Globalizations

ISSN: 1474-7731 (Print) 1474-774X (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rglo20

# Syrian refugees in Turkey and trade union responses

Seyhan Erdoğdu

**To cite this article:** Seyhan Erdoğdu (2018) Syrian refugees in Turkey and trade union responses, Globalizations, 15:6, 838-853, DOI: 10.1080/14747731.2018.1474038

**To link to this article:** https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2018.1474038

Published online: 18 Jun 2018.

GLOBALIZATIONS
2018, VOL. 15, NO. 6, 838–853
https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2018.1474038

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group



# Syrian refugees in Turkey and trade union responses

Seyhan Erdoğdu

Ankara University, Ankara, Turkey

**ABSTRACT**

This article discusses trade union responses in Turkey to Syrian refugees against a background characterized by shrinking boundaries of union inclusion. The analysis is based on semi-structured interviews with trade union executives from confederations and affiliated trade unions in textile and garment, construction, local public services, commerce and metal sectors, and focus group discussions with union members in the workplace. At the confederation level, Turkey's trade union movement generally adopts a solidaristic rhetoric regarding Syrian refugees and attempts to shape trade union policies accordingly. However, there is little articulation with sectoral unions and the work-place level. Sectoral unions who do not encounter Syrian workers in the workplace do not place refugee issues on the trade union agenda. Instead union-level responses foreground the negative effects of Syrian refugees on the labour market while humanitarian considerations remain secondary. Unions demand formal employment of Syrian refugees should be ensured to eliminate these problems to prevent competition with local labour leading to a race to the bottom regarding pay and working conditions. Members at the workplace level oppose Syrian refugees with an exclusionary and somewhat hostile attitude, alleging that they damage the labour market, urban security and social life.

**KEYWORDS**

Immigration; trade unions; Syrian refugees; Turkey

## Introduction

This article discusses trade union responses in Turkey to Syrians under temporary protection against a background characterized by shrinking boundaries of union inclusion in a segmented labour market with Syrian refugee labour forming the lowest strata together with the rest of the undeclared migrant workers from different nationalities.

The research angles in this paper are restricted to discussion of two questions: First, what are the defining characteristics of the trade union attitudes and actions towards Syrians under temporary protection in Turkey at the confederal, sectoral and membership level and which factors shape these characteristics. Second, are there differences in these attitudes and actions; if so, how these differences can be explained.

These questions will be taken up in an analysis based on semi-structured interviews with trade union executives from three different trade union confederations and affiliated trade unions in textile and garment, construction, local public services, commerce and metal sectors, and focus group discussions with union members in the workplace and screening of trade union congress decisions and publications.[1]

**CONTACT** Seyhan Erdoğdu serdogdu@politics.ankara.edu.tr

After a brief discussion on the theoretical and historical aspects of trade union solidarity with migrant workers, for a better understanding, some information on Turkish trade unions and their response to irregular labour migration prior to the Syrian refugee crisis will be provided. Then, information on the Syrians under temporary protection in Turkey which we think contributes to analysing the attitudes of the trade unionists will be presented. Next, in search of answers to our research questions, the findings of our 2017 research on trade union attitudes and actions towards Syrian refugees in Turkey will be analysed. In the conclusion we summarize our findings around our research questions.

## From solidarity with migrant workers in the nineteenth century to the restrictive policies of the twentieth century

Historically, trade union solidarity with migrant workers peaked during the period when skilled 'journeymen' migrated across Europe, at a time when there were no national regulations limiting labour mobility. During this period, many of the first generation of union leaders met trade union and socialist ideas during their travels as journeymen. National trade unions supported skilled migrants, even providing them with identity cards. This solidarity was consolidated by the work and life experiences of skilled migrants. According to Danish data for example, during the 1870s and 1880s, 15–65% of the work force in various professions comprised skilled migrant workers. In Germany, before the First World War the estimated number of migrant workers was 1.5 million (Logue, 1980).

