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Abstract
This research tried to explore and describe young people’s experience and perception in community violence in Woreda 4, Kebele 45 of Kirkos Sub-city. This area was selected because of the prevalence of different kind of violent crimes than the rest of the kebeles in the sub city. The rational of this study is that, there is no research done in the area under study that focuses on young people’s experience and perception in community violence. The objective to achieve in trying to explore and describe young people’s experiences and perceptions in community violence was by identify young individual’s perception about risk factors of community violence and to identify community violence intervention strategies from the perspective of young people. The study used a mixed methods research applied a concurrent design, the selected study design in this study gives a QUALITATIVE-quantitative weight and a concurrent (time-wise) nested mixed design. For the qualitative method used a case study design and the quantitative method used a survey design. For the survey a sample size of 265 was taken from a population of 850. While purposive sampling was used in the process of selecting participants in the qualitative data so as to reach specific group of people such as young people who are victims of different kinds of crimes and young people that are residents of the area in general. A maximum of 7 participants was taken for the collection qualitative data. For the qualitative study, the data collection techniques used include; in-depth interviews with participant, key-informant interviews, FGD and observation. A survey questionnaire was designed and employed to collect quantitative data. A concurrent mixed analysis was utilized to analyze the qualitative and quantitative data. The result confirmed that most of the young people in the community have unstable economic status. Unemployment was found to be the major factor which leads the young people to commit violent acts. Majority of the respondents claimed that victims prefer to report their cases relatives, friends and significant others rather than reporting to the police. Four areas of risk factors of community violence identified in this research include community factors, family factors, and relationships with peers, and personal characteristics. The study revealed that in majority of the cases perpetrators are peers of the victims. Several personal level emotional responses were identified by young people as outcomes of community violence. In addition to the personal level emotional responses, five community level outcomes were documented. The study also revealed seven key areas for intervention. In conclusion unemployment is one of the leading problems in the community. Young people in the community have different unmet needs and are particularly at risk of participating in problem behaviors. Young people who have the most severe unmet needs in their lives are particularly in jeopardy of participating in violent behavior. The issue of community violence in many occasions, the responsibility, resides on immediate families, the community and the society at large. Even though, some of the youth accept on the progress, most of them believe that there could have been a better result if the government works in closer ties with them. Hence, more work should be done in this regard to improve the situation. Based on the finding this study recommends that policies and programs be devised and implemented by concerned organizations, more research should be done in regards to tackling unemployment in the area and education and training should be done to address employment opportunities and concealing overcoming their addictions to different substances.

Key Words: Young people, community violence
Chapter One: Introduction

Background of the study

We can define community violence more broadly as violent acts committed against one person that have the potential to impact the community (Hamblen & Goguen, 2016).

Community violence is recognized as a major public health problem (WHO, 2002). As stated by Reza, Krug, Mercy (2001), the main actors of community violence are young people who are both the victims and perpetrators. Exposure to community violence is among the most detrimental experiences children can have, impacting how they think, feel and act (Richters & Martinez, 1993). As stated by United States Department of Health and Human Services (2001) the experiences of the young people during their childhood could be determining their engagement in violence as well and this exposure to violence is defined as the vicarious experience of violence (e.g., hearing about violence), being the direct victim of a violent act, or witnessing violence involving others.

Adolescents living in urban communities, marked by poverty, crime, and drug-related activities, are often at increased risk for violence exposure and victimization (United States Department of Health and Human Services, 2001). Youth violence deeply harms not only its victims, but also their families, friends and communities. Violence involving young people greatly undermines the fabric of society. Violent young people tend to commit a range of crimes. They also often display other problems, such as truancy and dropping out of school, substance abuse, compulsive lying, reckless driving and high rates of sexually transmitted diseases, however, not all violent youths have significant problems other than their violence and not all young people with problems are necessarily violent (United States Department of Health and Human Services, 2001).
As stated by Buka, Stichick, Birdthistle, and, Earls, (2001), exposure to community violence is an all too common occurrence among urban adolescents. Studies have consistently documented the connection between exposure to community violence and adolescents’ psychological and behavioral problems (Buka et al., 2001; Bingenheimer, Brennan, & Earls, 2005; Margolin & Gordis, 2000). McGill, Brown, Lai, Osborne, Tiwari, LeBlanc and Kelley, (2014), also states adolescents who are exposed to violence during childhood are at an increased risk for developing posttraumatic stress (PTS) symptoms.

It is also unfortunate that in many cultures in Ethiopia, violence is also involved in disciplining children and often their views are ignored (Africa Child Policy Forum, 2006). As noted by DuRant, Cadenhead, Pendergrast, Slavens, and Linder, (1994), exposure to violence is a strong predictor of delinquent behavior.

According to the police reports and information from both the community members and Woreda 4 administration office the young people that are currently situated in Addis Ababa, Woreda 4, Kebele 45 also known by its unique name “Enat” are highly exposed to different kinds of violence ranging from attempted murder to petty theft that occur within their community. According to the views of some police person’s, it’s true a decade ago crimes were worse than they are today in this area but when looking at recent reports it indicates a rising number of crimes committed by young people.

During my several encounter with the young people living in Kebele 45, I observed that most of them lurked around smoking, chewing chat, sitting around insulting whoever passes by them. But knowing what the inner cause of this young people in regards to their experience and perceptions of community violence will help researchers and other
professionals to develop an intervention strategy. Hence, this study focused on those young people aged 18-24 and explored and described the experiences and perception of community violence in the study site.

**Statement of the problem**

Community violence is a common occurrence all around the world and young people’s experiences and perceptions vary from one community to the other even if there maybe similarities. There are varieties of researches conducted on the subject of community violence among young people. These researches are studied by different scholars, medical and social departments of different universities, hospitals and institutions. Among those, Smith & Tolan (1998) examined the role of exposure to community violence and developmental problems among inner-city youth. Buka et al., 2001, examines youth exposure to violence and its Prevalence, risks, and consequences. Similarly, McGill, et al., 2014, examines the effects of exposure to community violence and family violence on school functioning problems among urban youth. Kelly, (2010), examines the psychological consequences to adolescents of exposure to gang violence in the community. The study shows adolescents develop internalizing symptoms and externalizing behaviors after exposure to violence; but other factors influence adolescents’ exposure and reaction to violence such as their relationship with their parents.

Community violence has been seen in relation to its effects from several angels (Quille, Griffin, Stuart, Bradshaw, and Holden, 2009), studied on community violence and youth in regards to affect, behavior, substance use, and academics. Moreira et al., 2008), examine community violence and alcohol abuse among adolescents. Eitle & Turner
(2002), examines the exposure to community violence and young adult crime: The effects of witnessing violence, traumatic victimization, and other stressful life events. This study shows that recent exposure to violence in the community along with a history of receiving traumatic news, direct victimizations in the community, recent life events, and associations with criminal peers increase the risk for young adult criminal offending.

Anderson & Kidd (2014) studied the perceptions of community safety on the exposure to community violence in a low risk Australian population. The finding shows that males exposed to high levels of community violence were significantly more likely to perceive their community as unsafe compared to males exposed to lower levels of violence. In contrast, females who had been exposed to higher levels of community violence did not perceive their community to be less safe. Moreover, while females were more likely to perceive they had social support, there was no evident relationship between social support and community safety for either females or males in the studied group.

Grossman & Sharples (2010) examines young people’s perspective on community safety and policing which regards to how young people defined ‘safety’ which was as the absence of anxiety when walking around the street or neighborhood; not feeling that they were in danger, and not needing to be vigilant about security.

Even if, there are a handful of studies on the experiences and perception of community violence among young people, there exists limited literature in Ethiopian context and more specifically in the area that the research is conducted. While reviewing these literatures it helped me view the importance of knowing the young people’s experience and perception in community violence in order to implement appropriate intervention strategies and reduce community violence. The rational of this study is that, there is no
research done in the area under study that focuses on young people’s experience and perception in community violence particularly in the area under study. The focus of these researches done cannot represent the case of young people found in urban Ethiopian community because the experiences and perception of individuals across different nations vary even if there may be similarities. The strategies that can be used to intervene should come in light of the different conditions (socio-demographic characteristics etc.) of the study area that the individuals under study are undergoing. Hence, further research should be done in this chosen study area in regards to the experience and perception of community violence, perceived risk factors and intervention strategies among young people in the community. Furthermore, keeping in mind the crime report in 2007 and 2008 by the police, I found Kebele 45 to be an appropriate place to explore and describe the experience and perception of community violence among young people to meet the objective of the study since there was a wider range of violent crimes that are being committed in this community than the rest.

**Objective of the study**

**General objective**

The general objective of this research is to get a clear idea on the experience and perception of young people about community violence

**Specific objectives**

Based on the general objectives this research will have three specific research objectives

- To explore and describe the experiences and perceptions of community violence among young people.
Identify young individual’s perception about risk factors of community violence.

To identify community violence interventions strategies from the perspective of young people.

**Research question**

This research will address three questions which are;

- What is the experience and perceptions of community violence among young people?
- What are the perceived risk factors of community violence by young people?
- What are community violence intervention strategies that can be identified from the perspective of young people?

**Significance of the study**

The research is believed to assist governmental and non-governmental organizations working on youth to adjust their intervention strategies based on the findings of the study.

Furthermore, the study will serve as a tool for awareness creation about community violence among youth. Above all it will help in social work and police practice, especially for community policing.

**Operational definitions**

**Community Violence:** For the purpose of this study community violence will be defined as; violence between people or groups who may or may not be known to each other (strangers or acquaintances), which occurs generally (but not always) in a public place. (Preventing Violence, 2005, pg. 8)

**Young people:** for this research, young people are those aged 18-24.
Chapter Two: Literature Review

General overview

According to Burrowes, (2016) violence is a social interference in the genetically programmed feelings, thoughts, sensing and/or behavior of another organism. The violence inflicted by human adults on themselves, each other and the Earth is an outcome of the visible, invisible and utterly invisible violence inflicted on them as children. Morrison, (2004) states that crime is associated with harm and violence; harm to individuals, destruction of property, and the denial of respect to people and institutions.

