Proceedings Paper:
Al-Homoud, M. and Ghanem, H. (2019) Regeneration of Amman center — social acceptance of Syrian migrants in downtown Amman. In: International Journal on Proceedings of Science and Technology (Resourceedings). 2nd Green Urbanism Conference - Periphery as a Catalyst for Energy and skills, 05-06 Dec 2018, Rome, Italy. IEREK Press , pp. 27-42.

10.21625/resourceedings.v2i1.450

IEREK PRESS Academic Research Community

http://www.press.ierek.com

Resourceedings Proceedings of Science and Technology

CrossMark

ISSN (Print: 2537-0731, online: 2537-074X)

International Journal on:

Proceedings of Science and Technology

DOI: 10.21625/resourceedings.v2i1.450

Regeneration of Amman Center — Social Acceptance of Syrian Migrants in Downtown Amman

Prof. Dr. Majd Al-Homoud[1], Hala Ghanem[2]

[1]*School of Architecture and Built Environment, German Jordanian University, P. O. Box 35247, Amman 11180, Jordan. , Email: majd.alhomoud@gju.edu.jo*

[2]*School of Architecture and Built Environment, German Jordanian University, P. O. Box 35247, Amman 11180, Jordan*

Abstract

Several studies discussed attitudes towards migrants; some of the issues pointed out are integration that requires interaction between migrants and the host society. Homogenous social groupings produce stronger communities. As the conflict in Syria entered its fifth year, Jordan hosted about 1.4 million registered Syrians, of whom 646,700 are informal refugees. Eighty-five percent of the refugees live outside camps in some of the poorest areas of Jordan. Consequently, new household's typologies pressured the supply side. Such non-camp refugees' migration patterns and housing market conditions formed ethnic homogeneous enclaves in different locations in Amman. Accordingly, non-camp refugees occupied and rented the upper floors of mixed used commercial buildings in downtown Amman.

The present study investigated social acceptance of Syrian migrants residing in upper floors of commercial mixed used buildings located in the city center of Amman. The primary purpose of this research is to study how social acceptance of Syrian migrants is influenced by social gating. The hypothesis of the present study states that social acceptance of Syrian migrants in downtown Amman is influenced by sense of merchants' sense of social gating. The significance of the study stems from that the development of downtown Amman with such rich social context can be informative and useful for strategic planners, local governments, NGO's, social workers, and psychologists. This paper offers such an opportunity to reflect on an unfolding crisis that is of major social concern with changing urban demographics.

The study was conducted using a quantitative and qualitative research strategy; an embedded research design was used. The quantitative method was conducted using a survey with downtown merchants, in addition to supportive qualitative methods of face-to-face interviews. The study was conducted in the central part of Amman, known locally as Wast Al-balad, which is considered the old commercial area that dates back to the second quarter of the twentieth century. Some of these secondary residential units became spaces (enclaves) for migrants that formed ethnic low-income enclaves. In the last five years, low-income Syrian migrants started to rent these units in Amman's urban center. Outcomes indicated that social cohesion is the strongest motivator for acceptance of outsiders by the local merchants to reside in the upper floors of the commercial buildings of Downtown Amman area.

Keywords

Regeneration; city; center; Immigrants; Jordan; Residential; Housing; Infill; social; Gating; Cohesion; Syrian; Refugees

1. Introduction

Many studies reflected that successful integration of migrants requires meaningful interaction between with the host society (Arous, 2013; Rudiger, 2008). Spencer (2008) describes integration as a two-way process. Homogeneous groupings produce communities that are established based on common backgrounds or mutual interests or values (Gans, 1961; Mitchel, 1996). Migrants form ethnic homogenous groups to reinforce their identities and their political strengths by concentrating themselves in a certain geopolitical border in the host community (Fischer, 1984). Meanwhile, insiders use social gating as a form of resistance to limit interaction and/or integration with new comers or outsiders. Social gating is a concept of socially defending neighborhoods. It is a form of collective self-awareness against outsiders' threat to their identity and their spatial units, especially when physical boundaries are not clearly defined (Suttles, 1972; Newman, 1973; Flanagan, 1990).

As the conflict in Syria entered its fifth year, Jordan hosted about 1.4 million registered Syrians, of whom 646,700 are informal refugees. Eighty-five percent of the refugees lived outside camps in some of the poorest areas of Jordan; twenty-eight percent of which are residing in Amman with a significant proportion are considered as vulnerable (MoP, 2015). Accordingly, the needs of Syrian migrants in Jordan boomed, and new households became a pressure on the supply side (UN Habitat, 2014). Additionally, in some municipalities, refugees outnumbered residents; therefore it impacted inflation, employment, access to public services, and community resources that fuelled local tensions and threatened to ignite social unrest (MoP, 2015).

Such migration patterns and housing market conditions formed ethnic homogenous enclaves in multiple locations in Amman (MoP, 2015). According to a report of UNHCR in 2014, Central Amman hosts more than twenty thousand non-camp migrants, this influx of migrants facilitated the come back to city center trend, and infill locations attracted many of them, where they formed low-income communities. Amman downtown attracted many of them and refugees fluxed into mixed use commercial buildings' upper floors and rented the residential units there.

The study investigates social acceptance of downtown Amman merchants towards Syrian migrants residing in the upper floors of their rented building stores, as well as, it explores the availability of social gating patterns. The primary purpose of this research is to study how social acceptance of Syrian migrants is influencing the social gating attributes. To achieve the primary purpose of the present study, the following research questions are presented:

1.What are the main conflicts between the migrants and the host community in Amman?

