

# The Attitudes towards Syrians Living in Turkey: A Scale Development

Arzu Çalışkan Sarı\*, Özden Yalçınkaya Alkar\*\*

## Abstract

*An inventory to assess attitudes of the host (local) society towards Syrian migrants in Turkey was developed. 314 participants over the age of 18 were recruited in this study. First of all, an item pool was created by giving emphasis on related scales or theories like Social Distance Scale, intergroup bias theories or by depending on our observations about attitudes of host community towards Syrian in many domains, such as living together, opinions about migration policies, problems between locals and migrants and so on... At the end of the content analysis, there were 48 items in total in the scale. Intergroup Bias Scale and Intergroup Contact Conditions Scale were used to measure the criterion validity of our scale. After factor analysis, 25 items remained with three factors. These three factors explained 53% of the total variance. Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient was found as .73. Upper/Lower 27% of Group Reliability was also applied and it was found that items had a good discrimination.*

**Key words:** *attitude towards migrants, Syrian migrants, host society's attitudes about migrants*

---

\* PhD Candidate, Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University, Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Psychology, e-mail: arzu.caliskan@goc.gov.tr

\*\* Associate Professor, Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University, Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Psychology, e-mail:ozdenalkar@yahoo.com

# Türkiye’de Yaşayan Suriyelilere Yönelik Tutumlar: Anket Geliştirme

Arzu Çalışkan Sarı\*, Özden Yalçınkaya Alkar\*\*

## Öz

*Türkiye’deki Suriyeli göçmenlere yönelik yerel (ev sahibi) toplumun tutumlarını ölçmek için bir anket geliştirilmiştir. Çalışmaya 18 yaş üstü 314 kişi katılmıştır. İlk olarak, sosyal mesafe ölçeği gibi ölçekler ya da gruplar arası önyargı kuramları gibi teorilere vurgu yaparak soru havuzu hazırlanmıştır. Ev sahibi topluluğun Suriyeli göçmenlere karşı birlikte yaşamak, göç politikaları, yerli halk ile göçmenler arasındaki sorunlar gibi pek çok alandaki tutumlarına yönelik gözlemlerimize bağlı olarak da madde havuzu genişletilmiştir. İçerik analizinin sonunda ölçekte toplam 48 madde kalmıştır. Gruplararası Temas Koşulları Ölçeği ve Gruplararası Önyargı Ölçeği mevcut ölçeğin ölçüt geçerliliğini test etmek için kullanılmıştır. Faktör analizi yapıldıktan sonra 3 faktörden oluşan 25 madde kalmıştır. Bu 3 faktör toplam varyansın %53’ünü açıklamaktadır. Ölçeğin Cronbach alfa güvenilirlik katsayısı .73 olarak bulunmuştur. %27’lik alt-üst grup güvenilirliği de uygulanmıştır ve maddelerin bir ayrımına sahip olduğu görülmüştür.*

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** *göçmenlere yönelik tutumlar, Suriyeli göçmenler, yerel toplum göçmenler hakkındaki tutumları*

\*Doktor Adayı, Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Psikoloji Bölümü, e-posta: arzu.caliskan@goc.gov.tr

\*\*Doç. Dr., Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Psikoloji Bölümü, e-posta: ozdenalkar@yahoo.com

## INTRODUCTION<sup>1</sup>

After the war in Syria, Turkey has become a host country for millions of people. Due to Turkey's geopolitical location, history and cultural ties, it is obvious that Turkey will be affected for a long time by ongoing Syrian refugee crisis. According to statistics of Directorate General of Migration Management at 05.10.2018, there are 3.577.752 registered Syrian migrants within the scope of Temporary Protection in Turkey (DGMM, 2018). In Turkey, according to the 2007 World Development Report, studies focused on the impact of migration, integration and the effects of migration on both host community and migrant individuals have been neglected in the past (Unicef, 2007). The effect of migration is a new field of research that needs to be further developed in the near future. With the extension of Syrians stay in Turkey, social tension has begun to increase between Syrians and Turkish local community (Ankaralı et al., 2017). In this context, knowing the attitudes of local people towards Syrians has become a desirable situation in many areas with the purpose of determining public policies to be used in integration studies. Since Syrians who have different cultural and social identities migrated to Turkey are included in Turkish society as a new social group, it is inevitable that they will establish human contacts at interpersonal and inter-group level. Considering the history of the world, many positive or negative group interactions have been observed in the context of race, ethnicity and religious origin (Güler, 2013). Some dramatic events, such as the Jewish genocide, Black and White conflicts in United States of America, genocides in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Palestinian-Israeli conflict give us information about the existence of many different groups.

---

1 In this article, the concept of *migrants* was chosen for the Syrians. Items in the survey were asked as migrants instead of Syrian migrants, but there was a statement at the top of the survey that respondents should reply the items by thinking Syrian migrants living in Turkey. In fact, Syrians came to Turkey with a mass flux, so Turkish government has been granted them Temporary Protection Status collectively with the Law of Foreigners and International Protection numbered 6458. However, using the concept of Syrians under temporary protection status every time in the article can disrupt the flow of the article. Therefore, we used Syrian migrant term shortly. The reason we did not prefer to use Syrian refugee concept was that Turkey has signed Geneva Convention with geographical restriction. Syrians have not been in Turkey as refugee status because they did not come from Europa.

These events also allow us to develop and study theories about the nature of these conflicts and intergroup relations (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2011). In that point, it is very important to understand in depth a person's group and this group's relations to others within the scope of the social identity, social classifications and social comparisons for better social policies and reduce prejudices and conflicts between groups. The massive flow of ethnic migration has become a major public issue that has led to much controversy, as politicians and the public realized that there was no temporary problem to deal with (Coenders, Lubbers & Scheepers, 2003). Taking the migrant population in Turkey after the civil war in Syria into account, it is important to investigate their social, emotional and psychological integrations as well as host communities' perceptions and attitudes towards them to take necessary precautions respectively.