According to Bronfenbrenner, (1979) ecological theories acknowledge that youth are shaped by multiple processes that occur at various levels, including the micro level or immediate environment (e.g., family, schools, and community) and the macro level (e.g., societal and cultural contexts). The UN youth proclamation, (1965) states that the main cause of delinquency is societal background, unemployment and under employment especially acute in ruler society it can appear as an unwelcome break up of their ambition and desire.

When we came to community violence as a concept it applies not only to direct personal exposure (happened to you), it also includes exposure through witnessing (saw it happen to someone else) and vicarious (know someone it happened to) routes (Foy & Goguen, 1998). Hamblen & Goguen, (2016) identified community violence as a complex term that has been used to refer to a wide range of events including riots, sniper attacks, gang wars, drive-by shootings, workplace assaults, terrorist attacks, torture, bombings, war, ethnic cleansing, and widespread sexual, physical, and emotional abuse.
Impact of exposure to community violence

According to Strickland et al., 2009, academic difficulties, behavior problems, and substance use are adverse outcome of chronic community violence exposure. Moreira et al., 2008, stated that adolescents of both sexes who consume more alcohol are at greater risk of suffering from community violence. In accordance with this McGill et al., 2014 and Fairbrook (2013) also explained that PTS symptoms potentially mediate the relationship between violence exposure and school functioning problems across two settings (community and home). An increased risk of PTSD and internalizing symptoms were associated with CVE. According to Buka et al., 2001, males, ethnic minorities, and urban residents are at increased risk for witnessing violence, and that higher rates of PTSD, depression, distress, aggression, and externalizing behavior disturbances are reported among those who witness violence. Degree of family conflict, domestic violence, and family support were demonstrated to modify the impact of exposure to violence.

Smith & Tolan (1998), states that exposure to community violence was related to increases in aggressive behavior and depression over a 1-year period even after controlling for previous status but the participants only included male who are in schools hence lacked to address both genders even though it gave a comprehensive understanding in this regards. In this note Guerra, Huesmann, & Spindler (2003), also describe that witnessing community violence has an effect on children’s aggressive behavior through both imitation of violence and the development of associated cognitions as children get older. Hence it can be seen that as Gardner & Gunn (2009), state lower violent crime
rates explain inverse association between the variety of youth organizations available at the neighborhood level and adolescents’ exposure to community violence.

According to Kelly, (2010), little research has focused on adolescents’ exposure to gang violence and its effects on adolescents’ mental health. Adolescents develop internalizing symptoms and externalizing behaviors after exposure to violence; but other factors influence adolescents’ exposure and reaction to violence. Linder, Lambert & Ialongo, (2010), identified three vulnerable classes, a moderate risk/medium protection class, and a moderate risk/high protection class. The classes differentially predicted depressive symptoms but not aggressive behavior for boys and girls. The class with the highest community violence exposure also had the lowest self-worth. DuRant et al., 1994), stated that self-reported use of violence was associated with exposure to violence and personal victimization, hopelessness, depression, family conflict, previous corporal punishment, purpose in life, self-assessment of the probability of being alive at age 25, and age was higher among males. However, adolescents with a higher sense of purpose in life and less depression were better able to withstand the influence of exposure to violence in the home and in the community.

Reza, Mercy & Krug, (2001), stated that in 1990, an estimated 1,851,000 people died from violence (35.3 per 100,000) in the world. There were an estimated 786,000 suicides. Overall suicide rates ranged from 3.4 per 100,000 in Sub-Saharan Africa to 30.4 per 100,000 in China. There were an estimated 563,000 homicides. Overall homicide rates ranged from 1.0 per 100,000 in established market economies to 44.8 per 100,000 in Sub-Saharan Africa with peaks among males aged 15–24 years old, and among females aged 0–4 years old. In contrast Eitle & Turner (2002) stated that exposure to violence in the
community along with a history of receiving traumatic news, direct victimizations in the community, recent life events, and associations with criminal peers increase the risk for young adult criminal offending.

**Experience and Perception of Community Violence**

Anderson & Kidd (2014), states that males exposed to high levels of community violence were significantly more likely to perceive their community as unsafe compared to males exposed to lower levels of violence. In contrast, females who had been exposed to higher levels of community violence did not perceive their community to be less safe. Moreover, while females were more likely to perceive they had social support, there was no evident relationship between social support and community safety for either females or males in the studied group. In accordance with this in a study done by Grossman & Sharples (2010) young people defined ‘safety’ as the absence of anxiety when walking around the street or neighborhood; not feeling that they were in danger, and not needing to be vigilant about security. The main public places young people said were unsafe for them were: train and bus stations; on public transport; walking down the street, and in local parks. Young people overwhelmingly reported train and bus stations as more unsafe than other areas. Rasmussen, Aber&Bhana (2004), explains that in low and medium crime rate areas, using confrontive strategies was significantly correlated within increased exposure to violence, and no strategies were associated with perceptions of safety. Coping strategies were associated with perceived safety to a substantial degree only in high crime neighborhoods, and none were associated with exposure to violence. It also identified groups that differed in coping profiles and varied in rates of exposure to
violence. Moderating effects of gender, ethnicity, and neighborhood were found for both person level and variable level analyses.

Howard, Kaljee&Jackson, (2002), state that although perceptions of safety varied according to weapon-carrying/fighting status, staying locked inside one's home and maintaining a vigilance when dealing with others were identified as primary protective strategies. MEPS scores were not predictive of appraisal or coping processes. Youth were not expressive about emotional distress aroused by exposure.

According to Smith & Green, (2007), oppressive environments are closely linked to hostility and violence. Halsey & White, (2008), explains that while it’s generally acknowledged that official crime statistics are subject to many inherent limitations, e.g. changes to police recording practices and the absence of crimes unreported by the public. Therefore, in order to shed light on the realities of youth crime, alternative sources of information on youth offending behavior are essential. Although self-report studies have been conducted, they have been done intermittently and therefore it is difficult to make confident assertions about long-term trends in youth crime. The absence of corroboratory evidence on youth crime means that it would be hard to evaluate the true impact of strategies or policies that seek to address youth offending. A long-term, self-report offending survey for young people along the lines of the BCS would make a valuable addition to this analysis of criminal behavior.

According to Martin, Lang, Falsone, and O'Donoghue, (2007), risk factors associated with ‘family and household’ and ‘relationships with parents / caregivers’ were considered the higher risk factors by young people, general community and stakeholders likewise risk factors associated with ‘community and neighborhood’, ‘personal risk factors’ and
‘relationships with peers’ were also, however, considered important. In general, this research confirmed that other strategies will potentially have little effect if early intervention strategies are not also put into place. Greater visibility of Police was considered a key strategy for young people, stakeholders and the general community as a proactive, rather than reactive, measure. School-based strategies and organized community activities are also considered important. Structural strategies, particularly increased lighting in dark areas, was considered important. Community violence is a high concern to young people, general community and stakeholders. Behaviors that are of concern include physical fighting, verbal abuse, graffiti / vandalism and intimidating behavior. Situations that are of concern include evenings, weekends and more generally, situations where you are ‘alone’. Specific locations that are considered a concern include parks, shopping centers, public transport, night clubs / pubs and late-night fast food outlets.

Friggieri, (2013), states young people seem to be fully aware that they are vulnerable to violent relationships as more than 90% of them confirmed their exposure to such behavior. Young people attribute violent relationships to low self-esteem (35%), deserving to be mistreated, feeling emotionally numb and helpless and feeling afraid as the other pre-dominant factors.

Pells, Portela&Revollo, (2016), state that bullying experienced in adolescence is associated with negative psychosocial well-being in early adulthood Findings show that better data collection and increased resource allocations to bullying prevention are needed. The development and evaluation of different types of effective, sustainable and
scalable bullying prevention models in low- and middle-income country contexts are priorities for programming and research.

**Intimate Partner Violence as a sub-component of Community Violence**

Abeya, Afework & Yalew, (2012), state that most discussants perceive, intimate partner violence is accepted in the community in circumstances of practicing extra marital sex and suspected infidelity. The majority of women are keeping silent and very few defend themselves from the violent husband/partner. The suggested measures by the community to stop or reduce were targeting actions at the level of individual, family, community, and society. In light if this Raghavan, Mennerich, Sexton, and James (2006), also explains that living in neighborhood with higher levels of social disorder and using substances increased women’s exposure to community violence that, in turn, was associated with increased rates of IPV. In addition, although not associated with community violence NIPV was associated with increased IPV. The result suggests that examining neighborhood level factors is important in domestic violence, policy, practice, and research.

According to Semahegn & Mengistie, (2015), domestic violence against women was relatively high in different parts of Ethiopia. Domestic violence has direct relationship with socio-demographic characteristics of the victim as well as the perpetrator. Therefore, appropriate health promotion information activities needed to tackle associated factors of domestic violence against women or to prevent and control the problem to save women from being victims.

**Community violence in Africa**
According to Baker & Ricardo (2005), changing gender norms is slow, and it is made even slower by the fact that those who make program and policy decisions often have their own deep-seated biases about gender and are frequently resistant to question those. Ruto (2009), states that 58 of every 100 children have been sexually harassed while 29% boys and 24% girls reported to have been forced into unwanted sex in Kenyan schools. The main perpetrators of the violence were mentioned as peers while the home featured as the most unsafe place. Similarly, Gender links, (2008), demonstrates that there is a vast array of initiatives across the country, covering most but not all of the arenas for action for ending GBV. While the examples cited in this chapter show many different attempts to measure progress these are mainly short term and do not give a composite picture of the impact of preventive efforts in the GBV sector. In contrast UNICEF, (2006), shows that young people see what happens to girls in the face of violence and discrimination. But they also suggest ways to change how girls are treated and see themselves as vital part of the process. According to Borwankar,Diallo, Going, Sommerfelt, and, Oluwole, (2009), domestic violence levels are high and deserve to be recognized as a development priority in Africa.

