

# Ahiska Turks And Their Social Support Perceptions In Relation To Immigration

Orhan Kocak<sup>1</sup>, Serdar Aydin<sup>2</sup>, Ibrahim Zalankoy<sup>3</sup>, Sandra Collins<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Istanbul University. Cerrahpasa, Faculty of Health Science. Istanbul, Turkey

<sup>2</sup>Southern Illinois University Carbondale. School of Health Sciences. Carbondale, Illinois. United States

<sup>3</sup>Erzincan Binali Yıldırım University. Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences. Department of Social Work. Erzincan, Turkey.

Corresponding Author Email: skcollin@siu.edu

**Abstract:** Global migration rates have significantly increased over the last few years. Given immigration is known to have an impact on both the mental and physical health and the overall well-being of those migrating, this has encouraged a rising number of investigative studies focused on the mental and physical health of immigrants after relocation. Previously, most of **immigration**-focused psychological research largely involved the challenges and negative issues related to migration. More current interest now involves comprehending the components that are instrumental to the positive welfare of immigrants. Given the magnitude of issues involved with immigration, social analysis is warranted to determine causes and consequences. An in-depth analysis of the traumatic life experiences often associated with migration and resettlement may help spur social movement and change, as well as identify ways to reduce or eliminate potential disagreeable effects. The moral support mechanisms in the immigrant's adaptation process becomes prominent since immigration may challenge the individual's economic, social, cognitive and psychological support systems. Social support systems play an important role in immigration given they may minimize any unpleasantness the immigrant may experience during the process and may help them to more readily integrate into new places. How an individual interprets the systems through their perceived social support functions acts as a compass for them to determine their perspective of the events. The reasons that lead to immigration and the socio-political and economic opportunities that the new location may provide, affect an immigrant's perception of social support. Perception of social support is of vital importance in relation to immigration, especially considering the life experiences where multiple losses and tragedies may occur during and after the relocation. In this study, the focus is on understanding the normal to high social support perceptions of Ahiska Turks and the financial and moral supports provided by their country which have an important effect on this result.

**Keywords**— Immigration, Forced Immigration, Ahiska Turks, Social Support, Perceived Social Support

## INTRODUCTION

Immigration is a dynamic process that creates change and brings forth new needs in the immigrants economic, social, political and cultural dimensions. Change often holds a negative connotation, especially with regard to immigration. The changes in the social dimension show that there is an adaptation process that needs to be managed and supported. Especially in situations that can have devastating effects, such as immigration, successful adaptation is critical. In addition to social support systems that ensure social cohesion, it is necessary to understand how this support is perceived by the individual who immigrates (Adiguzel, 2018). As a result of the efforts completed within the scope of Law on the Acceptance and Settlement of Ahiska Turks to Turkey, Ahiska Turks were accepted on refugee status. Regardless of forced or voluntary migration, Ahiska Turks migrated to Turkey due to the effects of the war and their preference for Turkey. The voluntary dimension of the preference of their migration is demonstrated due to the descent and other binding elements of the Ahiska Turks (Bakioglu, 2018).

## Migration

Migration is among one of the most important global issues in terms of its effects. Given the vast impact, the concept of migration should be analyzed from a social perspective in terms of its causes and consequences (Kocak & Gunduz,

2016). Multidimensional dynamics of migration include primitive, forced, free, internal, and external migrations (Akkas, 2017). Additionally, migration has now gained an international dimension given the effect of globalization and changes in geographical location and cultural life which constitute the main problems that migrants face (Aktepe et. al., 2017). These dimensions are thought to significantly affect the initiation, process, and subsequent developments of immigration (Ekici & Tuncel, 2015). In addition to occurring for different reasons, migration is a catalyst for change in societal dimensions. Today, especially with regard to the speed of interactions being different from that of other centuries, also affected are economic, political and social developments. Migration interacts with many areas of life and it changes in spatial, regional and social dimensions which are important factors in shaping the life and perceptions of immigrants. It is possible to classify migrations in Turkey as regular and irregular. Regular migrations mean that Turkish and Muslim immigrants come to Turkey within the scope of the law. Irregular migrations include immigrants who enter the country illegally or who are in the country despite visa expiration and overstay (Adiguzel, 2018). This study focuses on the evaluation of the regular migration of Ahiska Turks.

