Research Terms of Reference
Information Consumption amongst Syrian Refugee Communities in Jordan
Jordan

REACH Informing more effective humanitarian action

1. Summary

Country of intervention	Jordan					
Type of Emergency		Natural disaster		Conflict	x	Complex emergency
Type of Crisis		Sudden onset		Slow onset	x	Protracted
Mandating Body/ Agency	DFID					
Project Code	13Iadl 0z4 (ACTED: 13 CXN J67)					
REACH Pillar		Planning in Emergencies	x	Displacement	x	Building Community Resilience
Research Timeframe	1 March-31 May 2017					
General Objective	Assess the primary ways in which information about assistance, services, and government policies is accessed, understood, and used by Syrian refugees living in Jordanian host communities.					
Specific Objective(s)	• Evaluate the effectiveness of particular information dissemination mechanisms used by humanitarian and governmental actors • Identify the primary informal and formal information sources accessed by refugees, and perceptions of their accuracy and trustworthiness • Understand how information disseminated is used in household decision making • Identify gaps in knowledge and understanding[1] and specific information needs					

Research Questions	1. What is the current level of knowledge among Syrian refugees of subjects regularly communicated to refugees, such as acquiring work permits, provision of assistance, and complaints mechanisms?
	 2. By what means do Syrian refugees in Jordan receive information from humanitarian and governmental actors?
	    a. Why are these methods used by refugees to access information?
	    b. How effective and relevant are these methods?
	    c. How accurate and trustworthy do refugees find these methods? Why?
	 3. By which means to refugees prefer to receive information and why?
	 4. How to refugees use the information they receive?
	    a. To what extent is understanding affecting use of information in decision-making processes?
	 5. How much of the information that is received understood by Syrian refugees?
	 6. To what extent does the level of understanding affect trust in the information received?
	    a. What information needs are not being met?					

Research Type		Quantitative	x	Qualitative		Mixed methods
Geographic Coverage	Jordanian host communities					
Target Population(s)	Syrian refugees in the Jordanian host communities					

---

[1] Here knowledge refers to the actual information that have (and any gaps in information received). Understanding refers to their ability to interpret and apply that knowledge i.e. they have knowledge of NFI distributions taking place on a certain date, but lack the knowledge of where to receive this distribution or what they are entitled to and therefore do not understand the assistance available to them.

Data Sources	Secondary Data:
	• **Desk review** will be compiled using existing reports from NGOs, UN agencies, past REACH assessments, and other organisations to inform the research design and triangulate primary data findings
	• **Tools** from previous REACH assessments, including the Mass Communications assessments in Zaatari and Azraq camps, will be consulted and portions potentially adapted for the host communities context
	Primary Data:
	• **Key informant interviews** with stakeholders from the humanitarian sector and from the Jordanian government to contextualise data from focus group discussions
	• **Focus group discussions** with Syrian refugees

Expected Outputs	
	• **Preliminary findings presentation** at the mid-point of data collection, delivered to the assessment's Steering Committee to guide the remainder of the data collection phase
	• **Final report** of key findings and recommendations for further research, advocacy, and programming
	• **Final presentation** of findings to the Steering Committee and other interested humanitarian/governmental actors

Key Resources	
	• REACH technical staff (Assessment Officer, Assessment Intern)
	• REACH operations staff (Field Manager, Field Officer, Project Assistants)
	• ACTED logistics and support staff
	• IMPACT technical backstopping staff and resources

Humanitarian milestones	Milestone		Timeframe
		Cluster plan/strategy	
	x	Inter-cluster plan/strategy	2017-2018
	x	Donor plan/strategy	2017-2018
	x	NGO plan/strategy	2017-2018

Audience	Humanitarian actors operating in Jordan as well as governmental actors particularly from the Ministry of Labour		
	Audience type		Specific actors
	x	Operational	GoJ, DFID, UNHCR, and their implementing partners
	x	Programmatic	DFID, UNHCR, and their implementing partners
	x	Strategic	GoJ, DFID, UNHCR, and their implementing partners

Access	x	Public (available on REACH research center and other humanitarian platforms)
		Restricted (bilateral dissemination only upon agreed dissemination list, no publication on REACH or other platforms)

Visibility	REACH, NRC, and DFID logos on all assessment products

Dissemination	Presentation of key findings to:
	• Assessment Steering Committee
	• Protection Working Group
	• Other sectorial forums as requested
	Dissemination of the final report and presentation slides through:
	• REACH Resource Centre,
	• ReliefWeb
	• UNHCR inter-agency data sharing portal
	• IMPACT/REACH social media (Facebook, Twitter)

2. Background & Rationale

Humanitarian actors working to assist Syrian refugees living in Jordan, such as UNHCR, employ a variety of means to communicate information to beneficiaries and communities of interest, including text messaging and other mechanisms. These tools are used to communicate important information such as targeting decisions and complaints mechanisms that are key to effective and efficient programming. Despite this, there is at present a lack of knowledge and understanding around information consumption among the refugee community, and in particular how well-aligned the methods employed by humanitarian actors are to refugees' preferred and most effective means of receiving information.

