opinions with translators as they are the first person of contact for refugees.

86% of the respondents are not aware and have not seen any complaints box in the centre. 4% respondents have seen the box but have not used it. Only 6% of the respondents have sometimes used the box. This complements the discussion with staff and volunteers as they rarely receive any feedback through the box. The reasons behind this are lack of awareness among communities on the feedback channels and how to use the box to share complaints/feedback.

Communities prefer the box to be placed in Community Centres (66% respondents) or close to their homes (18% respondents). Although respondents in FGDs report, many have not used the box because they did not have any major concerns to report but also because they did not receive any response after sharing a feedback. Hence the face-to-face approach is preferred. In the assessment, it was found there were no complaint box in Sultanbeyli, Hatay and Izmir.
54% of the respondents have called 168 call centre to ask questions or share feedback on ESSN card or to seek other information. Around 37% respondents never called the line due to lack of knowledge and only 3% have called for Community Centre related issues. Staff at the centre reports communities are informed that the 168 call centre is available to ask questions or receive feedback on the ESSN card. While 45% respondents feel they received a response from TRCS to their questions, complaints or feedback, around 42% inform they did not receive any response.

Communities prefer to speak face-to-face privately in Community Centres to ask questions or share feedback (74% respondents) or to speak to TRCS representative at their homes (15% respondents). Around 15% respondents prefer to contact TRCS over phone, although few (3% respondents) prefer to make anonymous calls while contacting. 5% respondents would like to share feedback during community meetings at the centre. 2% respondents prefer to write and post suggestions in the complaints box while others from FGDs prefer SMS or websites and email. Several respondents in FGDs with refugees report that they would like to share feedback with the centre manager or a psychologist. Communities would like the feedback mechanism to be transparent and confidential. The staff FGD in Ankara informs that the feedback is not recorded systematically for understanding trend.
Communities prefer to use the similar channels to share sensitive complaints. 74% respondents prefer face-to-face privately in CCs, 14% privately at home, 8% by telephone, 3% in community meetings, 2% anonymous calls and 3% through boxes. Respondents emphasize, sensitive complaints should be fast tracked and responded with confidentiality. For sensitive complaints, communities prefer to speak to any staff of TRCS (61% respondents), although 20% prefer to speak to a female staff. FGD with local women report that they prefer to write or speak to a senior TRCS staff. Refugee children and staff in Adana, for example, say refugees prefer to speak to a translator to share feedback or concerns. However, some refugees in the FGD prefer to keep silent and not visit the centre regarding sexual abuse issues.

48% respondents prefer not to make anonymous complaints. However, 26% of the respondents prefer to make complaints anonymously for all issues and 20% would like to make anonymous complaints only for sensitive issues.

A common observation was that the word ‘complaint’ had a negative connotation and hence the term ‘feedback’ is preferred.

51% respondents do not have any barriers when it comes to complaining or sharing feedback. 32% respondents feel language issues, literacy rate and political influence are some of the barriers. FGD with refugees inform some are shy about expressing emotions and may consider not sharing any feedback, particularly for sensitive issues.

Communities would like to receive response from TRCS through face-to-face meetings (73% respondents), telephone (21% respondents) and community meetings (5% respondents). Others prefer through SMS, call centre, WhatsApp or outreach workers at home.

Communities prefer to receive a response from TRCS instantly (51% respondents), or within 1-2 weeks (39% respondents).

Around 66% of the respondents inform that they do not know the principles of the Red Cross Red Crescent (RCRC) Movement (66% respondents). Only 33% are aware of the RCRC Fundamental principles.
**Capacity Building**

FGDs with staff suggest the need for an orientation/training for staff/volunteers on community engagement and understanding social cohesion and inclusion. Other trainings requested are for team building, first aid, and protection. Staff seek technical support for monitoring the effectiveness and quality of work and suggest organising debriefing sessions where they can express their opinions. The work at the centre can be stressful due to lack of human resources and the nature of work itself. Staff suggest to provision counselling sessions for those who need it. Community Centre staff are interested to learn from other National Societies the experience on Community Centre work in another context.

Staff inform there is some lack of safety while performing work in the field. However, this needs to be further understood and discussed. Staff have requested more support from the TRCS communications team in Ankara. Events such as campaigns on the prevention of child marriage and child labour are important. They seek technical support to engage refugees and local communities and improve their relationships. Regarding peer bullying, staff in Bağcılar mention that they organised a parent-teacher meeting at school. However, this needs to be scaled up in all the other centres. A peer bullying module has been developed that will be rolled out soon.

Community Centres communicate with the Muhtars for information about refugees or to advocate for issues affecting them. In Bağcılar for example, when TRCS receives food, shelter, they are usually distributed through consulting with the Muhtars. The Centre in Bağcılar has approached Imams and Muhtars to talk about child marriage and child labour. However, this needs to be promoted in other cities and followed up.
Short Term (now up to 6 months)

Information Needs

About TRCS CCs and Programmes

- Disseminate key information on TRCS CC services, other interventions by TRCS such as cash programmes, RCRC Movement principles and code of conduct, TRCS social media links and Hello Hope application, key behaviour and protection messages (including RFL).
- Promote and disseminate information about CC services through setting information boards in different languages at the centre, reviewing, updating brochures, developing short videos, organising information kiosks, promotional events in schools and different locations of the city and advisory committee meetings.
- Update the TRCS Facebook pages, in multiple languages, with information about the centre and promote links of TRCS social media accounts through brochures, videos, promotional events and advisory committees.
- Organise information seminars with local and refugee children, parents and teachers at school or at the centre to provide information about youth activities.

About behaviour and protection issues

- Develop key messages and IEC materials on protection and other behavioural issues including on child marriage to create awareness among communities so that they can adopt safer and healthier practices. Pocket cards, brochures and short clips can be used as communication channels.
- Develop a mini booklet, in multiple languages, with information on legal rights, employment, registration services, hospitals, education facilities for children, social rights and other issues.
- Engage Imams to promote information about TRCS services and key behaviour.