## Voluntary and Forced Migration

Migration can be mandatory or voluntary. While increasing the quality of life and economic concerns may be

the main cause of voluntary migration, forced migration generally occurs due to political factors and the need for asylum. Additionally, migration occurs with different structural conditions such as internal migration and external migration. It is generally known that such migration originates from the reasons specific to its subject. Although Ahiska Turks have immigrant status according to Turkish national legislation, it will, undoubtedly, be seen that they migrate in a forced manner considering the reasons for their migration. Based on this, it is possible to evaluate the migration movement of Ahiska Turks as both voluntary and forced. Escaping from the negative effects of war demonstrate the forced dimension of this migration; selecting Turkey as a country that they willingly choose to migrate to can be interpreted as voluntary migration (Ekici & Tuncel, 2015).

### Ahiska Turks

Ahiska Turks, who took their names from the Ahiska region of Georgia, are known as Meskhetian Turks. They had to leave their homeland due to factors associated with forced migration and exile. After this process, which started with forced migration in 1828, Ahiska Turks could not return to the Ahiska region. In 1992, approximately 200 families of Ahiska Turks were legally accepted into Turkey (Akkas, 2017) based on the annual number allowed as decided by the President of Turkey (No. 3835, 1992).

After the political and military activity in the east of Ukraine expressed a threat to their safety, Ahiska Turks requested migration to Turkey for residential purposes, which was then allowed in 2014. Upon the order of President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, the immigration request was accepted and many families were placed in the Uzumlu district of Erzincan and Ahlat district of Bitlis (Aydingun, 2017). In the study done by Aktepe et al. In 2017 with the families who first migrated to the Uzumlu district of Erzincan, Ahiska Turks stated that their social cohesion was relatively easy since opportunities were readily available for them and their basic needs such as food and shelter were met. Despite some incident, there was easy access to the services they needed, they were socially accepted, they lived their culture comfortably, and their belief that the Republic of Turkey could provide solutions to their other problems was affirmed. Turkey enacted necessary legislation for the purpose of protecting its cognates and supporting families in their quest to exit psychosocially and economically with less loss than what they might have experienced if exiled. According to data from 2016, Erzincan is one of the provinces where Ahiska Turks settled the most (Aydingun, 2017).

Changes in geographical and cultural dimensions cause immigrants to experience challenges in many areas such as employment, cultural cohesion, and shelter. Ahiska Turks, on the other hand, are thought to potentially experience social integration more easily than other immigrant individuals due to their legal privileges and lineage bond (Aktepe et al., 2017). Because of security, proximity, ease of transportation, the open-door policy and social support mechanisms, Turkey is preferred by refugees (Bakioglu et al, 2018). Ahiska Turks,

like refugees, preferred to immigrate to Turkey because of both religious and national common elements.

Besides preserving the anthropological elements belonging to the culture of the land they were separated from, Muslim Turks harmonized with the Anatolian culture by developing a sense of belonging to the Turkish nation (Mečiar, 2017). The material and moral support provided by Turkey is one of the important efforts that contributed to the accommodation of Ahiska Turks. In total, there were 468, of which 194 were women, who worked in the Uzumlu Governorate and Municipality through the Turkey Business Institution. The satisfaction of Ahiska Turks for the supports provided is also reflected in the feedback in the national media (Haber, 2018).

### Social Support

Social support means the environmental support provided socially and psychologically to a person (Yildirim, 1997). Social support systems affect human health and social life (Zalankoy, 2015) which may include need, access to resources, and satisfaction (Ozdevecioglu, 2004). Since the support provided by social support systems affect psychosocial well-being and social interactions of the person, every person is believed to need social support. Schaefer et al. (1981) reported that social support can be categorized into varying areas including: emotional, network, respect, information and concrete-physical. This provides backing that social support mechanisms can contribute financially and morally to social cohesion (Schaefer et, al; Halis & Demirel, 2016).

### Perceived Social Support

An individual's interpretation of the social support systems, within the framework of their psychological perception, indicates their perceived social support. While social support expresses an objective situation, perceived social support means evaluating social support by passing it through a subjective sieve. The social environment is important in terms of people's social support systems since a human is a social entity who should be evaluated without isolating them from society). In addition to understanding the social support systems of Ahiska Turks, it is necessary to understand how individuals make sense of social support in their own environment. Therefore, it is important to understand the perception of social support as well as the extent of social support as presented in this investigation (Zalankoy, 2015).

