The Relationship between Attitudes towards Asylum Seekers and Compassion Levels of University Students
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Abstract: The aim of this study is to adapt the attitude scale towards asylum seekers and refugees to Turkish culture and to examine the relation of university students' attitudes towards asylum seekers to certain personality traits. The study was conducted with the participation of 340 university students. The attitude scales for both asylum seekers and refugees were adapted to Turkish culture and validity and reliability studies were conducted in the study. Findings have shown that they provide the necessary conditions on both scales and can be used as a reliable and valid measuring tool in studies. In addition, students with a high level of compassion, empathy and understanding have been found to have a more positive attitude toward asylum seekers / refugees at a meaningful level. Also, the students studying at the faculty of theology have more positive attitude than the students studying at other faculties. However, the attitude towards asylum seekers / refugees did not differ according to gender. Findings are discussed in the light of the literature.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Mankind has been forced to migrate from some place to another due to various reasons since the first day of its life. Thus, migration is a question as old as the human history. The ones who migrate to create a better future for themselves are called immigrants. Immigration may take place in two different forms, i.e. willingly or forcedly. Forced migration refers to the individuals’ abandonment of their countries temporarily, but forcedly, due to the threats aimed at their safety, arising from the ongoing civil wars, ethnic, religious, or political oppressions in their countries (Martin, 2002). The persons under such circumstances are given the status of refugee or asylum-seeker (Aksu-Kargın, 2016).

Some countries are ranked at the top of the list of countries preferred the most by the immigrants, thanks to their economic opportunities, state policies, and geographical locations. Turkey has become a country immigrant population of which has been increasing rapidly in the recent years (Ünal, 2014). Especially due to the civil war erupted in Syria as of 2011, millions of Syrians have taken shelter in Turkey. Various factors play a role in making such a choice. Turkey has a critical position for Syrian refugees both as a passageway to Europe, and as an...
asylum (Kolukırık, 2014). In the meantime, Turkey’s adoption of the open-door policy since the first days of the war in Syria (Aras-Gökalp & Mencütek, 2015), Syrians’ trust in Turkey, and religious motives are also influential in this choice (Disaster and Emergency Management Agency of T.R. Prime Ministry-AFAD, 2013).

Since the arrival of the first refugee convoy in Turkey as of 2011, it was estimated as of 2013 that, the number of the Syrians living in the camps reached 600,000, while the ones living outside the camps were more than 400,000 (Dinçer, Federici, Ferris, Karaca, Kırişçi, & Çarmıklı, 2013). While the the number of Syrians was announced as 2.749.140 as of 2016 (The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees-UNHCR, 2016), it was estimated as 3.412.368 Syrian people as of December 2017 (Directorate-General of Immigration Administration of T.R. Ministry of Internal Affairs, 2017).

Not restricting the Syrian asylum-seekers to living within a specific region, but allowing them to take part in the daily life, Turkey has offered the Syrian asylum-seekers various opportunities for their orientation. For instance, the ones who decide not to live in the tent cities are provided with the right to reside at the downtowns of the cities. In addition, they are given the permission to open up businesses, healthcare support, most importantly, the students are given the opportunity to resume their education not only at universities, but also at the primary and secondary educations (Yıldız, 2013). In order to resume their higher-education, the Syrian students are at first provided with the opportunity to learn Turkish, and then to resume their higher-education. It appears that the Syrian students seize this opportunity very well. In fact, while there were only 455 Syrian students studying at the higher-education institutions in Turkey as of 2010, the same figure has significantly risen up to 17967 only for those studying at the state universities (out of the total of 20701) as of the academic year of 2017-2018 (YÖK (Higher-Education Institute), 2018).

Apart from the state’s receptive attitude, whether the native population is evenly receptive is a critical factor for the psychological and social harmony of the refugees or asylum-seekers who have left their countries and been trying to adapt to their new settlements. Just like in elsewhere around the world, the asylum-seekers and refugees may encounter negative attitudes and behaviors, such as social exclusion, discrimination, racism, xenophobia, alienation, also in Turkey (Erdoğan, 2015; Ünal, 2014). In this respect, it is suggested that, such negative attitudes of the native population against the asylum-seekers/refugees has a great potential of negatively affecting the rehabilitation of the asylum-seekers.

It draws attention that, the first studies with regard to the attitudes towards the asylum-seekers/refugees were performed in the countries being most frequently applied by the asylum-seekers/refugees, such as Canada, Australia, USA, South Africa (Gordon, 2016; Nickerson & Louis, 2008). It is emphasized in this study that, cognitive, affective, and behavioral factors stand out predominantly among those influencing the society’s attitudes towards the refugees (Croucamp, O’Connor, Pedersen, & Breen (2017). Economic reasons (Christophersen, Liu, Thorleifsson, and Tiltnes, 2013; Ceobanu & Escandell, 2010), nationalism and misbeliefs (Pederson, Attwell & Heveli, 2005), safety, social harmony, cultural threat, and social dominance tendency (Nickerson & Louis, 2008) have been singled out the most in this respect among the factors affecting the attitude towards refugees.