This is increasingly important given developments in the Jordanian context, such as increased opportunities for refugees to apply for work permits. Without access to sufficient and relevant information, many Syrian refugees may miss out on crucial livelihoods opportunities, as without the relevant information on how to access to work permits the process can be extremely challenging. In order to address this information gap and better understand the relevance and effectiveness of media used by humanitarian actors to disseminate information, and better inform the communication of information to refugees, REACH Jordan will partner with DFID and NRC to conduct a three-month assessment of information consumption among Syrian refugees living in the country. This will be carried out in close collaboration with the Beneficiaries Communication Working Group initiated by DFID. Members of this working group will for a Steering Committee to provide input on methodology and tools and well as acting in an advisory capacity to help guide research throughout the assessment.

3. Research Objectives

Primary objective:
Assess the primary ways in which information about assistance, services, and government policies is accessed, understood, and used by Syrian refugees living in Jordanian host communities.

Specific objectives:
- Evaluate the effectiveness of particular information dissemination mechanisms used by humanitarian and governmental actors
- Identify the primary informal and formal information sources accessed by refugees, and perceptions of their accuracy and trustworthiness
- Understand how information disseminated to refugees is used in household decision making
- Identify gaps in knowledge and unerstanding and specific information needs

4. Research Questions

1. What is the current level of knowledge among Syrian refugees of subjects regularly communicated to refugees, such as acquiring work permits, provision of assistance, and complaints mechanisms?
2. By what means do Syrian refugees in Jordan receive information from humanitarian and governmental actors?
   a. Why are these methods used by refugees to access information?
   b. How effective and relevant are these methods?
   c. How accurate and trustworthy do refugees find these methods? Why?
3. What are the preferred means by which refugees want to receive information and why?
4. How to refugees use the information they receive?
   a. To what extent is understanding affecting use of information in decision-making processes?
5. How much of the information that is received understood by Syrian refugees?
   a. To what extent does the level of understanding affect trust in the information received?
6. What information needs are not being met?

5. Methodology

5.1. Methodology overview

The project will collect detailed qualitative data on information consumption among Syrian refugees through a number of focus group discussions and key informant interviews, which will be informed by findings from an initial desk review. At the project outset, REACH will work with DFID and NRC to establish an inter-agency Steering Committee out of the Beneficiary Communications Working Group. This committee will be comprised of relevant organizational partners, engaged in beneficiary communications, who can provide their programmatic guidance and expertise throughout the research cycle. As there is a dearth of existing research in the field of beneficiary communications, the committee will provide input and recommendations on methodology and assessment tools, as well as serving in an advisory capacity to direct and give context to the research, and thereby allow REACH to engage with both sides of the communication channel. This will further serve as a forum through which to identify key informants for interview.

Table 1: Steering committee members

Project partners	DFID	NRC	REACH		
UN agencies	UNHCR	UNICEF			
INGOs	ACTED	CARE	DRC	IMC	IRC

5.2. Population of interest

The population of interest includes all Syrian refugees living in Jordanian host communities. Of particular interest are refugees designated as "hard to reach" populations, and a specific number of FGDs will be dedicated to understanding their unique informational needs and access barriers. Examples of hard to reach populations include but are not limited to refugees living in informal tented settlements (ITS) or families without access to mobile phones; the full set of criteria defining "hard-to-reach" will be finalized in consultation with the steering committee.

5.3. Desk review

A preliminary desk review prior to the start of primary data collection will serve as an opportunity to explore in detail the current methods used by humanitarian organizations to disseminate information to refugees in Jordan and inform the design of the research. This will include a review of programmes currently implemented aiming at providing information to refugees, such as those implemented by BBC Media Action, UNESCO, as well as other first-hand research such as that conducted by InterNews. This research will help inform the data collection tools with regards to the types and methods of information communication asked about in focus group discussions as well as demographic variations or 'har-to-reach' characteristics affecting service uptake.

5.4. Primary Data Collection

Key Informant interviews (up to 20)
A number of key informant interviews will be conducted concurrently with the secondary data review phase. This will involve individual interviews with key stakeholders such as UNHCR, members of relevant Working Groups, as well as NGOs and local government figures. These interviews will feed into the design of the project alongside the secondary data review, will inform the design of data collection tools, and will also provide primary data for analysis. The key informant interviews (KII) will also serve to inform the research by aiming to identify any marginal communities that may be inaccessible given the sampling framework selected, such as those refugees with insufficient resources to purchase mobile phones. Additional KIIs with humanitarian and governmental stakeholders are planned at the midpoint of the FGDs. These later interviews will serve to contextualize any surprising or unexpected themes emerging from the focus groups, as well as to guide the remainder of data collection and any necessary revisions to the tools.

Interviews will be conducted in English by a member of the REACH assessment team or in Arabic by the REACH Field Manager.

Focus group discussions (up to 26)

Twenty six sex-segregated Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) will be conducted with 6-8 participants in each. The FGDs will serve to collect qualitative data through semi-structured interviews giving participants the opportunity to discuss information communication channels used and information needs relating to refugee services and entitlements. Through a participatory exercise at the start of the discussion, the key informational areas of interest to the participants (e.g. work permit registration, access to health services, cash assistance, etc.) will be selected and used to guide the subsequent conversation. FDGs will cover currently used information sources, preferred methods for information dissemination and consumption, understanding and use of information, impact on decision-making, informational needs, and perceptions regarding internet and internet-based tools for accessing information, given potential programmatic focus on web-based applications as communications tools. Focus groups will also be conducted with hard-to-reach Syrian refugee groups that may not have access to information media, such as those without access to mobile phones. Ten FGDs with be conducted with males and females in this group.