Due to its geographical and strategic location, Turkey has faced major migration and asylum flows in history and continues to face. Turkey has a tradition of being a deep-rooted compassionate society which opens its doors to migrants and protects those in need. The characteristic of Turkey being a compassion society has created a positive atmosphere by approaching the people who escaped from the war in Syria (Erdoğan, 2017). However, being a guest is a short-term situation. Therefore, some reactions by the local society have begun to occur towards Syrian people and attitudes towards these people have begun to become negative after local society understand that they are permanent in Turkey (Erdoğan, 2017). In addition, sharing the limited resources with Syrian people have changed local society's attitudes negatively (Demir, 2017; Tuğsuz & Yılmaz, 2015). There are some concerns of the host society that Syrians are taking their jobs away from them and they are creating cheap labor (Erdoğan, 2014). The rate of people that think Syrians take Turkish people's job is 56% and this rate is increasing in neighboring cities according to that report. Several studies have been conducted in order to learn about the agendas of the local people for the Syrian people, but they are not based on a structured questionnaire (Demir, 2015; Yenciun, 2014). There have been some investigations about public attitudes in the form of household interviews or telephone interviews (Demir, 2017; Yenciun, 2014). In this regard, it is

clear that a valid and reliable questionnaire measuring the attitudes towards the Syrians from a broad perspective is needed.

While the researchers developed current attitude scale towards migrants (Syrians specifically), they based on the theories related to intergroup bias. Theories that have investigated some biases about the relationship between different groups in terms of ethnicity or religion can be sorted, such as Social Identity Theory, Intergroup Contact Theory, Social Dominance Theory and Prejudice Theories. The items in the current questionnaire were written using the thoughts in the above-listed theories. There are many international studies that measure attitudes toward migrants. One of them is Pettigrew and Meertens' measure of blatant and subtle prejudice towards migrants (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995). This scale measures two types of intergroup prejudices which are blatant and subtle. Blatant prejudice is a traditional form of prejudice which is direct and easy to understand while subtle prejudice is a modern form of prejudice which is indirect and distant. This survey is a 20 items Likert scale and it consists of five sub-dimensions which are threat and rejection, intimacy, traditional values, cultural differences and affective prejudice (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995). While current scale's item pool is constituted, threat and rejection and intimacy sub-dimensions that belong to blatant form have been guided.

When measuring the attitudes towards the Syrians, it would be unfair to pass on the issues of group contact, prejudice and bias without referring to the theories. Based on a study of attitudes towards xenophobia (hostility towards foreigners), three key factors are found to be important: thoughts about foreigners, beliefs about how much participants have knowledge about foreigners, and the importance of foreigners for participants (Wagner, Van Dick, Pettigrew & Christ, 2003). Positive contact for them does not only lead to more positive attitudes towards foreigners but also contributes about strengthening the attitudes based on these three key elements. Refugees and migrants are exposed to negative attitudes for various reasons in many parts of the world. Previous studies have shown that intergroup anxiety causes bias against outgroups (Islam & Hewstone, 1993). Stephan and Stephan (1985) argue that intergroup anxiety arises primarily from expecting negative results during interactions with outgroups. The

theory suggests that people with high prejudice and limited interactions with outgroups are more likely to experience intergroup anxiety (Stephan & Stephan, 1985; Dijker, 1987). Another reason for intergroup prejudice is the perception of threat (Stephan & Stephan, 1996). The integrated threat theory of prejudice suggests that there are four types of threats in a relationship between outgroups which are realistic threats, symbolic threats, intergroup anxiety and negative stereotypes (Stephan & Stephan, 1996). These can be the cause of intergroup prejudice in intercultural relationships. When developing a questionnaire about the attitudes towards migrants, the issue of intergroup threat is among the topics that should be investigated. The theoretical origins of realistic threat are based on realistic group conflict theory developed by Muzaffer Sherif (Bizman & Yinon, 2001). Research has shown that realistic threats include intergroup competition on limited resources like job facilities or land and threats related to social status and health opportunities (Jackson, 1993; Levine & Cambell, 1972; Stephan & Stephan, 1996). Studies have consistently reported that realistic threat is a firm predictor of prejudice (Schwarzwald & Tur-Kaspa, 1997; Islam & Jahjah, 2001; Stephan, Ybarra & Bachman, 1999). The symbolic threat is about perceiving group difference in values, morality, standards, beliefs and attitudes (Stephan & Stephan, 1996). Studies investigating the symbolic threat have shown that outgroups who have different worldviews pose a threat to the group and as a result, outgroups are not welcomed (Stephan, Diaz, Loving & Duran, 2000). The demonstration of prejudice of symbolic threat is to condemn ethnic traditions and customs that constitute a threat towards in-group's moral values and benefit outgroups in social politics (Branscombe & Wann, 1994; Esses, Jackson & Armstrong, 1998). Thirdly, intergroup anxiety expresses the personal threatening experience when interacting socially with outgroup members; because of the individual worries about the negative consequences of self-denial, and ridicule (Stephan & Stephan, 1985). Lastly, negative stereotypes are subtle threats related to outgroup members because individuals have some expectations related to outgroups' behavior (Stephan, Ybarra & Bachman, 1999). According to a study, if in-group members perceive outgroups' members as dishonest, aggressive or brute, they will expect negative relationships and therefore have negative attitudes towards them (Esses, Haddock & Zanna,

1993). In the current scale, two types of threats which are a realistic threat (items like “Migrants harm the country’s economy.”, “I am not disturbed that migrant children benefit from Turkey’s educational institution.” or “I am not disturbed by the fact that migrants have free access to health services.” and negative stereotypes (items, such as “The attitude of migrants about cleanliness disturb me.” or “Migrants living in Turkey mainly consists of good people”) were used while constituting the items.