As modern industry rapidly spread across European countries, the industrial working class grew and the nature of labour migration began to change. Now, semi-rural, unskilled workers from Italy, Poland and Russia began looking for work in agriculture, mining and factories in Austria, Germany and France. These semi-rural workers were deprived of the trade union and professional experience of skilled workers and, as they were not unionized in their own country, they did not respond to efforts to organize in unions in the countries they worked in. By the end of the nineteenth century, the policy of trade union solidarity among skilled migrants was transformed into protectionist or restrictive policies towards migration. For example, the International Secretariat of National Trade Unions defended limiting migrant labour and called for a prohibition on immigration during strikes and industrial crises (Dreyfus, 2000). After the First World War, trade unions chose to prevent competition from migrant workers by securing national legislation to restrict immigration. Nation states were to decide who comes to the country and the circumstances in which they come (Zincone, Penninx, & Borkert, 2011).

In the course of the twentieth century, most trade unions in developed capitalist countries pursued restrictive approaches to migrant workers on the basis of job protectionism (Briggs, 2001; Castles, 1990; Zincone et al., 2011). Especially during economic crises, these unions established new alliances with state authorities to encourage restrictive immigration policies. The international trade union movement as represented by the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions[2] reflected the attitude of the national trade unions by not promoting worker mobility in its policy documents; at best, it suggested equal labour and social rights for regular migrants (ICFTU, 1983, 1999). Even during the growth and prosperity years of the post war period the unions were concerned about the alleged threat of migrants to wages and working conditions of their members (Freeman, 1979). The discourse on internationalism was in many cases overshadowed by the priority given to the concept of citizenship.

While advocating restrictive immigration policies was the general trend, many unions displayed inclusionary approaches towards migrants after they became settled in the country concerned as in the case of German unions playing an important role in the subsequent integration processes of guest workers of 1960s and their families (Penninx & Roosblad, 2000). The French unions tried to bring foreign workers into the unions despite the strong hostility at the shop-floor level (Castles, 1990). In the 1960s and 1970s, Danish unions exerted much effort to organizing immigrants into unions and unemployment insurance schemes (Wrench, 2004).

In seeking answers to the question of what determined the specific responses of trade unions towards migrant workers, variables affecting trade unions' attitudes and practices towards migration and migrant labour have been explored in various comparative or country specific studies.

In their classic comparative study of trade union attitudes toward migrant workers, Penninx and Roosblad (2000) identify four major variables determining relations between trade unions and regular and irregular migrant workers: the power that trade unions have in society and in national socio-economic decision-making; economic and labour market conditions; social aspects such as public discourse, institutional arrangements, legislation, and institutional actors like national authorities, civil society organizations, and political parties; and the characteristics of immigrants and public perceptions. In another comparative study of trade unions in Germany, Spain and South Korea, Agtas, Sauviat, and Amler (2007) found that the trade union type, based on historical and structural circumstances is the key factor determining trade union attitudes towards migrant workers and business unionism, political unionism, social dialogue unionism and corporatist unionism were associated with lower enthusiasm for organizing migrant workers, while social movement unionism and syndicalism led to more interest. Hardy, Eldring, and Schulten (2012) compare trade union strategies towards migrant workers from three sectors in the UK, Norway and Germany and conclude that trade union responses to these migrant workers are shaped by the complex interplay of national industrial relations systems, sectoral dynamics, European Union (EU) regulation and the agency of individual trade unions.

Country-specific and comparative studies show that during economic stagnation, especially recession, unemployment increases and negative societal attitudes toward migrant workers strengthen (Beets & Willekens, 2010). Outside periods of economic crisis, if there are concerns about unemployment in a particular sector, trade unions may take a restrictive stand against labour migration.

An important variable affecting the unions' approach to migrants is their legal status. Regarding irregular migrants, unions generally advocate three policies: preventing irregular migration, protecting the fundamental rights of irregular migrants and regularizing them (Watts, 2002). Which of these policies gets prioritized depends on current labour market conditions and union characteristics.

