

Yilmaz, Gaye; Erdogan, Diyar

Working Paper

Anatomy of a refugee workshop: Syrian labourers in Istanbul

Global Labour University Working Paper, No. 56

Provided in Cooperation with:

The Global Labour University (GLU)

Suggested Citation: Yilmaz, Gaye; Erdogan, Diyar (2019) : Anatomy of a refugee workshop: Syrian labourers in Istanbul, Global Labour University Working Paper, No. 56, International Labour Organization (ILO), Geneva

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/206726>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

Working Paper No. 56
JUNE 2019



International
Labour
Office



ANATOMY OF A REFUGEE WORKSHOP: SYRIAN LABOURERS IN ISTANBUL

Gaye Yilmaz
Diyar Erdogan

GLOBAL
LABOUR
UNIVERSITY

The **Global Labour University** (GLU), www.global-labour-university.org, is an international network of universities, trade unions, research institutes, think tanks and the International Labour Organisation that

- ❖ develops and implements university post graduate programmes on labour and globalization for trade unionists and other labour experts;
- ❖ undertakes joint research and organizes international discussion fora on global labour issues;
- ❖ publishes textbooks, research and discussion papers on labour and globalization issues.

Editorial Board

Patrick Belser (International Labour Organisation)
Hansjörg Herr (Berlin School of Economics and Law, Germany)
Frank Hoffer (Action, Collaboration, Transformation)
Seeraj Mohamed (University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa)
Rafael Peels (International Labour Organisation)
Archana Prasad (Jawaharlal Nehru University, India)
Helen Schwenken (University of Osnabrück, Germany)
Michael Watt (International Labour Organisation)
Marcelo WeishauptProni (Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Brazil)

Contact Address

Hochschule für Wirtschaft und Recht Berlin
IMB - Prof. Hansjörg Herr
Badensche Str. 52
D-10825 Berlin
E-mail: glu.workingpapers@global-labour-university.org
<http://www.global-labour-university.org>

Layout: Harald Kröck

ANATOMY OF A REFUGEE WORKSHOP: SYRIAN LABOURERS IN ISTANBUL

Gaye Yilmaz

Diyar Erdogan

The responsibility for opinions expressed in the GLU working papers rests solely with their authors, and publication does not constitute an endorsement by the International Labour Office of the opinions expressed in them.

Copyright © International Labour Organization 2019

First published 2019

Publications of the International Labour Office enjoy copyright under Protocol 2 of the Universal Copyright Convention. Nevertheless, short excerpts from them may be reproduced without authorization, on condition that the source is indicated. For rights of reproduction or translation, application should be made to ILO Publications (Rights and Permissions), International Labour Office, CH-1211 Geneva 22, Switzerland, or by email: rights@ilo.org. The International Labour Office welcomes such applications.

Libraries, institutions and other users registered with reproduction rights organizations may make copies in accordance with the licences issued to them for this purpose. Visit www.ifrro.org to find the reproduction rights organization in your country.

ISSN: 1866-0541 (print) ; 2194-7465 (PDF)

The designations employed in ILO publications, which are in conformity with United Nations practice, and the presentation of material therein do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the International Labour Office concerning the legal status of any country, area or territory or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers.

The responsibility for opinions expressed in signed articles, studies and other contributions rests solely with their authors, and publication does not constitute an endorsement by the International Labour Office of the opinions expressed in them.

Reference to names of firms and commercial products and processes does not imply their endorsement by the International Labour Office, and any failure to mention a particular firm, commercial product or process is not a sign of disapproval.

Information on ILO publications and digital products can be found at: www.ilo.org/publns.

Printed in Switzerland



ABSTRACT

There is no doubt that any work carried out with refugees requires much greater sensitivity and care than others. On the other hand, if these studies have to be done with limited budgets in a very limited time, it may be harder to reach meaningful results without sacrificing the necessary sensitivity. Unlike many other works which solely focus on the results, in this study, we aim to bring to light the proceedings of a refugee labour workshop, collaboratively organized by Global Labour University (GLU) Alumnis in Turkey, the ICDD and Kassel University, which, though operated within a limited timeframe and a stringent budget, attained unexpected positive results. While we were coordinating and organizing this workshop, we also came to a conclusion that labour studies may not necessarily be done only through field researches which demands extensive human and financial resources. Indeed, we found that a well-planned workshop, supported with special techniques and ethical concerns may well replace field research in terms of the results achieved. We, therefore, present the background of the Syrian refugee labour workshop held in Istanbul/Boğaziçi University in February 2017 so that similar such endeavours may be undertaken in future when time and resources are limited.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
1. COORDINATION OF A REGIONAL MEETING ON THE POSITION OF SYRIAN REFUGEE WORKERS IN TURKEY	3
1.1 Purpose and Framework.....	4
1.2 Planning.....	6
1.3 Participants and Dissemination	10
1.4 Outputs	10
2. STEPS TOWARDS A COLLABORATIVE WORKSHOP WITH SYRIAN AND TURKISH WORKERS.....	12
2.1 Finding and Convincing Syrians to Participate in the Project.....	12
2.2 Assessment of Traced Ethical Principles	16
3. FISHBOWL ACTIVITY	24
4. CONCLUSION REMARKS.....	27
5. REFERENCES.....	30
6. ANNEXURE	35

INTRODUCTION

Even after eight years since the Syrian crisis had ensued, as the international community is still struggling to respond to the humanitarian catastrophe, more than half of Syria's population either comprises internally displaced persons (IDP) or refugees. Forced population movements have extraordinarily diverse historical and political causes and the displaced people find themselves in qualitatively different situations and predicaments. Nationalism and racism, xenophobia and immigration policies, state practices of violence and war, censorship and silencing, human rights and challenges to state sovereignty, 'development' discourse and humanitarian interventions, citizenship and cultural or religious identities, travel and diaspora, and memory and historicity are just some of the issues and practices that generate the inescapably relevant context of human displacement today (Malkki, 1995: 495, 496).

As it is the case with all refugee flows, Syrian refugees who participated in the workshop have raised numerous questions before scholars, trade unions and NGOs engaged in social research. In this context, researches focusing on Syrians settled in developing countries are under double pressure compared to those in western countries. The first cause of worry is related with inadequate monetary resources, one of the prerequisites for any research; universities, NGOs, trade unions and governments in developing countries have it in a minimal quantum as compared to western countries. This disadvantage can of course be overcome, in part, if researches are conducted jointly with organizations of the central countries as had been possible in the case of the workshop that has been the subject of this paper, an event made feasible by the solidarity and cooperation of German and Turkish universities and organizations. However, it should not be forgotten that there are limitations if similar such researches need to be carried out between western universities and institutions and those in developing countries. In other words, it is clear that it would not suffice to link all the research studies to this source only.

Second, developing countries are facing with the most intensive migration flows as in the case of those surrounding Syria. More than 5 million displaced Syrians live in its neighbouring countries in the Middle East and North Africa. As can be inferred from the proportion of Syrians in Turkey (3.4 million), Lebanon (1 million), Jordan (660,000) and Iraq (250,000) that about four-in-ten Syrians are displaced around the world (41%), as per the estimates based on data from the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). More than 150,000 Syrians also live in North African countries like Egypt and Libya. According to asylum seeker data from Eurostat, Europe's statistical agency, and UNHCR data on refugee resettlement (Connor, 2018), only about 1 million displaced Syrians have moved to Europe as asylum seekers or refugees since the conflict began. This is another stressful factor on developing country researchers since millions of Syrian refugees are waiting to gain access to the labour market and find solutions for many teething problems that they face such as healthcare, education, shelter and

transportation. Further, owing to wrong estimations, many in Turkey had believed that the presence of Syrian refugees¹ in Turkey would be for a temporary period and that they would be able to return home within a few months. However, in the present context many acknowledge that refugees are likely to stay in Turkey for a long time which has opened up costly challenges before Turkey (Kirişçi, 2014:18).

Studies on refugees involve different governmental agencies and it is hard to identify the target population, or figure out how to assist host communities, especially in the absence of a comprehensive systematic need assessment exercise. The presence of growing number of Syrians in Turkey is deeply impacting host communities economically, socially, as well as politically. In addition, the humanitarian and political situation inside Syria is increasingly deteriorating (Kirişçi, 2014: 5, 6).

In the given context, researchers need to find innovative ways to resolve the problem, apart from seeking cooperation and solidarity with western institutions. Each city where Syrians have settled must be scanned scientifically and findings must be shared by governmental authorities, universities, trade unions and concerned NGOs. According to the official data of December 2016, Istanbul, which is also the city where our workshop was held, has the largest number of refugees in Turkey, estimating to almost 3.5 million in total of which 3.1 million are Syrians; it has a population of between 17% and 25% of the total number of refugees alone (Erdoğan, 2017: 8). The ongoing refugee crisis in the Middle East has underscored the difficulties of qualitative research on forced migration. Borrowing Krause's idea (2017: 24) that a research is not only about the results but also about the processes and related theoretical and methodological reflections, we have focussed on the way we coordinated the workshop, found and convinced the Syrian refugees to take part in the programme, and finally, jointly organized this interactive workshop. Our initial goal was to make a workshop with refugees only, but the result was like a field research with 44 Syrians and 13 Turkish workers; however, in the end, we managed to reach these targeted numbers with only a few missing participants on both sides. What made this possible was the mutual trust which was established at four separate meetings held with Syrians before the workshop and also the superb skills and endeavours of the moderators who actively involved themselves with all participants in the workshop. The entire event and workshop was held at Boğaziçi University, Istanbul, in February 2017, in cooperation with the International Center for Development and Decent Work (ICDD)/University of Kassel and Boğaziçi University.

In Chapter 1 (Part 1), we will describe the story of the coordination phase of this event including the preparation meeting and Skype conferences held among the organizers and comparing them with similar studies. In Part 2, we will share our experiences on how we reached 44 Syrians and nine Turkish workers, convey our

¹ Although Syrian immigrants in Turkey were categorized under 'temporary protection', which is a different statute from 'refugee', we use the concept of refugee in this study in the sociological sense.

preliminary meetings with participants before the workshop and discuss the positive impacts of these preliminary works on the effectiveness of workshops in the frame of ethics, confidentiality and mutual trust. Part 3, directly and solely, focuses on the day of the organization of the workshop with Syrian refugees and Turkish workers, describing the series of steps we had taken to achieve their enthusiastic and fruitful participation. Our paper ends with concluding remarks and possible follow-up recommendations for the future by keeping the words of Finlay (2002) in mind that 'research process itself has the potential to transform the very phenomenon being studied'.

1. COORDINATION OF A REGIONAL MEETING ON THE POSITION OF SYRIAN REFUGEE WORKERS IN TURKEY

After the conflict in Syria, Turkey has become the major refugee-hosting country for many Syrians who leave their homeland to survive Syria's civil war. According to the historical figures, this is the second biggest immigration wave after the Second World War (Bahçekapili and Cetin, 2015: 1). Since the start of the conflict in 2011, the estimated number of Syrians who entered Turkey was 2.834.441 by 2016 (İçişleri Bakanlığı Göç İdaresi Genel Müdürlüğü, 2017: 76). However, this number does not reflect the reality as there are many Syrians who are not under Temporary Protection. While the flood of refugees started with thousands at the beginning of Syria's civil war in 2011, the influx continued increasing and reached to millions with Turkey's open door policy. (Esen and Binatlı, 2017: 1). Under these circumstances, Syrians have been exposed to vulnerable and problematic conditions that make this situation a humanitarian crisis in the region.

Furthermore, the situation of Syrian refugees becomes more complex under the Turkish legal system. According to the 1951 Geneva Convention, which was signed by Turkey under a geographical constriction, only asylum seekers from Europe were being accepted as a refugee (UNHCR Global Appeal 2008-2009: 304). Based on this definition, Syrians were not legally referred to as refugees in Turkey and this has created a problem as they have not been considered eligible to benefit from the rights based on the Geneva Convention.² Their status being defined as 'guest', do not provide any basis for a legal settlement for their living and working conditions. This procedure continued until the Temporary Protection Regulation came into force in 2014 (Kaygısız, 2017: 3). From 2011 until the legislative procedure took effect, Syrians did not have any legal protection for building a life in Turkey, as their settlement was seen as temporary. However, though the Temporary Protection Regulation defined the Syrian settlement, it did not regulate the entrance of Syrians into the labour market as they remained

² "The Convention lays down basic minimum standards for the treatment of refugees, without prejudice to States granting more favourable treatment. Such rights include access to the courts, to primary education, to work, and the provision for documentation, including a refugee travel document in passport form." (UNHCR, 2010:4)

under Temporary Protection. It was only made possible with the Regulation on the Work Permits of Foreigners under Temporary Protection in January 2016 (Okuy, 2017: 5) Thus, after five years of having entered into the Turkish labour market informally and unregistered, the living and working conditions of Syrians gained a rooted importance.

