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1 **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Explosive Remnants of War (ERW) Risk Education Knowledge, Attitude and Practices (KAP) was conducted by the Danish Refugee Council (DRC) and Danish Demining Group (DDG) in December 2015 in Sanliurfa and Hatay Province of Turkey with support from the Swedish Postcode Foundation and UNICEF.

By 2015, UNHCR reports that more than 4.2 million\(^1\) people have sought refuge in neighbouring countries due to the protracted crisis in Syria, and 6.6 million\(^2\) more are internally displaced. Approximately 1.7 million Syrian Refugees reside in Turkey, the majority in South-East Turkey cities Sanliurfa, Hatay, Kilis and Gaziantep. The armed conflict has also resulted in extensive contamination of Explosive Remnants of War (ERW) in Syria, with reports of ERW-related accidents increasing since the conflict started in 2011.

DRC/DDG has been implementing ERW Risk Education to people at risk, especially children, in areas where cross-border movements and returns were recorded since 2013. The objective is to raise awareness of the risks and threats of mines and Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) and to promote safe behavior in order to decrease the number of casualties due to ERW. Though the only way to ensure safe access to conflict-affected areas is the physical removing and destruction of ERW, Risk Education allows for people to live and move safely in confirmed or suspected contaminated areas. The project continued in Hatay and Sanliurfa in partnership with UNICEF and the Swedish Postcode Foundation in 2015, and this KAP Survey is part of the project to understand the to identify and understand at-risk groups and risk taking behaviour and different factors that influence the behaviour of at-risk populations and mobility of refugees, in order to ensure that messages provided are relevant and tailored to the target group.

The survey was conducted via Mobile Computer Assisted Personal Interviews (using tablets) for quantitative study and Focus Group Discussions (FGD) for qualitative study. The KAP survey questionnaires followed recommendations from IMAS Mine Risk Education Best Practice Handbook\(^3\) and UNICEF Emergency MRE Handbook.\(^4\) Also, questions to collect data on child labour and access to education was integrated into the questionnaire, in order to understand child protection issues in the areas of work. The survey was conducted by ERW Risk Education Project Assistants and KAP Survey volunteer teams recruited in December 2015 in both locations. The survey teams were provided a comprehensive training in survey enumeration and confidentiality in data collection.

The KAP Survey covered a representative sample of 1,789 respondents; 50.4% adults, 49.5% children under 18, and 54% female and 46% male questionnaire respondents, coupled with qualitative data collected through 19 FGDs (10 adult FGDs and 9 Children) The KAP survey thereby provides valid and representative data and information on the current aspects of knowledge, attitude and practices related to ERW within the Syrian population currently based in Sanliurfa and Hatay province in Turkey. The following were the main observations:

- Syria is highly contaminated with ERWs and mines. Most of the explosive ordnance are located in areas where people live, do livelihoods and travel (roads, fields etc).
- Most of the Syrian refugees living in Turkey are frequently mobile (20% have been back to Syria since arriving in Turkey despite borders being closed) and cross over the border to Syria to visit family members and tend to their properties.
- The most at-risk group for the threat of ERW and mines are children, due to lack of information and understanding of the danger that ERW pose.
- There are consistent misconceptions (ERW are always visible, unknown areas are not dangerous, not dangerous after long time etc.) that can put adults and children in harm and at-risk of ERW-related incidents.

---


\(^3\) IMAS Mine Risk Education Best Practice Handbook 2005

• Majority of respondents (90%+) did not have any prior information about ERW/mines prior to the survey. Therefore information dissemination in this area is a gap.

Main knowledge gaps identified include; (a) low understanding of risk of ERW after long durations, (b) that ERW/mines come in different shapes, sizes and colours and are difficult to see, (c) knowing clues for dangerous areas for ERW/mines, (d) insufficient information in risks and dangers, eg. that ERW are extremely volatile and unstable and can explode even if careful, (e) children not knowing actions that can cause an ERW to explode and safe behavior around ERW (f) lack of information about types of warning signs (especially informal).

Based on these observations it is recommended to continue ERW Risk Education for Syrian refugees in Turkey based in Hatay and Sanliurfa. The main themes to focus on include:

• ERW recognition and risk;
• Information about dangerous/contaminated areas and precautions to take while travelling to such areas;
• Warning signs (informal and formal);
• Effects of not practicing safe behaviour.

From a communication perspective the survey identified that main target group for the awareness messages should be children, young adults and adults due to existing risk-taking behaviour.

It is also recommended that adults (male and female) to be engaged into a community-based model of awareness raising where adults are trained to deliver information to younger adults and children. Also methods to disseminate key information via television and social media platforms should be explored. Meanwhile, information should be disseminated via the support of hospitals/health facilities, mosques and schools, since these are channels used for receiving information.

2 BACKGROUND

The human cost of the five-year protracted and violent crisis in Syria has been grave, with hundreds of thousands losing their lives and many more countering injuries due to the widespread damage and destruction within the country. Recent reports by UNHCR showed that currently there are more than 4.2 million people displaced in neighbouring countries, majority of whom are hosted in Turkey which amounts up to 1, 700,000 people.