2.Will the host community in downtown Amman reject the Syrian migrants' ethnic enclaves and form a social gating against them?

3.How does accepting the migrants affect various attributes of social gating?

The hypothesis of the present study states that social acceptance of Syrian migrants in downtown Amman is influenced by sense of merchants' social gating. The sub hypotheses of the study include:

1.Social acceptance of Syrian migrants is affected by merchants' natural surveillance.

2.Social acceptance of Syrian migrants is affected by merchants' zone of influence.

3.Social acceptance of Syrian migrants is affected by social cohesion of merchants.

The significance of the study stems from that the development of downtown Amman with such rich social context can be informative and useful for strategic planners, local governments, NGO's, social workers, and psychologists.

Related literature did not clearly concentrate on the social impacts of displacement in urban centers. Most studies advocate on behalf of urban refugees and do not consider the impacts of their urbanization on settled (out-side camps) populations. This paper will offers such an opportunity to reflect on an unfolding crisis that is of major social concern with changing urban demographics.

The study will be conducted using a combination of both quantitative and qualitative research strategy; an embedded design will be used. The quantitative method is conducted using a survey of downtown merchants. In addition to a qualitative methods collecting data from face-to-face interviews and documents.

Research Setting

The study was conducted in the central part of Amman, known locally as Wast Al-balad, which is considered the old commercial area that dates back to the second quarter of the twentieth century. Downtown Amman is made up of a numerous Souqs (markets) and independently owned businesses. Buildings contain shops along the ground floor, while their upper floors house a variety of functions, including office, café, low-budget hotel space, sewing workshops and small residential units. Some of these upper-floor spaces have become vacant over the years (see Figure 1). Some of these small residential units became spaces for migrants that formed ethnic low-income enclaves. In the last five years, low-income Syrian migrants started to rent these units in Amman's urban center. More than twenty thousand registered migrants resided in Central Amman (UNHCR, 2014). Precise mapping of these masses is not available, therefore an area of 540 (sq. km) in Wast Al-balad was selected for conducting the field study. Outcomes of the study aim to map certain locations of Syrian non-camp refugees' communities and potential locations of their agglomerations.

2. Literature Background

The literature review covers the concepts of social acceptance, social gating, and social cohesion. The following is a thematic review of literature.

2.1. Social Acceptance

Attitudes of local people and factors affecting infill acceptability are widely studied by Jenks (1996) who introduced the concept of social capacity. Social capacity is a measure of limits to intensification in terms of local acceptance. According to Jenks (1997) intensification can have both positive and negative impacts, if managed well, the process can be acceptable, and provide more sustainable urban areas to the city. The character and quality of an area impacts how intensification is received. In established high status areas, which have more to lose from changes, intensification is less readily accepted. People living in more suburban often seek to protect peace, quietness, and space. Their primary concern is about environmental quality. By contrast, people in mixed-use, central urban areas appear to be tolerant to change (Breheny, 1997). Spencer (2003) stated that in order to conceive social acceptance between insiders and new comers; three charaxteristics must be found in the community: assimilation, inclusion, and participation.

Assimilation: It is a pre-existing unified social order with a homogeneous culture for a set of values. A migrant's origin may make complete assimilation impossible. Although it stays difficult to trace what exactly migrant should assimilate to; they may assimilate to working class, metropolitan lifestyles, or pre-existing ethnic communities (Rudiger, 2008).

Inclusion and Participation: Social inclusion is a policy directed at eliminating the exclusion of disadvantaged groups to enable them to have access, use, participation, and benefit from a certain area of a society (EU, 2011). Spencer (2008) indicated that social integration is a highly normative concept that implies desirable social order with a high degree of internal cohesion.

2.2. Social Gating – Resistance to integrate

2.2.1. Socially Defended Neighborhoods

A defended neighborhood is a spatial unit that serves daily living needs for its members who develop certain degree of collective self-awareness in response to a threatening outside force. Suttles (1972) described it as an ascribed grouping and its members who are joined in a common problem. Flanagan (1990) identified defended neighborhood through formed common perception against an outside threat. He indicated that defended neighborhoods are examples of how conflict and cohesion occur as outcomes of social processes.

2.2.2. Defensible Space

Newman (1973) studies of urban residential areas showed how physical design contributed to victimization. Newman explored the concepts of human territoriality, natural surveillance, and the modification of existing structures to effectively reduce crime, which are the basis of building security design today. Multiple critics attacked this theory focusing only on the physical aspects of the built environment and that it is vague and ill-defined to be empirically tested (Hillier, 1973; Taylor et al. 1980). The following are key principles of Newman's theory:

Natural Surveillance: This term refers to the capacity of the physical design to provide residents with surveillance opportunities. When people observe and control public spaces they leave the environment safer, and allow enhanced utilization of public areas. Thus, housing units' orientation enhances residents' ability to control public areas, especially by directing openings towards shared open spaces (Newman, 1972).

Zone of Influence: This term refers to clear identification of territorial zones of users' impact and influence. Boundaries should distinctly identify the extent and the field of influence. People take care of areas identified as their own, where they maintain feelings of identity, and intruders cab be easily identified. Strong boundaries definition creates territorial responsibilities, safer environment, and strengthens communal ties (Newman, 1972).

