

Harmonization Problem of Refugee Students: Turkey Case

Yunus Akdeniz¹, Serhat Arslan²

Article History:

Received 11.03.2022

Received in revised form

03.10.2022

Accepted

Available online 04.10.2022

In this study, Syrian refugee students', who have been living in Turkey since the beginning of the Syrian civil war, adaptation problems and the level of Turkish students' adoption, are searched in terms of gender and class level. In this context, investigating Republic of Turkey's education policies, possible problems in future and solutions are aimed with the opinions of the instructors of temporary training centers with the help of semi-structured interview form. The sample group of this study is formed of 700 students from Şanlıurfa Haliliye Rabia Hatun Girl Anatolian Religious High School, Konuklu Vocational and Technical Anatolian High School, Rabia Hatun Religious Temporary Training Center and Milli İrade Temporary Training Center, 211 of them are refugees and 489 of them are Turkish. 173 of these students are male and 527 of them are female. For the qualitative part of the study, 15 temporary education center instructors are viewed from 4 different cities. In this study, Syrian refugee students' adaptation problems and the level of Turkish students' adoption are searched in terms of gender and class level and temporary training centers' instructors' opinions on these topics and refugees' educational status are analyzed. In addition to this, while explaining the variances, the figures like average, standard deviation, and percentiles were represented.

© IJERE. All rights reserved

Keywords: Refugee students, adaptation problems, education, educational status, education policies, instructor opinions.

INTRODUCTION

United Nations (2015) defines immigration as change of place of an individual from one place of residence to another to live there permanently. Although these changes of place are grounded on many reasons, they are generally voluntary changes of place (Kaypak, 2014). According to TDK (2016), immigration is defined as going from one country to another, from one settlement to another, moving or hejira by individuals or communities due to economic, social or political reasons. Özyakışır (2013) defines the immigration concept as temporary or permanent change of place voluntarily or involuntarily in order to have better living conditions for various reasons such as political, economic, social and sociocultural factors.

The concept "refugee" must certainly be differentiated from the concept "immigrant" although they are colloquially supposed to have the same meaning. In short, the people who are obliged to leave their country for various reasons are defined as refugees. The basic statement that distinguishes the refugees from immigrants is that they leave their country not voluntarily but under obligation. According to the definition of the Turkish Ministry of Internal Affairs Directorate General of Migration Management (2016), the people who are out of the country of nationality and who, for justifiable reasons, cannot or don't want to return to the country of nationality for fear of persecution due to their "race, religion, nationality, affiliation to a certain social group or political opinion. Deniz (2014), the difference is that the people who leave their country of residence voluntarily for various reasons, mostly economic reasons, and enter another country through legal means and live in that country legally are called immigrants. The people who leave their country of residence for fear of threats to safety of life and property or unfair deal and

¹Sakarya University, yunusakdeniz@gmail.com, 0000-0003-1503-8397

²Necmettin Erbakan University, serhat.arslan@erbakan.edu.tr, orcid.org/ 0000-0003-4422-8421

This study was produced from Yunus Akdeniz's master thesis

cannot take advantage of protection of the country of residence and don't want to return to their own country are considered as refugees. Contrary to immigrants, refugees leave their home and country under obligation not at choice (UNCHR, 2000). The people who have left or cannot return to their country for fear of being subject to persecution and torture due to race, religion, nationality or having a certain social group or political opinion are defined as refugees (UNCHR, 1951).

Residence, language, education and business opportunities are the most important problems that the refugees encounter. Particularly refugee children are excessively affected by those problems which they and their families encounter in their life all the time (Strekalova ve Hoot, 2008). As a result, movements of migration over the refugees' own will, insufficient preparations, the fact that they consist of more ignorant people compared to the immigrants and they cannot be controlled make things difficult for them in the countries in which they take refuge (Zhou, 2001).

Due to the ongoing internal conflicts in Syria since 2011, it has become a country that gives rise to refugees most in the world. According to the estimations of by Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (2017), the total number of Syrian refugees as of September 8, 2017 is found 5.225.475. According to the same report, 3.181.537 of these refugees are hosted by Turkey, 1.001.051 by Lebanon, 654.582 by Jordan, 244.235 by Iraq, and 124.534 by Egypt.

According to the report published by UNCHR (2015), 42500 people a day on average become refugees based on 2014 data and of these refugees, 51% is children. Also, when the statistics are examined, it is found that one Syrian child becomes a refugee each 30 seconds. 86% of the refugee population which is over 65 million around the world lives in the developing countries. The crisis in Syria is the biggest refugee crisis encountered since the World War II. 11 million Syrian around the world had to leave his/her place of residence and approximately 5 million of them took refuge in the neighboring countries. When the ongoing conditions are reviewed, it is anticipated that the crisis will not end in the short term. In the meantime, there is an increase each passing day in the number of refugees that try to get to European Union countries through disorganized ways and insufficient means. According to the same report, the number of refugees that have lost their lives in the Mediterranean so far is over 10 thousand.

Throughout the region, 116 non-governmental organizations together with the United Nations provide humanitarian aid to the refugees. According to UNCHR report (2017) as of the date of July 21, 2017, food relief is provided to 2.5 million refugees, monetary assistance in hard cash to 1.8 million refugees, health benefit assistance to 1,5 million refugees, fresh water assistance to 1.1 million refugees, educational assistance to 993 thousand refugee children, social harmony assistance to 548.500 refugees, livelihood assistance to 81 thousand refugees, sheltering assistance to 173 thousand refugees, assistance for residence in a different country to 25.500 refugees.

According to estimations of the Ministry of Internal Affairs Directorate General of Migration Management (2018), the number of Syrian refugees with biometric data recorded in Turkey is 3.561.707 in total. Of them, 1.931.717 is male, 1.629.990 is female. The number of other non-Syrian refugees is 18.632 according to the report published by UNCHR (2015).

Culture and Acculturation

Culture can be defined as tradition, custom, and values that a person learns from his/her environment (Sue and Sue, 1990). Sam (2006), defined culture as the believes, values, traditions, behaviors and senses of art that are shared by the individuals constituting the society. Stocking (1966), explained culture as traditions, beliefs and social institutions that form the characteristics of each society. Culture is a lifestyle that contains the emotions of a society as much as their belief systems, accumulation of knowledge, values, physical movements and behaviors. Culture is learned by experience rather than being acquired by birth or by instinct (Chinoy, 1954). Besides, cultures are alive and dynamic, the values that constitute cultures are in interaction with each other, as well (Jackson & Meadows, 1991). Therefore, culture is not only the accumulation of experience and traditions obtained through past experiences, but it is also an important factor in terms of which direction the society is going to develop on a going-forward basis (Berry and Dasen, 1974).