Personality has been suggested as a critical factor affecting the attitude towards refugees, like individual’s belief system, socio-cultural and political tendencies. However, this factor seems to have not been taken into consideration seriously in the research studies. In one of the few number of studies performed in this regard, the traits of being agreeable and open to experience have been singled out as a critical precursor of the positive attitude towards refugees (Gallego & Pardos-Prado, 2014). Compassion, as being a trait, is also suggested to be among the critical factors determining the attitude towards the refugees. Compassion signifies the state
of emotion, thinking, and behavior, consisting of helping the others in overcoming their grief and problems without judging them, and being aware of tenderness and sharing (Neff, 2003). Compassion is a feature that enables us to understand the inner-world of the individual, and drives us to support him/her (Demirci-Seyrek, Ersanlı & Tunc, 2016). In view of the studies performed respectively, a meaningful positive change has been observed in the attitudes and behaviors of the school staff, having undergone a sensibility-based training program, towards the children suffering trauma (Wilson, 2013). In the meantime, sensibility trainings seem to be utilized in the arrangements intended for the refugee, hybrid, or trauma-victim children, and in bringing up qualified persons and suitable environments intended for eliminating the increasing degeneration in the society (Arnot, Pinson, & Candappa, 2009; Boyden, 2009). After all, it may be suggested that the persons with higher levels of sensibility/compassion are to bear more positive attitudes towards the persons under difficult situations, such as refugees or asylum-seekers.

It has been foreseen that the increase in the number of refugee and asylum-seeker population may have certain negative effect on both Turkish society and on the refugee and asylum-seeker population (Unal, 2014). It is implied that Turkish society’s attitudes towards Syrian asylum-seekers are not all that positive (Demir, 2016). It is emphasized that seeing the asylum-seekers as an economic burden, causing disturbance in the social order and daily life are the motives that create negative attitudes among a part of Turkish society, which is expanded day by day (Yildiz, 2013).

It is deemed significant to support these opinions emphasized by the authors with empirical research studies. However there is a limited number of studies performed on this issue, and almost all of them seem to be qualitative studies attained by interviews made up of open-ended questions (Ergin, 2016; Karakuş & Göktona-Yaylacı, 2015; Özdemir & Öner-Özkan, 2016). Qualitative studies provide more in-depth knowledge in comparison to the knowledge obtained by quantitative assessment instruments. However, it is in need of performing more comprehensive research studies in order to bring light onto the question of how and at which level both native population and the asylum-seekers themselves are affected from the ever-increasing number of the refugees and asylum-seekers (Unal, 2014). Thus valid and reliable assessment instruments are sought after in order to evaluate Turkish society’s attitudes towards the asylum-seekers/refugees, and the relation of these attitudes with psychosocial and personal factors. As a result of the literature search within the scope of the study, no assessment instrument having undergone validity and reliability studies in Turkish culture was found available in order to assess the society’s attitude towards refugees/asylum-seekers Lack of a scale to assess the society’s attitude towards the asylum-seekers makes it difficult to examine the relation of the other variants with the society’s attitude. It is hereby intended first to have the assessment instruments, namely the “Illegal Aliens Scale”, developed by Ommundsen & Larsen (1997), and the “Attitudes Towards Asylum Seekers Scale”, developed by Pederson, Attwell & Heveli (2005), adapted to the Turkish culture, and undergo comparison in terms of their psychometric features in order to assess the attitude towards asylum-seekers/refugees. It is intended in the second part of the study to examine the relations between attitude towards asylum-seekers, refugees and sensibility/compassion.

2. METHOD

This research has been made in accordance with the relational model of general screening model. In addition, this study is a scale adaptation study using the basic survey model. Firstly, two scales were adapted to Turkish culture and secondly, the relations among some personality traits and attitudes to refugee and asylum seekers.
2.1. Study Group

The study group of this study is composed of students at undergraduate level at a university. The students were selected from 7 different faculties through appropriate sampling method. The average age of participants ranging from 17 to 29 is 20.95. A total of 340 participants consisted of 101 male, 234 female and 5 ones not explained.

2.2. Instruments

2.2.1. Attitudes towards Refugees Scale

The original scale (Illegal Aliens Scale) was developed by Ommundsen and Larsen (1997) to measure the attitudes towards illegal immigrants. At the first stage 80 statements related to attitudes to illegal immigrants were written and these were applied to 75 university students. After the item analysis, 30 items 14 positive and 16 negative statements remained and their item-total correlation ranged from .59 to .76. In the second stage, a different university student sample with 100 people was used. There was a significant correlation of .89 in the scale split method. In the third stage, a similar sample of 115 university students was examined in relation to similar scales. In this study, attitude scales for African-Americans and homosexuals were used within the scope of concurrent validity. As a result of the analysis, there was a significant correlation between the current scale and the African-American attitude .44 and the homosexual attitude .60.

2.2.2. Attitudes towards Asylum-Seekers Scale:

The original scale (Attitudes Towards Asylum Seekers Scale) was developed by Pederson et al. (2005) to measure the attitude of the public towards asylum seekers. During the development phase of the scale, firstly people from different socio-economic status were interviewed. Later, a yearly publication related to asylum-seeker of a journal was reviewed and twenty-five scale items were written based on these reports. These items were sent to 20 people for clarification and to improve the writing rules. This review resulted in an 18-item form containing 9 negative and 9 positive statements.

An exploratory factor analysis was performed to determine the factor structure of the scale. At the end of the analysis, a three factor structure emerged which is higher than the value of 1, which explains 66.9% variance. However, a single-factor structure has been accepted because it has a one-factor structure in the screen plot graph. As a result, a one-factor structure was acknowledged, which has Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of .94 and item-total correlation of .30 above.

2.2.3. Compassion Scale

The Compassion Scale was developed by Demirci-Seyrek, Ersanlı and Tunç (2016) with the aim of measuring the sensitivity of adult individuals. The measuring tool was developed in the sample of academic staff. In the development process of the scale, exploratory factor analysis was performed and a four-dimensional, 15-item measurement tool was formed. Dimension names are called mercy, empathy, understanding, and humanitarianism. Item-total correlation and sub-over-group comparisons were examined within the context of item analysis. Confirmatory factor analysis also found that the scale's structure was confirmed. In the reliability analysis, Cronbach alpha values were .70 for the mercy factor, .65 for the empathy factor, .62 for the understanding factor, .60 for the humanitarianism factor and .80 for the total scale.

