
CONFERENCE REPORT

REFUGEES: INTEGRATION, HARMONISATION,
SOLIDARITY, HOSPITALITY, OR WHAT?

PHILOSOPHIES, POLICIES, PRACTICES
IN TURKEY AND GERMANY

Istanbul

26.11.2021

Prepared by
FRANCK DUVELL & ALI ZAFER SAGIROGLU

Conference Report
Refugees: Integration, Harmonisation, Solidarity, Hospitality, or What?
Philosophies, Policies, and Practices in Turkey and Germany

Istanbul

26.11.2021

Prepared by
Franck DUVELL, IMIS, Osnabrück University
Ali Zafer SAGIROGLU, AYBU-GPM, Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University

Designed by
Furkan OZENCI

This report was prepared on 29.04.2022

Citation:

Düvell, F. & Sağıroğlu, A. Z., (2022). Conference Report: "Refugee, Integration, Harmonisation, Solidarity, Hospitality, or What? Philosophies, Policies, and Practices in Turkey and Germany, Ankara & Osnabrück: IMIS & AYBU-GPM.

2022 © All Rights Reserved.

No part of this report may be reproduced, copied or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or printed, without the permission. The views expressed in this report are the author's own.

The conference aimed to offer an inclusive and diverse environment and facilitate an open conversation and cooperation between German and Turkish academics enriched by some international experts on how to think about and how to govern (new) diversity with the view to also underpin the practical challenges especially on the level of municipalities in both countries. It was designed as an academic event though with a policy audience in mind and thus with some applied touch. Accordingly, efforts were made to communicate scientific results to a mixed audience of policy makers and practitioners on local and national level. The event took place in the context of a heated public controversy over the issue of Syrian, Afghan and other refugees; in fact, it has been the first time that such a public debate unfolded.

The event was held on 26 November 2021 in Istanbul in a hybrid format (mixed onsite and online presentations and participation). The conference was divided into two opening and closing plenary debates and eight panel sessions with four presentations each providing a total of 39 presentations. Speakers were mostly from Turkey and Germany though there were also individual experts from the Netherlands, Spain, UK, Afghanistan and Qatar.

Key take-aways:

- Municipalities play an increasing and important role in migrant and refugee integration (denoted the “local turn” in academic discourse).
- Municipalities almost naturally take an intercultural approach aiming at improving social cohesion.
- National imbalances across regions and groups resulting in unequal opportunities should be avoided.
- Civil society complements municipalities as important actors in refugee integration.
- Securitised thinking about refugees undermines integration efforts.
- Economic marginalisation diminishes social cohesion.

OUTLINE

Introduction: Bonds, similarities and difference between Turkey and Germany

Opening plenary: Scholarly perspectives on integration, harmonisation and interculturalism

Panel 1: Role of municipalities

Panel 2: Urban perspectives in migrant and refugee integration

Panel 3: Role of civil society in migrant and refugee integration

Panel 4: Education and care

Panel 5: Refugee integration from a more conceptual and theoretical perspective

Panel 6: Access to services and the citizenship process

Panel 7: Comparative outlook on German and Turkish economics and labour integration

Panel 8: How to talk about controversies

Closing plenary: Challenges, solutions and bottlenecks around the concept of integration

Conclusion

Appendix

The opening remarks highlighted the bonds and some similarities and difference between Turkey and Germany.

First, Dr Düvell recalled some crucial anniversaries all coinciding with the conference, notably the 60th anniversary of Turkish-Germany labour recruitment scheme, the 10th anniversary of the beginning of the upheaval in Syria and the 5th anniversary of the EU-Turkey statement. He pointed out that migration binds together the two countries in important ways through the Turkish diaspora in Germany and through the shared experience of being the two countries hosting the largest Syrian refugee populations. Both countries now also share the experience of and must deal with some xenophobic backlash. He also acknowledged the traumas of racism and racist murder, some ill-feelings on the Turkish side as well as certain frustrations on the EU side but argued that there are significant misunderstandings on both sides and thus scope for improving communication. On the level of municipalities, however, he sees important similarities in the experience of the sudden large-scale influx of Syrians, the challenges this poses to local policies and the benefits of sharing know-how and learning from one another.