Alemika & Chukwuma (2000), state police-community violence is facilitated in the country by the frustration of citizens and police arising from inadequate transportation and telecommunication facilities that militate against effective and timely communication by distressed citizens with police and prompt response of the latter to citizen's call for assistance. This in adequacy portrays the police as ineffective and the citizen as unreasonable, thereby hardening mutual prejudice and hostility between the police and citizens, which under certain conditions erupt into violence. Majority of the citizens lack
adequate knowledge of the role and powers of police. Therefore any action of the police, even within law and which should elicit cooperation, is resented. In such situation, the police may enforce the law using measures that would normally have been unnecessary.

According to OECD, (2011), the positive outcomes of VPUU are due to the interaction between numerous committed stakeholders and an area-based approach, with a major emphasis on community participation, social development, and operation maintenance and management of spaces. In contrast, Leoschut&Burton, (2009), state school environment gives rise to factors that have a diminishing effect on children’s potential to commit crime.

**Intervention on Community Violence**

According to Bailey & Whittle (2004), the recent evidence base in the field of young people as victims of violence is beginning to identify processes, mechanisms and interventions that can start to counteract the damage done to the individual, families, communities and generations of children

Ferdon&Simon, (2014) explained that everyone has a role to play in preventing youth violence, it describes actions that young people, families, caregivers, adults who work with youth, and other community members can take to reduce youth violence such as by being a consistent model for how to respond nonviolently to conflict, stress, and fear. Carefully monitor youth’s activities and behavior, helping youth make safe choices, and talk with others who have a strong influence on young people. Building a connection with young people that allows them to feel comfortable discussing violence and related concerns are some of the roles that can be played to prevent youth violence.
Evidence clearly demonstrates that this reactionary, disciplinary approach has little effect on reducing violence (Stith, 2004; Ruttenberg, 1994). Instead, 7 interventions that realign the perpetrators’ belief system (e.g., anger management and abuser intervention programs) and address the trauma experienced by victims have been shown to reduce community violence and improve community members’ sense of safety. Interventions for victims that focus on education, counseling and direct involvement appear to be effective in improving victims’ sense of safety and quality of life ratings (Dobash & Dobash, 2000).

Those communities that have been the most successful in combating community violence do so through a combination of increasing public awareness of the issues, providing treatment for victims, building shared trust, as well as increasing community capacity to prevent violence. Saturation methods consist of individual level education on conflict resolution techniques, concurrent with community-wide programs to address the attitudes and beliefs that foster violent behavior (Stith, Spivak & Hausman, 1987, p. 68).
Conceptual Framework

The study applied the following conceptual framework as a guide to show how the different concepts were related to each other. The conceptual framework presented in this paper identifies a number of components of factors that cause violence and its impact if there is no intervention. The description of different interventions to reduce violence within the community shows intervention can be approached not only from the perspective of different disciplines but also from perspectives that focus on violence control, prevention, or reduction through rebuilding social capital. In terms of potential concrete intervention, the proposal for violence resolution is important to design simultaneous violence reduction measures at national, and local levels.

Causes of community violence | Impact of Community violence | Intervention
---|---|---
Social factor: E.g. Living environment, peer pressure | Experience and perception of community | Mental/Behavioral problems: E.g. depression, disruptive behavior
Demographic factor: E.g. Age, sex | Increase in crime | Decrease crime and increase social cohesiveness through violence reduction measures at national and local levels
Economic factor: E.g. Income | | |
Chapter Three: Methodology

In order to explore and describe the experiences and perception of community violence among young people who are situated in Kebele45, this study employed a single case study with a mixed research method involving a concurrent nested design. The rationale for choosing this method was to get a broader perspective as a result of using both qualitative and quantitative method.

In this section, the description of the study area, study period to collect data, type of the research design that this research has been employed, study population and sampling, data collection tools, data collection procedures, analysis of data, and ethical issues are described.

Research Design

Case study is “a method of study in depth rather than breadth” (Kothari, 2004). Yin (1984) defines the case study research method as an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which multiple sources of evidence are used (Yin, 1984, p. 23). In order to get in-depth information, this study has used multiple case study. Multiple case study enable the researcher to use multiple cases to a single issue as well as multiple cases from a multiple research sites and also helps to show different perspective on a single study issue (Creswell, 2007).

Morse (1991) stated that a primarily qualitative design could embed some quantitative data to enrich the description of its participants. As such the selected study design in this study gives a QUALITATIVE-quantitate weight and a concurrent (time-wise) nested mixed design. The study explores and describes the experiences and
perception of community violence among young. The study can be considered descriptive since young people’s experience and perception of community violence has been described in the context of their socio-economic characteristics such as gender, income, education, and exposure to violence, etc. Therefore, the nature of the study led the researcher to use both quantitative and qualitative data collection techniques which are illustrated in this chapter. In this design both qualitative and quantitative data are collected during the same stage, although one form of data is given more weight over the other (Creswell, 2003). Hence more weight was given to the qualitative data in this specific study. From the quantitative designs survey will be applied.

**Methodological considerations**

There have been a number of methodological considerations that is taken in the research design, which include:

- The importance of separating ‘perpetrators’ and ‘at risk’ young people from victims. It was important to separate those in the groups who were either ‘victims’, this ensured that participants were able to share their experiences with others of a similar disposition and similar experiences without, for example, the potential ‘fear’ of a victim being in a focus group with a known perpetrator.
- Including affinity groups within the research alongside more traditional focus groups. An affinity group is a group of between two and four individuals who are ‘friends’ that is they are familiar with each other and have established relationships. It was felt that this was the most appropriate combination of techniques as, while also maintaining the inclusion of some traditional focus groups, it gave the added potential of providing richer discussions with young
participants who knew other members within the group. In affinity groups, there is a greater degree of open discussion and expression of opinions as a result of better group synergy and rapport among participants.

The key considerations taken into account when designing the quantitative design; the adoption of an approach to obtain a representative sample of the young people living in the community, and the development of questionnaire appropriate in length to maximize response rates.

**Description of the study area**

I conducted the study in Kirkos sub-city, Woreda 4, Kebele 45, Kera in Addis Ababa. The Kebele was selected for this study since it is found to be one of the hot spots to entertain community violence as preliminary assessment shows. Although, there is not separate report documented from the census made some nine years ago, Woreda 4 administration office provided the information that about 850 youth between the ages of 18-24 live in the Kebele. The presence of a wider range of violent crimes that are being committed in this community than the rest of the kebele’s in the woreda motivated me to choose the area.

**Sampling Method**

Young people who are between the ages of 18-24 living in the area under study have been the population of this study. The study participant includes youth that are involved in criminal activities, victims of crime and those that are neither perpetrators nor victims in the study area but who simply live there.

Simple random and purposive sampling method has been used for the recruitment of participants for this study. Simple Random sampling has been used to identify the sample
size required for the quantitative data required to administer the questionnaire. While purposive sampling have been used for the collection of the qualitative data so as to reach specific group of people such as young people who are offenders, victims of different kinds of crimes and young people that are residents of the area in general. Moreover, with the intention of collecting sufficient data on the research questions key informants have been purposefully selected based on their special experience and knowledge on the issue under study.

**Sample Size**

There are no specific rules when determining an appropriate number of participants in qualitative research. The number of participants in qualitative research may best be determined by the time allotted, resources available, and study objectives (Patton, 1990).

As Sandelowski (1995) points out, "determining adequate sample size in qualitative research is ultimately a matter of judgment and experience" and researchers need to evaluate the quality of the information collected in light of the uses to which it will be put, and the research method, sampling and analytical strategy employed. Strauss and Corbin (1998) suggest that saturation is a "matter of degree" (p.136). They suggest that the longer researchers examine, familiarize themselves and analyze their data, there will always be the potential for "the new to emerge". Instead, they conclude that saturation should be more concerned with reaching the point where it becomes "counter-productive" and that "the new" is discovered does not necessarily add anything to the overall story, model, theory or framework (p.136). Green and Thorogood (2009, p.120) state that "the experience of most qualitative researchers is that in interview studies little that is 'new' comes out of transcripts after you have interviewed 20 or so people". Hence, taking this
in to account a sample size of a maximum 7 individuals has been taken for each specified category pointed out above.

While in the case of determining a sample size for the quantitative data statistically valid sample size of a 95% confidence level with a confidence interval (also known as margin of error) of +/-5 chosen for accuracy. In Kebele 45, as mentioned earlier an estimated amount 850 young people are found whose age group ranges from 18-24. These groups of youth have been sampled for this research, out of which a total of 265 youths have been randomly selected from Kebele 45. The following formula have been use to determine the sample size since its impossible to survey every member of a population because of time and money this formula was particularly used because it gained the highest marks for survey creation, analysis and administration methods, making it the best to determine the sample size.

Formula used to determine sample size:

\[
n = \frac{p(1 - p)z^2}{ME^2}
\]

\[
0.5(1 - 0.5)(1.96) \frac{2}{0.05^2}
\]

\[
\frac{(0.25)(3.8416)}{0.05^2} = 384.16
\]

\[
True\ sample = \frac{n \times tp}{n + tp - 1}
\]

\[
\frac{384.2 \times 850}{384.2 + 850 - 1} = 264.7
\]
Whereas,

ME= Margin of error ±5

z= z-score 95% = 1.96 confidence interval

P = Prior judgment of the correct value of p. (percentage 50%)

n = sample size

tp = Total population (850)

Data Collection Tools

Data collection in case study is typically extensive, drawing on multiple sources of information (Creswell, 2007). Different methods were selected to gather relevant data from various sources. The study involved careful collection and use of a variety of empirical data such as data gathered from both primary and secondary data collection methods for the qualitative data.