2.3. Data Collection and Analysis

In the first part of the works intended for the adaptation of the attitude towards asylum-seekers scales, among the authors in charge of the assessment instruments, Knud Larsen was
contacted for the Attitude towards Illegal Immigrants Scale, and Anne Pedersen was contacted for the Attitude towards Asylum-Seekers Scale, thereupon the permits necessary for the adaptation of them to the Turkish culture were obtained. Further required permits were obtained from the Ethics Board of the related university with regard to the practicability and applicability of the study.

Language validity of the assessment instruments was maintained upon the consensus of five persons having command of both languages, and four of whom were to serve in the field of psychological counseling. Two ones translated each item into Turkish independently. Later, it was decided which translations were more appropriate for Turkish language and culture. For validity and reliability of translated scale data were collected from 340 university students by the researchers. Application permit was obtained from the lecturer of the course upon showing him/her the ethics board report. Although being present in the classroom during the application, the lecturers did not interfere in the application. Seeking for the voluntariness of the students with regard to the application, they were further provided with the essential information on the study by the researchers themselves. The applications lasted for an average of 15 minutes.

Data were selected from the students studying at seven different faculties of a state university. Not only there are asylum-seekers living together with the native society, there is also an asylum-seekers camp in the city where the university is domiciled. It was therefore suggested that the students may be familiar with the asylum-seeker concept. Furthermore, the participants were sought to have been residing in the city for no shorter than 1.5 years, so that they had come by the asylum-seekers anyhow.

Before transferring the data attained by making use of assessment instruments to the computer, two forms not suitable to the directive were excluded. Before starting the analysis of the data, average values were used in place of missing data, normal distribution criteria were reviewed, and the data were thereby made ready for the analyses. SPSS and AMOS programs were used in data analysis.

Confirmatory factor analysis was performed for the construct validity of the assessment instruments. Chi-Square fit test ($\chi^2$), the ratio of the Chi-Square to the degree of freedom ($\chi^2/\text{sd}$), Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Normalized Fit Index (NFI), Incremental Fit Index (IFI), Goodness of Fit Index (GFI), Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI), Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), and the fit indices thereof were examined in the evaluation of the model’s construct. CFI, NFI, IFI GFI, and AGFI values being more than .90, and RMSEA value being less than .05 are the tokens of good fit (Byrne, 2001).

3. FINDINGS
3.1. Validity Studies of Attitudes towards Refugees Scale

This subsection includes results of validity studies about Attitudes towards Refugees Scale.

3.1.1. Translation study

In the studies of adaptation from another language, translation suitability is quite critical for the proper understanding of the expressions in the language and culture to which the adaptation is to be made. In the translation process, first of all, the items of the assessment instruments were translated into Turkish by two persons independent of each other, who had a command of both languages, and were serving in the field of psychological counseling. The translations were subsequently reviewed by the researchers, and having the translations considered as being more meaningful and to be understood more easily in the culture accepted consensually, Turkish form of the assessment instruments were thereby created (see appendix 1).
3.1.2. Construct validity

Confirmatory factor analysis was performed in order to ascertain whether the factor structure of the unique form of the scale was similar in Turkish culture. Confirmatory factor analysis is utilized in testing the hypotheses about the structures previously established on a theoretical basis (Brown, 2006).

While KMO was reviewed in order to decide about the data’s suitability for the factor analysis, Bartlett Test was reviewed in order to ascertain whether the correlation matrix was actually a unit matrix. As a result of the analysis, KMO value was found as .93, and the Bartlett test was found as meaningful (p≤.001). These values reveal that the sample is suitable for undergoing factor analysis (Hair, Anderson, Tatham and Black, 2003).

Fit indices of the single-factor structure of the scale’s Turkish form were examined by way of DFA analysis. In the first analysis, not only the fit indices were found as being inadequate, but also the factor loads of some of the items were found as being quite low. That is why the items 7, 12, 21, and 22 with item-factor loads lower than .30 (Martin & Newel, 2004) were phased out of the analysis. Taking a look at the aforementioned items deleted, they were found either as being not directly related with the asylum-seekers (item 7: Entering our country is quite easy), or not setting an example for the conditions of the asylum-seekers living in Turkey (item 21: Asylum seekers should not encounter discrimination). Confirmatory factor analysis was repeated with the remaining 26 items, and data regarding DFA were shown in Figure 1.

![Figure 1. Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis of Attitudes to Refugees](image)

Standardized estimates of the items are shown in Figure 1. As being seen in the figure, standardized estimates vary between .39 and .76. These estimates are meaningful at the level of p≤0.05. The model fit (χ²=363.09, sd=271, p≤ .005, χ²/sd=1.34) and the fit indices (RMSEA=.03  NFI=.89  CFI=.97  IFI=.97  AGFI=.90  GFI=.92) of the single-factor scale construct with 26 items were found to be at good level.
3.1.3. Concurrent Validity

The attitude towards asylum-seekers scale having undergone adaptation in the current study was utilized in examining the similar scale validity of the attitude towards refugees scale. Pearson correlation coefficient between the two assessment instruments was sought after. Meaningful relation of .84 was found between the two scales as an outcome of the analysis (p≤.001). Such a relation is deemed as being at a high level (Cohen, 1988).

3.1.4. Discriminant validity—Comparison of 27% Lower-Upper Group Averages

Attitude towards Refugees Scale was examined in terms of its adequacy in distinguishing the persons as per the trait it assessed. This analysis allows researchers to establish the scale’s ability to distinguish those who have a positive attitude towards the characteristic that is being measured from those who have a negative attitude towards the same (Erkuş, 2005). In this context, averages of lower 27% (91 participants) and upper 27% groups were compared as per each item and total score of the scale. t-test analysis was performed for ascertaining whether there was a meaningful difference between these groups (Table 1). As a result of the analysis, a meaningful relation was found between the lower and upper group averages both as per each item and total score of the scale [t(180)=-42.662, p<.001]. Although there is a meaningful relation between the lower and upper group averages, it is recommended to have the effect size calculated in order to ascertain whether the same relation is significant in theory and practice (Huck, 2008). The effect size of the study was calculated by η2 as .91. This value is considered to be a major effect (Cohen, 1988).