Each FGD will be led by a REACH Project Assistant in the role of facilitator, while a second Project Assistant acts as the scribe, noting down key discussion points and responses, areas of contention or disagreement amongst participants, areas of agreement, topics where participants were particularly engaged, and any logistical or methodological challenges experienced during the discussion.

Table 2: Breakdown of FGDs by refugee population, geographic area, and sex

Refugee population	Geographic area	Male	Female
Syrian	Amman	2	2
	Mafraq	2	2
	Irbid	2	2
	Zarqa	2	2
Hard to reach (Syrian)[2]	Multiple – TBD	5	5

5.5. Data Analysis Plan

Debriefs

KIIs and FGDs will all be recorded by a scribe, contingent upon the consent of the interviewee and the FGD participants. Following each KII, the interviewer will complete a debrief in English with the Assessment Officer leading the project using a predesigned debrief form. Following each full day of FGDs, a full day will be dedicated to completing debriefs with the facilitators and scribes. Debriefs will either be conducted in English by a member of the assessment team, or in Arabic with the Field Manager who will then translate the form into English.

Qualitative analysis

The assessment team will consolidate all data from the FGD and KII debrief forms in separate Excel matrices, to facilitate the identification of key themes and make comparisons between different geographic areas and between male and female respondents. Analysis of the information gleaned through the debriefs will be supplemented by the raw data (i.e. recorded interview/discussion), follow-up discussions with the data collection teams, and scribes' notes. Analysis will take place throughout the data collection phase in order to capture any surprising or unexpected themes that can then be explored further through KIIs planned mid-way through with humanitarian and government stakeholders. This will further guide themes to probe for further detail in the remaining FGDs. See 'Annex 5: Data Analysis Framework' for further detail.

---

[2] This will include Syrians in the southern governorates e.g. Ma'an or rural informal tented settlements (ITS) in Tafila. Specific location to be determined following Key Informant Interviews (KIIs).

6. Product Typology

Table 1: Type and number of products required

Type of Product	Number of Product(s)	Additional information
Report	1	Final analytical report
Presentation	2	Preliminary and final presentations

7. Management arrangements and work plan

7.1. Roles and Responsibilities, Organogram

Table 2: Description of roles and responsibilities

Task Description	Responsible	Accountable	Consulted	Informed
Development of assessment methodology and tools	Assessment Officer	Assessment Manager	Steering committee	Steering committee
Training of facilitators and scribes	Field Manager, Field Officer	Field Manager	Assessment Officer and Manager	DFID, NRC
Implementing data collection (FGDs)	Project Assistants	Field Manager, Field Officer	Assessment Officer and Manager	DFID, NRC
Implementing data collection (KIIs)	Assessment Officer, Field Manager	Assessment Officer	Assessment Manager, steering committee	Steering committee
Debriefs	Assessment and Operations teams	Field Manager, Assessment Officer	Assessment Manager	DFID, NRC
Data analysis	Assessment Officer	Assessment Manager	Operations team, steering committee	DFID, NRC, steering committee
Output production	Assessment Officer	Assessment Manager	DFID, NRC	Steering committee

Responsible: *the person(s) who execute the task*

Accountable: *the person who validate the completion of the task and is accountable of the final output or milestone*

Consulted: *the person(s) who must be consulted when the task is implemented*

Informed: *the person(s) who need to be informed when the task is completed*

7.2. Work plan

Table 3: Project work plan

Activities												
Months	**March**				**April**				**May**			
Weeks	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
Desk review	▓	▓										
Kick-off meeting		▓										
Develop tools		▓	▓	▓								
First steering committee meeting				▓								
Incorporate committee feedback and finalize tools					▓							
First round of KIIs with stakeholders						▓						
FGDs (including one day of training)							▓	▓	▓			
Debriefs							▓	▓	▓			
Preliminary data analysis							▓	▓				
Second steering committee/preliminary presentation								▓				
Second round of KIIs with stakeholders										▓		
Complete data analysis									▓			
Produce outputs (report and presentation)									▓	▓	▓	
Validation of outputs (donor and HQ)											▓	▓
Third steering committee/final presentation												▓

8. Risks & Assumptions

Table 3: List of risks and mitigating action

Risk	*Mitigation Measure*
Bias towards refugees who can be easily contacted. Identification of refugee respondents using community contacts, NGO networks, and phone lists can bias the respondent group towards those who already have these contacts and thus can access information more easily.	FGDs specifically targeting hard to reach communities should help to avoid this, and KI interviews with stakeholders will be used to identify ways of accessing these groups.
Difficulty identifying and confirming PRS participants. To date, REACH assessments in Jordan have focused primarily on Syrian refugees, and at times included Jordanians living in host communities. Therefore an established relationship with the PRS community is lacking.	As a part of the steering community, REACH will work with UNRWA colleagues to identify PRS communities in Jordan and contact individuals who are interested in participating in a focus group.