Acculturation is a concept that has been debated by social scientists beginning from the end of 19th century (Berry,1980). This concept has come out in 1880 at first and used to define the cultural exchange between two different groups in communication with each other (Jasinskaja-Lahti, 2000). Recently, the concept of acculturation; cultural patterns, social institutions, political structures and psychological processes have been studied (Padilla, 1980). Cross-cultural transitions occur when communities with different cultures communicate with each other. This cultural transition process is called acculturation (Negy&Woods, 1992). Berry (2003) defines acculturation as socio-cultural and psychological harmonization process of individuals interacting with different cultures. According to Ward (2001), psychological acculturation is related to cognitive, affective and behavioral changes of an individual in cultural terms. Sam (2006) considers these changes as short term results of acculturation process. This process doesn't take place as direct adoption of any standard of judgment smoothly from another society. There must be similarities between these two cultures. There must also be mutual similarities between societies, and transmission of the dominant culture doesn't necessarily take place all the time. Some of the cultural values of minority societies may adjust to the dominant culture if they are not in conflict, as well.

Berry (2001) has defined four strategies for acculturation process. These are; Harmonization/Integration; refugee children keep living and sustaining their own cultures. In the meantime, they learn the language, norms and values of the host

country. Dissociation; refugee children refuse the culture of the host country and attach to their cultures. They don't adopt any cultural value or judgment related to the host country. Assimilation; refugee children quickly adopt the culture of the host country and learn the required values. They become estranged from their own cultures and this process may even result in denial of their own cultural identities.

Alienation – Marginalization; refugee children neither adopt the culture and values of the host country nor sustain the values of their own culture. They shut themselves out of the society and become alienated and nurture enmity. Berry emphasized that the most appropriate of them is harmonization/integration. Along with immigration, the people that are different from each other in terms of many factors such as language, religion, tradition, culture become obligated to live their life in the same environment (Aksoy, 2012). Studies show that the factors such as age, gender, language, city culture, academic levels, period of living in the new culture, socio-economic status, family relationships, the level of hospitality and adoption of the new society, characteristic properties and self-confidence of the refugees. In this study, Syrian refugee students', who have been living in Turkey since the beginning of the Syrian civil war, adaptation problems and the level of Turkish students' adoption, are searched in terms of gender and class level.

Method

In this study, mixed method is used by applying both qualitative and quantitative study. In the study, descriptive survey model from qualitative research design is applied to the case study in quantitative applications. Descriptive survey model is a research model that aims to reflect a case that is in the past or still continues in the present as is (Karasar, 2006). In case study which is from qualitative study group, one or more case is viewed as a whole and analysed under determined conditions (Yıldırım ve Şimşek, 2013).

Study Group

Study group of the study consists of 211 (30,14%) refugees, 489 (69,86%) Turkish students that receive education in Rabia Hatun Anatolian Imam Hatip High School For Girls, Konuklu Vocational and Technical Anatolian High School, Rabia Hatun Temporary Imam Hatip Education Center and Milli İrade Provisional Center that is in service in Şanlıurfa province Haliliye district in 2016-2017 school year considering the group to which quantitative research is applied. The refugee and Turkish students involved in the study group receive education in the same school at the same hours. Of the study group, 173 (24,71%) students are male, 527 (75,29%) students are female. When they are viewed in terms of grade, it is found that 225 (32,14%) of them are 9th grade, 324 (46,29%) of them are 10th grade, 151 (21,57%) of them are 11th grade. Although more students are reached within the scope of the study, 50 students scales of which are found to be filled insincerely are excluded from the study group.

Data Collection Tools

In data collection process of the study, Ethnic Acculturation Scale (EAS) and interview form for researching educational experiences of the refugee students in Turkey and their future objectives are used.

Ethnic Acculturation Scale

In order to measure ethnic acculturation levels of the participants, "Ethnic Acculturation Scale" developed by Barry (2011) and adapted to Turkish by the researcher is used. This scale through which the individuals participating in the study evaluate themselves is applied as paper and pencil test. 7-point likert is used in the scale. For each item, the numbers have the following meanings: (1) Strongly disagree, (2) Partly disagree, (3) Disagree, (4) Neutral, (5) Partly agree, (6) Agree, (7) Strongly agree. The scale consists of 29 items and 4 sub-dimensions. These sub-dimensions are determined as assimilation, dissociation, harmonization and marginalization (alienation). Scale reliability is calculated by Cronbach Alfa and it is found 0.77 for assimilation sub-dimension, 0.76 for dissociation sub-dimension, 0.74 for harmonization sub-dimension, and 0.85 for marginalization (alienation) sub-dimension. Total item correlation of the scale is found 0.57.

Interview Form

A descriptive study is carried out for principals of provisional education centers for Syrian refugee students that receive education in Turkey in order to identify their students, determine the main problems their students encounter and offer solutions, and determine the opinions of the refugee students in Turkey on education life and future plans their students make. First of all, questions are prepared for the interview form and necessary adjustments are made in accordance with the opinions of the relevant experts, and the interview form is put into final form. The interview form is applied to 15 provisional education center principals in total in 4 different provinces of Turkey. The study group is formed on a voluntary basis.

The researcher interviewed with the principals in the study group and informed them in detail on the purpose and scope of the study. Interview form is submitted to the principals that accept to be volunteers, and they are guaranteed that their personal identifying information is kept confidential. In line with the interview forms submitted via electronic media, communication is made by means of face to face meetings and phone calls at analysis stage and when necessary.

FINDINGS

Findings on Quantitative Dimension of the Study

In this section, detailed results and comments of the statistical analyses conducted in line with sub-problems of quantitative section of the study.

