



Master Thesis

International Public Management and Public Policy

**Striking the Balance for IOs:  
Challenges of Pragmatic Approaches and Idealistic  
Values in Turkey's Migration Management**

Kahraman Timur (570632)

First Reader: Dr. Saliha Metinsoy

Second Reader: Dr. Agnieszka Kanas

Word Count: 11.917

07.07.2023

## **Abstract**

This study aims to investigate how International Organizations (IOs) strike a balance between promoting universal values and pragmatic cooperation in their interaction with states, within the constraints created by states' national policies contrary to universal values. Exclusively, the study focuses on the interaction between IOs and states in relation to Turkey's migration management, with a particular emphasis on capacity building and social cohesion. For this research, in which Turkey was chosen as a case study, interviews were conducted with 10 experts who could provide in-depth analysis of Turkey's migration management and support of IOs. This study seeks to understand the dynamics and challenges involved in the IOs' engagement with states, particularly in the context of Turkey's migration management by using the qualitative research method. Furthermore, this study aims to analyze the extent to which the theory of pragmatic idealism can explain the complex equilibria in the interaction of IOs with states. In the framework of the analysis of interviews with NGO and IO Representatives as well as academicians, whether the theory of pragmatic idealism has explanatory value will be investigated in the context of capacity building and social cohesion.

## **Acknowledgement**

I express my deepest gratitude and appreciation to my esteemed thesis supervisor, Saliha Metinsoy, for her invaluable guidance, unwavering support, and exceptional mentorship throughout the entire research process. Her insightful comments, expertise, and dedication have played a vital role in shaping the outcome of this thesis.

I also extend my sincere appreciation to the Jean Monnet Scholarship Programme for their generous financial support, which has provided me with the invaluable opportunity to pursue research in a highly esteemed academic environment.

Lastly, I would like to emphasize my heartfelt appreciation to the representatives of the EU Turkey Delegation, UNHCR, IOM, ILO, People in Need (PIN), Relief International, Association for Solidarity with Asylum Seekers and Migrants (SGDD-ASAM), and Research Center on Asylum and Migration (IGAM) for their invaluable contributions to my thesis through their interviews.

## **List of Abbreviations**

EU: European Union

GDDM: Republic of Turkey Ministry of Interior Presidency of Migration Management

IGAM: Research Center on Asylum and Migration

ILO: International Labour Organization

IOM: International Organization for Migration

IOs: International Organizations

NGOs: Non-Governmental Organizations

PIN: People in Need

SGDD-ASAM: Association for Solidarity with Asylum Seekers and Migrants

UDHR: Universal Declaration of Human Rights

UNCHR: United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

UNICEF: United Nations Children's Funds

## List of Content

Abstract .....	2
Acknowledgement .....	3
List of Abbreviations .....	4
<b>1. Introduction</b> .....	<b>7</b>
1.1 Research Aim .....	9
1.2 Theoretical Relevance .....	10
1.3 Societal Relevance .....	10
1.4 Structural Outline .....	10
<b>2. Literature Review</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>3. Theoretical Framework</b> .....	<b>12</b>
3.1 Actors in Migration Management .....	12
3.1.1 States .....	13
3.1.2 International Organizations .....	13
3.1.3 Non-governmental Organizations .....	14
3.2 Realism and Cosmopolitanism .....	15
3.3 Pragmatic Idealism .....	16
3.4 Capacity Building and Social Cohesion .....	17
3.4.1 Capacity Building .....	17
3.4.2 Social Cohesion .....	17
3.5 Historical and Legal Framework .....	18
<b>4. Methodology</b> .....	<b>19</b>
4.1 Research Design and Objectives .....	19
4.2 Data Collection .....	20
4.3 Data Analysis .....	22
4.4 Limitations .....	22
<b>5. Analysis</b> .....	<b>23</b>
5.1 Capacity Building .....	23

5.1.1 Refugee Protection and Border Security .....	23
5.1.2 Funding and Resource Challenges .....	24
5.1.3 Healthcare and Well-being .....	25
5.1.4 Coordination and Collaboration .....	27
5.2 Social Cohesion .....	28
5.2.1 Social Cohesion and IOs .....	29
5.2.2 A Comprehensive Plan for Social Cohesion .....	29
5.2.3 Three Necessary Stages for Social Cohesion and IOs .....	30
5.2.4 Social Cohesion and Turkey .....	33
<b>6. Discussion</b> .....	<b>33</b>
<b>7. Conclusion</b> .....	<b>35</b>
7.1 Recommendation .....	36
References .....	38

## 1. Introduction

Migration management is a multifaceted process involving comprehensive surveillance and regulation of international population movements (Ashutosh & Mountz, 2011). Migration management includes the formulation of policies on immigration. Additionally, it encompasses the provision of requisite documentation and services to facilitate the execution of migration policies, as well as the safeguarding of the rights of refugees throughout the entirety of the migration process (Lüleci-Sula & Sula, 2021). One of the central concepts in migration management is sovereignty. States have the jurisdiction to exercise control over their borders and regulate the entry and exit of refugees (Lüleci-Sula & Sula, 2021). Secondly, migration management encompasses the protection of the fundamental freedoms, security, and welfare of refugees within the framework of human rights (Ashutosh & Mountz, 2011).

States prioritize their national interests while acting in accordance with the norms and principles of international organizations to which they belong (Ahouga, 2020). Despite potential criticism, states often prioritize their own economic, demographic, and security concerns (Ahouga, 2020). In the context of a competitive global market and strain on public services, states may follow a more protectionist policy at the borders (Hiscox & Hainmuller, 2010). However, if refugees are seen as potential contributors to the economy through their workforce, states may display greater tolerance towards them (Rumbaut et al., 1995). Demographic concerns can also influence states' desire to control the number of refugees of different ethnic origins within their borders (Carlin, 2011). Furthermore, concerns about potential conflicts arising from refugees within a country can lead states to adopt more protectionist policies (Carlin, 2011).

During international crises, such as those involving migration flows, the critical focus of debate often revolves around International Organizations (IOs). IOs advocate for universal values such as human rights, democracy, and the rule of law within the global political arena by establishing norms and principles (Moretti, 2020). These universal values became the fundamental values of international law with the human rights regime established after the Second World War (Clark, 1999). The international human rights regime is based on the principles, laws, agreements, and organizations necessary to prevent the recurrence of crimes against humanity committed during the Second World War (Moretti, 2020). The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) is the most fundamental document of these universal principles in international politics (Clark, 1999). Adopted by the United Nations General

Assembly in 1948, this declaration proclaims an international guarantee of the fundamental rights of individuals, including the right to life, liberty, and security (Adhikari, 2020). When states deviate from these universal values, IOs are anticipated to apply pressure. Through various enforcement mechanisms and tactics of persuasion, IOs play a crucial role in ensuring that states align their actions with universally accepted values (Adhikari, 2020).

IOs also reinforce the capacity of states in various areas, including migration management (Schweller, 2020). IOs offer emergency response and humanitarian assistance in migration crises. They support the monitoring and evaluation of migration policies and programs (Lischer, 2017). Through these efforts, IOs play a crucial role in assisting countries in managing migration effectively, protecting migrants' rights, and promoting inclusive and sustainable migration policies (Adhikari, 2020).

In this study, IO's support for Turkey's migration management regarding capacity building and social cohesion will be analyzed through pragmatic idealism theory. Pragmatic idealism refers to the delicate balance between pragmatic attitudes and idealistic values in addressing migration challenges. Capacity building includes enriching and strengthening the skills necessary for individuals and organizations to work towards a purpose (James, 1998). Capacity building includes supporting individuals and communities as well as institutional strengthening (James, 1998). In capacity building, individuals and institutions are supported in terms of knowledge and resources. In addition, providing the necessary training for the development of the skills of the institutions, enriching the documents, and creating systems are also within the scope (James, 1998). On the other hand, social cohesion expresses the spirit of solidarity and unity between refugees and local communities. It covers the harmonious integration of refugees with the host community, developing a sense of belonging and a common identity. Technical and legal support alone is not enough for social cohesion to take place. A common identity must be formed between the two communities (Schiefer & Van Der Noll, 2016). In addition, the criticisms of the non-governmental organizations (NGOs) providing support to refugees in Turkey towards the interaction between IOs and Turkey will be used as a complementary part of the analysis.

This study focuses on Turkey as a compelling case study due to its geographical location and significant migration management capacity. The study employed qualitative interviews with ten experts, including representatives from NGOs, IOs, and academia. These interviews



provide valuable insights into how IOs navigate the tension between pragmatism and idealism in their support to the Government and the People of Turkey.

The following research question will be answered by examining the support of European Union (EU) and global organizations such as International Organization for Migration (IOM), United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), International Labour Organization (ILO) to Turkey's migration management in terms of capacity building and social cohesion:

*How do international organizations (IOs) balance pragmatic attitudes and idealistic values when it comes to social cohesion and capacity building in the context of supporting Turkey's migration management capacity?*

### **1.1 Research Aim**

The research question that explores how international organizations (IOs) balance pragmatic attitudes and idealistic values in social cohesion and capacity building while supporting Turkey's migration management capacity fills a significant gap in the existing literature. This study will contribute to the IO literature as comprehensive research on the interaction of IOs with states in the delicate balance between pragmatism and idealism through Turkey, which hosts the highest number of refugees in the world. The interaction between IOs and states will be analyzed regarding social cohesion and capacity building in the context of migration management. Social cohesion and capacity building is an area that offers insights into the balance that IOs have to strike between pragmatism and idealism in their participation in migration management. IOs provide financial and technical support so that Turkey can host refugees in accordance with universal principles in the context of capacity building. Since 3.6 million refugees in Turkey are permanent in the country rather than guests, moving to the second stage of migration management, the social cohesion phase will be necessary. The study will comprehensively explore the delicate balance between pragmatism and idealism in migration management by analyzing the interaction of IOs with Turkey in the context of these two phases. The study contributes to the IO literature in the international arena, as the migration flow to Europe is expected to increase by 21% to 44% by 2030 (Acostamadiedo et al., 2020). The delicate balance in Turkey's migration management will also provide vital insights for the countries that will be the center of refugee flows in the future.