Furthermore, exhaustive use of explosive weapons across Syria has resulted in widespread contamination of mines and Explosive Remnants of War (ERW). There has also been an increase in the number, size and complexity of Improvised Explosive Devices (IEDs), booby-traps and cluster munitions used in the conflict since 2011 and land mines are known to be present in the Syria-Turkey border areas as well. Increased mobility due to the conflict and insufficient awareness and knowledge about the risks and types of landmines and other explosive ordnance used and their locations further complicate the issue. Risk-taking behaviour such as self-clearance, re-use of Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) and scrap-metal collection has also been reported. Consequently, reports of ERW-related accidents has increased since the conflict started in 2011.9. Meanwhile, it was reported that many refugees that returned to Kobane, Syria from Turkey in 2015 were killed or injured by mines and ERW (including booby traps and IEDs) inside Syria.10 Majority of the victims of these incidents are children.11

---

This contaminated environment poses substantial risks to the safety and security of the Syrian refugee population; hindering their lives and livelihoods and acting as a barrier to fulfilling their fundamental human rights such as access to basic needs and humanitarian aid. Over the longer-term, presence of explosive ordnance will disrupt safe return and long-term development. According to UN OCHA 2016 Humanitarian Needs Overview, 50% of the Syrian governorates highlighted explosive threats as the overall number two concern for the population.\(^{12}\)

In 2013, Danish Refugee Council (DRC) started its operations in response to the Syrian crisis focusing on protection, livelihoods and basic needs relief targeted at urban (non-camp) Syrian refugees in Sanliurfa, Hatay and Kilis provinces in Turkey. These South-Eastern border cities host at least 85% of the Syrian refugees living in Turkey. Moreover, in 2013 DRC with Danish Demining Group (DDG) – DRC’s Humanitarian Mine Action Department – initiated an ERW Risk Education project in Hatay and Sanliurfa province and in 2015 in Kilis.

Since mid-2015, ERW Risk Education in Sanliurfa and Hatay province is being implemented in partnership with UNICEF and the Swedish Postcode Foundation, aiming at ensuring people at risk being better protected from the effects of landmines and other unexploded or abandoned ordnance in risk areas where cross-border movement and returns are recorded. The project provides structured and tailored ERW Risk Education to children (6-11 years), youth (12 – 17 years) and adults (18+) that are delivered in an interactive manner designed to meet the learning abilities of each target group. All the pedagogical tools, materials and messages have been developed according to International Mine Action Standards (IMAS) and DDGs internal Mine Risk Education Standard Operation Procedures.

As part of the project, DRC/DDG undertook this Knowledge, Attitude and Practices Survey in Sanliurfa and Hatay province of Turkey during December 2015 with the aim to better understanding of the different aspects that influence the behaviour of at-risk populations towards ERW and mines, and to adapt and contextualise the materials being used for Risk Education to the target populations.

### 3 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

An ERW KAP survey is a representative survey that supports to provide a better understanding of the different aspects that influence the behaviour of at-risk populations towards ERW and mines. The aim of the KAP survey is to identify and understand at-risk groups and risk taking behaviour and different factors that influence the behaviour of at-risk populations and the mobility of refugees. Specific objectives include:

- To identify knowledge gaps and practices related to ERWs and ERW safety;
- To understand cultural beliefs and obstacles to how messages are communicated to beneficiaries;
- To identify the most effective communication channels/platforms that are appropriate to disseminate awareness messages.

Therefore, the KAP survey’s main purpose is to ensure that ERW Risk Education messages, methods and materials are developed and adapted to address the knowledge gaps, issues in practice and to the priorities of the specific target groups. This in-depth understanding of the predominant behaviours and subsequent practices within the Syrian Refugee population in Turkey towards ERW would support to plan, implement and eventually evaluate the ERW Risk Education project of DRC/DDG.

4 Methodology

4.1 Survey Design

The KAP survey was designed to collect comprehensive data from a representative sample in areas with large Syrian populations and where DR/DDG has an established presence. Therefore the survey was administered in Sanliurfa and in Hatay provinces in South-East Turkey by applying a stratified random sampling method (see section 4.2). The survey was designed to collect comprehensive data (both qualitative and quantitative) guided by IMAS Mine Risk Education Best Practice Handbook\textsuperscript{13} and UNICEF Emergency MRE Handbook\textsuperscript{14}. The survey was delivered in Arabic and Kurdish language based on the language of operation of the target district.

The survey was conducted in each location over four weeks - 7 December 2015 to 31 December 2015. This timeframe included training of survey enumerator team Coordinator and Risk Education Project Assistants, planning survey logistics and developing travel plans, and survey enumeration itself.

The data was collected with the support of 16 survey enumeration volunteers (6 in Urfa, 10 in Hatay). These volunteers were selected specifically to administer the KAP survey, with a specific Terms of Reference through the DRC Volunteer recruitment procedure.

In each location a survey coordination team was set up consisting of a DRC/DDG ERW Risk Education Project Officer acting as Survey Coordinator, ensuring coordination with survey partners, managing day-day survey administration and facilitating sample tracking for each location. Each survey coordination team further consisted of Four DRC/DDG ERW Risk Education Project Assistants whose main task was to support the survey enumeration team in survey tracking, community mobilisation and translation (when and where required) as well as facilitating Focus Group Discussions (FGD).