Secondary data was collected from police and Kebele records. While the primary data was collected from young people, police officers and government officials using several instruments such as in-depth interview with participant, key-informant interview, FGD and observation. Survey method was employed to collect the quantitative data as such; the data collection instrument that was used was a questionnaire.
Qualitative data collection tools

In-depth interview


An unstructured interview is selected to get holistic and in-depth information about the situation of the interviewees’. In-depth interview helps the researcher to explore and deeply understand how the interviewee view the issues raised. In addition, it enables the research participants to talk and express their feelings and opinion freely. According to Kumar (1999) in-depth interview data collection method is essential in a situation where either in-depth information is needed or little is known about the study area.

Key informant interview

Key informants were selected from relevant government offices. For the purpose of this study one key informant from each government officewere selected for the interviewee both from the police department and Kebeleadministration from the study site.

Observation

Observation is the other commonly used data collection tool in qualitative research. According to Creswell (2014) qualitative observation means that the researcher takes field notes on the behavior and activities of individuals at the research site and records observations. Creswell also stated that it may also enable the researcher to engage in roles varying from a nonparticipant to a complete participant. Therefore, it helps the researcher to get information about the physical set up of the community. Here the strategy the research used is participant observation whereby the researcher watched the subjects
under study, with their knowledge, but also participated in their everyday interactions and meetings (discussions), asked simple questions to the young people that live in the area under study.

**Focus group discussion**

Focus group discussion was selected to get a wide range of responses about different demographic and socioeconomic characteristics. The young people that were selected to engage within the community were able to look at the issue from different dimensions through group interaction. It also helped people to remember important ideas related with the issues that might have been forgotten. In addition, through this interaction, moderators get the content from responses, and they get to observe the group and pick up on emotional responses, contradictions, stress, anger, frustration, enthusiasm and other feelings that do not come through a structured questionnaire. This interactive discussion format typically draws out more useful data than a collection of individual research responses and also it’s of low cost both in time and money. (Kokemuller, 2017).

**Survey Questionnaire**

The major components that were included were demographic questions: age, gender, income, employment, education, and place of birth. Young people and violent crime: on respondents’ opinions, experience, contributory factors about violence. Young people, police and community safety questions: on seeking help, trust and attitudes toward police.

**Data collection procedure**

Different checklists were prepared, which guided the researcher during the interview. The checklists consist of questions that helped the researcher to explore the research objectives. After the researcher informs the objective of the study to the respondents and
ask their willingness to be interviewed and recorded. Then after, the interview with the respondents was documented by cassettes/mobile recorder through their permission as backups in addition to the notes that the researcher kept.

The FGD started by introducing the researcher and briefing the discussants on the objective of the study. Following this, discussants were given the chance to raise questions, if the objective of the study wasn’t clear. The focus group discussion was intended not to take more than one hour.

And in which case the questionnaires was also be distributed to other respondent’s in the area after also informing the objective of the study and getting their permission to participate.

The period that took to collect the data was about one month. This is because in this case study it took several visits to get all the required data needed for the research as the situation of the people needed for the data was unpredictable.

**Data analysis Method**

Mixed analysis involves the use of both quantitative and qualitative analytical techniques within the same framework. A concurrent mixed analysis was utilized to analyze the qualitative and quantitative data. This involved, all qualitative and quantitative data was analyzed concurrently against key topics/variables by the individual researcher in their entirety. Traditionally, as noted by Creswell & Clark P. (2007), “Data analysis in mixed methods research consists of analyzing the quantitative data using quantitative methods and the qualitative data using qualitative methods” (p. 128). In contrast, if the qualitative analysis component is given significantly higher priority, then the analysis essentially is a qualitative-dominant mixed analysis, whereby the analyst
assumes a constructivist-poststructuralist-critical stance with respect to the mixed analysis process, while believing simultaneously that the inclusion of quantitative data and analysis is likely to provide richer data and interpretations (Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, & Turner, 2007). These analyses were used to gain an understanding of the types of information, and issues and to develop a tentative thematic framework (i.e. compilation of key, consistent themes throughout the qualitative research) and the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) 16.0 was used to analyze the quantitative data.

**Ethical consideration**

The fundamental ethical principle of social work research is not to force anyone into participating in the study it should always be voluntary hence before starting the study, every participants of the study were clearly informed about the purpose of the study and the possible length of time the interview could take so that the research would only be carried out with the full consent of the participants.

The principle of informed consent as well as participant wellbeing was given priority over the research objectives at all times. Interviews were, therefore, stopped/ suspended if individuals become distressed in anyway. Therefore careful thought was given to the following ethical issues throughout the course of the research project; all information gathered was kept anonymous and confidential, participants’ right to privacy was upheld at all times. Each participant was allocated a code known only to the researcher addressed including how the data was recorded in a secured way and to whom it was to be revealed after all.
Chapter Four: Findings

This chapter presents the findings of study. The first section presents the socio-demographic characteristics of the participants. The section that follow the socio-demographics section present findings in relation to community, the perceived risk factors and intervention strategies that can be identified from the perspective of young people.

Socio-demographic profile of participants

In this study seven participants were interviewed four males and three females. Their ages ranged from 18 to 24. Two of the participants were from Southern nations and nationalities, four were from Addis Ababa, and one was from Amhara region. The FGD has been conducted among 6 homogenous target populations, who share a common characteristic such as age, sex, educational background also ranging from ages 18 to 24. In addition both key kebele informants and police officers of the area were interviewed.

Furthermore, 265 participant’s residents living in Keble 45 were also asked to fill a questionnaire, which was prepared for the study. The participants were selected randomly where they were asked their background information and questions related to community violence. The details of the participants’ background are presented in table 1 and 2.
### Table 1: Socio-demographic characteristic of survey respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-demographic description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>72.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>27.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age of respondents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>29.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>19.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Birth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addis Ababa</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>95.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside of Addis Ababa(^1)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>38.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>61.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>35.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVET</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily laborer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Emp</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Gov. Emp</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Emp</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income per month</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150-500</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-1000</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 150</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 1000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) These include Arbaminch, Asmara, Mekele, Debreziet, Harar, SNNPR and Wollo Regions
respondents are literate (99.25%). Where most of them are in high school level (63.4%). But only 38.11% of the respondents are employed furthermore, only 23.76% of the respondents have an income above 1000 ETB which shows the majority have a poor standard of living as described in the table above.

Table 2: Socio-demographic characteristics of FGD participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic description</th>
<th>Young people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of origin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addis Ababa</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside of Addis Ababa²</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar to that of the in-depth interview participants the participants of the FGD respondent’s socio-economic statuses are very poor, as can be seen from the table below.

**Factors indicating community violence**

When young people were asked to talk about what makes a place entertaining or violent, consistent themes were apparent among both males and females. When young people in the community were asked they mentioned factors that impact negatively on community experience reflecting on their own experiences which are;

² These include SNNPR and Amhara Regions
• Robbery was described as occurring in broad day light by group of individuals with in the community. It was often described as being impacted by lack of employment and drug abuse. These robberies are so intensive that even some of the young people interviewed have witnessed such acts occurring. One of the interviewee stated “I have seen men jumping up walls of people’s house in day time and this is a common occurrence in our area.”

• Fighting and over drinking, were more mentioned in the context of fighting among younger people which sometimes have led to a person dying. One interview respondent stated that “a couple of month ago in a fight that broke out in a cub house between two individuals resulted in the death of one person and the body of the deceased was found in the sewage bitten up”. Hence, the presence of clubs and chat houses were significant factors as over drinking and using other substances can hinder straight thinking. However, when prompted it was acknowledged that ‘older’ people also enter fights driven by this substances, “yes its young people that are the trouble makers here but even those older than 25 do get into serious fight” stated an interviewee.

• Verbal abuse Similar to the physical acts described above, verbal abuse was also described as being between people in the streets, public areas or shopping centers who may, or may not, be known to each other. Verbal abuse was perceived by many, particularly females, as something that undermines from a positive community experience as they mentioned some experience such kind off abuse starting from their own family members to the community in general, whether it was a sexual harassment or insults. A female interviewee stated
“...it’s a common occurrence all around Addis Ababa whether in shopping centers or streets I always get insulted about my cloth or just because am walking passed them sometimes my own family say many things to me.” While a male interviewee described his perception in regards to verbal abuse in a different light as he stated “its females that verbal abuse each other they yell and insult each other they have no respect for themselves.”

- Unemployment and the Lack of activities within the community which was lack of things to dowere seen also as one of the undermining factors from a good community. For many, this was discussed as a risk factor to each of the points discussed above and others such as violence/fighting, verbal abuse, Robbery, fraud, pick pocket. That is, as young people had less to do, they were more frequently involved in negative behaviors. Several FGD respondents stated that unemployment was the reason they themselves spend a lot off time sitting around the community and chewingkaht or drinkingalcohol for enjoyment. As stated by an interviewee “you found me sitting here because I don’t have a job most of the young people you see here chew kaht or drink for enjoyment to let the day pass. If I could find a job I wouldn’t be here or at least if there was a better thing to do in this area.” Furthermore, respondents who participated in the survey stated that the major contributing factor to community violence within their community is unemployment where 44.91% responded it’s the major factor.

- The rise in homelessness was also mentioned as a factor mostly by those who came from the regional states. As this young people had no place to stay,
they usually lived in houses in large groups of numbers which sometimes led to fights, theft and other crimes. “I couldn’t afford to rent a house so I had to live in one little room with other six friends of mine. Some like me who came from the countryside who don’t know anybody to share a house with work by day and spend the night in the streets till they can be able to afford to rent. I myself lived in the streets for a couple of month before I met my friends but it’s still hard to live with so many people as fights and stealing sometimes occur with may be dangerous as it might lead to more serious crimes.