## **1.2 Theoretical Relevance**

The study will contribute to the field of international relations by making a comprehensive analysis of the delicate balance between idealism and pragmatism. Analyzing the interaction of IOs with states in terms of this delicate balance will provide insights into global governance theory through the observations of IO and NGO representatives and experienced academics who are experts in Turkey's migration management. In the context of Turkey, analyzing how IOs interact with states in the balance between pragmatism and idealism in the phases of capacity building and social cohesion will enrich the knowledge of migration management. Investigating how IOs strike a balance between these two seemingly contrasting perspectives helps elucidate how global governance operates and the challenges faced in managing diverse agendas and interests.

## **1.3 Societal Relevance**

The research question on how IOs balance pragmatic attitudes and idealistic values in social cohesion and capacity building while supporting Turkey's migration management capacity holds significant societal relevance. By investigating this interplay, we can gain insights into the complexities of global governance and contribute to the development of more effective and sustainable migration policies.

The research is particularly relevant to Turkey, as it directly impacts the country's social fabric and ability to manage migration. Furthermore, the findings can contribute to global knowledge sharing and learning, leading to more comprehensive and sustainable solutions to migration challenges worldwide. Ultimately, this research has implications for individuals, communities, and societies affected by migration, making it socially important.

## **1.4 Structural Outline**

Chapter 1 will present the research question and explain its theoretical significance. In Chapter 2, a literature review of the theories to be used in the theoretical framework of the research will be presented. Chapter 3 will discuss the theories of realism, cosmopolitanism, and pragmatic idealism and why the theory of pragmatic idealism is the most comprehensive theory for investigating the interaction between IOs and states. In Chapter 4, the methodology chosen for the study will be presented, and the research methods will be justified. Chapter 5 will analyze interviews and empirical data within the framework of pragmatic idealism. In Chapter

6, statistical data and interview insights will be analyzed analytically. In Chapter 7, conclusion and recommendations for future work will be made within the framework of the insights gained from this analysis.

## **2. Literature Review**

A literature review was conducted to establish the necessary theoretical framework for answering the research question. The literature review found that the theories of cosmopolitanism and realism were predominant in the criticism of idealist and pragmatic attitudes in the analysis of the interaction between IOs and states. In many studies, the interaction of IOs with states has been critically addressed regarding states' sovereign rights and national interests. States can use humanitarian assistance and assistance provided by IOs as a tool for increasing their sphere of influence and for stronger alliances (Ozkan & Beeson, 2016). Criticisms from the realist point of view address that the states evaluate the humanitarian aid and assistance offered by the IOs in terms of national interests (Heintze & Thielbörger, 2018). Levy et al. (2016) argue that IOs fall short of developing refugees' ability to adapt to a foreign culture. Criticisms of IOs in the literature within the framework of cosmopolitan values focus on the inadequacy of these organizations in terms of open-door policy, free flow of people and goods, and open interaction between cultures (Beardsworth, 2011; Gizatova et al., 2017).

In the literature on the interaction between IOs and Turkey, it has been observed that IOs promote universal principles. However, the influence of IOs is limited due to Turkey's national policies. Dereli emphasizes that the ILO's impact on improving the union rights of workers in Turkey is limited since the law in Turkey is not independent of politics. However, the ILO works to promote universal principles (2020). Zieck argues that the relationship between UNHCR and Turkey raises concerns about the erosion of the member states' obligation to comply with international laws (2010). Kirişçi explains that UNHCR's activities in Turkey remained low-key before 1980, but this has changed with new refugee flows. In this new situation, it is thought that Turkey's "geographical reservation" condition, meaning that Turkey does not recognize refugee status for non-Europeans, complicates cooperation with UNHCR (2001). Abdelaaty says that UNHCR does not use the concept of "refugee" in its writings about Turkey and that this self-censorship means approving Turkey's policies (2019, p.2). Beltekin, on the other hand, argues that UNHCR's work in Turkey is beneficial for the education of Syrian refugees. Contrary to the criticisms in the literature, UNICEF significantly contributes

to the education of Syrian refugees by providing standardization and technical support (2016). Kaiser and Kaya emphasize that Turkey's being a "transit country" in the refugee flow makes Turkey an essential part of the EU's asylum policy (2015, p.97). Concurrently, Imrie-Kuzu and Özerdem argue that the EU policy of keeping refugees in Turkey adversely affects social cohesion (2023).

### **3. Theoretical Framework**

This section sets the stage for a comprehensive analysis of migration management. By considering the actors involved, exploring contrasting theoretical perspectives, and analyzing the legal framework, this study can gain valuable insights into the role of IOs and their effectiveness in addressing the complex challenges posed by migration. To begin, the study will investigate the diverse stakeholders in migration management. These include nation-states, intergovernmental organizations, and non-governmental organizations. Each actor possesses distinct interests, perspectives, and responsibilities, shaping migration policies and practices. NGOs will contribute to deepening the research as they are in a critical position to defend universal values against the interaction of IOs with states. Next, this study will present theoretical perspectives: realism and cosmopolitanism. Realism was chosen because it was based on the interests of the states and was skeptical of the IOs, and cosmopolitanism was preferred for the sake of the multidimensionality of the work, as they were in a critical position against the states in order to defend universal values. Building upon these theories, this study will analyze whether pragmatic idealism offers a comprehensive framework for analyzing IOs' role in migration management.

Furthermore, capacity building and social cohesion will be discussed. Finally, within this framework, we will explore the legal dimensions of migration management. Specifically, the 1951 Geneva Convention and the 1967 Protocol, essential documents for migration management, will be discussed.

#### **3.1 Actors in Migration Management**

This section aims to provide a theoretical foundation for the analysis of NGOs, IOs, and states in the context of global affairs. Through this exploration, this study will contribute to the broader discourse on global governance and the pursuit of sustainable and equitable solutions to contemporary global challenges.

### **3.1.1 States**

The most decisive force in migration management in international politics is modern nation-states (Fjader, 2014). Modern states have become the leading power worldwide with the overthrow of premodern power centers with the French Revolution (Strauss, 2016). The modern state has a monopoly on violence within a certain territorial region (Devetak, 2021). This monopoly of violence becomes very important when it comes to migration management. A state can use force against people within its borders when necessary. Other actors do not have the authority to use such violence within a country's territorial borders (Lodewyckx et al., 2010).

With the human rights regime established after the Second World War, states became the central actors of migration management (Moretti, 2020). Although states are the sole authority within their own borders, they have to act on universal values in international issues such as migration management (Moretti, 2020). States are responsible for developing and implementing policies that address migration's economic, social, and cultural dimensions (Devetak, 2021). They play a crucial role in fostering social cohesion by creating inclusive environments and providing essential services to meet the needs of host communities and refugees (Lodewyckx et al., 2010). Additionally, states are responsible for strengthening the capacities of local institutions to respond effectively to migration challenges (Guizardi, 2019). However, states also face challenges in migration management, such as balancing migration flows with human rights principles (Guizardi, 2019). Despite these challenges, there are opportunities for states to leverage migration as a driver of economic and social development. By promoting labor market integration and establishing partnerships with stakeholders, states can enhance social cohesion, economic growth, and the effective management of migration (Devetak, 2021). States play a pivotal role in migration management. They have responsibilities in policy development, inclusive community-building, and the provision of essential services (Guizardi, 2019). While challenges exist in balancing migration management and upholding human rights, opportunities arise from leveraging migration for development (Guizardi, 2019).

### **3.1.2 International Organizations**

IOs employ a range of approaches in their support for migration management. They promote policy coherence, working with states to develop comprehensive and rights-based

migration policies (Van de Haar, 2009). IOs also advocate for the inclusion of social cohesion considerations in policy frameworks, aiming to foster inclusive societies that value diversity (Nuruzzaman, 2008). Furthermore, IOs facilitate knowledge sharing and exchange, enabling states to learn from each other's experiences and best practices. Capacity building is another core aspect of IO activities, as they provide training, technical assistance, and resources to enhance the capacities of states and local institutions in migration management (Nuruzzaman, 2008).

For migration management, international institutions not only provide a platform for dialogue and negotiations but also determine the norms that states must comply with. According to Thomas Risse and Kathryn Sikkink, in the process of "socialization" of international norms, strategic bargaining, moral consciousness-raising, dialogue, and institutionalization take place. In this way, governments that violate the rules face sanctions through the diffusion of international norms (1999, p. 4). IOs can affect governments through this mechanism. On the other hand, IOs are still not a power within the borders of a country (Irrera, 2016). This sets the limits of IOs. If governments continue pursuing a more protectionist policy for their national interests despite external pressures, IOs may be ineffective. Two different dimensions can therefore shape cooperation between IOs and governments. IOs may have to consider the security concerns of governments while advocating for humanitarian values.

### **3.1.3 Non-governmental Organizations**

One of the most prominent characteristics of NGOs is their independence (Papadopoulos et al., 2013). NGOs determine their actions with the concept of the non-profit. Proceeds from operations and fundraising are invested in other humanitarian activities (Sharry, 2020). This distinguishes NGOs from transnational corporations. NGOs operate through the voluntary activities of the communities they represent (Lewis, 2010). Volunteering also reflects the vital importance that civil society attaches to humanitarian values. Although IOs define the principles and norms that should be valid in global politics, NGOs can be more active in their defense (Clarke, 1998). Using all the resources of civil society, NGOs come to the fore in defending humanitarian values.

While governments can cooperate much more actively with IOs, they can protect themselves against NGOs (Lewis, 2020). Governments are more suspicious of NGOs

compared to IOs due to concerns over their independent and flexible nature, which allows for dissenting views and potential challenges to government policies, as well as the perceived risk of foreign influence and competition for influence and legitimacy (Ford & Lyons, 2013). Because of all these factors, NGO representatives' criticisms of IOs' interactions with states will assist in a more comprehensive analysis of the research question. NGO representatives can bring comprehensive criticism to the cooperation between the IO and states within the framework of universal principles (Sardinha, 2009).