The survey team for Hatay was considerably larger than Sanliurfa as more locations (districts) were being covered in Hatay and the distance of travel to the villages was larger. Meanwhile, gender balance was maintained in selection of survey enumerators to ensure access to both female and male respondents were approached equally during the survey.

4.2 Sampling

The stratified random sample for the survey consisted of Syrian refugees residing in these locations, the sample for the project was calculated separately for Hatay and for Sanliurfa taking into account the distinct difference in access to the area by DRC/DDG and the particularities of the population of refugees living in the area. The criteria applied in Sanliurfa and Hatay province to choose the districts where the survey was implemented is as follows; (a) high number of urban Syrian refugees residing in the district, (b) close proximity to the Syrian border and probable mobility of the population to and from Syria as evidenced by 2014 KAP Survey in Hatay and from information obtained from local authorities (c) access to the area by the survey team through established partnerships with local Non-Governmental Organisations, International Non-Governmental Organisations and (d) authorisation from local authorities for DRC/DDG to work in the area. Finding accurate location specific population data for each location proved to be difficult and therefore population data from Turkish Interior Ministry in ORSAM Report No: 195 of January 2015 was used for sampling. The respondents were randomly selected from the cluster locations after applying a specific statistical stratified random sample. Then the data was orally collected through individual structured and semi-structured interviews, conducted by the trained Project Assistants and KAP survey volunteers. A gender focus was integrated in the survey sampling and targeting methodology by constant monitoring by the survey coordination team.

\textsuperscript{13} IMAS Mine Risk Education Best Practice Handbook 2005

As per above criteria Hatay, the survey was administered in Al tü nö zü , Antakya, Kirkhan, Kumlu, Reyhanlı, Samandağ and Yayladağ. The sample was calculated assuming that at least 190,000\textsuperscript{15} urban refugees resided in the areas, as stated by the Turkish authorities, meeting the criteria for survey administration. As such by applying a 95% confidence level and a percentage interval of 3 as a result, the survey covered 979 respondents via questionnaire in Hatay, of which 481 (49%) children under 18 and 498 (51%) adults over 18. In Hatay, the individual surveys were implemented via door-to-door surveys in villages and district centres, access via schools and in DRC Community Centres.

In Sanliurfa province, the survey was implemented in Sanliurfa Centre, Harran and Suruc, taking into account that the Syrian Refugee population was 170,000\textsuperscript{16} as per information obtained from the authorities. However, in Sanliurfa province DRC/DDG had no access to Acakale which is home to a large population of refugees residing in Sanliurfa province, therefore total population residing in Sanliurfa that DRC/DDG had access to is assumed to be approximately 100,000 and was used for sample calculation. In Sanliurfa, a sample of 800 respondents were targeted applying a similar sample calculation of 95% confidence level and a percentage interval of 3, as used in Hatay. As a result, 810 respondents were covered, of which 405 were adults and 405 children (ie. 50%). The individual surveys were implemented via door-to-door surveys in villages and district centres and via partner INGO/NGO Community Centre’s (such as AAR Japan, Kizilay/Turkish Red Crescent Society, International Blue Crescent).

This type of statistical sampling helps to translate the integrity and reliability of the data collection. By applying a 95% confidence level, the sample chosen in each location will generate a 95% certainty that each respondents specific answer was to the best of their knowledge. Meanwhile, by sampling at a percentage interval of 3, the total percentage of respondents who responded to each answer is representative of +/-3% of the whole population in that location, for an example 66% of respondents responded positively with safe behaviour actions that they would do if they see an ERW. Therefore, statistically if the question was asked to the whole representative population, 63% (66-3) to 69% (66+3) of the whole would have given the same response. The lower the percentage interval the more accurate the data is determined to be in a survey. Therefore, in this survey the data is 95% reliable that the result applies by +/-3% to the representative population.

\textsuperscript{15} Turkish Ministry of Interior, ORSAM Report No: 195, January 2015
\textsuperscript{16} Turkish Ministry of Interior, ORSAM Report No: 195, January 2015

\textbf{Figure 1:} KAP Survey Team out to do survey questionnaires in Harran, Sanliurfa (DRC/DDG December 2015)
The total number of people to be consulted for qualitative method, i.e. Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) was calculated to be representative of 10% of the statistical sample applied to each location, to ensure a representative triangulation opportunity. The FGD participants were selected in each location randomly as per gender and age group specified, but were ensured that they did not take part in the quantitative survey questionnaire to avoid double counting and overlapping triangulation. Selection of FGD members were supported by community focal points, with the support of schools in Hatay and through partner INGO/NGOs. FGDs were conducted for three main groups, one above 18 years old (female and male separately), 12-17 year olds (mixed gender), and 6-11 year old (mixed gender). Thereby, in Hatay 5 FGDs for adults and 5 for children were conducted covering 122 people. Meanwhile, in Sanliurfa 4 FGDs were conducted for adults and 5 for children, totally covering 110 people.