Almost all participants of the FGD mentioned the number and variety of activities as being an important element influencing their ‘positive’ perceptions of their community. The activities mentioned were typically centered on, free activities where they could socialize and ‘hang out’ such as café areas, recreations centers, and playing grounds. In addition to this element respondents mentioned a ‘feeling’ associated with a ‘good area’. These were described as, a feeling of safety which contributes to a sense of freedom and sense of ‘ease’ that comes from people within the community feeling ‘at ease’ with each other and from closeness within the community with neighbors and strangers being ‘close-knit’ which contributed to a sense of dependability on people around you.

A High socio economic status or living in a wealthy environment was considered important by some respondents, who described the frequency of seeing and being approached by a beggar contributing to a ‘bad area’, and that the presence of wealth or wealthy people make the an area better as FGD respondent stated “the community would also be rid of slum house and other bad living conditions that is currently being experienced by most people in the area but what worries me is most people including me
would have to relocate if the slum houses are demolished.” In addition, they stated “the area would be safer as each house would have their own guard.” The other point made was that the high proportion of ‘drunks’ and ‘druggies’ was perceived a disadvantage to the sense of a ‘good area’ which this community had a large of young people who are both drunks and drug addict.

The environment or the communities layout although mentioned less frequently, the physical condition of the area was a contributing factor to some. The fact that an area appeared ‘cared for’ was expressed as ‘making you feel better and safer’ because it appeared that there was order within the community and someone watching out for it.

The physical appearance of an area was described in terms of, cleanliness (in public and private areas) maintenance of public areas. As can be generally observed the area was filled with dark alleys and curvy roads that leads to different crumpled up slum houses. The FGD respondents stated “people are scared to pass through the curvy streets of our community not only because of the other facts but because it has dirty slum house and streets it creates feeling of unease so if the area was more cared for it would make you feel better and safe.”

When asked to describe their own community, the majority of respondents gave either a positive or neutral response, with only few respondents giving a negative response. As one participant stated “I love my community even if it has problems I believe it’s a good community to live in.” while another respondent stated “I just live here I don’t believe it’s a bad or good community.” Similar to two qualitative respondents one interviewee stated “...it’s a bad to live in if I could I would leave and live somewhere else am sure if I get married and have kids in the future I wouldn’t stay here.” This is reflective of qualitative
discussions with participants where the majority, although able to give several examples of negative experiences, generally held positive or neutral attitudes towards their community.

**Defining community violence**

I asked the participants of the qualitative interview to define community violence. Apart from defining community violence participants were asked to describe the drivers of community violence and risk factors part of which will be discussed in later section of this chapter. In general, the elements described by young people are in-line with the definition adopted in this study.

Community violence is defined as “violence between people or groups who may or may not be known to each other (strangers or acquaintances), which occurs generally (but not always) in a public place” (Preventing Violence, 2005, pg. 8). Physical elements that define community violence for young people; physical - fighting, verbal abuse, robbery / home invasion, intimidating behavior, fraud, were all mentioned as elements of community violence. In regards to all this types of crimes all of the participants have experienced at least one. One interview stated “I have experienced several violence against me….I have been in fights, I have been verbally abused by my family that I am useless and more.” For many, verbal abuse is there commonest occurrence special among girls. Female participants have stated that they would get verbally abused by men like teasing, name calling. In addition, the types of crimes that occur within the community which are reported by the police can be found in the annex VII. The report from the police clearly shows that kemeya, theft, burglary, car parts theft, attempted murder, pick pocket, theft of material inside cars are the crimes that occur in the area. The report
shows the difference in crime rates between the years 2007 and 2008. It shows there are a wider range of violent crimes that are being committed in this community than the rest. According to the survey 55.85% of the respondents stated that these crimes are committed by those between the ages 18-24 as can be clearly seen from the table 5 below.

Table 3: Perception of young people on age at which crime is committed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who do you think are committing more community violence in terms of age category?</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young people 15-17 years</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>25.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people 18-24 years</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>55.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults over 25 years</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>18.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rise in homelessness, unemployment and the presence of clubs and khat houses where considered as factors contributing to community violence by the respondents. As described in table 5 the majority of respondents considered unemployment as the major contributory factor to community violence.
Table 4: Factors contributing to community violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which of the following most contribute to violence in your community?</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raise in number of homelessness</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>29.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The presence of clubs, Khat houses, etc</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>25.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>44.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Young people and government officials around community violence

According to the kebele key informant and the police officer the reason for young people’s involvement in violence is mainly due to drug addiction and unemployment. They stated that the kebele has trained several individuals in order to make them eligible for a loan from the small scale and micro enterprise investment. Several of them have formed groups and have started to work specially in the car wash business but some of these groups tend to fall apart due to misunderstandings to share their profit which is the common problem. Major critics include the lack of transparency, inclusiveness and the issue of beneficence. Nevertheless, when young people were asked that stated that there can be a better result if the government works in close ties with them. The other strategies the kebele does includes counseling for this individuals and providing monitoring program which usually occurs one or twice a month with families of the young people within the
community which is called “Buna tetu” program where family members can discuss about different issues regarding the young people and other problems concerning their community. In addition, community policing is established across different kebeles including kebele 45 where community members themselves form groups work towards ensuring the peace and security in the community.

Study participants from the police and the kebele officials believe that providing counseling, sharing information about crimes with the police by community members would bring change in the community to some extent and decrease violence.

Table 5: Perception and attitude of youth respondents towards police duties and responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How do you evaluate police officers in your community?</th>
<th>Feq.</th>
<th>percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committed to their job</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed to their job, aren't Sociable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t understand people’s problems</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>22.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t understand people’s problems, aren’t sociable</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociable</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>35.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociable, Committed to their job</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociable, Don’t understand people’s problems, aren’t sociable</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aren’t sociable</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
hen we see how the police in the community are perceived by the young people from the table above that even if they are considered sociable more than half of the respondents believe they lack the tendency to understand people’s problem. Hence, it would be the reason for more than half of the respondents stating that victims should report crime to other bodies stated below in table 7 other than the police. In addition, reporting crimes to friends and relatives was more reasonable for young people than to social workers and medical staff.

Table 6: Youth attitude and perception where to report crime experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To whom do the victims must report violence experiences?</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical staff</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nobody</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast, when the respondents were asked about the factors holding back victims from reporting an abuse, 47.17% stated it is because victims are frightened of the consequences while 27.55% stated it is due to lack of proof. Others, 23.77% of the respondents stated it is due to lack of enough information about who to ask. The remaining 1.15% did not mention any specific factor. The response on the specific factors that holdback from reporting violence experiences are summarized.
Table 7: Factors likely to hold back a victim from reporting an abusive experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which of the following is likely to hold back a victim from reporting abuse?</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not enough information about who to ask</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>23.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims are frightened of the consequence</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>47.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of proof</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>265</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Young people were asked if there were any specific situations, or places where they were concerned about community violence. Most participants mentioned at least two or three places in which they expressed a concern about community violence occurring, that is, places in which they would feel unsafe, namely: Dark alleyways, to poorly light areas, night clubs, and the community’s football field. A female interviewee stated “the dark alleyway for example to my house is really scary at night both guys and girls of all ages have had their phones stolen at night, and the nightclub is unsafe because it is near where people live so there are lots of drunk people going out so they grab you call you names and as I am sure lots of other people told you too the football field is used by the young people here and also young people from kebele 38 to use drugs even the police knows this and at night when girls pass by they have been raped in the past.”

Many participants described the sense of insecurity in these places increase during night times. This is due to the fact that people tend to get drunk around the nightclubs and tend to be a hangout place for most of the drunks and drug users of the area as stated by the interviewee above. Despite the fact that nearly all young people who participated in
the qualitative research were able to account to community violence situations they had personally encountered or were aware of, not all were willing to acknowledge a high level of concern for the issue.

On one hand, many of them described a high level of concern. On the other hand, the same proportion of them described a lower degree of personal concern. Those who expressed these lower levels of concern were more likely to be of the opinion that “you just have to ignore it”.

**Perceived risk factors**

The four levels of perceived risk factors identified in this study include; community level risk factors, family level risk factors, peer/group level risk factors and personal level risk factors.

**Community Level Risk Factors**

Community level risk factors were consistently mentioned by young people. They mentioned situational factors like the lack of activities and entertainment options within the community was considered as some of the risk factor at community level, which may lead to community violence. The lack of activities may lead to boredom and frustration which again may lead to acts of community violence. “There is no activity for us to do in this area we want to have fun with what we can so we drink or chew Khat here like you might see others use drugs or get into other crimes because it boring to just sit around. These are the only kinds of entertainment there is a football field but it can’t be used by everybody so lots of young people even under 18 years of age just use this for enjoyment which in turn make them need money to continue enjoying go they go rob houses or steel and get involved in different kinds of crimes.” (FGD Respondents)
Economic disadvantage demonstrated by lack of job and employment was discussed as a community level risk factor as well. But was considerably more relative to the aforementioned community and community risk factor. An interviewee stated “there is high level of unemployment so they just still around which is trying so they hurt them self by abusing alcohol or get into crimes where they can easily get money from like robbery and others.” This can also be seen as only 101 young people stated they are employed from the total of 265 where only 24 young people have an income above 1000 ETB.