### **3.2. Realism and Cosmopolitanism**

States can be comprehended through the lens of realism, a school of thought that views global politics from a confrontational standpoint. Realism posits that states act to safeguard their national interests (Guzzini, 2001). In the context of migration management, national interests play a decisive role. Concerns such as demography, economy, and security shape states' policies during migration crises. States may pursue protectionist policies if they perceive refugees as a threat to national security. Similarly, states facing population decline and a decrease in the working-age population may adopt integration-oriented policies (Pearson, 2022). Realism suggests that states can prioritize power in the international arena alongside humanitarian values when formulating strategies for refugees (Hansen, 2022). States may also leverage the migration crisis as an opportunity to exert pressure on rival states.

Furthermore, according to realism, states possess sovereignty within their borders (Hansen, 2022). In terms of migration management, states hold dominant power over the fate of refugees within their borders. International norms and cooperation must acknowledge this dominant power position of states. Effective international cooperation requires consideration of states' national interests (Hennig & Ballas, 2020). Realism, however, is skeptical of the ability of IOs to enforce their own standards in the context of the migration crisis (Kumar, 2022). It should be noted that realism alone does not suffice as a theoretical framework for the activities of IOs and NGOs, as it primarily focuses on states' policies based on their national interests.

Cosmopolitanism opposes the primacy of national interests in crises such as migration flows, instead prioritizing universal human values. It emphasizes the importance of global justice and respect for human rights (Beardsworth, 2011). This school of thought transcends borders and national interests in the context of the migration crisis. It advocates for the defense

of individuals regardless of their national, sexual, or religious identity (Sayapin, 2009). Cosmopolitanism promotes rights beyond citizenship-based entitlements, asserting that refugees should be respected not solely as citizens of a particular state but as human beings (Yanacopulos & Smith, 2007). It deems protectionist policies in the name of national interests unacceptable and calls for more humanitarian approaches to the migration crisis. Equal treatment of refugees is a fundamental principle.

### **3.3 Pragmatic Idealism**

IOs have to cooperate with states, and states act based on self-interest on significant issues such as migration management. Cooperation between IOs and states must, therefore, always consider states' interests (Irrera, 2016). The idea that states can agree on a rational basis through dialogue and negotiation may remain too optimistic in international crises. On the other hand, an exaggerated emphasis on the interests of states will cause universal values to be discredited. It can also be argued that these institutions may lose their functions when IOs cease to defend universal values (Geiger & Pécoud, 2013). For this reason, a synthesis is necessary for both the states' national interests to be considered and for universal values to be defended.

Pragmatic idealism combines the national interest-based point of view of the realism school and the idealist view of liberalism on universal values (Rudnicka-Drozak, 2016). Pragmatic idealism can provide a comprehensive theoretical framework for analyzing IOs. States will develop policies based on national interests when faced with migration flows. States will approach this crisis within the framework of security concerns and economic strategies (Christian, 2023). It is also possible for states to use the migration flow as a trump card in regional and global politics. IOs, on the other hand, will develop cooperation against the crisis created by the migration flow by advocating for universal values (Christian, 2023). These collaborations will also consider the states' national interests and security concerns. IOs will also be aware that states are sovereign powers within their borders. IOs will recognize states as the main actors in such crises.

Cosmopolitanism is viewed as overly idealistic and moralist by realist scholars, with a focus more on what 'should be' rather than what 'is,' making it less pragmatic in policy implementation (Christian, 2023). In contrast, realism prioritizes national interests and security, emphasizing power politics (Rudnicka-Drozak, 2016). Because realism ignores ethical concerns and is overly critical of cooperation between IOs and states, it may fall short



of analyzing IOs' interactions with states. (Rudnicka-Drozak, 2016). Pragmatic idealism, a blend of cosmopolitanism and realism, proposes principled yet realistic policies. It combines the ethical principles of cosmopolitanism and the practical actions safeguarding national and global interests inherent in realism. This approach could better explain the IOs.

### **3.4 Capacity Building and Social Cohesion**

This chapter explores the concepts of social cohesion and capacity building in the context of migration management. Analyzing these concepts is crucial for analyzing how IOs balance pragmatic attitudes and idealistic values while supporting Turkey's migration management capacity.

#### **3.4.1 Capacity Building**

Capacity building entails enhancing the knowledge, skills, resources, and institutional capabilities of various stakeholders involved in migration management. This includes host communities, local institutions, and refugees (James, 1998). Capacity building aims to strengthen the abilities of these stakeholders to effectively address the challenges and opportunities presented by migration (Schiefer & Van Der Noll, 2016). In migration management, capacity building is essential for various stakeholders involved in addressing the challenges and opportunities posed by migration. This includes host communities, local institutions, government agencies, civil society organizations, and refugees (Massari, 2021). Capacity building encompasses a range of activities, including training programs, workshops, mentoring, technical assistance, and knowledge sharing (James, 1998). These activities aim to enhance technical skills, management capabilities, policy development expertise, and organizational effectiveness. Capacity building initiatives may focus on data analysis, policy formulation, program implementation, intercultural communication, community engagement, and coordination among stakeholders (Schiefer & Van Der Noll, 2016).

#### **3.4.2 Social Cohesion**

Social cohesion refers to the degree of social integration, inclusion, and solidarity within a society. In the context of migration, social cohesion becomes vital for fostering harmonious coexistence among diverse communities and promoting the well-being of both host communities and refugees (Schiefer & Van Der Noll, 2016). Social cohesion is essential for sustainable and inclusive societies (Schiefer & Van Der Noll, 2016). In the context of

migration, promoting social cohesion involves addressing social tensions, promoting cultural diversity, and supporting the integration of refugees. (Schiefer and Van Der Noll, 2016). Enhancing social cohesion may include policies and programs promoting inclusive education, intercultural dialogue, community engagement, and equal access to healthcare, housing, and employment opportunities (James, 1998). Building social networks, fostering community-based initiatives, and promoting awareness and acceptance of diverse cultures also contribute to social cohesion (Lalot et al., 2021).

The analysis of social cohesion within the framework of migration management and the interaction between international organizations and states represents a crucial area for addressing the research question. Social cohesion requires refugees to coalesce with the host culture in accordance with universal values. Social cohesion will provide a good observation opportunity to see whether there is a violation of universal principles in migration management.

### **3.5 Historical and Legal Framework**

In order to analyze the interaction of IOs with Turkey in the migration management context, the legal framework determining the status of refugees within the country needs to be included in the analysis. The primary legal framework determining policies toward refugees is the 1951 Convention and the 1967 Protocol. With the 1951 Convention, it was determined by signatory states who would legally have refugee status. In addition, the rights of refugees are also guaranteed by this convention (Ineli-Ciger, 2017). The 1967 Protocol, on the other hand, aims to specify the 1951 Convention further. The geographical and temporal restrictions in the contract signed in 1951 were removed with this protocol (Ineli-Ciger, 2017). The concept of refugee status has expanded to include broader categories of forced displacement, and regional instruments have been developed to address specific challenges (Ineli-Ciger, 2017). The international community has continually worked to improve and strengthen refugee protection, resulting in the establishment of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the development of complementary protection mechanisms (Ineli-Ciger, 2017).

Turkey joined this protocol on the condition of geographical reservation. Turkey does not grant refugee status to people coming from outside of Europe except those of Turkish origin. Only those who come to Turkey from Europe due to an obligation can have refugee status (GDDM, 2016). Along with the Syrian Civil War, Turkey's accession to the 1967 protocol on the condition of geographical reservation caused a crisis in Turkey's migration

management capacity since Syrians do not have legal refugee status (Akar & Erdogdu, 2018). The Syrian civil war, which started in 2011, has caused millions of Syrians to flee to Turkey (Akar & Erdogdu, 2018). The Republic of Turkey Ministry of Interior Migration Management Board states that Turkey hosts 3.4 million refugees as of 2023 (MMB, 2023). Turkey adopted the "temporary protection" regime in 2014 for Syrians. After this new regulation, Turkey legally recognized the existence of Syrians within its borders. (Koyuncu, 2018). However, Turkey has not legally recognized the refugee status of Syrians due to the geographical reservation requirement. In 2014, Turkey adopted the Law on Foreigners and International Protection to legally recognize Syrians. The law established a legal framework for all foreigners in Turkey and introduced new categories of international protection for people outside of Europe including "conditional refugees" (Yildiz, 2007, p.211). According to this legal status, Syrians can temporarily stay within the borders of Turkey until they immigrate to a third country. To summarize, although the geographical reservation requirement for people outside of Europe continues, temporary refugee status has been accepted so that Syrians can access essential services.

## **4. Methodology**

### **4.1 Research Design and Objectives**

This study focuses on Turkey as a case study due to its significant role as the country with the highest number of registered refugees globally, estimated at 3.6 million (Akar, 2023). The presence of such a substantial refugee population raises questions regarding the extent to which refugees are protected in accordance with universal values (Akar, 2023). Turkey serves as a host country for millions of refugees and acts as a transit nation, playing a crucial role in preventing refugee flows toward Europe. Consequently, Turkey's refugee crisis provides an important context for examining the pragmatic and idealistic approaches of international institutions such as the EU, UNHCR, ILO, and IOM.

In this study, qualitative research methods will be used. It was decided to use the case study method for the analysis of the interaction of IOs with states. The Turkish case is particularly suitable for this study as it provides an ideal setting to test the application of the pragmatic idealist theory in the context of the Syrian refugee crisis. Turkey has been significantly impacted by the influx of millions of Syrian refugees, presenting complex challenges that require a delicate balance between pragmatic attitudes and idealistic values.

## 4.2 Data Collection

Interviews with IO and NGO representatives working in Turkey's refugee crisis and academics will be used as primary data for this research. The main reason for using these interviews instead of statistical data in the research is the complex nature of the research question. Statistical data will be used as a supplement in this qualitative study, which includes interviews with experts in the field. Interviews will provide more important data in investigating complex concepts such as human values. The opinions of NGO and IO representatives, who have developed close cooperation with Turkey in this refugee crisis, and academics conducting academic studies on this issue for many years will be useful.

The interviews with high-level experts from IOM, UNHCR, ILO, and the European Union, who have played pivotal roles in the significant technical advancements in migration management in Turkey over the past 15 years, aimed to capture their invaluable contributions to this progress. These individuals have been at the forefront of developing strategies, implementing policies, and mobilizing resources to effectively manage the challenges posed by the influx of millions of refugees, particularly in the Syrian conflict. Through their expertise, dedication, and collaborative efforts, they have actively shaped and guided Turkey's development in addressing the multifaceted dimensions of migration management.