3.2. Reliability Studies of Attitudes towards Refugees Scale

This subsection includes results of reliability studies about Attitudes towards Refugees Scale.

3.2.1. Internal Consistency Coefficient

Internal consistency reliability analyses were examined at first in the context of the reliability of the assessment instrument. Having the internal consistency of the assessment instrument calculated by means of Cronbach Alfa coefficient, it was found as .92. This value indicates that the internal consistency of this value assessment instrument is quite high (Pallant, 2005).

Corrected item-total correlation was examined in order to determine the level of the relation between the items of the scale. Since the item being examined was excluded from the remaining of the scale in this examination, the corrected item-total correlation was preferred. The correlation values seem to vary between .36 and .71 as a result of the analysis (Table 1). It is asserted that these values are to be higher than .30 in order to be accepted (Erdoğan, Nahcivan & Nihal, 2014).
Table 1. T test results of comparison of 27% group, Cronbach alpha, item-total correlation, and test-retest values of Attitudes towards Refugees Scale

| Item No | t value for 27% groups | Cronbach α | Item-total correlation | Test-retest correlation |
|---------|------------------------|------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| s1      | -17.268**              | .92        | .62                    | .31*                   |
| s2      | -12.749**              | .92        | .57                    | .46**                  |
| s3      | -13.003**              | .92        | .54                    | .57**                  |
| s4      | -8.988**               | .92        | .42                    | .55**                  |
| s5      | -12.873**              | .92        | .54                    | .70**                  |
| s6      | -11.321**              | .92        | .52                    | .53**                  |
| s8      | -12.249**              | .92        | .54                    | .49**                  |
| s9      | -7.529**               | .92        | .40                    | .49**                  |
| s10     | -8.474**               | .92        | .44                    | .69**                  |
| s11     | -7.753**               | .92        | .39                    | .59**                  |
| s13     | -7.545**               | .92        | .38                    | .41**                  |
| s14     | -15.006**              | .92        | .62                    | .76**                  |
| s15     | -8.379**               | .92        | .37                    | .50**                  |
| s16     | -10.311**              | .92        | .40                    | .52**                  |
| s17     | -12.772**              | .92        | .53                    | .65**                  |
| s18     | -11.414**              | .92        | .50                    | .67**                  |
| s19     | -13.432**              | .92        | .56                    | .70**                  |
| s20     | -16.267**              | .92        | .62                    | .62**                  |
| s23     | -22.140**              | .91        | .71                    | .53**                  |
| s24     | -7.723**               | .92        | .36                    | .32**                  |
| s25     | -16.908**              | .91        | .67                    | .80**                  |
| s26     | -17.923**              | .91        | .69                    | .56**                  |
| s27     | -11.120**              | .92        | .48                    | .47**                  |
| s28     | -13.763**              | .92        | .60                    | .36*                   |
| s29     | -21.698**              | .91        | .69                    | .63**                  |
| s30     | -15.173**              | .92        | .61                    | .55**                  |
| Total   | -42.662**              | .92        | -                      | .67**                  |

3.2.2. Test-retest reliability

Test-retest analysis was performed in order to ascertain the temporary stability of the assessment instrument, or whether the constant scores remained constant during the transition from one condition to another (Burns & Grove, 2003). In this context, the assessment instrument was applied to 41 university students twice in three weeks of interval. The relation between the two assessments was examined by way of Pearson Correlation analysis. Meaningful relation of .67 was found between the two assessments as an outcome of the analysis (p≤.001). Such a relation is deemed as being at a high level (Cohen, 1988).

3.3. Validity Studies of Attitudes towards Asylum-Seekers Scale

This subsection includes results of validity studies about Attitudes towards Asylum-Seekers Scale.

3.3.1. Translation study

In the studies of adaptation from another language, translation suitability is quite critical for the proper understanding of the expressions in the language and culture to which the adaptation is to be made. In the translation process, first of all, the items of the assessment instruments were translated into Turkish by two persons independent of each other, who had a command of both languages, and were serving in the field of psychological counseling. The translations were subsequently reviewed by the researchers, and having the translations considered as being more meaningful and to be understood more easily in the culture accepted
consensually, Turkish form of the assessment instruments were thereby created (see appendix 2).

3.3.2. Construct validity

Confirmatory factor analysis: Confirmatory factor analysis was performed in order to ascertain whether the factor structure of the unique form of the scale was confirmed in Turkish culture. Confirmatory factor analysis is utilized in testing the hypotheses about the structures previously established on a theoretical basis (Brown, 2006).

While KMO was reviewed in order to decide about the data’s suitability for the factor analysis, Bartlett Test was reviewed in order to ascertain whether the correlation matrix was actually a unit matrix. As a result of the analysis, KMO value was found as 0.85, and the Bartlett test was found as meaningful (p≤.001). These values reveal that the sample is suitable for undergoing factor analysis (Hair, Anderson, Tatham and Black, 2003).

Fit indices of the single-factor structure of the scale’s Turkish form was examined by way of DFA analysis. In the first analysis of the adaptation study, not only the fit indices were found as being inadequate, but also the factor loads of some of the items were found as being quite low. That is why the items 3, 4, 7, 9, 12, 14, and 15 with item-factor loads lower than .30 (Martin & Newel, 2004) were phased out of the analysis. Taking a look at them, there are items that do not fit to the situation of the shelter-seekers in Turkey (item 7: Asylum-seekers are rightful to go on hunger strike to draw attention to their conditions). Confirmatory factor analysis was repeated with the remaining 11 items, and data regarding DFA were shown in Figure 2.