Intergroup contact is also very important in reducing prejudice and increasing positive attitudes towards outgroups’ members. Pettigrew and Tropp’s (2006) meta-analysis shows the benefits of contact between other groups. They showed that there was a significant and negative relationship between contact and prejudice among groups in their scanning study that 516 studies were scanned. However, in order to reduce the prejudices with contact, it is necessary to control the mediators and other factors as moderators in the environment. For example, in the environment of threat and anxiety, there is a positive relationship between contact and prejudice, that is, as contact increases prejudice also increases (Stephan & Stephan, as cited in Güler, 2013). Several studies have been developed to measure intergroup contact. Pettigrew’s eight items Valenced Contact Scale (2008), Stephan et. al.’s 17 items Negative Experiences Inventory (2000), Islam and Hewstone’s five items General Intergroup Contact Quantity and Contact Quality Scale are some of them (1993). These examples are measures of intergroup contact. Current scales’ difference from all these scales is that it does not only compose of intergroup contact related items and it is measuring attitudes towards Syrians specifically living in Turkey. Another research that emphasizes the importance of intergroup contact and the nature of this contact is as follows: In a study (Wagner, Hewstone & Machleit, 1989) conducted between Turkish and German population who were 15-year-old children living in Germany, it was researched that whether the kind of relationship established in the neighborhood, school and leisure activities reduced the prejudice or not. It has been seen that spending leisure time of German sample with a Turkish friend decreases the prejudice. In addition, there is no relationship between the neighborhood or school friendship and reduction of prejudices. Becoming close

friends is more effective in reducing prejudices than more artificial relationships, such as neighborhood or work-place cooperation (Hamberger & Hewstone, 1997; Pettigrew, 1997). Although it is theoretically correct that the contact between the groups reduce prejudices and increase friendship, yet how this contact will be built is a difficult question. The answer for why contact is difficult can be found in the social identity theory.

There is a tendency for people to perceive their group as superior to other groups because people have the motivation to make a positive self-assessment for themselves (Brehm & Kassin, 1993; Hogg & Abrams, 2001). At this point, the concept of social identity comes out. The Social Identity Theory, developed by Henri Tajfel and John Turner in the mid-1970s, is a social psychology theory that deals with group membership, group processes, and intergroup relations (Argyle, 1992; Brehm & Kassin, 1993; Hogg & Williams, 2000). In order to understand this theory better, it is necessary to learn the basic assumptions of it. The basic assumptions of Social Identity Theory can be listed as social identities, social comparison, and in-group favoritism. People classify and evaluate themselves according to the social group they belong to (Turner, 1987). At the end of this classification and evaluation, they identify themselves with the group they belong to and this identification creates social identities. Other groups in the social environment help the individual to assess his/her position in his/her own group (Turner, 1975). Individuals who want to create a positive social identity and raise their self-esteem show a bias favoring towards their own groups and to underestimate other groups while making social comparisons. This process is called in-group favoritism (Doosje & Ellemers, 1997).

Thus, while presenting the items in the current scale, it has also benefited from the social identity theory that forms the basis of intergroup relations. For example, items asking attitudes about Syrians' cleaning habits or their properties of making noise were prepared by taking a reference to social identity theory. There are some people who make too much noise in every society regardless of ethnic origin. The aim of this item related to noise is to find out whether the local society put Syrians as noisy group or not in order to highlight the underlying social comparison. At the same

time, the item about the cleaning habits of Syrians is a similar example. Of course, some people from the host community may not be clean enough. However, the perception that the Syrians are not clean when they are mentioned can be considered as a social comparison. The item that “Migrants are more likely to commit crimes.” also can show social comparison. In addition, social distance theory developed by Bogardus was also utilized while developing the current scale (1925). Social distance refers to social evaluation and approval as social groups’ perceived degree of closeness to each other as the neighborhood, friendship and marriage. This closeness is based on the degree of acceptance of people from different religions, ethnic and racial groups as neighboring, friendship or marriage to the other group or persons. For example, items asking attitudes about marriage and friendship relationships or shopping from Syrians’ stores were created by taking a reference to the Social Distance Scale. Furthermore, reports like “Suriyeliler Barometresi (Erdoğan, 2017)” and “Türkiye’deki Suriyeliler Toplumsal Kabul ve Uyum (Erdoğan, 2014)” were used while preparing items in the scale. Especially, items related to the work permit, economic burden, crime relations of Syrians, living in the city centers were created by taking a reference to these reports.

In order to develop interventions or social policies about the integration of migrants or positive attitudes between groups, we should understand firstly how migrant-related issues are perceived by the local society. Integration of migrants is not only necessary to provide economic and cultural benefits, but also as a way of ensuring the security and stability of societies as a whole. Without understanding the attitudes towards a migrant group by host community, projects related to increasing intergroup contact or integration of migrants can be superficial. The aim of this study is to develop a valid and reliable scale to measure attitudes toward specifically Syrian migrants living in Turkey. As we investigated, there is no scale was developed to measure local people’s attitudes who are over 18 years old towards Syrians living in Turkey. There are many surveys about attitudes towards outgroups in international literature, but there is no survey has been developed specifically for the Syrians in Turkey (Stephan, Ybarra & Bachman, 1999; Islam & Hewstone, 1993). After the current scale is constituted, this

scale could be used in many cultures by adapting it and in many facets like adolescents' attitude towards Syrian migrants, government employee's attitudes towards them, as well. Researchers can also make some comparisons between people with low and high socioeconomic status or different political standings about an attitude towards migrants.

## **METHOD**

### **Participants**

A total of 314 people who are over the age of 18 years old participated in the current study. The mean age of participants was 24.9 (SD= 7.03). 128 of the study group were male and 186 were female. Of the total sample, two were graduated from secondary school, 26 were graduated from high school, 238 graduated from university and 48 were postgraduate. The criteria which we used in the number of participants depended on both Comrey's classification (1973) and Tinsley and Tinsley's calculation (1987). According to Comrey, 100 participants are poor, 200 participants fair and 300 participants are good. Therefore, the sample size consisted of 314 participants. According to Tinsley, the number of items in the scale is multiplied with five to ten. So, if the number 48 which is the number of items of the current scale is multiplied with five, it can be reached the number of 240. The sample size of the current study was suitable for both criteria.

## **MEASURES**

### **Demographic Form**

A demographic form that consists of questions, such as gender, age, education level, the place of birth as village, town or city, monthly income of the participants were asked to participants to fill out. In addition, the situation of going abroad and the reason for it, the number of visited country and the interaction experience of the participant with Syrian migrants were written in the demographic form.

