

Quality of Life of Syrian Civil War Refugees in Turkey: A Comparison Between Refugees Living in Camps and Refugees Living Out-side Camps

Kadir Çavuş¹, Saime Şahinöz²

Abstract

This study aimed to evaluate the quality of life of refugees according to their residential areas who want to reach a better life by leaving their living areas due to various human and natural induced disasters. In addition, another reason that forms the basis for this purpose is the belief that the quality of life of refugees will affect the development of the country in which they will live in the future, with their knowledge, skills and equipment. The Internationally valid "quality of life scale" developed by the World Health Organization was used in the research. The research was conducted in the container city outside the shelter center in Pendik district of Istanbul and in the Yayladağı container city, which is the shelter center in Hatay. To research; 313 people from the container city and 148 people from Istanbul were participated. The data were analyzed by SPSS 22 package program and AMOS 23 package program. Although there is no significant difference between inside and outside the camp in terms of the quality of life obtained as a result of the scale, a significant difference was detected between the environmental quality of life and the question about the quality of life, which was asked on a single question basis, between inside and outside the camp. Mean 2.98 ± 0.61 points were obtained from environmental quality of life inside the camp, and mean 3.13 ± 0.56 points were obtained outside the camp. In terms of perceived quality of life in a single question, mean 2.89 ± 0.73 points were obtained from inside the camp and mean 3.20 ± 0.80 points were obtained from outside the camp. The results of this study suggest that policies related to life in camps should be revised. For example, abolishing in-camp living or further improving the living conditions in the camps can be presented as an exemplary suggestion. It is also suggested that this suggestion should be taken into consideration in future mass migrations. The results obtained from this study are discussed in the light of the literature in order to shed light on future studies in this field and some suggestions are made.

Keywords: Man-Made Disaster, Migration, Refugee, Shelter Center, Quality of Life

1. INTRODUCTION

From ancient times till today human beings have to change their location due to reasons such as natural disasters, wars, famine, and drought. Although this mobility has a history as old as the history of humanity, it continues to exist today. The phenomenon of forced migration has developed its capabilities through human and natural disasters. Today, human-threatening crises caused by hurricanes, tsunamis, earthquakes, climate changes, nuclear accidents, wars and terrorism, violence and political instability continue to displace millions of people (Karataş, 2018; Martin, 2016). According to the figures determined by the United Nations High Council for Refugees (UNHCR), there were 70.8 million forcibly displaced people worldwide at the time of the

¹ Öğretim Görevlisi, Artvin Çoruh Üniversitesi, Sağlık Hizmetleri Meslek Yüksekokulu, Tıbbi Hizmetler ve Teknikler Bölümü, Artvin e-posta / Corresponding author e-mail: cvskadir08@artvin.edu.tr ORCID No: 0000-0003-3105-7993

² Profesör Doktor, Ordu Üniversitesi, Tıp Fakültesi, Halk Sağlığı Anabilim Dalı, Ordu e-posta: drsaim@hotmail.com ORCID No: 0000-0003-0915-9344

To cite this article

Çavuş, K., Şahinöz, S. (2024). Quality of Life of Syrian Civil War Refugees in Turkey: A Comparison Between Refugees Living in Camps and Refugees Living Out-side Camps. *Journal of Disaster and Risk*, 7(3), 609-623.

research. Today, the number of forced immigrants in the world has exceeded 108.4 million. This increase has occurred only in the last 4 years. Of these, 62.5 million were compulsory internally displaced persons, 29.4 million were refugees, 5.9 million were Palestine refugees, 5.4 million were asylum-seekers and 5.2 million were other people in need of international protection (URL 1).

Before the civil war in 2011, the population of Syria was 21 million. According to the latest figures released by UNHCR, more than 15 million people are in need of help.

Moreover, both the civil war and the Kahramanmaraş centered earthquakes that took place on February 6, 2023, dragged the Syrian people living in the region to an even more needy situation. According to current figures, 6.8 million people are internally displaced. Among these figures, 5.28 million people took refuge in neighboring countries such as Turkey, Iraq and Egypt. With these figures announced, the last example of events that manifest as a humanitarian crisis emerges on the axis of Syria (AFAD, 2017; URL 2).

Due to its strategic position, Turkey is of great importance in terms of forced migration movements caused by the problems arising from regional instability in the region where it is located. According to the numbers announced by the UNHCR the number of refugees hosted in Turkey today is exceeding 3.5 million and this feature also explains Turkey's situation (URL 3; URL 1).

The Arab Spring movement, which began in Tunisia in 2010 and spread to Syria, has forced millions of people to leave their place. Firstly, a group of 260 refugees passed to Turkey through the district of Yayladağı in Hatay on April 29, 2011, from Syria, where the Arab spring movement jumped in 2011. Today it has reached more than three and a half million refugees (AFAD, 2017). According to the current figures announced by the Presidency of Migration Management, there are 73,854 Syrian refugees in temporary accommodation centers in Turkey. The total number of Syrians under temporary protection is over 3.3 million (URL 4). With these figures, Turkey has become a country with the highest number of refugees in the world. At the time the research was conducted, the number of refugees in Turkey was 3 605 615. At that time, 136,880 of the refugees in Turkey were residing in shelters.