The structure of the union itself is another important variable. Internal factors shaping union attitudes towards migrants include ideology, sector structure (public-private; labour intense-capital intense; local market-export market), financial power, level of bureaucracy, political influence and role in social dialogue mechanisms (Agtas et al., 2007). In some countries, unions are represented in trilateral structures for migration management, which enables them to play a direct role in local management of migration. In some countries, unions play a role in regularizing temporary labour migration and recruiting workers. There are some cases where union membership in one country is recognized by another country (Betts, 2011).

Recent studies show that trade unions are more inclusive towards migrants, with newly emerging organizational models based on the inclusionary efforts of certain unions in both North America and Europe. While unions' approaches based on citizenship and legality continue to limit their

imagination on solidarity with migrant workers, there are increasing numbers of examples of unions being instrumental in organizing irregular migrant workers (Ford, 2004; Lüthje & Scherrer, 2001; Milkman, 2000, 2006; Ness, 2005; Watts, 2002). Research on Southern Europe has shown that trade unions have adopted a cooperative and positive position towards immigration, supporting regularizations, offering political support for immigrants' rights claims and providing various services (González-Enríquez & Triandafyllidou, 2009). Marino, Penninx, and Roosblad (2015), revisiting the comparative approach of Penninx and Roosblad (2000), argue that changing migration patterns and policies, and changes in labour markets and industrial relations have driven trade unions towards more inclusive policies. In a quantitative 14 country analysis of union members' attitudes towards immigrant workers Gorodzeisky and Richards (2016), concludes that, in the majority of countries analysed, unionized workers are likely to express lower levels of objection to admitting immigrants into society.

Nevertheless, in a world where labour is still not free to move, it seems too early to declare that an alternative imagination of solidarity with migrant workers, whether regular or irregular, has emerged despite much rhetoric on inclusiveness.

## Trade unions in Turkey and their response to irregular labour migration

In Turkey, trade unions are organized nationally in different branches of activity, with three major trade union confederations. The biggest confederation, TÜRK-İŞ, the Confederation of Turkish Trade Unions, was established in 1952. DİSK, the Confederation of Progressive Trade Unions, was established in 1967 by a group of unions that split from TÜRK-İŞ. HAK-İŞ, The Confederation of Rights Trade Unions, was established in 1972. TÜRK-İŞ has 33 affiliates from different branches of activity (882,496 members); DİSK has 21 (141,490 members) and HAK-İŞ has 22 (447,930 members) (Çalışma ve Sosyal Güvenlik Bakanlığı [ÇSGB], 2016).

After the 1980 military intervention in Turkey and subsequent neoliberal transformation, trade unions in Turkey lost significant power, in both membership and political influence. The current unionization rate for registered workers is only 11.5% (ÇSGB, 2016), and even lower if unregistered workers are taken into account. One-third of unionized workers are in the public sector. Women form only a minority of union members and are almost non-existent in union management. Overall, the Turkish union movement focuses on improving remuneration and working conditions while having limited influence on economic and social policies. As the boundaries of union inclusion have contracted due to the drop in unionization rates and loss of power, solidarity has also shrunk to its practical level of union membership. Meanwhile, Turkish unions have failed to reach out to unorganized sections of the working class, most of them maintaining instead their centralized, bureaucratic structures.

Since the mid-1990s Turkey, a country long known as a 'sending' country, witnessed an ever increasing inflow of irregular migrant workers exacerbating the informalization of the economy and the precarization of work in the most vulnerable sectors of a segmented labour market. Economic uncertainties and poverty in the former socialist countries; wars and political unrest in neighbouring countries; Turkey's geographical position as a transit region between east and west; rigid migration policies and stricter border control in the European countries and poor implementation of Turkish legislation related to irregular migration are the factors that nurtured this increase. The widespread nature of informal employment in Turkey makes it possible for irregular migrant workers to get absorbed by informal sectors where wages lower than legal minimum, irregular and even non-payment of wages; long working hours, absence of social security;

impossibility of unionization; no protection in terms of occupational health and safety are common features.