### **Data Collection and Development Process for Attitudes of Host Society towards Syrian Migrants Scale**

The recent scale aims to describe the attitudes of local people towards Syrian migrant people. In the development of the scale, the literature was

firstly examined (Meertens & Pettigrew, 1997; Bogardus, 1925; Stephan & Stephan, 1985). Based on the information obtained from the field, the researchers formed a 48 item pool. Then the items of the scale were evaluated by the authors of the paper, Ph.D. students taking a scale development course and experts in the field of migration and integration. Taking into consideration the suggestions made by the experts, the draft form of the scale has been reduced to 48 items by subtracting 5 items from the scale and adding 1 item. The item “I do not feel uncomfortable that a close relative (like a sister or brother) marries an immigrant.” was separated into two items. It was asked to participants by distinguishing it for sister and brother because, in the Turkish culture, the answers can be differentiated by gender of the relative. Increasing scores on the scale showed positive attitudes towards Syrian migrants while low scores showed negative attitudes towards them. Current measurement is self-report Likert type scale that has 5 points changing from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Explanatory factor analysis was performed to determine the validity of the scale by means of the 48-item draft scale. The separation of the factors in the draft is determined by the analysis of the basic components. Factor analysis was repeated by excluding the factors that were lower than .32 with exploratory factor analysis. The validity of the scales over the remaining 25 items was tested by calculating item discrimination powers and item-total correlations. The reliability of the scale was determined by internal consistency levels and by 27% upper-lower group reliability. Cronbach’s Alpha reliability coefficient was used in determining internal consistency level.

### **Intergroup Bias Scale**

The scale was developed by the researcher to measure intergroup bias (Güler, 2013). Intergroup bias means perceiving the individuals’ own group members as more positive than other members of outgroups (Hewstone, Rubin & Willis, 2002). The scale is consisted of eight items in total. “I find the ones from other origins valuable.” is a sample item for intergroup bias scale. The participant was presented with an option X which best represented himself/herself from the “I do not agree”, “Partially disagree”, “I am not sure”, “Partially agree” and “I totally agree” options, on the 5-point Likert-type. Item-total correlations were obtained as high values ranging

from 0.35 to 0.53. The Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient for the scale was 0.77. This was a high value and indicated that the scale used was reliable. The reliability analysis for the Intergroup Bias Scale was repeated according to the Split Half model and the Spearman-Brown reliability coefficient was found as .72.

### **Intergroup Contact Conditions Scale**

Intergroup contact conditions scale was prepared on the basis of intergroup equal status, co-operation, common goals, and definition of support from authority (Güler, 2013). On the scale, participants are given the idea with X that best represents themselves from the “I do not agree”, “Partially disagree”, “Undecided”, “Partially agree”, and “I totally agree” options on a 5-point Likert type. The scale items were written by the researcher herself on the basis of Allport’s (1954) Intergroup Contact Theory. Allport (1954) noted that the positive effects of group contact would occur under four conditions which are equal status, cooperation, common goals and support from authority. The scale consisted of 5 items. Item-total correlations were high, ranging from 0.35 to 0.53 values. The Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient for the scale was 0.77 and The Spearman-Brown reliability coefficient was .59 (Güler, 2013).

### **Analysis**

All statistical analyses were carried out through Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS v.20) in the recent study (Field, 2005). First of all, descriptive statistics were obtained for demographic variables after cleaning the data. The data were normally distributed. Then, correlations between the variables of the current study were calculated. After implementing independent sample t-test, one-way analysis of variance was conducted to examine the effects of gender and education levels on the study variables. Because of the fact that there is not any prior hypothesis in terms of the number of factors, so exploratory factor analysis was used for internal consistency (Loevinger, 1957; Floyd & Widaman, 1995). As for the reliability of the recent scale, Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient and Upper/Lower 27% of group reliability were used (Cronbach, 1951; Büyüköztürk, 2007). Validity was provided by adding two additional scales (criterion va-

lidity). Factor analysis was applied to ensure construct validity (DeVellis, 2003). Expert opinion was also taken to ensure the content validity of the scale while developing the items (Clark & Watson, 1995).

## **Procedures**

Necessary permission was taken from the Social Sciences and Humanities Ethic Committee of authors' university. After taking the permission, informed consent forms, demographic forms, Attitudes of Host Society towards Syrian Migrants Scales, Intergroup Bias Scales and Intergroup Contact Conditions Scale were delivered to the participants in different platforms with snowball sampling method by the experimenter and her colleges. For example, co-workers, the family members of co-workers, neighbors, tradesmen, and friends filled out the surveys. The data collected from different provinces of Turkey, such as Ankara, Eskişehir, Hatay, Trabzon, Niğde, Kırklareli to capture the diversity. The provinces that are easily accessible to collect data have been selected. The number of Syrians was influential in the selection of these cities because the possibility of the local people to see Syrians is much higher in some of the cities. For example, the rate of Syrians in Hatay province is very high while the rate of Syrians in cities like Eskişehir, Trabzon, Niğde, and Kırklareli are relatively low. For example, 439.642 Syrians (%28 of the general population consists of Syrians) live in Hatay while 4.115 Syrians live in Eskişehir (%0.48 of the general population consists of Syrians) according to DGMM statistics (DGMM, 2018). Ankara province was chosen as a metropolitan city. In the informed consent form, the aim of the study was explained and voluntary participation was reminded. They filled out three different inventories and a demographic form. It took 15 minutes time to fill out. The participants were thanked for their contributions by completing the scales.

## **RESULTS**

### **Descriptive Statistics of Study Variables**

After required reverse coding for all sub-factors was completed, the sum of all the scores was calculated to reach the overall scores for sub-factors. Increasing scores on the scale showed positive attitudes towards Syrian migrants while low scores showed negative attitudes towards them. Items

10, 12, 13, 14, 18, 20, 21, 22 were reversely coded. Means, standard deviations, and minimum-maximum score ranges can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1. Means, Standard Deviations and Minimum-Maximum Scores of Scale and Sub-scales Validity

Scale and Sub-scales	M	SD	Minimum-Maximum
Attitudes towards Migrants	77.25	18.98	25-125
<b>Subscales</b>			
Attitudes towards Crime Relations	8.62	2.73	3-15
Attitudes towards Marriage Relations	8.50	3.47	3-15
General Attitudes about Daily Issues	60.13	14.56	19-95

### **Content validity**

Content validity is a precondition for construct validity (Turner, 1979). Content validity can be achieved by taking views from relevant experts (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991). During the design phase of the scale, after the item pool was established, a total of seven experts were consulted. Two of these experts were authors of this paper while the other five experts were experts from migration and integration area and Ph.D. students taking a scale development course. The expert opinions correspond to a process related to the content and face validity of the measurement tool. Content validity concerns about how much a scale covers the extent that it wants to measure (Nunnally, 1978). Expert opinions were frequently referred along with the directives and answer options in the current scale when the pool of items was determined.