Overall, the KAP survey covered 1,789 respondents, i.e. 50.4% adults, 49.5% children under 18. It is a gender representative sample, of which 54% is female and 46% is male. The results were disaggregated into age groups (6-11, 12-17, 18-25, 26-59 and 60+) as well as gender to enable cross-analysis and identify possible differences between the target groups.

4.3 Questionnaire Design and Administration

The survey was conducted using two main data collection methods: structured questionnaires for quantitative study and Focus Group Discussions (FGD) to complement as qualitative study for triangulation.

The structured questionnaires included two different questionnaires designed specifically for two target age groups sampled for the survey. One questionnaire was designed and adapted for adults 18 years and over, and included 56 questions (refer to Annex A). Whilst, the second questionnaire was aimed at children under 18 years old and 43 questions specifically designed and simplified for the age group (refer to Annex B). Both KAP survey questionnaires followed recommendations from IMAS Mine Risk Education Best Practice Handbook17 and UNICEF Emergency MRE Handbook18. Also, questions to collect data on child labour and access to education was integrated into both questionnaires in consultation with UNICEF and DRC Protection Team, in order to understand child protection issues in the areas where the project is implemented.

The structured questionnaires were conducted via Mobile Computer Assisted Personal Interviews (using tablets), and was administered in Arabic and Kurdish (Kurdish in Kurdish speaking area in Suruc, Sanliurfa). This supported to reduce mistakes in data entry and enabled real-time access to data by the survey coordination team.

17 IMAS Mine Risk Education Best Practice Handbook 2005
Meanwhile, the semi-structured FGD questionnaires were also specifically developed for each age group (See Annex C and D), and included open ended questions to gather in-depth and detail information of the knowledge and attitudes towards ERW/mines and types of communication methodologies preferred by the target group.

The survey teams were provided a comprehensive training in survey enumeration, methodologies and confidentiality in data collection by the ERW Risk Education Project Coordinator. All information was kept anonymous taking into consideration the confidentiality of the data, interviews were conducted with informed consent and respondents were informed beforehand that participation was voluntary.

5 FINDINGS

5.1 Demography

Out of the survey respondents 50.4% were adults, 49.5% children were under 18. Of which, 54% is female and 46% is male. The survey was conducted for 810 respondents (405 Adults, 405 Children) in Sanliurfa and 979 respondents (498 Adults and 481 Children) in Hatay, with a total coverage of 1789 respondents.

Figure 3 below shows the disaggregation of the survey respondents by age groups and locations. In total 26% were children 6-11 years old, 24% 12-17 youth years old, 30% aged 18-34 year old young adults, 19% 35 to 59 years old adults and 2% over 60+ years old. Overall the survey demographic is 50% below 18, and 50% above 18 years old. This disaggregation was maintained in Sanliurfa and in Hatay, where survey data represents is 50% below 18, and 50% above 18 years old.
Of the adults interviewed, 69% (37% male, 33% female) could read and write Arabic, whilst 20% (7% male, 14% female) reported to being able to neither read nor write. Meanwhile, 2% could only read. Figure 4 below displays disaggregated data for Arabic language skills by location and by age. In both locations, majority of those interviewed were literate, but more so (79%) in Hatay compared to (57%) in Sanliurfa. Furthermore, adults were also questioned on their ability to read or write Kurdish, 27% of those interviewed said they couldn’t read or write Kurdish whilst 71% said they do not know. This may be because 16% of the survey in Sanliurfa was conducted in Suruc – an area where Kurdish speaking Syrian refugees from Kobane reside, of which 2% were able to read or write Kurdish.

Meanwhile, figure 5 and 6 shows the areas where respondents came from in Syria for Hatay and for Sanliurfa province separately. Majority of those interviewed were from Idlib (49%), whilst in Sanliurfa the people interviewed were from different governorates in Syria.
73% of adults interviewed had people in the household undertaking some livelihood activities. Majority (28%) worked in agriculture and 10% in construction. See figure 7 below for disaggregated data by gender and by location. For “other” people specified odd jobs such as washing cars, delivery man, working at a café, working in NGOs.
5.2 Displacement and mobility

60% of respondents (both children and adults) reported to have moved within Syria before arriving in Turkey showing the scale of internal displacement. This is a slight decrease when compared to 78% whom reported to have moved within Syria in the 2014 KAP Survey in Hatay. This difference may be because the majority of whom interviewed in Sanliurfa province was in Harran and Suruc who would have moved directly from border cities in Syria such as Kobane and Aleppo to Turkey. The data also highlighted the frequency of multiple displacement within Syria, 28% moved once, 55% 2-5 times, 17% more than 5 times within Syria before arriving in Turkey (Figure 8).

Majority of the total number of respondents (31%) arrived in Turkey in 2015. Figure 9 below shows the arrival year of the respondents in Turkey for comparison, as there are differences between the locations. This accounts to 47% in Urfa, and 18% in Hatay. As per data, majority (62%) of the people
interviewed in Hatay arrived in 2012 and 2013, 3-4 years before the survey was conducted and have been settled in Turkey for long term. Meanwhile, in Sanliurfa 80% of those interviewed had arrived 1-2 years before, in 2014 and 2015. This data for Sanliurfa may have been influenced by the survey locations in Sanliurfa - n Suruc, most refugees arrived in Turkey during the 2014 Kobane influx, and the refugee population in Harran consist of refugees who arrived in 2014 Tel-Abed influx and people who arrived irregularly over the border of Acakale looking for work.