A detailed look at the Syrian demography in Turkey shows that 36.74% refugees were under 15, while 61.2% of the registered refugee population in 2016 was between 15–64 years; among the Syrian refugees, 1.323.054 were female and 1.511.387 male. By the end of 2016, when the distribution of the registered Syrians was examined, Istanbul at 438.861 had the highest population, followed by Şanlıurfa at 405.511 and Hatay at 379.141 (İçişleri Bakanlığı Göç İdaresi Genel Müdürlüğü, 2017: 77).

Based on these figures, it can be interpreted that the young population who could access the Turkish labour market is relatively high among Syrian refugees. It creates an important issue in relation to the existing conditions of the Turkish market, where the percentage of informal workers in November 2016 was 33.3. The agriculture sector has the highest level of informal employment, followed by the construction sector and hotels and restaurants in the service sector (Kaygısız, 2017: 3).

Under these conditions, Syrian refugees' main entrance to the Turkish labour market occurred through the informal sector with low wages and absence of decent working conditions. They work mainly in seasonal agricultural work, construction, manufacturing, textiles, waste picking and begging areas (Kaygısız, 2017: 8-13). Such jobs have proved problematic with regard to core labour and social rights concerns, thereby making the refugee situation more vulnerable.

In this context, the question remains how far they can be integrated into society with all these circumstances they face and what would be the role of civil society organizations, trade unions and academia on this very important issue. These questions have triggered the Global Labour University (GLU) Alumni in Turkey to conduct a workshop on the Syrian refugees.

1.1 Purpose and Framework

Before getting into details of the purpose and framework of our workshop, here is a rough picture on the GLU Alumni in Turkey who achieved to work collectively in this process. The number of graduates from Turkey at GLU has increased and in 2018 there were 15 alumnis from different master courses. Due to the ongoing connections between alumnis, a network among graduates was built who took the initiative. The alumni network in Turkey aspired to build strong relationships between the GLU graduates while bringing trade unionists, NGOs and scholars together for strengthening the labour movement in Turkey and in the region.

Even though there are many aspects in Turkish labour movement that requires attention, the situation of Syrian refugees in Turkey presents the special problems of the Turkish labour market. It acts like a litmus test and uncovers the Turkish

labour market within a broad socioeconomic frame. Further, the humanitarian aspect of the issue created the basis for urgent reaction to the ongoing crisis.

Under these facts, the GLU Alumnis in Turkey made a decision to apply for the 'Call for Proposal for Regional Alumni Workshops in 2016 and 2017', which would be financed by the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) based on the coordination that is provided by the ICDD. We, as GLU Alumnis in Turkey, made a collaborative work for preparing the concept note and submitted it in March 2016. The overall aim of the concept note was to increase international solidarity regarding the situation of Syrian refugees and create a platform for collaborations on solidarity actions in Turkey. The concept note's objectives were specified on organizing a regional meeting to have a participatory discussion on the Syrian refugees in Turkey, particularly with regard to the issues of integration of Syrian refugees into the labour market, living conditions of Syrian refugees, and the role of trade unions and civil society organizations on providing decent and inclusive living and working conditions in Turkey. In order to achieve these aims four focus areas were determined:

1. Overview of the Syrian crisis and its impact on the Syrian people and neighbouring countries.
2. General impression of the Turkish labour market and trade union movement: challenges and future aspects.
3. Possible ways of integration of Syrian refugees to the labour market and improvement of working conditions of Syrian refugees with a specific focus on young Syrians. This area also covered the themes of child labour and gender-based violence.
4. Access to education, healthcare and shelters for decent living conditions.

Coordination of this project was run by GLU Alumni Diyar Erdoğan. The proposed regional meeting was structured in two phases: at the first phase, a planning meeting was proposed to be organized for having a detailed discussion on the preparatory work of the regional meeting and finalizing the programme. The planning meeting was of crucial importance for developing a sound strategy to reach out to Syrian refugees, who would be able to attend the regional meeting, and designing a comprehensive meeting programme with the contribution of most relevant partners and organizers. We were all aware of the fact that Syrian refugee labourers would be constructive elements for this regional meeting. In its guide for Participatory Planning Workshop, the UNHCR noted:

With the assistance of the multifunctional teams, refugees, internally displaced persons and returnees should select a reasonable number of community members who represent all ages and backgrounds, reflect gender balance, and are genuinely able to participate. The participants should also receive support in preparing adequately for the workshop, to ensure meaningful participation and avoid token presence (UNHCR, 2006: 48).

Unfortunately, owing to time constraints, we were unable to receive assistance from Syrian refugees in planning meeting. Thus, the first planning meeting was organized with participants from ICDD, International Labour Organization (ILO), GLU Alumnis from Turkey, academics and representatives of relevant NGOs.

At the second phase, a regional meeting was to be organized which would bring GLU Alumnis from Turkey, representatives of ICDD, ILO, Syrian refugees, trade unions, academia, NGOs and international organizations together. In the concept note, the main event, the regional meeting, was planned for eight days and two different locations were designed for the meetings. Accordingly, the first planning meeting was to be in Istanbul and the regional meeting in Mersin with the collaboration of Mersin University. The reason for choosing Mersin for the regional meeting in the proposed concept note was the fact that the city was located in southern Turkey, which is historically defined as a city of migration tracing back to more than 200 years. According to official numbers, in 2014 there were 58,800 Syrian refugees in Mersin. However, it has been repeatedly reported that the actual number of refugees might actually be closer to 200,000. (ORSAM, TESEV, 2015: 32). Because of its geographical position, Mersin is one of the main hubs for trafficking refugee. The proposed programme for the regional meeting also included a visit to the camp(s) and local NGOs in Mersin for showing solidarity to refugees and local NGOs through a field trip and additionally listening to their stories witnessing their conditions in camp(s). Based on this framework, the approval for the proposed concept note was received in May 2016. Even though the location and duration of the proposed regional meeting were changed based on the discussion at the preparatory meeting, the essence and objectives of the concept note was preserved in the actual regional meeting.

1.2 Planning

After receiving the approval, the first step was taken regarding the planning of the regional meeting. It was decided to organize the preparatory meeting in Istanbul in November 2016. The preparatory meeting was hosted by the Bogazici University Centre for Educational Policy Studies (BEPAM) with the participants from GLU Alumnis in Turkey, University of Kassel, ICDD, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung Istanbul, ILO, and an expert scholar on the issue from Mugla University. The focus of the preparatory meeting was to determine the overall scope, objectives, programme and sessions of the regional meeting. In order to have better understanding of the scope of the issue, Associate Prof. Saniye Dedeoğlu was invited as guest speaker to make a presentation on the current situation of Syrian refugees in Turkey and her experiences on the field with Syrian refugees as part of her research project. The presentation provided inputs on the latest figures of Syrians in relation to their position in Turkish labour market.

During the discussions at the meeting, the main concerns were framing the programme by considering its outputs, location and the duration of the regional meeting. Regarding duration and location of the regional meeting, we had two important constraints—budget of the regional meeting and political atmosphere

in the country. The most critical point in the budget was simultaneous translation item and it was necessary to have a service provider who would have technological and technical capacity for providing Turkish, English and Arabic translation. It was soon understood that organizing the regional meeting in Mersin city would become much more difficult due to the given budgetary limitations, especially for translation expenses (mainly because of astronomic costs of transportation of equipment to Mersin) and other organizational matters. Mersin, as a location, was critical for the purpose of the regional meeting, since it was aimed to create interaction with Syrian refugees and local NGOs for showing solidarity and listening to their stories. However, this might well be overcome by using different workshop techniques like Fishbowl which would be more interactive than having passive participants in the camps around Mersin. What is more, compared to those living in Istanbul, refugees in the camps are more unfamiliar with market relations such as seeking jobs, knowing working conditions or facing discriminations in job. Beyond all these when the programme structure were being discussed in more detail, it was clear that the framework should be kept more concrete and the regional meeting for more than four days would not be applicable and feasible under the human and financial resources of the project.

Second important issue was the political situation in Turkey; only five months had passed since the failed coup attempt and emergency law was put in force since then. Many important NGOs have been shut down by the ministry as part of the state of emergency and many scholars were dismissed from their position in the universities. So it was apparent that we would encounter difficulties in inviteing certain NGOs and scholars. Furthermore, the host institution's support was critical under this political pressure. Bogazici University BEPAM was collaborative to the aim of the regional meeting and values of the GLU and Alumnis in these conditions. Based on the sources and actual conditions, it was decided to have the regional meeting for four days with the Istanbul/Bogazici University as the host institution.

Another important point was that since as GLU Alumnis, an alumni network in Turkey, we were facing a setback as we had a very low recognition. Moreover, as a network we did not have any legal basis. We were concerned that it would create a problem for actualizing the regional meeting. It was very important to have the right partners for organizing this event. In that sense, to have the references of the partners of the regional meeting was crucial to overcome difficulties of organizational and logistic issues.

The considerations on output and related target of the regional meeting were framed based on short-term and long-term results with the main focus on labour market participation of Syrian refugees in Turkey. First, the short-term result aimed to create policy recommendations at the end of the regional meeting by combining all important points that were presented by participants. Second, long-term impact was aimed by providing a platform for collaborations on solidarity actions to take place. Based on these aims, the main outputs were

formalized as policy recommendations, final report of the workshop and possible platforms for further actions. According to this, the duration of the programme was planned to be three days for the regional meeting and one day for fishbowl workshop. University students, academicians, labour activists and NGO members were the targeted audience for the first three days while Syrian and Turkish workers and organizers from Germany and Turkey were aimed to be the participants at the fishbowl workshop on the fourth day.

In the preparatory meeting it was also discussed whether it would be proper and/or possible for Syrian refugees to participate in all events during the four-day tenure. It was agreed that there would be various problems to include Syrians entirely in the four-day event. It was decided that first we would select and invite those Syrians with experiences in job markets to attend events only for one day.³ Second, it was assumed that during the first three days of the event, it would be boring for the refugees to participate in an activity replete with academic presentations. Third, it would unnecessarily increase translation costs and would neither contribute meaningfully towards the realization of the aims of the regional workshop nor for the Syrian refugees themselves.

The programme (Annex) was organized thematically and separated into sessions which would enable one to focus on different objectives each day. The first day was aimed to provide an introduction on the current status of Syrian refugees in Turkey, with a detailed look on the Turkish labour market, particularly how it had been affected by the Syrian crisis including the increasing precarization of different sectors in labour market, and labour migration policies. On the second day, it was purposed to go beyond the theoretical debate to practical and concrete experiences, especially from field studies and presentations of NGOs on matters related to gender and child labour. Furthermore, sessions on migration policies in Germany and Turkey regarding Syrian refugees were compared in terms of access to the labour market, public services, gender and discrimination. In order to create a collaborative policy recommendation and present it with a debate for the general audience, a round table discussion was organized which was limited to seven speakers and was closed to the audience. The last day of the regional meeting was devoted to informal labour markets and a session on identity and discrimination cases towards Syrians in Turkey. The regional meeting was planned to finalize the summary of all the recommendations that was gathered from the previous days and were to be presented for an open general discussion with the audience. The fishbowl workshop, organized separately from the regional meeting, was closed to press/media, the audience and speakers, as it were to be organized only for Syrian and Turkish worker participants. However, it was agreed that the findings of this event were to be shared in the workshop report.⁴

³ Most refugees have only one day off per week because they work in the informal sector.

⁴ See the Report written by Dr Tolga Tören, 'Documentation Report: Syrian Refugees in the Turkish Labour Market', ICDD Working Paper.

Another issue that caused distress in the coordination stage was that the event was to be held in Turkey, but the sponsor and partner institutions were from Germany. A Skype meeting was organized between the organizing team in Turkey and Germany in January 2017, prior to the workshop dates. Two important issues were discussed. First, the organizational and logistic matters were planned according to 100 participants per day for the regional meeting. Second, details about the organization of the Syrian and Turkish workers at the fishbowl workshop were discussed (these issues will be explained in subsequent chapters). Furthermore, in relation to the fishbowl workshop, another Skype meeting was organized in January 2017 between the moderators and the organizing team on the implementation of the fishbowl technique. The topics of discussion revolved around the profile of the participants, the fishbowl technique and questions that were planned to be asked to workers. As part of the implementation of the technique, one needed detailed information on issues that we aimed to raise during the fishbowl workshop. The proposed questions and topics were the following:

- The ways of finding job (formal and informal ways: friends, neighbours, etc.)
- Did you have experience or did you get training before you started to work?
- Working conditions (working days/hours; breaks/holidays; overtime work: paid or unpaid; H&S; free lunch and free service vehicle)
- Does your employer organize training related to your work? Can all workers equally benefit from these trainings?
- Wages, bonuses and aids given in kind (heating, food or cleaning supplies)
- Access to public services (health, schooling of children and public transportation)
- Housing and transportation
- Are there discriminative practices at your workplace based on ethnical origin, migrant statute and/or sexual orientation?
- What would you want the most if a campaign is organized to improve the living and working conditions of Syrian refugees?
- What would you desire the most if a campaign is organized to improve the living and working conditions of Turkish workers?

