

Compulsory Migration From Syria to Gaziantep and Reviews About Residences

Derya Bakbak^a

Abstract

As the staying duration of the refugees who come from Syria to Gaziantep prolonged, the need for residence together with the need for shelter came up. This city, which received internal migration previously and which already had an intense squatting problem, increased its housing demand further with the fast migration of Syrian refugees to the city and unfortunately had to open up even the unhealthy, unused structures to be used. This study aims to identify the lifestyle, family structure, economic condition, type of housing, and places that refugees use both in Syria and in Gaziantep in order to solve the housing problem more optimally, to compare and evaluate the condition and use of the cultural and social areas available around residences, and to shed light on the housing projects which will be built later. As a result, the size of the residences which Syrians use decreased. If new structures which will be preferred also by Syrians will be built, the green areas and social facilities of these structures should be structured. As apartment type structures are preferred more, more number of rooms and the separate design of the bathroom and WC should also be organized.

Keywords

Syrian refugees, comparing housing, residence problems

In the past, the Syrian people already lived together which was in the borders of the same country (Ottoman Empire) and they shared the same geography. Borders changed after the 1st World War and other wars, and the countries and lives were separated. In the changing globalizing world, the two named countries have lived in a culture which is differing and changing within each other.

While the Syrian population was around 21.5 million in the year 2010, around 10 million of this population was deterritorialized, which accounted for almost half of the population of the country. While around 6.5 million people were deterritorialized within their own country, around 3.5 million people had to leave their country, so to say, refugees (Velieçoğlu Yonca 2014).

As a result of the past years, these people come to

Gaziantep from Syria from different life styles, different climate, culture, economic status, social status, dietary habits, and educational status, and these refugees continue their lives in Turkey in very different conditions. The situation has to be looked at from a holistic view while evaluating their many needs like job status, educational status, and sociological status in their lives in Gaziantep as solution oriented. Sheltering should have a special place among the needs waiting to be solved. The solution of the sheltering need should not be any kind

^aUniversity of Hasan Kalyoncu, Turkey

Correspondent Author:

Derya Bakbak, Havalimanı Yolu 27410 Şahinbey, Gaziantep, Turkey

of structure as considering whether the structures produced for public are positive or not, as the need of reevaluating the user needs is of quite importance for the use of resources which are already scarce.

REFUGEE PROBLEM IN THE WORLD

UNHCR (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees) Global Trends Report showed that there was an absolute increase in the number of people who forcibly had to leave the area where they were born, and that 59.5 million people were forcibly deterritorialized at the end of the year 2014, compared to the 51.2 million people in the year 2013 and 37.5 million people one decade earlier who were deterritorialized. Of all the people who were forcibly deterritorialized in the year 2014, 38.2 million were forced to relocate within their own country, 19.5 million became refugees, and 1.8 million became asylum seekers. These data showed the dimension that international refugee problem became world-wide (UNHCR 2018).

The first months, the very first year, following 4-5 years and the following decade are important for the people who had to leave their countries in adapting to the socio-cultural structures, geographical situations, and business making skills of the country they refuged to. They face with what they lost in the first place, and they show a serious effort in the following years to regain what they have lost. Many work in jobs which are not suitable to their qualities and they become obliged to live in places where they are not accustomed to in the first years. Adaptation process of refugees can only be completed within four or five years (Stein 1981).

In Dublin III Regulation, it is decided that the effective politics which are used for refugees are cancelled, and that a shared solution among the countries for irregular refugees is agreed by imposing a quota for refugee settlement load by reviewing the system which many countries in European Union use

by registering (Delacrétaz, Kominers, and Teytelboym 2016).

In the United Nations Summit (September 2016), it was promised for 50 countries that 360,000 refugees would be located until the end of 2017 (Delacrétaz et al. 2016). While the policies of some countries are clear in terms of the location of refugees, the policies of some other countries are not. For instance, England shelters many of the refugees in a special residence and their rents are supported with centrally managed residence money. Denmark, the Netherlands define their refugee locating plans with multi-annual quotas; Germany defines with last three years quota; Finland, Sweden, England, Portugal, and Ireland define annually; France defines with a fixed quota since 2008; and Belgium, Czechia, and Spain define with quotas agreed each year¹.

There are also important differences in terms of refugee sheltering conditions among European Union countries. Besides the quota, there are also difficulties and differences in finding shelter. Municipalities in Austria, Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands, and Sweden provide sheltering opportunity with quota system. Refugees have to find their own sheltering places in Czechia, Poland, and Portugal. Locating is managed through reception centers in Spain and France. Austria provides solution in refugee camps, and Denmark provides solution by giving a house for 1-2 months and then manages its own adaptation process with a cheap house, apartment, or a new house. Germany provides solution to refugees refunctioning the unused places with new houses. Spain provides blocks of houses, residences, special standard house solutions, building, and shelter (IFHP 2015).

Priorities, willingness, and sheltering capacities of the locals are important. It is important that they host the refugees in places where they can control the refugees. When the psycho-social situation of the deterritorialized refugees is considered, finding a suitable residence and living in the residence is the most critical sign of the successful integration for

refugees (Delacrétaz et al. 2016). Access of refugees and asylum seekers to suitable residences is a sign of successful integration. Only in this way can the newcomers start a new life in the host countries (Ager and Strang 2004; 2008). Despite the difficulties faced, new alternative solutions are being developed by different stakeholders (housing companies, NGOs, refugee organizations, etc.) in order to host the refugees (IFHP 2015).

The crisis in Syria had effects in important dimensions and depths on the countries neighboring Syria. The unique structure of each country made it inevitable that the effects of the crisis and the reactions which were given to this were different. However, as the effects of the crisis on neighboring countries are closely interrelated, it is not possible to tell apart the aforementioned effects from each other and at that point, it is necessary to emphasize that no countries in the area are not immune from the effects of the Syria crisis. For instance, even if not compared with Turkey, Jordan was able to develop a more systematical refugee policy compared to Lebanon and Iraq thanks to not only its migration experience in the past but also the monetary aids it received from the benefactors. However, at that point, there is a significant difference in terms of the effects that migration is led between Turkey and Jordan: while Turkey receives minimal supports from international organizations and benefactors for the Syrians it hosts, it realizes a great part of the expenses with its own resources.

SYRIAN REFUGEES IN TURKEY

Turkey has been a country which experiences intensive human mobility throughout history; it also embraced those within the same geography with language, religion, lineage, and relative relationships in Ottoman Empire period, and while it is an emigrant country, it became a country with more extensive entrances because of recently changing and improving

economical, social, and political reasons. Turkey also became the country which receives the most intensive migration with its open gate policy after the civil war in Syria.