The opening plenary introduced diverse scholarly perspectives on integration, harmonisation and interculturalism.

The opening plenary brought together an international panel of scholars from Germany, Turkey, the Netherlands and Spain. The aim was to obtain a broader introduction into key topics and challenges that are relevant for the issue of hosting refugee in Turkey.

Prof Zapata Barrero promoted the concept of interculturalism, an approach applied in Spain, another new immigration country that changed over a short period of time. It is based on the idea of promoting contact between and address and involve all parts of society. He emphasised the importance of multi-level governance, the collaboration of state agencies with civil society and suggests that cities and municipalities play an important role in mediating such a network.

Prof Penninx calls to distinguish between “integration” as a scientific analytical concept (migrant-society interaction on individual, group and institutional level) and “integration” or other concepts such as “harmonisation”, “multiculturalism” etc as normative and political concepts. He reminds us to distinguish three main domains, legal-political (rights), socio-economic (how to find jobs etc) and cultural (living together). Discussing different forms of governance, he identifies multi-level governance involving all relevant stakeholders as most successful.

Prof Glorius reiterates the importance of place, in other words, municipalities, and recalls the challenges arising from the nexus of policy on the national level and the realities and practices on the local level. She suggests there is no “one size fits all”; instead, diverse municipalities have diverse situations. For instance, in Germany municipalities enjoy considerable autonomy and should thus develop local policies whilst not overruling national law.

Finally, Prof Yüксеker brings to the fore the complexities of governance and cohabitation in Turkey, the multiple fields this encompasses (economy, health, education etc.), the specific challenges related to internationally displaced persons not registered where they reside and the daily struggles people face. She highlighted the diversity and fractured nature of Turkish society and raised important questions regarding whom to integrate and integrate into what, whilst emphasising the importance of legal statuses.

- Even though we heard evidence from four different cases representing two different patterns, old immigration countries and new immigration countries in all four countries municipalities play an increasing and important role in migrant and refugee integration (denoted the “local turn” in academic discourse). Issues identified are the kind of collaboration between the different levels and actors and the resources and discretion municipalities have to address the issues within their communities.

Panel 1: Role of municipalities

Prof Kale showed that over time the needs of Syrians refugees in Turkey, now in a protracted situation, have changed. Due to the initial lack of official social integration policies local governments had to develop ad hoc tailored responses often aiming at improving social cohesion. She confirmed Glorius’ observation, namely that also in Turkey municipalities responded differently to the influx of displaced persons. Dr Efe from Kilis suggested that the actual crisis is not yet over, notably registration of recent arrivals remains problematic. He explained that whilst the central government decides and the DGMM develops strategies, it is the PDMM jointly with the municipalities who implement policies. This he argued results in “a localisation of integration policies”. However, he observed on the level of municipalities some uncertainty and lack of confidence and thus sees a need to further empower local governments. Ms Reinhold addressed an issue relevant for Turkey and Germany; the mandatory dispersal of refugees across the country. She kicked-off her presentation with the observation that not every person feels comfortable and wants to or can build a future at the same place and not every local community can offer the same adequate supplies to respond to their needs and wishes relevant for further integration processes. She then pointed out that neglecting local capacities or individual aspiration may undermine prospects of successful integration. In Germany, she showed, there is scope for a more active role of municipalities, notably with regards to the dispersal of asylum seekers and presented a project, an alternative approach aiming at better matching refugees’ aspirations with local capacity. Ms Demiroglu, taking the case of Elazig, pointed out differences between urban and local practices and between bureaucratic requirements and local pragmatic approaches. She highlighted a key difference between Turkey and Germany; voluntary vs compulsory language and integration courses. She also pointed to the bureaucratic hurdles that applicants in Turkey face when dealing with an administration that is not well prepared to deal with demand from refugees. Lack of good quality interpretation, as in this case in some peripheral place, was identified as a key concern.