### Methods

The aim of this study was to understand social support perceptions in order to understand the existence of social support systems of Ahiska Turks and their relation to these support systems. For this purpose, the Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS) was utilized. MSPSS contains of 12 questions and measures the perceived social support in three sub-categories: family, special human, and

friend sub-scale. MSPSS uses a Likert type scale in which scores ranging from 1-7 are made; there are three sub-scale and each sub-scale consists of four questions. Table 1 below is provided as the interpretation guide of the MSPSS score.

**Table 1 - Interpretation Guide of MSPSS Score**

Perception of Social Support			
	Low	Normal	High
Sub-scales	4-11	12-20	21-28
Total	12-35	36-60	61-84

Source: (Arman, 2009, p. 96, tabulated by author).

The population of this study consisted of 575 households located in MHAT (Mass Housing Administration of Turkey) residences in Geyikli, Bayırbag, Yunusemre, and Fatih districts of Uzumlu County. Questionnaire form and scale questions were obtained through the face-to-face interview method, questionnaire form and the scale which could be applied to 259 households and only one person was interviewed from each household (Eker et al, 2001).

### Data Analysis

The data obtained from the questionnaire and scale questions were evaluated using the statistical analysis program SPSS 22.0. In our study, factor, reliability, descriptive statistics, t-test, one-way variance and regression analyses were performed. It is seen that the data of our study are statistically appropriate and meet the necessary criteria.

As seen in Table 2 and 3, the KMO measure is not a statistical test and has developed the categories in Table 1 to determine the suitability of Kaiser and Rice (Turanli, et al. 2012). Within the scope of the criteria proposed for the KMO conformity test, three factors can explain 88% of the scale consisting of 12 questions according to the result of the factor analysis.

Furthermore, Table 4 demonstrates that Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (BTS) appears to be  $p = .000$ . This result explains suitability for factor analysis in terms of sample and correlation matrix. Factor analysis was completed to confirm the validity of the MSPSS and factor structures (Karabulut & Erbası, 2016). Since the KMO measure was 0.829 in this study, factor analysis could be interpreted as statistically appropriate, and since the BTS was  $0.000 < 0.05$ , it was seen that the factor analysis result of the sample was suitable.

**Table 2 - Recommended Criteria for KMO Conformity Test**

KMO Scale	Suggested Level
0.90+	Exceptional
0.80+	Very good
0.70+	Good
0.60+	Middle
0.50+	Bad
0.50-	Unacceptable

Source: (Turanlı, Cengiz ve Bozkır, 2012, s. 48).

**Table 3 - Eigenvalues and Variance Explanation Percentages**

	Eigenvalue	Variance Explanation	Cumulative
1	5.598	32.523	32.523
2	2.914	29.224	61.747
3	2.048	26.258	88.005

**Table 4 - KMO and Bartlett's Test**

KMO Scale		.829
Bartlett Test	$\chi^2$	4472.032
	Sd	66
	Sig.	.000

When reviewing Table 5, the questions and their distributions in the 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> factors appear. It can be observed that the distribution of the factors in question is in accordance with the sub-dimensions of the scale. The answers regarding the demographic information were given by individuals who participated in this study to the survey questions and the social support scores according to the MSPSS results were presented by the table method.

**Table 5 - Distribution of Questions to Factors**

Scale Questions	Factors		
	1	2	3
My family tries to help me	.041	.010	.809
I get the emotional help and support I need from my family	.073	.133	.899
I can discuss my problems with my family	.013	.114	.880
My family is willing to help me make my decisions	.070	.136	.908
My friends really help me	.225	.874	.238
I can trust my friends when things go bad	.145	.939	.084
I can discuss my problems with my friends.	.171	.947	.093
I have friends who can share my joy and sorrows	.282	.863	.040
There is a person, out of my family and friends, who cares about my emotions	.961	.206	.027
There is a person, out of my family and friend, with me when I need it	.968	.195	.062
There is a person, out of my family and friends, who really relaxes me	.963	.224	.063
There is a person, out of my family and friends, that I can share my joys and sorrows with	.960	.195	.074

In Table 6, there are findings connected to the distribution of the demographic information of the individuals who participated in the sample:

- 161 (62.2%) of the participants were women,
- 5 or more people resided in households of 141 (54.4%) participants,
- 138 (53.3%) were unemployed,
- 85 (33.8%) earned more than minimum wage, and
- There was an individual in need of care in households of 22 (8.5%) participants.