1.1. Living Conditions of Syrian Refugees in Turkey According to Their Rights and Housing Areas

Regardless of their sheltering areas the refugees who took refuge in Turkey are subject to "Foreigners and International Protection Law numbered 6458" which was published in 2013. The law in question is the last and current regulation defining refugees and asylum seekers what the status in Turkey and the opportunities they have without distinguishing inside the camp and outside the camp. According to this law Syrian refugees are defined as persons under temporary protection in Turkey (URL 5). Within the framework of the "Temporary Protection Regulation (TPR)" issued in accordance with "Law No. 6458" and Article 91 of this Act some rights have been granted to Syrians living in Turkey. According to Article 26 of Section 6 of this regulation, Syrians will benefit from similar services such as health, education, access to the labor market, social assistance services and translation services (URL 6). The article in question covers all Syrians regardless of whether they are inside or outside the camps.

The Presidency of Migration Management stated that temporary accommodation centers provide services in various fields such as education, health, and worship. In addition, courses are also offered for adults in the older age group to acquire a profession (URL 7). Yayladağı Shelter Center, where inside the camp part of the research was carried out is a city consisting of containers. It has been observed that the areas where Syrians living outside the shelter center are living, are in the

form of detached house, slums or flats. In addition, those in need among those who are in need of temporary shelters outside the temporary shelter center can be accommodated in places determined by the governorships to the extent possible.

The opportunities Syrian refugees have inside and outside the camps (URL 6):

- The health services that refugees need are provided by the Republic of Türkiye Ministry of Health both in temporary accommodation centers and outside temporary accommodation centers.
- Similarly, the educational activities needed by refugees are carried out by the Republic of Türkiye Ministry of National Education both in temporary accommodation centers and outside temporary accommodation centers.
- Whether living inside or outside the camp, Syrians with temporary protection identity cards can be given work permits in certain sectors and business lines by the Republic of Türkiye Ministry of Labor.
- Among the foreigners under temporary protection, those in need can benefit from social assistance regardless of whether they live inside or outside the camp.
- Food, shelter, health, social assistance, education, and similar services are provided to those in temporary accommodation centers within the bounds of possibilities. Temporary shelters who are not included in the temporary accommodation centers can benefit from the services in these centers to the extent possible.

There is limited literature available on the living conditions of Syrian refugees in relation to their shelter areas, whether from official institutions or scientific articles. Despite this limitation, efforts have been made to explain the living conditions of refugees based on their accommodations.

One of the most important dimensions for displaced people is quality of life and welfare levels. The quality of life of displaced people affects both their ability to adapt to society and prevents them from accessing the knowledge and skills that would be useful if they return to their country. (Mansourian, 2018; International Organization for Migration (IOM), 2013).

In the historical context, studies on quality of life have been conducted by official institutions and their general purpose is to make an analysis on objective variables such as employment and income. However, in recent years, it has been stated by various academics that quality of life has a subjective dimension rather than an objective reality. Subjective quality of life; includes subjective assessments of people in terms of their employment status, housing, local environment, health, and quality of life (Marans, 2011; Marans, 2015).

Another point that draws attention with regard to the research's about quality of life is that despite the fact that "the desire to reach a better life" underlying the phenomenon of displacement, the researchers carry out such research's on the general population instead of focusing on groups such as refugees and asylum-seekers (Bak-Klımek et al., 2015).

As far as is known, although Türkiye hosts the largest number of refugees in the world, no study has been conducted to measure the quality of life of refugees in Türkiye at the time the study was conducted. In light of all these realities, Türkiye poses significant importance for scientists engaged in research in this field.

Within all these terms in the context, regardless of refugees being sent back to their country, their resettlement in a third country or be allowed to permanently reside in Turkey, evaluation of the quality of life of refugees is of great importance in order to increase the welfare level of their country and their own. For this reason, the quality of life of the Syrian refugees will be evaluated according to their residential areas in this study.

2. METHOD

2.1. Participants

The population of the study is represented by the population of Syrian refugees aged 18-65 in two separate areas, inside and outside the camps. According to the information received from the Hatay Governorship Provincial Directorate of Migration Management, there are 2520 people living over the age of 18 in the Yayladağı Temporary Accommodation Center. A total of 350 people were interviewed for the questionnaire in Hatay Yayladağı. 37 of these questionnaires were found to be inaccurate or incomplete and were not analyzed. In Istanbul, the net number of people between the ages of 18-65 could not be reached; as a result of the report published in 2017 it was determined that there were 4921 Syrians from all age groups in the Pendik district of Istanbul. Due to a number of limitations in Istanbul, only 150 refugees could be interviewed, and 15 of the surveys that were collected as a result of these interviews were found to be inaccurate and / or incomplete and were not subjected to statistical analysis. A total of 448 Syrian refugees were interviewed. Among the in-camp participants, 40.9% were male (128) and 59.1% were female (185). Among the participants outside the camps, 46.7% were male (63) and 53.3% were female (72). In total, 42.4% of the participants were male (191) and 57.6% (257) were female. The Yayladağı field survey lasted 10 days and the Pendik field survey lasted 30 days.