- Municipalities seem to sometimes almost naturally but maybe even unconsciously though not intentionally take an intercultural approach aiming at improving social cohesion. It appears that in both countries, Turkey and Germany, there is scope for empowering municipalities in taking forward the integration of refugees.

Panel 2: Urban perspectives in migrant and refugee integration

Dr Kaya presented his research on how religious networks contribute to the integration process of refugees in Sanliurfa province, Turkey. He found that religious institutions and networks are transferred from origin countries to the host country, shaping matters there

on the local level. Religious institutions and networks are important shelters for refugees, facilitating access to various resources and providing psychological relief to tackle the trauma of war and displacement. They also bridge between host society and institutions and function as guides and intermediaries in accessing humanitarian aid and public services. Religious education is at the centre of these institutions and networks and tolerated by local authorities. However, religious institutions and networks also exclude people of different beliefs and views and contribute to the marginalisation of some groups. Ms Ziss in her comparative study on Germany and Turkey pointed out that many Syrians have family members in Turkey and Germany and that thus important transnational ties exist and bind together refugee communities in Turkey and Germany. She found that refugees and local communities alike share a similarly precarious situation, face similar challenges and compared conditions. Dr Gundacker analysed the impact compulsory dispersal across Germany has on integration outcome. She recalls that the different municipalities are characterised by different resources and conditions - education, health care and childcare services, local labour market conditions, host societies' attitudes towards newcomers, public transport system and showed that this contributes to and may explain different (more or less successful) integration outcomes. Generally, prospects of women and persons with precarious status are found to be problematic calling for more policy interventions; also local labour markets are decisive for individual integration trajectories. The latter suggests that considering local labour market conditions and individual labour market fit in the allocation of refugees may improve early integration outcomes of refugees. The last presenter Dr Kleist took the case of civil responses in Germany in 2015. He concluded that volunteers also played a crucial role to the welcome of refugees and provided important services to integration processes in Germany.

- Because transnational ties bind together refugee communities in Turkey and Germany there is scope for policies to consider the implications this could have on integration and resettlement policies. Also, the finding that religious institutions and volunteers play important roles in integration processes may be relevant for policy design and delivery. Vice versa, differences in local refugee integration capacities should be identified to prevent gross national imbalances and disadvantages across regions and groups.

Panel 3: Role of civil society in migrant and refugee integration

Dr Bostanci recalled that it took Germany over 50 years to acknowledge that a more participatory approach would suit better the aim of migrant and refugee integration. Notably, she analysed the important responsibility and role the state has in supporting civil society's refugee work. Dr Barin shows that in Turkey the government and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) have been complementary actors in immigrant integration policies. Dr Mencütek specifically paid attention to refugee-led organisations and emphasised their potentially important role in integration governance. Whilst she promotes empowering them in order to improvement of conditions of refugee communities the diagnosis is that they are rarely able to change existing power relations. Notably, while refugee community organisations (RCOs) potentially hold important (social, cultural and informational) capital refugees maybe be too apprehensive to participate and speak out. Dr Göttsche illustrated that in Germany, too, despite vanishing engagement, civil society continues to play a role in

providing sustainable structures of support for refugees. However, she suggested that interventions need to abstain from broad-brush labelling and instead acknowledge the complexity of refugees' vulnerability. She also argued that there are two sides to the coin, vulnerability vs agency, respectively, patronising vs empowerment, and that vulnerability and agency go hand in hand. In particular, she illustrated cases of unduly interference in personal matters (gender roles, religiosity) whilst pointing out that with time peoples' independence increases.

- The experts agreed that civil society complements municipalities as important actors and thus too has an important role to play in refugee integration and that state support of civil society enhances this role. However, they also identify issues such as patronising trends or lack of appreciation by state agencies.