Figure 9: Year of arrival in Turkey disaggregated by location

Of the survey respondents, 20% reported they have been back to Syria since arriving in Turkey for the first time. 12% have been to Syria once, while 7.5% have been to Syria 2-4 times and 1% more than 5 times. Meanwhile, 22% also reported that their family or friends have been back to Syria after they came to Turkey. This is a marked decrease from 2014 KAP survey in Hatay where 58% reported to have travelled to Syria, and can be associated to the Turkey/Syria borders being closed through most of 2015 but is also an indication of the increased mobility that would start if the borders reopen. Most people (52%) who had returned back returned to visit family members and to oversee property (13%). Similarly, this can correlate to the length of displacement as majority of those interviewed had arrived in Turkey during the last two or three years.

### 5.3 Child Protection and Related Issues

51% of households participating in the survey had children under 18 in the family, on average 2-3 children in a house. Whilst 89% of the children live in Turkey with both their parents, 8% live with one parent or family member and 3% live with someone they know. Therefore, majority of children interviewed has sufficient oversight of adults over their upbringing.

Access to education for children is low in the Syrian population interviewed with 31% of adults and 55% of children reporting that their children or they themselves do not attend school. Also, 47% of children do not get any alternative education either with only 3% attending educational activities with INGOs. Figure 10 highlights the reasons for children not attending school disaggregated by location, the major reasons being language barrier (8%) and costs (30%). The language barrier referred here is that majority of the schools in the area is conducted in Turkish and most families spoke Arabic. Upon analysis of the reason given for people who chose only “other” (30% out of 75% who responded to other and multiple reasons) included school being far from the area, no school in the area (this refers to Harran in Sanliurfa) and need for children to work to support the family. Also majority of the respondents marked multiple reasons with 10% stating both language barrier and costs, 15% stating language barrier, no transportation and high costs and 22% stating no vacancies, no transportation and costs. However, 42% of children who do go to school attend school 5 days a week.
This was further validated by FGDs where people stated that schools, school materials and transportation were expensive and that children couldn’t progress well due to language barrier. Furthermore, adults spoke of differential treatments and bullying by teachers and older children due to which some children refused to attend school. Adults also mentioned that some children were being placed either in lower grades for their age or higher grades for their age subjecting them to be isolated and bullied in class.

Prevalence of child labour was surprisingly low as well with 81% of adults reporting that their children do not work (see figure 11). However, due to the culture of Syrian people the FGDs highlighted that most parents do not consider their children as “working” when they support them within their own livelihoods – this applies to a child working a few hours (time they are “free”) in an agricultural field for the parents; therefore this data might not be fully accurate. In total, 19% of respondents reported that children undertook labour, of which 6% had 1 child who worked and another 6% said they had more than 5 children working. The main reason given for children undertaking child labour was to support the family (12%), 1% because they had nothing to do and 5% responded “other” which included reasons such as because children were not going school to go and to make more money.
Meanwhile, 13% of adults reported having children with disability in the family of which 66% was physical disabilities and 34% mental. All families reported to not having received any support to date.

5.4 ERW Recognition and Marking

50.39% (26% male, 24% female) of adults and 37% (19% female, 18% male) of children reported to have seen an ERW in real life when showed pictures of different ERW (see figure 12). Also 41% adults responded that there were mines and ERW in the area they used to live. This indicates the scale of ERW contamination in Syria over the past 4 years, as figure 5 and 6 above shows 51% of respondents from Hatay are from Idlib and Aleppo governorate in Syria which are known to be areas where heavy fighting has occurred and therefore widespread contamination of ERW is likely. During the FGD when showed pictures of ERWs people reacted to say that they are all over Syria, and that the conflict had caused both adults and children to be very familiar with such explosive materials.

Figure 12: ERW Recognition disaggregated by age group and gender

Figure 13 below shows where respondents reported to have seen ERWs in Syria by location. Majority of adults and children said on the roads (20% Adults, 23% children), in the fields (20% adults, 17% children), next to the road (18% adults, 23% children) and 22% said “other” – specifically in their house, in check points, all over Syria, in schools and in areas where shelling or bombing has occurred. Meanwhile, 23% of children said they do not know where they saw ERWs. This data indicates that ERW in Syria is located in areas where people would frequently travel through (roads) and work in (fields), making the threat of ERWs all the more prevalent and risky. Also that children have come across ERWs frequently, and may have been at risk of injury due to such materials at different points.
Additional, whilst most adults (55% - 23% female, 32% male) recognised warning signs for ERW/mines, 31% of children (12% female, 19% male) did not recognise the warning signs and 27% of children said that they believe that areas with ERW are always marked, whilst 15% said they don’t. During focus group discussions, generally adults and children recognised that the sign is a warning sign and indicated danger but did not know that the formal warning sign for ERW/mines indicated existence of life-threatening materials. Informal warning signs were regarded as confusing and was not recognised as warning signs by most children. This indicates the need to educate children on the types of marking being used in Syria, especially informal warning signs to discourage risk-taking behaviour.