2.2. Measure

WHO Quality of Life Scale (WHOQOL) (URL 8), there are 2 questions measuring health and quality of life perception and 24 other questions consisting of 4 factors. These factors are physical health quality of life, psychological quality of life, social quality of life and environmental quality of life respectively. The question, which is one of these 24 questions and aims to measure "the level of satisfaction with sexual life" of the refugees, has been removed from the scale because it is sensitive for the refugees. WHO recommends removing the question in cases of data loss of more than 20%. Therefore, it was excluded from the scale considering that a large part of the respondents did not answer the question.

For the reliability analysis of the scale, Cronbach's Alpha value was found to be 0.873.

Confirmatory factor analysis was also conducted for the data collected within the scope of this study. The results obtained as a result of this analysis can be summarized as follows; χ^2/sd showed excellent fit with 2.5, RMSEA showed good fit with 0.05, CFI showed acceptable fit with 0.87, TLI showed acceptable fit with 0.84, GFI showed good fit with 0.90, RMR showed good fit with 0.06, and IFI showed acceptable fit with 0.87.

2.3. Procedure

Within the scope of this research, physical health, psychological, social relations and environmental quality of life of Syrian refugees will be evaluated in the context of quality of life. In this study, the effects of variables such as gender, age, income, education, number of people in the household and residential area on quality of life were investigated. In addition, individual average scores of the factors and questions in the scale were determined. Necessary permissions were obtained from both the Hatay Provincial Directorate of Immigration and the Istanbul Provincial Directorate of Immigration to carry out this research.

In this research, the internationally validated quality of life scale developed by World Health Organization (WHO) and which was applied to refugees in various field researches was used (URL 8). In order to use the scale, an agreement was signed with the World Health Organization and necessary permissions were obtained in this way.

Data were analyzed using AMOS 23 and SPSS 22 software. In addition to descriptive statistical methods (frequency, descriptive), chi square test, One-way Anova and students' t test were used in the data analysis. Students' t test was used to evaluate the question, factor and general scale mean scores according to two independent groups. In the case of more than two independent groups, the One-way Anova test was used. As a result of the research, the raw scores of the factors were converted to the scores that they meet in the range of 4-20 and 0-100 with the guidance of WHO. The significance value was accepted at the level of $p < 0.05$ in the analysis made with chi-square test and students-t test.

3. RESULTS

It was determined that the proportion of female participants in the research was predominant both inside the camp (59.1%) and outside the camp (53.3%). In terms of age, the proportion of the elderly population inside the camps is higher than outside the camps. But overall, the average age is at a low level. The average age of the participants is 31.5 for women and 36.7 for men. It is seen that most of the participants are married. The rate of married is 71.6% inside the camp and 61.5% outside the camp. Information on other demographic variables was presented in detail in Table 1.

Table 1. Assessment of Demographic Characteristics of Syrian Refugees According to their Residential Areas

	IN-CAMP		OUT-CAMP		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
GENDER						
Men	128	40,9%	63	46,7%	191	42,4%
Women	185	59,1%	72	53,3%	257	57,6%
Pearson Chi-Square; 0.296						
AGE						
18-25	80	25,6%	49	36,3%	129	28,8%
26-35	87	27,8%	55	40,7%	142	31,7%
36-45	87	27,8%	16	11,9%	103	23%
46-55	39	12,5%	12	8,9%	51	11,4%
56-65	20	6,4%	3	2,2%	23	5,1%
Pearson Chi-Square; 0.000						
MARITAL STATUS						
Single	69	22%	37	28,9%	106	23,7%
Married	224	71,6%	85	61,5%	309	69%
Widowed	18	5,8%	8	5,9%	26	5,8%
Divorced	2	0,6%	5	3,7%	7	1,5%
Pearson Chi-Square; 0.036						
EDUCATION						
Illiteracy and primary school	138	44,1%	34	25,2%	172	38,3%
Secondary school and high school	144	46%	63	46,7%	207	46,2%
University and higher	31	9,9%	38	28,2%	69	15,5%
Pearson Chi-Square; 0.000						
NUMBER OF PERSONS IN THE HOUSEHOLDS						
1-3 people	77	24,6%	23	17%	100	22,3%
4-6 people	191	61%	73	54,1%	264	59%
7+	45	14,4%	39	28,9%	84	18,7%
Pearson Chi-Square; 0.002						

Quality of Life Syrian Civil War Refugees in Turkey: A Comparison Between Refugees Living in Camps and Refugees Living Out-side Camps

INCOME LEVEL						
Below 1000 TL	287	91,7%	49	36,3%	336	75%
1000 TL and above	26	8,3%	86	63,7%	112	25%
Pearson Chi-Square; 0.000						

This analysis was conducted to understand whether there is a significant difference in measured quality of life according to gender. No significant difference was detected in general quality of life and quality of life scores in the 4 sub-factors according to gender. The average quality of life was 3.21 points for both men and women (Table 2).