Prof. Ahmet İçduygu, an expert in international relations and Turkey's migration management, provides policy consultancy to IOM and UNCHR as an academician. He will provide valuable insights for developing a comprehensive migration management capacity transformation analysis. As a former spokesperson and External Relations Officer of the UNHCR Turkey Office and Director of the Research Center on Asylum and Migration (IGAM), Metin Çorabatır, who has over 20 years of experience at UNHCR, will offer crucial perspectives on the challenges and opportunities faced by Turkey in managing migration.

The interview with Tomasso De Cataldo, Head of Migration Management IOM Turkey, who possesses direct field experience, will significantly contribute to investigating insights from someone actively engaged in the field. Head of Human and Social Development Laurent Guirkingier and Marcin Grabiec, Head of Migration Policy in the EU Turkey Delegation, will provide specific insights into the impact of the readmission agreement signed between Turkey and the EU on Turkey's capacity for managing migration. Volkan Deli, the National Project

Manager at UNCHR Turkey, holds a crucial position in the organization's efforts related to migration management in Turkey. Having previously served as the Senior Project Manager of the Council of Europe, his expertise and perspective will provide essential perspectives on the potential issues and dynamics in collaboration between institutions and official authorities. Gizem Karslı, head of Employment & Education in the ILO, will provide essential insights into the challenges faced in integrating refugees in Turkey into the labor force.

Ali Beyazgül, an activist and senior executive at Relief International, will provide important insights into the collaboration between NGOs and Turkish institutions. Bindal Güner, representing People In Need, will discuss the specific problems encountered in their work in Turkey and potential solutions. Kadir Beyaztaş, the General Coordinator of the Association for Solidarity with Asylum Seekers and Migrants (SGDD-ASAM), brings significant expertise and leadership in migration management. With his extensive experience and role as a key figure in SGDD-ASAM, Kadir Beyaztaş offers valuable insights into the challenges and potential problems in cooperation between institutions and official authorities.

By conducting interviews with ten experts from various organizations, it is aimed to analyze IOs and their commitment to universal values. Furthermore, obtaining numerical data regarding the assistance provided by IOs for capacity building and social cohesion, aimed at strengthening Turkey's migration management, will be instrumental in comprehending the dualistic nature of IOs. In summary, the case of Turkey serves as a valuable research context to investigate the interactions between states and IOs in migration management. Conducting interviews with experts from diverse organizations, along with analyzing numerical data on capacity-building assistance, will enhance the analysis of the complexities and variations in IOs' approach to universal values.

#### **4.3 Data Analysis**

The methodology used in this study is based on triangulation, which includes the integration of multiple data sources to increase the reliability and validity of the findings. In the triangulation method, qualitative and statistical data are analyzed mutually, thus testing the safety of qualitative and statistical data. In this method, thoughts and claims revealed in interviews are triangulated with statistical data obtained from secondary sources. Thus, possible prejudices revealed in the interviews are corrected in the light of secondary data.

Social cohesion and capacity building themes were taken as the basis in the analysis of the interviews. Social cohesion and capacity building will help analyze what appears paradoxical about IOs.

It is decisive for analyzing the practical assistance of organizations to refugees. The distinction between social cohesion and capacity building will also preclude unilateral analysis of IOs. In approaching IOs critically, there is a danger that the aid these organizations provide to refugees is overlooked. In the more pragmatic steps of IOs, the possibility that idealistic commitment to universal values may continue should be considered. For this reason, examining the aid provided by organizations for the refugee crisis in two different dimensions will prevent the danger of such a one-sided analysis.

#### **4.4 Limitations**

One of the most important limitations of research may be selection bias. If the interviews are not supported by a detailed and meticulous analysis, the contribution of international organizations to Turkey's migration management cannot be addressed objectively. Inconsistencies may also occur during data collection. To prevent this, only reports published by official institutions should be used. This necessity will mean that the data pool for the research is necessarily limited. Not enough coverage of the views of other key actors, such as policymakers, can have a similar effect.

Another objective of this study was to conduct interviews with state officials in Turkey. However, it should be acknowledged that the state dimension of the research might be limited due to the challenges encountered in obtaining positive responses from government officials for interview requests citing reasons such as the sensitivity of the issue and security-related concerns. To ensure state's aspect is not overlooked, the report issued by the Ministry of Internal Affairs, specifically the General Directorate of Migration Management, dated 2023, will be utilized as a supplementary source of information. Incorporating this report into the study is intended to compensate for the potential absence of direct input from state officials and provide a comprehensive analysis of the subject matter.

## **5. Analysis**

Chapter 5 investigating the significance of social cohesion and capacity building, analyzing the role of IOs within the framework of pragmatic idealism theory.

### **5.1 Capacity Building**

This section will analyze the interaction between IOs and Turkey regarding refugee protection, border security, funding, health care, and coordination. In the analysis, the support offered by IOs for capacity building will be investigated through statistical data, and insights from the interviews will be used to discuss how these supports are compatible with the universal values of IOs in migration management. Another dimension of the analysis will be how Turkey's state policies lead IOs to adopt a more pragmatic stance.

#### **5.1.1 Refugee Protection and Border Security**

Tommaso De Cataldo, Head of the Migration Management Department of IOM Turkey, emphasizes that IOM provides significant support in the preparation of legislation in Turkey's fight against irregular migration. According to De Cataldo, IOM provided significant support in the development of a plan titled "entry, stay, return, reintegration in the countries of origin, and mainstreaming human rights" on irregular migration, thus enabling irregular migrants to benefit from human rights and assistance. Academician and UNCHR National Project Manager Volkan Deli adds that UNHCR offers protection services to refugees in removal centers, camps in border regions, and cases of deportation. Statistical data also confirm that IOs significantly contribute to protecting refugees and border security. The International Organization for Migration (IOM) played a significant role by providing extensive training to over 1,000 Turkish border guards (IOM Turkey, 2022). The focus of this training was international migration law and standards, aimed at enhancing their competence in managing border crossings and ensuring the rights of migrants.

Further collaboration between IOM and UNHCR was witnessed in their support of the construction of a new border facility in Gaziantep, Turkey (IOM Turkey, 2022). In addition to managing the flow of incoming migrants and refugees, there was a focus on those choosing to return to their countries of origin. The IOM assisted with the voluntary repatriation of over 20,000 refugees in 2021, providing them with the necessary support and ensuring a safe return

(IOM Turkey, 2022). Parallely, the UNHCR extended their assistance to the reintegration process by supporting over 10,000 refugees who returned home, further underscoring their commitment to the entirety of the refugee displacement process.

SGDD-ASAM representative Kadir Beyaztaş warns about the limits of the support given by IO. Beyaztaş emphasizes that IOs "had to be content with insufficient solutions within the framework put forward by the state." According to Beyaztaş, the state is the determinant of the limits of the support provided by the IOs in the protection of refugees and border security and IOs have to find a solution in line with Turkey's policies. Academician Prof. Ahmet İçduygu and UNCHR National Project Manager highlight that IOs face limitations in ensuring refugees' full access to the rights recognized by international law, as Turkey grants temporary status to Syrians. Therefore, IOs cannot facilitate refugees' complete realization of the rights acknowledged under international law. IOM Representative Tommaso De Cataldo emphasizes that IOM recognizes Turkey's national sovereignty, but migration management should be compatible with national and international law. From the perspective of IOM, Turkey's temporary status decision is evaluated within the framework of Turkey's national sovereignty. However, Tommaso De Cataldo emphasizes that IOM defends international law, adding that this decision will create challenges for Turkey.

Statistical data on the support provided by IOs also show that Turkey's policies limit this support. IOM has provided protection support for the voluntary return of 20000 refugees, but the voluntary return of refugees complies with the framework of Turkey's policy. Thus, it is seen that IOs are able to offer support to refugees where Turkey allows. IOs provide support for refugees in Turkey to be treated according to universal principles if they are deported to removal centers. People in Need representative Bindal Güler adds that since Turkey does not recognize Syrians as refugees, their deportation may not be compatible with universal principles. This complex interaction reveals that IOs have developed pragmatic collaborations to continue supporting refugees within the framework of Turkey's refugee policy against universal principles.

### **5.1.2 Funding and Resource Challenges**

According to UNHCR data, financial support allocated to refugee programs in Turkey amounted to approximately \$311.8 million in 2020 alone (UNHCR, 2020). Thanks to this fund, UNHCR supported programs implemented for the protection of refugees in Turkey. The EU



has been helping Turkey host Syrian refugees by providing €7.66 billion in financial support since 2011 (EU, 2022). However, considering that Turkey is the center of a vital migration flow, the question of how sufficient these figures can be may be asked. Prof. Ahmet İçduygu and Metin Çorabatır emphasize that in resource constraints in the management of refugees in Turkey, human resources and technical expertise are insufficient to manage the challenges posed by the refugee population effectively. In 2021, International Organizations were significant contributors to Turkey's migration management, with the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) collectively providing a substantial amount of €200 million (IOM Turkey, 2022). This funding was directed towards various initiatives aimed at supporting migrants and refugees, including healthcare, education, and integration programs. Crucially, a significant portion of these funds was facilitated by the European Union (EU), affirming its status as the largest donor to the IOM and UNHCR's work in Turkey (IOM Turkey, 2022). The EU contributed an impressive sum of over €100 million in 2021 alone. This generous financial support underscores the EU's commitment to managing migration effectively and ethically, highlighting its critical role in the international community's efforts to address migration challenges in Turkey.

On the other hand, People In Need Representative Bindal Güner emphasizes that the financial support of IOs is insufficient to solve the problems of refugees. The necessary institutional cooperation to make financial support sustainable between Turkey and IOs has not yet been realized. Turkey's interaction with IOs is limited, so that refugees will be deprived of financial support. This may be one of the underlying dynamics for IOs to adopt a more pragmatic attitude in their interactions with Turkey. For refugees in Turkey to continue to be financially supported, IOs need to be able to continue their pragmatic cooperation with Turkey. If IOs put aside finding the balance between pragmatic attitude and idealistic values, they will not be able to support refugees in Turkey financially. This means that refugees in Turkey may be even more vulnerable.