Participation and Social Cohesion

- Through re-formation of the advisory committee at each Community Centres, it will ensure it is participatory and representative of the vulnerable people who can voice concerns about the implementation of activities and interact with local stakeholders to discuss about wider issues affecting them. Participation of both local community and refugees in advisory committees needs to be increased to support collective decision-making. Functions and responsibilities of the committee should be formalised to improve effectiveness. In this regard, a Terms of Reference has been developed and shared with Community Centres.
- Organise anti-discrimination seminars/meetings, joint interventions and cultural activities to increase interaction among refugees and locals.
- TRCS through its youth activities at the community center can form a youth club to ensure local and refugee children participate in the designing of youth activities and its implementation. Similar to the advisory committee, the youth club will comprise of members from local and refugee children and will act as a platform to share information about the services and to voice issues affecting them. Similar to the advisory committee, a Terms of Reference will be drafted to outline the responsibilities and expected outcome of the youth club.
- The youth club will collaborate with schools to organize anti-discrimination seminars, social activities and anti-bullying campaigns for children, parents and teachers. The club members will act as peers to promote an enabling environment to strengthen relationship between refugee and local children.
- Organise meetings with youth and children to consult on the youth activities and increase their participation. Maintain coordination with local schools to undertake joint interventions such as anti-discrimination seminars and activities to prevent peer bullying.
- Organise meeting with local community to understand and consult the relevance of the CC activities and ways to improve services appropriate for local community.
- Advocacy issues should be identified for dialogue with local municipality and public institutions. Relationship with the Muhtars should be strengthened either through inviting them in advisory committee meetings or organizing discussion forums with refugees.

Feedback Mechanism

- Establish a systematic rumour tracking mechanism to collect, analyse and respond to rumours. Social media pages and advisory committee meetings will be used for responding to rumours.
- Set up a feedback mechanism to collect, analyse and respond to complaints, feedback and questions. Depending on the feasibility, opportunities to use existing TRCS database will be explored.
- Developing feedback and rumour tracking protocol for CC staff/volunteers.

Capacity Building

- Training on CEA, feedback mechanisms and rumour tracking for staff and volunteers.
- Pocket cards on minimum actions for CEA.
- Develop institutional documents on CEA and social cohesion.

Long Term

Information Needs:

About TRCS CCs and Programmes

- Explore opportunity to work with Turkcell to update the ‘Hello Hope’ application and promote the application for use by communities.
About behaviour and protection issues

- Depending on the feasibility and given the community-based approach of the programme, in the long term, participatory radio programmes can be piloted to promote positive behaviour and engage local and refugees in similar discussions. Listeners’ clubs can be formed to engage women and the youth group on issues affecting them.

**Participation and Social Cohesion**

- Conduct perception study to understand communities’ views on the relevance of the services provided by the Community Centre and other agencies.

**Feedback Mechanism**

- Explore opportunities to build on the existing TRCS call centre for CC services.

**Capacity Building**

- Develop a pool of trainers through a ToT Training on CEA, feedback mechanisms and rumour tracking for staff and volunteers.
Community Engagement and Accountability Assessment Questions

The CEA Assessment Questionnaire is aimed to understand communities' information needs, access to and preferences of using communication channels, current structures and preferred mechanisms to raise concerns or share feedback. The findings of the assessment will guide adjustments and improvements to ongoing interventions by TRCS Community Centre (CC).

Instruction to staff/volunteer conducting assessment: Please complete all the questions in the questionnaire. There are 55 questions in total that will take 15 minutes to complete.

The type and number of respondents targeted for this assessment are outlined below:

- Refugees at TRCS Community Centre who are beneficiaries: 30 individuals will be interviewed (60-40 female male ratio)
- Locals at TRCS Community Centre who are beneficiaries: 5 individuals will be interviewed (60-40 female male ratio)
- Refugees population living around the CC: 25 individuals (60-40 female male ratio)
- Locals living around CC: 15 individuals (60-40 female male ratio)

Below is a suggested script:

We are conducting an assessment on behalf of the Turkish Red Crescent Society (TRCS) to understand how the TRCS Community Centre support communities, like yours, with vital information, listen and act on your feedback and how we can improve our services based on needs. Some of these questions relate to your personal data such as your age and nationality. All information you provide will be confidential and anonymous and will not be shared with external organisations.

You have been randomly selected to take part in this assessment. The results of this assessment will be used by Turkish Red Crescent to improve its programmes. Your participation will have no effect on any services you receive, and the information will be used for analysis only.

Asking the questions:

Specific guidance for enumerators

- Where the beneficiary does not wish to respond, please reflect this by ticking the appropriate option.
- If respondents select 'other' for any of the questions, please do try to elicit a qualitative response and enter in the box provided.
- All questions should be read aloud in full to respondents and not paraphrased.

Instruction to staff/volunteer conducting assessment: Please complete all the questions in the questionnaire. There are 55 questions in total that will take 15 minutes to complete.

Information needs of the community

1. Do you know anything about the TRCS Community Center (CC) and its services?

   If the response is No, skip to Q 9

   For all respondents

   No

   Yes

   Moderately

   Do not wish to answer

   Tick all that apply

   It provides information on registration

   It provides information about other agencies’ service providers

   It provides language courses

   It provides health and hygiene sessions

   It supports a Child Friendly Space and children activities

   It provides vocational training

   It provides support to refugees only

   Others

   Do not wish to answer

2. What do you know about the TRCS CC? for all respondents

   If the response is No, skip to Q 9

   Tick all that apply

   Provides information on other agencies’ service providers

   Provides health and hygiene sessions

   Provides information on registration

   Provides language courses

3. Do you use the CC? for all respondents

   If the response is No, skip to Q 7

   Yes, regularly

   Yes, sometimes

   No, I don’t use at all

   Do not wish to answer

4. If yes, what services do you access there? for all respondents

   Tick all that apply

   Updates on CC activities

   How to maintain health and hygiene

   Language courses and how I can participate

   Vocational courses and how I can participate

   How to find a job

5. What information do you receive directly from the CC? for all respondents

   Tick all that apply

   Updates on CC activities

   How to maintain health and hygiene

   Language courses and how I can participate

   Vocational courses and how I can participate

   How to find a job

   How to take care of my child

   How to take care of new/ pregnant mothers

   How to participate in advisory council meetings to share my feedback

   How to share feedback about CC service

   Others, Specify:

   Do not wish to answer

Introduction: Demographic questions

1. Name

   Male

   Female

   Other/Not to say

2. Sex

   Tick one

3. Age

   16 - 18

   19 - 30

   31 - 50

   51 and over

4. Nationality

   Syrian

   Turkish

   Others

5. Status

   Present in the country

   Refugee registered

   Refugee not registered

   Do not wish to answer

6. Highest Education level

   Tick one

   Primary

   Secondary

   Vocational/technical training

   University

   Post Graduate

   No education

7. Person with Disability

   Yes

   No

   Tick one

   Tick all that apply

   Communication: How to participate in advisory council meetings to share my feedback