Panel 4: Education and care

Dr Kollender compared civil society initiatives in Berlin and Istanbul in the field of education which support schools, for instance, by addressing monolingual school culture, as well as racist perceptions and discriminatory pedagogical practices. At the outset she queried the notion of "the refugee student" and argued that such categorisation rather impedes integration. She found that it is possible for civil society in both countries to stimulate a reflection on discrimination in state schools. However, she also acknowledged that there are limits to cooperatively dealing with discrimination, especially at the institutional level, determined by (lack of) political regulations, powerful social discourses on integration and belonging, as well as exclusionary school routines. Dr Fansa shared insights from his research on education in temporary shelters in Hatay. He concluded with the need for multi-cultural education policies as well as for in-service trainings on teaching Turkish to foreigners. Dr Alkan devoted her presentation to refugee families in Turkey and Germany. She found that different asylum and migration management schemes have created a significant disparity between the family constellations of Syrian refugees in these countries and produce different outcomes at the intersections of familial care arrangements and citizenship statuses. Turkey's migration regime has allowed for fuller family constellations and thus only generates limited friction of kin-contracts. In contrast, German refugee law does not recognise certain configurations of families, limits family reunification, and disrupts the traditional 'kin-contract' of Syrians. However, because family constellations and family relations have deep and direct effects on feelings of belonging, identification with the host society, and subsequently social cohesion, the different outcomes of the impact on families require nuanced policy responses.

- It can be concluded that civil society has a role to play in discrimination-sensitive education and can support schools in addressing obstacles to integration. Also, the family constellations permitted by refugee law are an issue to be considered when thinking about improving conditions for integration and social cohesion.

Panel 5: Refugee integration from a more conceptual and theoretical perspective

Prof Özçürümez took social cohesion as a starting point to suggest that there are important lessons to be learned from the Turkish case. She too emphasised the prevalence of the local level. Talking about social cohesion implies a transformation of responsibility by and for society and refugees alike. Generally, she suggested a context-sensitive approach based on ideas of resilience, peace-building, community engagement and thus interactionism. Similarly, Prof Korntheuer took society as a whole as her starting point and accordingly suggested a broader meaning holistic inclusion policy based on an intersectional approach integrating gender, migration, disability and age into her model. She believed that society and its institutions need to adapt their structures to be accessible for all humans and provide possibilities to fully participate in societies. She showed that key obstacles in participation in integration programmes are dispersal, mental health, housing circumstances and legal precarity. She argued that it is crucial to get to know the target group by conducting home visits and speaking the language to then mobilise refugees into specific programmes. In contrast, Dr Ariner was more critical and pessimistic suggesting that Turks and Syrians are alienated and that social distance is in fact increasing. This is because social cohesion classes are voluntary while temporary education centres closed down and informal employment prevails. He concluded that harmonisation policy in Turkey is rather a failure dating back to a fundamental mistake made from the outset: a debate by experts and policy made behind closed doors characterised by a lack of accountability, a rather neo-liberal paternalism shifting responsibility from state to private actors whilst neglecting economic hardship. In panel 8, Siddikoglu adds to this thread by suggesting there are several dimensions to social cohesion, notably economic and cultural cohesion. Finally, Dr Shoukri discussed refugee integration from the perspective of religious namely Islamic ethics. He commenced with the observation that many refugees are from Muslim countries and that many refugee hosting countries are Muslim countries. He shows that there are many similarities between the Islamic tradition relating to the concept of “hijra” (migration), “jiwar” (protection) and the laws of “aman” (safe conduct) and the 1951 Geneva Convention relating to the status of refugees, and argues that both are compatible. The main difference is, he believed, that in the former context hosting refugees is an affection whereas in the latter it is an obligation. Both agree, however, that safety should be guaranteed and that states should provide protection.