Table 2. Evaluation of the Quality of Life of the Syrian Refugees According to the Gender

Assessment of General Quality of Life According to Gender					
Gender	N	M	SD	t	p
Men	191	3.21	0.522		
Women	257	3.21	0.520	-0.003	0.997
Assessment of Psychological Quality of Life According to Gender					
Men	191	3.18	0.686		
Women	257	3.13	0.715	0.630	0.529
Assessment of Physical Health Quality of Life According to Gender					
Men	191	3.34	0.699		
Women	257	3.42	0.656	-1225	0.221
Assessment of Social Relations Quality of Life According to Gender					
Men	191	3.42	0.765		
Women	257	3.52	0.826	-1329	0.185
Assessment of Environmental Health Quality of Life According to Gender					
Men	191	3.06	0.550		
Women	257	3.00	0.576	1105	0.270

Physical Health Life Quality and Psychological Life Quality of the participants were evaluated according to their accommodation areas.

There is no significant difference in physical health quality of life between inside and outside the camps. In-camp score is 3.41, out-camp score is 3.37 and total score is 3.39. Syrians describe their physical health quality of life as “moderate-good” with similar proportions in both, in-camp and out-camp. There is no significant difference in psychological quality of life between in-camp and out-camp. In-camp score is 3.16, out-camp score is 3.13 and total score is 3.15. Syrians describe their psychological quality of life as “intermediate level” both in and outside the camps. The psychological quality of life factor has the second lowest score obtained when evaluating the quality of life of Syrians (Table 3).

The social relations quality of life and environmental quality of life of the participants were evaluated according to their accommodation areas.

There is no significant difference in the quality of social life between in-camp and out-camp. In-camp score is 3.48, out-camp score is 3.47 and total score is 3.48. Syrians describe their social quality of life as “good” both in the camp and outside the camp. There was a significant difference in environmental quality of life between in-camp and out-camp. In-camp score is 2.98, out-camp score is 3.13 and total score is 3.03. Syrians living inside and outside the camps defined their environmental quality of life as “moderate”. However, it is concluded that Syrians living inside the camps perceive their environmental quality of life worse than those living outside the camps. The

overall environmental quality of life score was moderate. Environmental quality of life factor has the lowest score obtained when evaluating the quality of life of Syrians (Table 4).

Table 3. Assessment of Physical Health Life Quality and Psychological Life Quality of Syrian Refugees According to their Residential Areas

Physical Health Quality of Life						
	Residential Area	N	M	SD	t	P
To what extent do you think your pain is preventing you from doing what you need to do?	In-camp	313	2.31	0.888	-1654	0.099
	Out-camp	135	2.49	1.225		
How much do you need for any medical treatment to carry out your daily tasks?	In-camp	313	2.21	0.913	-1884	0.06
	Out-camp	135	2.42	1.359		
Do you have enough strength to sustain daily life?	In-camp	313	3.17	0.956	0.264	0.792
	Out-camp	135	3.14	1.005		
How is your physical mobility skill?	In-camp	313	3.11	1.027	0.364	0.716
	Out-camp	135	3.07	0.963		
How satisfied are you with your sleep?	In-camp	313	3.38	1.124	0.242	0.809
	Out-camp	135	3.35	1.163		
How satisfied are you with your ability to carry out daily tasks?	In-camp	313	3.43	0.992	0.635	0.53
	Out-camp	135	3.36	1.13		
How satisfied are you with your capacity to work?	In-camp	313	3.32	1.043	-2.729	0.01
	Out-camp	135	3.62	1.159		
Physical Health Quality of Life Overall Average	In-camp	313	3.41	0.64549	0.602	0.547
	Out-camp	135	3.37	0.74491		
Total Physical Health Quality of Life		448	3.39	0.67648		
Psychological Quality of Life						
How much do you enjoy living?	In-camp	313	2.78	0.918	2.215	0.027
	Out-camp	135	2.56	0.988		
To what extent do you find your life meaningful?	In-camp	313	2.84	1.027	-0.323	0.747
	Out-camp	135	2.87	1.135		
How successful are you in concentrating?	In-camp	313	3.22	0.994	0.759	0.448
	Out-camp	135	3.14	1.08		
Would you accept your physical appearance?	In-camp	313	3.55	1.095	-1.765	0.078
	Out-camp	135	3.75	1.016		
How satisfied are you with yourself?	In-camp	313	3.84	0.991	2.058	0.04
	Out-camp	135	3.61	1.18		
How often do you get negative emotions?	In-camp	313	3.89	0.788	0.804	0.422
	Out-camp	135	3.81	1.021		
Psychological Quality of Life Overall Average		313	3.16	0.68523	0.492	