Besides war, conflict, and unrest atmosphere in Middle East, because of Turkey's being the transit country which is used in the passage of immigrants to Europe Continent, Turkey became a country which received a considerable number of immigrants in the world and the area (Şeker, Sirkeci, and Yüceşahin 2015). According to IOM (International Organization for Migration) data, there are 2,964,916 immigrants in Turkey as of 2015. This number makes up around 3.8% of 2015 population of Turkey (Sönmez and Adıgüzel 2017). In July 2015, Syrian citizens who migrated intensively in the last five years made up for 60.8% (1,805,255) of the immigrants available in Turkey (UNHCR 2018).

According to 15.02.2017 explanations of Ministry of Interior in Turkey, there are 3 million 551 thousand 78 people in Turkey as refugees, and 48,738 of these people have residence permit. According to AFAD (Disaster and Emergency Management Presidency) data, the number of Syrian residences in Sheltering Centers as of May 2, 2017 is 248,103 (AFAD 2018). Guests staying in cities prefer primarily the cities which are close to border, such as Gaziantep, Şanlıurfa, Kilis, Hatay, Kahramanmaraş, Adana, Adıyaman, Osmaniye, Mardin, Malatya, and Mersin. According to Gaziantep Provincial Migration Management Directorate 31.01.2017 records, there are recorded 367,096 people under temporary protection.

A great majority of refugees live on the helps of the people besides the public assistances. However, they stated that the helps and assistances done are not sufficient. Syrian refugees still state that they are not pleased with being in Turkey despite problems like notably unemployment and high rents economically. The comings of the refugees were managed in cities with governorship, district governorship, Provincial

Migration Management Directorate, and institutions like AFAD, ASPB (Ministry of Family and Social Policy), and NGOs. Although in small scale, the existence of municipalities in internationally funded projects started since 2014 (3RP 2016).

REFUGEES AND RESIDENCE PROBLEM IN TURKEY SPECIFIC TO SYRIANS

According to the 25th article of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, “everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate ... housing”. Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing, and medical care and necessary social services (Barakat 2003). UNHCR defines “sufficient housing” concept as legal credibility of duty period, services, materials, facilities, infrastructure usability, affordable pricing, inhabitability, and locational and cultural sufficiency. Residence is accepted as a house, a shelter, or a living place and is regarded as a place where one or more families carry on their feeding and other vital activities (Clauson-Kaas et al. 1996).

Residence is a must for the well-being of the society. Individuals who live in the residence carry a social center, pride, and cultural identity value for their kinsmen (Barakat 2003). When those who are deterritorialized and exposed to natural disasters are considered and their psychological situation is evaluated, the importance of the issue can be seen more.

Residence is an important element of the structural environment and it is an element which unites with social life besides its personal value. Sovereignty area includes a scale from residence settlement, from spacial identity, to residence immediate environment and to city identity (Fozdar and Hartley 2013). Appropriation and embracing the place is important. It places an important role from physical environment to structural environment. Satisfaction and gratitude to

the place lived is closely related to loyalty (De Young 1996). Adaptation after the forced migration is related to effects of loyalty to the place, sheltering and conduct of life. People’s continuing their own cultures to some extent in their new lives eases the negativities experienced. Relocation carries a great importance life-long for the whole life of the refugees in their host countries/local areas where they were located (Aslund and Fredriksson 2009; Aslund, Östh, and Zenou 2006; Aslund and Rooth 2003; Damm 2014).

When it is thought specific to refugees, it is foreseen that stiffening of the permanency situations of the refugees in the country and correspondingly the policies to be developed can be evolved doubly by formulizing the current situation as “otherization or adaptation” (Yaman 2017). The need of these people for sheltering structures is undeniable in both scenarios.

Settlement population is related to the situation of people’s staying in a place for a long time. It is necessary that a prediction is made about the duration of stay of the refugees and the needs of the population are analyzed and that a road map is determined by presenting living area, its shape, and options. People do not invest on things they would not be able to buy when they return (IFRC 2006). How many of the refugees would return and how many of them would like to turn back is an important issue here. It should be analyzed well and houses for rent and for sale should be planned accordingly. The expectancies from house for sale and for rent are quite different. Residence expectancy of refugees and of those who live in settled area is also different. Related to refugees and asylum seekers, access to appropriate residences is a sign of successful integration. Besides, the newcomers could set up a new life in host countries (Ager and Strang 2004; 2008).

The first step for this work to be successful would be the studies and organizations in the locality. The application area for all the gathered information would be in the local. Various means should be developed to take and refuge refugees at local municipalities level.

That the municipalities take such a great responsibility would make it a must for them to have extra allowances. Sheltering, habits, cultural life, number of residences, and vital expectancies should also be known in order to reach an effective solution in problem solving in a city which received as many refugees as the city population.

According to an additional observance, residences of reasonable prices can generally be found more easily in fairly small municipalities, and that may sometimes be farther than attractive city centers; and for those who would like to reach education and/or education or specific teamwork skills, this situation may include a barrier against integration in more isolated areas. Nevertheless, smaller communities can provide a softer integration process to refugees because of local communities and networks which are easily accessible, and provide an opportunity to take advantage of their information and skills (IFHP 2015).

IMPORTANCE AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The field studies which were conducted related to Syrian refugees are generally made up of the identification of demographical and educational data, reasons for migration, problems which were faced with during the migration, identification of job and work opportunities. Besides, studies generally include people who live in cities, towns, or camps where refugees mostly live. Refugees who come from Syria to Gaziantep have to continue their lives both with a lot of differences such as psychological, social, economic, etc. in Syria and in Gaziantep. Analyzing the changing life style, number of family members, education, job status, economic situation, residence type, space need, and life expectancies of Syrians when they came to Turkey and their lives in Syria well, evaluating many variables holistically would be very important for the new lives of these people who come from Syria to Gaziantep while meeting their sheltering

needs. For the individuals who cannot solve their sheltering problem, they do not succeed in the solution of other problems, either. Evaluating refugees who come from Syria to Gaziantep has importance from two aspects. The first aspect is the differences in income levels of the refugees who came and the city dwellers and that Syrian's changing places change the quality of residence need and residence problem. The second aspect is what the demographical situation, changing life conditions and expectancies from the residences and their surroundings, likes and problems of the refugees who come from Syria to Gaziantep are. Thus, both the needs will be met according to expectancies and the new designs will be pioneered.

When it is thought that the main aim of the residences is to meet the needs of the people and when it is considered that most of the refugees have a tendency to reside in the country that they come worldwide, identification of the needs of refugees is important. The data obtained from this study will contribute to the applications in the local.

In this context, answers for the questions below are sought.

(1) Comparison of the lives of refugees in Syria and in Gaziantep:

- (a) Income levels;
- (b) Job opportunities.

(2) Comparison of characteristics of residences they resided in Syria and are residing in Turkey:

- (a) Residence types, size, and ownership;
- (b) Divisions of the houses they own;
- (c) Reasons of preference of the residences that they use;
- (d) Thoughts about the environment where they found their residences from.

METHOD

This is a survey from quantitative research model type of study. It is based on the identification of a group's ideas and opinions about an issue (Büyüköztürk et al.