### **5.1.3 Healthcare and Well-being**

Healthcare includes both the urgent needs of refugees who have left the war zone and the necessary arrangements for these refugees to access health services. People In Need representative Bindal Güner emphasizes that the legal regulation is insufficient for refugees to access health services. The fact that refugees have temporary status poses an obstacle to refugees' access to health services. Bindal Güner stressed that Turkey's migration management

lacks a centralized policy framework and the requisite institutions to align with universal values effectively. Consequently, this deficiency leads to a situation where refugees' health issues are not adequately recognized or addressed as substantive concerns.

IOs are assisting refugees in a context where Turkey does not offer comprehensive health support to refugees within a central migration policy framework. IOM extended medical care to over 1 million refugees residing both within camps and urban areas in Turkey, with UNHCR supplementing these efforts by providing medical care to an additional 500,000 refugees (IOM Turkey, 2022). The investment was also channeled toward the physical healthcare infrastructure, with IOM and UNHCR supporting the construction of a new healthcare facility in Gaziantep, Turkey. They further supplemented these measures by providing essential medicines and medical supplies to over 100,000 refugees, ensuring continued access to necessary treatment and medication (IOM Turkey, 2022). The scope of IOM, EU, and UNHCR's support extended beyond healthcare to encompass broader aspects of refugees' well-being. In 2021, the organizations provided psychosocial support to over 600,000 refugees, helping them cope with the psychological strain of displacement (IOM Turkey, 2022: UNHCR, 2023). Their support is also focused on education and skills training, with IOM supporting over 100,000 refugees and UNHCR assisting over 500,000 (IOM Turkey, 2022: UNHCR, 2023). These initiatives helped refugees acquire critical skills and knowledge, empowering them for a more independent life.

Nevertheless, Relief International representative Ali Beyazgül's warning should be taken into account; sustainability in these health supports has not been achieved yet. In the comparative analysis made between the refugees in Turkey and the refugees in Europe, it was found that the "Syrian refugees in Turkey are in a better position" in terms of healthcare assistance "than the refugees in Europe" (Tas et al., 2018, p.310). Despite this, it is stated that these health benefits are not regular, comprehensive, and sustainable. (Tas et al., 2018) People In Need representative Bindal Güler emphasizes that the protection of refugees' health cannot be achieved with temporary aid. Although IOs provide vital support to Turkey's migration management capacity, these are not sustainable aids since Turkey does not have a comprehensive healthcare plan for refugees. Turkey again sets the limits of the support that IOs can offer. Turkey does not implement institutions and a central policy to provide services such as comprehensive health screening. Turkey's provisional status to Syrians also limits the extent of support IOs can offer. This is an important example of the role of IOs in terms of

pragmatic idealist theory because it confines the support of IOs to a limited framework. Protecting the health of refugees is one of the core values and principles of IOs. IOs continue to support refugees in Turkey due to idealistic values. On the other hand, due to the deprivation of the legal status of refugees in Turkey, IOs have to seek pragmatic solutions to support refugees in terms of health. The unsustainability of these solutions is one of the important aspects of the balance between idealistic values and pragmatic attitudes.

#### **5.1.4 Coordination and Collaboration**

As of 2021, UNHCR reports that more than 60 NGOs are working on projects focusing on various aspects of refugee assistance and protection in Turkey. Achieving effective collaboration and coordination among numerous institutions necessitates significant efforts and cooperation. (UNHCR, 2018). EU Representative Guirkingner emphasized during the interview that the EU contributed to the development of cooperation in hosting refugees by working with international organizations such as UNHCR and IOM and Turkey's institutions. It should still be noted here that for Guirkingner, the agreement signed between Turkey and the EU has been a significant success regarding cooperation and the resolution of refugee crises. EU Representative Grabiec also stresses the importance of the long-standing cooperation between the EU and Turkey on migration issues. Grabiec cites the 2016 EU-Turkey statement as the main framework that guides the relations between the two sides. The statement was created in response to the mass migration from Syria and aimed to streamline the flow of refugees and provide support to Turkey in managing the crisis. The readmission agreement signed between the European Union and Turkey entered into force on 18 March 2016. According to this agreement, refugees entering the European border illegally will be sent back to Turkey (Lehner, 2018). Although it was not possible to interview state officials on this subject, it is argued in the 2016 report of the Migration Management Board that the readmission agreement with the EU will provide significant benefits based on reciprocity in preventing irregular migration. This defense argues that although Turkey's readmission agreement was signed within the framework of national policy, it attaches importance to universal values (GDMM, 2021).

Guirkingner emphasizes that although it is a political declaration, the EU-Turkey statement has been implemented for seven years, indicating a level of satisfaction and continued cooperation between the two sides. He also mentions that the EU knows Turkey is moving away from "European standards" in "certain areas." Despite this, the EU continued to support civil society and fundamental rights in Turkey. This presents an important insight for

the EU's policy based on pragmatic idealism. While the EU sees the support of civil society and fundamental rights as a red line within the framework of idealism, a ground suitable for the interests of both sides has been found within the framework of the 2016 agreement, which is seen as a political declaration. This "political declaration" shows that the theory of pragmatic idealism can serve an explanatory function in the EU's interaction with Turkey. A "political declaration" states that the parties' national interests are considered. The parties signed this agreement to find a balance between national interests.

IOM Representative Tommaso De Cataldo emphasizes that Chapter 24 is an essential incentive for Turkey's EU membership negotiations to align Turkey's refugee policy with international laws. Chapter 24, which is among the chapters that Turkey must comply with in the process of full membership to the EU, covers issues such as recognition of the legal status of refugees, compliance with the deportation process with universal principles, effective border security in the fight against irregular migration and human smuggling (Kirişçi, 2007). Chapter 24 indicates that the EU provides significant support for Turkey's migration management to be compatible with universal values. Tommaso De Cataldo underlines the critical imperative for Turkey to align its migration management with the provisions outlined in Chapter 24. Director of the Research Center on Asylum and Migration Metin Çorabatır states that Turkey has conveyed to the EU that Turkey will accept all universal principles on migration management in the process of harmonization with the EU. However, Metin Çorabatır adds that Turkey asks the EU and UNCHR not to pressure the removal of the geographical reservation requirement. While Turkey agreed to take steps to render migration management compatible with universal principles, Turkey did not agree to grant refugee status to non-Europeans. Although the EU determines the necessary rules for migration management under universal principles, Turkey is the decisive actor in the implementation of these rules. This delicate balance can serve to analyze the pragmatic, idealistic attitude of IOs. Although IOs promote universal principles for migration management, they can pragmatically help refugees in migration crises within a limited framework offered by states.

## **5.2. Social Cohesion**

In this section, the interaction between IOs and Turkey will be discussed within the framework of the concept of social cohesion. First, the support of IOs for Turkey's migration management will be examined regarding social cohesion. Barriers to social cohesion will then

be discussed, along with interview insights. Insights from the interviews will investigate the requirements for realizing social cohesion in Turkey.

### **5.2.1 Social Cohesion and IOs**

One of the main objectives of IOs to facilitate social inclusion and integration of refugees by actively involving them in sports activities, cultural events, and language training. IOM and UNHCR supported over 100,000 refugees to partake in such activities, allowing them to interact with the local Turkish population and immerse themselves in the culture (IOM, 2021). One noteworthy initiative was an IOM-supported project, which organized sports tournaments and cultural events, effectively breaking down barriers and fostering a sense of community between refugees and the local population (IOM, 2020). In 2021, over 100,000 refugees were provided access to education and skills training with the support of IOM, EU, ILO, and UNHCR (IOM, 2021; UNHCR, 2018). These initiatives gave refugees the necessary skills to gain employment and contribute to the Turkish economy. An illustrative example was an IOM-supported project that offered vocational training to refugees, equipping them with new skills and improving their employment prospects (IOM, 2022).

Statistical data show that IOs also support Turkey's migration capacity regarding social cohesion. This support of IOs is an indication of the defense of idealistic values. International Organizations provide the necessary technical support for refugees to come together with the host community within a common identity framework. These statistical data alone cannot be accepted as evidence that social cohesion is possible. Insights obtained from interviews with experts in the field, rather than statistical data, will contribute to the analysis of social cohesion. Social cohesion requires extensive cooperation between Turkey and International Organizations as it is based on universal values. IOs will face challenges if Turkey does not implement a plan for social cohesion. IOs can develop pragmatic cooperation with Turkey in order to be the defenders of idealistic values.

### **5.2.2 A comprehensive Plan for Social Cohesion**

Although statistical data confirms that IOs also contribute in terms of social cohesion, it has been observed in interviews with NGO representatives and academics that there is not strong enough progress on social cohesion for the integration of refugees in Turkey with the host community in accordance with the concept of social cohesion. Academician and UNCHR National Project Manager Volkan Deli, SGDD-ASAM Deputy General Coordinator Kadir

Beyaztaş, People In Need Representative Bindal Güner, and academician Ahmet İçduygu emphasize that Turkey is reluctant to establish the necessary institutions to promote social cohesion and to develop a central policy for this. The fact that Turkey does not take the necessary steps for social cohesion also means that the support of IOs is possible in a limited area. Thus, IOs have to develop pragmatic collaborations to support refugees within a limited area. Volkan Deli stresses the need for a more integrated state policy regarding social cohesion. Even though the concept of social cohesion has become a "glowing concept" in recent years, states have implemented such a policy against refugee influxes in the past. Volkan Deli stresses that for social cohesion to occur, there must be a realistic integration plan. Social cohesion can only be possible if the state implements an active policy. This policy will have three important pillars. First of all, refugees need to be able to become a part of the workforce. Reforms in education and the adaptation of refugees to the integration process will be another essential step. Volkan Deli also emphasizes that classifications will be important for integration. It is necessary to determine which refugees will be integrated into society and to shape state policies toward this.