Quality of Life Syrian Civil War Refugees in Turkey: A Comparison Between Refugees Living in Camps and Refugees Living Out-side Camps

	Out-camp	135	3.13	0.74217	0.623
Total Quality of Psychological Life		448	3.15	0.70227	

Table 4. Assessment of Social Relations Quality of Life and Environmental Quality of Syrian Refugees According to their Residential Areas

Social Relations Quality of Life						
	Residential Area	N	M	SD	t	P
How satisfied are you with your relationships with other people?	In-camp	313	3.89	0.788	0.804	0.422
	Out-camp	135	3.81	1.021		
How satisfied are you with the support of your friends?	In-camp	313	3.11	1.1	-0.217	0.828
	Out-camp	135	3.14	1.203		
Social Life Quality Overall Average	In-camp	313	3.48	0.75871	0.158	0.875
	Out-camp	135	3.47	0.90049		
Total Quality of Social Life		448	3.48	0.80326		
Environmental Quality of Life						
How safe do you feel in your daily life?	In-camp	313	3.65	0.868	2.825	0.005
	Out-camp	135	3.38	1.057		
How healthy is your physical environment?	In-camp	313	2.85	1.031	-5.093	0.0001
	Out-camp	135	3.4	1.087		
Do you have enough money to meet your needs?	In-camp	313	1.89	0.828	-6.3	0.0001
	Out-camp	135	2.48	1.088		
To what extent do you have the necessary information and news in your daily life?	In-camp	313	2.78	1.026	-2.071	0.039
	Out-camp	135	3	0.919		
To what extent do you have opportunities for spare time activities?	In-camp	313	2.42	1.068	2.518	0.012
	Out-camp	135	2.13	1.151		
How satisfied are you with the conditions of the house you live in?	In-camp	313	3.02	1.024	-3.124	0.0001
	Out-camp	135	3.36	1.124		
How satisfied are you with your health care conditions?	In-camp	313	3.81	0.972	1.052	0.11
	Out-camp	135	3.7	1.1		
How satisfied are you with your transportation?	In-camp	313	3.5	0.943	-0.969	0.33
	Out-camp	135	3.6	1.189		
Environmental Quality of Life Overall Average	In-camp	313	2.98	0.5401	-2.497	0.013
	Out-camp	135	3.13	0.61086		
Total Environmental Quality of Life			3.03	0.56564		

As a result of the analysis, the general quality of life for those who live in households as 5 or below people was 3.25, psychological quality of life was 3.22, physical health quality of life was 3.45. The

overall quality of life of the households with 5 or more people was 3.14, psychological quality was 3.03, physical health quality was 3.31. According to these findings, it can be concluded that the quality of life is low in places where there are more people in the households (table 5).

Table 5. Evaluation of the Quality of Life of the Syrian Refugees According to the Number of Persons in the Households

Evaluation of the General Quality of Life According to the Number of People Living in Households					
Number of People	N	M	SD	t	P
5 people and under	283	3.25	0.52756		
6 people and above	165	3.14	0.52405	2.192	0.029
Evaluation of Quality of Psychological Life According to Number of Persons Living in Households					
5 people and under	283	3.22	0.70060		
6 people and above	165	3.03	0.71410	2.715	0.007
Assessment of Physical Health Quality of Life According to Number of Persons Living in Households					
5 people and under	283	3.45	0.70480		
6 people and above	165	3.31	0.63731	1.990	0.047

It was aimed to evaluate the quality of life of Syrian refugees according to their education level. According to this evaluation, the quality of life of the participants with a high education level was also determined to be high (table 6).

The quality of life of the participants was evaluated according to their income levels. As a result of this evaluation, the general quality of life of those with a income of 1000 TL or above was determined as 3.32, physical health quality of life was 3.51 and environmental quality of life was 3.18. For those with income levels of 1000 TL or below, the overall quality of life was 3.18, physical health was 3.36 and environmental quality was 2.99 (table 7). According to these findings, it can be concluded that individuals with high income levels have high quality of life.

It was examined whether the quality of life changes according to age. In this study, significant changes were found in general quality of life, physical health quality of life and psychological quality of life according to age. Considering the chronic diseases that occur with age, the result is rationalized (table 8).

It was found that the overall quality of life score that the participants received from the scale is 3.21. This score corresponds to a medium degree. In addition, the in-camp score is 3.20, and the out-of-camp score is 3.23. Factor scores included in the scale were also determined. Here, social life quality is determined as 3.48 points, physical health life quality is 3.39 points, psychological life quality is 3.15 points, and environmental life quality is 3.03 points. Participants reported their environmental quality of life as the lowest level. Participants reported that their social life quality was at a good level. Syrians living inside the camps define their quality of life with a score of 2.89, while those living outside the camps define it with a score of 3.20 (single question). (table 9).

