



Another Reshuffle? A Digital Listening Report on Jordanians Engagement with the Third Cabinet Reshuffle

Rand Azem

Digital Listening Unit

Politics and Society Institute (PSI)



Executive Summary

This report tracks the patterns of Jordanian digital engagement with the cabinet reshuffle issued on 11 August 2026 in the government of Dr. Jaafar Hassan, over the course of the day on which the Royal Decree was announced. The reshuffle was a limited one. It involved three figures who were already part of the ministerial team, and it was carried out to satisfy a constitutional requirement arising from the merger of the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Higher Education.

The monitoring shows that engagement peaked during the first hours following the Royal Decree, then dropped sharply and did not rebound the next day. The conversation, in other words, was exhausted within a narrow window of time and never developed into a sustained public controversy.

That conversation was distributed across two spaces operating on opposite logics. On official pages, the language of congratulation and blessing prevailed and criticism was entirely absent, while more than 87 per cent of engagement on news pages was classified as negative. The difference was not confined to tone. It extended to the structure of engagement itself: the audience of the official page settled for quick reactions and resharing, whereas the audience of the news page turned to writing positions. Positive engagement on official pages is therefore not an indicator of general satisfaction but a property of that particular space. The monitoring also shows that Jordanian news platforms constituted the starting point of the conversation rather than merely a conduit for it, since engagement begins with their publication of the story and then takes shape within the space they make available.

Criticism converged on four themes: a reading of the reshuffle as redistribution rather than change, which matches the text of the Royal Decree and does not rest on inaccurate information; a demand for a youth presence in the line-up, expressing the difficulty of new names reaching decision-making positions more than it demanded younger ministers; questions about the value of raising the number of deputy prime ministers to three, divided between concern over cost and doubt about added value; and a call to clarify the reasoning on which the decision was based.



Notably, the government had issued a clarification of the reshuffle's rationale a day before the Royal Decree, yet it left no trace in a digital conversation that formed around the text of the decree alone. The issue therefore concerns the effectiveness of government communication rather than its absence.

Finally, engagement took the form of expressing a position rather than proposing policy. No alternative names and no executive proposals appeared, which suggests that these spaces are used for expression more than for participation in shaping decisions.

Introduction

Cabinet reshuffles in Jordan are a recurrent instrument for redistributing responsibilities within the government team, yet they usually generate a public debate that reaches beyond the names of incoming and outgoing ministers to questions about selection criteria and about how far a reshuffle affects government performance. With the expanding use of digital platforms, a large part of this debate has migrated to them, making them a space in which opinions form and competing readings of government decisions circulate alongside traditional media coverage.

The government of Dr. Jaafar Hassan, which took the constitutional oath on 18 September 2024 following the parliamentary elections and the acceptance of Bisher Al-Khasawneh's resignation, offers a suitable case for tracing this dynamic. It has seen three reshuffles of varying scope in less than two years. The first, on 6 August 2025, was the broadest: ten ministers left the team and new faces took their place. The second, on 14 July 2026, was confined to the appointment of Dr. Nidal Al-Qatamin as Minister of Transport and Minister of Labour. The third came on 11 August 2026 and is the subject of this report.

This reshuffle was not a purely political choice. It was imposed by a constitutional requirement arising from the Education and Human Resources Development Law, passed by the House of Representatives in April 2026, which abolished the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research and established a single ministry overseeing all stages of education. Once the law entered into force upon publication in the Official Gazette, the previous ministerial title was no longer legally valid, which made it necessary to appoint a minister for the new ministry under its newly created name. Since ministers are appointed by Royal Decree upon the recommendation of the Prime Minister, meeting this requirement called for a reshuffle.



On 11 August 2026 the Royal Decree approving the reshuffle was issued. Under it, Eng. Walid Al-Masri was appointed Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Local Administration; Muhannad Shehadeh Khalil was appointed Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of State for Economic Affairs; and Dr. Azmi Mahafzah was appointed Minister of Education and Human Resources Development. The reshuffle covered three figures who were already part of the ministerial team: their resignations from their previous posts were accepted and they were then reappointed under amended titles, which amounted to the promotion of two of them to the deputy premiership alongside the constitutional renaming of the merged education portfolio. The number of deputy prime ministers thus rose to three, in addition to Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs and Expatriates Ayman Safadi.