Based on the feedbacks of the organizing team, moderator Sinem Sefa Bayraktar framed the questions under four main titles: *Working life and conditions*: finding a job and entering into Turkish labour market; *Working conditions and opportunities*: access to work/workplace; *Living conditions*: basic necessities; *Access to public services*: education, health, social welfare. And these were the focus areas that were discussed with Syrian and Turkish workers.

1.3 Participants and Dissemination

The participation for the regional meeting aimed at a target of minimum 100 participants per day. In order to reach the participants, the dissemination of the event was constructed through online sources. A website was launched under the name of <https://gluturkeyalumninetwork.wordpress.com/> and a facebook page of the GLU Alumni network in Turkey was created and linked to this website.

In order to announce the event, an invitation list with 62 organizations was prepared which included NGOs, trade unions and public authorities. An event announcement was launched through facebook and 647 persons responded for participation. Due to limited space and other source constraints we had, implementation of a pre-registration form became necessary. The requests for participation were narrowed down with the registration application which had questions like 'organization' and 'reason for the participation'. The collection of registration forms was useful not only for reducing the number of participants but also to be aware of the profile of the targeted audience. This information was shared with the speakers so that they could also work on their presentations based on the profile of the participants. At the end, we received 240 registration application forms. In the final stage, the number of participants was reduced to 158 people per day including the speakers and the organization team.

The pictures that were taken during the regional meeting were presented on the website and also shared on the facebook page. Furthermore, presentations of speakers were recorded via camera for archiving purposes. Before and during the regional meeting we had received requests from the press. Thus, the participation of journalists also helped to a great deal in the dissemination of the regional meeting. At the same time, a press release was prepared and shared with the support of Boğaziçi University, BEPAM. The dissemination of the regional meeting was also supplemented with brochures, posters of the regional meeting and printouts of the programme which were used before and during the event.

1.4 Outputs

The outputs of the regional meeting consisted of policy recommendations, final report of the workshop and possible platforms for further actions under the objective of increasing international solidarity for the cause of Syrian refugees and creating a platform for collaborations on solidarity actions in Turkey. The final report, delivered to the ICDD, included policy recommendations and the evaluation of the regional meeting. Apart from the final report and policy recommendations, the last output, an edited book, is a proposal being worked upon. During the regional meeting, GLU members and the Alumni network in Turkey had a meeting to discuss the next steps for creating possible platforms. As a result of this meeting, it was decided to publish a book on the regional meeting of Syrian refugees and their integration into Turkish labour markets. The first steps have been taken with a call for contributions in February 2018. At this point, the team of editors has completed their work and the manuscript is at the publication stage.

The regional meeting was organized based on the 'Call for Proposal for Regional Alumni Workshops in 2016 and 2017' which also aimed to strengthen the relations between alumnis. This was achieved through further efforts that involved establishing website content. It aimed to inform on the developments concerning the labour issue in the world and Turkey and to create possible networks. The website called "*kureselemek.org*" has been launched in Turkish in February 2018. However, future plans include an English version of the website. The content in this website is being produced with volunteer support from the GLU Alumnis in Turkey through translation of articles in English and Turkish to cater to the need of information exchange on labour issues. The regional meeting had an important effect for creating initiative of GLU Alumni network in Turkey and the members are motivated to take this further with other possible projects. As an alumni network we have attained a certain degree of recognition through the regional meeting and it has allowed us to have better basis for organizing our next events.

Regarding our targeted audience, we have preserved a relation with scholars and NGOs after the regional meeting. We have received emails and requests for further information on certain speakers and report of the regional meeting findings. The fishbowl workshop will be explained, in detail, in subsequent chapters, however, it is important to note that it was a critical event for achieving our aims. Among the overall aims of the regional workshop, it was aimed that the workshop would assist towards the creation of a network and solidarity between Syrian and Turkish workers to understand and recognize the problems they face. Bringing Syrian and Turkish workers together in an event where they shared their working and living conditions was an important step for creating a mutual understanding to reach a platform for collaborations on solidarity actions in Turkey. We have tried to approach the situation of Syrian refugees in the Turkish labour market in a laboratorial atmosphere. We wanted to create a platform for sharing experiences without being alienated from their struggles as workers in the Turkish labour market. In order to show solidarity to the initiatives of the Syrian refugees in Turkey, we received catering services from a collective called 'Syrian Kitchen Collective' during the fishbowl workshop. It created a chance for Syrian women to make their labour visible in the eye of Turkish and German organizers, Turkish workers, university students who were voluntarily around to assist organizers and to their husbands who were the participants of the Fishbowl Workshop.

To sum up, the regional meeting served as a multilevel platform for collaborations for many actors who were GLU alumnis in Turkey, German academics and organizers, people and organizations that work on Syrian refugees, and Turkish workers.

2. STEPS TOWARDS A COLLABORATIVE WORKSHOP WITH SYRIAN AND TURKISH WORKERS

In the previous chapter, we discussed our project which aimed to understand the positions of Syrian refugees in the Turkish labour market and shared the details of the coordination process including a number of preliminary activities such as first preparation meeting at Boğaziçi University and a Skype conference. As it is mentioned in Chapter 1, finding and convincing refugees to participate in the project was the second stage of our research. This was initiated immediately after the preparatory meeting which was held in November 2016, in which majority of the steps to be taken were agreed and identified. However, only two and a half months remained to the date of workshop amounting that Syrian participants would be found under a great time constraint. Moreover, it was obvious that political conditions in Turkey⁵ in that period would further augment the given limitations. In addition to these, we had to make a division of tasks according to the job responsibilities of each GLU researchers who lived and worked in Istanbul. As the number adequate for these criteria was only three and as two of these three were full timers, the task of finding Syrian refugees was undertaken by Gaye Yılmaz⁶ (GY). Thereby, an intensive communication traffic started off which lasted for two months between the concerned NGOs of Syrians, Turkish labour-friendly NGOs, Turkish Labour organizations, ICDD researchers, university administration and the Turkish GLU alumnis as discussed below.

2.1 Finding and Convincing Syrians to Participate in the Project

Refugee research usually begins by communicating with a local NGO or association though the specifics vary. This initial relationship then multiplies and expands therebyby articulating different relationships. First, we must note that our focus participants, by definition, were the self-settled refugees who remained outside the formal settlements and lived in the districts together with non-refugees. Bakewell (2008: 444) asserted that in the course of the talks or interviews, it may be possible to ask about people's origins, their movements and how did they come, but it is again very difficult to verify the responses. Although we were aware of the risks which may be generated from field research techniques such as sharing the same social group or belonging to the same religious group, or interacting with a particular NGO (Jacobsen and Landau, 2003: 13), owing to the techniques we employed before and during the workshop, the

⁵ Since Turkey entered into an almost endless process of state of emergency following the failed coup in July 2016 both preparatory meeting and workshop were held under these conditions. One difficulty, for instance, was the fact that hundreds of democratic NGOs, journals, magazines were closed down. Another difficulty was that entrances to the universities and organizing events in the campuses were subject to strict controls following the failed coup.

⁶ GLU-Kassel Alumni and ICDD Associate.

reactions we received were quite diverse. Indeed, we found Syrian refugees at a similar process.

First, GY, one of the researchers of the Project, gave a brief notice to the university students she taught and asked for help. Since both Boğaziçi University as an institution and also its students were extremely well suited to social work, those students who declared that they were ready to assist voluntarily, contacted her immediately. At the same time, the students⁷ also gave a list of the activities organized by the university in relation to this topic and provided the names and contact addresses of concerned scholars. In the very beginning of the process, consecutive and highly fruitful talks were held with faculty members, assistants and students who participated in the organization of such events beforehand and asked for information on possible problems they faced. In these talks, it was noted that the most underlined problem was the fact that the activities of the refugees were held in large conference rooms and that the events were open to the press and the media. It was not surprising that Syrian refugees expressed the same concerns at the preparatory meetings. Through their observations, experienced faculty members, assistants and students also underlined the fact that in case of events held at big conference rooms, the media and press participants tend either to evade questions or to hide the reality. Another problem they emphasized was the meeting styles where refugees felt themselves in complete self-loneliness. They highlighted that Syrian refugees were sick of being taken under the lens in similar events which solely focused on themselves. After a tour of talks between Turkish GLU alumnis and the ICDD research team, we agreed also to involve Turkish workers—though their numbers were kept fewer than Syrian participants because of budget constraints—preferably working in the same industry with the Syrians. Considering that this way might also become an opportunity for us to compare working conditions of Syrians and Turkish workers, we soon contacted both the DİSK/Confederation of Progressive Trade Unions of Turkey and also few independent labour NGOs. Our efforts resulted with the involvement of nine Turkish workers from different industries into the workshop and before they attended in workshop, they were also provided with the Turkish version of the same informative note which was given to Syrians. We observed that Syrian refugees become very happy when they heard in the second informal gathering that they would be together with Turkish workers during workshop. They expressed that discriminative work practices that they were exposed to in everyday life would be seen by a broader audience, including Turkish and German academics.

Birman (2005: 164) emphasizes that an ethical approach to research is to insist on including the diversity of immigrant and refugee populations in research and to include questions about the variety of within-group variations in the research protocol. For him, researchers need to define and describe the specific population of interest and the ways in which their sampling strategies are intended to

⁷ With our warmest and special thanks to Şevval Şener (student) who voluntarily assisted GY by offering incredible help in all stages of the workshop

capture its particular segments. As our project is based on an assumption that what is right for any refugee group is also true for the Syrian refugees and also because we need to do this within few activity days, we had to narrow and limit our research question with the labour market instead of focusing on the interests of refugees. Thus, for Syrian participants, the only criterion we employed as the basis for creating the sample was that the participants must become Syrian refugees with more or less work experience as our project aimed to understand the position of Syrians in Turkish labour markets. Adopting this criterion, which is sufficiently inclusive and extensive, made it possible for us to understand both the working and living conditions of them. Because of the fact that Syrians already had a number of difficulties to enter into the labour markets in Turkey and owing to time constraints, we did not have the luxury of pursuing the diversity principle while creating the sample. For instance, to some extent we had to undervalue ethical, cultural, gender-based and religious diversities—which must definitely be handled by further researches—that existed within the Syrian populations while creating the sample.

Following the initial talks and interviews held with faculty members, assistants and students, with the help of few students of GY, three refugee groups one in Okmeydanı, one in Fatih and one in Avcılar district were visited within their own premises and the first four general informative meetings (two in Okmeydanı, one in Avcılar and one in Fatih) to facilitate exchange of views took place during these gatherings. Thus, in total, four meetings with 70–80 Syrian refugees were held before the workshop. Meetings were held under the host of two community associations one of which was founded by Turkish activists and the other solely founded and composed by Syrian refugees themselves. At this point, we must keep in mind that some of the refugees might have had large ethnic enclaves while others might not. Birman, states that other smaller groups might have had ethnic concentrations in specific regions inside the city. Bigger ones had the option of settling within ethnic enclaves that maintained some infrastructure, including cultural institutions, events, agencies, and programmes in the native language. This infrastructure provided opportunities to interact with others from similar backgrounds. On the other hand, other groups which were relatively small, and even when small ethnic enclaves existed, they did not provide the types of resources that larger communities could sustain (Birman, 2005: 158). In our event, the latter was the case; those in Okmeydanı, Avcılar and Fatih were small ethnic concentrations. While men either were seeking informal jobs or working under highly precarious and instable conditions, women reported that they were produced foods such as marmalades and tomato paste in very small scale. For instance, female refugees asked the researcher whether they might have the opportunity to exhibit and sell their products on the day of the event at the university. As this was something to be agreed with the research team and also a preliminary permission from the university was needed, women had to wait for a while till all these stages were completed.

In these early meetings women seemed less familiar with speaking Turkish than men, probably because the latter were spending more time outside home compared to their wives. All these meetings were run with volunteer Syrian translators interacting between Arabic and Turkish. In the first meeting, following few tours of questions and answers, participants asked GY to prepare an informative note which explained the aims, expectations and methods of the workshop with the hope to inform friends who were unable to attend the meeting but likely to attend the workshop day. Those from Okmeydanı and Avcılar needed Turkish but other groups in Fatih needed the English note. Both versions of note in TR and EN were prepared and given to the contact persons in each district to be translated into Arabic in the final. Following consecutive contacts between GY and the project coordinator Diyar Erdoğan (DE) these notes were prepared considering the basic questions raised during the first four meetings held within the premises of Syrian refugees.

Yu & Lieu (1986) underlines that immigrants possessing no valid documents might fear being identified, thus shy away from participation in research studies, particularly, if the research might lead to their identification by authorities (Trimble and Fisher, 2005: 157). In their article, 'Stop Stealing Our Stories', Pittaway et.al. (2010) also highlight a similar risk that refugees may feel physical risks; e.g., when published papers include (unauthorized) names and/or pictures of interviewees, they might be exposed to harmful reactions from government authorities and military leaders (Krause, 2017: 11). Beyond the content of these informative notes, it was noticed that the biggest fear/concern of Syrian men and women was also to make sure that this is a labour and refugee-friendly initiative where the Turkish State is not involved. They even asked the researcher, GY to prove her academic identity in order to be completely sure of this in the first meeting. They were also shown official research authorization letter with the ICDD logo and it was observed that this letter was circulated hand to hand among participants even though it was written in an unknown language for majority of them. In these preparatory meetings with Syrians, other related questions such as their transportation from their homes to the workshop venue and vice versa, entrance to the university campus without facing any trouble and arrangement of lunch were also raised.