   Others, Specify:

   Do not wish to answer
### Community Engagement and Accountability (CEA) Assessment

#### Annex 1

**6. Do you find the information useful and easy to understand?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tick one</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, the information given to me is easy to understand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, information is easy to understand but not useful for me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, information is useful but difficult to understand as it is not in my language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information is not easy to understand or accessible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not wish to answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7. How did you learn about TRCS Community Centres?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tick all that apply</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends and neighbours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRCS Community Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochures and posters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community leaders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instagram</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LinkedIn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouTube</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WhatsApp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email - Twitter, Facebook etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Crescent Umut - mobile app</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV screens at CC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Crescent volunteers or staff at TRC CC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, Specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not wish to answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**8. How well do you think information about the CC are communicated to the community?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tick one</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well communicated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well communicated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not clearly communicated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all advertised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not wish to answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**9. If we wanted to provide you with information about our services in TRC CC or other topics, how would you prefer to receive it?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tick all that apply</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Through face to face at home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through face to face meeting at CC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community meetings at CC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community meetings at our locality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochures and posters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community leaders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosque / religious leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instagram</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LinkedIn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouTube</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WhatsApp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Crescent Umut - mobile app</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice boards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV screens at CC/ Video</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Crescent volunteers or staff at TRC CC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, Specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not wish to answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**10. Which sources of information do you trust the most?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tick all that apply</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends and neighbours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRCS Community Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochures and posters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV screens at CC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community leaders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosque / religious leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media - Twitter, Facebook etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice boards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Crescent volunteers or staff at TRC CC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Crescent outreach worker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, Specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not wish to answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**11. What are the main issues that you or your family need information on right NOW?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tick all that apply</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General news about what is happening here</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about TRC CC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to register for an ID, ESN, COTC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to find housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal rights for refugees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about nutrition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to get help after sexual / gender based violence / domestic violence or harassment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to stay safe to prevent abuse / harassment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information to get help on children trafficking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on child marriage and abuse to report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on missing family member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education for my children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on ps and post natal care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother and child care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about safe internet use for children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about who to ask if you feel down</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather forecasts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on general hygiene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on menstrual hygiene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on HIV and safe sex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Aid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to ask questions or provide feedback to organisations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, Specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not wish to answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**12. Does anything stop you now or anything that may make it difficult for you to get information?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tick all that apply</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to read</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not own any equipment eg radio, mobile phone, TV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of charging equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence on another family member to get information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information not in local language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information inaccessible (for visually impaired, disabled, etc)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing stops me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't have time to get information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, Specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not wish to answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**WARNING**: this question can be confused with what people’s general needs are, not their information needs, so this may need to be explained.
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#### Annex

**Access to Communication Channels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> Do you own a mobile phone?</td>
<td>Yes, No, Do not wish to answer</td>
<td>For all respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> What mobile service provider do you use?</td>
<td>Turkcell, Turk Telecom, Others, Do not wish to answer</td>
<td>For all respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> What do you do most with your phone?</td>
<td>Voice calls, SMS, Use applications, Use internet, Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, LinkedIn, Youtube, Others, Do not wish to answer</td>
<td>For all respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> Have you used Merhaba Umut application in your phone?</td>
<td>Share heard but I don’t use, Share heard and I use, I don’t know and don’t use, Do not wish to answer</td>
<td>For all respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> Have you visited TRC Community Centre in Social Media (for eg.)</td>
<td>Yes, I visit regularly, Yes, sometimes, Yes, I visit but it is not in my language, No I don’t know and don’t visit, Do not wish to answer</td>
<td>For all respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong> If yes, which social media do you use most for CC?</td>
<td>Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, LinkedIn, Youtube, Others, Do not wish to answer</td>
<td>For all respondents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Community Structure and Social Cohesion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong> Do you listen to radio?</td>
<td>Yes, I used to listen to radio in my country, No, Do not wish to answer</td>
<td>For all respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong> If yes, what station do you listen to or channel?</td>
<td>Do not wish to answer</td>
<td>For all respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9</strong> Do you use other communication devices or channels?</td>
<td>TV, Computer, Tablet, Newspaper, Do not wish to answer</td>
<td>For all respondents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**For refugees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> How are decisions made in your community?</td>
<td>Through community committee, Through community meetings, Through the advisory committee in the TRC Community Centre, No decisions are made, Don’t know, Other, Specify, Do not wish to answer</td>
<td>For refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> How do people share information in your community?</td>
<td>Through community leader, Through community committee members, Through social media, Through mobile phones, No information is shared, Others, Specify, Do not wish to answer</td>
<td>For refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> How do the refugee community live in the cities?</td>
<td>Scattered, Clustered in different parts of the city, Merged within the local community, Do not wish to answer</td>
<td>For refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> Do you have any community meetings within your community. If yes, where are they held?</td>
<td>Yes, In a market place, Yes, in our homes, Yes, we use the TRC CC, Yes, Others, No, There are no community meetings, Do not wish to answer</td>
<td>For refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> If yes, do you take part in those meetings?</td>
<td>Never, Sometimes, Yes, very often, Do not wish to answer</td>
<td>For refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong> How important is it to you that you are involved in decisions about your community?</td>
<td>Very important, Important, Not important, I don’t know, Do not wish to answer</td>
<td>For refugees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7 How do you interact with host community/refugee community? for all respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Do not wish to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In community projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In shops and health centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At TRC Community Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not interact with people from other back grounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, Specify:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 Rate the relationship between refugees and host communities in this location. for all respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Hostile</th>
<th>Do not wish to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9 Were there any conflicts here in this location between host and refugees in the last 3 months? for all respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Do not wish to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10 If yes, what are the reasons? for all respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Do not wish to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11 Were there conflicts among the refugees in the last 3 months? for all respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Do not wish to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12 If yes, what were the reasons? for all respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Do not wish to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13 How were the tensions resolved in both cases for all respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution</th>
<th>By our community leader</th>
<th>By community committee members</th>
<th>By Local people/host community</th>
<th>By police</th>
<th>Others, Specify:</th>
<th>Do not wish to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14 How can the relationship be improved among host and refugee communities for all respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Through cultural activities</th>
<th>Through community dialogues</th>
<th>Promoting access to employment</th>
<th>Awareness raising among host and refugee communities on non-discrimination</th>
<th>Joint interventions by refugee and host community children at school to stop peer bullying</th>
<th>Mediation among families and parents to stop peer bullying</th>
<th>Others, Specify:</th>
<th>Do not wish to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Participation and Feedback