**Table 6 - Demographic Information of Participants**

Demographic Information	N	%	
Gender	Female	161	62.2
	Male	98	37.8
Marital Status	Married	200	77.2
	Single	27	10.4
	Divorced	3	1.2
	Widow	29	11.2
Education Status	Primary School	15	5.8
	Middle School	92	35.5
	High School	120	46.3
	Undergraduate	26	10.0
	Illiterate	6	2.3
Number of Individuals Residing in the House	1	6	2.3
	2	22	8.5
	3	36	13.9
	4	54	20.8
	5 and over	141	54.4
Job Status	Unemployed	138	53.3
	Working	121	46.7
Monthly Income of the House	0	2	.8
	500	7	2.7
	501-1000	8	3.1
	1001-1500	14	5.4
	1501-2000	143	55.2
	2001-2500	30	11.6
	2501-3000	55	21.2
Number of individuals in need of care	No	237	91.5
	1	21	8.1
	2 and over	1	.4
Total		259	100.0

In Table 7 and Table 8, according to the 'Gender' independent variable, MSPSS family, private and friend sub-scales and total social support scores are compared, and since p values are larger than 0.05, there is no statistically noteworthy differences between perceptions of social support. According to the 'gender' independent variable, it is seen that all individuals, except the 'Specific Person' sub-scale, have high perceptions of social support in the 'Family, Friend and Specific Person' and 'Total Social Support' sub-scales. Women's perception of social support in the 'Specific Person' sub-scale is at a normal level.

**Table 7 - Perceived Social Support - 'Gender'**

Sub-scale	Gender	N	$\bar{x}$	F	P
Family	Female	161	265652	2.644	.336
	Male	98	269896		
Friend	Female	161	220620	2.323	.292
	Male	98	229896		
Specific Person	Female	161	209380	.733	.699
	Male	98	213468		
Total Social Support	Female	161	695592	3.041	.322
	Male	98	713268		

**Table 8 - Perceived Social Support - 'Age'**

MSPSS	Perceived Social Support score increase rate with each age increase
Famly Sub-scale	$25792 + 0.005 * Yaş, R^2 .009$
Family Sub-scale	$20552 + 0.011 * Yaş, R^2 .009$
Specific Person Sub-scale	$16900 + 0.024 * Yaş, R^2 .033$
Total Social Support	$63228 + 0.013 * Yaş, R^2 .032$

In Table 9, the MSPSS family, specific person and friend sub-scales and total social support scores were compared according to the 'Employment Status' independent variable, and, since the p values are greater than 0.05 except for the friend sub-scale, there is no statistically significant difference between the perceptions of social support. In the friend sub-scale, since the p-value is  $0.025 < 0.05$ , there is a statistically noteworthy difference between perceptions of social support. However, it is seen that individuals who are unemployed according to the 'Employment Status' independent variable have high perceptions of social support in the 'Family and Friends' sub-scales and 'Social Support in Total' scale except for the 'Specific Person' sub-scale. The perception of social support in the 'Specific Person' sub-scale of unemployed individuals is at a normal level.

**Table 9 - Perceived Social Support - 'Employment Status'**

Sub-scale	Employment Status	N	$\bar{x}$	F	P
Family	Unemployed	138	26.4712	6.166	.203
	Working	121	27.0164		
Friend	Unemployed	138	21.5216	9.172	.025
	Working	121	23.4296		
Specific Person	Unemployed	138	20.8480	.093	.611
	Working	121	21.3720		
Total Social Support	Unemployed	138	68.8404	4.745	.086

In Table 10, according to the independent variable, 'Education Status', MSPSS family, specific person and friend sub-scales were compared with the total social support score, and, since the p values were greater than 0.05, except for the friend sub-dimension, there was no statistically significant difference between the perceptions of social support. In the friend sub-scale, since the p-value is  $0.012 < 0.05$ , there is a statistically significant difference between perceptions of social support. However, according to the 'Education Status' independent variable, individuals in categories of 'High School' and 'Illiterate' in the 'Private Person' sub-scale and individuals in the category of 'Illiterate' in the 'Total Social Support' scale have normal levels of perceptions of social support. On the other hand, it is notable that the perception of social support is high in the 'Family, Friend, Private Person and Total Social Support' sub-scales.