2013). Descriptive studies aim to explain the interaction between situations by considering the relationships of current events with previous events and conditions (Sahu 2016). Survey model is a research approach which aims to define an existing situation as how it is. The event, individual, or object, which is the subject of the study is tried to be defined within its own conditions and as how it is. The important thing is to view and identify whatever the subject of the study is in the most appropriate way (Fowler Jr. 2013; Karasar 2008). For data restriction and applications to be defined correctly, detailed information should be presented related to the medium of the study.

Data Collection Tool

Survey questions were prepared in order to correctly diagnose first the characteristics of residences of refugees who came from Syria to Gaziantep with migration in Syria, then the interior and external environment characteristics of the residence where they lived when they came to Gaziantep. The survey which was prepared by Özyılmaz (2001) was based in the preparation of survey questions and editing was made (Özyılmaz 2001). The questions which are asked later are closed-ended: question types such as graded answers, best answer, two option answers, and answers with more than one option. The survey is made up of two axis and subdivisions. In the first main part of the survey, demographical information and questions related to the information about the spaces used in Syria take part. The second main part includes two sections, the first of which includes demographical and job information and the second of which includes questioning information related to the residence lived in Gaziantep. Surveys were carried out by Gaziantep University Arabic Architecture students with the refugees who come from Syria by migration face to face.

Sampling

Syrian refugees who are staying in Turkey under

refuge and are living in Gaziantep are the samples of this study. Sampling group was chosen according to convenience sampling method (Etikan, Musa, and Alkassim 2016) from those refugees who could be accessible through Gaziantep University Arabic Architecture students and who would represent different groups. Data related to identify the sampling are presented below.

When the residential area in Syria of the participants is studied, 141 families (76.2%) lived in city center, 26 families (14.1%) in town center, and 18 families (9.7%) in city center.

According to Table 1, while there are four families who cannot have a mother in the residence, one of the families has two mothers and one other family has four mothers. The 15 participant families do not have fathers. There are only three families who do not have children. The number of families who have five children and above is 53 (28.6%). Families have 3.5 children on average. The 31 families have grandmother and 18 families have grandfather. The study represents 1,060 people in total. According to sampling size calculations, if we accept the number of refugees who live in Gaziantep as 400,000, there is a 3% margin of error in 95% confidence interval.

When their educational status is studied (see Table 2), while the percentage of the illiterate mothers is 10.8%, the percentage of university graduate mothers is 31.4%. The 20 mothers continue their education. The percentage of illiterate fathers is 2.9%, while 45% of them are university graduates. The 19 of the fathers still continue their education. When the children are considered, 5.8% of them are illiterate, while 5.3% are university graduates. Although most of the grandmothers are literate, three grandmothers still study in primary school. Six of the grandfathers are illiterate while 12 of them have education.

When Table 3 is studied, it can be seen that while 127 of mothers stated their jobs as housewife, 22 of them stated being a teacher, and 11 an officer. There are four academicians, three doctors-dentists, three

Table 1. Distribution of the People Who Live in Residence

People living in residence and their numbers	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total
Mother	4	179	1		1						185
Father	15	170									170
Child	3	19	32	39	39	32	16	3	1	1	650
Grandmother	154	30	1								32
Grandfather	167	18									18
Other	180	2	3								8

Table 2. Educational Status of Participants

Educational status	Mother	Father	Children	Grandmother	Grandfather
Illiterate	20	5	38	19	6
Studying in primary school	9	7	152	3	2
Primary school graduate	12	10	52	2	3
Studying in secondary school	2	4	84		
Secondary school graduate	21	22	45	4	1
Studying in high school	5	2	73		1
High school graduate	49	39	33	2	3
Studying in university	4	6	93		
University graduate	58	78	35	1	2
Nursery-Kindergarten			28		

engineers-architects and there is one lawyer. The 23.8% of mothers belong to a qualified occupational group. The 40 of fathers stated being a worker-servant while 21 of them stated being an officer and 14 being teachers. There are also two academicians, eight doctors-dentists, one health care professional, six engineers-architects, and eight lawyers. Qualified occupational group percentage is 34.6%. One of the grandmothers is a teacher while the rest are housewives or unemployed. There are one teacher and one worker among the grandfathers, while the rest of them are unemployed. The 103 of the children have a job while 96 of them are unemployed.

Data Analysis

Surveys were coded in SPSS program according to the questions asked, and data were input through data cast

form. Cross table was used next to definitive statistics. Distributions were firstly checked for whether they have normal distribution for the comparison of quantitative data in Syria and Gaziantep. As they did not have a normal distribution as a result of Shapiro-Wilk test (Field 2009), Wilcoxon sign test out of non-parametric tests was used to compare variables (Pallant 2013). Statistical meaningfulness level was accepted as .05. Also descriptive statistical data were calculated.

RESULTS

Information related to the preference of migration and preference of Gaziantep was firstly presented in the presentation of findings. Comparative data related to the lives and the residences of refugees in Syria and in

Table 3. Jobs That Participants Have

Jobs	Mother	Father	Children	Grandmother	Grandfather
Housewife	127		18	14	
Officer	11	21	17		
Teacher	22	14	3	1	1
Academician	4	2	7		
Doctor-Dentist	3	8	4		
Health care professional		1	1		
Engineer-Architect	3	6	4		
Lawyer	1	8	3		
Self-Employed	1	9	39		
Worker-Servant	6	40	25		1
Unemployed	2	20	96	12	10

Gaziantep will be presented later. This part will give evaluations related to the types of residences where they live and spaces while comparing the participants in job and income status.

Result Related to Refugees' Life Opportunities in Syria and in Gaziantep

Income level. When the refugees' income distribution in Syria is considered, 14 families (7.6%) stated having a monthly income of below \$200, 46 families (24.9%) stated having a monthly income in \$200-400, and 47 families (25.4%) stated a monthly income in \$400-800. In this regard, the majority of the group have an income of below \$800. The remaining families stated having a monthly income as follows: 32 families (17.3%) in \$800-1,600, 28 families (15.1%) in \$1,600-2,500, eight families (4.3%) in \$2,500-5,000, and 10 families (5.4%) above \$5,000. Estimated average monthly income is \$922. When their monthly income in Turkey is considered, 39 families (21.1%) stated having a monthly income of below ₺400, 47 families (25.4%) stated having a monthly income between ₺400-800, and 41 families (22.2%) between ₺800-1,200. More than half of the group has a monthly income of below ₺1,200. The monthly income level among the remaining families is

as follows: 26 families (14.1%) between ₺ 1,200-1,800, 22 families (11.9%) between ₺ 1,800-2,500, eight families (4.3%) between ₺2,500-5,000, and two families (1.1%) above ₺5,000. Estimated average monthly income is ₺962. When ₺ is converted to \$, that would be \$255 (\$1 = ₺3.76 as of January 15, 2018).

According to the comparison results, while there is a decrease in monthly income levels of 104 families, income level of 42 families increased and income level of 39 families remained the same (see Table 4). Wilcoxon sign test was administered to study this change. The decrease in the monthly income level is in statistically meaningfulness level according to test result. So, when general comparison is made, family income levels of refugees decreased after they migrated to Turkey.