Table 6. Evaluation of the Quality of Life of Syrian Refugees by Level of Education

Level of Education	N	General Quality of Life			
		M	SD	F	P
Primary school and below	172	3.14	0.522	6.619	0.001
Secondary school and high school	207	3.22	0.513		
University and higher	69	3.41	0.500		
Psychological Quality of Life					
Primary school and below	172	3.04	0.712	5.661	0.004
Secondary school and high school	207	3.20	0.645		
University and higher	69	3.35	0.752		
Physical Health Quality of Life					
Primary school and below	172	3.30	0.697	6.376	0.002
Secondary school and high school	207	3.40	0.652		
University and higher	69	3.64	0.649		
Social Relations Quality of Life					
Primary school and below	172	3.47	0.770	0.126	0.881
Secondary school and high school	207	3.47	0.828		
University and higher	69	3.52	0.808		
Environmental Quality of Life					
Primary school and below	172	2.99	0.565	4.753	0.009
Secondary school and high school	207	2.99	0.572		
University and higher	69	3.22	0.548		

Table 7. The Quality of Life of the Syrian Refugees According to Their Income Level

Assessment of General Quality of Life According to Income Level					
Income Level	Number	M	SD	t	P
1000 TL and above	112	3.32	0.55626	2.423	0.016
Below 1000 TL	336	3.18	0.20275		
Assessment of Physical Quality of Life According to Income Level					
1000 TL and above	112	3.51	0.68290	2.003	0.046
Below 1000 TL	336	3.36	0.67699		
Assessment of Environmental Health Quality of Life According to Income Level					
1000 TL and above	112	3.18	0.61213	3.044	0.002
Below 1000 TL	336	2.99	0.53218		

Table 8. Evaluation of the Quality of Life of the Syrian Refugees According to the Age

Age	N	M	General Quality of Life		
			SD	F	P
18-25	129	3.33	0.536	2.850	0.02
26-35	142	3.21	0.536		
36-45	103	3.13	0.473		
46-55	51	3.10	0.488		
56-65	23	3.16	0.538		
			Psychological Quality of Life		
18-25	129	3.31	0.740	2.780	0.02
26-35	142	3.14	0.748		
36-45	103	3.01	0.641		
46-55	51	3.12	0.544		
56-65	23	3.09	0.643		
			Physical Health Quality of Life		
18-25	129	3.60	0.636	5.578	0.00
26-35	142	3.38	0.675		
36-45	103	3.30	0.629		
46-55	51	3.19	0.756		
56-65	23	3.18	0.662		
			Social Relations Quality of Life		
18-25	129	3.49	0.829	0.358	0.83
26-35	142	3.48	0.841		
36-45	103	3.52	0.735		
46-55	51	3.36	0.848		
56-65	23	3.47	0.611		
			Environmental Quality of Life		
18-25	129	3.05	0.606	0.695	0.59
26-35	142	3.06			
36-45	103	2.98			
46-55	51	2.96			
56-65	23	3.11			

Table 9. Quality of Life Assessment

Factor	Score	Converted Score (4-20)	Converted Score (0-100)	
Quality of Social Life	3.48/ in a Good Level	13.9	55.7	
Physical health quality of life	3.39 / Good to Moderate level	13.5	54.3	
Psychological quality of life	3.15 / ModerateLevel	12.6	50.5	
Environmental quality of life	3.03 / Moderate Level	12.1	48.5	
Overall quality of life	3.21 / Moderate Level			
Quality of Life in a Single Question				
Residential Area	M	SD	t	P
In-camp	2.89	0.738	-3.905	0.0001
Out-camp	3.20	0.809		
Total	2.99	0.722		

4. DISCUSSION

This research aimed to compare those living in-camp and out-camp. When this assessment was first evaluated on raw scores, the camp residents had 3.48 points in social quality of life, 3.41

points in physical quality of life, 3.16 points in psychological quality of life, and 2.98 points in environmental quality of life. Those living outside the camps achieved 3.47 points in social quality of life, 3.37 points in physical quality of life, 3.13 points in psychological quality of life, and 3.13 points in environmental quality of life.

In general, social quality of life was 3.48 (13.9/55.7) points, physical health quality of life was 3.39 (13.5/54.3) points, psychological quality of life was 3.15 (12.6/50.5) points, environmental quality of life was 3.03 (12.1/48.5) points.

In addition, Syrians living in camps (2,89) think that their quality of life is worse than those living outside camps (3,20). The reason for this situation are considered inadequate in the variables such as the monetary situation, home conditions, physical environment, which are very concrete and highly regarded parts of daily life. Because the related variables have been the determining factors in the perception of the quality of life of the Syrians as bad.

Looking at other studies in the field, it is seen that in Araya et al. (2011) conducted a study comparing in-camp and out-camp for internally displaced persons in Ethiopia due to war and various compulsory reasons. It was found that in this research, psychological quality of life was 14 points, physical life quality was 13.6 points, environmental quality of life was 9.5 points, social relations quality of life was 9.1 points among the people living outside the camps. The psychological quality of life was 13.2 points, physical quality was 12.9 points, environmental quality of life was 8.3 points and social relations quality of life was 7.5 points among the people living in the camps. In general, when the two residential places were compared with each other, a significant difference was found between the four factor areas and between the two areas in terms of overall quality of life, and those living in the accommodation centers (in-camp) had a lower quality of life score.