### **Construct validity (Factor Analysis)**

In order to determine the factor structure of the collected data, exploratory factor analysis was conducted on 48 items of the current scale. The Kaiser Mayer Olkin (KMO) value and the Bartlett test were used to check whether the scale of the attitudes towards migrants was used to perform factor  $\chi$  analysis on the 314 collected observations. KMO value was found as .93 ( $p = 0.00$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) and it was considered to be appropriate for applying the factor analysis because the sample size was sufficient and Bartlett's test was found to be significant with a Chi-square value of 7482.43 and a degree of freedom of 1128. In the validity study, it was seen that 63.38%

of the total variance was explained by 11 factors. However, 38 items were loaded to the first factor while other 10 items were loaded to 10 different factors. Then, some items were also excluded because the correlation between these items was below .05. When the communalities values of the factors are examined, there is no item below the factor load of .30 (Büyüköztürk, 2010). Therefore, there was no need for removing any item in terms of communalities. In some articles, the cutting point is also taken as .50 and items with a factor load of less than 50 can be removed (Çokluk, Şekercioğlu & Büyüköztürk, 2010). Factor analysis has been renewed with the remaining questions. KMO value was found as .94 and it was considered to be appropriate for applying the factor analysis, this is because the sample size was sufficient and Bartlett's test was found to be significant ( $p = 0.00$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), with a Chi-square value of 4115.13 and a degree of freedom of 300. When the scree plot and component matrix were examined in the new analysis, it was seen that there were 3 factors. These 3 factors explained 55% of the total variance. The current scale was a three-factor structure with 1% eigenvalue and 5.32 % variance, which explained 55% of the total variance. The first factor described 42.32 % of the variance, 49.80 % of the second factor and 55.12 of the third factor. When deciding on the number of factors, if the eigenvalues and factor loads were taken into consideration, it was seen that the scale had three factors. This three-factor structure has reached its final condition by eliminating items related to cultural communication and cultural diversity. The reason for the emergence of a factor structure with 11 factors in the first analysis is the items related to cultural communication. All of the correlations of items related to cultural diversity and communication were found to be below .05. They were eliminated in the factor analysis from the possibility that these items had measured another structure rather than attitudes towards migrants. For example, the item that "Migrants create cultural diversity in our country" an eliminated item related to the perception of cultural diversity.

Büyüköztürk (2010) stated that the explained total variance in the scale development studies is more than 41% and that the factor loadings of the items above .32 are sufficient for the scale to be valid. The factor loadings of each item in the current measure is above .32 (the factor loadings

of the items were between .33 and .73) and explained 55% of the variance. For this reason, it can be said that the recent attitude scale towards Syrian migrants is valid. The first factor can be called as general attitudes towards Syrian migrants. The second factor can be called as attitudes towards the crime relations of Syrian migrants and the third factor can be called as attitudes towards marriage with Syrian migrants. Factor loadings and item-total correlations can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2. Factor Loading Values of Attitudes of Host Society towards Syrian Migrants Scale According to the Results of Exploratory Factor Analysis

Item	Factor Loadings	Item-Total Correlations
Factor 1		
1.Migrants living in Turkey mainly consists of good people.	.33	.29
2.I am not disturbed by the fact that migrants have free access to health services.	.43	.47
3. Efforts should be made to ensure that migrants are adapted to our country.	.42	.45
4. I can become friends with a migrant.	.63	.65
5. I'm not disturbed living in the same apartment with a migrant.	.62	.64
6. I am not disturbed with the acceptance of migrants in our country.	.65	.54
7. I am not disturbed working at the same workplace with a migrant	.68	.66
8.I can be a business partner with a migrant.	.61	.64
9. I am not disturbed with migrants getting a work permit in Turkey.	.57	.60
10. Migrants harm the country's economy.	.49	-.40
11. I am not disturbed that migrant children benefit from Turkey's educational institutions.	.54	.53
12. The attitude of migrants about cleanliness disturb me.	.43	-.26
13. I am disturbed by the fact that migrants make too much noise	.46	-.32
14.Migrants increase the risk of terrorism in our country.	.48	-.36
15.Migrants coming to our country should be able to live in city centers.	.57	.60
16. I am not disturbed moving to a neighborhood where migrants live heavily.	.51	.48
17. I am not disturbed by the fact that migrants are allowed to acquire property in our country.	.55	.56
18.Migrants are more likely to commit crimes.	.42	-.35

19. I am not disturbed to do my shopping at the sores of migrants.	.45	.52
Factor 2		
20. I think that migrants are often involved in theft and snatching.	.62	-.25
21. I think that migrants are often involved in harassment and molestation.	.63	-.22
22. I think that migrants are often involved in rape.	.57	-.30
Factor 3		
23. I am not disturbed with my brother marrying a migrant.	.69	.58
24. I am not disturbed marrying a migrant.	.72	.54
25. I am not disturbed with my sister marrying a migrant.	.73	.58
Eigen Value	1.33	
Total Variance Explained by 3 factors:	55.12	
Cronbach Alpha of general attitudes towards Syrians about daily issues	.72	
Cronbach Alpha of attitudes towards the crime relations of Syrians	.79	
Cronbach Alpha of attitudes towards marriage with Syrians	.85	
Total Scale's Cronbach Alpha	.73	

Note: Think Syrians living in Turkey while answering the items in the scale.