However, despite the ever-increasing presence and the plight of migrant workers in Turkey, labour migration has not found its way onto the agenda of the country's trade unions, as revealed by the findings of two field studies conducted by this author (Erdoğdu & Şenses, 2015; Gökbayrak & Erdoğdu, 2008; Toksöz, Erdoğdu, & Kaşka, 2012). Both studies were based on semi-structured interviews with trade unionists at confederation, trade union and branch levels, chosen by purposive sampling. The 2012 findings replicate the 2008 research results, with no major change in trade union attitudes of regarding irregular migrant workers. All three confederations and affiliated unıons both at central, sectoral and work-place level have lenient attitudes towards migrant labour based on humanitarian considerations. However they neither actively protect nor organize migrant workers, whether regular or irregular, nor play a role in determining migration management policies. The policies of the trade unions towards migrant workers can best be desribed as solidarity in words, indifference in deeds.

The phenomenon of irregular migrant work in Turkey which started in the mid-1990s has entered a new phase after 2011 with the Syrian refugees coming to Turkey en masse, creating urban refugee cities and entering the labour market as low-skilled, low-paid informal workers. With this turn in the migration history of Turkey, while the solidaristic discourse at the confederal level is preserved, hitherto lenient attitude of the trade unions towards migrant labour at the work-place level turned to negative.

## Syrian refugees in Turkey[3]

Inflow of refugees to Turkey, sharing a 911 km long border with Syria, started right after the outbreak of civil war in Syria in 2011. Having already reached crisis proportions in 2013, the refugee flow became a seemingly irreversible immigration crisis by the end of 2015. By April 2017, the official figure for Syrian refugees had reached 2,992,562, constituting 4% of Turkey's population (Directorate General of Migration Management, 2017).

Turkey's Disaster and Emergency Management Authority, which has been coordinating the country's response to the Syrian refugees, has housed close to 260,000 Syrian nationals in 26 temporary shelter centres to address their basic needs (AFAD, 2016). These refugee shelter centres are located in 10 cities close to the border region. Whereas in the world as a whole, the proportion of refugees living in urban areas is 60% (UNHCR, 2017, p. 55) 92% of Syrians under temporary protection in Turkey live in urban areas outside the refugee camps overwhelming urban host communities and trying to make a living by engaging in informal jobs.

Turkey applied an 'open door policy' and a *de facto* 'temporary protection' regime to the Syrian Refugees until the adoption of Turkey's new Law on Foreigners and International Protection in April 2013, which came into full force in April 2014. Later that year, in October 2014, the adoption of the Temporary Protection Regulation finally meant that Turkey's existing *de facto* 'temporary protection' practice had a proper legislative basis. In January 2016, the long-expected 'Regulation on Work Permit of Refugees under Temporary Protection' was issued, which specified conditions and restrictions on work permits for foreigners under temporary protection. Despite the adoption of the 'Regulation on Work Permit of Refugees under Temporary Protection', no progress has yet been made in transferring Syrian refugees into registered employment.

The impact of Syrian refugees on Turkey's labour markets, social life and social expenditure has been dramatic. Approximately 650,000 refugees are estimated to be employed, overwhelmingly

informally, and mostly in the agriculture, construction, textile and apparel sectors, and in small establishments in manufacturing and services (INGEV, 2017). Being at the lowest end of the informal sector, Syrian refugees including children work for wages lower than the legal minimum; face irregular and even non-payment of wages; long working hours. They have no social security coverage; no protection in terms of occupational health and safety and other basic practices relating to working life. Their informal status keeps them away from existing mechanisms of complaint and thus reproduces these adversities. There is a wide range of research activity on the impact of Syrian refugees on the Turkish labour market and societal relations. Studies about the economic and labour market impact of Syrian refugees in Turkey's border region cities have produced mixed findings (Akgündüz, van den Berg, & Hassink, 2015; Carpio & Wagner, 2015; Ceritoğlu, Gürcihan-Yüncüler, Torun, & Tümen, 2017; Konuk & Tümen, 2015). Local people, however, have extremely negative perceptions about the effects of Syrian refugees on the economy, social spending and the labour market. An ORSAM (2015) survey found that local interviewees in cities hosting Syrian refugees perceive a strong link between the presence of Syrian refugees and job losses, declining wages, increased risk of dismissals, higher food prices, increased housing rents, lower quality of health services, declining quality of education and increased internal emigration. Field reseach on social reactions to Syrian refugees shows that, in parallel with an increased number of refugees and a growing urban refugee phenomenon, earlier tolerance for Syrian refugees was replaced by discontent or, in some cases, hostility (Erdoğan, 2014, 2017; Erdoğan & Ünver, 2015; Navruz & Çukurçayır, 2015).