When the results of the present study was compared to Araya and his friends' study, Araya and his friends found a significant elevation in favor of out-of-camp in 4 factors, whereas in our study, only the environmental quality of life was in favor of out-of-camp. In other words, there were no significant differences in physical, psychological and social areas, and environmental quality of life was lower in-camp. In this respect, it is similar to the study of Araya, but it differs from the study of Araya in 3 factors. On the other hand, social relations have the lowest score in the study of Araya. In our study, social relations had the highest score. In this respect, the study of Araya differs from our study.

Izaaddin A. Aziz et al. (2014) conducted a survey to assess the quality of life of Syrian refugees living in refugee camps in Northern Iraq. As a result of this research, social relations quality of life of the refugees was found to be 15.23 points, physical health quality of life was 13.26 points, psychological quality of life was 12.62 points, and environmental quality of life was 11.66 points. Our study and Izaaddin A. Aziz et al.'s study show similarities. In both our study and Aziz's research, environmental quality of life achieved the lowest score. The score ranking of the factors of our study is the same as Aziz's study.

Mataria (2009) conducted a survey covering three different regions in order to evaluate the quality of life of Palestinians who were victims of civil war. The occupied Palestinian region achieved 67.6 points in social quality of life, 63.2 points in physical quality of life, 57.6 points in psychological quality of life, and 45.0 points in environmental quality of life. Our research is also

similar to the research conducted by Mataria both in terms of ranking of factor scores and in terms of having the lowest score of environmental quality of life.

In a study published by Duruel (2017), the main problems experienced by Syrian Refugees living in Hatay were discussed. In this study, 64% of the participants stated that the problems in the field of health that existed at the beginning were largely solved later. This finding is similar to the results on physical health quality of life obtained in the present study.

Mataria (2009) conducted a study on Palestinians who were victims of civil war and found that those with less education had lower quality of life. However, Mansourian's study (2018) did not reveal any improvement in the quality of life due to an increase in education. In our study, similar findings with the findings of Mataria was obtained. Both general quality of life, psychological quality of life and physical health quality of life of those with lower education level had statistically significant lower scores. In this respect, while Mataria's study and our study was similar, it was not similar to Mansourian's work.

Mansourian (2018) found a higher quality of life in men and the elderly in his study on Afghan refugees. In the study conducted by Mataria, the quality of life of elderly individuals and men was found to be lower. No significant difference was found in the gender variable of our study. However, a significant difference was detected according to age. For example, young individuals received higher scores for both their physical, psychological, and general quality of life.

Mansourian's study (2018) on Afghan refugees showed that the quality of life in 8 households and more was lower than those living with fewer people. According to Mansourian (2018), the quality of life score is 3.35 for 4-5 households, and 3.36 for 6-7 households, and 3.09 for 8 and more households. In our study, similar results were obtained with respect to ranking. While the quality of life of those living in the household with 5 or less was 3.25 points, the quality of life of those living with 6 or more was 3.14 points. In addition, apart from the topics discussed, another important issue found in our study was that the quality of life was higher in individuals with higher income.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Since they have the lowest scores in the scale, improvement studies are recommended especially for environmental quality of life and psychological quality of life.

The quality of life area in which there is a significant difference between inside and outside the camps is environmental quality of life. The environmental quality of life was found to be worse in the camps than outside the camps. Environmental quality of life achieved a score of 2.98 inside the camps and 3.13 outside the camps.

Since the quality of life obtained on a single question basis, both environmental quality of life and the results of the determinations made on the basis of questions have lower scores in the camps than outside the camps, it is recommended to revise the policies regarding the camp life. In this respect, it is recommended that the life in the camps be abolished or the life conditions is further improved.

While the Syrians living inside and outside the camps defined their relations with other people as good with a score of over 3.80, their relations with their friends were defined as medium with a score of over 3.10. It is suggested that further studies should be carried out for the reason of this situation.

In this research, it has been determined that the quality of life decreases as the number of people in the household increases. In this context, it is recommended to raise awareness of Syrians in areas such as family planning. Another recommendation is improvements should be made to those living in the households.

In this research, it was found that both the general quality of life, physical health quality of life, psychological quality of life and environmental quality of life of the people with high education level were higher. Therefore, it is recommended to pay more attention to the educational activities of Syrian children.

General quality of life, physical health quality of life and environmental quality of life were found to be significantly higher among those with high income levels. One of the most important factors that will improve the quality of life is to improve income levels and make reforms.

As the general situation shows similarities with other field researches, it will certainly not be wrong to consider these proposals in terms of other countries hosting the refugees.

It is important to consider the quality of life of Syrian refugees, whether they stay in Turkey, return to Syria, or are sent to a third country. The development level of the country they live in, the quality of the population, and the overall welfare are all crucial factors to consider. It is recommended to work together with the international community and other stakeholders to improve the quality of life for Refugees.