Empirical studies stress that refugees' living conditions in camps as well as urban areas are often shaped by structural restrictions, diverse forms of violence and limited livelihoods⁸ (Krause, 2017: 3). Jacobsen and Landau (2003) state that apart from distinct insecurities, the interaction with 'western' scholars can put participants at risk, especially when the authority figures object to the research and punish people for taking part. Moreover, partial selection and an insensitive approach towards participants or involuntary participation can cause fear or frustration among the people (Ellis et al. 2007; Mackenzie et al. 2007; Hugman et al. 2011a, cf. Krause, 2017:4). We must underline that those who joined our workshop were selected randomly, the technique best suited for broader

⁸ See, for example, Turner 2016; Crisp et al. 2012; Krause 2015; Agier 2011.

generalization. However, mainly because it was very hard for them to keep their job, participants were selected not by researchers, but by the extremely severe living conditions to which they were succumbed.

2.2 Assessment of Traced Ethical Principles

Recent academic literature identifies the key concerns regarding the ethics of research with refugees, IDP and other populations-at-risk (Jacobsen and Landau, 2003; Mackenzie, et al. 2007). These include the intersecting issues of the ethics of research with vulnerable groups' power and consent, confidentiality and trust, risks to researchers and potential harm to participants, as well as the broader cross-cutting issues of gender, culture, human rights and social justice. Reed argues (2002) that while there is growing evidence of these challenges, much of it are dispersed across a range of academic disciplines, descriptive in nature and offer little practical guidance to researchers working with refugee and IDP populations and those responsible for ethics oversight. Power imbalances between researchers and participants also raise complex ethical issues (Pittaway, et.al 2015: 232). For this reason, the first relationship with the Syrian refugees was an important step taken in terms of trust in the investigative institution and the individuals, as GY, one of the researchers chose to chat directly with them in a friendly way instead of leaving it to inexperienced interviewers. According to our observations, there were three factors that were most influential in persuading the refugees to provide explanations and commitments on logistic support in these first four meetings. First that the project will be carried out by a labour-intensive German institution (ICDD-GLU), second that the workshop will be organized in a highly prestigious and local university and lastly, an assurance to be given that they will be transferred to the venue by certain service vehicles which will be arranged by the organizers.

It is important to note that exposing refugees to a set of questions without considering and determining the most sensitive and appropriate way of doing so may cause (further) harm and put participants in difficult situations (Krause, 2017: 4). Although our event cannot be defined as a field research, we must remind once more that it can be regarded as a field research in respect to the outcomes it yielded, including face-to-face meetings with 44 refugees plus 9 workers from Turkey and collecting information during workshops which lasted for an entire day. We also observed that the four separate meetings held with the participants before the event were effective in the sense that there were no significant ethical problem during the workshop. Through the questions refugees raised during the early meetings regarding the format of the workshop, the possible questions they were expected to answer, queries on where and for what purposes the results of the research would be used, interests and identity of the parties (both universities) involved, including those who organized the event, the participants and researchers, the research solely on refugees was gradually transformed into a research conducted by and with the refugees. Leaning (2001) points out that the most complex challenge arises with the principles of beneficence—in whose interest this research is being done, and who would benefit from the results.

Because of the mobility and fluidity of many refugee populations, especially at times of acute crisis, it is difficult to design a study that has much realistic chance of conferring benefit to the specific individuals enrolled. In the very beginning, the study participants have to be made to understand that they are agreeing not only to enter a study that has some risks (the intervention might not be as good as the control) but also to undergo something that might not give them any benefit (Leaning, 2001: 1433).

Many authors (Ellis, et al. 2007; MacLean, et al. 2009; Pittaway, et al. 2010) also point out the importance of collaborative and participatory methods which are proposed as a potentially appropriate way to address some of the ethical issues that are raised in research involving marginalized and disenfranchized groups (Block, et.al. 2013). Hynes (2003: 13) states that in case newly arrived refugees do not know about the details of the research and are not being informed about the results, distrust may be exacerbated. Similarly, interviewing refugees for the sake of academic research raises a number of ethical considerations as structures of power, real or perceived, need to be borne in mind. Inequalities of political rights, economic positions, psychosocial positions, gender and other social and cultural factors between the researcher and the researched require attention. However, Baycan (2003) rightly points out the fact that refugees might also consider that researchers have a particular perception of who a refugee is and how they should behave. Refugees might feel the need to demonstrate or point out their resilience that they are not someone to be pitied, or at the end of a 'charity approach' or be 'labelled as vulnerable' or a 'victim' (Hynes, 2003:14). Indeed, one must keep in mind that overemphasizing the issue of 'vulnerability' may lead refugees see themselves as 'victims' rather than the subjects who possibly can become more powerful after having an agency to change their lives, especially when they organize and act collectively. Eventually, most of refugee researches mainly aim to empower them to fight for their lives rather than providing material aids.

On the other hand, refugees are quite often glad to tell their histories to researchers, particularly if they have politicized the experience and recognize it in a political context. In fact, it has been argued that the telling of their stories, or 'bearing witness' actually assists in this process (cf, Hynes, 2003:14).

Where ethical guidelines are taken into consideration, undercover researches are often found to be too strict to be applied to fieldworks. Krause (2017: 8) precisely states that the concept of undercover research entails that researchers neglect to identify themselves as such, but collect data secretly or 'undercover'. Hence, research subjects are neither asked about their participation nor informed about the purpose of the research or manners of data use. In this context, we must highlight that our project was not an 'undercover' research as participants were informed about the purpose of research or manners of data both prior to and during the workshop. Although researcher GY behaved as a labour activist when she was working with Syrians, she didn't hide her academic identity from the participants.

How did we convince the Syrian refugees for voluntary participation? Recognizing the complex dimensions of research ethics, Guillemin and Gillam (2004) distinguish between 'procedural ethics', which involves formal processes of gaining consent through ethics committees, and 'ethics in practice', which involves responding to the everyday issues that can arise in the processes of research (Block, et.al. 2013). Over the past years, informed consent forms have become widely debated and accepted as part of a code of conduct for scholars and a standard tool in fieldwork in medical and social science to prove voluntary and informed participation of interviewees (Brounéus, 2011: 150; Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007: 42-43). It is widely argued that informed consent consists of three main features: participants must (1) receive information about the research to (2) adequately understand what they are agreeing to, and (3) be able and free to decide to participate. Similarly, standardized consent forms (Ellis, et al. 2007) aim to certify that participants possess sufficient knowledge about the research project, use of data, their rights, and their voluntary participation in order for them to weigh the benefits and disadvantages and to decide about their contributions (cf. Krause, 2017: 10). Also, for Birman (2005:165), informed consent procedures conducted by research teams can help them to educate the communities they study and prevent unethical practices. Some of the organizations that refugees encounter do not follow the kind of ethical standards that are adhered to by the university researchers. Thus, refugees may have had experiences that lead them to distrust researchers, questionnaires and any assurances of confidentiality. But as our study targeted Syrian refugees, the most vulnerable group in Turkey who have been exposed to extremely harsh political restrictions in the society, any request for a written consent form these people would be very risky for it would be a step to prevent their participation from the outset.⁹ Pittaway and Bartolomei (2013: 157) expressed: '[i]nformed consent is a joke when there is no food, no proper interpreters to read the legalistic forms we take. No security [...] sometimes it makes me feel sick to have to ask people' (cf. Krause, 2017: 10).

Also for Czymoniewicz-Klippel et al. (2010) the processes of obtaining consent that involve providing written explanations and consent forms are inappropriate for populations or individuals who are likely to have low literacy rates, or may be reluctant to sign documents (cf. Block, et al., 2013). Instead, we visited participants in their own premises and learned that they had some apprehensions and did not want their names and pictures appear in the press, media or later publications. Thus, a topic that was first highlighted in the talks with faculty members, assistants and students, based on their experiences, was also confirmed by the participants themselves in the field. Hence, they were not asked to give a written and signed consent regarding their participation,

⁹Birman (2005: 166) argues that informed consent procedures can also discourage members of communities from participating in research projects for a variety of reasons. The need to sign informed consent forms takes away the possibility of anonymous participation and may create great fears about loss of confidentiality. Studies (Howard-Jones, 1982) have shown that research participants perceive the informed consent process as intended to protect the researcher rather than the participant (Birman, 2005:166).

although an informative note aiming to address most of the questions in their mind was prepared and given to them.

Confidentiality is vital for protecting both the identities of and information provided by research participants. It appears that researchers in refugee and IDP settings have often forgotten the capacity that their work might have to cause unintended harm to participants through inappropriate disclosure of identities or other personal information that to the researchers might have appeared innocuous. For example, stories or photographs identifying individuals in documents may become known in the original context, despite being published in another country or another language (Beauchamp and Childress, 2001; Mackenzie, et al. 2007; cf. Pittaway, et al. 2015: 234). Thus, it is crucial to take into consideration all these aspects when anonymizing data to guarantee the safety of the participants. That is precisely why we banned taking photographs, blocked the participation of media and press into the event and committed to them that their names will not be published to fulfill the wishes of participants.

The question about financial or material reimbursement also polarizes and provokes wide-ranging debates among scholars. On the one hand, financial benefits can create bias because participants may feel obligated to answer questions in a particular way. Offering favours may also put researchers in a powerful position superior to those collecting them, a possible handover to 'those in need'. On the other hand, participants travel distances and take time to support the research when they cannot work which must financially be met (Ruppenthal, et al. 2005, cf. Krause, 2017:16; Temple and Moran, 2011; Marmo, 2013; Vervliet, et al. 2015). The ethical considerations of the Canadian Council for Refugees similarly declare its principle for 'Fair Return for Assistance: While financial compensation can be offered for people's time and/or child care and/or transportation costs in order to remove barriers to participation, it should be proportionate and reasonable' (Kazak, 2017: 12). In our project, financial reimbursement or daily allowance was also one of the most important motivations for Syrian participants; when they heard in the first four meetings that they would fairly be reimbursed, their eagerness to participate was apparent. However, it is equally important to underline the fact that those who took part in the first four 'informal' meetings would not necessarily be the same as those who were available to attend the workshop, because both had their respective working conditions and individual difficulties of obtaining paid or unpaid leave. In fact, this issue was clearly stated by the Syrian women and men themselves during the first meetings. When they were asked whether this may cause any tension at the workshop between those available and those not, they noted that they have already been living in a sort of solidarity by adding that per diem allowances will be shared among the members of each community. Surprisingly, we witnessed that none of the participants seemed uncomfortable with this conclusion. Although it is not easy to say precisely about the reasons for this, one may take extremely severe living conditions as the reason of this solidarity-based lifestyle.

Refugees constantly approach researchers seeking assistance for themselves or their family, providing what is often compelling evidence of malpractice or neglect in the systems of protection that govern their lives. Sometimes refugees take considerable risk to raise these concerns, as many camp authorities will punish refugees after the researchers have left for perceived breaches of confidence (Pittaway, et al. 2015: 232). Research rarely directly benefits individual respondents. This needs to be clearly explained to people in situations of forced migration, so that they do not participate only in the hope that their participation will bring direct material, legal, or other benefits (Kazak, 2017: 13). Indeed, some male and female Syrians approached GY seeking assistance for their personal problems. Raised questions at these moments were mostly related with their personal capacity to work or access in public health provision or education of their children or possibilities (if any?) to go to one of the European countries. Instead, giving concrete answer to these individual questions, they were told by GY that the workshop itself is the best venue to share their stories freely and enable the Project team to convey their problems to official authorities.

The desire of the refugees themselves to have their 'stories' told to the international community can outweigh considerations of potential danger to themselves and their communities (Pittaway et al. 2015: 233). Community leaders and those familiar with the language, social systems and culture in these settings may exert tight control through their ability to offer patronage to some researchers (Ebbs, 1996, cf. Pittaway, et al. 2015: 233). This poses both practical and philosophical problems, in that researchers may be asked to compromise their methodology, or participants may not be giving genuinely voluntary consent. At the same time, however, without such patronage access may be impossible. This is often exacerbated by the non-governmental organization (NGO) gatekeepers, who control access to community leaders. These particular leaders have a vested interest in ensuring that the NGOs who validate their power are protected from negative research outcomes (Pittaway, et al. 2015: 233). In our case, the founder of OkmeydanıGöç-Der was also a worker who attended the workshop under the category of Turkish workers. The leader of the other group from Fatih district was a young Syrian man, a university graduate, who spoke English fluently unlike other group members. But there was no patronage effect in the early informal meetings or during workshop as the refugees could freely express themselves and as there was a strong mutual trust and friendship between the founders of Göç-Der and the Fatih group and those refugee members of both associations.