### **5.2.3 Three necessary stages for social cohesion and IOs**

The ILO is developing cooperation with Turkey on the labor force participation of refugees, which is one of the three requirements for social cohesion emphasized by SGDD-ASAM Representative, UNCHR Representative, Metin Çorabatır and Prof. Ahmet İçduygu. However, these collaborations have to remain at a pragmatic level due to Turkey's policies. According to the ILO Representative Gizem Karşlı, even the registered employment of refugees is not sufficient in terms of social cohesion. There is a risk that refugees who work formally will have to work informally again. Such a risk would mean "reverse in terms of social cohesion." Important steps need to be taken to ensure social cohesion among registered refugees and domestic workers to avoid the reverse in terms of social cohesion. Despite this, the ILO continues its efforts to inform refugees in Turkey about workers' rights and direct informal workers to formal jobs. The lack of a central plan for the labor force participation of refugees in Turkey limits the contributions of the ILO. The ILO's universal principles require the full participation of refugees in the workforce. Although Turkey carries out a refugee policy contrary to the universal principles of the ILO, the ILO continues to support refugees in Turkey in order to prevent them from becoming vulnerable in working life. In this respect, the ILO enters into pragmatic cooperation with Turkey, which has a refugee policy contrary to its own

universal principles, in order to protect the universal principles, albeit to a limited extent. This shows that the ILO has had to pursue a pragmatic attitude to assist refugees in a political context where Turkey does not grant permanent status to refugees. The ILO Representative sees the development of collective consciousness about social rights as an important step for social cohesion. Workers come together against overwork, mobbing, and other problems, and this brings local workers and refugees together around a common identity and belonging. The ILO Representative stresses universal values and red lines that the ILO has to comply with. This view can also be considered in line with the theory of pragmatic idealism as Turkey does not manage the labor force participation of refugees following universal principles and leaves the ILO limited scope to support refugees in this regard.

Another important step for social cohesion is the classification of refugees and the legal status of refugees who will stay in Turkey. Metin Çorabatır and Prof. Ahmet İçduygu stress that legal regulations must be inclusive. The temporary status of refugees in Turkey is an essential obstacle to social cohesion. According to the Ministry of Internal Affairs, General Directorate of Migration Management report, the Law on Foreigners and International Protection became official in 2014. The law also prohibits refoulement, which will apply if refugees are sent back to countries where they will face the risk of death and oppression (GDMM, 2021).

The General Directorate of Migration Management argues that the position of refugees in Turkey has been harmonized with international laws and universal values (GDMM, 2021). However, it should be noted that this report has no emphasis or prediction on refugees having permanent status. This shows that Turkey does not have a plan to make the necessary legislative changes in terms of social cohesion. Due to the temporary status of refugees, it is unclear whether refugees are temporary or permanent in Turkey (Yitman et al., 2022). For the realization of social cohesion, refugees must have legal status. The fact that Turkey does not grant refugees legal status also limits the support that IOs can provide for social cohesion. Due to legal restrictions, IOs cannot provide the necessary support for refugees in Turkey to be classified by a legal institution and penetrate the guest community culture. For this reason, IOs are content with projects such as raising social awareness for social cohesion and therefore display a pragmatic attitude.

In education, another subject that UNCHR Representative, SGDD-ASAM Representative and Prof. Ahmet İçduygu, claim is essential for social cohesion, the

contributions of IOs are also confirmed by statistical data. According to UNHCR data, as of 2021, 63% of refugee children aged 5-17 are enrolled in formal education in Turkey. On the other hand, UNICEF reports that the gross primary school enrollment rate of Syrian refugee children reached 65% in 2020. (UNICEF, 2020). Considering these figures, significant steps have been taken to adapt Syrian students to the education system. In this context, in 2020 alone, UNHCR contributed approximately \$15.5 million to education-related activities in Turkey (UNHCR, 2020). However, these figures are insufficient for education. UNICEF's Humanitarian Action for Children report highlights the need for at least \$126 million to support education programs for Syrian refugee children (2021). This may mean that Syrian students encounter a language barrier. The language barrier will be a “barrier to the integration of refugees” in terms of social skills and participation in working life (Ochieng, 2013, p. 143).

Relief International Representative, UNCHR Representative and SGDD-ASAM Representative consider Turkey's lack of a central education policy for refugees as one of the biggest obstacles to social cohesion. People in Need Representative emphasizes that Syrian students are sent to the same schools as Turkish students but that the necessary curriculum changes have not been made to bring Syrian students into the culture and the Turkish language. However, the General Directorate of Migration Management states that Syrian students can participate in education thanks to the temporary protection status that came into effect in 2014. It should be noted that the Directorate stopped publishing an annual report after 2017, and the report does not emphasize social cohesion in the section on the education of Syrians (General Directorate of Migration Management, 2017). UNCHR Representative also emphasizes that as a state policy, Turkey has not established a central education plan for Syrians to become a part of education life. The fact that Turkey does not put such a central plan in terms of education shows that social cohesion is not a state policy. IOs can only support the education of refugees within this narrow framework. This means that IOs have to develop more pragmatic collaborations to support the education of Syrian refugees. People in Need Representative emphasizes that the fact that refugee students can receive education in schools in Turkey does not mean that a central education system has been put in place for social cohesion. In this respect, the financial contributions of IOs such as UNHCR only mean that refugee students receive temporary support in terms of education. In Turkey's absence of central institutions and policies for social cohesion, IOs are limited to such pragmatic solutions.



### **5.2.3 Social Cohesion and Turkey**

There are significant barriers to the social cohesion of refugees in Turkey, including education, workforce, and legal status. The reason for these obstacles is Turkey's current state policy. Turkey does not have a plan to take the necessary steps for the social cohesion of refugees. The current situation jeopardizes refugees' ability to live in harmony with universal values. Turkey's resistance to social cohesion also limits the support that IOs can provide. In addition, the fact that local administrators have different savings on refugees is among the biggest obstacles to social cohesion. People in Need, SGDD-ASAM and UNCHR Representative emphasize the differences in the approaches of Gaziantep and Hatay governorships as an example. While the governor of Hatay shows a softer and more inclusive approach to cooperation with NGOs, the governorship of Gaziantep follows a stricter attitude. Refugees may encounter different attitudes in government offices depending on the cities they reside in. Relief International Representative even mentions that some of his clients change cities to solve their problems. This phenomenon, frequently encountered in the literature, is not unique to Turkey. Therefore, the importance of the behavior of local administrators in the absence of a central migration management plan is a deficiency of migration management. As Mojumder and Panday stress, different attitudes of local administrators have become one of the important obstacles to social cohesion (2019). Kadir Beyaztaş suggests a big initiative like the Ministry of Immigration for social cohesion. A central initiative such as the Ministry of Immigration can make social cohesion a realistic state policy.

## **6. Discussion**

As a theoretical perspective, pragmatic idealism seeks to reconcile the often opposing views of idealism and realism (Baker, 2007). The idealistic side posits that international cooperation can lead to a more peaceful and harmonious world. On the other hand, realism underscores the importance of self-interest and power dynamics between nations. Pragmatic idealists accept that self-interest drives countries but also believe in the transformative power of international cooperation and norms.

Turkey has a unique relationship with the EU as a candidate for membership and is a major player in managing the migration crisis. Pragmatically, the EU-Turkey deal 2016 saw Turkey taking on a "gatekeeper" role, reducing the flow of refugees into Europe in exchange for financial aid. Idealistically, the EU also exerts normative pressure on Turkey to adhere to

certain asylum and migration policy standards, aiming to ensure the humane treatment of refugees, since Turkey is one of the candidate countries for the European Union. The UNHCR primarily aims to protect and support refugees, advocating for their rights and well-being. The support and expertise of the UNHCR has been crucial. UNHCR supports refugees in Turkey within the boundaries of Turkey's refugee policy. UNHCR still offers assistance for refugee protection in areas such as border security, refugee protection, student education and health care. UNHCR continues its cooperation with Turkey so that refugees are not vulnerable. This relationship aligns with the idealist perspective, but it also has a pragmatic aspect as the UNHCR aids Turkey in managing this significant refugee population, reducing potential social tension and economic pressures. The IOM works to promote humane and orderly migration. In Turkey, it aids in managing migratory flows, contributes to capacity building for migration management, and assists in integrating refugees. Here, the pragmatic benefit to Turkey is support in managing migration effectively, while the idealistic aspect is the promotion of orderly, safe, and humane migration processes. In a framework where Turkey does not allow full participation of Syrians in the workforce as permanent status holders, the ILO continues its support to ensure that refugees are not exposed to mobbing and work informally. In addition, the ILO implements training and awareness raising projects to develop mutual awareness between refugees and local workers.

The European Union's approach to migration management includes both pragmatic and idealistic attitudes. The European Union's pragmatic approach includes border control, prevention of illegal migration and meeting the needs of asylum seekers (Kirişçi, 2007). The European Union also advocates idealistic principles such as human rights, solidarity and the European project. In addition to protecting refugees and asylum-seekers, the EU also promotes a more open and inclusive approach to migration (Yitman et al., 2022). It should be acknowledged that the balance between the pragmatic attitude of the European Union and its idealistic values is determined by international politics in Turkey's case. The refugee crisis, which escalated after 2015, strengthened the pragmatic orientation of the EU (Lehner, 2018). Due to a significant influx of refugees seeking to migrate to Europe from war-torn areas in the Middle East and North Africa after 2015, the EU takes a more restrictive approach to border controls and asylum rights (Lehner, 2018).

When examining the EU's cooperation with Turkey in the context of migration, it becomes apparent that the EU has prioritized its own interests over the adherence to universal

values. The EU-Turkey Statement of 2016, which aimed to address the migration crisis and manage the flow of refugees entering Europe through Turkey, can be seen as a reflection of this approach. Under the agreement, Turkey received financial support from the EU in exchange for its efforts to prevent refugees from crossing into Europe. This has resulted in the containment of refugees within Turkey's borders and an increased burden on the country in terms of hosting and providing for a large number of displaced individuals. EU-Turkey cooperation fails to uphold universal values such as the right to seek asylum and protection from persecution (Rygiel et al., 2021). The agreement undermined the principle of non-refoulement, which prohibits the return of individuals to a country where they may face persecution or harm. Additionally, the EU's cooperation with Turkey has been seen as driven by its own interests, including a desire to control and manage migration flows to Europe (Rygiel et al., 2021). By outsourcing the responsibility of hosting refugees to Turkey, the EU aimed to reduce the number of arrivals on its own territory, thereby addressing political and public concerns within member states). This approach can be viewed as a pragmatic pursuit of the EU's interests, prioritizing border control and political stability within its member states (Carling, J., & Hernández-Carretero, 2011). However, it raises questions about the EU's commitment to universal values and its role as a defender of human rights and refugee protection. In contrast to the EU, global organizations such as the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) adhere more strictly to universal values in their efforts to protect and assist refugees. The UNHCR's primary mandate is to ensure the well-being and rights of refugees worldwide, without compromising their fundamental human rights or engaging in agreements that may contradict these principles. Organizations such as UNHCR, ILO and IOM have to consider Turkey's national interests to support refugees in Turkey. These organizations display a more pragmatic attitude in order to achieve this goal. The pragmatic attitude can be observed in the aid provided to prevent the refugee crisis from growing. These organizations contribute to Turkey's migration capacity through financial assistance, training, and personnel support.