9. Monitoring and Evaluation

Table 4: Monitoring and evaluation targets

Objective	External Indicator	Internal Indicator	Data collection methodology
Humanitarian staekholders are engaged in REACH programs throughout the research cycle	Number of humanitarian organizations directly contributing to IMPACT programmes	# organizations/persons attending first steering committee meeting	Fill engagement log
		# organizations/ persons providing input in tool development	Fill engagement log
		# organizations/ persons providing sources and individuals for data collection (Key Informants and FGD participants)	Fill engagement log
		# organizations/ persons attending second steering committee meeting	Fill engagement log
		# organizations/ clusters/ persons attending breifings on final report	Fill engagement log
		# organizations/ clusters/ persons requesting bilateral breifings on final report	Fill engagement log
REACH activities contribute to better programme implementation and coordination of humanitarian response	Humanitarian actors use REACH evidence/ products as a basis for decision making, aid planning and delivery	Expectations (ex. Filling information gaps, trainings, etc.) met through REACH outputs	Survey monkey
		Perceived usefulness and influence of REACH outputs	Individual interviews with HCT, HC, UN Rep, NGO CD, Senior donor rep, Government rep)
		Level of engagement of partner organizations (see also indicators for 'humanitarian stakeholders are engaged in REACH programs throughout the research cycle' objective)	Survey monkey
		Usefulness of REACH outputs for planning/ delivery of aid	Survey monkey
		Perceived quality of outputs	Survey monkey
		Perceived timeliness of outputs	Survey monkey
		Perceived technical capacity of REACH team	Survey monkey

		Recommendations to strengthen REACH programme implementation	Survey monkey
Humanitarian and governmental actors access REACH information and analysis products	Number of humanitarian organizations and/or individuals accessing IMPACT services/ products	# downloads of final report from Resource Center	Google analytics & bitly trackable links
		# dowloads of final report from Relief Web	Request to Relief Web
		# downloads of final report from Country level platforms	Request to country level platform
		# of page clicks on x product from the global newsletter	Mailchimp
Humanitarian stakeholders are using REACH products	Number of humanitarian organizations utilizing REACH products	# references in single agency documents	Fill reference log
		# references (verbal/written) explicitly stating that REACH information informed decision-making processes	Fill reference log

10. Documentation Plan

Documents to be archived:

- *ToR*
- *Data collection tools*
- *FGD debriefs*
- *FGD scribe notes*
- *KII debriefs*
- *Presentations*
- *Final report*

11. Annexes

1. Data Management Plan
2. FGD Question Route
3. KII Question Route
4. Debriefing Tool
5. Data Analysis Framework
6. Dissemination Matrix

Annex 1 : Data Management Plan[3]

Administrative Data	
Project Name	Information Consumption amongst Syrian Refugee Communities in Jordan
Project Code	13Iadl 0z4 (ACTED: 13 CXN J67)
Donor	DFID (through NRC)
Project partners	DFID, NRC
Project Description	Qualitative study examining information consumption amongst Syrian refugees living in Jordanian host communities
Project Data Contacts	Sarah Vose (sarah.vose@reach-initiative.org)
DMP Version	V1 – April 2017
Related Policies	n/a
Data Collection	
What data will you collect or create?	Qualitative data on information dissemination to Syrian refugees and Palestinian refugees from Syria in Jordan by humanitarian and governmental actors, as well as perceptions regarding understanding and use of information.
How will the data be collected or created?	Focus group discussions with refugees and Key Informant interviews with humanitarian and governmental actors
Documentation and Metadata	
What documentation and metadata will accompany the data?	- Dates and locations of FGDs and KIIs - Interviewer/facilitator, scribe, and debriefer names
Ethics and Legal Compliance	
How will you manage any ethical issues?	Information collected from participants will be confidential and anonymized: - Participants will be asked for their informed consent prior to the start of the interview or discussion - No personal identifiers such as surname or registration number will be collected. - First names will be removed from any databases and will not be used in outputs.
How will you manage copyright and Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) issues?	The partnership agreement stipulates that ownership, title, and intellectual property rights on the materials created under this project shall rest with NRC and the donor (DFID). REACH is granted a non-exclusive license to reproduce or adapt the materials created for non-commercial purposes, provided that NRC has approved this in writing and is appropriately attributed.
Storage and Backup	
How will the data be stored and backed up during the research?	During data collection all scribe notes will be stored securely in REACH offices. Once digitized, these will be destroyed. Debrief forms will be stored in three ways: 1. Locally on the debriefer's computer 2. REACH MENA Dropbox 3. REACH Jordan server Scribe's notes will be scanned and stored similarly: 1. Assessment Officer's computer 2. REACH MENA Dropbox 3. REACH Jordan server
How will you manage access and security?	Both the server and Dropbox are password protected, and Dropbox encrypts all files using 256-bit Advanced Encryption Standard (AES). Physical access to offices in which data is stored is secured, and requires pin-code access to enter.
Selection and Preservation	
Which data should be retained, shared, and/or preserved?	All digital copies of scribes notes, debrief forms, and the final datasets (i.e. Excel matrices consolidating all data from the debrief forms).

---

[3] Adapted from: DCC. (2013). Checklist for a Data Management Plan. v.4.0. Edinburgh: Digital CurationCentre. Available online: http://www.dcc.ac.uk/resources/data-management-plans

What is the long-term preservation plan for the dataset?	The data will be preserved on the REACH Jordan server.
Data Sharing	
How will you share the data?	The cleaned and consolidated data will not be published, but can be shared upon request from the project partners. Key findings from the data will be shared through preliminary and final presentations to the steering committee/other interested parties.
Are any restrictions on data sharing required?	As ownership of the data will lie with NRC and DFID, requests for access to either the raw or the cleaned and consolidated data will be directed to these parties.
Responsibilities	
Who will be responsible for data management?	REACH Jordan Assessment Officer

Annex 2 : FGD Questionnaire

Information consumption amongst Syrian refugee communities in Jordan

Focus group discussion question route

Introduction

Fill in the OKD form with each participants' information:

Welcome and introduction (5 minutes)

- Hello, thank you for your willingness to participate in this session today. We appreciate your time as your point of view is important to us.
- The goal of this session is to gather information on the relevance and effectiveness of media used by humanitarian actors to disseminate information in Jordan, as well as well receive community opinions regarding means to improve the communication of information to refugees in the host communities in Jordan. This data collection exercise aims to inform the programming and planning of humanitarian agencies in the country. **Please answer *all* questions in reference to your sex and age group, and make it very clear if you are ever referring to other demographics.**
- All information you provide to us today will remain anonymous. I and the other group participants would appreciate if you do not discuss the comments made by members of the group outside of this discussion. 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, we very much appreciate your involvement and ask you to participate as much as possible.
- This discussion will take no more than 1.5 hours. We appreciate your time and attention.

Ground Rules (2 minutes)

- It is very important that only one person speaks at a time. Though you may be tempted to jump in when someone else is talking, please wait until they have finished. We will be sure to listen to the opinions of everyone in the group.
- There are no right or wrong answers.
- You do not have to agree with the views of other people in the group. It is important that everyone is able to express their own opinions openly so please respect what others have to say.

Section 1: Information sources

These questions aim to introduce the topic of information dissemination to the group and start discussions regarding available and preferred information sources. The engagement question is designed to narrow the focus of the discussion from a wide range of services or policies to a few that are of most interest to the group.

1. **(Engagement question) For which issues or topics do you most frequently need or seek information? This can include information about accessing services (like education, health care, protection, or psychosocial services) receiving humanitarian assistance, government policies about obtaining work permits or MoI service cards, or any other area which I have not mentioned.**

    a. *Participatory exercise: While the facilitator moderates the discussion, the scribe records the answers provided from the group on a flipchart. Once all responses are recorded on the flipchart, the facilitator asks the participants to mark a dot next to their top three information areas. The 2-3 information areas with the highest number of dots will be selected to guide the discussion.*

    [Repeat the following questions for each of the 2-3 information areas selected in the participatory exercise]

Section 2: Information communication experiences

The following questions aim to understand participants' past experiences in engaging with different information sources, how different factors surrounding information dissemination affect comprehension, and how the information is used

2.a. Describe a time where you received information about _____ where the information received fully met your needs. (Please get as much detail as possible about their understanding of the topic that they are discussing i.e. what information are they saying they do know such as regulations surrounding application for work permits or eligibility criteria for eye-scan assistance)

Discussion probes

    i.   How was the information delivered to you, and was this an effective method? Did you seek the information or was it provided unprompted?

    ii.   [If word-of-mouth/friends/neighbours/etc. is the method] Where does _____ obtain this information?

          1.   Describe how the information is shared – passed on verbally? Through social media? *(if through social media, ask if through specific Facebook pages, WhatsApp groups, etc.)*

    iii.   Did you find the information provided to be clear and comprehensive? Was anything left out that you would have liked to have known?

    iv.   Do you feel that you understood the information you received?

    v.   What are the main advantages and disadvantages of this method of receiving information? i.e. is it trustworthy/ reliable?

    vi.   Were you able to use the information to make better decisions for yourself or for your household? Why or why not?

2.b. What are the key areas of information you feel that you lack? Why do you think this is? (Hint: Are you unable to find information about the facility offering the service, such as location, operating hours, registration information, or cost of services? Are you lacking information about submitting feedback or complaints regarding a humanitarian NGO providing services or assistance? Are you lacking up-to-date information?)

Discussion probes

    i.   How would you prefer to receive information about _____?

    ii.   Did you seek any alternative or additional sources to corroborate the information you received, such as fellow community members or social media groups, or did you feel that this was not necessary? Why?

    iii.   [If participants do not seem to have a clear understanding of the issue] It seems there is some confusion regarding the process for ____. How has a lack of clarity affected your ability to use this information to obtain ____ (work permits, enroll children in school, etc.)?

    iv.   [If participants do seem to have a clear understanding of the issue] It seems that everyone is familiar with the process for ____. If information is not the issue, what are some other reasons for why individuals in your community do not obtain ____ (work permits, enroll children in school, etc.)?

    v.   What has been the impact of this lack of information on how you access services or exercise legal entitlements?

3.a. Describe a time where you received information about _____, where the information received did <u>not</u> fully meet your needs.

Discussion probes

    i.   How was the information delivered to you? Did you find this to be an effective method? Why or why not? Did you seek the information or was it provided unprompted?

ii. What are the challenges you typically face when information is provided to you through this method?

iii. Did you find the information to be confusing or difficult to understand?

iv. Do you find the information source/ channel to be trustworthy? Why?

v. Was the information you received incomplete? What additional information would you have liked to receive?

vi. Did you receive the information too late to actually use it in your personal or household decision making?

vii. Do you feel that you understood the information that you did receive?

viii. Where there any advantages to receiving information via this method? i.e. is it trustworthy/ reliable?

ix. Given the challenges you've described, did you try to seek out alternative sources to clarify or confirm the information you received, such as fellow community members or social media groups? What sources, and why?

3.b. What are the key areas of information you feel that you lack? Why do you think this is? (Hint: Are you unable to find information about the facility offering the service, such as location, operating hours, registration information, or cost of services? Are you lacking information about submitting feedback or complaints regarding a humanitarian NGO providing services or assistance? Are you lacking up-to-date information?)