In Table 11, according to the 'Marital Status' independent variable, MSPSS family, specific person and friend sub-scales were compared with the total social support score, and, since p values were greater than 0.05, except for the family sub-scale, there is no statistically significant difference among perceptions of social support. As for the family sub-scale, since the p-value is  $0.01 < 0.05$ , there is a statistically significant difference between perceptions of social support. However, according to the 'Marital Status' independent variable, it is seen that all individuals have high perceptions of social support in the 'Family, Friend, Specific Person and 'Total Social Support' sub-scales, except the individuals in the 'Single' category of the 'Specific Person' sub-scale. The perception of social support in single individuals of the 'Specific Person' sub-scale is at a normal level.

**Table 10 - Perceived Social Support - 'Education Status'**

Sub-scale		N	$\bar{x}$	F	P
Family	Primary School	15	26.8668	.547	.702
	Middle School	92	26.3368		
	High School	120	26.9584		
	Undergraduate	26	26.7308		
	Illiterate	6	27.6668		
Friend	Primary School	15	23.6000	3.303	.012
	Middle School	92	22.0652		
	High School	120	22.8416		
	Undergraduate	26	23.1540		
	Illiterate	6	13.0000		
Specific Person	Primary School	15	22.2668	.886	.473
	Middle School	92	21.2064		
	High School	120	20.6084		
	Undergraduate	26	23.1152		
	Illiterate	6	17.3332		
Total Social Support	Primary School	15	72.7332	1.607	.173
	Middle School	92	69.6084		
	High School	120	70.4004		
	Undergraduate	26	72.9996		
	Illiterate	6	57.9996		

**Table 11 - Perceived Social Support - 'Marital Status'**

Sub-scale		N	$\bar{x}$	F	P
Family	Married	200	26.9200	5.857	.001
	Single	27	24.2592		
	Divorced	3	28.0000		
	Widow	29	27.5516		
Friend	Married	200	22.2900	.125	.945
	Single	27	23.1112		
	Divorced	3	23.0000		
	Widow	29	22.5516		
Specific Person	Married	200	21.0400	.411	.745
	Single	27	20.0372		
	Divorced	3	23.6668		
	Widow	29	22.1724		
Total Social Support	Married	200	70.2456	.680	.565
	Single	27	67.4076		
	Divorced	3	74.6664		
	Widow	29	72.2760		

In Table 12, according to the 'Income Status' independent variable, MSPSS family, friend and specific person sub-scales and total social support score were compared. Since p values were greater than 0.05, except for the family sub-scale, there is no statistically significant difference among social support perceptions. In the family sub-scale, since the p-value is 0.010 < 0.05, there is a statistically significant difference between perceptions of social support. However, according to the 'Income Status' independent variable, individuals with '0' and '1001-1500' income status in the 'Friend' sub-scale, with '0', '501-1000' and '1001-1500' income status in the 'Specific Person' sub-scale, and lastly, individuals with '0' and '2001-2500' income status in 'Total Social Support' sub-scale, have normal levels of social support perceptions. It is seen that the perception of social support is high in all other individuals with 'Family, Friends, Specific Person, Total Social Support' sub-scales.

**Table 12 - Perceived Social Support - 'Income Status'**

Subscale	Income Status	N	$\bar{x}$	F	P
Family	0	2	280000	2.862	.010
	500	7	252856		
	501-1000	8	225000		
	1001-1500	14	260000		
	1501-2000	143	269652		
	2001-2500	30	263668		
	2501-3000	55	272364		
Friend	0	2	155000	1.294	.261
	500	7	230000		
	501-1000	8	250000		
	1001-1500	14	192856		
	1501-2000	143	228952		
	2001-2500	30	227332		
	2501-3000	55	215820		
Specific Person	0	2	160000	1.043	.398
	500	7	228572		
	501-1000	8	157500		
	1001-1500	14	199284		
	1501-2000	143	214964		
	2001-2500	30	224000		
Total Social Support	0	2	594996	1.095	.366
	500	7	711432		
	501-1000	8	632496		
	1001-1500	14	652140		
	1501-2000	143	713496		
	2001-2500	30	594996		
	2501-3000	55	711432		

In Table 13, according to 'Number of Individuals Living in the House' the independent variable, MSPSS family, friend and specific person sub-scales were compared with the total social support score, and, since p values are greater than 0.05, there is no statistically significant difference between perceptions of social support. However, according to the independent variable 'Number of Individuals Living in the House', the perception of social support of individuals who are in the 'Specific Person' sub-scale and whose '2' and '4' persons reside in their household have normal levels of social support perception. It is seen that all other individuals have a high perception of social support in the 'Family, Friend and Specific Person and Total Social Support' sub-scales.