2.3. Social Cohesion:

Social cohesion is multi-dimensional in nature, not only to inclusion of and participation by all in economic, social, cultural and political life, but also to a sense of solidarity and belonging to society based on an effective enjoyment of citizenship (CoE, 2008). Rudiger (2008) indicated that the role of social interaction is crucial in the process of integration. It is through social contacts and the climate created by the possibility of such contacts that people develop sense of belonging in a particular social space. However, social cohesion does not require communities to merge into a homogeneous entity populated by individualists lacking differences and governed by a set of similar norms. On the contrary, cohesion can be achieved in a pluralist society through the interaction of different communities that build a bond through the recognition of both difference and interdependence (Spencer, 2008).

3. Methodology

A mixed methods design was used with embedded design to conduct data collection. A quantitative data collection supported by qualitative data collection was utilized.

3.1. Qualitative Design

Supportive qualitative methods were conducted to enrich overall understanding of the quantitative data. Face-to-face semi-structured interviews were conducted at the selected research setting. Interviews were recorded using audiotapes and then transcribed into text. Additionally, responses to an open-ended questionnaire are gathered. These interviews are used so participants can best voice their experiences.

3.2. Quantitative Design

A quantitative survey is conducted to test hypothesis.

Target Population and Unit of Analysis: The target population of the study was merchants at the target area in Amman downtown. The unit of analysis was the shop owners in the selected area of 540 (sq km) at Amman downtown.

Sampling Technique: Simple random sampling technique was used to select 100 subjects to respond to the survey. The selection started from the first shop in King Faisal Street, and then shops were chosen alternatively

until a sample size of 100 was reached.

Hypotheses: The hypothesis of the present study states that social acceptance of Syrian migrants in downtown Amman is influenced by attributes of merchants' social gating.

Sub hypothesis 1: Social acceptance of Syrian migrants affected by social cohesion.

Sub hypothesis 2: Social acceptance of Syrian migrants affected by downtown merchants' zone of influence.

Sub hypothesis 3: Social acceptance of Syrian migrants affected by downtown merchants' natural surveillance.

The Dependent Variable: Social Acceptance: It was defined by the acceptance of Syrian migrants as residence in the upper floors of merchant's shop in downtown area of Amman. It was measured using a dichotomous scale: (1) No, (2) Yes.

The Independent Variables: Social Gating: the construct was defined by attributes of neighborhood defense. The following three attributes were used as sub variables: social cohesion, zones of influence, and natural surveillance. These variables and sub-variables were measured using a 6 point-Likert scale: (1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Not Sure, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree, (6) Not applicable.

Variable 1 - Social Cohesion: It was defined by the willingness of members of a community to cooperate with each other in order to survive. It was defined by the inclusion and participation in economic, social, cultural, and political life, based on an effective enjoyment of citizenship and democracy. Also, it was defined by social contacts and the climate created by the possibility of such contacts that develop sense of belonging. Data was collected through the following sub attributes: (1) Overall Social Cohesion: willingness of members of a community to cooperate with each other in order to survive; (2) Inclusion and participation in economic life; (3) Inclusion and participation in social life; (4) Inclusion and participation in cultural life; (5) Inclusion and participation in political life; (6) An effective enjoyment of citizenship; (7) An effective enjoyment of democracy; (8). Social contacts; and (9) Social climate.

Variable 2 - Zones of influence: It is defined by the capacity of the physical pattern to generate zones of territorial influences over public spaces, being perceived as semi-private or private spaces. Data was collected through the following sub attributes: (1) Overall zone of influence; (2) Extension of store space; (3) Identification of strangers; and (4) Use of outdoor space.

Variable 3 - Natural Surveillance: It is defined by the capacity of the store to provide opportunities of surveillance. Data was collected through the following sub attributes: (1) Direct access; (2) Observe over outdoor activities; and (3) Observe over users of upper floors.

Cofounding Variables: The confounding constructs were measured using nominal scale. They included: (1) Gender; (2) Age; (3) Educational Level; (4) Income Level; (5) Place of Residence; (6) Ownership of the Shop; (7) Length of Attendance at the Shop; (8) Ethnic Background; and (9) Connection to Syrian Origin.

The Instrument of the Study: The instrument was administered by the researcher. The instrument included three sections:

1.Demographics Section: This section was designed to collect data to measure cofounding variables. It was measured using various nominal scales. Data was collected through questions (Q1-Q9).
2.The Dependent Variable Section: This section was designed to collect data about merchants' social acceptability of Syrian migrants. It was measured using a dichotomous scale: (1) No, (2) Yes. Data was collected through question (Q10).
3.The Independent Variables Section: This section was designed to collect data about multiple forms of social gating. It was divided to three sub-variables: social cohesion, zone of influence, and natural surveillance. Variables were measured using a six point-Likert scale: (1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Not Sure, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree, (6) Not applicable. Data was collected through questions (Q11-21).

4. Analysis and Discussion

A number of merchants expressed how they reject Syrians to reside in the same building of their store. But at the same time, they contradicted themselves in other questions.

4.1. Qualitative Data Analysis

The process of analyzing and interpreting data consisted of transcribing interviews, identifying general ideas, grouping similar data into categories, coding, creating detailed descriptions, and interpreting the data. The following themes:

Theme 1: Why merchants are highly bonded to downtown Amman: Shop Inheritance from many generations, The ethnic Identity of downtown, working there for many years (20-60 years and many of the merchantes have downtown as a place of both residence and work.