![Figure 2](image)

**Figure 2.** Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis of Attitudes to Asylum-Seekers

Standardized estimates of the items are shown in Figure 2. As being seen in the figure, standardized estimates vary between 0.42 and 0.69. These estimates are meaningful at the level of p≤0.05. The model fit ($\chi^2=64.68$, sd=38, p≤ .005, $\chi^2/\text{sd}=1.70$) and the fit indices (RMSEA=.04 NFI=.94 CFI=.97 IFI=.97 AGFI=.94 GFI=.96) of the single-factor scale construct with 11 items were found to be at good level.
3.3.3. Concurrent validity

The attitude towards refugees scale having undergone adaptation to Turkish culture in the current study was utilized in examining the similar scale validity of the attitude towards asylum-seekers scale. Pearson correlation coefficient was sought after between the two assessment instruments. Meaningful relation of .84 was found between the two scales as an outcome of the analysis (p≤.001). Such a relation is deemed as being at a high level (Cohen, 1988).

3.3.4. Discriminant validity—Comparison of 27% Lower-Upper Group Averages

The Attitude towards Asylum-Seekers Scale was examined as per its ability to distinguish those who have a positive attitude towards the trait that is being measured from those who have a negative attitude towards the same (Erkuş, 2005). In this context, averages of lower 27% and upper 27% groups were compared as per each item and total score of the scale (Table 2). Unpaired t-test analysis was performed for ascertaining whether there was a meaningful difference between these groups. As a result of the analysis, a meaningful relation was found between the lower and upper group averages both as per each item and total score of the scale [t(180)=-39.073, p<.001]. Although there is a meaningful relation between the lower and upper group averages, it is recommended to have the effect size calculated in order to ascertain whether the same relation is significant in theory and practice (Huck, 2008). By means of et square (η²) the effect size was calculated for this study, and found as .89. This value is deemed as being a strong effect (Cohen, 1988).

3.4. Reliability Studies of Attitudes towards Asylum-Seekers Scale

This subsection includes results of reliability studies about Attitudes towards Refugees Scale.

3.4.1. Internal consistency coefficient

Internal consistency reliability analyses were examined at first in the context of the reliability of the assessment instrument. Having the internal consistency of the assessment instrument calculated by means of Cronbach Alfa coefficient, it was found as 0.85. This value indicates that, the internal consistency of this value assessment instrument is quite high (Pallant, 2005). Each and every item was further examined as per its relation with the total reliability of the scale. In this examination, it was found that, deletion of any one of the scale’s items was not to change the scale’s total reliability significantly (Table 2). It has been suggested that researchers should not make changes in the scale if excluding the item does not lead to major changes in Cronbach’s alpha coefficient (Cortina, 1993).

Item-total correlation was examined in order to determine the level of the relation between the items of the scale. While the item being examined was excluded from the remaining of the scale in this examination, therefore the corrected item-total correlation was preferred. The correlation values seem to vary between 0.41 and 0.62 as a result of the analysis (Table 2). It is asserted that, these values are to be higher than .30 in order to be accepted (Erdoğan, Nahcivan, & Nihal, 2014).

3.4.2. Test-retest reliability

Test–retest reliability is an important analysis as it shows the extent to which the responses to the items in the scale may change over time (Burns & Grove, 2003). In this context, the assessment instrument was applied to 36 university students twice in three weeks of interval. The relation between the two assessments was examined by way of Pearson Correlation analysis. Meaningful relation of .52 was found between the two assessments as an outcome of the analysis (p≤0.01). Such a relation is deemed as being at a medium level (Cohen, 1988). Temporary stability of each item was further examined. As a result of this examination, all but one (g6) of the items was found to possess stability valid for the assessments (Table 2).
Table 2. Cronbach alpha, item-total correlation and test-retest values of Attitudes towards Asylum-Seekers

| Item No | t value for 27% groups | Cronbach α | Item-total correlation | Test-retest correlation |
|---------|------------------------|------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| g1      | -18.166**              | .83        | .60                    | .69**                  |
| g2      | -10.968**              | .84        | .47                    | .51**                  |
| g5      | -18.797**              | .83        | .61                    | .42*                   |
| g6      | -9.299**               | .84        | .42                    | .32                    |
| g8      | -13.331**              | .84        | .50                    | .39*                   |
| g10     | -13.995**              | .83        | .55                    | .45**                  |
| g11     | -12.597**              | .84        | .49                    | .63**                  |
| g13     | -15.849**              | .83        | .62                    | .57**                  |
| g16     | -14.943**              | .83        | .59                    | .42*                   |
| g17     | -14.614**              | .83        | .55                    | .83**                  |
| g18     | -10.875**              | .84        | .41                    | .60**                  |
| Total   | -39.073**              | .85        | -                      | .52**                  |

3.5. The Relations of Attitudes towards Refugee and Asylum-Seekers with Some Variables

This part includes results of some demographic variables and the relations of them with attitudes to refugees and asylum-seeker. Firstly, the participants’ attitudes towards asylum-seekers and refugees were examined as per their genders, and outcomes attained therefrom were shown in Table 3.

Table 3. T-test results of comparisons of attitudes towards refugees and asylum-seekers in terms of gender

|              | Group   | n   | Mean   | Sd   | df   | t    | p    |
|--------------|---------|-----|--------|------|------|------|------|
| Refugee      | Male    | 100 | 87.75  | 21.62| 332  | -.697| .48  |
|              | Female  | 234 | 89.47  | 20.21|      |      |      |
| Asylum seeker| Male    | 100 | 36.49  | 9.87 | 332  | .120 | .90  |
|              | Female  | 234 | 36.36  | 8.82 |      |      |      |

As being seen in Table 3, university students’ attitudes towards asylum-seekers and refugees do not reveal a meaningful variation as per their genders (p>.05).