No doubt that central to any study on refugees is the issue of trust. As Daniel and Knudsen (1995) point out 'the refugee mistrusts and is mistrusted' and it is important to elaborate on this statement by exploring why and who refugees mistrust and why and by whom refugees are mistrusted at each phase of forced migration (Hynes, 2003: 1). As Fink (2001) suggests, the 'culture of mistrust' is said to 'have characterized not only the military regime but, in many cases, the opposition groups as well'. Upon arrival, a refugee may 'mistrust everybody they encounter', including members of their so-called community. Refugee

community organisations may have much to offer individuals when they are attempting to rebuild their lives and reconstitute trust but even here trust is not a given (Hynes, 2003: 1, 4 and 7). Emmanuel Marx (1990), in his research on social networks, puts forward the idea that there is a 'boundless social universe' of social networks that need constantly to be borne in mind when researching the lives of refugees. His paper suggests that there is also a boundless universe of mistrust that needs consideration when conducting research with refugees, much of which will remain unknown to the researcher:

'This does not mean that research should not be carried out; rather the researcher needs to be aware of the layer upon layer of mistrust that is a product of the refugee experience. Neither does this mean that the information received from refugees during the course of research is not accurate. What this does mean is that the researcher, the 'outsider', must be aware of mutual mistrust that may exist between the person being interviewed, the country of asylum and the mistrust that permeates exile communities as explained earlier. As researchers we need to consider our approach at many levels. We need to choose whether we research for, on or with refugees (cf, Hynes, 2003:14).

The risks of asymmetries in power between researchers and research participants have also long been noted. Bourdieu, in his essay entitled 'Understanding' (1996), suggests that research may inflict 'symbolic violence' through misunderstanding or misrepresenting research participants. Potential for misrepresentation arises through the difficulties of communicating when researchers and research subjects occupy different positions within social structures. Accordingly, the most disempowered participants are the most vulnerable to being subjected to symbolic violence through research (Block, et al. 2013).

'It is the investigator who starts the game and who sets up its rules: it is most often she who, unilaterally and without any preliminary negotiations, assigns to the interview its objectives and uses, and on occasion these may be poorly specified—at least for the respondent. This asymmetry is underlined by a social asymmetry which occurs every time the investigator occupies a higher place in the social hierarchy' (Bourdieu, 1996, cf. Block, et al. 2013).

Here, we must also point out one distinctive aspect of our work that unlike field researches based on one-to-one interviews with individuals, not only in the workshop but also in the four preliminary meetings with Syrians, each refugee had a chance to hear the questions and answers of others. We clearly observed that this way can easily motivate people to talk to those who do not speak, or to ask questions for those who are shy to ask question which is something hard to do in a field research. This was also very helpful to remove invisible hierarchical walls based on the different social statutes of the researcher and participants so that soon after many refugees started to ask questions or to comment on topics and preliminary meetings turned to chats rather than formal gatherings.

When jointly conceptualizing research, refugees must have an influential role. Either based on specific previously developed research questions and aims or with an overall subject in mind, scholars consult with refugees on the way forward, which may include specifying issues to be analyzed, whom to speak with and how to do that (manner and methodical approach) and where to go. Research processes are therefore designed in cooperation. For such endeavors, scholars need time, must know the context and people well already, and have built trusting relationships. Moreover, those who are part of the team effort need to have knowledge about academic work. Due to their influential roles, it is important to ensure that consulting groups are well balanced and include people from different backgrounds to prevent biases and harm (Krause, 2017: 21). Both moderators and experts who organized and run workshop activities with fishbowl technique joined Skype conference which was held by the Project coordinator two months before the workshop. Details of the Skype conference was discussed in Chapter 1 and how the workshop day and fishbowl event was organized will be elaborated in the next section. When it comes to Syrian and Turkish refugees, although they knew the aim and Project institutions in general when they came to the workshop they were very surprised with the format (fishbowl and few beginning dramas) and found it highly inclusive and enjoyable.

Transferring research findings for practical application aims to influence developments and processes in humanitarian refugee aid in a way that marginalized people - in this case displaced persons - can receive better protection and have improved living conditions. From a normative or moral perspective, it could even be argued that social scientists have the obligation to share research results outside their academic circle and contribute to improvements (Krause, 2017: 23). How to address the dual necessities so that our work can both be academically rigorous and relevant to policy? Though many see these demands as mutually exclusive, as social scientists are trained in logical argument and methodological rigor, these styles of work can provide a solid empirical basis for policy and advocacy efforts. Indeed, this is the kind of research on which policy should be based. Effective and ethical research requires that employed methodologies need to be sound and explicitly recognize and criticize the limits and strengths of adopted approaches to generate both data and the conclusions drawn from them (Jacobsen and Landau, 2003: 2). Our decision to share the entire preparation process through this paper and also the comprehensive report written by Tolga Tören which was published by ICDD¹⁰ is based on our common goal to convey the findings of the workshop to policymakers both in Turkey and in Germany with the hope of reaching any possible improvement in the working and living conditions of Syrians in both countries. These papers are also manifestations that we did our best for not bypassing a basic research ethic as we declared that this workshop is expected to be political reflections aimed to improve their working and living conditions

¹⁰ Documentation Report: Syrian Refugees in the Turkish Labour Market by Tolga Tören <https://www.upress.uni-kassel.de/katalog/abstract.php?978-3-7376-0450-5>

when we responded to the questions asked in the first two meetings with Syrian refugees in their own premises.

Common wish of social scientists to influence refugee policy through their research gives rise to questions such as, are the analysis and conclusions based on sound principles of descriptive and causal inference and robust data collection practices? King (1995) and Ragin (1994) state that refugee research employs a wide range of quantitative and qualitative techniques, from personal case histories to large-scale surveys. Regardless of the methodology employed, good scholarship demands that researchers reveal and explain their methods (Jacobsen and Landau, 2003: 2). One of the most significant questions appears with regard to the reliability of the data collected from the field which in our case was prepared as an environment free from any exclusion, oppression and/or discrimination in order to receive the most possible reliable answers. It was equally important for us to make them feel a friendly and relaxed environment which would be hard to achieve in a workshop full with Turkish and European researchers and academics. To reach this goal, we achieved to involve Turkish workers as well by considering that a sort of class brotherhood may develop instead of hostility based on national differences. Not surprisingly, ease behaviours shown by their Turkish counterparts motivated Syrian workers to express their problems dauntlessly.

In spite of existing challenges, it is apparent that providing feedback is important. In addition to receiving reports, those attending discussions can act as multipliers to inform members of communities about the results. Working with multipliers can be necessary when a great number of people participated in research who cannot be informed individually. In these group discussions, the meaning of findings for communities can be deliberated so that it is not only about scholars informing participants about 'their' results but rather for communities and scholars to speak about them and perhaps discuss ways in which they can be useful (Krause, 2017: 25). We think that a follow-up meeting which has not been held yet is our most basic weakness at present. On the other hand, this significant drawback may still be overcome with a follow-up meeting, as we still have access to a significant portion of the Syrian refugees who participated in the workshop.

3. FISHBOWL ACTIVITY ¹¹

In this section, we aim to show how fishbowl day was organized. With the help of the two well-prepared moderators, we successfully managed the entire day. In the beginning of the day, participants were first asked to stand up and join into a series of games which were organized by the moderators. It was observed that the main goal of these games was to reduce the prejudices of participants against each other generated from the fact that they might have different national belongings and religious affiliations.¹² The next was the distribution of small notes composed by a number of questions on age, job (previous in Syria and actual one), sex, etc., that participants were asked to give written answers. The problem we encountered at this stage mainly came from the fact that we did not tell the moderators that these short notes and questions should be translated into Arabic beforehand. Luckily beside two translators we hired we had also two Syrian participants who had good command of English that they helped others to understand and answer these questions. All written answers were translated into English from Arabic later by these two Syrian participants in return of a reasonable fee. We must also note that together with the results of the fishbowl activity, this stage also was very helpful in terms of the results we achieved for it gave us an opportunity to make a comprehensive report just like a field research.

Following the collection of the written answers, we had a coffee break before starting fishbowl. We surprisingly observed that Syrians and Turkish workers got started to talk with the help of interpreters probably owing to the games they had played earlier in the morning. Also, Syrians who had very limited communication before the first coffee break were conversing in a heated manner. Now, the psychological infrastructure, needed to start the Fishbowl activity had also been formed.

In some definitions, fishbowl is a teaching strategy involving a small group of students/participants sitting in a circle surrounded by a circle comprising the rest of the class. After all participants have read the text, the group in the inside circle discusses the text while those in the outside circle listen. After a brief discussion, the ones in the inside can switch with others from the outside for a continuing of the discussion (Hurst and Pearman, 2013: 229). For UNICEF (2015: 1), the fishbowl method requires a facilitator to allow direct conversations with experts, as a means of providing noteworthy participants with a prominent platform while still maintaining interactivity, or for discussing controversial issues that people may feel strongly about. Nick Martin (2018) also points out that a fishbowl technique used to help a large group of people reach a common understanding on a set of issues or proposal and increase their feeling of participation in a relatively short amount of time.

¹¹ In these sections, Zeynep Ekin's notes are used. Authors would like thank Zeynep Ekin who is a GLU Alumni.

¹² Any question regarding their religious affiliations was avoided as this is quite a sensitive issue, even the main reason for the civil war in Syria.

During our last day event, the workshop was structured with the participation of only the Syrian and Turkish citizens while the audience and press were not allowed to interrupt or ask any questions. The workshop organizing team took the notes in detail by documenting the discussed issues. Sinem Bayraktar from Development Workshop and Kamil Orhan from Pamukkale University were the facilitators of the workshop. One of GLU Alumni Turkey, Zeynep Ekin, who had proposed fishbowl to the organizing team and had contacted with the facilitators, undertook the role of moderator in the second session of the game. Since Syrian participants were composed of women and men working mostly in the textile sector, between the ages of 20–50, migrating from Aleppo and Damascus, the gender balance was also born in mind for the facilitation.

The fishbowl technique was preferred for managing the group discussion in the workshop. This special technique is an alternative to the traditional open discussion in which only a few people are active while the rest of the participants are isolated to just listen without any opportunity to interrupt. Rather, the fishbowl technique is used to have a participatory discussion giving an opportunity to everyone to become an active participant. This technique is useful for ventilating controversial or hot topics or sharing ideas or information from a variety of perspectives,¹³ avoiding lengthy speeches (OHCHR, 2017).

Alongside the advantages of fishbowl technique, one of the major obstacles for the organizing team and facilitators was the language barrier. This workshop could have been more effectively carried out if the facilitators could speak Arabic. Although the simultaneous translation was provided, this warm atmosphere was required to speak in Arabic without the needed translation. Another major problem was that the facilitators did not have enough knowledge about the labour side of the Syrian refugee issue. This problem could have been removed if the organizing team had a chance to reach a person who had capability of being a facilitator in fishbowl technique and was knowledgeable about the process of integration of Syrians into the labour market and the existing labour policies in Turkey. Simon (2003: 1) points out that the workshop coordinator or organizing committee members should be familiar with all the steps before moving forward.

When it comes to the question of how this technique was effective in achieving results even better than field researches, we must remind readers that questions prepared and asked by organizers motivated participants not only for discussing the given issues but also for raising new questions and giving new information. Their statements at the fishbowl workshop manifested that Syrian refugees have been facing difficulties to enter the labour market mainly because of the legal requirement for work permit. Because of the difficulties with the legal procedures with regards to work permit and identity cards, many of them had to accept work under vulnerable situations illegally without social security as being underpaid and with long working hours. Apart from the problems in their legal status, the main barrier for their integration to better living and working conditions is the language barrier. They are having problems with expressing their issues to local

¹³<http://www.betterevaluation.org/en/evaluation-options/fishbowltechnique>

authorities or take action and therefore it makes harder to reach the basic necessities and public services. This also reflects on the problems they face in housing, access to education, health, social welfare.

Based on the statements from Turkish workers, it was also noticed that some of the workers consider the problems of the refugees as a systematic problem that Turkish people could also have in the future. Additionally, they expressed that Turkish workers and Syrian workers have common problems in relation to employment conditions and finding decent jobs. While the focus at the workshop was sharing the experiences on working and living conditions in Turkey, Turkish workers mostly provided result-oriented suggestions to the situation of Syrian refugees. They have shared suggestions. Some of the main suggestions were the empowerment of international solidarity, government, trade unions, NGOs and employer associations who should work together; there should be decent, legal and guaranteed conditions for people in Turkey; legal frameworks should be re-regulated for Syrian and Turkish workers and there should be language cohesion with the opening of Turkish and Arabic courses.

At the end of the fishbowl workshop, a brief information session was held on the local NGOs, international organizations and public services that provide support on education, health, human right and legal issues for refugees. As it was noticed, many of them were unfamiliar of the work that have been done with all these organizations and institutions and showed great interest. Furthermore, based on the questions of the moderators it was noted that very few of the Syrian participants (only 4 in 44) were benefiting for government assistances.