Discussion probes

i. How would you prefer to receive information about _____?

ii. [If participants do not seem to have a clear understanding of the issue] It seems there is some confusion regarding the process for ____. How has a lack of clarity affected your ability to use this information to obtain ____ (work permits, enroll children in school, etc.)?

iii. [If participants do seem to have a clear understanding of the issue] It seems that everyone is familiar with the process for ____. If information is not the issue, what are some other reasons for why individuals in your community do not obtain ____ (work permits, enroll children in school, etc.)?

4. Have you ever faced a situation where two sources of information provided inaccurate or contradictory information? Please describe the situation.

Discussion probes

i. What were the two sources?

ii. How did the information differ?

iii. Did this impact your ability to use the information effectively? How so?

iv. Has receiving this contradictory information affected how you view these information sources?

v. Do you feel that either of these sources are less reliable or trustworthy as a result? Why or why not?

5. Describe a situation where you have received information that helped you or your household make a major decision.

Discussion probes

i. What was the information source/channel? Was the information delivered to you unprompted, or did you actively consult the source?

ii. What kind of impact did receiving this information have on your decision making process?

iii. Did the information you received help you access specific services, assistance, or legal entitlements that you otherwise would not have been able to access?

iv. What can be done in the future to ensure that information dissemination provides greater support to your decision making process? (Hint: repetition of the information, multi-channel communications).

6. **Do you feel that access to information about _____ is dependent on any other factors, such as age, sex, disability, literacy, geographic location, or access to/possession of communications technology?**

Section 3: Information Communication Technology

The following questions aim to understand participants' level of engagement with information communication technologies, and willingness to engage with new platforms. If you feel that issues such as internet and chat application use has been adequately discussed, please move past question 7.

7. **Would you be comfortable using the internet to access information about _____? Why or why not?**

   a. **Discussion probes**

      i. Have you ever used UNHCR's services advisor? If so, describe your experience using the website and your frequency of use.

      ii. Do social media sites like Facebook play a role in how you access information? If so, describe your experience using such mediums and your frequency of use.

      iii. Do you use chat applications like Whatsapp or Viber to receive or share information with friends, family, neighbours, or other members of your community? If so, describe your experience using chat groups or messages and your frequency of use.

8. **What are your opinions about a smart-phone application that would allow you to access the experiences of other Syrian refugees in your geographic area with a particular service?**
   a. **Discussion probes**

      i. What could be potential advantages and drawbacks of a digital tool like this?

      ii. Would particular groups in your community be more inclined to use it, for example men versus women, specific age

Annex 3 : KII Questionnaire

Information consumption amongst Syrian refugee communities in Jordan

Key Informant question route

Date:
Name:
Organization:
Position:

Section 1: Engagement with Beneficiaries

1.   In what ways do you engage with beneficiaries in your work? I.e. what sectors/ areas (This can include service provision such as education, healthcare, protection, psychosocial services, humanitarian assistance, or livelihoods activities). *Please describe in as much detail as possible.*

2.   At what level, if any, are you engaged in beneficiary communications? I.e. General policy on messaging, case work, distribution worker etc.

3.   What are the issues or topics that you perceive to be the most relevant to beneficiaries?
- In your experience, do you find these are the issues or topics that beneficiaries are most interested in? Why?
- What are the issues or topics that you perceive beneficiaries to be least interested in? Why do you think this is?
- What they see as beneficiary's main needs
- How do you plan communication strategies around this? I.e. specific targeting?

Section 2: Communication of information

4.   What are the main mechanisms through which you are providing information about _____ to Syrian refugees in host communities? (*Prompt:* Formal mechanisms such as radio, TV, SMS, flyers and leaflets, from NGO workers or government ministries etc. or informal such as Whatsapp groups, social media, word of mouth, community gatherings)
- What they think works/ what doesn't
- How effective they perceive their strategies
- Specific communication mechanisms that have worked well
- How NGOs capitalise on their programming in communication strategies
- In what ways do you think that the mechanisms used affects the level of beneficiary engagement? Why so?
- Are there mechanisms you think beneficiaries prefer or find more reliable?

5.   Do you think that the information communicated meets beneficiary needs? Please elaborate.

Section 3: Challenges faced in the communication process

6.   What problems that you know of do beneficiaries face in accessing this information?
- In your opinion, is this affected by demographics?
- How do you try to address this?

7.   What specific misunderstandings (on the part of beneficiaries) about these issues have you come across in your work? Please elaborate and give as much detail as possible.

8.   In your experience, what do you think is at the origin of these misunderstandings? Please elaborate. (*Prompt:* lack of clarity of information provided? Amount of information provided i.e. too much at once or too little? More effective communication channels could be used? Alteration of the original message due to informal channels? Mistrust? Conflicting information?

9.   Are there any groups of particular demographics of beneficiaries that you are struggling to reach? Why do you think this is?
- Is there a particular demographic that you perceive to be most/ least engaged?

- Why do you think that you are reaching these demographics in particular? i.e. level of interest/ relevance of the information, ways of accessing information, specific targeting campaigns
- What kind of obstacles are you facing to reach them? (Prompt: Financial obstacle? Geographic obstacle? Cultural obstacle? Etc.)
- Have you made any particular targeting efforts? If yes, what were they and how effective have they been?
- According to you, how could you better reach these beneficiaries? (Prompt: Change in the channel of communication, multi-channel communication strategy…)

10. **What information in particular do you perceive beneficiaries to most lack information about?**
- What they perceive to be the main gaps
- What do you perceive the impact of this lack of information to be on how beneficiaries access services or exercise legal entitlements?