1 Does TRCS CC staff ask your opinion and are you involved in any discussion related to programme decision/design? for all respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involvement</th>
<th>Yes, after each vocational training or language courses</th>
<th>Yes, in advisory committee meetings</th>
<th>Yes, I was asked if I was satisfied with their services through group discussions/survey</th>
<th>Yes, sometimes</th>
<th>Do</th>
<th>Others, Specify:</th>
<th>Do not wish to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2 Do you feel Community Centre is open to your suggestions for improving existing services or making additional services available? for all respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Openness</th>
<th>Yes, they are very open to suggestions</th>
<th>Yes, they are somewhat open</th>
<th>No, they do not accept our suggestions</th>
<th>Please provide any suggestions you have on how to improve the Centre</th>
<th>Do not wish to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3 Do you know how to communicate with TRC CC for questions or feedback about its services and staff? for all respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Yes, through mobile phone</th>
<th>Yes, by visiting the CC</th>
<th>Yes, by sending an email</th>
<th>Mobile phone</th>
<th>Do not wish to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4 How do you contact TRC CC for questions or share feedback about its services and staff? for all respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Method</th>
<th>Mobile phone</th>
<th>In person by physically visiting the CC</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>SMS</th>
<th>Do not wish to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5 Have you used the complaints box in TRC CC? for all respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Box</th>
<th>Yes, many times</th>
<th>Yes, sometimes</th>
<th>No, I am not aware</th>
<th>No, I have not seen any box</th>
<th>Do not wish to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6 Have you called 168 call centre to ask questions or share complaints about services on CC? for all respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Called</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Do not wish to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
7. Have you received response to your questions, complaints or feedback?  
   Tick one
   | Yes | Sometimes | No | Do not wish to answer |

8. If you wanted to ask questions or raise complaints to TRC about its services, how would you most like to do so?  
   (Instruction to interviewer: please note the choices may be different from men, women and children)  
   Tick all that apply
   | Face-to-face with a representative of the organisation (privately) at home | Face-to-face with a representative of the organisation (privately) at CC | In community meetings at CC | By telephone and speaking to someone | By writing and posting in a suggestion in complaint box | Through community committee or local body | By telephone, but must be anonymous | By email | By SMS | Facebook | Twitter | Instagram | WhatsApp | I don’t feel comfortable asking questions or raising complaints in any way | Other (specify) | Do not wish to answer |

9. If you wanted to raise sensitive complaints to TRCS regarding staff behaviour, sexual assault or corruption, how would you most like to do so? (Instruction to interviewer: please note the choices may be different from men, women and children)  
   Tick all that apply
   | Face-to-face with a representative of the organisation (privately) at home | Face-to-face with a representative of the organisation (privately) at CC | In community meetings at CC | By telephone and speaking to someone | By writing and posting in a suggestion in complaint box | Through community committee or local body | By telephone, but must be anonymous | By email | By SMS | Facebook | Twitter | Instagram | Other (specify) | I don’t feel comfortable asking questions or raising complaints in any way | Do not wish to answer |

10. For sensitive complaints, if you wanted to share feedback face to face or over phone, who would you prefer to talk? (Examples of sensitive complaints are sexual assault by staff/volunteers, corruption, etc.)  
    Tick one
    | Any project staff in CC | Male project staff in CC | Female Project Staff in CC | Refugee volunteer | TRCS Outreach worker | Out Community Leader | Others (Specify) | Do not wish to answer |

11. In case of complaints box, where would you prefer it to be placed, so it is safe and accessible?  
    Tick all that apply
    | TRCS Community Information Centres | Close to our homes | Others (Specify) | Do not wish to answer |

12. Would you prefer to make anonymous complaints, although the response to such complaints can be difficult?  
    Tick one
    | Yes | Sometimes | No | Do not wish to answer |

13. Are there any barriers, that we should be aware of, when it comes to complaining or sharing feedback?  
    (Instruction to interviewer: please note the choices may be different from men, women and children)  
    Tick all that apply
    | Political influence | Can not write | Do not have phone to make a call | Language issues | Other (Specify) | Do not wish to answer |

14. How would you like TRC CC to respond to your complaints/feedback?  
    Tick all that apply
    | Face-to-face with a representative of the organisation (privately) | In community meetings held at TRC CC | By telephone and speaking to someone | By writing and posting in a suggestion in complaint box | Through my community committee | By telephone, but must be anonymous | By email | Don’t feel comfortable asking questions or raising complaints in any way | Other (Specify) | Do not wish to answer |

15. What is a reasonable time to receive a response?  
    Tick one
    | Instantly | 1-2 weeks | 3-4 weeks | Others (Specify) | Do not wish to answer |

16. Do you know the principles of the TRCS and how they work?  
    Tick one
    | Yes | To some extent | No | Do not wish to answer |

17. Are you treated respectfully by TRCS staff and volunteers?  
    Tick one
    | Yes | To some extent | No | Do not wish to answer |

The End
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Preparation before the focus group

- Is the room easily accessible for men, women, disabled/elderly?
- If not, what can you do to improve?
- Are any refreshments available?
- Do you have a name tag for each participant?
- Do you have paper and pen(s) to record the discussion?

Introduction for the focus group discussion

Prior to beginning the focus group discussion, the focus group facilitator introduces the purpose of the focus group, and provides information about consent, and confidentiality.

Use the following text:

Thank you very much for coming today. We are conducting an assessment on behalf of Turkish Red Crescent Society (TRCS) to understand how the TRCS Community Centre (CC) is helping you and your community.

We have heard that some children are choosing to work instead of studying. Why do you think this is happening?

What do you know about TRCS Community Centre (CC)?

What are the main issues that you or your family are facing?

Do you have the topic guide?

Name of the Interviewer

Are you happy to continue participating?

Just before we begin, I would like to state some ground rules that will help our discussion go well.

- The most important rule is that only one person speaks at a time. There may be a temptation to jump in when someone is talking but please wait until they have finished so that we can listen to everyone’s views.
- While there are any questions or discussions that you do not wish to answer or participate in, you do not have to do so; however please try to answer and be as involved as possible.
- When you do have something to say, please do so. There are many of you in the group and it is important that I obtain the views of each of you.
- You do not have to agree with the views of other people in the group but to respect each other’s views.
- Retain from discussing the comments of other group members outside, after the focus group.