Theme 2:Is it better for downtown Amman if almost everyone shares customs and traditions, and if there is only one ethnic group in downtown Amman: (1) Positive responses: respecting the other, social acculturation, cultural exchange, brotherhood between Jordanians and Syrians, and some raised that they were against racism. (2) Negative respones: Homogeneous community is better, strange nationalities are not welcomed.

Theme 3:Does the government facilitate with the community participation the decision of hosting migrants in downtown Amman: (1) Positive:Government hosted Syrian migrants, Long history of hosting war migrants and refugees, generosity of Jordan. (2) Negative:Lack of public participation in local decisions, eliminate stakeholders from participating. (3) Fear: a large number of the sample refused to answer this question or any other questions related to any political aspect.

Theme 4:Do you think Syrian migrants took jobs away from locals: The majority of the sample agreed that Syrian migrants took jobs away, from this question, the researcher concluded that the merchant main concern towards the migrants is an economic one rather than a social one. Main statements were: competition, low wages of Syrian workers, bad influence on our profit, skillful cheap labor, Jordanian took advantage of them.

4.2. Quantitative Data Analysis:

4.2.1. Descriptive analysis is presented in the following table:

Table 1 presents the means distribution for all the variables of the study.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

		Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Kurtosis
Gender	103	0	1	1	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Age	103	5	1	6	3.49	1.57	2.45	-1.23
Education Level	103	4	1	5	3.03	1.20	1.44	-1.04
Income Level	103	3	1	4	1.72	1.05	1.11	0.21
Place of Residence	103	1	1	2	1.86	0.34	0.12	2.70
Ownership of the Shop	103	2	1	3	1.83	0.41	0.17	1.02
Length of Attendance at the Shop	103	2	1	3	2.60	0.66	0.44	0.73
Ethnic Background	103	2	1	3	2.10	0.33	0.11	4.71
Connection to Syrian Origin	103	2	1	3	2.67	0.62	0.38	1.71
Social Acceptance	103	1	1	2	1.42	0.50	0.25	-1.92
Overall Social Cohesion	103	5	1	6	3.79	1.29	1.66	0.25
Social Cohesion – Economic	103	5	1	6	3.83	1.10	1.20	1.25
Social Cohesion – Social	103	5	1	6	3.76	1.26	1.58	0.35

Continued on next page

Table 1 continued

Social Cohesion – Cultural	103	5	1	6	3.71	1.51	2.27	-0.58
Social Cohesion – Political	103	5	1	6	3.45	1.53	2.35	-0.75
Enjoyment of Citizenship	103	5	1	6	3.94	1.31	1.72	0.27
Enjoyment of Democracy	103	5	1	6	3.54	1.65	2.72	-0.87
Social Contacts	103	5	1	6	3.83	1.40	1.96	-0.02
Social Climate	103	5	1	6	3.78	1.51	2.29	-0.40
Sum of Social Cohesion	103	5	1	6	3.74	0.98	0.96	1.46
Overall Zone of Influence	103	5	1	6	3.67	1.53	2.34	-0.64
Extension of Store Space	103	5	1	6	3.99	1.35	1.83	0.44
Identification of Strangers	103	5	1	6	3.56	1.70	2.87	-1.10
Use of Outdoor Space	103	5	1	6	3.72	1.61	2.60	-0.95
Sum of Zone of Influence	103	5	1	6	3.74	1.32	1.74	-0.35
Direct Access	103	5	1	6	3.99	1.45	2.09	0.00
Observe over Outdoor Activities	103	5	1	6	3.83	1.46	2.13	-0.41
Observe over users of upper floors	103	5	1	6	3.25	1.81	3.30	-1.26
Sum of Natural Surveillance	103	5	1	6	3.69	1.36	1.84	-.39

4.2.2. Hypotheses Testing

Factors affecting social acceptance of Syrian migrants in downtown Amman are tested through the general hypothesis and the sub-hypotheses as follows:

General Hypothesis: Overall all model of social acceptance of Syrian migrants with social gating

A regression test was carried out to test the total interactive model of social acceptance of Syrian migrants with social gating major components (overall social cohesion, overall zones of influence, and overall natural surveillance). The interactive relationship of the set of variables with social acceptance is reported significant in Table (2). This suggests that the three major attributes (overall social cohesion, overall zone of influence, and overall natural surveillance) work together to influence social acceptance of Syrian migrants in downtown Amman.

Table 2. .Regression Model Summary - Social Acceptance with Overall SocialGating.

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	5.40	3	1.80	13.18	0.00
Residual	13.53	99	0.14		
Total	18.93	102			

Although all attributes interact together to impact social acceptance of the Syrian migrants in downtown Amman, only overall social cohesion contributed individually [t (3, 102) = 5.50], $P < 0.00$. Contribution strength of attributes in the model from highest to lowest is as follows: Overall social cohesion, overall zones of Influence, and overall natural surveillance. On the other hand, overall zones of influence seems to contribute to the model in a negative direction, Table (3). This suggests the more merchants have influence over their surrounding space, the less they will have social acceptance to the Syrian migrants to reside in the upper units of their buildings.

Table 3. Coefficients for Regression Model Summary - Social Acceptance with Overall Social Gating.