Relation of the participants’ attitudes towards asylum-seekers and refugees with various variants were examined. The relation between the compassion personality scale of the attitude scales in this direction and the sub-dimensions thereof is shown in Table 4.

Table 4. The results of correlations among attitudes towards refugees, asylum-seekers and compassion

| Variables         | Asylum-seeker | Refugee | Compassion (total) | Compassion (subscale) | Empathy | Understanding | M    | Ss    |
|-------------------|---------------|---------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------|---------------|------|-------|
| Asylum-seeker     | -             |         |                    |                       |         |               | 6.35 | 9.18  |
| Refugee           | 86**          | -       |                    |                       |         |               | 8.87 | 20.78 |
| Compassion        | -17**         | -17**   | -                  |                       |         |               | 3.93 | 7.32  |
| -Mercy            | -12*          | -13*    | 78**               | -                     |         |               | 2.41 | 2.66  |
| -Empathy          | -18**         | -16**   | 72**               | 39**                  | 41**    |               | 1.55 | 2.61  |
| -Understanding    | -10           | -13*    | 75**               | 53**                  | 41**    |               | 7.08 | 2.34  |
| -Humanitarian     | -08           | -06     | 62**               | 30**                  | 26**    | 25**          | 2.90 | 2.54  |
As seen in Table 4, a very highly meaningful relation at the level of .86 was found between the attitude towards asylum-seekers and the attitude towards refugees (p≤.01). While the attitude towards asylum-seekers scale displayed meaningful relation of -.17 with compassion trait, of -.12 with mercy sub and -.18 with empathy, that are among the sub-dimensions of compassion (p≤.05), it displayed no meaningful relation with understanding and humanitarian features (p>.05).

While the attitude towards refugees scale displayed meaningful relation of -.17 with compassion trait, of -.13 with mercy, -.16 with empathy and -.13 with understanding that are among the sub-dimensions of compassion (p≤.05), it displayed no meaningful relation with humanitarian features (p>.05).

Whether the university students’ attitudes towards refugees varied as per the faculties they were studying at was analyzed via ANOVA, and the results thereof are shown in Table 5.

Table 5. Anova results of comparisons of attitudes towards refugees in terms of study departments

| Source              | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F      | p≤   |
|---------------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|
| Between Groups      | 19436.821      | 6   | 3239.470    | 8.499  | .001 |
| Within Groups       | 126545.056     | 332 | 381.160     |        |      |
| Total               | 145981.876     | 338 |             |        |      |

As being seen in Table 5, the participants’ attitudes towards refugees vary as per the faculties they study at (p≤.05). Scheffe among the post-hoc tests of ANOVA was utilized in order to ascertain the source of this variation. Scheffe Test is known to be the firmest test so as to avoid 1st Type error (Huck, 2000). Findings regarding Scheffe Test are shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Post-hoc (scheffe) results of comparisons of attitudes towards refugees in terms of study departments

| 1. Education             | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2. Economics& administrative sciences | .32 |    |    |    |    |
| 3. Theology              | 20.77* | 20.45* |    |    |    |
| 4. Science&Letters       | 4.08 | 3.76 | -16.68* |    |    |
| 5. Health sciences       | -11.29 | -11.61 | -32.06* | -15.38 |    |
| 6. Engineering           | -4.71 | -5.03 | -25.48* | -8.79 | 6.58 |
| 7. Agriculture           | 4.86 | 4.55 | -15.90* | .78 | 16.16 | 9.58 |

As being seen in Table 6, a meaningful difference was found (p≤.05) between the theology faculty students’ attitudes towards immigrants and those of the students from other faculties. This difference is to the favor of the theology faculty students. In other words, the theology faculty students’ attitudes towards refugees are meaningfully more positive than those of the students from other faculties. No significant difference was found among the students from other faculties.

Whether the university students’ attitudes towards asylum-seekers varied as per the faculties they were studying at was analyzed via ANOVA, and the results thereof are shown in Table 7.
Table 7. Anova results of comparisons of attitudes towards asylum-seekers in terms of study departments

| Source          | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | p≤    |
|-----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|-------|
| Between Groups  | 3898.925       | 6   | 649.821     | 8.763 | .001  |
| Within Groups   | 24619.477      | 332 | 74.155      |       |       |
| Total           | 28518.402      | 338 |             |       |       |

As being seen in Table 7, the participants’ attitudes towards asylum seekers vary as per the faculties they study at (p≤.05). Scheffe among the post-hoc tests of ANOVA was utilized in order to ascertain the source of this variation. Findings regarding Scheffe Test are shown in Table 8.

Table 8. Post-hoc (scheffe) results of comparisons of attitudes towards asylum-seekers in terms of study departments

| 1. Education       | 2. Economics& administrative sciences | 3. Theology | 4. Science&Letters | 5. Health sciences | 6. Engineering | 7. Agriculture |
|--------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------|---------------|
| 2.05               | 2.05                                  | 10.31*      | 3.33               | -2.17              | -.97           | 2.86"         |
|                    |                                       | 8,264*      | 1,284              | -4,230             | -3,032         | .806          |
|                    |                                       | -6,980*     | -6,980*            | -12,494*           | -11,296*       | -7,458*       |
|                    |                                       |             |                    |                    |                |              |
|                    |                                       |             |                    |                    |                |              |
|                    |                                       |             |                    |                    |                |              |

As being seen in Table 8, a meaningful difference was found (p≤.05) between the theology faculty students’ attitudes towards asylum-seekers and those of the students from other faculties. This difference is to the favor of the theology faculty students. In other words, the theology faculty students’ attitudes towards asylum-seekers are meaningfully more positive than those of the students from other faculties. No significant difference was found among the students from other faculties.