When asked to adults how ERW/mines in the areas where they used to live in Syria was marked, 18% said it is formally marked with official skull and bones-signs. The rest of the 53% responded with various methods of informal marking such as red cloth, piled stones, painted stones, piles of sticks and graffiti with warning messages (see Figure 14 for warning signs by location). Meanwhile 3% said there were no markings and 17% responded don’t know. This indicates that existing warning signs and markings in Syria currently is informal and that there are areas where there are no markings posing grave danger to children and adults. Moreover, 73% of adults said that if seeing any of the above signs and signals would tell them that it is a dangerous area if they were walking alone, meanwhile 82% of the children responded in a similar manner suggesting existence of sound information on warning signs and markings.
However, 79% adults (32% female, 47% male) and 45% children (26% male, 19% female) identified correct behaviour for warning signs i.e. stop walking and go back to where they came from whilst 9% of adults and 36% of children said they would continue walking or don’t know (figure 15). This signifies that overall people understand the reason for warning sign and follows safe behaviour by instinct, however the low number of children that understand safe behaviour is alarming and concerning.

5.5 Knowledge, Attitudes and Beliefs about ERW

The understanding of the danger that ERW poses is high with 96.46% of adults and 93% of children expressing that they believe that ERW are dangerous. However, only, 8% adults and 15% children believe that ERWs are dangerous even if has been there for a long time or after a conflict has ended.
and 6% adults and 11% children said they do not know if it’s dangerous after such a long period of time. Meanwhile 81.34% children and 76% adults recognised that ERW may cause physical damage and harm to them if it explodes by killing, maiming or blinding them (see figure 16). This was further corroborated in FGDs where majority of adults and children all knew the effects of ERW, though 15% of adults and 8% of children said they do not know what would happen if an ERW explodes. Meanwhile, a total 10% of each demographic group specified “other” stating it will burn the area, cause destruction and trauma etc. The data is interesting as children seem to display the knowledge of the dangers better than adults, whilst both demographic does not seem to consider that ERW explosion may cause to lose an integral sense such as sight.

![Figure 16: Respondents answer to effects if an ERW explodes disaggregated by age group](image)

Though the knowledge of danger exists, the data also shows that there are prevalent misconceptions about the danger of ERW and the risk they present denoted by 19% of adults and 24% of children reporting that they believe that ERW are always visible whilst 4% of adults and 13% of children respond that they don’t know (figure 17). Also, 8% of adults and 11% of children admitted that they think that unknown areas are safe for walking and 11% of adults and 10% of children believing that it is safe to pick up an ERW as long as you are careful.
Similarly, knowledge of how an ERW may explode is again high in adults with 98% responding positive answers (touching it, stepping on it, moving it etc), however 37% of the children admitted to not knowing or that they would not explode at all by doing any of these actions. This lack of information of safe behaviour in children is concerning and reinforces the importance of ERW Risk Education for children. During FGDs adults repeatedly marked that children are most at-risk of ERW as they do not understand the danger they pose, and find the materials interesting and play with them.

Majority of adults (47%) and children (35%) named former fighting areas as areas where ERW are likely to be, understanding that contamination of ERW is likely where bombing or shelling has occurred previously (figure 18). Overall, all adults and children interviewed were able to name more than one dangerous and area likely to be contaminated such as trenches, former fighting areas, military posts, national borders etc. without prompting, showing an overall understanding of potentially dangerous areas.
5.6 Practice

The consequences of this lack of knowledge of the risks and dangers of ERW, marking and prevalence is reflected by frequent risk-taking behaviour and practice. As such, 15% of adults and 10% children reported to have entered an area where they suspected there might be landmines/ERW despite the knowledge. 7% reported they went there for travelling, 1% for farming, 1% fetching food and water and 10% stated other which included crossing borders.

Furthermore, 10% adults and 11% children reported to have someone in the family who had an accident with ERW. Of which 4% adults and 5% children said that the person who had the accident knew they were in a dangerous area. During the FGDs both women and men shed light on personal experience and case stories of ERW accidents in their home towns or that they have heard about. This includes children getting injured while playing, men collecting ERW for salvage and getting injured and booby traps going off unknowingly. Additionally, the survey showed that 5% of adults and 8% children reported to know someone keeping ERW at home for different purposes, main reason given by 10% of the total people was to re-use and to make money (see Figure 19).
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*Figure 19: Prevalence of unsafe behaviour disaggregated by age group*

However, data showed that majority of the respondents was familiar with the safe behaviour practice towards ERW, with 66% (children and adults) both positively stating the safe behaviour actions of turning back, finding another path, marking the area, telling an adult and calling for help (see figure 20 below), but the practice does not seem to fully reflect this knowledge.
Similarly, 68% of adults and 54% of children also stated positive behaviour if they see someone tampering, handling or playing with an ERW, such as run away, tell him or her to stop, shout for help and call for police. However, 23% adults and 15% children said they don’t know what they would do, whilst 5% adults and as many as 18% children said they would take it away from him or her.