Findings on Assimilation, Dissociation, Harmonization (Integration) and Marginalization (Alienation) Levels of the Refugee Students by Age in Their Socio-Cultural Harmonization Process in Turkey

Table 1. t Test Table Regarding Assimilation, Dissociation, Harmonization (Integration), and Marginalization (Alienation) Levels of the Refugee Students by Gender in Their Socio-Cultural Harmonization Process in Turkey

			N	M	SS	Sh ₀	t Test		
							t	Sd	p
Refugee	Assimilation	Male	61	18,46	7,07	0,91	-0,613	209	0,541
		Female	150	19,08	6,51	0,53			
	Dissociation	Male	61	30,21	8,39	1,07	-2,951	209	0,004
		Female	150	33,72	7,58	0,62			
	Harmonization (Integration)	Male	61	25,18	8,61	1,10	-2,613	92,031	0,010
		Female	150	28,41	6,81	0,56			
	Marginalization (Alienation)	Male	61	32,16	7,58	0,97	1,382	209	0,169
		Female	150	30,79	6,06	0,49			

In Table 1, it is intended to find out if there is significant difference between point averages of assimilation, dissociation, harmonization (integration), and marginalization (alienation) levels of the refugees that participate in the study in their socio-cultural harmonization process in Turkey by gender. Accordingly, the difference between dissociation levels by gender is found statistically significant ($t = -2.951 - p < 0.05$) and it is observed that total point averages of dissociation level of female students are significantly higher than those of males. Likewise, when total point averages of harmonization (integration) level of the refugees are compared by gender, the difference between the averages is found statistically significant ($t = -2.613 - p < 0.05$). Therefore, it is observed that total average of harmonization (integration) level of the female students is significantly higher than that of males. The difference between total point averages of assimilation and marginalization (alienation) levels of the refugee students by gender is not found statistically significant ($p > 0.005$).

Findings on Assimilation, Dissociation, Harmonization (Integration) and Marginalization (Alienation) Levels of the Refugee Students by Grade Levels

Table 2. T Test Results Regarding Assimilation, Dissociation, Harmonization (Integration) and Marginalization (Alienation) Levels of the Refugee Students by Grade Levels

		N	̄	ss	Sh _o	t Test		
						t	Sd	p
Refugee	Assimilation	9th Grade	74	18.36	6.66	-0.858	209	0.392
		10th Grade	137	19.19	6.67			
	Dissociation	9th Grade	74	32.68	8.05	-0.041	209	0.968
		10th Grade	137	32.72	7.95			
	Harmonization (Integration)	9th Grade	74	27.12	7.50	-0.501	209	0.617
		10th Grade	137	27.66	7.52			
	Marginalization (Alienation)	9th Grade	74	31.64	6.58	0.726	209	0.469
		10th Grade	137	30.95	6.54			

In Table 2, the difference between the total point averages of assimilation, dissociation, harmonization (integration) and marginalization (alienation) levels of the refugee students that participate in the study by grade levels is not found statistically significant ($p > 0.005$).

Findings on Adoption, Dissociation, Harmonization (Integration) and Exclusion Levels of Turkish Students towards Refugees by Gender

Table 3. t Test Results Regarding Adoption, Dissociation, Harmonization (Integration) and Exclusion Levels of Turkish Students towards Refugees by Gender

		N	̄	ss	Sh _o	t Test		
						t	Sd	p
Turkish Student	Adoption	Male	112	9,57	5,82	-9,164	217,289	p<0.001
		Female	377	15,61	7,06			
	Dissociation	Male	112	20,30	12,51	-6,927	487	p<0.001
		Female	377	29,79	12,78			
	Harmonization (Integration)	Male	112	12,88	8,25	-7,236	199,706	p<0.001
		Female	377	19,47	9,18			
	Exclusion	Male	112	26,10	6,67	3,151	213,121	0,002
		Female	377	23,73	7,94			

When existence of significant difference between point averages of adoption, dissociation, harmonization (integration) and exclusion levels of the Turkish students that participate in the study towards the refugees by gender is examined, the difference between the total point averages of adoption level of Turkish students by gender is found statistically significant and total point averages of adoption level of female

students are determined to be significantly higher than those of males. Likewise, the difference between total point averages of dissociation, harmonization (integration) and exclusion levels of Turkish students by gender is found statistically significant (Respectively; $t = -6.927 - p < 0.001$, $t = -7.236 - p < 0.001$, $t = 3.151 - p < 0.05$). Accordingly, it is found that total point averages of dissociation and harmonization (integration) levels of female students are significantly higher than those of males, and total point averages of exclusion level of male students are significantly higher than those of female. Findings on Adoption, Dissociation, Harmonization (Integration) and Exclusion Levels of Turkish **Students towards Refugees by Grade Levels**

When existence of statistical significance of the difference between point averages of adoption, dissociation, harmonization (integration) and exclusion levels of Turkish students towards the refugees by grade levels is examined, it is found that the differences between total point averages of adoption, dissociation, and harmonization (integration) levels of Turkish students are found statistically significant (Respectively; $F = 18.805 - p < 0.001$, $F = 18.096 - p < 0.001$, $F = 26.308 - p < 0.05$).

These differences are found to result from 10th grade- 9th grade, 11th grade-9th grade and 11th grade-10th grade pairs in comparisons of adoption and grade levels. In other words, refugee adoption averages of 10th and 11th grade Turkish students are higher than those of 9th grade. In comparisons of dissociation and grade levels, the differences are found to result from 10th grade- 9th grade and 11th grade- 9th grade pairs. In other words, dissociation averages of 10th and 11th grade Turkish students are higher than those of 9th grade. Similarly in comparisons of harmonization and grade levels, the differences are found to result from 10th grade-9th grade, 11th grade-9th grade, and 11th grade-10th grade pairs. This case can be explained in other words that harmonization (integration) averages of 10th and 11th grade Turkish students are higher than those of 9th grade.

When total point averages of grade levels and exclusion levels of Turkish students that participate in the study towards the refugee students are compared, the difference is not found statistically significant.

Findings on Qualitative Dimension of The Study

In this section, the meetings with provisional education center principals within the qualitative scope of the study are analysed in detail and examined in tabular form.