For monitoring purposes, the reshuffle derives its interest precisely from its procedural character. It was limited in scope, it was preceded by an official clarification from the Prime Ministry announcing that it would not include new ministers and that it implemented a constitutional requirement, and it brought no new name into the ministerial team. Even so, this limited decision produced a marked digital conversation dominated by a negative tone in the media space, one organised around questions that reached beyond the reshuffle itself to the structure of the government team and to the pathways leading to decision-making positions.

From this the questions of the report follow: how was the digital conversation about the reshuffle distributed between the official space and the media space? What themes governed that conversation? And what do these engagement patterns reveal about the way Jordanians receive government decisions more generally? The report addresses these questions by monitoring Jordanian digital content related to the reshuffle on social media platforms and news sites after its announcement, over the day the Royal Decree was issued, 11 August 2026.

I. The Temporal Curve of the Conversation



[Figure 1: Volume of engagement over time, "Cabinet reshuffle in Jordan (August 2026)", 11 to 12 August 2026]

Reading the distribution of engagement over time adds a dimension to understanding the nature of the Jordanian digital conversation about the reshuffle. Engagement peaked during the first hours following the Royal Decree, then fell sharply, followed by a second and lower wave most likely representing later comments and interpretations of the story. The curve then declined steadily until it reached its lowest levels during the night hours, and it stayed at that level throughout the following day with no appreciable rebound.

This pattern indicates that the reshuffle provoked an intense but immediate reaction that did not develop into a sustained public debate. Digital discussion of government decisions is therefore characterised not only by a short memory but also by a short lifespan: a topic is consumed within a few hours and attention then moves away from it without producing follow-up or continuing accountability. This carries a dual implication. On one hand, the wave of criticism remains temporally bounded and has little cumulative effect. On the other, the narrowness of the time window means that any government clarification issued after it has closed loses its chance to shape the public position.

This pattern also justifies confining the present monitoring to the day the Royal Decree was issued, since actual engagement was concentrated in a narrow window that did not extend into the following day.

II. Engagement Patterns on Official and Non-Official Pages

2.1 Official pages: congratulations as a social act

When the reshuffle was announced on official pages, including the page of the Royal Hashemite Court and the pages of ministries and government bodies, comments were dominated by expressions of congratulation and good wishes addressed to the newly appointed ministers and to



the King on the occasion of the reshuffle. No direct criticism of the new line-up's performance was recorded on these pages, and discussion of the substance of the decision or of the policies associated with it was absent.



[Figure 2: Sample comment on the Royal Hashemite Court post]

This pattern is supported by the engagement figures on the Royal Hashemite Court's post announcing the Royal Decree. Total engagement reached roughly 1.2 thousand during the first two hours after publication, distributed across 979 reactions, 161 shares and 98 comments, while the post reached some 103 thousand users out of 3.6-million-page followers. It is notable that reactions exceeded comments by a factor of about ten, meaning that most of those engaging settled for a quick click rather than writing a comment that expressed a position. Sentiment classification, for its part, returned to 28.6 per cent positive and 0 per cent negative.



[Figure 3: Sentiment classification and engagement metrics for the Royal Hashemite Court post]



"Congratulation" here deserves an analytical pause, because it is not a passing expression of approval. In Jordanian social convention, offering congratulations is an act performed on occasions of celebration such as marriage, academic success and promotion. It belongs, that is, to a mode of interaction that assumes in advance that the event is an occasion for congratulation rather than for evaluation. When congratulation becomes the dominant response to a political decision, this indicates that the decision was received in that space within the frame of a social occasion rather than within the frame of public policy open to debate. This is an observation about the pattern of engagement, not about participants' position on the reshuffle itself.

Explaining the absence of criticism on these pages, however, admits more than one reading, and the data from official pages alone do not allow one reading to be favoured over another:

First, content moderation. Official pages are subject to comment management that may include deletion or hiding, which would make the absence of criticism a procedural outcome rather than a behavioural one.

Second, audience selection. Followers who engage with official pages are not a representative sample of platform users in general, since the decision to follow an official page and comment on it involves a self-selection bias.

Third, platform convention. Congratulating appointments is a recurrent behaviour independent of political context, and it extends to administrative and academic appointments among others.

Fourth, differentiation between spaces. Users may treat official pages as less suited to critical expression than independent spaces. This possibility draws plausibility from the continuing public debate around Cybercrime Law No. 17 of 2023, published in the Official Gazette on 13 August 2023 and entering into force thirty days after publication, which raised human rights concerns about its effect on freedom of expression online, particularly in relation to loosely drafted provisions and to content concerning public officials. Even so, invoking this context remains within the bounds of a possible explanation, since the data gathered here do not allow a direct causal relationship between the law and commenter behaviour to be established.