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		Std. Error	Beta		Std. Error
(Constant)	0.91	0.15		6.18	0.00

Continued on next page

Table 3 continued

Overall Social Cohesion	0.25	0.05	0.57	5.50	0.00
Overall Zones of Influence	-0.03	0.05	-0.10	-0.64	0.53
Overall Natural Surveillance	0.01	0.05	0.02	0.15	0.88

Further, a One way ANOVA test was carried out to test the difference in the mean of scores of social acceptance of Syrian migrants with the mean of scores of overall social cohesion, overall zones of influence, and overall natural surveillance. Results are presented in Table (4). The test indicated a significant effect of social acceptance by overall social cohesion [F (1, 102) = 39.42], $P < 0.00$, overall natural surveillance [F (1, 102) = 7.05], $P < 0.01$, and overall zones of influence [F (1, 102) = 5.71], $P < 0.02$. This suggests that social acceptance of Syrian migrants are affected by the three major attributes on a one-to-one base.

Table 4. ANOVA Test - Social Acceptance by Overall Social GatingComponents.

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Overall Social Cohesion	Between Groups	27.61	1	27.61	39.42	0.00
	Within Groups	70.73	101	0.70		
	Total	98.35	102			
Overall Zones of Influence	Between Groups	9.47	1	9.47	5.71	0.02
	Within Groups	167.51	101	1.66		
	Total	176.98	102			
Overall Natural Surveillance	Between Groups	12.26	1	12.26	7.05	0.01
	Within Groups	175.58	101	1.74		
	Total	187.84	102			

Subcomponents of Social Gating Regression Test

A regression test was carried out to test the total interactive model of the sub-components of social gating. The interactive relationship of the set of variables with social acceptance is reported significant in Table (5). This suggests that all sub components of social gating (inclusion and participation in economic life, inclusion and participation in social life, inclusion and participation in cultural life, inclusion and participation in political life, an effective enjoyment of citizenship, an effective enjoyment of democracy, social contacts, social climate; overall zone of influence; extension of store space, identification of strangers, use of outdoor space; direct access; observe over outdoor activities; and observe over users of upper floors) work together to influence social acceptance of Syrian migrants in downtown Amman.

Table 5. Regression Model Summary - Social Acceptance with Subcomponentsof Social Gating.

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	8.14	15	0.54	4.37	0.00
Residual	10.79	87	0.12		
Total	18.93	102			

However, individual contribution to social acceptance of Syrian migrants in downtown Amman within the interactive model was significant by the following sub-components in the order of their strength: an effective enjoyment of citizenship [t (3, 102) = 2.74], $P < 0.01$, social contacts [t (3, 102) = 2.62], $P < 0.01$, and social climate [t (3, 102) = 2.17], $P < 0.03$. On the other hand, social contacts seem to contribute to the model in a negative direction. Further, inclusion and participation in social life and direct access seem to marginally contribute to the model, Table (6).

Table 6. Coefficients of Regression Model Summary - Social Acceptancewith Subcomponents of Social Gating.

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		Std. Error	Beta		Std. Error
(Constant)	0.86	0.16	-	5.43	0.00
Social Cohesion – Economic	0.03	0.06	0.08	0.53	0.60
Social Cohesion – Social	0.12	0.06	0.35	1.88	0.06
Social Cohesion – Cultural	-0.01	0.04	-0.03	-0.24	0.81
Social Cohesion – Political	0.01	0.03	0.04	0.29	0.78
Enjoyment of Citizenship	0.11	0.04	0.33	2.74	0.01
Enjoyment of Democracy	-0.04	0.04	-0.16	-1.14	0.26
Social Contacts	-0.14	0.06	-0.47	-2.62	0.01
Social Climate	0.13	0.06	0.45	2.17	0.03
Overall Zone of Influence	0.04	0.04	0.14	0.86	0.39
Extension of Store Space	-0.05	0.04	-0.17	-1.29	0.20
Identification of Strangers	0.02	0.03	0.07	0.50	0.62
Use of Outdoor Space	-0.00	0.04	-0.01	-0.03	0.98
Direct Access	0.09	0.05	0.29	1.77	0.08
Observe over Outdoor Activities	-0.07	0.06	-0.24	-1.31	0.20
Observe over Users of Upper Floors	0.02	0.04	.078	0.53	0.60

Sub hypothesis 1: Social Acceptance of Syrian Migrants is affected by Social Cohesion:

A One way ANOVA test was carried out to test the difference in the mean of scores of social acceptance of Syrian migrants with the mean of scores of total social cohesion and its components: social cohesion – economic, social cohesion – social, social cohesion – cultural, social cohesion – political, enjoyment of citizenship, enjoyment of democracy, social contacts, and social climate. Results are presented in Table (7). The test indicated a significant effect of social acceptance by components of social cohesion components in the order of their strength as follows: social cohesion – social [F (1, 102) = 34.77], $P < 0.00$, enjoyment of citizenship [F (1, 102) = 32.78], $P < 0.00$, social cohesion – economic [F (1, 102) = 26.34], $P < 0.00$, social cohesion – cultural [F (1, 102) = 10.98], $P < 0.00$, social climate [F (1, 102) = 8.38], $P < 0.01$, and social cohesion – political [F (1, 102) = 5.40], $P < 0.02$. It also indicated a marginal effect of social acceptance by enjoyment of democracy and social contacts.

Table 7. ANOVA Test - Social Acceptance by Social Cohesion Components.