11. **What are your information gaps? What do you need to know from this assessment?**

Annex 4: FGD Debrief Form

Question	Response		
Date (day/month/year)			
Start time			
End time			
Name of enumerator (select 2)			
Place of FGD			
Sex of participant			
Number of participants			
Age of participant			
Neighbourhood of current residence			
When did you arrive in Jordan?			
Can you read?			
Can you write?			
How engaged were the participants? Did you have any problems (please explain)?			
What issues did participants seem most interested in/ animated about?			
Were there any significant disagreements between participants? Please elaborate			
Was there anything that you felt the questionnaire did not ask/ information it did not capture?			
Do you have any suggestions for how the question route could be improved?			
Section 1			
1. What were the issues/ topics beneficiaries most frequently needed information on?			
What was the 1st issue selected			
What was the 2nd issue selected			
(What was the 3rd issue selected)			
Was there any disagreement over which were the most important topics?			
Section 2	Topic 1	Topic 2	Topic 3
2.a. Describe a time when the participants received information about this topic that fully met their needs			
How did they receive information about this topic? (if word-of-mouth please elaborate)			
Did they seek the information or was it provided unprompted?			
Did you find the information provided to be clear and comprehensive? Was anything left out that you would have liked to have known?			
Did the participant feel that they understood the information that they received?			
What are the main advantages of these methods?			

	What are the main disadvantages of these methods?			
	How trustworthy does the participant find these methods?			
	How did this information impact the participant's ability to make decisions for themselves or their household?			
2. b. What, if any, were the key areas of information the participants felt they lacked?				
	Why did they think this was?			
	What methods of information communication would beneficiaries prefer? Why?			
	Did they seek alternative or additional sources of information?			
	How has their seeming understanding/ misunderstanding affected their ability to obtain assistance/ access services or exercise entitlements?			
3.a. Describe a time when the participants received information about this topic that DID NOT fully meet their needs				
	How did they receive information about this topic? (if word-of-mouth please elaborate)			
	Did they seek the information or was it provided unprompted?			
	What were the challenges they faced receiving information this way? I.e. was it confusing or difficult to understand? Was it reliable? Etc.			
	Did you find the information provided to be clear and comprehensive? Was anything left out that you would have liked to have known?			
	Did the participant feel that they understood the information that they received?			
	Where there any advantages of these methods?			
	Did they seek alternative or additional sources of information?			
3. b. What, if any, were the key areas of information the participants felt they lacked?				
	Why did they think this was?			
	What methods of information communication would beneficiaries prefer? Why?			
	How has their seeming understanding/ misunderstanding affected their ability to obtain assistance/ access services or exercise entitlements?			
4. Have the participants ever faced a situation where two credible sources of information provided inaccurate or contradictory information? Please elaborate				
	How did this affect the participant's ability to use the information and make a decision?			
	How has this affected their opinion about the reliability of these information sources?			

5. Did the participants describe any situations where they received information that helped them to make a major decision? Please elaborate				
	What was the information source/ channel?				*20*
	What impact did this information have on the decision making process?			
	Did it help the participant access services/ assistance/ legal entitlements?			
	What can be done in the future to ensure that information dissemination provides greater support to the decision making process?			
When discussing these examples, was there any significant level of agreement/ disagreement amongst the group? Please elaborate.				
To what extent did the participants seem to understand the information they were discussing?				
6. Did participants feel that access to information was dependant on any other factors, such as age, sex, disability, literacy, geographic location etc.?				
Section 3				
7. Would they be comfortable using the internet to access information? Why or why not?		
	To what extent do they already use social media sites or chat applications to source information?	
	Were they aware of the UNHCR services provider website?	
8. What were opinions about a smart-phone application that would allow access the experiences of other Syrian refugees in your geographic area with a particular service?		
	What were seen as the potential benefits/ drawbacks?	

Annex 5: Data Analysis Framework

Research questions	Data collection method	Indicator / Variable	Question	Data collection level	Sampling	Aggregation / Disaggregation	Aggregation / Disaggregation - **First indicator / variable**
1. What is the current level of knowledge among Syrian refugees and PRS of subjects regularly communicated to refugees	FGD	Types of information reportedly received by Syrian refugees and PRS	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - Female/Male
	FGD	Types of information reportedly received by Syrian refugees and PRS	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - Governorate or geographic area
	FGD	Types of information reportedly received by Syrian refugees and PRS	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - 'Hard to reach'
	FGD	Types of information reportedly received by Syrian refugees and PRS	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - PRS
	FGD	Information reportedly known by Syrian refugees and PRS, for each 'type' or issue	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - Female/Male
	FGD	Information reportedly known by Syrian refugees and PRS, for each 'type' or issue	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - Governorate or geographic area
	FGD	Information reportedly known by Syrian refugees and PRS, for each 'type' or issue	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - 'Hard to reach'
	FGD	Information reportedly known by Syrian refugees and PRS, for each 'type' or issue	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - PRS
	KI Interview	Detailed information for each 'type' or issue from relevant key stakeholder	KI Question route	Community	Purposive	Aggregation	Community
2. By what means do Syrian refugees and PRS in Jordan receive information from humanitarian and governmental actors? a. Why are these methods used by refugees to access information? b. How effective and relevant are these methods? c. How accurate and trustworthy do refugees find these methods? Why?	FGD	Methods of information communication that refugees report using	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - Female/Male
	FGD	Methods of information communication that refugees report using	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - Governorate or geographic area
	FGD	Methods of information communication that refugees report using	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - 'Hard to reach'
	FGD	Methods of information communication that refugees report using	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - PRS
	FGD	Reported advantages and disadvantages of methods of information communication used by refugees	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - Female/Male
	FGD	Reported advantages and disadvantages of methods of information communication used by refugees	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - Governorate or geographic area
	FGD	Reported advantages and disadvantages of methods of information communication used by refugees	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - 'Hard to reach'
	FGD	Reported advantages and disadvantages of methods of information communication used by refugees	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - PRS
	FGD	Reported accuracy and trustworthiness of methods of	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - Female/Male