### Criterion- related validity

The scores obtained from a scale should distinguish those that have the features that the scale is trying to measure and those that have not had the features. In order to distinguish these two groups with and without this feature, a scale that is known to be valid can be used (Ghiselli, Campbell & Zedeck, 1981). After applying both scales to the same sample group, the correlation coefficient between the scores of the two groups is calculated. High correlation coefficient indicates that the two scales make similar measurements to each other (Tezbaşaran, 1996). In order to test the criterion validity of current Attitudes of Local People towards Syrian Migrants Scale, Intergroup Contact Conditions Scale (Güler, 2013) and Intergroup Bias Scale (Güler, 2013) were used. Intergroup Contact Condition Scale aimed to understand participants' level of understanding about intergroup equal status, cooperation, common goals and support from authority towards intergroup relations. Therefore, this scale was seen as appropriate in terms of measuring intergroup relations. As a result of the analysis, the intergroup contact condition scale was found to have a correlation of .62 ( $p < .001$ ) with the current Attitude Scale towards Syrian Migrants. That is to say, a positive relationship was found between the Attitude Scale to-

wards Syrian migrants and the Intergroup Contact Condition Scale. The relationship between the Intergroup Bias Scale and the recent scale was also examined. Thus, another criterion point for the current scale is the Intergroup Bias Scale. Intergroup bias scale measured individuals' in-group and out-group perceptions (Hewstone, Rubin, & Willis, 2002). As a result of the analysis, the Intergroup Bias Scale was found to have a correlation of .41 ( $p < .001$ ) between the current Attitude Scale towards Syrian Migrants. There was a positive correlation between the two scales. In addition, attitudes towards crime relations subscale has a positive and significant relationship between attitudes towards marriage relationship with Syrians subscale ( $r=.48, p<.01$ ) and general attitudes towards Syrians about daily issues subscale ( $r=.61, p<.01$ ). There was also a positive and significant relationship between attitudes towards marriage relationship with Syrians subscale and general attitudes towards Syrians about daily issues subscale ( $r=.70, p<.01$ ). When we look at the correlations between sub-factors of the current scale and two scales chosen as the criterion, attitudes towards marriage relationship with Syrians subscale has a positive and significant relationship with Intergroup Contact Condition Scale ( $r=.32, p<.01$ ) and Intergroup Bias Scale ( $r=.50, p<.01$ ). Attitudes towards crime relations sub-scale has a positive and significant relationship between Intergroup Contact Condition Scale ( $r=.23, p<.01$ ) and Intergroup Bias Scale ( $r=.40, p<.01$ ). Finally, General attitudes towards Syrians about daily issues subscale has a positive and significant relationship between Intergroup Contact Condition Scale ( $r=.42, p<.01$ ) and Intergroup Bias Scale ( $r=.61, p<.01$ ).

## **RELIABILITY**

### **Internal Consistency**

To test the internal consistency of the current scale, Cronbach Alpha coefficient was used with 25 items (Cronbach, 1951). The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the current scale was found as .73. This value was an acceptable reliability coefficient according to literature (Nunnally, 1978; Özgüven, 2011; Şencan, 2005). These authors suggested that the Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .40 to .60 is low, but the acceptable reliability, the range of .60 to .80 is quietly reliable and the range of .80 to 1.00 is high-

ly reliable. When the sub-factors' reliability was taken into consideration, the first factor's Cronbach alpha reliability was found as .72. The second factor's Cronbach alpha was found as .79. The third factor's Cronbach alpha was found as .85.

### **Upper/Lower 27% of Group Reliability**

Another way to ensure reliability is to compare lower 27% to upper 27% groups of the items (Kelley, 1939). According to Büyüköztürk (2007), a criterion that shows the reliability of the scale is the difference between the responses to the items in the lower and upper groups. The t-test was conducted for the significance of the differences between the item mean scores of the upper 27% (N: 7) and lower 27% (N: 7) groups taken from the study population. According to results of the t-test, there was a significant difference between lower and upper groups ( $t(313) = 22.80, p < .001$ ). In relation to this result, it could be stated that items had a good discrimination.

## **DISCUSSION**

Attitudes towards Syrian migrants scale is a reliable and valid measurement that measures people's attitudes related to Syrian migrants. It is a five-point Likert type scale which changes between 1-"I totally disagree" and 5-"I totally agree". It consists of 25 items and has 3 factors. Nine items in the scale were reversely coded. Firstly, exploratory factor analysis was conducted with 314 people to determine the construct validity of the scale. A three-factor structure consisting of 25 items explaining 55% of the total variance was obtained. To determine the reliability of the scale, the Cronbach alpha coefficient and lower-upper group reliability were examined. The reliability of the scale was found to be .73 and it was determined that there was a significant difference between the two groups according to t-test results in the lower-upper group reliability study.

The correlation coefficients obtained from item-total correlations of the scale are above .20. The coefficient correlation of the items in the scale between .21 and .40 shows that items are good in their discriminating properties. .41 and above are considered as a very good item in terms of discrimination power according to participants' answers. (Şencan, 2005). In addition, the correlation coefficient of the items is higher than .20 means

that these items can serve significantly to the purpose of the relevant factor (Büyüköztürk, 2010; Korkmaz & Yeşil, 2011; Tavşancıl, 2010; Yüksel, 2009). In this study, it is seen that most of the items in the scale (16 of them) are valued above .41. The remaining 9 items are over .21. In this context, it can be concluded that the discriminatory powers of all the items on the scale are considered to be very good.

The humanitarian drama that emerged from the Syrian crisis is a matter that requires us to put integration issues in the center of Turkey. Migrants and integration issues, which are extremely dynamic, multidimensional and complex, should be comprehensively investigated. Due to the possibility that the hospitality of the Turkish citizens towards Syrian migrants, which has a very high acceptance level, may turn into xenophobia, attitudes of local people should be measured from time to time by questionnaires or other public opinion poll made in different ways (Erdoğan, 2014). It can be beneficial in terms of taking measure when determining social and political policies.

In Erdogan's report (2014), it was stated that special efforts should be made not to experience any crisis caused by the Syrians. In order to build up a positive atmosphere between local communities and migrants, local people's attitudes towards migrant societies should be assessed from time to time and authorities should be taken local people's pulse. It will not be useful to strive to create a positive attitude towards migrants or to conduct public awareness studies without understanding the real attitudes of the host society.

If local people experience failure of public services due to the huge number of Syrian people, it can create a high tension between them. In the current developed scale, there was an item which was "Migrants harm the economy of the country". With this item, it was aimed to learn how local people evaluated Syrian migrants from a financial perspective. At the same time, the item "I am not disturbed by the free use of migrants' health services" was aimed at learning how the local people's attitude in the field of health, which was so crucial in terms of finance. When we look at the financial impacts of the Syrians in general, there is a picture in which risks and

opportunities are intertwined. Even if the local people evaluate the impacts of Syrians on the economy of Turkey negatively, there are some opportunities, as well. For example, Syrian merchants and investors who have a trade and investment relationship with the Middle East countries and who are well acquainted with those markets contribute to Turkey in terms of trade and investment relationship with these countries (Orhan & Gündoğar, 2015). For this reason, the attitudes of the local people should be well measured so that the misinformation about the Syrians can be transmitted well.