- The panel highlighted the richness of thinking as well the diversity of concepts whilst revealing contrasting views on the success or failure of Turkish policies. Whilst some scholars suggested there are also non-western ethics and concepts to be considered in theoretical and normative debates, seconded by the argument that non-moralistic approaches might be unrealistic, others strictly argued there is no room for religion in modern societies.

Panel 6: Access to services and the citizenship process

Dr Akçiçek revealed that due to the pandemic refugees in Turkey often lost their jobs, suffered from wage reduction or unpaid wages and thus experienced a reduction or loss of income which resulted in increasing poverty and debts of refugees. However, Syrians are a

little less affected than other nationalities. During the pandemic, accessing online learning became an issue, mostly for technical reasons whereas refugees found it harder to access other public services. Another pattern was that Syrians were more hesitant to access services, notably health service, for fear of being quarantined in case they were found infected. Lack of access to the labour market, education and health care will not only result in a poorer, more distressed, marginalised and excluded refugee communities but as a consequence also undermine social cohesion. Dr Ayçiçek identified multiple barriers Syrian refugees in Turkey face with regards to access to health care. He argued that there is a need for specialised healthcare services for refugees and specific sub-groups (notably, persons with disabilities and war wounded). Dr Yanaşmayan reiterated the importance of citizenship for peoples' rights, legal status and identity. She compares the citizenship regimes in Germany and Turkey and finds them rather similar as both have been based on an ethno-national understanding, whereas naturalisation differs significantly in that one offers a regular but strict and lengthy procedure (Germany) and the other represents an exceptional partly incoherent and rather unpredictable procedure (Turkey).

- The negative impact of the pandemic remains a key concern and requires a fresh analysis of the current situation and a revision of integration politics. It seems more is still to be done to improve refugees' access to health care whilst paths to citizenship are also important to consider.

Panel 7: Comparative outlook on German and Turkish economics and labour market integration

Prof. Tümen identified a high demand for Syrian labour on the Turkish market whilst showing that legal restrictions (such as residence obligations for Syrians) increase their high likelihood of being irregularly employed. He fears this will even affect the economic participation processes of second-generation Syrians. This impedes short-term and long-term economic integration; it also negatively affects the wages of Turkish employees in the respective sectors fuelling social tensions. Prof Kayaoglu suggested there are now a kind of ethnic enclaves of Syrians in Turkey. She showed that it is the quality rather than the size of the ethnic enclave which affects the likelihood of employment. Particularly the employment rate in the ethnic network plays a role but less so the share of Syrian businesses. Dr Hunkler showed differences in the educational aspirations of different migrant groups in Germany: refugees are more likely than other migrant groups to invest in vocational training. However, it seems this does not pay in terms of securing a longer-term legal status. Dr Schulz from the city of Munich authority implied that their programme teaching digital skills to refugee women improves their employability. Furthermore, she highlighted the importance of the issue of the recognition of existing qualifications but also of role models within the communities.

- On the one hand, the legal arrangement for persons under temporary protection in Turkey facilitates economic marginalisation, undermines integration and thus also negatively affects social cohesion. In contrast, specific programmes can improve the chances of the targeted groups. Refugees in Germany seem to have high aspirations to invest in further education but this might be undermined by lack of pay-off.