Job opportunities. When Table 5 is studied, 35.7% of mothers have a job, while the percentage of working fathers is 94%. Unemployment rate is relatively low when compared to the rates in normal Syria. Besides, 46.5% of fathers work in a high qualified work. Most of the children are in schooling process. While only 13.3% of children have a job, 17.7% of children regard themselves as unemployed. Grandmothers and grandfathers are generally regarded as unemployed.

Table 4. Comparison of Refugees' Monthly Income in Turkey and in Syria

	N	Mean rank	Sum of ranks	Z	p
Negative ranks	104 ^a	73.38	7,631.50		
Positive ranks	42 ^b	73.80	3,099.50		
Ties	39 ^c			-4.553	.000*
Total	185				

Notes: ^a Monthly income in Turkey < Monthly income in Syria; ^b Monthly income in Turkey > Monthly income in Syria; ^c Monthly income in Turkey = Monthly income in Syria. * $p < .05$.

Table 5. Job Opportunities They Had When They Were in Syria

Type of Job	Mother	Father	Children	Grandmother	Grandfather
Officer	18	45	8	1	4
Teacher	28	12	5	2	
Academician	4	1	18		
Doctor-Dentist	4	6	3		
Health care professional	2	2	1		
Engineer-Architect	4	14	8		
Lawyer		6	4		
Self-Employed	2	52	24		5
Worker-Servant	4	36	16		
Unemployed	118	6	115	34	19

The 20% of mothers and 79.9% of fathers work in a job while they are living in Turkey (see Table 6). The 21.1% of fathers are unemployed. There is an increase in percentages when compared with their lives in Syria. The percentage of fathers working in a high qualified work is 18.2%. There is a serious decrease in the quality of the job where they work. While 17.5% of children work in a job, 21.5% of them are accepted as unemployed. Owning a job and unemployment increased in children.

Result Related to the Characteristics of the Residences Where Refugees Reside in Syria and in Turkey

Residence types, sizes, and ownership. According to Table 7, the 86% of the refugees own the residence they reside in. The most owned residence types are apartment (77), garden single storey (34), and old Arabic

house (26), respectively. Tenants make up 14% of the group. The most rented structures are apartment (12) and garden single storey (8), respectively. When their sizes are considered, most of the participants live in residences above 125 m² (67.6%). The 13.5% of the group live in small residences of 75-100 m².

When the residences they reside in Turkey is examined, the percentage of residence ownership is quite low (6%). Six families do not pay off for the residences they reside in, and the rest of the families use the residences they rented. The 48% of the participants reside in apartments. When the residence size is considered, the majority of the group (67%) reside in residences below 125 m². While 35 families reside in a residence below 75 m², nine families live in residences above 200 m² (see Table 8). Wilcoxon sign test was applied to compare the sizes of the residences which are used in Turkey and in Syria.

Table 6. Job Opportunities of Refugees in Turkey

Type of Job	Mother	Father	Children	Grandmother	Grandfather
Teacher	24	12	6	1	
Academician	4	3	3		
Doctor-Dentist	2	6	3		
Nurse, hospital attendant, etc.		1			
Pharmacist			1		
Engineer-Architect	2	5	2		
Lawyer		4			
Self-Employed	3	80	40	1	2
Worker-Servant		9	15		
Technician	1	2	1		
Master builder-apprentice		7	25	1	
International relief agencies, associations	1	5	18		
Unemployed	144	36	140	21	11

Table 7. Residence Type, Ownership, and Size Which Was Resided in Syria

		Between 75-100 m ²	Between 100-125 m ²	Between 125-150 m ²	Between 150-200 m ²	Larger than 200 m ²	Total	
Rental	Residence type	Gardened single storey	1	3	0	0	4	8
		Apartment	4	4	2	1	1	12
		Studio apartment	0	2	1	0	0	3
		Shanty	0	1	1	0	0	2
		Old Arabic house	0	0	1	0	0	1
	Total	5	10	5	1	5	26	
Residence owner	Residence type	Gardened single storey	2	5	4	10	13	34
		Apartment	8	10	21	25	13	77
		Duplex	0	1	0	1	5	7
		Housing estate	4	2	0	0	1	7
		Shanty	5	2	0	1	0	8
		Old Arabic house	2	4	11	6	3	26
	Total	21	24	36	43	35	159	

Table 8. Residence Type, Ownership, and Size Which Is Resided in Turkey

		Smaller than 75 m ²	Between 75-100 m ²	Between 100-125 m ²	Between 125-150 m ²	Between 150-200 m ²	Bigger than 200 m ²	Total	
Rental	Residence type	Gardened single storey	0	0	6	2	0	0	8
		Apartment	6	21	15	19	13	5	79
		Studio apartment	15	8	5	4	0	3	35
		Duplex	0	1	0	0	1	1	3
		Housing estate	0	1	1	2	0	0	4
		Shanty	9	16	2	4	1	0	32
		Antep house	0	4	2	1	0	0	7
	Total	30	51	31	32	15	9	168	

Table 8 to be continued

Residence owner	Residence type	Apartment	2	2	2	1	2	9
		Housing estate	1	0	0	0	1	2
	Total		3	2	2	1	3	11
I do not pay off	Residence type	Apartment	0	0	0		1	1
		Studio apartment	0	1	1		0	2
		Other	2	1	0		0	3
	Total		2	2	1		1	6

When Table 9 is studied, the size of the residences that 127 families use decreased. While 19 families reside in a bigger residence, 39 families live in residences of similar size. As a result of the analysis, as $p < .05$, the decrease in the sizes of the residences which families use is at statistically meaningfulness level. No correlation is found between the residence types that the refugees reside in Syria and in Turkey. This result may be because of rental possibility and economic reasons.

Partitions that residences have. When Table 10 is examined, while the number of the residence with more than one living room which is used in Turkey is only three, there are no living rooms in 14 houses. In the residences which 12 families use in Syria, there are two or more living rooms. The number of residences with no children's room used to be 18 in Syria, and this number increased to 59 in Turkey. Moreover, while the number of the residences with two and more children's room used to be 52 in Syria, this number decreased to 15. The number of residences with no parents' bedroom increased from six to 31. While the number of study rooms used to be 49 in Syria, this number decreased to 20 in Turkey. The number of houses with no saloons increased from 39 to 86. While there used to be six houses with two saloons, it was not preferred in Turkey. The number of houses with no kitchens increased from 11 to 21. The number of houses with more than one bathroom and more than one WC in Syria is more when compared

with Turkey. There is a decrease in the number of houses with no store rooms in Turkey compared to the other partitions. When the balcony status is considered, while there used to be 46 residences with more than two balconies in Syria, this number is only nine in Turkey. There is also a decrease in the numbers of entrance, yard, and garage. Totally, while there used to be 1,913 partitions in the residences which were resided in Syria, this number became 1,312 in Turkey. The decrease in the number of compartment may be because of the small size of the residences which are used.