2.2 Engagement in the media space: a contrasting pattern



Monitoring engagement with the same story on news pages reveals a pattern entirely different from the one that appeared in the official space. On the page of Ammon News, one of the most widely followed Jordanian news pages with around 4.3 million followers, comments and reactions were close to a one-to-one ratio, against one comment for every ten reactions on the Royal Hashemite Court's post. This shift in the structure of engagement means that the news page's audience did not settle for the quick click but moved to writing a position, precisely the type of engagement absent from the official space.

The contrast is equally clear in the form of circulation. The Royal Court's post attracted a relatively high number of shares compared with its comments, whereas sharing was almost absent from the Ammon post in favour of discussion inside the comment section. This suggests that the two spaces perform two different functions for users: the first for documentation and resharing, the second for commentary and accountability.



[Figure 4: Sentiment classification and engagement metrics for the Ammon News post]

Sentiment classification reflects the same inversion. On the Ammon post, 87.2 per cent of engagement was classified as negative and 3.5 per cent as positive. The magnitude of the gap between the two spaces is therefore too large to be attributed to classification error alone.

This comparison leads to a basic conclusion: criticism is indeed present in the public conversation about the reshuffle, but it is distributed unevenly across digital spaces, finding its way to news



pages rather than to official ones. Positive engagement in the official space cannot therefore be read as an indicator of general satisfaction, but only as a feature of that space in particular.

That said, the comparison does not allow us to separate two possibilities that lead to the same outcome: that users voluntarily refrain from critical expression on official pages, or that the administrators of those pages moderate comments and remove whatever falls outside the register of congratulation. Adjudicating between the two would require monitoring tools that go beyond the scope of this report.

Influencer	Network	Posts
 تابعنا http://www.sarahnews.net/		15 ↑7.1%
 مدار الساعة http://alsaa.net/		12 ↑50%
 dotjo http://petra.gov.jo/		11
 جميع الحقوق محفوظة http://www.khaberni.com/		11 ↑83.3%
 أخبار حياة Akhbar Hayat http://www.facebook.com/		10 ↑900%
 akhbar alblad - http://albaladnews.net/		9 ↑200%
 Roya News @RoyaNews		9 ↑800%
 وكالة صمون الاخبارية @ammonnews		9 ↑800%
 جفر نيوز http://jfrnews.com.jo/		8 ↓38.5%
 akhbar alardn - http://jomnews.com/		8 ↑60%

[Figure 5: Most prolific sources publishing on the reshuffle, by number of posts]

Alongside this, the role of news pages and websites stands out as the principal engine of the conversation. The distribution of the sources publishing most frequently on the reshuffle showed that the overwhelming majority were Jordanian news sites and platforms, led by Sarayanews, Madar Al-Saa, Khaberni, Al-Balad, Roya and Ammon, alongside a presence for the Jordan News Agency (Petra) as the official source of the story. These platforms did not merely transmit the



conversation; they constituted its point of departure, since engagement typically begins with their publication of the story and then takes shape within the space they open for commentary and resharing.

The importance of this role lies in the fact that these platforms combine broad reach with a wider margin for discussion, which makes them the space in which public positions on government decisions crystallise before travelling elsewhere. It follows that any monitoring of how government decisions are received digitally will remain incomplete if it does not cover these platforms, and that any government communication effort confined to official channels will fail to reach the space where discussion actually takes place.

These platforms also differ in the tone of engagement they attract. While a negative tone prevailed on some of them, others retained a wider margin of neutral or positive engagement, a variation indicating that each platform's audience and editorial policy contribute to shaping the pattern of discussion and not only to transmitting it.

III. Themes of the Discussion

3.1 The reshuffle as redistribution rather than change

A recurrent observation in Jordanian digital engagement held that the reshuffle brought no new names and merely redistributed roles among figures who were already part of the ministerial team. Particular expressions recurred in the comments to convey this reading, most prominently "recycling" and "the same faces", terms that carry an implicit judgement about the nature of the change more than they describe it neutrally.

It is worth noting that this reading rests on an accurate premise. According to the text of the Royal Decree, the reshuffle covered three figures all of whom were within the government before it was issued, since their resignations from their previous posts were accepted and they were then reappointed under amended titles. Commenters' observation about the absence of new faces therefore matches what the official document states, and it does not rest on an impression or on inaccurate information.