**Table 13 - Perceived Social Support - 'Number of Individuals Living in Household'**

Sub-scale - # of Individuals Living in Household	N	$\bar{x}$	F	P
Family	1	6	265000	.369 .830
	2	22	261820	
	3	36	268612	
	4	54	264076	
	5 and over	141	269080	
Friend	1	6	256668	1.148 .335
	2	22	215000	
	3	36	237776	
	4	54	230184	
	5 and over	141	218368	
Specific Person	1	6	278332	1.742 .141
	2	22	190456	
	3	36	226668	
	4	54	208520	
	5 and over	141	208156	
Total Social Support	1	6	800004	1.631 .167
	2	22	667272	
	3	36	733056	
	4	54	702780	
	5 and over	141	695532	

In Table 14, according to the independent variable 'Number of People with Need of Care in the House', the MSPSS family, specific person and friend subscales were compared with total social support score, and there is no statistically a significant difference among perceptions of social support because the p values were greater than 0.05 except for the family and total social support sub-scales. There is a statistically significant difference between the perceptions of social support in the family sub-scale and total social support scores since the p-value is 0.000 <0.05 and 0.041 <0.05.

**Table 14 - Perceived Social Support - 'Number of People with Care Needs in Household'**

Sub-scale	# of People with Care Needs in Household	N	$\bar{x}$	F	P
Family	No	237	270044	10.153	.000
	1	21	238572		
	2 and over	1	210000		
Friend	No	237	226032	1.732	.179
	1	21	200000		
	2 and over	1	280000		
Specific Person	No	237	212364	.975	.379
	1	21	191428		
	2 and over	1	280000		
Total Social Support	No	237	708396	3.245	.041
	1	21	630000		
	2 and over	1	770004		

**CONCLUSION**

Migration is a phenomenon that includes problems and situations that need to be evaluated from a social perspective given they can affect human social roles and social support systems. Migration has an impact on human life in many areas such as economic, political, and cultural spheres which may affect individuals who are disadvantaged. Changes in the social dimension can put people in a disadvantaged position. The financial and moral support of social support mechanisms for an individual have great importance, especially for individuals affected by immigration (Adiguezuel, 2018).

This study demonstrated that the supports provided to Ahiska Turks positively affect individuals' perception of social support. In line with the information received from the Uzumlu District Governorship Social Assistance and Solidarity Foundation Directorate, Erzincan, it was learned that all the needs and expenses such as furniture and heating expenses of the houses where the Ahiska Turks reside are provided free of charge by the state. There are also cash and food aids to families at certain time intervals. Having a working family member does not constitute an obstacle for them to benefit from assistance.

Although the settlement of Ahiska Turks in Erzincan is considered within the scope of forced migration, it is seen that they are not affected by the accommodation problems experienced as a result of other forced migrations. Besides the financial and moral support provided by the state, the fact that families can live in close relationships in MHAT residences has facilitated the continuity of the supportive nature of family and affinity relations. It can be suggested that Ahiska Turks successful overcame any adaptation problems experienced by immigrant families who had to live in different regions or cities for economic or social reasons. This is important for the quality of the contact and support provided with the social support systems.

The social support perceptions of individuals in some categories are at a normal level even though the social support perceptions of Ahiska Turks are generally high. In this study, there were not any individuals who held a low perception of social support. This situation can likely be associated with financial and moral aid to families. Considering that the psychological and economic conditions of individuals affect other family members, it is possible to say that the support provided to families has positive effects on the individual and family psychology. With assistance, the partial elimination of the problems caused by migration-based economic stressors in the family and the presence of social acceptance and state support that provide social harmony contributed significantly to the perceptions of social support.

Although 138 (53.3%) of participants in this study were unemployed, it can be posited that the adaptation problems of migrants partly continue in terms of work and that the services previously provided by the state to the families help individuals to build their hopes for the future. Literature in the field supports this view. In addition, despite the adverse effects of migration, the fact that Ahiska Turks see Turkey as the 'Homeland' and the state's disposal services for negative effects of immigration lead individuals to find the services more meaningful.