Preference Reasons of the Residences Which They Use

When Table 11 is analyzed, while the most effective factors when the refugees were in Syria were residence sizes' meeting the needs, residence ownership, clean environment, and good neighbor relationships, the most ineffective factors are having no other alternative and its being cheap. In Turkey, proportionally, residence sizes' meeting the needs, close proximity to school, and its being cheap stand out as effective factors. The least effective factors are having no other alternative and having children's friends in the same neighborhood. There is a proportional decrease in all factors except for being cheap when they are compared with the situation in Syria. Meeting the basic needs and its being cheap are considered.

Table 9. Comparison of Size Measurements of Residences in Turkey and in Syria

	N	Mean rank	Sum of ranks	z	p
Negative ranks	127 ^a	77.93	9,897.50		
Positive ranks	19 ^b	43.87	833.50	-8.962	.00
Ties	39 ^c				
Total	185				

Notes: ^a Residence in Turkey m² < Residence in Syria m²; ^b Residence in Turkey m² > Residence in Syria m²; ^c Residence in Turkey m² = Residence in Syria m². * $p < .05$.

Table 10. Conditions of Spaces in Residences Which Are Used in Syria and in Turkey

Spaces	Syria				Turkey			
	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3
Living room	1	172	10	2	14	168	3	
Children's room	18	115	45	7	59	111	15	
Parent bedroom	6	177	2		31	154		
Study	136	47	2		165	20		
Saloon	39	140	6		86	99		
Kitchen	11	171	3		21	164		
Only WC	51	128			94	89	2	
Only bathroom	66	112	6	1	114	69	2	
Bathroom & WC	58	110	15	2	111	74		
Storeroom	102	78	5		80	103	2	
Balcony	52	86	41	5	94	82	8	1
Entrance	64	116	5		112	72		1
Yard	118	61	5	1	167	18		
Garage	133	46	5		166	19		

Table 11. Preference Reasons of the Residence Which Is Used in Syria and in Turkey

	In Syria		In Turkey	
	Effective	Not	Effective	Not
Residence ownership	113	72	21	164
Residence sizes meet my needs	120	65	68	117
Environment is clean	83	102	42	143
Abundance of green spaces	72	113	24	161
Good neighborhood relationships	83	102	24	161
Children's friends are in the same neighborhood	42	143	8	177
Close proximity to school	63	122	62	123
Cheap price	32	153	61	124
Close proximity to social areas	70	115	51	134
Safety	75	110	57	128
No other alternative	1	184	4	181
Others	9	176	16	169

Table 12. Information Related to the Environment Where the Residences Which Are Resided in Syria and in Turkey Are

	Syria						Gaziantep/Turkey					
	Yes		No		Indecisive		Yes		No		Indecisive	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Is security sufficient?	170	91.89	10	5.41	5	2.70	136	73.51	21	11.35	26	14.05
Is cleaning sufficient?	147	79.46	29	15.68	9	4.86	126	68.11	45	24.32	13	7.03
Are green spaces sufficient?	107	57.84	61	32.97	14	7.57	88	47.57	72	38.92	24	12.97
Is social domain sufficient?	125	67.57	46	24.86	12	6.49	101	54.59	59	31.89	16	8.65
Is it crowded?	66	35.68	108	58.38	10	5.41	105	56.76	67	36.22	8	4.32
Is it appropriate to your traditions?	171	92.43	10	5.41	4	2.16	115	62.16	42	22.70	26	14.05

Table 13. Data Related to the Use of Outdoor Spaces Around the Residence

	Syria					Gaziantep/Turkey				
	Heavy	Normal	Rarely	I do not use	Not available	Heavy	Normal	Rarely	I do not use	Not available
Children's playground	37	89	29	9	20	35	106	15	17	9
Sports areas	17	54	53	29	32	14	77	45	35	10
Outdoor space sitting resting areas	32	86	23	22	21	25	99	25	22	9
Car road	55	101	11	14	4	36	75	16	42	12
Pedestrian way	49	107	16	2	11	47	116	9	6	2
Car park	33	79	26	25	17	27	71	18	50	9
Social facility	8	84	25	15	17	41	95	19	18	4
Mosque	72	96	7	3	5	42	115	11	7	3
Condolence house	6	41	53	29	47	7	52	40	53	20
Park area	58	74	29	8	13	55	82	8	11	9
Shopping units	55	89	16	7	15	53	97	16	8	5
Café, tea garden	40	52	42	30	18	38	71	27	30	14

Evaluation Related to the Environment Where the Residence Is

In the evaluation of the environment where the residences that participants resided in Syria are in, the participants stated its being appropriate to traditions as the most effective, and later its being secure (see Table 12). The majority of the group think that cleaning, green field, social are sufficient and that the environment is not crowded. However, while there is a decrease in the number of positive participation related to the environment where they are in Turkey, the majority of the group think of it as being appropriate to traditions,

secure, and clean. Moreover, again the majority of the group consider population as a lot and green space as insufficient.

Security perception is detailly studied as security concern is the leading reason among the reasons of the refugees for leaving their own countries. Besides making a contradiction, there is no change in security perception of 123 of the refugees. In other words, they regard their own countries as secure while regarding here as secure, or they regard their own countries as insecure while not accepting here as secure, either. There is a decrease in the security perception of 46

people, which means while they regard the perimeter of their house in their own country as secure, they consider here as insecure. Furthermore, there is an increase in security perception of 16 people.

Ideas Related to the Use of Outdoor Spaces Around the Residence

According to Table 13, when the use of spaces around the residences in Syria is studied, the first three are noticed as mosque, car road, and pedestrian way while the last three are noticed as café, tea house sports areas, and condolence houses. The 47 families state that there are no condolence houses, and 32 families state that there are no sports areas in the environment that they are. When the outdoor space usage in Turkey is considered, while pedestrian way, mosque, and shopping units are the first three articles, car park, sports areas, and condolence houses make up the last three articles. When the usage differences are studied, while there is an increase in social facility, sports area and café, and tea garden usage after they came to Turkey, there is a decrease in mosque, car park, and car road usage.

DISCUSSION

According to the field studies conducted, nine tenth of the Syrians in Turkey live in city centers (Sunata 2017). When it is thought in this context, studies that would be done in city centers would give more generalizable data on behalf of reflecting the current situation.

When the settlements in Syria of the participants are considered, 141 (76.2%) used to live in city centers, 26 (14.1%) families in town centers, and 18 (9.7%) families in villages. Another study similarly stated that 60% of participants used to live in city centers (Doğan and Karakuyu 2017).

Mother and father percentages are close to each other in participants. There are three families who do not have children. Average child number is 3.5.