What goes beyond this descriptive observation, however, is the question that emerged from it in the public conversation: what does a reshuffle mean if the team does not change, and should it be expected to make a tangible difference to government performance? At this point engagement moves from registering an event to assessing its usefulness, and in circulating discourse the reshuffle shifts from a constitutional procedure to an object of accountability regarding its capacity to produce actual change.



[Figure 6: Sample comments on the reshuffle as a redistribution of roles]

3.2 Age and generation as an entry point for criticism

Jordanian comments repeatedly called for a youth presence in the ministerial line-up, framed in direct terms as questions about the role of young people or about the place of the new generation. This demand was not tied to particular names, nor was it accompanied by specific proposals. It came in the form of a general expression of position

The demand has grounding in the country's demographic composition. Youth and children make up around 57 per cent of the Kingdom's population, while the ages of the ministers covered by the reshuffle fall within the older age brackets. The gap between the composition of the population and



the composition of the amended ministerial posts is thus a measurable datum rather than a mere impression.

A formulation also emerged in the comments that moved this demand from the level of preference to the level of institutional logic, by linking it to the retirement age and noting that those past sixty are adequately provided for by their pensions. This is an argument grounded in a rule applied in public service, which makes it closer to procedural accountability than to an objection based on age as such.



[Figure 7: Sample comment linking the demand for youth inclusion to the retirement age]

Reading this theme as a demand for a reshuffle bringing in ministers drawn from the youth category alone would nonetheless be incomplete. Terms such as "the new generation" and "the same faces" indicate that age here is an entry point for expressing a broader concern, namely the difficulty of new names reaching decision-making positions. This is evident in comments that combined the two observations, one of which linked the absence of young people to the recurrence of the same faces, meaning that commenters see the two as a single grievance rather than as two.



[Figure 8: Sample comment combining the absence of youth and the recurrence of the same faces]

This axis was also connected to the economic dimension, with unemployment present as the frame through which the demand for youth inclusion was read. That presence came largely in a sarcastic register, through comments presuming that every economic objective had already been met, from ending unemployment to repaying debt and employing the jobless, a formulation that expresses



scepticism about the reshuffle's capacity to address livelihood issues more than it expresses an actual expectation.



[Figure 9: Sample comments linking the reshuffle to unemployment and living conditions]

Finally, it may be observed that these comments took the form of expressing a position rather than proposing policy, since no alternative names or executive proposals appeared in Jordanians' digital engagement with the subject. This in itself is a datum about how these spaces are used: they function as an outlet for expression and venting more than as a channel for participation in shaping decisions.

3.3 Questions about the value of expanding the deputy premierships

Raising the number of deputy prime ministers to three formed a recurrent axis in the comments, expressing as direct surprise at the number itself and usually without being coupled to any explanation or comparison.

This questioning draws its grounding from the government's own trajectory. When the government was formed in September 2024, the number of deputy prime ministers was limited to one, after there had been three in the preceding Khasawneh government. The recent reshuffle therefore returned the number to what it had been before the government was formed, yet this context did not appear in the comments. Surprise attached to the number alone rather than to the shift it represented, which indicates that digital discussion treats the immediate decision in isolation from what preceded it.



Discussion of this point was distributed across two levels. The first is economic. A number of commenters linked the creation of posts to the salaries and allowances they entail, stressing that these are drawn from public funds. It may be noted here that the comments did not rest on figures or specific data, which makes them a popular expression of concern about cost rather than an estimate of it, though their recurrence indicates the presence of the financial dimension as a frame through which any expansion in the structure of government is read.



[Figure 10: Sample comment on the cost of the new posts]

The second level concerns the function of the post itself, expressed in a satirical register through the supposition of non-substantive reasons for the expansion, such as the first deputy being preoccupied with travel. This device operates as a form of indirect criticism: it places the decision in question by offering a witty explanation for it rather than confronting it with explicit objection.



[Figure 11: Sample satirical comment on the function of the new post]

The two levels converge on a single question: what added value does the new post provide? This is a question the government clarification issued before the reshuffle addressed, but the answer did not reach the digital conversation, in the manner the following theme discusses.

3.4 Calls to clarify the rationale of the decision

A further pattern appeared in the comments, less frequently than the preceding themes, that did not stop at objecting to the reshuffle but demanded an explanation of the logic on which it was based. This demand was framed as questions about the criteria for selecting names and about the



outcomes expected from the reshuffle, with an explicit distinction drawn between what accrues to the appointees in salaries and privileges and what is actually reflected in citizens' circumstances.