Findings on the Opinions of the Provisional Center Principals Regarding the Problems the Refugee Students Encounter in Turkey Harmonization Process

The findings of the provisional education center principals regarding their opinions on the problems encountered by the refugee students in Turkey harmonization process are stated in Table 5. Opinions of the Provisional Center Principals on the Problems Encountered by the Refugee Students in Turkey Harmonization Process

Theme (Categories)	Codes	f	%
Problems	Language (K1, K,3, K5, K6, K7, K8, K9, K10, K11, K12, K13, K14, K15)	13	84
	Culture (K1, K,3, K6, K7, K9, K10, K11, K12, K13)	9	60
	Social Harmony (K2, K12, K15)	3	20
	Unemployment and Financial Difficulty (K4, K5, K7, K14, K15)	5	33

13 of the participants mentioned language problem at first regarding the problems encountered by the students in Turkey harmonization process. Together with this problem, 9 participants stated culture, 3 participants' social harmony, and 5 participants' unemployment and financial difficulties at the forefront.

"In this process, we mostly encounter communication problem with our students. They have difficulty in communicating for not speaking our language. Of course, this causes them problems in adapting to us culturally. I consider these two as the most important problem. It is unlikely to deal with other problems without solving them first." (K1)

"Language is the biggest problem we see in our students. Most of them don't speak Turkish. In fact, the ones who can speak don't want to speak. They don't disclose themselves to us. They feel nervous all the time. But, there are also those who can overcome this problem. That is, firstly language and, through this, cultural harmonization problems must be solved. These two can be done together." (K3)

Findings on Opinions of the Provisional Center Principals on Educating the Refugee Students in Turkish Schools

Table 6. Opinions of the Provisional Education Center Principals on Educating the Refugee Students in Turkish Schools

Theme (Categories)	Codes	f	%
Reservations	Language problem (K1, K7, K8, K10, K12, K13, K15)	7	46
	Social harmony (K1, K2, K3, K6, K10, K12, K14)	7	46
	School attendance (K11, K12, K15)	3	20
	Racist discourses (K3, K12)	2	14
	Grouping (K2, K12)	2	14
	Assimilation anxiety (K13, K15)	2	14
	Disorder in school (K5, K9, K12)	3	20
	Decrease in academic success (K8, K12)	2	14

All of the participants express a positive opinion on educating the refugee students in Turkish schools. It is stated that this practice shall be more helpful through a well-planned education particularly in ensuring harmonization of the refugees with Turkish society and culture. However, some participants stated that certain conditions need to be fulfilled and certain mistakes need to be corrected in this respect. Although the participants are support the practice, they expressed a number of reservations.

"They cannot adapt to schools without learning Turkish efficiently. There should be coeducation, but a good language education should be provided first." (K10)

"At first, they should learn Turkish very well. They should be sent to schools after language courses. In addition, families are anxious about assimilation, so there are those who oppose to it, they don't want to send their children." (K13)

Findings on Future Objectives of the Provisional Education Center Principals Regarding the Refugee Students to Graduate from Their Workplace

Table 7. Future Objectives of the Provisional Education Center Principals Regarding the Refugee Students to Graduate from Their Workplace

Theme (Categories)	Codes	F	%
Objectives	University education(K1, K3, K4, K7, K10, K11,)	6	40
	Harmonization with Turkish society (K2, K5, K6, K12)	4	26
	Special Education (K5, K9, K14)	3	20
	Professional orientation (K6, K8, K12, K13, K15)	5	33

Six of the participants stated that they aim for the students to graduate from their institutions to continue their university education. Four participants stated that they only aim for their students to adapt to Turkish society and culture in the future. Three participants stated that they plan to discover the capable ones among their students and train them privately. Five participants stated that they aim to direct the graduate students to professions in accordance with their capabilities. All of the participants specified that their ultimate goal is to educate the refugee students studying in their institutions to become individuals that are beneficial for both Turkey and their own countries.

"We want them to be trained as good and well-behaved individuals. We do professional orientation substantially. It is important for the future of Syria. Plans should be made prospectively." (K6)

"Next generations are more efficient than the previous ones. I consider professional orientation necessary. Of course, those who have the required capacity should continue their education." (K8)

"We aim to direct the students to special education if necessary. Our main purpose is to provide them with occupation and adapt to the society." (K5)

Findings on Opinions of the Provisional Education Center Principals Regarding the Refugees out of the Formal Education

Table 8. Opinions of the Provisional Education Center Principals Regarding the Refugees out of the Formal Education

Theme (Categories)	Codes	f	%
Opinions	They should be included in education (K1, K2, K3, K4, K5, K6, K7, K8, K9, K10, K11, K12, K13, K14, K15)	15	100
	They should be directed to public training centers (K9, K10)	2	14
	They should be entitled the right to non-formal education (K3, K4, K14)	3	20
	Families should be interviewed (K12, K13)		
	Language education should be provided (K4, K11)	2	14
		2	14
	Relevant ministries should cooperate (K12)	1	7
	They should be provided with occupation (K8, K15)	2	14

All of the participants specified that they think all refugees at the age of education must certainly be included in the education system. In conjunction with this agreed idea, two participants argue that the refugees out of the formal education should be provided education public training centers; three participants stated that the refugees in this

situation should be entitled the right to formal education. Two participants stated that the families should be interviewed in order to include the refugee children into education. Two participants remark that language training should absolutely be provided at first. One participant proposes the idea that all ministries and institutions related to the refugees should solve this problem coordinately. Two participants argue that the refugees should be provided with occupation.

“The refugees not included in the formal education pose danger for both themselves and the society. These children must absolutely be included in the education. It can be in schools or courses.”(K1)

“If possible, formal education; if not, public training centers and vocational courses. They must certainly be included in the education one way or another.” (K10)

“Absolutely, they must be detected and included in the suitable educational institutions. If this is not possible, for instance, if their age is problem; then, vocational courses may be an option.” (K7)

Findings on Opinions of the Provisional Education Center Principals Regarding the Points that Turkey Should Take into Consideration to Determine a Policy on Education of Refugees

Table 9. Opinions of the Provisional Education Center Principals Regarding the Points that Turkey Should Take into Consideration to Determine a Policy on Education of Refugees

Theme (Categories)	Codes	F	%
Suggestions	The obstacles on education should be removed (K1, K2, K3, K4, K5, K6, K7, K8, K9, K10, K11, K12, K13, K14, K15)	15	100
	Sense of confidence should be given to refugee students (K5, K12)	2	14
	Data should be collected from the field (K1, K2, K3, K4, K5, K6, K7, K8, K9, K10, K11, K12, K13, K14, K15)	15	100
	Long-term plans should be made (K1, K2, K3, K4, K5, K6, K7, K8, K9, K10, K11, K12, K13, K14, K15)	15	100

7 participants specify harmonization problem, 6 participants language problem, 2 participants adoption of the refugees by the Turkish society as the main problem. All of the participants expressed a common opinion that language, socio-cultural harmonization and basic living needs should be prevented from being the obstacles on education when education policies are determined. 2 participants stated that refugee students and their families should particularly be explained that they don't face the threat of cultural assimilation. All of the participants come to an agreement that an education policy should be determined in long-term plans in consultation with the

experts working in the field, otherwise the interventions on the education system according to present situations will not leave a positive and lasting impact.