**Family Level Risk Factor**

Family level risk factors were consistently considered risk factors by both male and female young people in Keble 45. These factors were considered among the most influential by the respondents contributing to community violence. Family structures were considered a risk factor by young people, although not as strongly as family conflict and high risk behaviors of family members. The conflict within families was often discussed as a risk factor by young people as most of them felt that acts of community violence have retaliations to personal experience or violent situations in their family. A result of this conflict within families, for most, was that the young person avoided the home situation, hence spending a lot of time outside of the home on the streets where community violence occurred. An interviewee stated “this days families don’t understand they just bit up their kids like the old days or just scream at them yes for some it works but for most here they avoid home and since they are already adults they comfort them self’s with alcohol/drugs or go into criminal activities as they spend a lot of their time on the streets.” Discussions of high risk behaviors of parents typically categorized into three areas, violence/abusive behavior towards children, socio-economic status of the family.
was considered a risk factor, but it was more commonly described a risk factor for perpetrating than being a victim. Relationships with parents and caregivers were considered a highly influential risk factor by young people. In line with this another interviewee stated “they don’t just go into criminal activities because they get hit by their family I know rich kids also get hit by their parents but here since they also live in poverty either they have to be good at school or get a decent job to just have hope for the future I think if they lack this quality they see participating in crime as to get money and spend their free time lurking around the community getting into bad actions.”

From the total of six FGD respondents four, males and females alike, discussed a ‘learned behavior’ personality trait. The primary way this behavior was expressed as being learned was through parents and family. Young people discussed that offenders’ childhoods produced strong negative emotions that fueled acts of community violence. Young people considered low levels of parental monitoring and involvement a high risk factor for community violence. One FGD participant stated like the other three that “where else do people learn good or bad things from its their family those who are mistreated at home want to mistreat other outside and parents don’t monitor their kids from an early age here a nine year old child might go out early in the morning and return home at 7:00pm parents don’t know where the child was at all so from an early age they learn different thinks like smoking the child doesn’t feel anything for their actions because no one asks them they only get hit if they get caught.” They linked offender behavior to parents not showing responsibility for their children from an early age. For many this translated into the fact that the offender had a sense of ‘no responsibility’ for their actions as they felt they had no one to be accountable to.
Peer/Group Level Risk Factors

Relationships with peers was considered a risk factor by young people, although was considerably less frequently mentioned compared to relationships with parents and caregivers in the qualitative interview. Associations with deviant peers were considered a risk factor by young people.

Young people described the type of person who would be involved in community violence as someone who would be easily influenced by pressure from deviant peers. Two interviewee’s and FGD respondents linked this risk factor back to elements of low self-esteem, with the perception that responding to deviant peers was an attempt to ‘connect’ with, and be accepted by someone. As stated by an interviewee “... even if they might have been good before most get involved because of the fact that they what to make friends and in order to do that they have to be like their friends and they easily follow them because they lack confidence in themselves.” Four out of six FGD participants considered association with deviant peers was also considered a risk factor for victimization, but this was considerably weaker than the perceived risk of this factor for offending as FGD participants stated that “associating with deviant peers might bring about risk for abuse of those associating but it’s rare as most join them by free will we can say it has more risk for joining in on criminal activities rather than being abused.” The existence of peer/group level of risk factor is affirmed in the table below as a majority of 176 young people consider 18-24 year olds can be exposed to violent relationships of different kinds.

Table 7: Perceived violence as the result of peer relationship
Do you think that young people aged 18 – 24 can be exposed to violent relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>33.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>66.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from the table 9 below out of the 176 individuals who stated young people can be exposed to violent relationship in the above table 54 (30.68%) of them which is the highest of the other categories stated that it was peers who are most likely to be the abuser as compared to the rest in the table below. Hence, peer/group relationship is a relevant factor in community violence occurrences and it can also be seen aside from peers most people that are close to young people were considered abusers as well.

Table 8: Young people’s perception of who is most likely the abuser

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who is the most likely to be the Abuser?</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


### Personal Level Risk Factors

There were several personal characteristics identified as risk factors in this research. In regards to gender, there was a perception that community violence occurred among both females and males. There was clear acknowledgement, however, that the types of community violent behaviors were different between males and females. Females were considered more likely to display verbal violent behaviors, whereas males were more likely to display physical violent behaviors. An interviewee stated “everybody *is exposed*
to violence whether male or female but it’s different for both females mostly don’t fight they insult, call names verbal but men tend to be physically violent”

There were conflicting views whether age was a risk factor for community violence both by FGD and interview participants. Age as a risk factor was polarizing throughout the discussions with young people with some feeling that young people were more involved in community violence, and others believing that age had no role in determining violent behavior. To put this in an account one interview similar to five interviewee’s stated that “Age doesn’t matter haven’t you heard 12 year old kids raping little girl or abusing drugs, steeling and doing other stuff even in our community young kids are involved in criminal activities such as this and it’s even worse when it comes to older people as young people are just trying to get by mostly it’s the old who even commit serious crime.” And another FGD similar to two FGD respondents stated that “kids don’t understand what they are doing at a young age so age does matter they are just being kids it’s the young people and older people who are involved in community violence so age has to be put into consideration.”

The use of drugs was considered as a risk factor for community violence among young people. While drugs were considered indicators of high risk for perpetrating, similar to the discussion around alcohol, they were rarely discussed as being a ‘stand-alone’ risk factor. Drugs were acknowledged as a risk factor because of their likelihood to change behaviors in terms of increasing the propensity to ‘seek’ violence. An interviewee stated similar to the rest of the interviewees stated that “those who abuse drug and alcohol increase the tendency to seek violence I personally drink but when you abuse this thinks it doesn’t let you think or see straight that’s why when people get drunk they easily get into
fights and when this young people are exposed to drug and alcohol abuse it leads them to do aggressive things they would do if they were sober” As has been evidenced through the discussion in all previous risk factors, exposure to violence was considered as a risk factor in increasing levels of aggressive behavior hence social cognition was also considered a risk factor. Lower academic functioning was also considered as a risk factor for perpetration, but not as strongly as risk factors relating to community and family. One FGD respondents similar to the rest stated that “anybody who is exposed in a violent environment will be aggressive themselves since that’s what they know.” An interviewee stated similar to two other interviewee’s stated that “if young people don’t do good in school they tend to get involved in crimes because they don’t think there is another way.”

**Perceived outcome of community violence by young people**

Young people were asked to specifically discuss what they thought were the impacts of community violence. The outcomes of community violence were described as follows.

**Personal emotional outcomes**

Several personal emotional responses were identified by young people as outcomes of community violence. These outcomes were considered not only applicable to victims but also witnesses and those that are experiencing community violence vicariously. These outcomes are sense of anxiety, sense of insecurity and loss of safety, heightened sense of caution, fear resulting in withdrawal, Sadness, introversion, vulnerability / a feeling of being defenseless, and anger were stated both in by FGD and interview participants. An interview respondent similar to the rest stated that “…victims and those living in the area or who saw the crime happen would have fear, worry, and heightened sense of caution, sense of insecurity and loss of safety as people would think they would
get attacked and not trust the neighborhood." While another FGD respondent similar also to the rest also stated “People who might be victims are sad because of the attack against them while also not feeling safe anymore and family having a violent member hence will be self-absorbed and not get involved with others.” “Since people would think they are not safe they would feel helpless to attacks and this in turn will make people frustrated and have a negative mind set for their community.”

**Community outcomes**

In addition to the emotional responses, young people identified five community outcomes of community violence among young people. These are that people (of all ages) leave the community, people are less involved in the community, people obtain security infrastructure for their homes, community gets a bad reputation and visitation of outside those outside the community decreases, the community receives less contributions and benefits from business and government. One interview participant similar to the rest stated that “…people would leave the community to a safe and nicer place but not only people but business as well since if they feel they would get robbed they would also leave as some young people they get in to stores through the roof and rob them the community won’t get a chance to thrive of businesses.” In addition an FGD respondent stated similar to the rest of the participants that “Most rich people’s houses have security wires because of the robberies in the community plus in the future also people would less likely come if it worsens the government also would less likely help to change if the community continues with this situation.” Another FGD participant added “…people would get less involved in the community as they would only want to keep their safety through excluding themselves from others.”
Community violence intervention strategies

Young people were asked to discuss what they thought should be done in their community to address the issue. They identified seven key areas for intervention.

There were consistent mentions by young people that having designated areas for young people to participate in activities would be beneficial. This is not surprising given that they also rated lack of activities as a high risk factor. Discussions around activities were described as places to go where activities could be undertaken and organized activities within the community. As an interviewee stated “If there would be a better entertaining activity that would engage the youth or organized activities by the community for get together.”

Both FGD and interview respondents discussed potential intervention strategies associated with assisting families and parents. This is not surprising given that they also considered family situations a risk factor. These was primarily described as, intervention strategies to assist parents of problem youth, intervention strategies to promote the importance of monitoring and controlling their children as one interviewee similar to four other interview participants stated that “one thing that is important is that there should be taken ways to help parents whose children are problematic and teach parents the importance of monitoring and controlling their children as in this community there is little of this.” Intervention strategies to encourage stronger family relationships, with parental involvement, Encouraging relationships with parents, Fostering an environment that encourages young people to remain in the education system, Educating young people on ways to deal with community violence this was taken from FGD participants as they similarly stated “to solve this problem parents have to get involved and have a strong
relationship with their children which should be encouraged plus they should be brought about an encouraging situation for young people to stay in school while also helping them how to deal with community violence.”

Involving Police in intervention strategies was considered important by many young people. For many, it was specific to having a visible police presence on the street, rather than just increased sightings of Police. In addition, some described the potential for Police education programs within schools. This was often described as promoting the need for education on; the legal consequences (such as jail terms, criminal records), the personal consequences of how your behavior affects others and also increasing penalties for offense. An interviewee stated similar to several others stated “Police should teach young people about crimes and their consequences not only on themselves but on others and about jail and what it means to have a criminal record for their future but also the police should be increase all over the area and maybe increase penalties for crimes”

Discussion of educating young people about the personal consequences was not restricted to delivery by police, however many felt this to be an appropriate mechanism. Young people considered it important to initiate strategies that would involve young people in the community. One suggestion for this by one group of young people was to promote volunteering activities. An FGD participant stated that “it’s not only enough to involve the police young people have to be involved as well to decease this by involving them in volunteering activities to fight crime.” While another suggestion for this was to involve young people by encouraging them to organize and run their own community groups based on their own interests as another FGD participant stated “I think it would be god if young people are encouraged to organizing activities to run their own community
Two elements were discussed in relation to strategies based on infrastructure. Increased lighting in places that young people are currently congregating (for example schools and football field), maintain public telephone boxes (although this was mentioned by only a few groups of young people). One interviewee similar to three others stated “the government has to place more light around the community especially around schools and the football field...” While another interviewee similar to one other interviewee stated that “…the public telephone should be maintained for emergencies...”
Chapter Five: Discussion

This chapter discusses major findings of the study. The result confirmed that most of the young people in the community have unstable economic status. For example, 44.91% of the respondents from the quantitative study stated that unemployment was the major factor which leads the young people in the community to commit violent acts.