Panel 8: How to talk about controversies

Prof İçduygu assessed the conventional durable solutions to displacement, local integration, return, resettlement and specifically the policies of return and safe zones (to prevent exit and facilitate return) and highlights principles such as voluntariness, safety and sustainability. Specifically, he looked at Turkey's National Assisted Voluntary Return & Reintegration Programme (NAVRR) and some obstacles to its implementation. He recalled that over time the perception Syrian refugees have of the option of returning to Syria has changed from initial high hopes to return to giving up hope. Some participants suggested that due to the protracted nature of displacement, return is becoming increasingly unrealistic. Furthermore, the issue is now highly politicised which is not conducive to a reasonable debate. Dr Kolbaşı-Muyan compares the governmentality of integration of Turks in Germany and Syrians in Turkey. Both cases are characterised by processes of othering and subsequent precarious inclusion. Her presentation suggests some gross discrepancy in Turkey between the idea of harmonisation and the reality of exclusion on the ground (under conditions of growing public hostility towards refugees). Dr Siddikoglu and Prof Erdogan argued that there is a securitisation of forced migration of Afghans as well as the residence of Syrians. Siddikoglu highlighted the multiple and long-term suffering of Afghans (75% experienced displacement, 80% affected by drought, 88% violence, 95% living in poverty etc.) all aggravated by the recent brain drain. His presentation reveals that whilst Afghans in Turkey perceive some cultural proximity whereas for Turks the issue is rather securitised. Erdogan criticised that "social cohesion" is in fact a kind of internalising of security thinking, in the case of Turkey less so from above than from within society. This is based on the observation that in surveys (Syrians barometer) people are largely critical of the permanent presence of refugees and perceive them as a threat. This, they argued, has negative impacts on integration processes.

- There is a tension between the political aim to return Syrians and the aspiration Syrians hold whilst the politicisation of the issues renders discussions difficult. Meanwhile, perceiving or portraying refugees as a security issue diminishes chances for their integration.

Closing plenary: Challenges, solutions and bottlenecks around the concept of integration

In the closing panel, Dr Kemal Kirişçi underlined the importance of formal employment of Syrian refugees in Turkey as a precondition for any successful integration process. He exemplified the collaboration between the EU and Jordan to point out that through bilateral trade agreements Germany could support Turkey in this. Dr Korntheuer explained that in Germany functional integration made good progress though still the framing focuses on integration. Ideas of mutual adaption have not yet entered the institutional level. She emphasised that there is a developed civil society contributing in an important way to integration but certain rules and restrictions also slow down integration. Also, the debate on integration and post-integration is very intense. Dr Yanaşmayan stressed that for immigrants' access to rights is important and generally, such as other conference participants the importance of a rights-based approach. She specifically emphasised that access to citizenship - as the crowning of the integration process - is a very important element of the process.

She criticised though the citizenship practices in Germany and Turkey. She elaborated that although there are some difficulties in the citizenship procedures in both countries, the practices in Turkey have become less transparent and predictable. Notably, lack of transparency also gives rise to suspicion on the side of the Turkish people. She emphasised that politicians and the media have a direct impact on citizenship processes. Prof İçduygu explained how the majority of Turkish society and a considerable part of state agencies have perceived the recent influx mainly from Syria as an “ontological threat” to national identity and security. This was because Turkey has traditionally been identified with the state of Turks and Muslims but globalisation brought to the country a diversity of people challenging this assumption. Integration is often perceived as a form of assimilation. Finally, he underlined that more migration studies are needed in Turkish. Dr Daniş concluded that the conference has shown that the local level is decisive in integration processes. She also bemoans the lack of space to discuss issues related to refugee integration, though she believes that such a space is important for developing appropriate policies. She also added that pre-existing tensions and divisions in Turkish politics and society have been laid bare and intensified by the refugee issue and may peak in the forthcoming elections. She also pointed out how the migration management approach in Turkey has changed over time. The collaboration among scholars and their mission towards the societies are crucial. Lastly, Dr Sağiroğlu elaborated on the “uyum” concept in Turkey. He explained how this specific concept appeared in the Turkish context and what it implies and means. Notably, Sağiroğlu discussed whether “uyum” could be an alternative to integration or whether it is a kind of integration. He concludes that it is in fact a kind of integration in academic terms, as Penninx suggested at the outset of the conference. However, the concept “uyum” signals some politically different thinking based on a critical perception of what the ‘European’ interpretation of integration means.