Average family size is 5.7. According to another study in Gaziantep, of the 250,486 Syrians outside the camp who are registered to Gaziantep Governorship system, there are 125,592 women and 124,894 men. Woman-man percentages in each age group are close to each other (Sandal, Hançerkıran, and Tıraş 2016). In another study, family size is calculated as 6.2 (Paksoy 2013). According to the result of another study which identified the number of children, while 40% of the participants have between four and six children, 21% has between one and three, 17% has between seven and nine, 14% has more than 15, 5% has between 10 and 12, and 1% has 13 or 14 children. Six participants do not have children (Doğan and Karakuyu 2017). Generally considered, when the number of children condition of refugees is generally studied, it would be spotted that 4-6 children interval is the most and that it is more compared to the child condition in Turkey.

When their educational status is considered, while the percentage of illiterate mothers is 10.8%, university graduate percentage is 31.4%. For fathers, the illiterate percentage is 2.9%, and university graduate percentage is 45%. The 430 of the children still continue their educational process. According to a study result of AFAD (2013), although it is known that CHE (The Council of Higher Education) and Ministry of Education made some arrangements, only 14% of the children and teenagers who live outside the camps can continue their education (AFAD 2013). According to a study result which was conducted by Paksoy (2013), the university graduate percentage is 29%. In another study, 34% of the participants are high school graduates, 30% are primary and middle school graduates, 9% are university graduates, and 27% are illiterate (Doğan and Karakuyu 2017). In a study conducted by Apak (2014), while 13% of the participants are illiterate, 13% of them are university graduates. When it is compared with the study group mentioned above, this sample group can be said to have higher education level.

When their occupational status is considered, 23.8% of the mothers belong to a qualified line of work. The percentage of qualified line of work in fathers is 34.6%. While 103 of children have a job, 96 of them are unemployed. According to the results of the study conducted by Paksoy (2013), qualified occupational group percentage is 25.2%. In the study conducted by Apak (2014), the percentage of officers is identified as 9.8%.

The 35.7% of mothers used to work in a job in Syria. The 94% of fathers used to work in Syria. Unemployment rate in Syria in 2011 was 94% (Paksoy 2013). Unemployment rate in study group is quite low when compared to the rates in normal Syria. Besides, 46.5% of fathers used to work in a qualified line of work. While living in Turkey, 20% of mothers and 79.9% of fathers work in a job. The 21.1% of fathers are unemployed. There is an increase compared to the rate in Syria. The percentage of fathers who work in a qualified line of work is 18.2%. There is a serious decrease in the quality of the job worked at. According to the results of another study, the Syrian families working with more than one person in order to earn their livings and holding on to the daily life serve as a tactic for existing in the strategy area where high rents, cheap labor, and expensive living conditions dominate (Deniz, Hülür, and Ekinici 2016). According to another study, 50% of Syrian men work, and 24% are looking for a job. While 8% of Syrian refugee women work, 9% of them are unemployed. Primary source of income of Syrian refugees in Turkey is the wages that they earn by working (85%). Syrian refugees try to make the living of their families by being involved in labor market. The 90% of the Syrians in western cities, especially 93% of those in Istanbul make their livings by working (Sunata 2017). There are also studies which reach to different results. For instance, as a result of the study conducted by Kaynak and friends (2016), the great majority of the refugees continue their living with social reliefs besides the aids of the public.

However, they stated that the aids given are not sufficient (Kaynak et al. 2016).

Estimated average monthly income while they were living in Syria was \$922. Estimated average monthly income here is ₺962. When ₺ to \$ conversion is done, that would equal to \$255 (\$1 = ₺3.76 as of January 15, 2018). So, when a general comparison is made, their family income level decreased after they migrated to Turkey. According to many studies, most of the participants have a monthly income of below ₺500 (Paksoy 2013; Apak 2014). According to the results of another study conducted by Sunata (2017), monthly family consumption expenditure, which includes items like food, drinks, personal hygiene, of a Syrian refugee family is 867 TL. Expenditure per person is 140 TL. So, daily purchasing power of Syrian refugees per person is 1.33 dollars (Sunata 2017). According to the result of another study, while 22% of the participants have an income of 500 TL and below, 30% has an income between 501-1,000 TL, 25% between 1,001-1,500 TL, 20% between 1,501-2,000 TL, and 3% between 2,001-2,500 TL. According to these results, it can be seen that more than half of the participants have a 1,000 TL and below income, but only 3% have above 2,001 TL income (Doğan and Karakuyu 2017). In the comparison of their economic levels in Syria and economic levels in Turkey, the percentage of those who evaluate as bad and very bad is 60.6% (Apak 2014). They generally regard that their income decreases and that they feel themselves economically insufficient relatively.

The 86% of refugees own the residence they used in Syria. There were mostly apartment (77), gardened single storey (34), and old Arabic house (26) in residence ownership. When their sizes are considered, most of the participants (67.6%) resided in residences of above 125 m². The 13.5% of the group lived in small houses of 75-100 m². When the residences where they reside in Turkey are studied, residence ownership percentage is quite low (6%). The 48% of

the participants reside in apartment. When the residence size is considered, the majority of the group (67%) reside in houses below 125 m². The sizes of the residences which 127 families use decreased. While 19 families live in a bigger place, 39 families reside in residences of similar sizes. The sizes of the residences which refugees use decreased. No correlation has been found between the types of residences that they used to reside in Syria and that they reside in Gaziantep. This result may be caused by renting opportunity and economic reasons. In another study, they were asked to make a comparison between the residence they used to live in Syria and the one they stay in Kirikhan. According to this, while 69.2% of the refugees stated that their residences in Syria used to be better in terms of life standard, 11.1% of them stated that the residence in Kirikhan is in a better condition. The remaining 19.9% of the research stated that no big difference was identified between the two residences. Based on the observations which were made during the survey, it was seen that a great majority of the residences where Syrians live are one or two storey, of masonry construction characteristic and simple shelters (Atasoy and Demir 2015).

While the number of residences with more than one living room which is used in Turkey is only three, 14 residences do not have any living rooms. In the residences in Syria used by 12 families, there used to be two or more living rooms. The number of residences with no children's room increased to 59 from 18. Besides, while the number of residences with two or more children's room was 52, this number decreased to 15 in Turkey. The number of residences with no parents' bedroom increased from six to 31. While the number of study rooms used to be 47, this number became 20 in Turkey. Study room can be thought as a space which is not frequently preferred. As the number of individuals who live in the house increases, they prefer to use the rooms in general more. This could be a suggestion for the residences which would be designed in the future. The number of

residences which do not have a saloon used to be 39, and became 86. While there were totally 1,913 partitions in the residences that used to be resided in Syria, this number became 1,312 in Turkey. This decrease in the number of partitions may be caused by the small size of the residences which are used.

The 9.7% of the residences which are rented by Syrians are made up of one room, 30.8% are of two rooms, 50.1% are of three, and 9.7% are made up of four and more rooms. However, when the number of families and individuals who reside in the residence is considered, it can be seen that the situation is not so pleasant (Atasoy and Demir 2015). According to the study conducted by Paksoy (2013), around half of the Syrian refugees reside in residences with two or less rooms. The 66.7% of the participants stated that they do not have bedrooms, and 14.8% stated not having bathrooms.