4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Reviewing the findings of the research from a holistic point of view, it may be said that the Turkish form of both the attitude towards asylum-seekers scale and the attitude towards refugees scale is valid, and possesses a reliable structure.

Structural validity of the attitude towards refugees scale has not been verified just as in the original scale. Since some of the items thereof do not suit to their situation, these items may therefore have not made sense to the refugees in our country. Furthermore, it seems difficult to discern whether some of the items are related directly with the refugees. That is why the analyses were resumed after deleting four items from the original scale, and the structural validity was thereby maintained. The data attained with regard to the reliability of the scale show that, the assessment instrument has performed a reliable assessment. In fact both the internal consistency coefficient and the data attained from the test-retest method show that, the conditions required for reliable assessment have been maintained. After all, a one-dimensional, 26-item attitude towards refugees scale with proven validity and reliability, and rendering 34% of variance, has been brought in Turkish culture.

Structural validity of the attitude towards asylum-seekers scale has also not been verified as in the original scale. Since seven items were found to be not setting an example for the conditions of the asylum-seekers living in Turkey, and not being sufficiently related with the whole of the scale, they were deleted from the assessment instrument. After that structural
validity of the scale could have been verified in its new form. The scale has been found to be not only maintaining distinctive validity, but also possessing sufficient internal consistency coefficient, and remaining at a sufficient level in terms of test-retest score. After all, a one-dimensional, 11-item attitude towards asylum-seekers scale with proven validity and reliability, and rendering 40% of variance, which may be utilized for the assessment of the attitude towards asylum-seekers, has been brought in Turkish culture.

Considering the fact that, the difference between refugee and asylum-seeker has not been well-discerned in Turkish society, both two assessment instruments have been adapted to Turkish culture. In fact, reviewing the studies performed in Turkey, it may be seen that, the concepts of Syrian asylum-seeker (Kardeş, Banko and Akman, 2017; Topkaya & Akdağ, 2016), and Syrian refugee (Doğanay & Çoban-Keneş, 2016; Kağnıcı, 2017) have been used to identify the same group. Meanwhile, the high correlation (.86) between the instruments assessing the attitude towards refugees and those assessing the attitude towards the asylum-seekers in the current study may also be interpreted as a sign of the students’ unawareness of the difference between the two concepts. After all, as long as they are valid and with proven reliability, the attitude towards refugees/asylum-seekers scales may be utilized interchangeably. However, the attitude towards asylum-seekers scale may be deemed as being more useful thanks to the lesser number of its items, and for having rendered greater variance.

As the second objective of the study, the relation of the students’ attitudes towards the asylum-seekers with certain variants has been examined. It has been found that the students’ attitudes towards refugees and asylum-seekers do not change as per their genders. Similarly, no significant factor was found between the gender and the attitude towards asylum-seekers in the study performed by Kanbur (2017) among teachers, and in the study performed by Anderson (2017) among university students as well. On the other hand, there is an empirical research (Karaoğlu, 2015), and a meta-analysis study (Anderson & Ferguson, 2017), both having shown the fact that males possess significantly more negative attitude than that of the females. Reviewing the research findings from a holistic point of view, the relation of gender with the attitude towards asylum-seekers varies. It may be deemed necessary to perform more comprehensive studies, by way of including different variants in the research studies to be performed respectively in order to ascertain the source of this variation.

It has been found that the students’ attitudes towards the refugees and asylum-seekers are related with sensibility, traits, and the elements of compassion, empathy, and understanding that compose such traits. Despite the fact that the higher are the traits they possess, the more positive the attitudes they display towards refugees and asylum-seekers become, no significant relation has been found between human traits and the attitudes towards asylum-seekers.

Sensibility signifies the state of emotion, thinking, and behavior, consisting of helping the others in overcoming their grief and problems without judging them, and being aware of tenderness and shares (Neff, 2003). Sensibility is a feature that enables us to understand the inner-world of the individual, and drives us to support him/her (Demirci-Seyrek, Ersanlı, and Tunç, 2016). In view of the studies having been performed respectively, a meaningful positive change has been observed in the attitudes and behaviors of the school staff, having undergone a sensibility-based training program, towards the children suffering trauma (Wilson, 2013). In another study it was found the lower the individuals’ empathy skills, the higher their threat perceptions and prejudices regarding the refugees (Karaoğlu, 2015). Contemplating on the findings of the current study in conjunction with the outcomes attained from the previous studies, it may be said that the ones possessing higher sensibility trait are the ones also possessing higher empathic skills, and those who approach people in difficult situations affectionately. In this respect, it is a highly anticipated outcome that, the persons with higher sensibility traits are to bear positive attitudes towards the asylum-seekers trying to live in
Turkey under difficult situations and severe traumas. After all, it may be suggested that the persons with higher levels of sensibility are to bear more positive attitudes towards the persons being under difficult situations.

It has been examined whether the university students’ attitudes towards refugees and asylum-seekers vary as per the faculties they study at. Students from seven faculties were compared with this intent, and students from the faculty of theology were found as having adopted the sought attitude being meaningfully more positive than the students from other faculties. However, no significant difference was found respectively among other faculties. This outcome suggests the existence of a relation between religious attitude or devotion and the attitude towards asylum-seekers. In fact, it has been reported from several studies that, the ones with higher religious devotion bear more negative attitude towards asylum-seekers (Anderon & Ferguson 2017; Perry, Paradies & Pedersen, 2014). This situation is referred to the religion’s feature of being a determining factor in numerous prejudices (Shariff, Willard, Andersen, & Norenzayan, 2016). However, it is seen that the study group in the previous studies were composed of Christians persons being. In view of the fact that the refugees are mostly devouts of other religions, a cultural conflict may be in question. In the current study, for both the participants and the refugees are the devout of the same religion, a cultural sensitivity may come to the fore from the point of view of the theology faculty students.