		information communication used by refugees					
	FGD	Reported accuracy and trustworthiness of methods of information communication used by refugees	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - Governorate or geographic area
	FGD	Reported accuracy and trustworthiness of methods of information communication used by refugees	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - 'Hard to reach'
	FGD	Reported accuracy and trustworthiness of methods of information communication used by refugees	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - PRS
3. What are the preferred means by which refugees want to receive information and why?	FGD	Reported preferred means or methods of information communication by refugees	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - Female/ Male
	FGD	Reported preferred means or methods of information communication by refugees	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - Governorate or geographic area
	FGD	Reported preferred means or methods of information communication by refugees	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - 'Hard to reach'
	FGD	Reported preferred means or methods of information communication by refugees	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - PRS
	FGD	Reported advantages and disadvantages of methods of information communication *preferred* by refugees	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - Female/ Male
	FGD	Reported advantages and disadvantages of methods of information communication *preferred* by refugees	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - Governorate or geographic area
	FGD	Reported advantages and disadvantages of methods of information communication *preferred* by refugees	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - 'Hard to reach'
	FGD	Reported advantages and disadvantages of methods of information communication *preferred* by refugees	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - PRS
4. How to refugees use the information they receive? a. To what extent is understanding affecting use of information in decision-making processes?	FGD	Reported outcome or decisions made by refugees in response to information received	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - Female/ Male
	FGD	Reported outcome or decisions made by refugees in response to information received	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - Governorate or geographic area
	FGD	Reported outcome or decisions made by refugees in response to information received	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - 'Hard to reach'
	FGD	Reported outcome or decisions made by refugees in response to information received	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - PRS
	FGD	Reported difficulty or inability to make decisions due to inadequate quantity or quality of information received by refugees	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - Female/ Male
	FGD	Reported difficulty or inability to make decisions due to inadequate quantity or quality of information received by refugees	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - Governorate or geographic area
	FGD	Reported difficulty or inability to make decisions due to inadequate quantity or quality of information received by refugees	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - 'Hard to reach'

	FGD	Reported difficulty or inability to make decisions due to inadequate quantity or quality of information received by refugees	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - PRS
5. How much of the information that is received understood by Syrian refugees and PRS? a. To what extent does the level of understanding affect trust in the information received?	FGD	Reported understanding of the information received by refugees	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - Female/ Male
	FGD	Reported understanding of the information received by refugees	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - Governorate or geographic area
	FGD	Reported understanding of the information received by refugees	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - 'Hard to reach'
	FGD	Reported understanding of the information received by refugees	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - PRS
	KI Interview	Detailed information for each 'type' or issue from relevant key stakeholder	KI Question route	Community	Purposive	Aggregation	Community
6. What information needs are not being met?	FGD	Reported information gaps	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - Female/ Male
	FGD	Reported information gaps	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - Governorate or geographic area
	FGD	Reported information gaps	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - 'Hard to reach'
	FGD	Reported information gaps	FGD Question route	Group	Purposive	Disaggregation	Group - PRS
Disaggregation / Aggregation variables	FGD	FGD Group - Female/ Male	Participants are Female/ Male	Group	Purposive	N/A	N/A
	FGD	FGD Group - Governorate or Geographic Area	Participants live in Governorate or specific geographic area	Group	Purposive	N/A	N/A
	FGD	FGD Group - Hard to reach (Syrian)	Participants are designated as 'Hard to reach'	Group	Purposive	N/A	N/A
	FGD	FGD Group - PRS	Participants are PRS	Group	Purposive	N/A	N/A
	KI Interview	KI confidence level	Information communication stakeholder or humanitarian actor	Community	Purposive	N/A	N/A

Annex 6: Dissemination Matrix

Output	Method of dissemination	Audience	Time frame
Analytical report	• Shared directly with UNICEF • Sector working group mailing lists • Uploaded to the REACH resource centre • Uploaded to ReliefWeb • Social media, including REACH Twitter and Facebook	• DFID and NRC • Beneficiary Information Consumption Steering Committee • Key stakeholders and relevant actors operating Jordan	• To be completed within contract (by end of May)
Presentations	• Preliminary findings presentation to be given to the steering committee midway through data collection • Key findings presentation to be given to the steering committee once data collection and analysis is complete • Following review and completion of report, presentations may be given to all relevant sectoral working groups	• DFID and NRC • Beneficiary Information Consumption Steering Committee • Key stakeholders and relevant actors operating Jordan	• Preliminary presentation to be given in the final week of April • Final presentation to be given following completion of the report (end of May)