When the status of refugees' use of the facilities around the residences where they live is studied, while there is an increase in the use of social facilities, sports areas and café, and tea garden after they come to Turkey, there is a decrease in mosque, car park, and car road usage. When the modifications in the residence and different usages are considered, the most modifications and different usages happened in living room. Children's room and parents' bedroom received the second most modifications. Saloon comes second in usage with different purposes. Modifications and different usages in the remaining parts of the house are quite few.

About the appropriacy of the residences to the traditions, while 130 families consider as appropriate to traditions, 55 families think that the residences they reside in are not appropriate to their traditions. The reasons for inappropriacy to traditions were shown as general architectural designs of the residences (29) and lack of spaces (20). When their reasons for moving are studied, while the smallness and insufficiency of the present residence is quite effective, the effectiveness of other reasons is relatively low.

When the residence preference of those who wish to move is asked, most of them consider moving to an apartment.

When the percentage calculation of difference of likes and dislikes in identification of refugees' ideas related to the space of the residence where they reside and interspatial relationship is done, the number of those refugees who like is more compared to the number of refugees who dislike in all criteria. The difference between the articles of living room, letting the air in and having a separate WC is above 40%. Again, the difference related to having a separate bathroom, its being light, the district which the residence is in, and entrance-saloon connection is quite high. The criteria which have low like percentage and few differences are bathroom-WC being together, study, and garage.

The integration of asylum seekers is a multilateral process of integration, including asylum seekers and host citizens (Yıldız and Çakırer-Özservet 2016). For permanent integration, Fielden (2008) spoke three essential steps. It emphasizes the importance of immigrants' legal status in the countries of destination and indicates that legal status will allow them to benefit from basic rights. As a second step, migrants need to have an employment opportunity in sustainable and humanitarian terms in the economic context. Finally, social and cultural issues need to be developed along with the host society, and it is necessary for him to adapt to this process (Fielden 2008).

The data of this study show that there are still difficulties in the second step. Three major issues arise in this regard. Firstly, it is a sign that asylum seekers' income has fallen, the space they live in is getting smaller, and the liveliness of the houses they have placed is too small. From another point of view, one of the things that will accelerate the integration process is homeowning. In the residential projects that will be built in line with the data of the study, the integration process will be accelerated taking into

account the needs of asylum seekers. A similar idea has been spoken by Çakırer-Özservet (2015), and she stated that for integration politics, it is necessary to first introduce mechanisms for cheap and minimum comfort buildings for homeowning (Çakırer Özservet 2015). A third point, it remains a priority issue that without having to neglect their own unemployment, Turkey has to ensure they reach the level of income and asylum seekers also will raise living standards.

According to Yaman (2017), it can be predicted that the integration/adaptation process will be adversely affected if 89% of the asylum seekers are located outside the camps and the urban situation in the cities is more concentrated in the marginal areas. The existence of an immigrant who has grown up in the form of ghetto structuring and social influence already developing in a disconnected form, living away from education, low income, and experiencing identity problems in the form of internalized feelings of exclusion, above all else creates new security risks and problems in middle and long term preparing a suitable floor for.

In addition, there was no literature search for residential expectations of Syrian asylum seekers. Therefore, it is useful to read these findings in the framework of architecture. Urban planners and building planners need to take account of the needs of asylum seekers and cultural dimension to add functionality to the building. In this context, it is necessary to establish structures that Syrian asylum seekers will prefer. For example, WC and bathrooms should be separate and it should be examined carefully that because the number of children in the family is too many, the number of rooms in the buildings to be built must be too many.

CONCLUSIONS

While the average monthly income of the participants in Syria was \$922, Turkey is ₺962. In general, the income of asylum seekers has fallen. Of asylum

seekers, it has been an increase in the unemployment rate in Turkey. In addition, the rate of working in qualified jobs has decreased. Unemployment has increased in young people.

As expected, the rate of home ownership has fallen very seriously. The number of rooms and area of usage of house used has decreased. Asylum seekers are evaluating the surroundings of the houses in Syria more positively in relation to the neighborhood they live in.

As a result, if the buildings would be constructed for Syrians to prefer, the green spaces and social facilities of these buildings should also be prepared. Buildings of apartment blocks, more number of rooms, and separate design of bathroom and WC are necessary.

Note

1. Declaration of the State Agency for Refugees with the Council of Ministers. March 24, 2011. Bulgaria—equal partner in the building of the Common European Programme on Resettlement of Refugees, confirmed the 23 and 24 March, 2011 in Sofia.

References

- 3RP. 2016. *Turkey Regional Refugee & Resilience Plan 2016-2017 in Response to the Syria Crisis*. Retrieved April 11, 2018 (<http://www.3rpsyriacrisis.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/Turkey-2016-Regional-Refugee-Resilience-Plan.pdf>).
- AFAD. 2013. *Syrian Refugees in Turkey, 2013 Field Survey Results*. Retrieved (<https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/AFADSurveyonSyrianRefugeesinTurkey2013.pdf>).
- . 2018. *Geçici Barınma Merkezleri (Temporary Relocation Centers)*. Retrieved (https://www.afad.gov.tr/upload/Node/2374/files/15_01_2018_Suriye_GBM_Bilgi_Notu.pdf).
- Ager, A. and A. Strang. 2004. *Indicators of Integration*. London, UK: Home Office, Research, Development and Statistics Directorate.
- . 2008. "Understanding Integration: A Conceptual Framework." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 21(2):166-191.
- Apak, H. 2014. "Suriyeli Göçmenlerin Kente Uyumları: Mardin Örneği" (Adaptation of the Syrian Immigrants to Urban: A Case Study of Mardin). *MUKADDİME* 5(2):53-70.
- Aslund, O. and D.-O. Rooth. 2003. "Do When and Where Matter? Initial Labour Market Conditions and Immigrant Earnings." *The Economic Journal* 117(518):422-448.
- Aslund, O. and P. Fredriksson. 2009. "Peer Effects in Welfare Dependence Quasi-Experimental Evidence." *Journal of Human Resources* 44(3):798-825.
- Aslund, O., J. Östh, and Y. Zenou. 2006. "How Important Is Access to Jobs? Old Question—Improved Answer." *Journal of Economic Geography* 10(3):389-422.
- Atasoy, A. and H. Demir. 2015. "Suriyeli Sığınmacıların Kırkhan'a (Hatay) Etkileri" [The Effects of Syrian Asylum-Seekers in Kırkhan (Hatay)]. *Journal of International Social Research* 8(38):457-470.
- Barakat, S. 2003. *Housing Reconstruction After Conflict and Disaster*. London, UK: Humanitarian Practice Network, Overseas Development Institute.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., E. Kılıç Çakmak, Ö. Erkan Akgün, Ş. Karadeniz, and F. Demirel. 2013. *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri (Scientific Research Methods)*.
- Çakırer Özservet, Y. 2015. "Göçmen çocukların şehre uyumu ve eğitim politikası" (Adaptation and Education Policy of Immigrant Children). In *Uluslararası Göç ve Mülteci Uyumu Sorununda Kamu Yönetiminin Rolü (The Role of Public Administration in International Migration and Refugee Integration)*, edited by Y. Bulut. Kocaeli: Umuttepe Yayınları.
- Clauson-Kaas, J., A. Dzikus, C. Stephens, N. Høojlyng, and P. Aaby. 1996. "Urban Health: Human Settlement Indicators of Crowding." *Third World Planning Review* 18(3):349-363.
- Damm, A. P. 2014. "Neighborhood Quality and Labor Market Outcomes: Evidence From Quasi-Random Neighborhood Assignment of Immigrants." *Journal of Urban Economics* 79:139-166.
- De Young, R. 1996. "Some Psychological Aspects of Reduced Consumption Behavior: The Role of Intrinsic Satisfaction and Competence Motivation." *Environment and Behavior* 28(3):358-409.
- Delacrétaz, D., S. D. Kominers, and A. Teytelboym. 2016. *Refugee Resettlement*. Job Market Paper. Retrieved (<http://www.t8el.com/jmp.pdf>).
- Deniz, A. Ç., A. B. Hülür, and Y. Ekinci. 2016. "Göç, Strateji Ve Taktik: Suriyeli Sığınmacıların Gündelik Hayat Deneyimleri" (Migration, Strategy and Tactics: Daily Life Experiences of Syrian Asylum Seekers). *Journal of International Social Research* 9(42):1077-1087.
- Doğan, B. and M. Karakuyu. 2017. "Suriyeli Göçmenlerin Sosyoekonomik ve Sosyokültürel Özelliklerinin Analizi: İstanbul Beyoğlu Örneği" (Analysis of Socio-Economic