When the literature is examined, there have been a limited number of articles in Turkish on the attitudes towards the Syrian migrants (Keleş et al., 2016; Kılcan, Çepni & Kılınç, 2017). There was a questionnaire measuring students' attitudes (7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade students) towards Syrian refugee students (Kılcan, Çepni & Kılınç, 2017). Questionnaire' population consisted of 2 state schools in the province of Ankara. That is, this scale was developed to measure attitudes of adolescents towards Syrian refugees. However, the present study has measured attitudes towards Syrian migrant populations in adults over 18 years and data collected from the provinces in different regions of Turkey. In the other questionnaire which is "Attitudes towards Refugees", there was no item related to marriage with refugees (Keleş et al., 2016). In the current scale, this issue was found as a sub-factor that determined general attitudes towards them. Without asking about attitudes related to marriage with these different ethnic groups, scales may not be fully inclusive because of the attitudes toward marriage with Syrian migrants are a good sign of social distance (Bogardus, 1925). It was also developed on Turkish youths (Keleş et al., 2016). Current scale' age range was wider. Considering all of these reasons, the current scale was found to be different from other developed scales since it provided reliability and validity issues, as well.

While items were loaded under sub-factors, one item was not loaded as expected sub-factor. This item is "Migrants are more inclined to commit crimes." (Göçmenler suç işlemeye daha çok eğilimlidirler.) This item was not loaded under the sub-factor of crime relations of Syrians but was loaded under general attitudes towards Syrians about daily issues. As the way in which this item is expressed "more prone" (daha çok eğilimlidirler),

participants may have perceived as general attitudes about daily issues. On the crime relations of Syrians subscale, the items are very clear and to the point. For example, “I think that migrants are often involved in theft and snatching.” or “I think that migrants are often involved in harassment and molestation.” The item that “Migrants are more inclined to commit crimes.” can be seen as more like a personality trait of this group and therefore it can be considered as general attitudes towards Syrians about daily issues subscale by the participants. The other items in the crime relations of Syrians subscale are expressed in a different way.

This study has some limitations along with all these findings. Participants could have chosen from seven different geographical regions of Turkey with specific provinces that had huge numbers of Syrian people. That is to say, if geographical heterogeneity had been increased, the generalizability of the study could be higher. Nevertheless, this scale study of 314 people from six different cities can be considered as generalizable.

To conclude, the present scale is thought to be a valid and reliable measurement tool that will contribute to the literature in the process of evaluating the local people’s attitude towards Syrians. If the scale is applied to different samples, it is recommended that the validity and reliability analysis should be performed again.

## REFERENCES

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The Nature of Prejudice*, Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Ankaralı, H., Pasin, Ö., Karacan, B., Tokar, M., Künüroğlu, M., Çaç, M., Özislam, M. E. & Şahingöz, N. B. (2017). Üniversite öğrencilerinin Türkiye'deki Suriyeli sığınmacılara bakış açısı. *Düzce Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 7, 122-132.

Argyle, M. (1992). *The Social Psychology of Everyday Life*. London & New York: Routledge.

Bizman, A. & Yinon, Y. (2001). Intergroup and Interpersonal Threats as Determinants of Prejudice: The Moderating Role of In-group Identification. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 23(3), 191-196.

Bogardus, E. S. (1925). Social Distance and its Origin. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 9, 216- 226.

Branscombe, N. R. & Wann, D. L. (1994). Collective Self-esteem Consequences of Out-group Derogation When a Valued Social Identity is on Trial. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 24, 641-657.

Brehm, S. & Kassın, S. M. (1993). *Social Psychology*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2010). *Sosyal Bilimler için Çok Değişkenli İstatistik*. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2007). *Sosyal Bilimler için Veri Analizi El Kitabı (7ed.)*. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.

Clark, L. E. & Watson, D. (1995). Constructing Validity: Basic Issues in Objective Scale Development. *Psychological Assessment*, 7 (3), 309-319.

Comrey, A. L. (1973). *A First Course in Factor Analysis*. New York: Academic Press.

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient Alpha and the Internal Structure of Tests. *Psychometrika*, 16, 297-334.

Çokluk, Ö., Şekercioğlu, G. & Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2010). *Sosyal Bilimler*

için Çok Değişkenli İstatistik. SPSS ve Lisrel Uygulamaları. Ankara: Pa-  
gem Akademi.

Demir, O. (2017). Suriyeli Gündem Araştırması (p.8). İstanbul, Turkey:  
Ekonomistler Platformu. Retrieved from [http://www.ekonomistler.org.tr/  
wp-content/uploads/2017/10/suriye\\_gundem\\_algi.pdf](http://www.ekonomistler.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/suriye_gundem_algi.pdf)

Demir, O. Ö. (2015). Göç Politikaları, Toplumsal Kaygılar ve Suriyeli  
Mülteciler (p.1). Ankara, Turkey: Global Politika ve Strateji.

DGMM. (2018). Retrieved October 05, 2018, from [http://www.goc.gov.tr/  
icerik/goc-istatistikleri\\_363\\_378](http://www.goc.gov.tr/icerik/goc-istatistikleri_363_378)

Erdoğan, M. (2017). Suriyeliler Barometresi. İstanbul, Turkey: Bilgi  
Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Erdoğan, M. M. (2014). Türkiye'deki Suriyeliler: Toplumsal Katılım ve  
Uyum (p.3). Ankara, Turkey: Hacettepe University Migration and Politics  
Research Centre.

Esses, V. M., Jackson, L. M. & Armstrong, T.L. (1998). Intergroup Compe-  
tition and Attitudes towards Immigrants and Immigration. An instrumental  
Model of Group Conflict. *Journal of Social Issues*, 699-724.

Esses, V. M., Haddock, G. & Zanna, M. P. (1993). Values, Stereotypes and  
Emotions as Determinants of Intergroup Attitudes. In D. M. Mackie & D.  
L. Hamilton (Eds.), *Affect, Cognition and Stereotyping: Interactive Pro-  
cess in Group Perception*, (pp.137-166). Orlando, FL: Academic.