“Language training should be high quality. This should be considered primarily. Because, it is not possible to provide education in Arabic to all refugees. It is also not possible to provide education in a language they don’t speak and expect them to gain academic achievement. This problem should be overcome. In addition, we need a solid planning. That is, I think, a policy on this matter should be planned and long-term.” (K8)

“We should integrate refugee students into Turkish education system. There shouldn’t be a discord. We should make mid and long term plans by using accurate data. And these plans should be applicable. The primary target should be to reach as many students as possible. Of course, no concessions must be made on quality.” (K6)

“We should explain them that we do not try to assimilate them through education provided to the students. They must trust us, or else we cannot get through. If required, workload of the children particularly at high school age should be assisted in a way to take their workload off. The government should take the field.” (K5)

Conclusion, Discussion and Suggestions

As mentioned in introduction section of this study, the fundamental problem of the study is comprised of acculturation process of the Syrian refugees that live in Turkey, the possibilities they have for education life and the educational processes they undergo in Turkey. The study is structured by studying the mentioned fundamental problem in sub-problems.

A research is carried out on assimilation, dissociation, harmonization (integration), and marginalization (alienation) levels of the refugee students in their acculturation process in Turkey by gender and grade levels.

According to the results of the study, while a significant difference is found out between dissociation and harmonization levels of the refugees by gender, no significant difference is found between the assimilation and marginalization (alienation) levels. According to the results, it is observed that dissociation and harmonization (integration) levels of female refugees are higher than those of male refugees. In other words, female refugees show clearer emotional attitudes compared to male refugees. Literature review reveals that female refugees in general show clearer attitudes as the results of the study present. Whatever age, gender, educational level, cultural level of a refugee is, changes occur in his/her inner world due to the process he/she undergoes (Tunç,2013). In the asylum process, female refugees have to deal with both the responsibilities arising from their gender as the society encumber and problems that the asylum process poses (Sam, 2006).

Yaman (2002), specifies that asylum process is harder for female compared to males due to change of place and new roles and responsibilities such as assuming the role of householder. However Erdoğan (2014), states that females do not like the environment

of uncertainty compared to males and prefer to permanently settle in countries where they believe they can establish a good future for themselves, and they adjust to the new environment and do not consider returning to their countries after they live in a country for quite a while and get organized and include their children into the education life.

According to the study carried out by Barın (2015) and Balçılar (2016), more than 75% of the refugees that come from Syria to Turkey are children and women in need of protection. 50% of these refugees consist of adult women at 18-59 age range. Harmonization process of these refugee women that come to Turkey by leaving their environment and social values of their culture lasts for many years upon physical change of place.

Some of the Syrian refugee women live in camps while most of them live outside the camp. It is found that 42 percent of the Syrian refugee women prefer camps due to economic conditions, 27 percent of them due to security concerns. When they are asked if they want to live outside the camp, 54 percent of them give the answer "yes" (AFAD, 2014).

More than half of the Syrian refugees that live outside the camp are children, and particularly language problem and education opportunities should be considered for healthy social harmonization (Koç, 2015). Some of the schools that refugee children apply to receive education do not want to enroll them by putting forward various reasons, the children that study in schools cannot communicate with their friends and teacher particularly because of language problem, and they face a serious harmonization problem (Beter, 2006). According to the results of the study carried out by Akalın (2016) on harmonization problems of Syrian refugees, the most significant problems following the asylum process are harmonization and language problems.

It can be observed that refugees, particularly children, have social and cultural harmonization problems, and they can show introverted attitude and tendency to violence (Nar, 2008). Prejudgments of the people in the asylum region and language problem affect social harmonization process of the refugees adversely (Akalın, 2016).

Refugees yearn for the conditions they used to have in their countries and their regular lives that they leave behind, therefore they have difficulty in adjusting to conditions and society of the host country (Buz, 2008). According to Apak (2014), refugees try to make themselves accepted among the society in asylum countries. Economic difficulties and cultural differences have significant share in this harmonization process. According to the study carried out by Güler (2012), children cannot even become aware of the situation they are in and they face harmonization problems both in their family and in the society while they try to live together with different cultures. In the same time, attitudes of the people in the asylum region matter significantly for the refugees (Deniz ve Etlan, 2009). A study is carried out on adoption, dissociation, harmonization and exclusion levels of Turkish students in their acculturation process in Turkey by gender and grade levels.

Statistically significant differences are found among adoption, dissociation, harmonization (integration) and exclusion levels of Turkish students that participate in the study towards the refugees by gender and grade levels. According to the results, it is found that adoption, dissociation and harmonization (integration) levels of females are higher compared to males while exclusion levels of males towards the refugees are higher.

A significant difference is found among adoption, dissociation and harmonization (integration) levels of Turkish students that participate in the study towards the refugees by grade levels. When the results are reviewed, it is observed that adoption, dissociation and harmonization (integration) levels increase as the grade level gets higher. When total point averages of the grade levels of the Turkish students that participate in the study and their exclusion levels towards the refugee students are compared, the difference is not found statistically significant.

When the literature is reviewed, the results similar to this study draw the attention. According to the studies carried out by Erdoğan (2015) and Karasu (2016), particularly in the early years when immigration from Syria to Turkey has begun, the people have considered this case within the frame of basic values such as neighborliness, helping those in need, and religious fellowship, and they have showed positive attitudes towards the Syrian refugees. However, when studies of Kaypak ve Bimay (2016) are taken into consideration, Syrian refugees extension of stay time in Turkey, problems that begin to arise in employment and business, environmental pollution and epidemics, increases in prices and rents of houses, the fact that conferral of citizenship to refugees has come to the fore and the concern for perturbation and social dislocation in this regard have begun to affect the perspective towards Syrian refugees adversely. For this reason, Turkish society have begun to keep refugees at bay. Koyuncu (2014) specifies there is an opinion that Syrians commonly commit crimes such as robbery, prostitution, expropriation, and damage to public property.