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Overall Social Cohesion	Between Groups	0.11	1	0.11	0.44	0.51
	Within Groups	24.94	101	0.25		
	Total	25.05	102			
Social Cohesion – Economic	Between Groups	25.27	1	25.27	26.34	0.00
	Within Groups	96.92	101	0.96		
	Total	122.19	102			
Social Cohesion – Social	Between Groups	41.21	1	41.21	34.77	0.00
	Within Groups	119.72	101	1.19		
	Total	160.93	102			
Social Cohesion – Cultural	Between Groups	22.67	1	22.67	10.98	0.00
	Within Groups	208.59	101	2.07		
	Total	231.26	102			
Social Cohesion – Political	Between Groups	12.15	1	12.15	5.40	0.02

Continued on next page

Table 7 continued

	Within Groups	227.31	101	2.25		
	Total	239.46	102			
Enjoyment of Citizenship	Between Groups	43.04	1	43.04	32.78	0.00
	Within Groups	132.62	101	1.31		
	Total	175.65	102			
Enjoyment of Democracy	Between Groups	9.76	1	9.76	3.68	0.06
	Within Groups	267.80	101	2.65		
	Total	277.55	102			
Social Contacts	Between Groups	6.25	1	6.25	3.25	0.07
	Within Groups	193.95	101	1.92		
	Total	200.20	102			
Social Climate	Between Groups	17.92	1	17.92	8.38	0.01
	Within Groups	215.95	101	2.14		
	Total	233.86	102			

A regression test was carried out for the interactive model of social acceptance with social cohesion components. The interactive relationship of the set of variables with social acceptance is reported significant in Table (8). This suggests that social cohesion – economic, social cohesion – social, social cohesion – cultural, social cohesion – political, enjoyment of citizenship, enjoyment of democracy, social contacts, and social climate work all together influence social acceptance of Syrian migrants in downtown Amman.

Table 8. Regression Model Summary - Social Acceptance with SocialCohesion Components.

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	6.97	8	0.87	6.84	0.00
Residual	11.96	94	0.13		
Total	18.93	102			

Contribution of the sub-components to social acceptance of Syrian migrants in downtown Amman within the interactive model was significant only by social climate [t (8, 102) = 2.8], $P < 0.01$ and social contact [t (8, 102) = 2.45], $P < 0.02$. Meanwhile, social contacts seems to have a negative influence on social acceptance in the interaction model of the subcomponents, Table (9).

Table 9. Coefficients of Regression Model Summary - Social Acceptancewith Social Cohesion Components.

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		Std. Error	Beta		Std. Error
(Constant)	0.94	0.15		6.27	0.00
Social Cohesion – Economic	0.05	0.06	0.13	0.91	0.37
Social Cohesion – Social	0.10	0.06	0.28	1.60	0.11
Social Cohesion – Cultural	-0.09	0.04	-0.03	-0.21	0.84
Social Cohesion – Political	0.01	0.03	0.05	0.40	0.69
Enjoyment of Citizenship	0.09	0.04	0.26	2.29	0.02
Enjoyment of Democracy	-0.03	0.03	-0.12	-0.89	0.38
Social Contacts	-0.13	0.05	-0.43	-2.45	0.02
Social Climate	0.14	0.05	0.48	2.80	0.01

Sub hypothesis 2: Social acceptance of Syrian migrants is affected by merchants' zone of influence:

A One way ANOVA test was carried out to test the difference in the mean of scores of social acceptance of

Syrian migrants with the mean of scores of overall zone of influence and its components: extension of store space, identification of stangers, and use of outdoor space. Results are presented in Tables (10). The test indicated a significant effect of social acceptance only by identification of strangers [F (1, 102) = 4.93], P $<$ 0.03. This suggests that if merchants are able to identify strangers, then they react positively to their acceptance. It also indicated a marginal effect of social acceptance on use of outdoor space, overall zone of influence, and extension of store space.

Table 10. ANOVA Test - Social Acceptance by Zones of Influence Components.

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Overall Zone of Influence	Between Groups	8.58	1	8.58	3.77	0.06
	Within Groups	230.19	101	2.28		
	Total	238.78	102			
Extension of Store Space	Between Groups	6.11	1	6.11	3.41	0.07
	Within Groups	180.88	101	1.79		
	Total	186.99	102			
Identification of Strangers	Between Groups	13.65	1	13.65	4.93	0.03
	Within Groups	279.69	101	2.77		
	Total	293.34	102			
Use of Outdoor Space	Between Groups	10.30	1	10.30	4.09	0.05
	Within Groups	254.54	101	2.52		
	Total	264.84	102			

A regression test was carried out to test social acceptance with zones of influence components as an interactive model. The interactive relationship of the set of variables with social acceptance is reported none significant in Table (11).

Table 11. Regression Model Summary - Social Acceptance with Zones of InfluenceComponents.

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	1.05	4	0.26	1.44	0.22
Residual	17.88	98	0.182		
Total	18.93	102			

Also none of the sub-components contributed individually to social acceptance of Syrian migrants in downtown Amman within the interactive model as indicated in Table (12).

Table 12. Coefficients of Regression Model Summary - Social Acceptancewith Zones of Influence Components.

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		Std. Error
(Constant)	1.47	0.14		10.75	0.00
Overall Zone of Influence	0.01	0.05	0.03	0.19	0.85
Extension of Store Space	0.02	0.04	0.07	0.56	0.58
Identification of Strangers	0.03	0.04	0.13	0.95	0.34
Use of Outdoor Space	0.01	0.05	0.04	0.23	0.82

Sub hypothesis 3: Social acceptance of Syrian migrants is affected by merchants' natural surveillance.