## Findings of the 2017 study on trade union responses to Syrian refugees in Turkey

In tandem with our previous studies of 2008 and 2012 on trade union responses to migrant labour in Turkey, this current study is based on semi-structured interviews conducted with trade unionists from the confederation and sectoral trade union level, chosen by purposive sampling. The sample consists of the three main confederations in Turkey, namely TÜRK-İŞ, DİSK and HAK-İŞ, as well as unions affiliated to these confederations. The selected trade unions organize workers in the textile and garment, construction, local public services, commerce, food and metal sectors. Sixteen semi-structured face to face interviews were held with the trade union representatives, three being at the Confederation level. To learn the union members' views, two focus group interviews were held with workers in work places in the metal sector in Gebze, a town in western Turkey, where the proportion of Syrian refugees of the urban population is 1.75%, and workers in the public construction sector in Urfa, a city in south-east Turkey, where the proportion of Syrian refugees is 21.67%. Trade union publications and General Congress Reports were also reviewed to support the interview findings.

We found no significant discursive differences among the three trade union confederations in Turkey in their approach to Syrian refugees. Adhering to a solidaristic trade union position, they all support the government's open door policy, which they regard as unavoidable for humanitarian reasons. Although they have different views on the government's foreign policy regarding Syria, they generally remain supportive of the open-door policy despite a persistent increase in refugee numbers. What they find unacceptable is that EU countries unilaterally decided to diverge from EU common practices to reduce the number of asylum seekers and, in the case of some EU countries, closed their borders. Besides their critical approach to migration policies adopted by European countries, informal trade union discourse also refers to the role of 'imperialist policies leading to civil war in Syria' as the root cause of Syrian refugee crisis and the need to stop wars. The confederations' humanitarian approach is also seen in their participation in humanitarian aid campaigns carried out for Syrian

refugees. All three confederations favour regulations to ensure the inclusion of Syrian workers in the labour market through registered employment on equal pay and equal working conditions with local workers.

TURK-IS, which is a coalition of nationalist, conservative and social democratic unions, formulated its position regarding Syrian refugees in its Presidents' Council of 2014:

> TÜRK-İŞ Presidents' Council welcomes that humanitarian aid is provided to those who take refuge in Turkey, foremost to those coming from our bordering neighbour Syria. However, it is necessary to be careful and meticulous in terms of making their stay permanent, giving identity cards and work permits to avoid problems later on. It should be ensured that unregistered employment and unemployment do not become even more widespread, and that wage levels will not be further reduced. (TÜRK-İŞ, 2015, p. 15)

One TÜRK-İŞ executive stated that Syrian refugees

> should work in registered jobs, benefit from the same rights as Turkish citizens; so that tomorrow there will be no job brokery. If you oppose the employment of Syrian refugees, tomorrow they will go and work in so-called under-the-stairs jobs; employers will impose cheap labor on collective bargaining tables.

The left-leaning confederation DİSK issued the following remarks regarding Syrian refugee workers in the concluding statement of its 15th General Assembly, held in 2016:

> We will continue to work on the basis of class fraternity for all refugee workers, especially Syrian refugee workers, who have become part of the Turkish working class, in order to ensure that they benefit from all rights, particularly access to public services, the right to work and organize on equal terms.

The statement also emphasizes that policies such as lower insurance premiums for Syrian refugees should never be considered and practices making the Syrian workforce more attractive for employers will simply create a new source of cheap labour which may lead to serious social problems (DİSK, 2016).