[Figure 12: Sample comment demanding clarification of the criteria and expected outcomes]

It is notable that this demand appeared even though the Prime Ministry had issued a clarification a day before the Royal Decree, explaining that the reshuffle was limited and did not include new ministers, that it was carried out in fulfilment of the constitutional requirement arising from the merger of the two ministries, and that the appointment of two deputy prime ministers aimed to strengthen the economic modernisation and services committees and give them greater capacity to follow up files and accelerate delivery.

The issue, then, does not lie in the absence of an official clarification but in the limited extent to which it reached the audiences of the platforms. The government explanation was issued through traditional news channels, whereas the digital conversation formed around the text of the Royal Decree alone, a procedural text that lists names and positions without explanation. This is a gap in the effectiveness of communication rather than in its existence, since the clarification did not accompany the posts that drew the highest engagement.

That vacuum leaves a space filled by the interpretations circulating in the digital sphere, whether satirical or sceptical readings, interpretations that arise in the absence of a narrative that reaches its audience rather than in confrontation with an official narrative.

It may also be observed that these comments do not direct their question at any particular body but frame it generally, addressed to any party capable of clarifying. This is an indicator that users do not expect an answer and treat these spaces as a place for posing the question rather than for receiving a reply.



IV. Discussion and Findings

Monitoring engagement with the reshuffle reveals that the digital sphere is not a single space. The same platform contains distinct spaces, each with its own audience, its own convention and its own accepted mode of expression. This appeared clearly in the contrast between official pages, dominated by the language of congratulation and blessing with criticism entirely absent, and news pages, where most engagement was classified as negative. The difference was not confined to the tone of comments but extended to the structure of engagement itself: the official page's audience settled for quick reactions and resharing the story, while the news page's audience turned to writing positions in the comment section. The two spaces thus perform two different functions, the first for documentation and circulation, the second for discussion and accountability. It follows that reading positive engagement on official pages as an indicator of general satisfaction is a misleading reading, not merely an incomplete one.

It is striking that this broad negative discussion arose around a limited procedural decision, taken in fulfilment of a constitutional requirement and introducing no new name into the ministerial team. The themes that governed the discussion indicate that the reshuffle functioned as an occasion for raising accumulated questions more than it was itself the subject of discussion. Foremost among them was the reading of the reshuffle as redistribution rather than change, a reading that rests on an accurate premise rather than on an impression, since it matches the text of the Royal Decree itself. From it emerged a broader question about the value of the reshuffle and its capacity to make a tangible difference. This observation intersected with the demand for a youth presence in the line-up, a demand that concerns younger ministers less than it expresses the difficulty of new names reaching decision-making positions, which makes the two observations a single grievance about the fixity of the ministerial line-up rather than two separate ones. To these was added the question about the value of raising the number of deputy prime ministers to three, divided between concern over financial cost and doubt about the added value of the new post.



A paradox worth pausing over emerges here. The government had explained the rationale of the reshuffle a day before it was issued, stating that it was limited, that it implemented a constitutional requirement, and that the appointment of two deputy prime ministers was intended to strengthen the economic modernisation and services committees. Yet this clarification left no trace in the digital conversation, which formed around the text of the Royal Decree alone, a procedural text listing names and positions without explanation. The issue therefore concerns the effectiveness of government communication rather than its absence, and the fact that the message was issued through a channel different from the one in which the discussion took place. That vacuum leaves a space filled by interpretations circulating digitally, satirical or sceptical readings that arise in the absence of a narrative that reaches its audience rather than in confrontation with an official narrative.

Two further observations about the nature of digital discussion itself may be added. The first is that it treats the immediate decision in isolation from its antecedents. The number of deputy prime ministers was met with surprise without anyone recalling that the number had been three before the government was formed, which means that every decision is read as a separate event rather than as a link in a sequence. The second is that engagement took the form of expressing a position rather than proposing policy, since no alternative names or executive proposals appeared. This observation concerns the nature of the medium as much as it concerns the participants, since a comment section is not a space designed for policy formulation. At the same time, however, it points to the absence of a channel through which citizens know that their contribution will be read.