4. CONCLUSION REMARKS

In this study, we aimed to share information with readers on how we organized a workshop including also its preparation process which was organized and run to understand the working conditions of Syrian refugees in Turkey step by step. International organizations, especially ILO and UN, produce quite valuable papers to guide voluntary and non-binding principles and improve the living and working conditions not only for Syrian refugees but all migrant populations.¹⁴ Few of the most emphasized principles in these texts are non-discrimination (UN, 2019: 5), being managed under equal and fair rules (ILO, 2016: 4) and providing facilities for the migrant workers to learn the language of the host country (ILO, 2016: 3; ILO, 2018). But unfortunately, this important work doesn't see the attention and interest it deserves especially in developing countries practicing deep political and economic crisis like Turkey. Indeed, one of the most visible and tangible outputs of the workshop that we would like to emphasize, for example, was the extremely low number of Syrian participants (only four in total 44) who reported that they benefited from government assistance. Similarly, despite all these voluntary guiding principles that attached priority on language courses, communication with the Syrian participants required translators, as none of them were able to speak or understand Turkish. Admittedly, this case can be explained through the reasons that either the number of Syrian refugees in Turkey is much higher compared to other countries or that providing language courses for millions of Syrians within only a few years seem to be impossible. However, in the face of the facts that the workshop was held in a metropolitan city where the Syrian population was most intense and that participants were randomly selected in three different districts via three different NGOs, none of the 44 Syrians know Turkish even at the lowest level and this shows that there are other structural problems that requires attention.

Although we initially did not anticipate, our event turned nearly to a field research in terms of both achieved results and also the mixed methods we employed during the workshop. As one of the research methods, face-to-face interviewing is a costly and time-consuming tool (Kelley, et al. 2003: 262). Despite the fact that our workshop with the Syrian refugees took only a single day, we successfully organized in-depth interviews with many of them during the day. Besides interviewing, we also distributed those written questionnaires. In this manner, it did not become a time- or fund-consuming activity. Indeed, despite participants were paid per-diem for the entire four days,¹⁵ and also translators

¹⁴ See Guiding principles on the access of refugees and other forcibly displaced persons to the labour market, ILO The Tripartite Technical Meeting on 5-7 July 2016 in Geneva https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_protect/---protrav/---migrant/documents/genericdocument/wcms_536440.pdf; or The ILO Response to the Syrian Refugee Crisis: https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---exrel/documents/publication/wcms_357159.pdf or the UN Global Compact : https://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/73/195

¹⁵ Syrian and Turkish workers were also paid for their participation in previous three meetings at their premises

were hired full time for fishbowl day the total cost of the participation of Syrian and Turkish workers was considerably low with only 15% of the project budget.

As inexperienced organizers, we encountered with troubles as well to some extent. Also because of the fact that we as GLU Turkey Alumnis were working and living in different provinces of Turkey, we had difficulty to meet periodically to discuss different aspects of regional meeting. We did our best to overcome this problem via Skype meetings. Another critical issue was that we had to find the best interpreters on one hand but they must accept to work in return for the lowest prices on the other because of budgetary limits. We all knew how much interpretation was vital for such a workshop. As a result, we had to spend most part of the time that was given to us to find interpreters who met these criteria.

The third problem was that the sponsor institution (ICDD) was very far from where the event took place (Turkey). If for example, the sponsoring institution had an office in Istanbul, before the event we would probably have more meetings than what we originally had with ICDD staffs. Alongside the advantages of fishbowl technique, one of the major obstacles for the organizing team and facilitators was again the language barrier. This workshop could have been more effectively carried out if the facilitators could speak Arabic. Although simultaneous translation was provided, this warm atmosphere was required to speak in Arabic without the needed translation. Simon (2003: 1) points out that the workshop coordinator or organizing committee members should be familiar with all steps before moving forward.

Another major problem was that the facilitators did not have enough knowledge about the labour side of the Syrian refugee issue. This problem could have been removed if the organizing team had chance to reach a person who had capability of being the facilitator in the fishbowl technique and was knowledgeable about the process of integration of Syrians into the labour market and existing labour policies in Turkey. However, this obstacle was hard to overcome since many labour policy experts in Turkey do not know the fishbowl technique.

We think that a follow-up meeting, which has not been held, yet is our most basic weakness at present. On the other hand, this significant drawback may still be overcome with a follow-up meeting, as we still have access to a significant portion of the Syrian refugees who participated in the workshop.

The gains of the event, on the other, can be summarized as follows. As we pointed out before as well the entire programme became an incredible learning process for GLU-Alumnis in Turkey. Indeed, we must confess that none of us (GLU Alumnis Turkey) were familiar or experienced in organizing and/or coordinating a workshop. Thus, this workshop turned to be a learning process both for the organizers and coordinator who are all GLU-Turkey Alumnis.

We have also seen that developing country organizations and universities need to think about organizing more workshops besides allocating large funds and spending longer time for refugee field researches. For example, while conducting a nationwide field survey on Syrian workers, more than two years and a budget of

hundred thousand Euros is required; instead, if workshops are organized in every city where Syrians are settled, the time taken will be much shorter and the cost lower. Local workshops may also become more preferable as they allow a more detailed picture.

Based on the findings we reached from the fishbowl workshop, some suggestions could be made for future researches and projects in this area. As it is described in the previous section, Syrian refugees have a lack of information regarding the supports, aids and guidance for the problems they face during their stay in Turkey. Not every Syrian refugee has the same conditions to access government supports and what prevents them to have the same access in order to improve their living and working conditions needs to be studied in detail. Furthermore, as the participants showed great interest on the brief information that was provided on the fishbowl workshop, it should be noted that it is not only to provide services and support but also to show them how to gain access and improve their access to these supports. Even though there are many projects and funding for overcoming the difficulties that refugees face, they should be provided with training activities or informatory sessions that would inform and guide refugees to reach these supports, services and their rights. It also means that the availability and reachability of service and support of the public institutions and local NGOs also depend on their capacity. In order to strengthen and keep access to these institutions sustainable, it also requires policies and implementations to improve their capacity.

The last but not the least is that unlike field research, workshops provide an opportunity to bring the local people and refugees together, getting rid of prejudices and establishing solidarity bridges between natives and refugees.

5. REFERENCES

- Agier, M. (2011): *Managing the Undesirables. Refugee Camps and Humanitarian Government*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bahcekapili, C., and B. Cetin. (2015): The Impacts of Forced Migration on Regional Economies: the Case of Syrian Refugees in Turkey, *International Business Research*, 8(9).
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282390174_The_Impacts_of_Forced_Migration_on_Regional_Economies_The_Case_of_Syrian_Refugees_in_Turkey
- Bakewell. (2008): Research beyond the Categories: the Importance of Policy Irrelevant Research into Forced Migration, *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 21(4). Oxford University Press.
- Baycan, F. (2003): Deconstructing 'refugee women', in *In Exile Magazine*, Refugee Council, London.
- Beauchamp, T.J. and Childress, J.F. (2001): *Principles of Biomedical Ethics*. 5th ed. Oxford University Press.
- Birman, D., (2005): Ethical Issues in Research with Immigrants and Refugees, https://www.corwin.com/sites/default/files/upm-binaries/6063_Chapter_9__Trimble_I_Proof_3.pdf pp.155–77.
- Block, K., D. Warr, L. Gibbs and E. Riggs. (2013): Addressing Ethical and Methodological Challenges in Research with Refugee-background Young People: Reflections from the Field, *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 26(1): 69–87; <https://academic.oup.com/jrs/article/26/1/69/1559507>
- Brounéus, K. (2011): In-depth Interviewing: the Process, Skill and Ethics of Interviews in Peace Research, in K. Hoglund and M. Ober (eds), *Understanding Peace Research: Methods and Challenges*. London; New York: Routledge, pp.130–46.
- Connor, P. (2018): Most Displaced Syrians Are in the Middle East, and about a Million Are in Europe. Pew Research Center, 29 January.
<http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/01/29/where-displaced-syrians-have-resettled/>
- Crisp, J., T. Morris and H. Refstie. (2012): Displacement in Urban Areas: New Challenges, New Partnerships, *Disasters*, 36 Suppl 1, S23–42.
- Czymoniewicz-Klippel, M., Brijnath, B., Crockett, B. (2010): Ethics and the Promotion of Inclusiveness Within Qualitative Research: Case Examples From Asia and the Pacific
- Daniel, E.V. and J.C. Knudsen (eds.), (1995): *Mistrusting Refugees*, University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles and London.

- Ellis, B. H. et al. (2007): Ethical Research in Refugee Communities and the Use of Community Participatory Methods, *Transcultural Psychiatry*, 44 (3), 459-481.
- Erdoğan, M.M. (2017): Urban Refugees from “Detachment” to “Harmonization” Syrian Refugees and Process Management of Municipalities: the Case of Istanbul, The Research conducted by Migration Policy Workshop of Marmara Municipalities Union.
- Esen, O. and A. BinatlıOgus. (2017): The Impact of Syrian Refugees on the Turkish Economy: Regional Labour Market Effects, *Soc. Sci.*, 6(129); doi:10.3390/socsci6040129
- Fink, C. (2001): *Living Silence: Myanmar under Military Rule*, Zed Books, London.
- Finlay L. (2002): Negotiating the swamp: the opportunity and challenge of reflexivity in research practice. *Qualitative Research* 22, 209–230.
- Guillemin M, Gillam L. Ethics (2004): Reflexivity, and “Ethically Important Moments” in Research, *Qualitative Inquiry* , vol. 10 2pg. 261
- Hammersley, M. and P. Atkinson. (2007): *Ethnography. Principles in Practice*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Howard-Jones, N. (1982): Human experimentation in historical and ethical perspectives. *Social Science & Medicine*, 16(15), 1429–1448.
- Hugman, R., Bartolomei, L., and Pittaway, E. (2011a): Human Agency and the Meaning of Informed Consent: Reflections on Research with Refugees, *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 24 (4), 655-671.
- Hurst, B. and J. Pearman. (2013): Teach Reading? But I'm Not a Reading Teacher!, *Critical Questions in Education*, 4(3): 225–34.
- Hynes, T. (2003): The Issue of “Trust” or “Mistrust” in Research with Refugees: Choices, Caveats and Considerations for Researchers, UNHCR Working Paper No. 98.
- İçişleri Bakanlığı Göçİdaresi Genel Müdürlüğü (2017), Türkiye Göç Raporu (2016), *İçişleri Bakanlığı Göçİdaresi Genel Müdürlüğü Yayınları, Yayın No: 40*
- ILO. (2016): Guiding Principles on the Access of Refugees and Other Forcibly Displaced Persons to the Labour Market, The Tripartite Technical Meeting on the Access of Refugees and Other Forcibly Displaced Persons to the Labour Market, Geneva from 5–7 July 2016.
- ILO. (2018): The ILO Response to the Syrian Refugee Crisis, 3RP Regional, Refugee and Resilience Plan 2018-2019.
- Jacobsen, K. and B. L. Landau. (2003): The Dual Imperative in Refugee Research: Some Methodological and Ethical Considerations in Social Science Research on Forced Migration, NCBI Working Paper No.19.

- Kaygısız, I. (2017): Suriyeli Mültecilerin Türkiye İşgücü Piyasasına Etkileri, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.
- Kazak, C.C. (2017): Ethical Considerations: Research with People in Situations of Forced Migration, *The Canadian Association for Refugee and Forced Migration Studies*; <https://refuge.journals.yorku.ca/index.php/refuge/article/view/40467/36453>
- Kelley, K., B. Clark, V. Brown and J. Sitzia. (2003): Face to Face Interviewing Is a Costly and Time Consuming Tool, *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, 15(3): 261–66.
- King, G. (1995): Replication, Replication. PS: Political Science and Politics. (September 1995: 444-451.
- Kirişçi, K. (2014): Syrian Refugees and Turkey's Challenges: Going Beyond Hospitality; <https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Syrian-Refugees-and-Turkeys-Challenges-May-14-2014.pdf>
- Krause, U. (2015): A Continuum of Violence? Linking Sexual and Gender-based Violence during Conflict, Flight, and Encampment, *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 34(4): 1–19.
- Krause, U. (2017): Researching Forced Migration: Critical Reflections on Research Ethics during Fieldwork, Refugee Studies Center, Oxford Working Paper Series No.123.
- Leaning, J. (2001): Ethics of Research in Refugee Populations, *Lancet*, 357(9266):1432–3.
- Mackenzie, C., McDowell, C., and Pittaway, E. (2007): Beyond 'Do No Harm': The Challenge of Constructing Ethical Relationships in Refugee Research, *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 20 (2), 299-319
- MacLean, S., Warr, D. and Pyett, P. (2009): Was it Good for You Too? Impediments to Conducting University-based Collaborative Research with Communities Experiencing Disadvantage. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health* 33(5): 407–412.
- Malkki, H.L., (1995): Refugees and Exile: From "Refugee Studies" to the National Order of Things, *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.*, 24: 495–523.
- Marmo, M. (2013): The Ethical Implications of the Researcher's Dominant Position in Cross-Cultural Refugee Research, in Karen Block, Elisha Riggs, and Nick Haslam (eds.), *Values and Vulnerabilities. The Ethics of Research with Refugees and Asylum Seekers* (Toowong: Australian Academic Press), 85102.
- Martin, N. (2018): Fishbowl Discussion; <https://workshopbank.com/fishbowl-discussion>, accessed on 5 August 2018.