Does anyone have any questions?

OK, let’s begin…

- Let’s start by introducing ourselves.
- And how long have you been living in [which part of city]?
- When you do have something to say, please do so. There are many of you in the group and it is important that I obtain the views of each of you.

WARNING - this question can be confused with what people’s general needs are, not their information needs, so this may need to be explained.

Information needs of the community

- Do you use the CC? If yes, why? (not relevant to their needs, too far away, don’t know how to use it, etc.)
- If yes, what are the benefits? If you give examples, what do they actually mean? (e.g. help in a natural or crisis)
- Do refugees/poor people have access to the CC?
- If yes, how?
- If no, why?

Access to Communication Channels

- Have you used Media (what application in your phone?)
- If not, why?
- How many FGDs?
- What is the usual age for marriage in your community (for girls/boys)?
- Why do you think it is?

Community Engagement and Accountability Assessment

Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-45</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 and over</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Syrian</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraqi</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refug e registered</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List down professions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are you using (e.g. Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, Youtube) to interact?

Reason for tensions among refugee communities?

- How are the tensions minimized/resolved?
- How do refugees/poor people perceive the host community?
- Why do people engage in this?
- How can this be improved?
- Why do people engage in this?
- How do you use the CC? Is it relevant to their needs, too far away, don’t know how to use it, etc.
- If yes, what are the benefits? If you give examples, what do they actually mean? (e.g. help in a natural or crisis)
- If no, why?

Behavior and Practices

- Do you use the CC?
- If yes, why? (not relevant to their needs, too far away, don’t know how to use it, etc.)
- If yes, what are the benefits? If you give examples, what do they actually mean? (e.g. help in a natural or crisis)
- If no, why?

- Do you know if number of early marriages in your community has increased? Why?
- If yes, do you think it is?
- Do you know if number of early marriages in your community has increased? Why?
- If yes, why?

- Do you know if number of early marriages in your community has increased? Why?
- If yes, why?
- If no, why?

- Do you know if number of early marriages in your community has increased? Why?
- If yes, why?
- If no, why?

- Do you use the CC?
- If yes, why? (not relevant to their needs, too far away, don’t know how to use it, etc.)
- If yes, what are the benefits? If you give examples, what do they actually mean? (e.g. help in a natural or crisis)
- If no, why?

- Do you use the CC?
- If yes, why? (not relevant to their needs, too far away, don’t know how to use it, etc.)
- If yes, what are the benefits? If you give examples, what do they actually mean? (e.g. help in a natural or crisis)
- If no, why?

- Do you use the CC?
- If yes, why? (not relevant to their needs, too far away, don’t know how to use it, etc.)
- If yes, what are the benefits? If you give examples, what do they actually mean? (e.g. help in a natural or crisis)
- If no, why?
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Annex

Community Engagement and Accountability Assessment Questions

Guide for conductors
The TRC Community Centre is providing service for children, such as youth and children activities. To improve the quality of our work, we would like to discuss with children between age 14-18 to understand their information needs and how they would like to share feedback about our services. Their responses will be recorded by TRCS staff for documentation and improving its work for children.

Introduction for the focus group discussion
Prior to beginning the focus group discussion, the focus group facilitator introduces the purpose of the focus group, and provides information about consent, and confidentiality.

Use the following text:
Thank you very much for coming today. We are conducting an assessment on behalf of Turkish Red Crescent Society (TRCS) to understand how the TRCS Community Centre support children with vital information, listen and act on their feedback and how we can improve our services based on your needs. All information you provide will be kept confidential and will not be shared with external organisations. Your participation is voluntary and you can withdraw from participating in the focus group at any time. We will gather notes during our discussion and the results of this assessment will be used by Turkish Red Crescent to improve and measure the impact of their programmes.

The discussion should last between 1 hour. Participation is voluntary, and you can choose not to answer any of the questions, or to withdraw from participating in the focus group at any time. We will gather notes during our discussion and the results of this assessment will be used by Turkish Red Crescent to improve its programmes.

Are you happy to continue participating?

Just before we begin, I would like to state some ground rules that will help our discussion go well:
- The most important rule is that only one person speaks at a time. There may be a temptation to jump in when someone is talking but please wait until they have finished so that we can listen to everyone’s view.
- There are no right or wrong answers.
- If there are any questions or discussions that you do not wish to answer or participate in, you do not have to do so. However please try to answer and be involved as possible.
- When you do have something to say, please do so.
- There are many of you in the group and it is important that I obtain the views of each of you.
- You do not have to agree with the views of other people in the group but to respect each other’s views.
- Feel free to discuss the comments of other group members outside, after the focus group.
- Does anyone have any questions?

OK, let’s begin.
- Let’s start by introducing ourselves and saying where we’re from.
- And how long have you been living in which part of city?
- Main questions from topic guide.
- Before we finish does anyone have any more thoughts or opinions about what we have talked about today?

General note: One FGD is to be conducted for children (5 girls and 5 boys) in each of 6 locations. A maximum of 10 persons should participate in this FGD.

Are you happy to participate in this FGD?

Tick one
- Yes
- No

Name of the Interviewer

Date

Location (City)

Tick one

Demographic Information

1 Age

Tick one

- 14 - 16
- 17 - 18

2 Nationality

Tick one

- Syrian
- Turkish
- Others

3 Status

Tick one

- Resident in the country
- Refugee registered
- Refugee non registered
- do not wish to answer