Four areas of risk factors for community violence were identified in the finding of the study, which include at community, family, peer/group and personal level. Community factors which were mainly situational factors like the lack of activities. Economic disadvantage was discussed which was also under community and personal risk factor as documented in the finding of the study. The young people in the community have identified that relationships with parents and caregivers were highly influential risk factor. Respondents, males and females alike, discussed a ‘learned behavior’ personality trait. The primary way this behavior was expressed as being learned was through parents and family. Young people discussed that offenders’ childhoods produced strong negative emotions that fueled acts of community violence. As Reza, Krug, and Mercy (2001), documented the main actors of community violence are young people who are both the victims and perpetrators. Exposure to community violence is among the most detrimental experiences children can have, impacting how they think, feel and act (Richters, and Martinez, 1993) and young people considered low levels of parental monitoring and involvement a high risk factor for community violence. Participants, male and female,
linked offender behavior to parents not showing responsibility for their children from an early age. This translated into the fact that the offender had a sense of ‘no responsibility’ for their actions as they felt they had no one to be accountable to.

Relationships with peers was considered a risk factor by young people, although was considerably less frequently mentioned compared to relationships with parents and caregivers. Associations with deviant peers were considered a risk factor by young people. Many linked this risk factor back to elements of low self-esteem, with the perception that responding to peer pressure by deviant peers was an attempt to ‘connect’ with, and be accepted by someone. To some, association with deviant peers was also considered a risk factor for victimization, but this was considerably weaker than the perceived risk of this factor for offending. According to the survey result of this study 66.42% of the respondents stated that those 18-24 years old could be exposed to violent relationship while the rest do not believe so. In response to this, from those who believe that 18-24 aged young people can be in violent relationship 30.68% as compared to the rest stated in chapter four.

Bronfenbrenner, (1979) documented ecological theories that acknowledge youth are shaped by multiple processes that occur at various levels, including the micro level or immediate environment (e.g., family, schools, and community) and the macro level (e.g., societal and cultural contexts). There were several personal characteristics identified as risk factors in this research. In regards to gender there was a perception that community violence occurred among both females and males. There was clear acknowledgement, however, that the types of community violent behaviors were different between males and females. Females were considered more likely to display verbal behaviors, whereas
males were more likely to display physical behaviors which are both serious issues that affect both the behavioral and psychological wellbeing of the young people.

Some young people felt age was a determining factor, and others believing that age had no role in determining behavior, which shows that the perpetrators in the community are not of only a specific age group although the main actors are found to be those aged 18-24 years. The use of drugs was considered a risk factor for community violence among young people. While drugs were considered an indicator of high risk for perpetrating, similar to the discussion around alcohol, they were rarely discussed as being a ‘stand-alone’ risk factor. Because of their likelihood to change behaviors drugs and alcohol were acknowledged as a risk factor in terms of increasing the propensity to ‘seek’ violence. Lower academic functioning was also considered as a risk factor for perpetration, but not as strongly as risk factors relating to community and family as they are the foundation for both the adequate behavioral and mental state expected from young people.

The result showed that several personal emotional responses were identified by young people as outcomes of community violence. These outcomes were considered not only applicable to victims but also witnesses and those that are experiencing community violence vicariously. As stated in the finding of the study as young people experiencing sense of anxiety, sense of insecurity and loss of safety, heightened sense of caution, fear resulting in withdrawal, sadness, introversion, vulnerability this is so as stated by the young people because when a person doesn’t feel safe they will withdraw from the community as they it’s their own community they fear.
In addition to the emotional responses, young people identified five community outcomes of community violence in chapter four. These include the prudence where people (of all ages) leave the area, are less involved within the community, obtain security infrastructure for their homes, community gets a bad reputation and visitation of outside those outside the community decreases, and the community receives less contributions and benefits from business and government. Thus, further impact the community in negative directions as stated in chapter four and resulting in an ever increase in crime with in the community as the condition of the people will worsen.

In the finding of the study seven key areas were identified for intervention by the young people in the community. There were consistent mentions by young people that having designated areas for young people to participate in activities would be beneficial and discussed potential intervention strategies associated with assisting families and parents. Gardner and Gunn (2009), state lower violent crime rates explain inverse association between the variety of youth organizations available at the neighborhood level and adolescents’ exposure to community violence. Involving police in intervention strategies was considered important by young people. For them, it was specific to having a visible police presence on the street, rather than just increased sightings of police. In addition, some described the potential for police education programs within schools. Two elements were discussed in relation to strategies based on infrastructure were increased lighting in places that young people are currently congregating and provision of public telephone boxes for emergencies, education in schools, increased penalties for offending. We can see that identifying all this issue from the perception and experience of the young people in the community will be able to structure out an overall applicable intervention
A plan that can be immersed directly to the specific issues in order to decrease crime and increase social cohesiveness as also stated by Alemika and Chukwuma (2000), police-community violence is facilitated in the country by the frustration of citizens and police arising from inadequate transportation and telecommunication facilities that militate against effective and timely communication by distressed citizens with police and prompt response of the latter to citizen's call for assistance. This in inadequacy portrays the police as ineffective and the citizen as unreasonable, thereby hardening mutual prejudice and hostility between the police and citizens, which under certain conditions erupt into violence. Majority of the citizens lack adequate knowledge of the role and powers of police. Therefore, any action of the police, even within law and which should elicit cooperation is resented. In such situation, the police may enforce the law using measures that would normally have been unnecessary.
Chapter Six: Conclusion, Recommendations, and Social Work Implications

Conclusion

Community violence is one of the dominant problems in kebele 45. While several factors exist for the presence of violence within the community. Unemployment is one of the leading problems in the community. The lack of stable earning has lead the youth to subsistence or be it a dependent life. Regardless of this fact they have a positive or somewhat neural outlook about their community despite the lack of activities and jobs.

Young people in the community have different unmet needs and are particularly at risk of participating in problem behaviors. Young people who have the most severe unmet needs in their lives are particularly in jeopardy of participating in violent behavior, or using drugs and alcohol which is occurring in this community. This is mostly because this young people live in poor and high risk neighborhoods with few opportunities to get the critical experiences needed for positive development. Such youths have a substantial amount of free time that would eventually lead them to make bad decisions and actions.

Almost all of the participants have experienced at least one physical element of community violence. The issue of community violence in many occasions, the responsibility, resides on immediate families, the community and the society at large. Even though, some of the youth accept on the progress, most of them believe that there could have been a better result if the government works in closer ties with them. Hence, more work should be done in this regard to improve the situation.
Recommendations

Policy: policies and programs should be devised and implemented by concerned organizations including the government who bears the legal and moral responsibility of safeguarding its people. Collaborative strategies among caseworkers, police and judges are recommended as law enforcement intervention that has the potential to improve the situation.

Research: More study should be done in the area in regards to effective methods that could tackle unemployment and the low living conditions in the area in order to successfully implement the strategies. Conducting comparative research whether microfinance institutions were creating tension to its client or benefiting them.

Education: Educating young people on social skills including relationship education. Young people had not learnt how to communicate with each other from their parents and were not currently communicating effectively. In addition more education and training should be done to address employment opportunities and concealing overcoming their addictions to different substances.

Practice: Social worker in relations to communities should provide plenty of program opportunities that appeal to and meet the needs of diverse young people in the community, and should do so through local entities that can coordinate such work across the entire community. There should be a multiple actors that should be responsible and contribute to the development of intervention programs in order for youths to be successful. These actors include government particularly local governments, young people, schools, parents, local business, and the police, which are essential players to bring change among the lives of young people. The community programs aim should be
to promote community safety, pro-social behavior and healthy development as well as to prevent drug misuse and crime.

**Implications**

**Implications for Education:** The first implication that can be drawn from this study related to education is that training could also be given on skills needed for engaging at any job without upsetting whatever the job is; avoiding their addictedness, especially chewing Khat. Another area of training that may be given to parents is education in parenting.

**Implications for Policy:** The first implication related to policy is extending the collaboration of giving support to those mass unemployed and violent young people with local and international organizations up to their residential areas. Involving in community development and by empowering those unemployed youths in the community. This study has tried to explore and describe young people’s experience and perception in community violence and also it has tried to fill the gap of knowledge regarding this issue in the study area.

**Implication for Research:** Based on the findings in this study, the following are some of the questions that need more in-depth investigation. The first set of questions relates to the support for the young people in the community. Questions include; do all of the unemployment youth lack opportunities or just don’t have the incentive to work? The second question relates to strategies for enhancing and expanding service organizations. Questions may include what can be done to better rehabilitate those victims and perpetrators of community violence? What are the challenges they are being faced in providing services to this young people?
Implication for Practice: It’s to be recalled that the primary mission of the social work profession is to enhance human well-being and help meet the basic human needs of all people, with particular attention to the needs and empowerment of people who are vulnerable, oppressed, and living in poverty (NASW, 2005). The finding from this research will help to develop an informed understanding of the gaps or needs that exist within the community and their impacts upon the community’s members in regards to violence within the community. The national association of social workers noted the goal of social work practice, as aimed to enhance the problem solving, coping and developmental capacity of people. We help individuals to have good health, positive social relationship, and access to basic resources. As practitioners we have to acknowledge the environmental forces which hinder and/or hasten individual development. We social worker need to mobilize resources, build up their capacities and further strengthen the positive value of community and we need to mobilize resources and also important to connect clients with the needed service. Therefore, it is the duty of social workers to play the role of networking with relevant stakeholders and local self-help groups for practical interventions that involve protection and conservation. It is fundamental to the work of social workers. As we can observe most of the people in kebele 45 have low income and live in houses with low quality. As social workers we need program and strategies to assist them. To achieve the desired goal we should create partnership among the community members and governing officials. So, to bring sustainable development in the community social workers can facilitate the process by different mechanism which would have a positive effect on the wellbeing of participants and creates sense of ownership among the community.
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I want to thank you for taking the time to meet with me today. My name is ______________________ and I would like to talk to you about your experiences and perceptions of community violence and other specific issues concerning this topic.