As a result, the contribution of the element of consanguinity and having cultural and religious common values to social accommodations is especially important for immigrants. Based on the data obtained from our study, it can be seen that the Ahiska Turks are less affected by the harsh effects of forced migration and this situation positively affects their perceptions of social support.

#### REFERENCES

- Adiguzel, Y. (2018). *Sociology of Migration*. Ankara: Nobel Publishing.
- Akkas, I. (2017). Sociological examination of Ahiska Turks: The case of Erzincan. *Türkiz National Refereed Journal of Social Sciences in the World of Thought*, 45-62.
- Aktepe, E., Tekdere, M. & Gurbuz, A. S. (2017). An evaluation on the Ahiska Turks placed in Erzincan in the context of social cohesion and integration. *Journal of Migration Research*, 138-169.
- Arkar, Y. E. (2001). Factor structure validity and reliability of the revised form of the Multidimensional Perceived Social Support Scale. *Turkish Journal of Psychiatry*, 12(1), 17-25.
- Arman, N. (2009). Investigation of social support levels and burnout and anxiety levels perceived by mothers and fathers with mentally handicapped children. Master Thesis, Atatürk University Institute of Social Sciences, Educational Sciences.
- Aydingun, A. (2017). Ahiska Turks: Migration, identity, and transnationalism in the light of global dynamics. Erzincan International Ahiska Turks Symposium, Erzincan Binali Yildirim University Publications.
- Bakioglu, A. Artar, F., & Izmir, H. (2018). Refugee experiences of Syrians in Ankara, immigration, daily life, livelihood experiences, and social exclusion. *Sociology Association Publication*, No: 25, Ankara.
- Eker D, Arkar H, Yaldiz H (2001). Multidimensional scale of perceived social support –revised–Turkish Version (MSPSS-R-T). APA PsychTests. <https://doi-apa-org.proxy.lib.siu.edu/doi/10.1037/t06536-000>.
- Ekici, S. & Tuncel, H. (2015). Migration and human. *Individual and Society*, 5(9), 9-22.
- Haber (2018). Ahiska Turks have worked through İŞKUR. [http://www.haber7.com/erzincan/2633538-Ahiska\\_Turks\\_have\\_Worked\\_Through\\_Iskur](http://www.haber7.com/erzincan/2633538-Ahiska_Turks_have_Worked_Through_Iskur). Accessed 25.05.2018.
- Halis, M., & Demirel, Y. (2016). The effect of social Ssupport on organizational sbstraction (Exclusion). *Journal of Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 318-335.
- Karabulut, T. & Erbası, A. (2016). Evaluation of teachers' job satisfaction levels with fuzzy analytical hierarchy process method: An application in schools affiliated to the ministry of education in Erzincan. *Kahramanmaraş Sutcu Imam University Journal of Social Sciences*, 13(2), 17-46.
- Kocak, O. & Gunduz, D. (2016). European Union migration policies and their impact on the social nclusion of immigrants. *Yalova Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(12), 66-91.
- Mečiar, M. (2017). From Jerveni to Mustafapasa: Macedonian speaking bilingual Turks in Cappadocia. p. 378-382.
- No. 7321 Law on Ahiska Turks to Turkey Adoption and field Settlement, Law No: 3835, Accepted: 02.07.1992, Published in the Official Gazette Date: 11.07.1992, Issue 21281, Issue 5, Volume: 31.
- Ozdevecioglu, M. (2004). The effects of social support and life satisfaction on professional stress: A research with business owners operating in Kayseri. *Hacettepe University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences Journal*, 209-233.
- Schaefer C, Coyne J & Lazarus R. (1981). The health-related functions of social support. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00846149>. Retrieved on 3/29/2022 from: The health-related functions of social support | Semantic Scholar.
- Turanlı, M., Cengiz D. T. & Bozkir, O. (2012). Ranking of the provinces according to the success of the university entrance exams with factor analysis. *Istanbul University Faculty of Economics Journal of Econometrics and Statistics*, 45-68.
- Yildirim, I. (1997). Reliability of the perceived social support scale development. *Hacettepe University Faculty of Education Journal*, 13, 81-87.
- Zalankoy, K. I. (2015). Investigation of social support perception of individuals applying to medical social service unit. Master Thesis, Selcuk University Institute of Health Sciences, Konya.