Tick one

Number of participants
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**Lead Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What do you know about TRCS Community Centre (CC)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How do you participate in programme decisions for TRCS services?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Can you give example of how you have participated in decisions making of TRCS program? (eg. partcipation in youth activities, writing / articles, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are you aware of the child labor issues?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How do you feel your suggestions are listened to and acted upon? (for eg, through asking feedback after each session, BSS survey, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How do you promote the use of Merhaba Umut app and social media to communities at the centre or through social media?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How can this program be improved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. From your observation, what are the main issues that communities face in their daily questions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How can you give example of how the harmonization activity has introduced new knowledge?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How do you feel your suggestions are listened to and acted upon?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Community Engagement and Accountability Assessment Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How can this program be improved? (eg. partcipation in youth activities, writing / articles, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Have you attended the youth activities or any other activities at the CC? If so, what?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Have you bounded to provide you with information about our services in TRC CC or other topics, how would you prefer to receive it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What are the main issues that you face daily in your community? Do you feel your suggestions are listened to and acted upon? (for eg, through asking feedback after each session, BSS survey, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What are the barriers to receiving information?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Are you aware of the child labor issues?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How do you feel your suggestions are listened to and acted upon? (for eg, through asking feedback after each session, BSS survey, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How do you promote the use of Merhaba Umut app and social media to communities at the centre or through social media?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How can this program be improved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How do you feel your suggestions are listened to and acted upon?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Community Engagement and Accountability Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (City)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ankara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Participant Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Community Engagement and Accountability Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How did communities participate in programme design?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How is information about the CC disseminated to communities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How do communities share their feedbacks now?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Did you meet with any other organization or service provider to discuss child marriage and child labor issues?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What is the main challenge you face going to / attending school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What are the barriers when it comes to complaining or sharing feedback?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How can this program be improved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. From your observation, what are the main issues that communities face in their daily questions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How can you give example of how the harmonization activity has introduced new knowledge?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How do you feel your suggestions are listened to and acted upon?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Community Engagement and Accountability Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How can this program be improved? (eg. partcipation in youth activities, writing / articles, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Have you encountered any problems or barriers to communicating with TRCS staff and volunteers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are you satisfied with the communication channels available to you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How can this program be improved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How do you feel your suggestions are listened to and acted upon?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How can this program be improved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Are you aware of the child labor issues?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How do you feel your suggestions are listened to and acted upon? (for eg, through asking feedback after each session, BSS survey, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How can this program be improved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How do you feel your suggestions are listened to and acted upon?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Community Engagement and Accountability Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How did communities participate in programme design?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How is information about the CC disseminated to communities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How do communities share their feedbacks now?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does anythng stop you now or anything that may make it difficult for you to get involved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What is the main challenge you face going to / attending school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What are the barriers when it comes to complaining or sharing feedback?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How can this program be improved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. From your observation, what are the main issues that communities face in their daily questions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How can you give example of how the harmonization activity has introduced new knowledge?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How do you feel your suggestions are listened to and acted upon?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Definitions

The Red Cross Red Crescent Movement is based on 7 Fundamental Principles. Although you may not be a RCRC member, when performing any kind of work or activity on behalf of a component of the Movement, the following principles must be respected and adhered to:

**Humanity, Universality, Neutrality, Impartiality, Unity, Independence, Voluntary Protection**

Protection

Protection refers to the work that is done to keep people safe from harm, to ensure basic human rights are respected, and to preserve the safety, security and dignity of any person affected by crisis or violence.

Gender

Gender refers to the social differences between females and males during their life. It depends on cultural and societal aspects that determine a person’s role and power in society based on being male or female.

An example of gender roles can be the idea of women as carers of the house, loving the colour pink, and men as those working and providing for the family, and linked to the colour blue.

Gender Equality

It refers to the having the same human rights, the same access to services and the same power to make decisions in life regardless to a person’s gender.

Child

Any human being under the age of 18 years. Children are one of the most vulnerable groups in society and all children have the right to be safe and protected.

Child Protection

It refers to the set of activities, policies, and practices aimed at protecting the rights of children to life, family, health and education.

Unaccompanied and Separated Children

An 'unaccompanied child' is a child who is separated from both parents and other relatives – and is not in the care of an adult who is responsible for the child.

Child labour

Any form of paid or unpaid work performed by a person under 18 years of age.

Child marriage

It refers to the marriage and union, by customs, religion or law, of a child to another child or adult.

Gender Based Violence

It refers to any form of violence and act that can hurt a person physically, sexually or psychologically on the basis of their gender, according to them being male or female. It is a result of gender inequality and abuse of power. Examples of GBV are sexual violence, domestic violence, trafficking, forced or early marriage, forced prostitution and sexual exploitation and abuse.

Trafficking

‘Trafficking in human beings’ means the recruitment, transportation of a person through the threat or use of force or other forms of coercion in order to exploit the person. Examples can be slavery, forced prostitution or forced begging.

Exploitation

It refers to abuse or misuse of position or influence or failure to use proper discretion, for personal benefit or to benefit another person. Forms of exploitation can be sexual, financial, labour etc.

Do no Harm

“Do no harm” generally refers to avoiding any negative effects from humanitarian activities. It means to develop and implement actions that at a minimum do not further harm the affected persons.

Neglect and negligent treatment

Neglect means the failure to meet children’s physical and psychological needs, protect them from danger, or obtain medical, birth registration or other services when those responsible for children’s care have the means, knowledge and access to services to do so.”
The European Union is a unique economic and political union between 28 EU countries and is committed to helping victims of disasters worldwide and supports millions of people worldwide each year. Collectively, the EU and its constituent countries are the world’s leading donor of humanitarian aid. This aid, in the form of financing, provision of goods or services, or technical assistance, aims to help prepare for and deal urgently with crises that seriously affect populations outside the EU. EU action is guided by the principles of humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence. Aid is channelled through international and local partner organizations, agencies, and supported by thousands of volunteers.

TRCS – The Turkish Red Crescent Society (TRCS), founded in 1868, is the largest humanitarian organization in Turkey. The TRCS has country wide network with 400 Branches and provides support to vulnerable people living in Turkey and overseas. TRCS has nine regional and 25 local disaster management and logistics centers. The mission of TRCS is “Providing aid for needy and defenseless people in disasters and usual periods as a proactive organization, developing cooperation in the society, providing safe blood and decreasing vulnerability”. TRCS is being supported by IFRC, ICRC and National Societies, UN, EU and other partners to implement various humanitarian activities.

For more information, please contact us:

Community Based Migration Programme
Turkish Red Crescent
Kamil Erdem Güler
Programme Coordinator
kamil.guler@kizilay.org.tr

Arif Muştu
Social Cohesion Programme Manager
arif.mustu@kizilay.org.tr

Semih Paslı
Social Cohesion Programme Officer / CEA Focal Point
semih.pasli@kizilay.org.tr

IFRC – The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) is the world’s largest volunteer-based humanitarian network. With its 190 member National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies worldwide, IFRC is reaching 160. 7 million people annually through long-term services and development programmes, as well as 110 million people through disaster response and early recovery programmes. IFRC acts before, during and after disasters and health emergencies to meet the needs and improve the lives of vulnerable people. The Federation does so with impartiality as to nationality, race, gender, religious beliefs, class and political opinions.