Field, A.P. (2005). *Discovering Statistics using SPSS (2nd Edition)*. Lon-  
don: Sage.

Floyd, F. J. & Widaman, K. F. (1995). Factor Analysis in the Develop-  
ment and Refinement of Clinical Assessment Instruments. *Psychological  
Assessment*, 7, 286-299.

Ghiselli, B. E., Campbell, J. P. & Zedeck, S. (1981). *Measurement Theory  
for the Behavioral Sciences*. San Francisco: Freeman.

Güler, M. (2013). Gruplararası Temas, Kaygı ve Yanlılığın Sosyal Mesaf-  
eye Etkisi: Türk ve Kürt Kökenli Gruplar Üzerine Bir Çalışma. Unpub-

lished doctorate's thesis, Ankara University, Department of Psychology.

Hamberger, J. & Hewstone, M. (1997). Inter-ethnic contact as a predictor of blatant and subtle prejudice: Tests of a model in four west European nations. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 36, 173–190.

Hewstone, M., Rubin, M. & Willis, H. (2002) Intergroup bias, *Annual Review Psychology*, 53, 575- 604.

Hogg, M.A. & Abrams, D. (2001). *Intergroup relations: Key Readings in Social Psychology*. Philadelphia: Psychology Press.

Hog, M. A. & Williams, K. D. (2000). From I to We: Social identity and the collective self. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research and Practice*, 4(1), 81–97.

Islam, M. R. & Jahjah, M. (2001). Predictors of Young Australians' Attitudes toward Aborigines, Asian, and Arabs. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 29 (6), 569-580.

Jackson, J.W. (1993). *Realistic Group Conflict Theory: A Review and Evaluation of the Theoretical and Empirical Literature*. *The Psychological Report*, 43, 395-414.

Keleş, S. Ç., Aral, T., Yıldırım, M., Kurtoğlu, E. & Sunata, U. (2016). Attitudes of Turkish youth toward Syrian refugees in respect to youths' gender, income, education, and city: A Scale Development Study. *Turkish Migration 2016 Selected Papers*, 155.

Kılcan, B., Çepni, O. & Kılınç A. Ç. (2017). Mülteci Öğrencilere Yönelik Tutum Ölçeğinin Geliştirilmesi. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 14 (2), 1045-1057.

Levine, R. A. & Cambell, D. T. (1972). *Ethnocentrism: Theories of Conflict, Ethnic Attitudes AND Group Behavior*. NY: Wiley.

Loevinger, J. (1957). Objective Tests as Instruments of Psychological Theory. *Psychological Reports*, 3, 635-694.

Meertens, R. W. & Pettigrew, T. F. (1997). Is Subtle Prejudice Really Prejudice. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 61, 54-71.

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric Theory*, 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Orhan, O. & Gündoğar, S. (2015). Suriyeli Sığınmacıların Türkiye'ye Etkileri (p.8). Ankara, Turkey: Ortadoğu Stratejik Araştırmalar Merkezi (ORSAM).

Özgüven, İ. E. (2011). *Psikolojik testler*. Ankara: PDREM.

Pedhazur, E. J. & Schmelkin, L. P. (1991). *Measurement Design, and Analysis: An Integrated Approach*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, Hillsdale, NJ.

Pettigrew, T. F. & Tropp, L. R. (2011). When groups meet: The dynamics of intergroup contact. *Essays in Social Psychology*, Psychology Press.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1997). Generalized intergroup contact effects on prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 173-185.

Pettigrew, T. F. & Meertens, R. W. (1995). Subtle and Blatant Prejudice in Western Europe. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 25(1), 57-75.

Şencan, H. (2005). *Sosyal ve davranışsal ölçümlerde güvenilirlik ve geçerlilik*. Ankara: Seçkin.

Stephan, W. G., Diaz-Loving, R. & Duran, A. (2000). Integrated Threat Theory and Intercultural Attitudes: Mexico and United States. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 31(2), 240-249.

Stephan, C. W., Stephan, W. G., Demitrakakis, K. M., Yamada, A. M. & Clason, D. L. (2000). Women's Attitudes Toward Men: An Integrated Threat Theory Approach. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 24, 63-73.

Stephan, W. G., Ybarra, O. & Bachman, G. (1999). Prejudice towards Immigrants. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 29 (11), 2221-2237.

Stephan, W. G. & Stephan, C. (1996). Predicting Prejudice. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 20, 1-12.

Stephan, W. G. & Stephan, C.W. (1985). Intergroup anxiety. *Journal of Social Issues*, 41, 157-175.

Tezbaşaran, A. (1996). *Likert Tipi Ölçek Geliştirme Kılavuzu*. Ankara:

Türk Psikologlar Derneği Yayınları.

Tinsley, H. E. & Tinsley, D. J. (1987). Uses of Factor Analysis in Counseling Psychology Research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 34, 414-424.

Turner, J. (1987). *Rediscovering the Social Group: A Self-Categorization Theory*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Turner, S. (1979). The Concept of Face Validity. *Quality and Quantity*, 13: 85-90.

Turner, J. (1975). Social Comparison and Social Identity: Some prospects for Intergroup Behavior. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 5, 5-34.

UNICEF (2007). *Child Poverty in Perspective: An overview of child well-being in rich countries – A comprehensive assessment of the lives and well-being and adolescents in the economically advanced nations (7)*. Florence, Italy: UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre Report Card.

Wagner, U., Van Dick, R., Pettigrew, T., F., & Christ, O. (2003). Ethnic prejudice in East and West Germany: The explanatory power of intergroup contact. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 6, 22-36.

Wagner, U., Hewstone, M. & Machleit, U. (1989). Contact and prejudice between Germans and Turks: A correlational study, *Human Relations*, 42, (7), 561-574.

Yeniacı, S. H. (2014). *Suriyeli Sığınmacılar Raporu İstanbul Örneği (p. 2)*. İstanbul, Turkey: İstanbul Fikir Enstitüsü. Retrieved from [http://ife.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/Suriyeli-Sığınmacılar-Raporu\\_2.pdf](http://ife.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/Suriyeli-Sığınmacılar-Raporu_2.pdf).