- and Socio-Cultural Characteristics of Syrian Migrants: Istanbul Beyoglu Sample). *Marmara Coğrafya Dergisi* 33:302-333.
- Etikan, I., S. A. Musa, and R. S. Alkassim. 2016. "Comparison of Convenience Sampling and Purposive Sampling." *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics* 5(1):1-4.
- Field, A. 2009. *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Fielden, A. 2008. *Local Integration: An Under-Reported Solution to Protracted Refugee Situations*. Geneva, Switzerland: Policy Development and Evaluation Service, UNHCR.
- Fowler Jr., F. J. 2013. *Survey Research Methods*. London: Sage Publications.
- Fozdar, F. and L. Hartley. 2013. "Refugee Resettlement in Australia: What We Know and Need to Know." *Refugee Survey Quarterly* 32(3):23-51.
- IFHP. 2015. *Housing Refugees Report*. Retrieved (<http://www.ifhp.org/sites/default/files/staff/IFHP%20Housing%20Refugees%20Report%20-%20final.pdf>).
- IFRC. 2006. *Emergency Shelter in Natural Disasters*. Retrieved (<http://slideplayer.com/slide/1395684/>).
- Karasar, N. 2008. *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi: kavramlar-ilkeler-teknikler (Scientific Research Method: Concepts-Principles-Techniques)*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Kaynak, S., İ. Arslan, E. Alancioğlu, and M. A. Koçakoğlu. 2016. "Göçün Sosyo-Ekonomik Sonuçları: Suriyeli Göçmenler Üzerine Bir Uygulama" (Socio-Economic Results of Migration: An Application on the Syrian Migrants). Presented at the *2nd International Congress on Applied Sciences: Migration, Poverty and Employment*, September 23-25, Konya, Turkey.
- Özyılmaz, H. 2001. "Investigation of User Needs in New Settlement Areas in Diyarbakır in Terms of Housing and Environment." Unpublished master's thesis, Dicle Üniversitesi.
- Paksoy, M. 2013. *İç Savaştan Kaçarak Kilis'te Yaşamını Sürdüren Suriyelilerin Sosyo-Ekonomik Sorunları Üzerine Bir Araştırma Raporu (A Research Report on the Socio-Economic Problems of the Syrians Surviving Their Life in Kilis by Escaping From the Civil War)*. Kilis 7 Aralık Üniversitesi Ortadoğu Araştırmaları Uygulama ve Araştırma Merkezi Yayını (Kilis 7 Aralık University Middle East Studies Research and Application Center Publication).
- Pallant, J. 2013. *SPSS Survival Manual*. UK: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Sahu, P. K. 2016. *Research Methodology: A Guide for Researchers in Agricultural Science, Social Science and Other Related Fields*. New Delhi: Springer.
- Sandal, E. K., M. Hançerkıran, and M. Tıraş. 2016. "Türkiye'deki Suriyeli mülteciler ve Gaziantep ilindeki yansımaları" (Reflections on Syrian Refugees and Gaziantep in Turkey). *Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences* 15(2):461-483.
- Şeker, B. D., İ. Sirkeci, and M. M. Yüceşahin. 2015. *Göç ve Uyum (Migration and Integration)*. London: Transnational Press London.
- Sönmez, M. and F. Adıgüzel. 2017. "Perception of Syrian Refugees in Turkey: Case of Gaziantep City." *Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences* 16(3):797-807.
- Stein, B. N. 1981. "The Refugee Experience: Defining the Parameters of a Field of Study." *International Migration Review* 15(1-2):320-330.
- Sunata, U. 2017. *Suriyeli Mülteci Hayatlar Monitörü (Syrian Refugee Life Monitor)*. Istanbul: Ingev Publishing.
- UNHCR. 2018. *Syria Regional Refugee Response*. Retrieved (<https://data2.unhcr.org/en/situations/syria>).
- Veliçeoğlu Yonca, A. 2014. "Türkiye'deki Suriyeli Mülteciler" (Syrian Refugees in Turkey). Pp. 26-34 in *Suriyeli Göçmenlerin Sorunları Çalıştayı Sonuç Raporu (Syrian Migrants Questionnaire Workshop Final Report)*, edited by S. Karaca and U. Doğan. Mersin: Mersin University.
- Yaman, F. 2017. "Uyum ve Ötekileşme Ayrımında Suriyeli Sığınmacılar" (Syrian Asylum Separates From Adaptation and Alienation). *KADEM Kadın Araştırmaları Dergisi* 3(1):91-109.
- Yıldız, S. and Y. Çakırer-Özservet. 2016. "Türkiye Göç Politikalarının Entegrasyon Ve Yerel Yönetimler Açısından İncelenmesi" (Investigation of Turkey Integration of Migration Policy and Local Governments). In *Ortadoğu'daki Çatışmalar Bağlamında Göç Sorunu (The Problem of Migration in the Context of Conflicts in the Middle East)*, edited by H. M. Paksoy, E. Yıldırımci, K. Sarıçoban, and Ö. Özkan. Ankara: Efil Yayınevi.

Bio

Derya Bakbak, Ph.D., assistant professor, Department of Architecture, Faculty of Fine Arts and Architecture, University of Hasan Kalyoncu, Turkey; research field: architecture.