International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC)
Sayeeda Farhana
Community Engagement and Accountability (CEA) Delegate,
IFRC Turkey
sayeeda.farhana@ifrc.org

www.kizilaytoplummerkezleri.org
**FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION FINDINGS**

**SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR**

Together with other topics, Focus Group with refugees and host community analysed their perceptions and behavioral aspects about child marriage. Child marriage and child labor were two main topics to develop targeted messages. Participatory communication approaches and support communities to adapt safer practices. To enable communities to discuss openly and in-depth, questions around these topics were not included in the assessment.

**CHILD MARRIAGE**

Girls drop out of schools more frequently related to being married off through religious marriage. Turkish law does not permit marriage for girls under 18 years old.

The reasons for child marriage, as mentioned in the FG, are that the FGC, who is a brother in the family, a perception of security and prosperity of a better life if the child is married, and the normal child marriage practice in certain regions of Syria.

Both refugee and local community support the need to raise awareness among communities and engage with parents and religious leaders in this promotion of child marriage.

**PEER BULLYING**

Peer bullying between children at schools is often the result of misunderstanding and conflict brought about by cultural differences and behavioral aspects. Peer bullying can be one reason why children do not want to go to school. Syrian families reported that bullying increases when local communities have negative perceptions of Syrian children.

Refugees report that activities at the center have helped children to socialize and heal. However, in addition to psychological support, there is need to engage in activities and activities with children, parents, and school teachers.

Dilber from the Focus Group stated, through youth activities, TRCS can collaborate with schools to organize anti-bullying seminars, social activities and etc. Anti-bullying campaigns for these purposes are active. Children participating in TRCS youth activities can act as peers to provide an enabling environment and strengthen relationships between refugee and local children.

**CHILD LABOUR**

Children would prefer to study, but many refugee children drop-out of school and work in the agriculture sector or factories, often due to poor economic conditions.

Participating in the FGC supported the need for awareness among local members and school teachers to prevent child labour. To support families to over school education and provide psychosocial support.

“Poverty is the main reason for child labour in Turkey, children don’t have a chance to work but as poor economic conditions at home, children must work.”

Refugee boy, 15 years, Turkey

**PARTICIPATION AND FEEDBACK**

**HOW WOULD YOU PREFER TO ASK QUESTIONS OR RAISE COMPLAINTS TO TRCS ABOUT ITS SERVICES?**

How would you prefer to raise sensitive complaints?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General comments or feedback</th>
<th>Online (<a href="http://www.kizilay.org.tr">www.kizilay.org.tr</a>)</th>
<th>Anonymous phone call</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>310 (45%)</td>
<td>64 (9.5%)</td>
<td>61 (9.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DOES TRCS CC STAFF ASK FOR YOUR OPINION?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>151 (6%)</td>
<td>67 (25.7%)</td>
<td>293 (78.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DO YOU KNOW HOW TO CONTACT TRCS CC FOR QUESTIONS OR SHARE FEEDBACK?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>189 (51%)</td>
<td>172 (49%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY**

**TURKISH RED CRESCENT SOCIETY COMMUNITY-BASED MIGRATION PROGRAMME**

This Community Engagement and Accountability (CEA) assessment gave an analysis of refugee and host community members in Turkey, belonging to people of the same culture, from different communities’ characteristics, needs, concern, and willingness to participate in the migration programme. The assessment was conducted under the Turkish Red Crescent Society (TRCS) Community-Based Migration Programme.

- **Gender:**
  - Female: 78.7%
  - Male: 21.3%

- **Age:**
  - 18-24 years: 61.4%
  - 25-34 years: 29.8%
  - 35-44 years: 14.3%

- **Education:**
  - Completed primary education: 69.1%
  - Completed secondary education: 26.9%
  - Completed tertiary education: 3.8%

**COMMUNITY STRUCTURE, SOCIAL COHESION & BEHAVIOUR**

Building the structure of refugee communities, this section lists how local communities and refugee communities interact, and emerging roles and social positions. The focus is on social cohesion building and community engagement approaches to enhance inclusion, plurality and improved strategies amongst communities to adopt safer practices.

**PARTICIPATION AND FEEDBACK**

This section investigates how communities have been involved in the program design and their prioritized options for sharing feedback, concerns and complaints. This will inform the planning and adaptation of feedback mechanisms and enhances community participation.

**SUMMARY OF THE ASSESSMENT REPORT**

Community Engagement and Accountability (CEA) assessment gives an analysis of refugee and host community members in Turkey, belonging to people of the same culture, from different communities’ characteristics, needs, concern, and willingness to participate in the migration programme. The assessment was conducted under the Turkish Red Crescent Society (TRCS) Community-Based Migration Programme.

- **Gender:**
  - Female: 78.7%
  - Male: 21.3%

- **Age:**
  - 18-24 years: 61.4%
  - 25-34 years: 29.8%
  - 35-44 years: 14.3%

- **Education:**
  - Completed primary education: 69.1%
  - Completed secondary education: 26.9%
  - Completed tertiary education: 3.8%
Information Needs

Do you own a mobile phone? Do you use the CC? Does the CC have access to mobile phones? Understanding accessibility of mobile phones and communication devices defines appropriate CSA approaches and their ability to be communicated.

Do you use other communication devices or channels? 10% of respondents use mobile phones which is measured in the topographic area. Social groups report that television channels such as TNT are popular amongst the refugees but most do not understand the Turkish language.

Communication Channels

Do you have visited TRCS CC on social media? 29 people (76%) Yes 41 (11%) Yes regularly 38 (10%) Yes sometimes 292 (76%) 41 (11%) 38 (10%) Presence on social media. 76 people (19%) 41 (11%) 38 (10%) 292 (76%) 41 (11%) 38 (10%) Presence on social media.

Community Structure and Social Cohesion

How are decisions made in the refugee community? 68 people (16%) Through community meetings 49 (12%) No decisions are made 197 (66%) 132 (34%) 33 (11%) 197 (66%) 132 (34%) 33 (11%) Through community meetings. How do the refugees communicate with each other?

How did you learn about TRCS Community Centres? Which sources of information do you trust the most? How did you learn about TRCS Community Centres? Which sources of information do you trust the most?

What do you need right now? Information needs.

What services do you access in the community centre? 66% Language courses 10% English 2% French 22% English 10% Other 53% 95% of respondents reported materials knowledge.

Do you know anything about the TRCS CC and its services? Do you use the CC? What services do you access in the community centre? How would you prefer to receive information about the CC services and other topics?