The concept of guest is frequently used in our country when refugees are mentioned. Although this concept is very important in terms of social acceptance and harmonization, it can be interpreted in two different ways. While it can be assumed that positive points of view are developed towards refugees for the difficulties they encounter along with this concept, it can also be inferred that they cannot have rights beyond the rights of a guest and the host takes the initiative (Erdoğan, 2015).

Refugees are required to adapt to culture and social life of the society to which take refuge by preserving their own cultures and the host society is required to provide appropriate conditions for the harmonization process to take place in a sturdy. Otherwise, a multi-lingual and multi-cultural society is formed and this causes chaos. An integration along with social harmony is neither the duty of only the refugees nor only the host society. In this matter, all parties should do their part. Thus, their self-respect will increase and their socio-cultural harmonization processes will get easier

(Yavuz, 2013). Besides, Syrian refugees are considered as people that escape the battle and they are in a difficult situation, however they are not regarded as “one of us” (Erdoğan, 2014).

In the fifth sub-problem which is a subject of this study, opinions of the principals of provisional education centers operating within the Ministry of National Education in Turkey regarding the education processes of refugee students and planning of these processes are studied.

In this study, the principals of the provisional education centers are interviewed and their opinions on harmonization problems of the refugee students after they have taken refuge in Turkey, opinions on the refugee students to receive education in Turkish schools with Turkish students and in provisional education centers together with only refugee students, opinions on future objectives of the students studying in their institution, opinions on the refugees out of the formal education and opinions on education policy that Republic of Turkey should implement on refugees are covered.

According to the results obtained from the study;

The participants state that main problem of the refugee students is language. This problem is respectively followed by cultural problems, unemployment and financial difficulty, and problems in social life. It is emphasized that the refugees cannot be reached for other problems without solving language problem first, therefore it must be ensured that they use Turkish effectively and efficiently.

The idea that refugees face cultural identity confusion, and in order to solve this problem in a manner that they can both preserve their own cultures and adapt to Turkish culture, solutions that come from the life itself and match up with the refugees' experiences should be developed rather than theoretically planned activities. It is also emphasized that cultural harmonization plans should be associated to language trainings.

It is specified that almost all of the refugees face unemployment and financial difficulties. The financial difficulties that the families have compel the children at the age of education to work and prevent them from attending the school.

The participants remark that language problems of the refugee children should absolutely be solved through preliminary courses before they are included into the formal education in Turkish schools with Turkish students. Otherwise, both academic achievement and harmonization are affected adversely.

It is observed that the students that start in Turkish schools at later grades have more difficulties than the refugee students that receive education with Turkish students beginning from the first grade. Likewise, the students that start receiving education with Turkish students directly before starting any institution that only Syrian students receive education have relatively less problem.

It is also stated that the refugee students that has recently taken refuge to Turkey or was born in Turkey are relatively more successful than the previous students and they have less problem in terms of both academic achievement and language and harmonization. Mutual racist disclosures that arise between Turkish and refugee students in Turkish schools affect both groups adversely.

The ideas that the refugee students that continue studying in the provisional education centers should be directed to universities taking their academic achievements into consideration, those who are not eligible for university education should be directed to professions in line with their capabilities and accumulations of knowledge, highly gifted students and the students with special educational needs should be determined and provided with education that is suitable for them have come to prominence.

It is emphasized that all of the refugees that are out of formal education should be included into education one way or another. In this respect, significance of public training centers is stressed and the idea that informal education possibilities can also be used is put forward. Particularly language training is emphasized and the fact that families should be convinced to include their children in education is stated.

When literature review is carried out, the studies that support the ideas of the principals of provisional education centers that participate in the study and offer suggestions in this direction attract the attention.

According Apak (2014), language problem is the most important problems that the Syrian refugees face. Problems are encountered in integration of the refugee children into education due to the fact that refugee families and their children are not aware of the education opportunities entitled to them and don't speak the language of the host country (Döner, 2016).

Polat (2012) indicated that the refugee children with language problem remain unsolved cannot establish healthy communication. Yılmaz (2015) stated that language problem is one of the biggest problems that the refugee students have when they communicate with their friends and teachers. Uzun ve Bütün (2016) emphasize that language problem of the refugee students must be solved primarily in order for the lessons to be taught functionally in classroom environment. The fact that the language used in educational institutions and the native language used at home are different may cause social problems. In addition, as the children don't know the language used, their thinking skills are limited and they fails academically. They are also faced with self-expression problem in their environment (Han, 2010).

Language problem may cause the refugee children to be dissociated from other children and become lonely, thus they may turn in on themselves due to being unable to express themselves and show offensive attitudes (Yohani, 2010). Kirmayer et al. (2011) establish that one of the most significant reason for stress that the refugee children encounter following the asylum process is to receive education in a new language.

Knowing Turkish is a vital tool for the Syrian refugees that live in Turkey in order to continue their business and education lives (Seydi, 2014). According to a field work carried out by AFAD (2013) on Syrian refugees, 81,6% of the participants have language problem and this is the most significant problem of refugees. 87% of the refugees that participate in the study stated that they want to learn Turkish. Also, according to the results of the same study, 58% of the Syrians only communicate with Syrians. Language problem is again the main reason for this rate to be pretty high. In parallel with this, according to a study carried out by AFAD (2014), it is observed that the rate of Syrian women that are eager to learn Turkish is higher out of the camp, because the people living in the camp do not feel the need to learn Turkish significantly for speaking the same language among them. According to the research carried out by Akkaya (2013), while 96,2% of the refugees that receive Turkish education give positive feedbacks, only 3,8% of them give negative feedback. Through this research, significance of language education is established one more time.