- Okay A.S. (2017): Labour Market Integration of Syrian Refugees in Germany and Turkey: Challenges and Prospects, Global Turkey in Europe Working Paper 18; http://www.iai.it/sites/default/files/gte_wp_18.pdf
- Orsam, T. (2015): Effects of the Syrian Refugees on Turkey, Report No: 195; http://tesev.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Effects_Of_The_Syrian_Refugees_On_Turkey.pdf
- Pittaway, E., L. Bartolomei, and R. Hugman. (2010): Stop Stealing Our Stories: the Ethics of Research with Vulnerable Groups, Centre for Refugee Research School of Social Sciences and International Studies University of New South Wales Sydney NSW 2052 Australia.
- Pittaway E; Bartolomei LA. (2013): Doing Ethical Research: Whose problem is it anyway?, in Block K; Riggs E; Haslam N (ed.), Values and Vulnerabilities: The Ethics of Research with Refugees and Asylum Seekers, edn. 1st, Australian Academic Press, Toowong QLD, pp. 151 - 170,
- Ragin, C. (1994): Constructing Social Research. Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press.
- Reed, H. (2002): Research Ethics in Complex Humanitarian Emergencies: Summary of a Workshop. National Research Council Roundtable on the Demography of Eileen Pittaway, Linda Bartolomei and Richard Hugman 250 Forced Migration, Committee on Population. Washington: National Academy Press.
- Ruppenthal, L., Tuck, J., and Gagnon, A. J. (2005): Enhancing Research With Migrant Women Through Focus Groups, Western Journal of Nursing Research, 27 (6), 735-754.
- Simon, H.J. (2003): How to Coordinate and Host a Successful Workshop or How Not To Get Lost in the Detail, Region X Interpreter Education Center in the Regional Resource Center on Deafness at Western Oregon University
- Temple, Bogusia, and Rhetta Moran, eds. (2011): Doing Research with Refugees: Issues and Guidelines. Bristol: Policy
- Tören, T. (2018): Documentation Report: Syrian Refugees in the Turkish Labour Market; <https://www.upress.uni-kassel.de/katalog/abstract.php?978-3-7376-0450-5>
- Trimble, E.J. and B.C. Fisher. (2005): *The Handbook of Ethical Research with Ethnocultural Populations and Communities*. Sage Publications.
- Turner, S. (2016): What Is a Refugee Camp? Explorations of the Limits and Effects of the Camp, *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 29(2): 139–48.
- UN. (2019): Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration, Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 19 December 2018.

- UNHCR. (2006): The UNHCR Tool for Participatory Assessment in Operations;
<http://www.unhcr.org/publications/legal/450e963f2/unhcr-tool-participatory-assessment-operations.html>
- United Nations Human Right Office of the High Commissioner (OHCHR). (2017):
Fishbowl The Art of Active Listening;
<http://slitoolkit.ohchr.org/data/downloads/fishbowl.pdf>
- UNHCR Global Appeal (2008-2009): <http://www.unhcr.org/474ac8e60.pdf>
- UNHCR. (2010): Convention and Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees,
<https://cms.emergency.unhcr.org/documents/11982/55726/Convention+relating+to+the+Status+of+Refugees+%28signed+28+July+1951%2C+entered+into+force+22+April+1954%29+189+UNTS+150+and+Protocol+relating+to+the+Status+of+Refugees+%28signed+31+January+1967%2C+entered+into+force+4+October+1967%29+606+UNTS+267/0bf3248a-cfa8-4a60-864d-65cdfce1d47>
- UNHCR. (2018): Most Displaced Syrians Are in the Middle East, and about a Million Are in Europe; <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/01/29/where-displaced-syrians-have-resettled/>
- UNICEF. (2015): Maximizing Participation in Direct Conversations with Experts, Fishbowl/Tools/UNICEF KE Toolbox; https://www.unicef.org/knowledge-exchange/files/Fishbowl_production.pdf
- Vervliet, M. et al. (2015): Multilayered Ethics in Research Involving Unaccompanied Refugee Minors, *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 28 (4), 468-485.
- Yu, E. S. H., & Lieu, W. T. (1986): Methodological Problems and Policy Implications in Vietnamese Refugee Research. *International Migration Review*, 20(2), 483–502.

6. ANNEXURE

REGIONAL WORKSHOP ON SYRIAN REFUGEES AND INTEGRATION OF SYRIANS

10–13 February 2017 Boğaziçi University, Istanbul

PROGRAMME

Who is involved?

- Bogazici University Centre for Educational Policy Studies (BEPAM), the hosting organization.
- International Center for Development and Decent Work (ICDD) at the University of Kassel, initiator of the workshop.
- German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD), the funder.
- Global Labour University Alumni Network in Turkey, responsible for the organization of the workshop.
- Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung Turkey Office
- Speakers: You can see the list of name in below.

1.DAY

10 February 2017 Friday Bogazici University, New Hall 001, North Campus

9:00-09:30-Register

09:30-10:30

Opening Speeches

Prof. Dr. Christoph Scherrer, University of Kassel

Dr. Meral Apak, Bogazici University– BEPAM

Global Labour University (GLU) Turkey Alumni Representative

General Overview of the Current Status of Syrian Refugees in Turkey

I.Session: The situation of the labour market in Turkey after the Syrian crisis

Moderator: Prof. Dr. SeyhanErdoğan, Ankara University

Doç. Dr. Murat Erdoğan, Hacettepe University Migration and Politics Research Centre, "TürkİşDünyasıveMülteciler: "Kalkınmacılık" mı, "Kontrolsüzlük" mü?" (En: Turkish Business and Refugees: "Developmentalist "or"Uncontrolled"?)

10:30-11.00 Coffee Break

11:00-12:00 I.Session: The situation of the labour market in Turkey after the Syrian crisis continues

Yrd. Doç. Polat Alpman, Yalova University, "Sınıf, Kimlik ve Göçmenlik: Piyasalaşmış Savaşları İzleme Kılavuzu" (En: Class, Identity and Immigration: Guide to Watching the Marketed Wars)

İrfan Kaygısız, United Metalworkers' Union, "Suriyeli Mültecilerin Emek Piyasasına Etkileri" (En: The Effect of Syrian Refugees on the Labor Market)

12:00-13:00 Lunch

13:00 -15:00 II. Session: Reflections of Precarization on Different Sectors in Labour Market

Moderator: Dr. Gaye Yılmaz, GLU Alumni

Ergün İleri, DISK/ Textile Workers Union, "Güvencesizliğe Karşı İşçi Sınıfının Ortak Mücadelesi" (En: Joint Struggle of the Working Class against Precariousness)

Doç. Dr. Saniye Dedeoğlu, Mugla University, "Türkiye İşgücü Piyasasında Güvencesizleşme Dinamikleri: Suriyeli Tarım İşçileri Örneği" (En: Dynamics of Precarization in the Turkish Labor Market: Syrian Agricultural Workers' Case)

Doç. Dr. Selmin Kaşka, Marmara University, "İstanbul'da Göçmenler Nerede, Niçin Çalışıyor?" (En: Where are the immigrants in Istanbul and why do they work?)

Bilge Seçkin Çetinkaya, "Ölümle Kalım Arasında: Uluslararası Markaların Tedarik Zincirinde Çalışan Suriyeli Göçmen İşçiler" (En: Live on the Razor's Edge: Syrian Migrant Workers in the Supply Chain of International Brands)

15:00-15:30 Coffee Break

15:30-17:30 III. Session: Labour Migration Policies in Turkey: Situation of Refugees in Turkish Labour Market

Moderator: Dr. Tolga Tören, GLU Alumni

İsmail Doğa Karatepe, University of Kassel, "Syrian Refugees and Turkey's Labour Market: the State and Capital Perspective"

Bilge Pınar Yenigün, GLU Alumni, "Türkiye İşgücü Piyasasında Suriyeli Mülteciler: Yasal Çerçeve ve Mevcut Durum" (En: Syrian Refugees in the Turkish Labor Market: Legal Framework and Current Situation)

Gizem Demirci Al Kadah, The Association for Solidarity with Asylum Seekers and Migrants, "İş Piyasasına Erişimde Yaşanan Zorluklar" (En: Challenges of Accessing the Job Market)

Alp Biricik, Human Resource Development Foundation, "Suriyeli Mültecilerin Çalışma Hayatına İlişkin Saha Gözlemleri" (En: Observations from the field about Syrian Refugees' working life)

2.DAY

11 February 2017 Saturday Bogazici University, New Hall 101, North Campus

10:00-11:00 I.Session: Session of German Situation

Moderator: İsmail DoğaKaratepe ,Kassel University

Lisa-Marie Heimeshoff, University of Osnabrück, "The media discourse of work and the labor market in the context of refugee migration - Insights from the German case"

Dr. FlorisBiskamp, University of Kassel, "Lowering the Barrier by Lowering the Wage? The German Debate on a Suspension of the Minimum Wage for Refugees"

11:00-11:30 Coffee Break

11:30 - 13:00 II: Session: Labour Migration: Experiences from the Field

Moderator: Özge Berber Ağtaş, GLU Alumni

MetinÇorabatır, Center for Asylum and Migration Studies, "Refugee Integration: A right and an Urgency"

VolkanGörendağ, Amnesty International, " Türkiye'dekiMültecilerinEkonomik, SosyalveKültürelHaklaraErişimindekiProblemler" (En: Problems of Refugees in Turkey to Access Economic, Social and Cultural Rights)

Ayşe Beyazova, Bogazici University, "İstanbul'dakiSuriyeliMülteciEbeveynlerinÇocuklarıiçinEğitimArayışı" (En: Syrian refugee parents' pursuit of education for their children in Istanbul)

13:00 -14:00 Lunch

14:00 -15:30 III: Session: Gender Inequality and Syrian Refugees

Moderator: Prof.Dr. GülayToksöz, Ankara University

Doç. Dr. MeldaYaman, " SuriyeliKadınMültecilerinEmekKoşullarıveİstihdamaKatılımı" (En: Participation of Syrian women refugees to employment and their labour conditions)

Doç. Dr. ReyhanAtasüTopçuoğlu, Hacettepe University, "AtaerkillikveEnformelKapitalizminEklemlenmesindeGöçmenKadınEmeği" (En: Migrant women's labor in the articulation of patriarchy and informal capitalism)

Dr. Helen Schwenken, University of Osnabrück,"Between invisibility and hyper-visibility: Gender and refugee issues in Germany "

15:30-16:00 Coffee Break

16:00-17:30 IV. Session: Child Labourand Syrian Refugees

Moderator: Doç. Dr. Pınar UyanSemerci, İstanbul Bilgi University

Seda Akço,

Hümanist Büro, "Çocuk işçiliği ile mücadelede hukukelverişli bir araç mıdır?" (En: Is law a convenient tool for combating child labour?)

Ezgi Koman, "Türkiye'de Çocuk İşçiliği ve Mülteci Çocukların Çalıştırılması" (En: Child Labour in Turkey and Employment of Refugee Children)

Zeynep Ekin Aklar, Support To Life Foundation, "Mevsimlik Tarım Çocuk İşçiliğinde Adana Özelinde Kadıköy Örneği" (En: Child Labour in Seasonal Migratory Agriculture: A case study in Kadıköy district of Adana)

Nuran Gülenç, United Metalworkers' Union, "Tekstil Sektörüne Suriyeli Mülteci Çocuklar" (En: Textile Sector and Syrian Refugee Children)

3.DAY

12 February 2017 Sunday

Fishbowl Workshop with the participation of Syrian and Turkish Workers

This session will be closed to the audiences and speakers due to the fact that it will be organized only for Syrian participants. However findings of this event will be shared in the workshop report.

Moderator: Sinem Bayraktar (Development Workshop) and Kamil Orhan (Pamukkale University) 12 February 2017, Sunday

09:45 - Arrival to workshop place

10:00 - 10:30 Warming session (To get to know each other better and there will be briefing about the workshop)

10:30-12:00 1st fishbowl event on the subject of livelihood.

12:00-13:30 Lunch break

13:30-15:00 2nd fishbowl event on the subject of working conditions.

15:00-15:30 Break

15:30-17:00 3rd activity critical incident technique on the overall topic and discrimination.