Communication channels.
Göçmenler ve ev sahipliği alanlar arasındaki zorbalıklar konularıyla ilgili sorunlara dair algıları ve davranış biçimlerini analiz ederek, çocuk ișçiliği ve çocuklar arası akran zorbalığı konularına dair bir görüşme düzenleyen Odak Grup, diğer konuların yanı sıra, çocuk evliliği, çocuk eğitimi ve sunulması konularında farkındalığın oluşturulması gerektiğini belirtmiştir.

Önlemek için, çocuk eğitimini ve çocuk eğitiminin işgalinden korunması, düşük gelirli ailelere yönelik mali destek, psikososyal destek, farklı etnik kökenlere sahip çocukların_threads_3

Bu görüşmelerde, çocuk ișçiliği ve çocuklar arası zorbalık konularıyla ilgili algıları ve davranış biçimlerini analiz eden ve çocuk hakları ve psikososyal destek konularına odaklanan bir Toplum Merkezi'nde, çocukların sosyal olarak ve psikolojik olarak sağlıklı bir yaşam sürdürebilmesi için aile destek programları, psikososyal destek programları ve seminerler düzenlendi. Bu programlar, çocuk hakları ve psikososyal sağlık konularını ele alan seminerler, aile destek programları ve psikososyal destek programları ile birlikte, göçmenlerin niños de participar en estos programas y en los programas de apoyo social, de salud psicosocial y de talleres de sensibilización a la protección de los derechos del niño.
TÜRK Kızılay TOPLUM MERKEZLERİ İLE SUNDUĞU HİZMETLER HAKKINDA

Kalinmetin 371 (14%), oop telefonla konuşanlar olup, Emekli ve kadınlardan çıkanlar arasında durumün anlaşılmadığı, genellikle CEB yalnızlıkların tanımanması ve şehitlik diye teşkilat kurulduğu konsantrasyon olmak turmasa.

TOPULUK MERKEZİ'NİN HANGİ SOSYAL MÜHENDİS HİZMETİ KULLANMAZ MÜSÜNLÜ? (YOKTURMSUZ)


NASIL ÖĞRENİZ?

NAZM OĞRENİYOR “ABSAZ OĞRENİN” NAZM OĞRENİYOR

NASIL GELİŞTİRİLEBİLİR?

“Birlik Türkiye’de coğrafi ve Joan, Türkiye’nin değerini, zorunlu olarak almak zor olmayacak” olduğunu belirtmek için Facebook yapılıyor. “Facebook yapılıyor. Facebook yapılıyor.”

TOPLULUK TOPLANDIRMA ve HASTAPOLİTİKLER NASIL ALINIYOR? GÖÇMEN TOPLULUKLAR ARASINDAKİ İLİŞKİYİ NASIL GELİŞTİRİLEBİLİR?

GÖÇMEN TOPLULUKLAR ARASINDAKİ İLİŞKİYİ NASIL GELİŞTİRİLEBİLİR?

Bu telefonla konuşanlar olup, Emekli ve kadınlardan çıkanlar arasında durumün anlaşılmadığı, genellikle CEB yalnızlıkların tanımanması ve şehitlik diye teşkilat kurulduğu konsantrasyon olmak turmasa.

NAVİGATİON KULLANMAZ MÜSÜNLÜ? (YOKTURMSUZ)

İLETİŞİM KANALLARI

TOPLULUK TOPLANDIRMA ve HASTAPOLİTİKLER NASIL ALINIYOR? GÖÇMEN TOPLULUKLAR ARASINDAKİ İLİŞKİYİ NASIL GELİŞTİRİLEBİLİR?

TOPLULUK TOPLANDIRMA ve HASTAPOLİTİKLER NASIL ALINIYOR? GÖÇMEN TOPLULUKLAR ARASINDAKİ İLİŞKİYİ NASIL GELİŞTİRİLEBİLİR?

Bu telefonla konuşanlar olup, Emekli ve kadınlardan çıkanlar arasında durumün anlaşılmadığı, genellikle CEB yalnızتجارların tanımanması ve şehitlik diye teşkilat kurulduğu konsantrasyon olmak turmasa.

GÖÇMEN TOPLULUKLAR ARASINDAKİ İLİŞKİYİ NASIL GELİŞTİRİLEBİLİR?

Bu telefonla konuşanlar olup, Emekli ve kadınlardan çıkanlar arasında durumün anlaşılmadığı, genellikle CEB yalnızتجارların tanımanması ve şehitlik diye teşkilat kurulduğu konsantrasyon olmak turmasa.

GÖÇMEN TOPLULUKLAR ARASINDAKİ İLİŞKİYİ NASIL GELİŞTİRİLEBİLİR?

Bu telefonla konuşanlar olup, Emekli ve kadınlardan çıkanlar arasında durumün anlaşılmadığı, genellikle CEB yalnızتجارların tanımanması ve şehitlik diye teşkilat kurulduğu konsantrasyon olmak turmasa.

GÖÇMEN TOPLULUKLAR ARASINDAKİ İLİŞKİYİ NASIL GELİŞTİRİLEBİLİR?

Bu telefonla konuşanlar olup, Emekli ve kadınlardan çıkanlar arasında durumün anlaşılmadığı, genellikle CEB yalnızتجارların tanımanması ve şehitlik diye teşkilat kurulduğu konsantrasyon olmak turmasa.

YAYINLI SÜTLİLERDEN HABERİNCİ VAR Mİ? (YOKTURMSUZ)

Bahar, Milo ve Rabia Radyo olarak TRT gibi özel kanalların günlük yayınlar arasında popüler diyebileceğim, gerçek şu günün Türkçede anlattıkları konuşmaları var. 

TOPLULUK TOPLANDIRMA ve HASTAPOLİTİKLER NASIL ALINIYOR? GÖÇMEN TOPLULUKLAR ARASINDAKİ İLİŞKİYİ NASIL GELİŞTİRİLEBİLİR?

Bu telefonla konuşanlar olup, Emekli ve kadınlardan çıkanlar arasında durumün anlaşılmadığı, genellikle CEB yalnızتجارların tanımanması ve şehitlik diye teşkilat kurulduğu konsantrasyon olmak turmasa.

GÖÇMEN TOPLULUKLAR ARASINDAKİ İLİŞKİYİ NASIL GELİŞTİRİLEBİLİR?

Bu telefonla konuşanlar olup, Emekli ve kadınlardan çıkanlar arasında durumün anlaşılmadığı, genellikle CEB yalnızتجارlarının tanımanması ve şehitlik diye teşkilat kurulduğu konsantrasyon olmak turmasa.