Emin (2016) and Sakız (2016) specify that the refugee students that receive education have a number of problems, particularly language problem. Also, it is found out through the same studies that providing education to refugee students in Turkish schools causes some problems in those schools. Along with the number of refugees that has increased particularly in recent years, the increase in the number of refugee students studying in Turkish schools disarrange the order and functioning of the schools, this causes problems among students, and it is observed that some institution administrators and teachers do not hold with the refugee students continuing their study in their schools (Sakız, 2016). The mass asylum movements affect the education system, students and teachers adversely in host countries in terms of both the refugees and the local people. The fact that schools remain incapable physically, excessive numbers of students have to be taken to classes, periods of study, insufficient number of teachers and instructors, unbalanced distribution of the refugees within the country give rise to a number of problems (Şahin, 2012).

Suggestions Based on the Study Results

Considering the examination of harmonization problems of the refugee students that live in Turkey and Turkish students mutually by gender and grade level, and the findings and discussions in this direction in this study in which the opinions of the principals of the provisional education centers regarding the educational status of the refugee students, we have come to the following conclusions and put forward the following suggestions.

1. Ethnic Acculturation Scale is found suitable for Turkish and Turkish culture in terms of reliability and validity values.
2. Refugee students should be provided with language training before starting Turkish schools.

3. The families should be contacted in order for the refugee students to continue their education and responsibilities of the children apart from the education life should be minimized.
4. In order for social and cultural harmonization process to be completed sturdily, a sense of confidence should be given to the refugee students and their families stating that assimilation is not aimed in any way.
5. The refugee students and their families should be convinced on the necessity of education.
6. All refugee children to receive education in Turkey should be recorded and their marks, school attendance and development should be tracked realistically.
7. In cooperation with all related ministries, accurate and exact data should be collected from the field constantly, and a long-term and efficient education program should be prepared for refugees.

The following suggestions may be offered for the practices to be conducted based on the results of the study:

1. Studies can be done related to harmonization levels of the refugees that live inside and outside the refugee camps and education participation levels.
2. Studies can be done on harmonization levels between the refugee children that were born in Turkey and those born in their countries and their educational attainment.
3. Studies can be done on levels of harmonization with the Turkish society between the Syrian refugee students that receive education in provisional education centers and those in Turkish schools and their educational attainment.
4. The progress that the refugee students have made throughout their education process in Turkey.
5. The factors that affect academic achievements of refugee students can be examined.
6. Studies can be made on the reasons of leaving school for the refugees that do not want to continue their education life.
7. Studies that review the opinions of teachers regarding harmonization problems and educational attainments of refugee children can be done.

In this study, the scales applied to the students were applied in the province of Şanlıurfa, which ranks second in terms of the density of the refugee population. It is limited to a single province. The quantitative dimension of this research is limited to 714 students. Refugee and Turkish students study at the same school and at the same hours. Within the scope of this research, the interview made with the directors of temporary education centers through a semi-structured interview form is limited to 15 people. The findings obtained in the research are limited to the data obtained from the scales and interview forms.

References

- AFAD (2013). *Türkiye'deki Suriyeli sığınmacılar 2013 saha araştırması sonuçları*. AFAD Yayını, Ankara.
- AFAD, (2014). *Suriye'den Türkiye'ye nüfus hareketleri, kardeş topraklarındaki misafirlik*. <https://www.afad.gov.tr/Dokuman/TR/79-20140529153928-suriye'den-turkiye'ye-nufus-hareketleri,-kardestopraklarindaki-misafirlik,-2014.pdf>, 30/08/2014.
- Akalın, A. T. (2016). *Türkiye'ye gelen Suriyeli göçmen çocukların eğitim sorunları* [Yayımlanmış yüksek lisans tezi]. İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Akkaya, A. (2013). Suriyeli mültecilerin Türkçe algıları. *EKEV Akademi Dergisi*, 17(56), 179 - 190.
- Aksoy, Z. (2012). Uluslararası göç ve kültürlerarası iletişim. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 5(20), 292-303.
- Apak, H. (2014). Suriyeli göçmenlerin kente uyumları: Mardin örneği. *Mukaddime*, 5(2), 53-70.
- Balcılar, M. (2016). *Türkiye'deki Suriyeli mültecilerin sağlık durumu araştırması Türkiye'de yaşayan Suriyeli mültecilerde bulaşıcı olmayan hastalık risk faktörleri sıklığı*. AFAD, T.C.Sağlık Bakanlığı, World Health Organisation.
- Barın, H.(2015). Türkiye'deki Suriyeli kadınların toplumsal bağlamda yaşadıkları sorunlar ve çözüm önerileri. *Göç Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 1(2).
- Berry, J. (1980). Acculturation as varieties of adaptation. In A. Padilla (Ed.), *Acculturation: Theories, models, and some new findings*. Boulder, Co: Westview.
- Berry, J. W. (2001). A psychology of immigration. *Journal of Social Issues*, 51, 615-631.
- Berry, J.W. (2003). Conceptual approaches to acculturation. In K. Chun, P. Balls-Organista, & G. Marin (Eds), *Acculturation: Advances in theory, measurement and applied research* (pp. 17-37). Washington, DC: APA Press.
- Berry, J.W., & Dasen, P.R. (1974). *Culture and cognition*. London: Methuen.
- Beter, Ö. (2006). *Sınırlar ötesi umutlar*. Ankara: Sabev Yayınları.
- Buz, S. (2008). Türkiye'deki sığınmacıların sosyal profili. *Polis Bilimleri Dergisi*, 10(4), 1-14.
- Chinoy, E. (1954). *Sociological perspectives*. New York: Random House.
- Deniz, O., & Etlan, E. (2009). Kırdan kente göç ve göçmenlerin uyum süreci üzerine bir çalışma: Van örneği. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6(2), 472- 498.
- Deniz, T. (2014). Uluslararası göç sorunu perspektifinde Türkiye. *TSA Dergisi*, 18(1), 175-204.
- Döner, H. (2016). *Suriyeli göçmenlerle yaşanan sorunlar üzerine sosyolojik bir araştırma: Hatay ili örneği* [Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Fırat Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Emin, M. N. (2016). *Türkiye'deki Suriyeli çocukların eğitimi temel eğitim politikaları*. Siyaset, Ekonomi ve Toplum Araştırmaları Vakfı. İstanbul: Turkuvaz Yayıncılık.