A One way ANOVA test was carried out to test the difference in the mean of scores of social acceptance of Syrian migrants with the mean of scores of total natural surveillance and its components: direct access, observe over outdoor activities, and observe over users of upper floors. Results are presented in Tables (13). The test indicated

a significant effect of social acceptance by direct access [F (1, 102) = 7.56], P $<$ 0.01 and Observe over outdoor activities [F (1, 102) = 5.56], P $<$ 0.02. It also indicated a marginal effect of social acceptance by Observe over users of upper floors.

Table 13. ANOVA Test - Social Acceptance by Natural SurveillanceComponents.

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Direct access	Between Groups	14.83	1	14.83	7.56	0.01
	Within Groups	198.16	101	1.96		
	Total	212.99	102			
Observe over Outdoor Activities	Between Groups	11.31	1	11.31	5.56	0.02
	Within Groups	205.55	101	2.04		
	Total	216.85	102			
Observe over Users of Upper Floors	Between Groups	10.82	1	10.82	3.37	0.07
	Within Groups	324.62	101	3.21		
	Total	335.44	102			

A regression test was carried out to test the contribution of all sub-components as an interactive model. The interactive relationship of the set of variables with social acceptance showed marginal significant in Table (14).

Table 14. Regression Model Summary - Social Acceptance with NaturalSurveillance Components.

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	1.37	3	.46	2.58	0.06
Residual	17.56	99	.18		
Total	18.93	102			

Further, contribution of the sub-components to social acceptance of Syrian migrants in downtown Amman within the interactive model was none significant by all sub-components of natural surveillance, Table (15).

Table 15. Coefficients of Regression Model Summary - Social Acceptancewith Natural Surveillance Components.

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		Std. Error	Beta		Std. Error
(Constant)	1.43	0.13		11.40	0.00
Direct Access	0.07	0.05	0.23	1.32	0.19
Observe over Outdoor Activities	0.00	0.05	0.01	0.03	0.98
Observe over Users of Upper Floors	0.01	0.03	0.06	0.52	0.60

Demographic Characteristics Test

ANOVA Test:

A One way ANOVA test was carried out to assess the difference in the mean of scores of social acceptance of

Syrian migrants with the mean of scores of age and income level. Results are presented in Tables (16). The test indicated a significant effect of social acceptance only by age [F (1, 102) = 10.54], P $<$ 0.00. It also indicated no effect of social acceptance by income level.

Table 16. ANOVA Test - Social Acceptance by Demographic Characteristics.

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Age	Between Groups	23.60	1	23.60	10.54	0.00
	Within Groups	226.13	101	2.24		
	Total	249.73	102			
Income Level	Between Groups	0.86	1	0.86	0.78	0.38
	Within Groups	111.97	101	1.11		
	Total	112.84	102			

Chi-Square Tests:

A Chi-square test was carried out to investigate the individual association of social acceptance with the nominal demographic characteristics: gender, educational level, place of residence, ownership of the shop, length of attendance at the shop, ethnic background, and connection to Syrian origin. Results are displayed in table 17. Results indicate a significant association of social acceptance with length of attendance at the shop [χ2 (2, 103) = 24.51, P = 0.00] and ethnic background [χ2 (2, 103) = 10.59, P = 0.01].

Table 17. Pearson Chi-Square Tests - Social Acceptance with Demographic Characteristics.

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Education Level	7.97	4	0.09
N of Valid Cases	103		
Place of Residence	3.05	1	0.08
N of Valid Cases	103		
Ownership of the Shop	4.26	2	0.12
N of Valid Cases	103.00		
Length of Attendance at the Shop	24.51	2	0.00
N of Valid Cases	103		
Ethnic Background	105.9	2	0.01
N of Valid Cases	103		
Connection to Syrian Origin	3.82	2	0.15
N of Valid Cases	103		

Regression Model Test:

A regression test was carried out for the demographic characteristics as an interactive model to see their influence on social acceptance of migrants to the area. The interactive relationship of the set of variables with social acceptance is reported significant in Table (18). This suggests that gender, age, educational level, income level, place of residence, ownership of the shop, length of attendance at the shop, ethnic background, and connection to Syrian origin work together to influence social acceptance of Syrian migrants in downtown Amman

Table 18. Regression Model Summary - Social Acceptance with DemographicCharacteristics.

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	6.38	9	0.71	5.26	0.00
Residual	12.55	93	0.14		
Total	18.93	102			

However, individual contribution of attributes of demographic characteristics to social acceptance of Syrian migrants in downtown Amman within the interactive model was significant only by length of attendance at the Shop [t (9, 102) = 4.22], $P < 0.00$ and Ownership of the Shop [t (9, 102) = 2.15], $P < 0.03$, Table (19). This suggests that the strongest demographic attributes to social acceptance of outsiders to reside in the area are more related to territoriality, like ownership and long hours of attendance at the shop.

Table 19. Coefficients for Regression Model Summary - Social Acceptance with Demographic Characteristics.