## **7. Conclusion**

The determinant of the interaction between IOs and Turkey within the framework of migration management is Turkey's granting of temporary status to Syrians. Turkey does not have a comprehensive migration plan or a central policy for the future of Syrians in Turkey. It is unclear whether the refugees in Turkey are permanent in the country due to the temporary

status. This policy of Turkey prevents refugees from living within the framework of universal rights in line with the human rights regime. IOs, on the other hand, did not resist cooperating with Turkey within the framework of this policy of Turkey, contrary to universal principles. Despite the limits set by Turkey's current policy, IOs continue to support refugees and improve Turkey's migration management. This interaction of IOs with Turkey can be interpreted within the framework of pragmatic idealism theory. IOs do not limit their interactions with countries that violate their universal values. Within all these limitations, these institutions continue their projects to support refugees in accordance with universal values. Its pragmatic idealist theory also finds it wrong to completely sever ties with authoritarian regimes or countries that violate human rights in certain respects. It encourages the development of limited cooperation with these actors in terms of long-term goals. IOs continue their communication and cooperation with Turkey in order to prevent refugees in Turkey from becoming completely vulnerable. During these collaborations, IOs advocate and promote universal principles. Despite Turkey's resistance to abolishing the geographical reservation requirement, the initiation of chapters in line with universal principles in migration management between Turkey and the EU during the EU accession negotiations can be given as an example to this claim.

It has been observed that Turkey, which hosts millions of people, could become significantly inadequate in migration management without the contributions of the EU, UNHCR, IOM, and ILO. Throughout the thesis, the mentioned international organizations' contributions in terms of capacity building and social cohesion have been highlighted, allowing for a relatively better living conditions for refugees in Turkey. Therefore, instead of reducing cooperation with countries experiencing an increase in authoritarianism like Turkey, it would be beneficial for all parties if IOs strive to maintain their collaboration. Undoubtedly, the preservation of the delicate balance between pragmatic approaches and idealistic values will play a crucial role in defining the boundaries of this collaboration. It is worth noting, as emphasized throughout the thesis, that states continue to hold the primary agency in shaping this dynamic.

## **7.1 Recommendation**

In future studies, research on the differences in the attitudes of regional collaborations such as the EU and global organizations such as ILO, UNHCR, and IOM in international crises will be beneficial. The EU has to take into account the national interests of both the

counterparty and the European countries in its relations with countries outside of Europe. The EU faces protecting universal values in a much more complex process. Political polarization within the European Union and the member states' national goals must be considered. The European Union cannot be an organization that only defends universal values in international cooperation. The European Union can take a pragmatic attitude towards international crises as well as for the interests of its member states. In the case of institutions such as ILO, IOM, and UNHCR, the reason behind the pragmatic attitude is the national policies of the cooperating country. For the solution of international crises, such as migration, these institutions both advocate universal values and develop pragmatic cooperation with countries that move away from these values. In the absence of these pragmatic collaborations, refugees can be completely defenseless. This fact shows that the pragmatic stance of these institutions differs from that of the EU. Addressing the differences between the EU and institutions such as ILO, UNHRC, and IOM within the framework of pragmatic idealism theory will make the analysis much more comprehensive.

Lastly, particularly for researchers studying Turkey, it becomes apparent that, based on the consensus observed in interviews, the 2016 failed coup attempt, the subsequent rise of authoritarianism, and the increasing skepticism of the Turkish government towards "external actors" such as international organizations (IOs) and non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Therefore, the relationship between Turkey and these external actors has undergone a negative transformation in recent years. There is now a greater level of suspicion regarding their intentions. Examining this evolving dynamic between Turkey and IOs and NGOs, may presents a promising avenue of research for analyzing how the distancing of states experiencing an increase in authoritarianism, from institutions that promote universal values impact a country's governance capacity. Further exploration of this area in future studies is highly recommended to gain a deeper understanding of the implications and potential strategies for addressing these challenges in a more comprehensive manner.

## References

- Abdelaaty, L. (2019). Refugees and Guesthood in Turkey. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 34(3), 2827–2848. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fez097>
- Adhikari, K. (2012). The Search for Universal Values. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*. <https://doi.org/10.9790/0837-0216972>
- Ahouga, Y. (2017). The local turn in migration management: the IOM and the engagement of local authorities. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 44(9), 1523–1540. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183x.2017.1368371>
- Akar, S., & Erdoğan, M. M. (2018). Syrian Refugees in Turkey and Integration Problem Ahead. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 20(3), 925–940. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-018-0639-0>
- Ashutosh, I., & Mountz, A. (2011). Migration management for the benefit of whom? Interrogating the work of the International Organization for Migration. *Citizenship Studies*, 15(1), 21–38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2011.534914>
- Beardsworth, R. (2011). Cosmopolitanism and International Relations Theory. <https://leseprobe.buch.de/images-adb/06/87/068747b1-8ac2-4e8d-821a-a2e378788e9a.pdf>
- Beltekin, N. (2016). Turkey's Progress Toward Meeting Refugee Education Needs The Example of Syrian Refugees. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 16(66), 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2016.66.10>
- Carling, J., & Hernández-Carretero, M. (2011). Protecting Europe and Protecting Migrants? Strategies for Managing Unauthorised Migration from Africa. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 13(1), 42–58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-856x.2010.00438.x>
- Clark, T. S., & Crépeau, F. (1999). Mainstreaming Refugee Rights. *The 1951 Refugee Convention and International Human Rights Law*. *Netherlands Quarterly of Human Rights*, 17(4), 389–410. <https://doi.org/10.1177/092405199901700402>
- Clarke, G. (1998). Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and Politics in the Developing World. *Political Studies*, 46(1), 36–52. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9248.00128>

- Christian, B. (2023). Working for World Peace: Between Idealism and Cynicism in International Organizations. *Schweizerische Zeitschrift Für Soziologie*, 49(1), 21–39. <https://doi.org/10.2478/sjs-2023-0003>
- Devetak, R. (2001). The modern state and its origins. In Cambridge University Press eBooks (pp. 121–132). <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781139168557.012>
- Dorussen, H., & Ward, H. (2008). Intergovernmental Organizations and the Kantian Peace. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 52(2), 189–212. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022002707313688>
- Ekmekci, P. E. (2016). Syrian Refugees, Health and Migration Legislation in Turkey. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health*, 19(6), 1434–1441. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10903-016-0405-3>
- Fjäder, C. (2014). The nation-state, national security and resilience in the age of globalisation. *Resilience*, 2(2), 114–129. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21693293.2014.914771>
- Ford, M., & Lyons, L. (2013). Outsourcing Border Security: NGO Involvement in the Monitoring, Processing and Assistance of Indonesian Nationals Returning Illegally by Sea. *Contemporary Southeast Asia: A Journal of International and Strategic Affairs*, 35(2), 215. <https://doi.org/10.1355/cs35-2d>
- Geiger, M. J., & Pécoud, A. (2013). International Organisations and the Politics of Migration. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 40(6), 865–887. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183x.2013.855071>
- Gizatova, G. K., Ivanova, O. A., & Gedz, K. N. (2017). Cosmopolitanism as a Concept and a Social Phenomenon. *Tarih Kültür Ve Sanat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 6(5), 25. <https://doi.org/10.7596/taksad.v6i5.1294>
- Guizardi, M. L. (2019). The Age of Migration Crisis. *Tempo-niteroi*, 25(3), 577–598. <https://doi.org/10.1590/tem-1980-542x2019v250303>
- Guzzini, S. (2001). The Different Worlds of Realism in International Relations. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03058298010300010801>
- Güler, A. (2019). Turkey’s Geographical Limitation: The Legal Implications of an Eventual Lifting. *International Migration*, 58(5), 3–17. <https://doi.org/10.1111/imig.12683>
- Hainmueller, Jens and Michael J. Hiscox. “Attitudes toward Highly Skilled and Low-skilled Immigration: Evidence from a Survey Experiment.” *American Political Science Review* 104.01 (2010): 61-84.