5.1. Limitations of the Research

The most important limitation encountered during the research was that the population with traumatic stories such as being affected by the civil war and being forced to leave their own countries abstained and feared the interviewer's request for interview. Although this problem manifested itself inside the camp, it was mostly experienced outside the camp. Regarding the permission given to conduct the research, a direct statement was made to the refugees living inside the camps by the administrators in the camp that such a research would be conducted. In addition, the research was conducted in an environment where the refugees live very close to each other. The fact that the refugees witnessed the research over the days removed negative doubts about the research. This, in turn, enabled the researcher to reach a large number of refugees and complete the research in the camp spending time for without much persuasion.

However, there was no such advantage outside of the camp. Although the Syrian refugees living in Pendik (outside the camp) were given permission to research, the importance and ethical dimension of the research was explained to them; since this research could not be directly told to them by officials, the hesitations of Syrian refugees could not be remedied 100% and participation remained at a much lower rate than inside the camp. For this reason, only 135 people could be reached in a 1-month period. It has been experienced in researches in this field that such problems are experienced. Especially in future researches, more cooperation with public bodies may be considered in order to avoid such situations.

REFERENCES

- Afet ve Acil Durum Başkanlığı. (2017). Türkiye'deki Suriyelilerin demografik görünümü, Yaşam Koşulları ve Gelecek Beklentilerine Yönelik Saha Araştırması. Afet ve Acil Durum Yönetimi Başkanlığı, Ankara.
- Araya, M., Chotai, J., Komproe, I.H., & De J.J.T. (2011). Quality of life after postconflict displacement in ethiopia: Comparing placement in a community setting with that in shelters. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*. 46 (7): 585-593. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-010-0223-1>
- Aziz, I.A., Hutchinson, C.V., & Maltby, J. (2014). Quality of life of Syrian refugees living in camps in the Kurdistan region of Iraq. *PeerJ*. 2, e670: 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.670>
- Bak-Klimek, A., Karatzias, T., Elliott, L., & Maclean, R. (2015). The determinants of well-being among international economic immigrants: A systematic literature review and meta-analysis. *Applied Research in Quality of Life* 10 (1): 161-188. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-013-9297-8>
- Duruel, M. (2017). Suriyeli sığınmacıların karşılaştıkları temel sorunlar, algı ve beklentiler: Hatay örneği. *Akademik Bakış Uluslararası Hakemli Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, (62), 57-79
- International Organization for Migration (IOM). (2013). *World Migration Report. Migrant well-being and development*. Geneva, Switzerland.
- Karataş, K., Demiröz, F., Aygüler, E., Ayalp, M.Ç. & Bolgün, C. (2018). Türk Kızılayı Ankara Toplum Merkezinden hizmet alan Suriyeliler: Sorun, gereksinim, beklenti ve kurum memnuniyetleri. Türk Kızılayı Derneği, Ankara.
- Mansourian, H., & Rajaei, S.A. (2018). Quality of life of Afghan immigrants in Tehran City. *International Migration*. 56 (2): 163-176. <https://doi.org/10.1111/imig.12422>
- Marans, R.W., & Stimson, R.J. (2011). *Investigating quality of urban life: Theory, methods and empirical research*. Springer, United States, Australia, United Kingdom
- Marans, R.W. (2015). Quality of urban life & environmental sustainability studies: Future linkage opportunities. *Habitat International*. 45: 47-52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2014.06.019>
- Martin, S.F. (2016). New models of international agreement for refugee protection. *Journal on Migration and Human Security*. 4 (3): 60-75. <https://doi.org/10.1177/233150241600400302>
- Mataria, A., Giacaman, R., Stefanini, A., Naidoo, N., Kowal, P., & Chatterji, S. (2009). the quality of life of palestinians living in chronic conflict: Assessment and determinants. *The European Journal of Health Economics*. 10 (1): 93-101. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10198-008-0106-5>
- URL 1, <https://www.unhcr.org/about-unhcr/who-we-are/figures-glance> , (Son erişim: 25.08.2023)
- URL 2, <https://www.unhcr.org/emergencies/syria-emergency> , (Son erişim: 25.07.2023)
- URL 3, <https://www.goc.gov.tr/goc-tarihi> , (Son erişim: 17.08.2023)
- URL 4, <https://www.goc.gov.tr/gecici-koruma5638> , (Son erişim: 26.08.2023)
- URL 5, <https://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/MevzuatMetin/1.5.6458.pdf> , (Son erişim: 24.07.2020)
- URL 6, <https://www.goc.gov.tr/gecici-koruma-kanunu-ve-yonetmeli> , (Son erişim, 12.08.2020)
- URL 7, <https://www.goc.gov.tr/gecici-korumamiz-altindaki-suriyeliler> , (Son erişim: 23.08.2023)
- URL 8, <http://depts.washington.edu/seaqol/WHOQOL-BREF> , (Son erişim: 17.10.2024)