The interview will take about an hour. I will be recording the session because I don’t want to miss any of your valuable points (but this will depend on your willingness) during the interview. Although I will be taking some notes during the session, I can’t possibly write fast enough to get it all down. Because we’re on tape, please be sure to speak up so that we don’t miss any of your statement. Data will be used only for the purpose of this research. In addition, all the data will be kept solely in the hands of the researcher. All responses will be kept confidential. I will ensure that any information I include in my report does not identify you as the respondent. Remember, you don’t have to talk about anything you don’t want to and you may end the interview at any time. Hence, I hereby request you to be open and honest while responding so that the research could succeed and achieve the intended objectives.

Are there any questions about what I have just explained? Are you willing to participate in this interview?

__________________  __________________
Interviewee                                          Date
Appendix: II

In Depth Interview Guide for young people who live in Kebele45

Part I: Background information

1. Code

2. Sex  Age  3. Educational level  4. Your occupation

5. Your income per month

Part II: Questions on Community Violence and Related Issues

6. What does community mean to you? What are the characteristics to describe a community?

7. How do you describe the concept of community violence? And what are the basic indicators to say a community entertains violence?

8. Have you ever witnessed any violence in your community? What specific types of violence can you witness? (Please describe as detail as possible)

9. As you witnessed who experienced such violence (Probe: ask the participant to list those people experiencing violence by age, gender, economic and social status)

10. As a resident of the community have you any experienced any problem that you can consider as violence? If yes what type of violence you encountered and who did such violence on you?

11. What are the major contributing factors for the perspiration and occurrence of violence in the community? (Probe: ask the participant to describe categories of factors such as social, behavioural, economic, and cultural. Ask details on these factors, example economic-issue of unemployment, poverty, behavioural- drug use, mental health problem, etc.)
12. In your experience, who do you think are actors of community violence? (Probe: in terms of relationship with the victim, in terms of age, in terms of economic and social status, in terms of family status etc) and why are these individuals become actors of community violence? 13. As a witness on the occurrence of community violence on members of your community, what do you think are the consequences/outcomes of such violence? (Probe: peace and security, social, psychological, emotional, family relationship, and even community stability, etc.)?

13. What should be done to address community violence say?
   A) At individual level   (B). At family level C. At the level of the community
   D) By the government structure such as local administration, police, sub-city, etc.

14. If the above points are your suggestions to stop community violence, have you ever witnessed any measures taken so far? If yes can you describe the action steps being taken by each of the above actors?

15. Area specific question to a community level intervention to stop violence, what do you suggest for the community to act upon? (Probe: if the participant mentions any of the following actions: awareness/education, legal action, use of arms to stop violence, to strengthen families on socio-economic and emotional capabilities to assist their family members, etc.

16. Do you have any additional point to mention? Please take your time and tell me.

Thank you for the information you provide me.

If you have any further information to provide, please contact me via: (Phone: 0909535376 email:Selimarg@yahoo.com)
Appendix: III

Interview Guide for police officers (Key Informants)

Please give your answer in detail for each question below.

Part I: Background Information

1. Code

2. Sex——Age——Occupation/Position

Part II: Information on Community Violence and Related Issues

3. Can you please describe the extent of community violence in the *kebele* (mention the name of the *kebele*) where my research pays attention? (Probe: increasing, decreasing, remain same for a couple of years, etc.).

4. For the current status of community violence we discussed above how do you evaluate the participation of young people (refer to the age of your target youth participants)? (Probe: are young people major actors?)

5. What do you think are the possible reasons for the young people to involve in community violence? (Probe: the officer to respond to the following):
   a. Individual (victim/criminal factors). What and how?
   b. family factor. What and How?
   c. Community factor. What and how?
   d. legal factor (role of the police, courts, administrative bodies, etc.). What and how?
   e. Other social and economic factors (such as unemployment, drugs, other social malfunctioning, etc.). What and how?
6. What is the knowledge and attitude of young people towards the law enforcement bodies including police?
   a. Their knowledge…..? Please describe
   b. Their attitude….? Please describe

7. What are the most frequent community violence happened by the young people? (why do you think so the community violence you described above happened most frequently compared to any other type of violence?)

8. In order to address the current state of community violence what do you think are the action strategies to be taken by various actors at various level?
   a. by individual victims or perpetrators
   b. by families of victims and perpetrators
   c. by the community
   d. by the legal arms including police, court and other law enforcement bodies

9. Do you have any point you want to add on top of the information you provided above? Please take your time and tell me.

Thank you very much for your participation. If you want to provide me further information in future, please contact me via: (Phone: 0909535376 email:Selimarg@yahoo.com)
Appendix: IV

Interview Guide for Kebele Key Informants

Please give your answer in detail for each question below.

1. Name ——————————————————— (Optional and using pseudonym is possible)

2. Sex —— Age —— Occupation/Position ———————————————————

3. Do you think this kebele is experiencing community violence by young people?
(Please try to probe the participant to agree by proving her/him your data from the police, etc.).

4. If your response is yes to the above question what do you think are the possible reasons for the young people to involve in community violence? ————

5. What does the Kebele doing or plan to do at various levels to solve community violence issues? Describe:
   a. At individual level     b. At family level     c. At community level

7. What do you believe are the possible intervention strategies by other actors to address community violence?
   a. By individuals    b. By family
   c. By community     d. By government including the kebele administration

9. Do you have any other point in addition to what we have discussed above? Please take your time and describe.

Thank you for your participation and if you have additional information to give please contact me via: (Phone: 0909535376 email: Selimarg@yahoo.com)
Appendix: V

Focus Group Discussion with Young people in Kebele 45

Please, give detailed information on the issues I am going to rise for discussion

1. Tell me your basic information/date
   a. Age_____________ sex_____________
   b. Educational level_________________
   c. Occupation (if any)
   d. Monthly income (if any)

2. What does community mean to you? And what do is think is community violence? —

3. Do you think young people are involved in community violence? Why do you think young people are involved in community violence?

4. What do you think are the outcomes of community violence? –

5. What could be the possible intervention strategies for community violence? ——

6. What are the social and physical environmental factors that contribute for community violence in this community?

7. Do you have any additional information to add?

Thank you
Survey Questionnaire:

Instruction: Please give your answer for each question below.

Part I: Background information of the respondent

1. Code

2. Sex: Male ———, Female

3. Age ——— Place of birth

4. Educational level
   - Primary (1-6)
   - Secondary (7-8)
   - High school (9-10)
   - TVET
   - University
   - Traditional
   - Illiterate

5. Employment status:
   - Employed
   - Unemployed

6. Your occupation/Source of income
   - Government Employee
   - Non-Gov Employee
   - Private employment
   - Daily Labourer
   - other

7. Your income per month
   - Below 150 birr
   - 150-500 birr
   - 500-1000 birr
   - above 1000 birr

Part II: Questions Related to Community Violence

8. How do you evaluate police officers in your community? (Multiple response is possible)
   - A. sociable
   - B. Don’t understand people’s problems
   - C. Committed to their job
   - D. aren’t sociable
9. Which of the following most contribute to makes violence in your community?

A. unemployment

B. Rise in number of homelessness

C. The presence of clubs, chat houses

10. Who do you think are making more community violence compared to the other group?

A. Young people 15-17 years

B. Young people 18-25 years

C. adults over 25 years

11. Do you think that young people aged 18 – 25 can be exposed to violent relationships?

Yes______ No______

12. If your answer to Question 9 is “Yes”, who is the most likely to be the abuser?

Select only one (1) of the following:

A. Boyfriend

B. Girlfriend

C. Peers (e.g. friend or an employee at the workplace)

D. relative

E. anyone in a higher position than the victim (e.g. teacher or manager at work)

F. Other. Please specify: ______________________

13. To whom do the victims must report the violence? Please choose only one (1) of the following:

A. police

B. social worker

C. relatives

D. medical staff (e.g. doctor or psychiatrist)
E. Friends

G. nobody

H. Other. Please specify: _______________________

14. Which of the following is likely to hold back a victim from reporting an abuse? Please choose.

A. victims are frightening of the consequences

B. lack of proof prevents them from putting forward their report

C. not enough information about who to ask for help

D. Other. Please specify: _______________________

Finally, dear respondent I appreciate your cooperation and willingness in the name of Addis Ababa University Graduate School of Social Work family, children and youth concentration. Thank you!
Appendix: VII

Heavy crimes committed during 2007 and 2008 according to LematKetena police report when compared and described

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>kinds of crimes</th>
<th>31 kebele</th>
<th>32 kebele</th>
<th>38 kebele</th>
<th>39 kebele</th>
<th>40 kebele</th>
<th>Enat 45 kebele</th>
<th>Gote ra</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>31 kebele</th>
<th>32 kebele</th>
<th>38 kebele</th>
<th>39 kebele</th>
<th>40 kebele</th>
<th>Enat 45 kebele</th>
<th>Gote ra</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Kemeya&quot; theft; Car parts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted Murder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car theft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery with weapon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pick pocket</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft; materials in side cars</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>