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		Std. Error
(Constant)	0.84	0.57		1.47	0.14
Age	0.02	0.03	0.06	0.53	0.60
Education Level	-0.04	0.03	-0.10	-1.04	0.30
Income Level	0.02	0.04	0.04	0.38	0.70
Place of Residence	0.10	0.12	0.08	0.84	0.40
Ownership of the Shop	0.23	0.11	0.22	2.15	0.03
Length of Attendance at the Shop	0.25	0.06	0.39	4.22	0.00
Ethnic Background	-0.22	0.15	-0.17	-1.46	0.15
Connection to Syrian Origin	0.07	0.07	0.10	1.11	0.27
Social Acceptance	-0.04	0.08	-0.05	-0.54	0.59

5. Conclusions

It seems that social cohesion is the strongest motivator for acceptance of others. Further conclusions that are revealed from the study are as follows:

1. The overall models with social acceptance:

a. Overall model of social acceptance of Syrian migrants with social gating. The interactive relationship of the set of variables with social acceptance of Syrian migrants was reported significant. As well, contribution of each variable on social acceptance of Syrian migrants within the interactive model was significant only for overall social cohesion. Their order in the model from highest to lowest as follows: overall social cohesion, overall zones of influence, and overall natural surveillance. On the other hand, overall zones of influence seems to contribute to the model in a negative direction to the model.

b. Overall model of Social acceptance of Syrian migrants with Subcomponents of Social Gating. The interactive relationship of the set of variables with social acceptance of Syrian migrants was reported significant. As well, Contribution to social acceptance to Syrian migrants in downtown Amman within the interactive model was significant by an effective enjoyment of citizenship, social contacts, and social climate.

c. Overall model of social acceptance of Syrian migrants with social cohesion. The interactive relationship of the set of variables with Social acceptance was reported significant. Contribution to social acceptance to Syrian migrants in downtown Amman within the interactive model of the subcBomponents was significant only by social climate and social contact. Social contacts seems to have a negative influence on social acceptance in the interaction model of the subcomponents.
d. Overall model of social acceptance of Syrian migrants is affected by merchants' with zone of influence was reported none significant.
e. Overall model of social acceptance of Syrian migrants is affected by merchants' natural surveillance was reported with marginal significant.
2. Social acceptance of Syrian migrants is affected by:
a. The following social cohesion components: social cohesion – social, enjoyment of citizenship, social cohesion – economic, social cohesion – cultural, social climate, and social cohesion – political. It also indicated a marginal effect of social acceptance on enjoyment of democracy and social contacts.
b. The following zone of influence components: identification of strangers, and also a marginal effect of social acceptance on use of outdoor space, overall zone of influence, and extension of store space.
c. The following natural surveillance components: direct access and observe over outdoor activities. It also indicated a marginal effect of social acceptance on observe over users of upper floors.
d. The following socio-economic components: age, length of attendance at the shop, and ethnic background.

6. References

1. Arous, R. Refugee Setting and Urban Form and Governance. IUSD CAIRO. 2013. pp.129-137.
2. Breheny, M. Urban compaction: feasib le and acceptable? Cities. 1997. 14(4), pp.209-217.
3. Danielsen, K. Retracting Suburbia: Smart Growth and the Future of Housing. Housing Policy Debate. 1999. pp. 513.
4. CoE. Towards an Active, Fair and Socially Cohesive Europe. Report of high level task force on social cohesion. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. 2008
5. Eppig, M. and Brachman, L. Redeveloping Commercial Vacant Properties in Legacy Cities. Ohio, USA: Greater Ohio Policy Center. 2014.
6. Fischer, C. The Urban Experience. California, USA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers. 1984.
7. Flanagan, W. Urban Sociology. Boston, USA: Allyn and Bacon. 1990.
8. Gans, H. Planning and Social Life: Friendship and Neighbor Relations in Suburban Communities. Journal of the American Institute of Planners. 1961a. 27, pp.134-140.
9. Gans, H. The Balanced Community : Homogeneity or Heterogeneity in Resedential Areas. Journal of the American Institue of Planners. 1961b. 27, pp.176-184.
10. Hillier, B. In Defense of Space. RIBA Journal. 1973. 539-544.
11. Hoye, G., van Hooft, E., and Lievens, F. Networking as a job search behavior: A social network perspective. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, S2 (Part 3). 2009. pp. 616-682.
12. Jenks, M., Burton, E. and Williams, K. The Compact City: A Sustainable Urban Form? E&FN Spon, London. 1996a.
13. Jenks, M., Burton, E. and Williams, K. A sustainable future through the compact city? Urban intensification in the United Kingdom. Environments by Design, 1(1). l996b. pp. 5-21.

14. Jenks, M., Williams, K. and Burton, E. Urban Consolidation and the Benefits of Intensification. International Conference on Strategies and Methods for Improving Environmental Quality in Compact Cities, Groningen, Netherlands. 1997.

15. MoP. Jordan Response Plan. Amman, Jordan: Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation. 2015.

16. Newman, O. Communities of Interest. USA: HUD Office of Policy Development and Research. 1972.

17. Rudiger, A., and Spencer, S. Social Integration of Migrants and Ethnic Minorities. The Economic and Social Aspects of Migration. Brussels: The European Comission and the OECD. 2008.

18. Suttles, G. The Social Construction of Communitites. Chicago, USA: University of Chicago Press. 1972.

19. UNHCR. Syrian Refugees Living Outside Camps in Jordan. Amman, Jordan: UNHCR Jordan Operation. 2013.

20. Van Manen, M. Phenomenology of practice. Phenomenology & Practice, 7(1), pp. 11-30. 2007.

21. Van Manen, M. Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy. London, ON: Althouse Press. 1990.

22. Wegmann, J. and Nemirow, A. Secondary Units and Urban Infill: A Literature Review, Working Paper. California, USA: Institute of Urban and Regional Development. 2011.