17:00-17:30 Closing Activity

17:30 - Departure

4.DAY

13 February 2017 Monday Bogazici University Garanti Kültür Merkezi, Seminer Salon 1, Uçaksavar Campus

10:30-11:30

Intro input on informal labour markets by Christoph Scherrer

I. Session: "Welcome to Turkey": Identity, Conflict and Discrimination"

Moderator: Yrd. Doç. Polat Alpman, Yalova University

Dr. Gaye Yılmaz, GLU Alumni, "Kendisiyle Kavgalı Bir Toplumda hem Mülteci hem İşçi Olmak" (En: Being both refugee and worker in a society that at fight with itself)

Cahide Sarı, Demos, "İçerideki Sınır: Ayrımcılık" (En: Inside Border: Discrimination)

11:30– 12:00 Break

12:00-13:00

I. Session: "Welcome to Turkey": Identity, Conflict and Discrimination" continues

Soner Çalış and Beril Sönmez, Mülteciyim Hemşerim, "Mahallede Neler Oluyor?" (En: What's going on in the neighborhood?)

Burcu Karakaş, Journalist, "Medyanın imtihanı: Mülteciler melek mi şeytan mı?" (En: Media trial: Are the refugees an angel or a demons?)

13:00-14:00 Lunch

14:00 -16:00

II: Session: Policy Ideas and Recommendations

The summary of all the recommendations that gathered from previous days will be presented. It will be open to general discussion with the audience.

Final Remarks and Closing Speech

About the authors

Gaye Yilmaz holds a Masters in Labour Policies and Globalization from the Global Labour University (2004/5) and a doctorate degree in Development Economics from the Marmara University (2009). She worked for the Turkish Confederation of Progressive Trade Unions and for the United Metal Workers' Union between 1996 and 2008. Between 2011 and 2017 Dr. Yilmaz worked for the Boğaziçi University as part-time contract lecturer and is currently doing research for the International Center for Development and Decent Work (ICDD).

Diyar Erdogan holds a Masters in Labour Policies and Globalization from the Global Labour University (2012/13). She is project coordinator and researcher with a focus on human rights, labour and refugees issues.

Members of the GLU network:

British Trade Union Congress (TUC), UK
 Cardiff University, UK
 Central Única dos Trabalhadores (CUT) / Observatorio Social, Brazil
 Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU), South Africa
 Deutscher Gewerkschaftsbund (DGB) / DGB Bildungswerk, Germany
 European Trade Union Institute (ETUI)
 Hochschule für Wirtschaft und Recht Berlin (HWR), Germany
 Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (FES), Germany
 Global Union Research Network (GURN)
 Global Unions (GU)
 Hans-Böckler-Stiftung (HBS), Germany
 Industriegewerkschaft Metall (IG Metall), Germany
 International Federation of Workers' Education Associations (IFWEA)
 International Institute for Labour Studies (IILS), ILO
 International Labour Organisation (ILO) / Bureau for Workers' Activities (ACTRAV)
 Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU), New Delhi, India
 National Labour and Economic Development Institute (Naledi), South Africa
 PennState University, USA
 Ruskin College, Oxford, UK
 Tata Institute of Social Sciences, India
 Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Brazil
 Universität Kassel, Germany
 University of the Witwatersrand (WITS), South Africa

Published GLU Working Papers

- No.1 Seeraj Mohamed; Economic Policy, Globalization and the Labour Movement: Changes in the Global Economy from the Golden Age to the Neoliberal Era, February 2008
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.1.pdf
- No.2 Birgit Mahnkopf; EU Multi-Level Trade Policy: Neither coherent nor development-friendly, February 2008
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.2.pdf
- No.3 Edward Webster, Christine Bischoff, EdliraXhafa, JuçaraPortilhoLins, Doreen D. Deane, Dan Hawkins, Sharit K. Bhowmik, Nitin More, Naoko Otani, Sunghee Park, Eustace I. James, Melisa Serrano, Verna D. Viajar, Ramon A. Certeza, Gaye Yilmaz, BülendKaradağ, TolgaToren, ElifSinirlioğlu and LyudmylaVolynets; Closing the Representation Gap in Micro and Small Enterprises, November 2008
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.3.pdf
- No.4 Max J. Zenglein; Marketization of the Chinese Labor Market and the Role of Unions, November 2008
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.4.pdf
- No.5 WilfriedSchwetz and Donna McGuire; FIFA World Cup 2006 Germany: An opportunity for union revitalisation? November 2008
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.5.pdf
- No.6 Hansjörg Herr, MilkaKazandziska, SilkeMahnkopf-Praprotnik; The Theoretical Debate about Minimum Wages, February 2009
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.6.pdf
- No.7 Patricia Chong; Servitude with a Smile: An Anti-Oppression Analysis of Emotional Labour, March 2009
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.7.pdf
- No.8 Donna McGuire and ChristophScherrer with: Svetlana Boincean, Ramon Certeza, Doreen Deane, Eustace James, Luciana Hachmann, Kim Mijeoung, MaikeNiggemann, Joel Odigie, Rajeswari, Clair Siobhan Ruppert, Melisa Serrano, Verna Dinah Q. Viajar and Mina Vukojicic; Developing a Labour Voice in Trade Policy at the National Level, February 2010
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.8.pdf

- No.9 Paulo Eduardo de Andrade Baltar, AnselmoLuís dos Santos, José Dari Krein, Eugenia Leone, Marcelo WeishauptProni, AmiltonMoretto, AlexandreGori Maia and Carlos Salas;
Moving towards Decent Work. Labour in the Lula government: reflections on recent Brazilian experience, May 2010
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.9.pdf
- No.9 Paulo Eduardo de Andrade Baltar, AnselmoLuís dos Santos, José Dari Krein, Eugenia Leone, Marcelo WeishauptProni, AmiltonMoretto, AlexandreGori Maia and Carlos Salas;
Trabalho no governo Lula: umareflexãosobre a recenteexperiênciabrasileira, May 2010
(http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No._9_portuguese.pdf)
- No.10 Christine Bischoff, Melisa Serrano, Edward Webster and EdliraXhafa;
Strategies for Closing the Representation Gap in Micro and Small Enterprises, July 2010
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.10.pdf
- No.11 Hansjörg Herr and MilkaKazandziska; Principles of Minimum Wage Policy - Economics, Institutions and Recommendations, March 2011
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.11.pdf
- No.12 Chiara Benassi; The Implementation of Minimum Wage: Challenges and Creative Solutions, March 2011
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.12.pdf
- No.13 Rudolf Traub-Merz; All China Federation of Trade Unions: Structure, Functions and the Challenge of Collective Bargaining, August 2011
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.13.pdf
- No.14 Melisa R. Serrano and EdliraXhafa; The Quest for Alternatives beyond (Neoliberal) Capitalism, September 2011
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.14.pdf
- No.15 Anna Bolsheva; Minimum Wage Development in the Russian Federation, July 2012
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.15.pdf


- No.16 Hansjörg Herr and Gustav A. Horn; Wage Policy Today, August 2012
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.16.pdf
- No.17 Neil Coleman; Towards new Collective Bargaining, Wage and Social Protection Strategies in South Africa - Learning from the Brazilian Experience, November 2013
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.17.pdf
- No.18 Petra Dünhaupt; Determinants of Functional Income Distribution – Theory and Empirical Evidence, November 2013
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.18.pdf
- No.19 Hansjörg Herr and Zeynep M. Sonat; Neoliberal Unshared Growth Regime of Turkey in the Post-2001 Period, November 2013
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.19.pdf
- No.20 Peter Wahl; The European Civil Society Campaign on the Financial Transaction Tax, February 2014
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.20.pdf
- No.21 Kai Eicker-Wolf and Achim Truger; Demystifying a 'shining example': German public finances under the debt brake, February 2014
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.21.pdf
- No.22 Lena Lavinas, in collaboration with Thiago Andrade Moellmann Ferro; A Long Way from Tax Justice: the Brazilian Case, April 2014
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.22.pdf
- No.23 Daniel Detzer; Inequality and the Financial System - The Case of Germany, April 2014
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.23.pdf
- No.24 Hansjörg Herr and Bea Ruoff; Wage Dispersion – Empirical Developments, Explanations, and Reform Options, April 2014
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.24.pdf
- No.25 Bernhard Leubolt; Social Policies and Redistribution in South Africa, May 2014
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.25.pdf

- No.26 Bernhard Leubolt; Social Policies and Redistribution in Brazil, May 2014
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.26.pdf
- No.27 Sarah Godar, Christoph Paetz and Achim Truger; Progressive Tax Reform in OECD Countries: Perspectives and Obstacles, May 2014
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.27.pdf
- No.29 Thomas Obst; Long-term trends in income distribution - a global perspective, February 2015
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.29.pdf
- No.30 Bruno Dobrusin; Trade union debates on sustainable development in Brazil and Argentina, February 2015
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.30.pdf
- No.31 Christoph Hermann; Green New Deal and the Question of Environmental and Social Justice, February 2015
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.31.pdf
- No.32 John Cody; How labor manages productivity advances and crisis response: a comparative study of automotive manufacturing in Germany and the US, February 2015
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.32.pdf
- No.33 Lauro Mattei; The Brazilian Rural Development Model in the Context of Green Economy, 2015
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.33.pdf
- No.34 Daniela Magalhães Prates, Adriana Nunes Ferreira and Daniela Gorayeb; The Brazilian Credit Market: Recent Developments and Impact on Inequality, 2015
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.34.pdf
- No.35 Sumedha Bajar and Meenakshi Rajeev; The Impact of Infrastructure Provisioning on Inequality: Evidence from India, 2015
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.35.pdf

- No.36 LucioleSauviat; In Search for Political Consciousness. The Role of Workers' Education, 2015
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.36.pdf
- No.37 Meenakshi Rajeev; Financial Inclusion and Disparity: A Case of India, 2015
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.37.pdf
- No.38 MohdRaisul Islam Khan and Christa Wichterich; Safety and labour conditions: the accord and the national tripartite plan of action for the garment industry of Bangladesh, 2015
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.38.pdf
- No.39 Bea Ruoff; Labour Market Developments in Germany: Tales of Decency and Stability, 2016
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.39.pdf
- No.40 Claudia Hofmann and Norbert Schuster; Itain't over 'til it's over: The right to strike and the mandate of the ILO committee of experts revisited, 2016
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.40.pdf
- No.41 Adriana Nunes Ferreira, Ana Rosa Ribeiro de Mendonça and Simone Deos; The role of Brazilian public banks facing inequality: some reflections on the case of Brazilian development bank, Caixa and the federal regional banks, 2016
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.41.pdf
- No.42 Melisa R.Serrano and EdliraXhafa; From 'precarious informal employment' to 'protected employment': the 'positive transitioning effect' of trade unions, 2016
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.42.pdf
- No.43 ChristophScherrer and Stefan Beck; Trade regulations and global production networks, 2016
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.43.pdf
- No.44 Hansjörg Herr, Erwin Schweisshelm and Truong-Minh Vu; The integration of Vietnam in the global economy and its effects for Vietnamese economic development, 2016
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.44.pdf

- No.45 Devan Pillay and Michelle Williams; Rekindling the utopian imagination: Intellectual diversity and the GLU/ICDD network, 2017
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.45.pdf
- No.46 Glynne Williams, Steve Davies, Julius Lampert and Jonathan Tetteh; Chinese Multinationals: Threat to, or Opportunity for, Trade Unions? The case of SINOHYDRO in Ghana, 2017
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.46.pdf
- No.47 Tandi We Gross and Amar Kharate; Organizing the invisible – strategies of informal garment workers in Mumbai's slum economy, 2017
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.47.pdf
- No.48 Ho Ching Florence Yuen; Development of Wage Dispersion: A Case Study of Hong Kong, 2017
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.48.pdf
- No.49 Aelim Yun; Curbing precarious informal employment: A Case Study of precarious workers in the South Korean construction industry, 2017
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.49.pdf
- No.50 Baba Aye; "NUPENGASSAN" and the struggle against precarious work in the Nigerian oil and gas industry, 2017
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.50.pdf
- No.51 Devan Pillay; Trade union revitalisation in South Africa: Green shoots or false dawns?, 2017
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.51.pdf
- No.52 Ramon A. Certeza; The PALEA Struggle Against Outsourcing and Contractualization in the Airline Industry in the Philippines, 2018
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.52.pdf
- No.53 Hansjörg Herr and Zeynep M. Nettekoven; The Role of Small and Medium-sized Enterprises in Development: What Can be Learned from the German Experience?, 2018
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.53.pdf

- No.54 Marlesevon Broembsenand Jenna Harvey; Decent Work for Homeworkers in Global Supply Chains: Existing and Potential Mechanisms for Worker-Centred Governance, 2019
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.54.pdf
- No.55 EdliraXhafa;Organisingagainst all odds: Precariousworkersas 'actorsandauthorsoftheirowndrama', 2019
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.55.pdf
- No.56 Gaye Yılmaz and Diyar Erdoğan; Anatomy of a refugee workshop: Syrian labourers in Istanbul, 2019
http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.56.pdf



Global Labour University
c/o Bureau for Workers' Activities
International Labour Office
Route des Morillons 4
CH- 1211 Geneva 22
Switzerland

www.global-labour-university.org

glu.workingpapers@global-labour-university.org

ISSN 1866-0541