Conclusion

The conference revealed a mixed picture of optimistic and pessimistic views on refugee integration, harmonisation and social cohesion and the policies and practices addressing this issue. All were very well rooted in research and evidence-based, demonstrating high level expertise held by the academic communities. In any case, the scholars and practitioners unanimously emphasised the importance of municipalities and civil society and thus the local level demonstrating a “local turn” in refugee integration. Many aspects highlighted seem to confirm the principles of an intercultural approach: the importance of municipalities, multi-actor collaboration and social cohesion based on contacts between the diverse groups in society. It is suggested though that social cohesion is too broad a concept and that instead intersectional thinking would be better equipped to identify concrete challenges and specific target groups to tailor-make politics. Also, “refugees” are often found to be a too broad category; instead, pupils, families or groups with specific needs (people with disabilities, trauma, war injuries) are identified. Further to this, a discrepancy has been identified with regards to the partly mandatory German integration programmes, respectively pro-active state activities, and the partly laissez-faire and reactive approach in Turkey.

The speakers have identified multiple needs for policy interventions or revisions as well as several research and knowledge gaps.

Policy interventions suggested:

- Spell out what interculturalism means in practical terms and how it could inform policy making.
- Avoid too generic description of target group and instead recognise multifaceted nature of vulnerabilities and needs.
- Cautiously govern collaboration between national, regional, city and local levels and actors.
- Improve transparency in policy-making to prevent misperceptions.
- Consider the resources municipalities have to address the issues within their communities; also expand their discretion in policy implementation, if and where appropriate.
- Further empower municipalities in taking forward the integration of refugees.
- More acknowledge, collaborate with and empower civil society and utilise its capital.
- Address precarious employment situation (permission to work).
- Provide teaching of digital skills to refugee women to increase employability.
- Improve refugees’ access to health care (the need was highlighted by the pandemic).
- Avoid contributing to politicisation of migration and integration debate.

Knowledge gaps and research needs identified:

- More comparison of different cases (different cities, different countries) is required to facilitate mutual learning.
- More policy analysis is required notably on the implementation level to improve policy design.

- More policy evaluation is required to improve policy delivery.
- Some research is required on the dis/advantages of temporary protection and the successive transformation into a more permanent status (this is particularly relevant for the current temporary status of Ukrainians in Germany).
- On the micro-level of municipalities knowledge of the target groups could be improved.

Feedback from the participants and audience showed that such a gathering was found very constructive and helpful and suggests that the conference facilitated the development of a more structured collaboration.

APPENDIX

The conference was organised by Franck Düvell (IMIS), Zafer Sagiroglu (AYBU-GPM) and Esme Bayar (GIZ Ankara) and in collaboration with FFVT (Forced Migration and Refugee Studies: Networking and Knowledge Transfer), and TurkMiS (Turkey Migration Studies Network), supported by an advisory board of five members (Ahmet İçduygu, Koç University; Basak Kale, Middle East Technical University; Saime Özçürümez, Bilkent University; Annette Korntheuer, Catholic University Eichstätt and Zeynep Yanasmayan, German Institute for Integration and Migration Research). It was generously funded by the Turkish-German exchange project for the integration of Syrian refugees into host communities, commissioned by Germany's Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, and implemented by the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ).

In addition to some invited speakers we circulated a call for papers, also the pre-conference Tweets generated over 2700 views ('impressions') on the FFVT account. In the end, received 80 proposals. Papers were selected by a peer review process taking into account relevance to the call, quality, diversity of panelists as well as the coherence of the programme. A total of 39 presentations were given at the panels and eight contributions made for the plenary debates. Speakers were mostly from Turkey and Germany plus individual experts from the Netherlands, Spain, UK, Afghanistan and Qatar.

In addition, we hosted around 20 guests on-site, due to Covid-19 more were not permitted, and around 170 online-participants. Participants were, among others, from the German embassy representing the German foreign office (AA) and the ministry for international cooperation (BMZ), EU representation in Ankara, the International Organisation for Migration (IOM), UNHCR, former head of DGMM, Istanbul municipality, Adana Seyhan municipality, Izmir, Buca Municipality, Munich municipality, Konrad Adenauer Foundation (KAS) as well as many universities.