- Erdoğan, M. M. (2015). *Türkiye'deki Suriyeliler: Toplumsal kabul ve uyum*. Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Göç ve Siyaset Araştırmaları Merkezi Yayınları.
- Göç İdaresi Genel Müdürlüğü (GİGM) (2017). Geçici koruma. http://www.goc.gov.tr/icerik6/gecici-koruma_363_378_4713_icerik_25/04/2018_tarihinde_erişildi.
- Güler, G. (2012). *Çocuk hakları açısından Türkiye'deki sığınmacı çocuklar: Çeçen çocukları örneği* [Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Yalova Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Han, T. (2010). *Göç eden ailelerin çocuklarının eğitim ve öğretimde karşılaştıkları uyum sorunları*. [Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Ankara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Jackson, A. P., & Meadows, F. B. Jr. (1991). Getting to the bottom to understand the top. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 70, 72-78.
- Jasinskaja-Lahti, I. (2000). *Psychological acculturation and adaptation among russian-speaking immigrant adolescents in Finland*. Department of Social Psychology of the University of Helsinki.
- Karasu, M. A. (2016). Şanlıurfa'da yaşayan Suriyeli sığınmacıların kentle uyum sorunu. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 21, 995-1014.
- Kaypak, Ş. (2014). *Kent sosyolojisi*. Basılı Ders Notları, Antakya: MKÜ.
- Kaypak, Ş., & Bimay, M. (2016). Suriye savaşı nedeniyle yaşanan göçün ekonomik ve sosyo-kültürel etkileri: Batman örneği. *Batman Üniversitesi Yaşam Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6, 84-110.
- Kirmayer, L. J., Narasiah, L., Munoz, M., Rashid, M., Ryder, A. et al. (2011). *Commonmental health problems in immigrants and refugees: General approach in primarycare. Canadian guide lines for immigrant health*. <http://psychiatry.utoronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/Kirmayer-et-al-2011-common-mental-health-problems-in-immigrants-and-refugees.pdf>
- Koç, M., Görücü, İ., & Akbıyık, N. (2015). Suriyeli sığınmacılar ve istihdam problemleri. *Birey ve Toplum Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 5(1), 63-93.
- Koyuncu, A. (2014). *Kentin yeni misafirleri Suriyeliler*. Çizgi Yayınları, Konya.
- Nar, B. (2008). *Göçün eğitime ve eğitim yönetimine etkileri (Dilovası örneği)*. [Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi], Sakarya Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Negy, C., & Woods, D. J. (1992). A note on the relationship between acculturation and socioeconomic status. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 14(2), 248- 251.
- Özyakışır, D. (2013). *Göç kuram ve bölgesel bir uygulama*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın.
- Padilla, A. (1980). *The role of cultural awareness and ethnic loyalty in acculturation*. In A. Padilla (Ed.) *Acculturation: Theory, models, and some new findings*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Polat, F. (2012). *Türkiye'de öğrenim gören yabancı uyruklu ilköğretim öğrencilerinin karşılaştıkları sorunlar ve çözüm önerileri*. [Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi], Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Elazığ.

- Sakız, H. (2016). Göçmen çocuklar ve okul kültürleri. *Göç Dergisi*, 2, 65-81.
- Sam, D. L. (2006). Acculturation: Conceptual background and core components. In J. W. Berry, & D. L. Sam, *The Cambridge Handbook of Acculturation Psychology*, pp. 11-26. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Seydi, A.R. (2014). Türkiye'nin Suriyeli sığınmacıların eğitim sorununun çözümüne yönelik izlediği politikalar. *SDÜ Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 31.
- Stocking, G.W. (1966). Frank Boas and the culture concept in historical perspective. *American Anthropologist*, 68, 867-882.
- Strekalova, E., & Hoot, J.L. (2008). What is special about special needs of refugee children? Guidelines for teachers. *Multicultural Education*, 16(1), 21-26.
- Sue D.W., & Sue, D. (1990). *Counseling the culturally different* (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley.
- Şahin, M. (2012). Eğitimi ve okulu etkileyen bazı sosyal değişimlerin kavramsal çözümlemesi. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 41(194), 132-147.
- Tunç, İ. (2013). Uluslararası göç ve göçmenlerin sosyo-kültürel uyum sorunları. https://www.academia.edu/5875594/Uluslararası%C4%B1_G%C3%B6%C3%A7_ve_Uyum_Sorunlar%C4%B1,04.09.2015. 21/02/2018 tarihinde erişildi.
- UNHCR Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees*, www.unhcr.org, 1951.
- UNHCR (2017). Türkiye'deki Suriyeli mülteciler sıkça sorulan sorular. [http://www.unhcr.org/turkey/uploads/root/faq_for_syrians_\(turkish\)_0203201.pdf](http://www.unhcr.org/turkey/uploads/root/faq_for_syrians_(turkish)_0203201.pdf) 18/03/2018 tarihinde erişildi.
- United Nations Commission on Refugees (2000). *The UNHCR global report 1999*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Uzun, E. M., & Bütün, E. (2016). Okul öncesi eğitim kurumlarındaki Suriyeli sığınmacı çocukların karşılaştıkları sorunlar hakkında öğretmen görüşleri. *Uluslararası Erken Çocukluk Eğitimi Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 1(1), 72-83.
- Ward, C. (2001). The ABCs of acculturation. In D. Matsumoto (ed.), *Handbook of culture and psychology* (pp. 411-455). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Yaman, H., Kut, A., Yaman, A., et al. (2002). Health problems among un refugees at a family medical centre in Ankara, Turkey. *Scand J Prim Health Care*, 20, 85-87.
- Yavuz, S. (2013). Göç, entegrasyon ve din: Avrupa'da yaşayan Türkler bağlamında bir değerlendirme. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 6(26), 610-623.
- Yıldırım, A., & H. Şimşek. (2005). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri*. (Genişletilmiş 5. Baskı) Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Yılmaz, A. (2015). Uluslararası göç ve Türkiye: Türkiye'deki çocuk göçmen ve sığınmacı ailelere tanınan haklar ve daha iyi uygulamalar için öneriler. *Akademik Bakış Dergisi*, 49, 475-493.
- Yohani, S. (2010). Nurturing hope in refugee children during early years of post-war adjustment. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 32(6), 865-873.

Zhou, M. (2001). *Straddling different worlds: The acculturation of Vietnamese Refugee Children*. In R. G. Rumbaut & A. Protes (Eds.), *Ethnicities* (pp. 187-225). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.