V. Recommendations

On the basis of this monitoring, public opinion should not be gauged from official pages alone. Engagement on them is celebratory by nature and yields an inverted image rather than a partial one. Assessing how decisions are received requires monitoring news and independent platforms alongside them, on a regular basis rather than only during crises and major events. This is reinforced by the fact that discussion actually takes place on news platforms, which are its point



of departure and its widest arena, and which make government communication confined to official channels a form of communication that misses its audience.

The explanation of a decision needs to appear within the announcement itself rather than in a separate statement. The government clarification was issued a day before the reshuffle, yet the discussion formed around the text of the Royal Decree alone, and two lines explaining the rationale within the post itself would have been enough to close the gap that speculation filled. Timing is also decisive: engagement is concentrated in the first hours after an announcement and then falls away quickly, so any clarification issued after that window loses its effect because the public position has already formed.

When a new ministerial post is created, it is advisable to set out its mandate and its expected outputs. Most of the questions about the deputy prime ministers concerned the usefulness of the post, and answering them moves the discussion from surprise to follow-up. The same logic applies to financial matters: comments about cost came with no numerical basis, which left estimation open to guesswork, whereas publishing the data confines the discussion within its factual limits. Youth representation appears to be a standing issue in its own right. Its emergence on a procedural occasion unconnected to it indicates a prior accumulation that predates the event and requires independent treatment rather than a situational response. Related to this is the fact that comments expressed positions without proposing alternatives, which reflects the absence of a channel through which citizens know that their contribution will be read.

Finally, monitoring the engagement of those directly affected by the merger of the two ministries, including teachers, parents and students, remains a complementary step that may reveal a pattern different from that of the general discussion.



[^1]: "Ten ministers left Hassan's government in the first reshuffle", Al Mamlaka TV, 6 August 2025, accessed 11 August 2026: <https://www.almamlakatv.com/news/175576b>

[^2]: "Royal Decree approving a reshuffle of Hassan's government", Al Mamlaka TV, 14 July 2026, accessed 11 August 2026: <https://www.almamlakatv.com/news/204586>

[^3]: "Jordan's parliament passes a law merging the ministries of education and higher education", Al-Araby Al-Jadeed, 8 April 2026, accessed 11 August 2026: <https://www.alaraby.co.uk/society/نواب-الأردن-يقرون-قانونا-لدمج-وزارتي-التربية-والتعليم-العالي>

[^4]: "Publication of the law merging the ministries of education and higher education in the Official Gazette", Ammon News Agency, 14 May 2026, accessed 11 August 2026: <https://www.ammonnews.net/article/998866>

[^5]: "After the merger of 'education' and 'higher education': a reshuffle expected in Jaafar Hassan's government", Roya News, August 2026, accessed 11 August 2026: <https://royanews.tv/news/391257>

[^6]: "Royal Decree carrying out a reshuffle of Jaafar Hassan's government: Al-Masri, Shehadeh and Mahafzah", Madar Al-Saa, 11 August 2026: <https://alsaa.net/article/648124>

[^7]: "'Shehadeh and Al-Masri' as deputies to the Prime Minister in the third reshuffle", Al-Haqiqa International Agency, 11 August 2026, accessed 11 August 2026: <https://factjo.com/news/146544>

[^8]: Text of Cybercrime Law No. (17) of 2023 as published in the Official Gazette, issue 5874, 13 August 2023, accessed 11 August 2026: <https://jo24.net/article/480436>



[^9]: "Jordan: concerns over cybercrime legislation and shrinking civic space", Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), August 2023: <https://www.ohchr.org/ar/press-briefing-notes/2023/08/jordan-concerns-over-cybercrime-legislation-and-shrinking-civic-space>

[^10]: "57% of Jordanians are youth and children", Khaberni, August 2026, accessed 12 August 2026: <https://www.khaberni.com/news/837281>

[^11]: Ministers' data, Prime Ministry of Jordan: [بيانات_الوزراء/308/3072/https://www.pm.gov.jo/AR/ListDetails/308/3072/](https://www.pm.gov.jo/AR/ListDetails/308/3072/بيانات_الوزراء)

[^12]: "Jordan: the new government headed by Jaafar Hassan takes the constitutional oath", Arab48, 18 September 2024: <https://www.arab48.com/-/الوطن-أخبار-عربية-ودولية/أخبار-الوطن-18/09/2024/العربي-الأردن-الحكومة-الجديدة-برئاسة-جعفر-حسان-تؤدي-اليمن-الدستورية>

[^13]: "Prime Ministry: a limited reshuffle with no new ministers", Assabeel, 10 August 2026: <https://assabeel.net/81288>