5.7 Communication – Transfer of Knowledge

The survey supported to understand the different communication channels that the Syrian population in Hatay and Sanliurfa use to get information about health and other important information. As seen in Figure 21 below both female (32%) and male (29%) adults primarily get their information via television. The next main source of information is from friends, family and neighbours (10% female, 13% male). Meanwhile, 10% of the women reported that they get information from hospitals and health facilities. Noticably, only 2% male and 3% female reported to get information via radio and does not seem to be as popular as televisions. Meanwhile, online news websites seem to be more popular with men (7%) compared with women (3%). People also specified Muhtars (elected village head), “educated people” and internet as main sources of information. In the FGDs, people said that their main source of information for safety information and the situation in Syria was via Facebook pages operated by people inside Syria, and this would be the primary source to obtain information if they were to travel back to Syria.
Furthermore, when asked to adults who are the most influential people in their lives both female (43%) and male (41%) responded their parents. 27% of the men and 12% of the women reported it was their spouse. 24% and 23% male and female adults stated other and named Islamic scholars, political leaders and teachers as their role models. During FGDs, adults highlighted that the best method to teach children would be via teachers and through schools. They also stressed that messages need to be delivered in Arabic language in a method that children would easily understand. Meanwhile, women’s FGDs stressed that women would prefer to receive messages at home from female members of their own community. Children were eager to learn either from their parents or teachers. This data concludes that the most effective methods to provide awareness messages to this population would be television and peer-peer information sharing. As parents were named as the most influential group for adult women and men, and would apply to children as well, engaging elderly and young adults to deliver awareness messages would be useful; adopting a community-based approach and to include parents when targeting children. Clearly, engaging the Syrian population to deliver awareness messages and ERW Risk Education is the best way to engage the people and potentially see a behaviour change.

The survey also investigated whether people had received information about risks and threats regarding ERW/mines prior to the survey. 92% of children and 91% of adults of all respondents interviewed had not previously received any information about ERW/mines or safe behaviour (see figure 22). 8% children and adults both said they have received information about this topic before from family (17% adults, 50% children), friends (15% adults, 10% children), military/ex-military or soldiers (10% adults, 6% children) and from NGOs (20% adults and 11% children).
The KAP survey was completed for 1,789 respondents; 50.4% adults, 49.5% children under 18 making a statistically valid sample to evaluate against the objectives. 54% of the respondents were female and 46% were male, corroborating a gender balanced sample. Specifically, the survey was conducted for 810 respondents (405 adults, 405 children) in Sanliurfa and 979 respondents (498 adults and 481 children) in Hatay providing opportunity to analyse data in a location specific manner. Qualitative data was collected through 19 FGDs (10 adult and 9 children) to support triangulation. The KAP survey provided valid and representative data and information on the current aspects of knowledge, attitude and practices related to ERW within the Syrian population currently based in Sanliurfa and Hatay province in Turkey.

6.1 Prevalence of ERW and Displacement Movements

The 5 year conflict in Syria has caused widespread and frequent internal displacement with 60% of respondents (both children and adults) reported to have moved within Syria before arriving in Turkey and at least 55% reporting to have moved 2-5 times within Syria before arriving in Turkey.

This rapid and recurrent displacement not only poses an extensive risk to the Syrian population residing inside Syria, but also poses an invariable threat to those who have sought refuge and settled in Turkey. The survey found this population to be highly mobile as well of which 20% of the respondents, of whom 31% arrived in Turkey in 2015, reported they have been back to Syria since first arriving in Turkey and 22% reported their family or friends have been back to Syria since arriving in Turkey. The survey demographic data shows that respondents in Hatay and Sanliurfa come from areas where there have been intense armed violence such as Idlib, Aleppo, Hama and Kobane. Most people (52%) who had returned back returned to visit family members and to oversee property (13%). This is a significant amount when correlated that the borders between Syria and Turkey being largely officially closed in 2015. Surmising that the majority of these movements must have been irregular border crossings making these movements furthermore risky and dangerous due to the borders between Turkey-Syria being mined, especially non-formal crossing areas.

41% of the adult respondents stated that there were mines and ERW in the area they used to live in Syria. Most respondents (20% adults and 23% children) reported that ERW were mostly found on roads and on the fields (18% adults and 17% children) where they work. This indicates the extent of ERW
contamination in Syria at the moment and depicts that the ERW contamination is centered in the areas where people reside, travel and conduct livelihoods putting their life at risk. Furthermore, this poses a considerable threat to the high mobile displaced populations, and the populations moving between Turkey and Syria as reported above. Therefore, information and awareness about safety measures to take to protect themselves from ERW and safe behaviour if they come across ERW is urgent and necessary.

6.2 Existing Knowledge and Knowledge Gaps

The ERW contamination in Syria has caused the vastly displaced Syrian population to be intrinsically informed and familiar with ERW and to build an overall understanding that ERW and mines. The general knowledge about risks and contamination of ERW proved to be rather high within the population surveyed; 81% children and 76% adults identified that ERW are harmful and may cause death or injuries, whilst 93% children and 96% adults admitted that they believe ERW are dangerous. In addition, 47% adults and 35% children showed understanding that contamination of ERW is more likely to be where bombing or shelling has occurred previously and in former military areas, military posts and borders. The difference between genders in the response was negligible for both age groups.