Despite the significant contributions having been brought in the field by this research, it also has certain limitations. First of all, after the deletion of the items from the assessment instrument, the findings attained from the same sample were dealt with. Having not performed a reconfirmation process in a different sample is a limitation of the study. On the other hand, having not approached a different sample in order to examine the relation of the demographic features and levels of sensibility of the participants with their attitudes towards asylum-seekers is also considered as a limitation.

In conclusion, taking the findings attained from the study into consideration, a number of suggestions may be made for both the researchers and the practitioners. First of all, two assessment instruments with proven validity and reliability may be utilized for the purpose of assessing the attitudes towards the asylum-seekers and refugees. On the other hand, these assessment instruments may be retested in samples with different demographic features. Furthermore, different variants that may be related with the individuals’ attitudes towards asylum-seekers may also be uncovered. Practitioners, too, may organize trainings on the development of the individuals’ sensibility characteristics which are critical for both the asylum-seekers’ adaptation to our country, and for the society’s recognition of their presence.
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Mültecilerle Yönelik Tutum Ölçeği

1= Hiç katılmıyorum, 2= Çoçk az katlıyorum, 3= Kismen katlıyorum, 4= Çoğunlukla katlıyorum 5= Tamamen katlıyorum

| No.  | Soru |
|------|------|
| 1    | Sığınmacılar benim verdiği vergiden faydalananmadılar. |
| 2    | Bizim vergilerimiz ülkemizde bulunan sığınmacılar için kullanılabilmelidir. |
| 3    | Ülkemizde herkese yetecek yeterince yer var. |
| 4    | Sığınmacılar ülkemizin kaynaklarını köşeye kullanıyorlar. |
| 5    | Sığınmacılar toplumumuzda sıkıntı vermektedir. |
| 6    | Ülkemizin sınırları uluslararası tüm sığınmacılaraca açık olmalıdır. |
| 7    | Sığınmacılar gıda yardımcı alabilirmelidir. |
| 8    | Ülkemizde doğan yapan sığınmacılar ülke vatandaşlarına alınmalıdır. |
| 9    | Ülkemiz tüm siyasi sığınmacıları kabul etmelidir. |
| 10   | Sığınmacıların ülkemize her yıl milyonlarca dolar maliyeti olmaktadır. |
| 11   | Sığınmacılar ülkemize önemli ölçüde insan kaynağı sağlamaktadırlar. |
| 12   | Devletimizi sığınmacılarca ücretsiz olarak eğitim, bakım, sağlık hizmeti sunmalıdır. |
| 13   | Sığınmacılar yüzünden ülkemizin nüfusu aşıri derecede artmaktadır. |
| 14   | Sığınmacılar bu ülkenin vatandaşı olarak nhuşaları sahip olmamalıdır. |
| 15   | Sığınmacıların da hakları var. |
| 16   | Başka ülkelerin vatandaşlarına yardım etmek bizim ülkemizin sorumluluğunda değildir. |
| 17   | Sığınmacıların bu ülkenin vatandaşı olarak nhuşaları sahip olmaya hakkı vardır. |
| 18   | Mülteciler kendi ülkelerine dönmeye zorlanmalıdır. |
| 19   | Benim vergim mültecileri desteklemek için kullanılmalıdır. |
| 20   | Ülkemizde yaşayan herkese eşit fırsatlar sunulmalıdır. |
| 21   | Sığınmacılar büyük bir soruna dönüşmüştü. |
| 22   | Sığınmacılar ülkemizin dışında tutmak için, sınırlarımızdaki güvendiğin artırılmalıdır. |
| 23   | Kendi evimizi nasıl koruyorsak, ülkemizi de sığınmacılarдан korumalıyız. |
| 24   | Sığınmacıların ülkemizi kendi sorunlarına bir sığınak olarak görmelerini istemiyorum. |
| 25   | Sığınmacılar toplumun yoğunlaşmasına neden olmaktadır. |
| 26   | Sığınmacılar kanunları ihlal ediyorlar. |

Ters kodlanan maddeler: 2,3,4,6,7,8,9,11,12,15,17,20

Puanın yükseklüğü olumsuz tutuma işaret etmektedir.
Appendix-2: Attitudes towards Asylum-Seekers Scale

| Sığınmacılara Yönelik Tutum Ölçeği |
|------------------------------------|
| 1. Siğınmacılar, çeşitli eylemlerde bulunarak devletimize istediklerini yaptırıyorlar. |
| 2. Siğınmacılar ülkemizde uzun süre kalmak istiyorlarsa bu hak onlara verilmelidir. |
| 3. Siğınmacılar, ülkemizde çeşitli eylemler yaparak nankör davranıyorlar. |
| 4. Siğınmacıların içinde bulundukları duruma üzülüyorum. |
| 5. Devletin siğınmacılara yönelik politikasını doğru buluyorum. |
| 6. Siğınmacılar, kendine zarar verme gibi davranışlara başvurarak insanları kandırmaya çalışıyorlar. |
| 7. Siğınmacılar, toplumuma uyum sağlamak için çaba harcamıyorlar |
| 8. Siğınmacılar meşru mültecidir ve onlar hoşgörü ile karşılanmaları gerekir. |
| 9. Siğınmacılar toplumda nefret uyanırıyor. |
| 10. Eğer siğınmacılar ülkemizde mutlu değilse, kendi ülkelerine gönderilsin. |
| 11. Siğınmacıların, kamplar yerine toplumun içinde olmaları daha iyi olur. |
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