- Haferlach, L., & Kurban, D. (2017). Lessons Learnt from the EU-Turkey Refugee Agreement in Guiding EU Migration Partnerships with Origin and Transit Countries. *Global Policy*, 8, 85–93. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.12432>
- Hansen, R. (2002). Globalization, Embedded Realism, and Path Dependence. *Comparative Political Studies*, 35(3), 259–283. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001041400203500300>
- Hennig, B. D., & Ballas, D. (2020). In Focus: Nationality, Citizenship and Refugees: A Global Perspective. *Political Insight*, 11(3), 20–21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2041905820958818>
- Imrie-Kuzu, D., & Özerdem, A. (2023). Keeping Syrian refugees in Turkey is not a good idea: a new concept of ‘reluctant local integration.’ *Third World Quarterly*, 44(7), 1606–1624. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2023.2197205>
- Ineli-Ciger, M. (2017). Protecting Syrians in Turkey: A Legal Analysis. *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 29(4), 555–579. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijrl/eex042>
- IOM and UNHCR support Directorate General of Migration Management in Removal Centres and ATDs with EU Funded Project. (2021, May 31). UNHCR Türkiye. <https://www.unhcr.org/tr/en/28841-iom-and-unhcr-support-directorate-general-of-migration-management-in-removal-centres-and-atds-with-eu-funded-project.html>
- IOM Turkey Country Strategy: 2021 - 2025. (2021). International Organization for Migration. [https://turkiye.iom.int/sites/g/files/tmzbd1061/files/documents/iom\\_turkey\\_missionstrategy2021-2025\\_1.pdf](https://turkiye.iom.int/sites/g/files/tmzbd1061/files/documents/iom_turkey_missionstrategy2021-2025_1.pdf)
- Jarvik, L. (2007). NGOs: A ‘New Class’ in International Relations. *Orbis*, 51(2), 217–238. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orbis.2007.01.003>
- Kaiser, B., & Kaya, A. (2015). Transformation of migration and asylum policies in Turkey. In Routledge eBooks (pp. 94–115). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315733005-7>
- Kirişçi, K. (2001). UNHCR and Turkey: Cooperating for Improved Implementation of the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees. *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 13(1 and 2), 71–97. [https://doi.org/10.1093/ijrl/13.1\\_and\\_2.71](https://doi.org/10.1093/ijrl/13.1_and_2.71)
- Kirişçi, K. 2007. “Border Management and EU-Turkish Relations: Convergence or Deadlock, (CARIM Research Report 2007/03, European University Institute, Florence, 2007) [https://cadmus.eui.eu/bitstream/handle/1814/7988/CARIM-RR\\_2007\\_03.pdf](https://cadmus.eui.eu/bitstream/handle/1814/7988/CARIM-RR_2007_03.pdf)
- Koyuncu, A. (2018). Syrians in Turkey under Temporary Protection: From Guest Status to Citizenship. *Middle East Journal of Refugee Studies*, 3(2). <https://doi.org/10.12738/mejrs.2018.3.2.0009>



- Kumar, A. (2022). Understanding Various Traditions of the Realism in International Relations. *Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, 5(4), 96. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.jpsir.20220504.11>
- Lalot, F., Abrams, D., Broadwood, J., Hayon, K. D., & Platts-Dunn, I. (2021). The social cohesion investment: Communities that invested in integration programmes are showing greater social cohesion in the midst of the COVID -19 pandemic. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 32(3), 536–554. <https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2522>
- Lehner, R. (2018). The EU-Turkey-’deal’: Legal Challenges and Pitfalls. *International Migration*, 57(2), 176–185. <https://doi.org/10.1111/imig.12462>
- Levy, O., Peiperl, M., & Jonsen, K. (2016). Cosmopolitanism in a Globalized World: An Interdisciplinary Perspective. In Emerald Group Publishing Limited eBooks (pp. 281–323). <https://doi.org/10.1108/s1535-120320160000009009>
- Lewis, D. A. (2010). Nongovernmental Organizations, Definition and History. In Springer eBooks (pp. 1056–1062). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-93996-4\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-93996-4_3)
- Lewis, D. A., Kanji, N., & Themudo, N. S. (2020). NGOs and international humanitarian action. In *Non-Governmental Organizations and Development*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429434518-9>
- Lischer, S. K. (2017). The Global Refugee Crisis: Regional Destabilization & Humanitarian Protection. *Daedalus*, 146(4), 85–97. [https://doi.org/10.1162/daed\\_a\\_00461](https://doi.org/10.1162/daed_a_00461)
- Lodewyckx, I., Timmerman, C., & Wets, J. (2010). FROM NATION STATE TO MIGRATION STATE. *Economics & Sociology*, 3(2), 9–22. <https://doi.org/10.14254/2071-789x.2010/3-2/2>
- Lüleci-Sula, Ç., & Sula, İ. E. (2021). Migration Management in Turkey: Discourse and Practice. *Uluslararası İlişkiler Dergisi*. <https://doi.org/10.33458/uidergisi.1000756>
- Massari, A. (2021). Humanitarian NGOs and Global Governance: One, No One and One Hundred Thousand Humanitarian NGOs. In Springer eBooks (pp. 73–101). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-71143-6\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-71143-6_4)
- Mojumder, M. J. H., & Panday, P. K. (2019). NGOs’ collaboration with local government institutions. In *Government and NGOs in South Asia*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780367855215-10>
- Moretti, S. (2020). Between refugee protection and migration management: the quest for coordination between UNHCR and IOM in the Asia-Pacific region. *Third World Quarterly*, 42(1), 34–51. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2020.1780910>

- Nuruzzaman, M. (2008). Liberal Institutionalism and International Cooperation after 11 September 2001. *International Studies*, 45(3), 193–213. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002088170904500302>
- Papadopoulos, A. N., Chalkias, C., & Fratsea, L. (2013). Challenges to immigrant associations and NGOs in contemporary Greece. *Migration Letters*, 10(3), 342–358. <https://doi.org/10.33182/ml.v10i3.133>
- Pearson, J. T. (2022). Realism in the ethics of immigration. *Philosophy & Social Criticism*, 019145372210796. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01914537221079676>
- Republic of Türkiye Ministry of Interior. (n.d.). Republic of Türkiye Ministry of Interior Presidency of Migration Management. Presidency of Migration Management. <https://en.goc.gov.tr/>
- Rumbaut, R. G., Briggs, V. M., Jr, Moore, S., Clark, R. L., Passel, J. S., Zimmerman, W. N., Fix, M. E., Collinson, S., Fix, M. E., LeMay, M. C., Meissner, D. M., Hormats, R. D., Walker, A. G., Ogata, S., & Suro, R. (1995). Mass Immigration and the National Interest. *Contemporary Sociology*, 24(4), 307. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2077626>
- Risse, T., Ropp, S., & Sikkink, K. (Eds.). (1999). *The Power of Human Rights: International Norms and Domestic Change* (Cambridge Studies in International Relations). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511598777
- Rygiel, K., Baban, F., & Ilcan, S. (2016). The Syrian refugee crisis: The EU-Turkey ‘deal’ and temporary protection. *Global Social Policy*, 16(3), 315–320. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468018116666153>
- Sardinha J. (2009). *Immigrant Associations, Integration and Identity: Angolan, Brazilian and Eastern European Communities in Portugal*, Amsterdam: IMISCOE.
- Sayapin, S. (2009). The International Committee of the Red Cross and International Human Rights Law. *Human Rights Law Review*, 9(1), 95–126. <https://doi.org/10.1093/hrlr/ngn044>
- Schiefer, D., & Van Der Noll, J. (2016). The Essentials of Social Cohesion: A Literature Review. *Social Indicators Research*, 132(2), 579–603. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-016-1314-5>
- Schweller, R. L. (2000). Democracy and the Post-Cold War Era. In Palgrave Macmillan UK eBooks (pp. 46–80). [https://doi.org/10.1057/9781403905277\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1057/9781403905277_3)
- Sharry, F. (2000). “NGOs and the Future of the Migration Debate”. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*. 1(1): 121-130.

- Ozkan, E., & Beeson, D. (2016). The Realist and Liberal Positions on the Role of International Organizations in Maintaining World Order. *European Scientific Journal*, ESJ. <https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2016.v12n17p85>
- Tas, S., Erdal, M., & Aruntaş, H. Y. (2018). Refugee Problems in Turkey and Its Evaluation in the Context of Sustainability. In *Lecture notes in civil engineering*. Springer Nature. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-64349-6\\_24](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-64349-6_24)
- T.C. İç İşleri Bakanlığı Göç İdaresi Genel Müdürlüğü. (2016). Uluslararası Koruma. [http://www.goc.gov.tr/icerik6/uluslararasi-koruma\\_363\\_378\\_4712\\_icerik](http://www.goc.gov.tr/icerik6/uluslararasi-koruma_363_378_4712_icerik) Erişim Tarihi: 25.11.2017
- T.C. İç İşleri Bakanlığı Göç İdaresi Genel Müdürlüğü. (2017). Geçici Koruma. [http://www.goc.gov.tr/icerik6/gecici-koruma\\_363\\_378\\_4713\\_icerik](http://www.goc.gov.tr/icerik6/gecici-koruma_363_378_4713_icerik) Erişim Tarihi: 25.11.2017
- T.C. İç İşleri Bakanlığı Göç İdaresi Genel Müdürlüğü (2021). Yıllık Rapor. [https://www.goc.gov.tr/kurumlar/goc.gov.tr/Yayinlar/Kitaplar/turkiyevegoc\\_tr.pdf](https://www.goc.gov.tr/kurumlar/goc.gov.tr/Yayinlar/Kitaplar/turkiyevegoc_tr.pdf)
- Türkiye - UNHCR Global Focus. (n.d.). UNHCR. <https://reporting.unhcr.org/operational/operations/t%C3%BCrkiye>
- UNHCR in Türkiye. (n.d.). UNHCR. <https://www.unhcr.org/tr/en/unhcr-in-turkey>
- UNICEF, (2022). Suriye Krizi: İki Haftada Bir Yayınlanan İnsani Durum Raporu, 20 Eylül - 10 Ekim 2022 UNICEF, Sağlık. [https://www.unicefturk.org/yazi/calismalarimiz\\_dunyada\\_saglik](https://www.unicefturk.org/yazi/calismalarimiz_dunyada_saglik).2018.
- UNHCR, Eğitim. <http://www.unhcr.org/tr/egitim>. 2018 UNHCR in Türkiye. (n.d.). UNHCR. <https://www.unhcr.org/tr/en/unhcr-in-turkey>
- Van De Haar, E. (2009). Liberalism and International Relations Theory. In *Palgrave Macmillan US eBooks* (pp. 125–150). [https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230623972\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230623972_7)
- Yanacopoulos, H., & Smith, M. (2007). The Ambivalent Cosmopolitanism of International NGOs. In *Zed Books Ltd*. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350218833.ch-015>
- Yildiz, G. B. (2007). Foreign Workers in Turkey, Their Rights and Obligations Regulated in Turkish Labour Law. *European Journal of Migration and Law*, 9(2), 207–227. <https://doi.org/10.1163/138836407x190442>
- Yitmen, Ş., Verkuyten, M., Martinovic, B., & Erdogan, M. (2022). Acceptance of Syrian Refugees in Turkey: The Roles of Perceived Threat, Intergroup Contact, Perceived Similarity and Temporary Settlement. In *Routledge eBooks* (pp. 150–174). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003182436-10>

Zieck, M. (2010). UNHCR and Turkey, and Beyond: of Parallel Tracks and Symptomatic Cracks. *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 22(4), 593–622.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/ijrl/eeq033>