Meanwhile, 55% adults recognized warning signs for ERW/mines, with 18% reporting the areas where they used to live in Syria was marked formally, and 53% reporting it was marked informally in different ways. However, 15% of the children participating in the survey said dangerous areas are always marked, 31% (12% female, 19% male) of the children did not recognise the warning signs, and adults had difficulty identifying informal warning signs as markings for ERW. This indicates the need to educate especially children on the types of marking being used in Syria, in particular informal warning signs, and areas likely to be contaminated to discourage risk-taking behaviour.

However, one main concern is about the predominant myths, misconceptions towards the risk of ERW that the data represents. For an example, data shows that people believe that ERW cannot be dangerous if handled carefully even though most (90%) said that ERW were generally dangerous. As such, 23% of adults and 37% of children reported that they believed that ERW are always visible or were not sure about it and 8% of adults and 11% of children think that unknown areas are safe for walking. Additionally, 6% adults and 11% children said they do not know if ERW are dangerous after a long period of time and as many as 37% of the children did not know whether touching, stepping and moving an ERW would cause it to explode. Again the difference between genders in the response was negligible for both age groups, but is specified in detail in Section 5. This lack of information of safe behavior amongst children is concerning and reinforces the importance of ERW Risk Education specifically targeting children.

6.3 Risk-taking Behaviour

These prevalent misconceptions, contradictions and “normalisation” attitude is concerning, and may lead to increased risk taking behaviour even though a general awareness exists. These knowledge gaps Whilst 66% (children and adults) both positively stated safe behaviour actions i.e. stop walking, call for help and go back to where they came from if they see a warning sign, 15% of adults and 10% children reported to have entered an area where they suspected there might be ERW/mines despite the knowledge. There was no specific differences by gender. 10% adults and 11% children also reported to have someone in the family who had an accident with ERW of which 4% adults and 5% children said that the person who had the accident knew they were in a dangerous area.

Moreover, research shows that 27% of ERW accident victims in Syria in 2015 was children. Particularly concerning was the lack of knowledge of actions that might cause an ERW to explode (touching, throwing a stone and etc) in children under 18. Overall data from the survey also corroborates that

---

children under 18 are more unaware of the impacts and effects of ERW compared to adults. This concludes that children is a high-risk group to getting injured by ERW.

6.4 Risk Education and Core Messages

The survey thereby confirms the importance and priority to continue ERW Risk Education in Syria-Turkey border provinces. It also supports to identify the main messages that need to be prioritised in delivering ERW Risk Education to ensure that existing knowledge gaps and misconceptions which lead to risk taking behaviour is appropriately targeted. The main topics and themes to focus on include:

- ERW recognition and risks: ERW/mines can come in different shapes, sizes and colours and can be dangerous for a long time;
- Dangerous areas: what are the clues that show that areas are contaminated with ERW and areas likely to be contaminated;
- Precautions to take while travelling to such areas;
- Recognising warning signs and safe behaviour around warning signs;
- Effects (physical, social and economic) of not practicing safe behaviour.

6.5 Information Dissemination

Most people who took part in the survey (90%+) had not received any information about ERW/mines or safe behaviour prior to the survey. This indicates that information dissemination in this area is a gap and coordination with other Humanitarian Mine Action organisations is recommended to ensure better coverage.

The KAP survey also successfully supported to understand cultural beliefs and obstacles to how messages are communicated to beneficiaries and to identify the most effective communication channels/platforms that are appropriate to disseminate awareness messages. The findings indicate that the surveyed Syrian population prefer to receive awareness messages in their own language of operation (Arabic or Kurdish) through people of their own community (Syrians). Women also mentioned that they would prefer to receive messages via women in their own homes instead of outside. Similarly, parents specified that they would prefer their children to receive messages via teachers or educated people.

Also from the responses derived from the KAP, it is determined that a community-based methodology that would engage community members to learn and improve awareness of each other would be effective with the Syrian population. Majority (40%) of adults specified that the most influential people for them were their parents and elderly, indicating that engaging community members to spread information would be a suitable methodology.

As 30% of the respondents specified that they receive information via television and some (3%) by social media platforms (especially Facebook) one main methodology that can be effective would be to utilise these resources for information dissemination. However, this needs to be explored through Turkish legal framework. Also it needs to be approached with caution due to sensitivity of the topic and prevalent misconceptions already existing in the target group.

Furthermore, whilst literacy is generally high for Arabic within the population, methodology that include non-written materials with clear visual messages and flipcharts should be used and further explored to ensure involvement and full inclusion of all groups.

In conclusion, this KAP survey provided insight into the existing knowledge, the gaps and the attitudes that inform the behaviour and practices of Syrian people in Turkey towards ERWs. It also brought to light underlying risk-taking behaviours such as mobility, which is difficult to identify without such a survey. Overall, it confirms that ERW Risk Education is crucial to ensure that people are safe and protected from threats of ERWs and mines in case of irregular or mass returns.