HAK-İŞ which is mainly conservative, made the following statement about refugees, including Syrians, in its decisions of the 13th General Assembly, convened in 2015:

> Feasible and sustainable national and international policies should be developed for asylum seekers who are forced to leave their countries for economic, political and social reasons … HAK-İŞ draws attention to the problems caused by different languages, cultures and lifestyles between asylum seekers and local people. For this reason, it emphasises the importance of activities for the harmonization of asylum seekers with society. (HAK-İŞ, 2015b)

Even though the Syrian refugee crisis has played an important role in reshaping Turkey's migration management policies the issue was not discussed in the national tripartite bodies. Trade unions are not included in the migration related advisory boards under the General Directorate of Migration Management. This may be explained by the limited political power of the trade unions.

In summary, we can say that all three confederations endorse the government's open-door policy concerning Syrian refugees despite concerns about the negative effects of the large number of refugees on the labour market. All three confederations support regulations that will provide registered employment for Syrian refugees under equal working conditions with local workers in order to reduce the negative labour market effects. While class solidarity is highlighted in the discourse of DİSK, TÜRK-İŞ's discourse emphasizes possible negative effects on the local labour market and

HAK-İŞ's discourse stresses an understanding of integration that conforms to the government's foreign and refugee policies.

In all three confederations, trade union actions towards the Syrian refugees are extremely limited. They have produced some publicationss regarding the refugee issue (DISK, 2015; HAK-İŞ, 2016; Uğraş, 2016) and have sent some humanitarian aid. HAK-IS has provided an EU-supported vocational training programme to a group of 20 refugees through a project called 'Social Integration of Refugees Through Vocational Education' (HAK-İŞ, 2015a).

Affiliated sectoral trade unions constitute the second organizational level in the Turkish trade union structure. Syrian workers are almost non-existent in unionized workplaces so the only point of contact for union members with Syrian workers is in urban spaces. Given that more than three million Syrian people now live in Turkish cities, trade unionists, like other local people, regularly encounter Syrian refugees in social environments. Like local informal workers, Syrian refugees remain outside the organizational inclusion line of trade unions, which some trade unionists attribute to the characteristics of the unionized sectors while others link it to the characteristics of union jobs. As one trade unionist in the metal sector put it,

> Syrians do not work the workplaces where we are organised in the metal sector. The metal sector generally employs skilled vocational high school graduates. Not suitable for refugee employment. However, we hear some subcontractors are employing Syrians as home workers to assembly electrical outlets.

In fact many Syrians are informally employed in the metal sector in small and medium enterprises where there is no trade union; outsourced and sub-contracted jobs and even home based assembly of electric sockets. But this sector is also the one where first cases of formal and even unionized Syrian workers can be seen though their number is small. Within the total 195.000 members of the Metal Union of Turkey (TÜRK METAL) there are 25 Syrian members, most of whom are in Kocaeli. The company that these workers are employed is a medium size unionized moulding plant and formal employment of Syrians may be attributed to the fact that moulding work is not preferred by domestic workers. The Steel Workers Union) ÇELİK–İŞ Union says they also came across 12 registered Syrian workers employed by a firm in an Organized Industrial District in İstanbul. The enterprise is unionized and Syrian workers will become members of ÇELİK-İŞ after their testing period.

In the services sector employment of Syrians are limited to small shops where there are no unions. One executive of a trade union organizing in supermarkets reported that, 'in our supermarket sector, the employees should speak proper Turkish as they deal with customers. They should have at least a high school graduation. Occupation groups need to be certified. Syrian refugees don't fit into this picture.'

In Turkey, the media have widely reported on Syrian refugees working in 'under-the-stairs' textile and clothing sweatshops. Garment workshops employing many unregistered Syrian workers and Syrian children aged 8–10 years are well-known sights. However, these workers have no contact with unionized textile and garment workers and their unions.

> We are mostly organised in the institutionalised textile and garment firms producing for international brands. For this reason, Syrian workers do not work in our workplaces. Local companies that manufacture for international brands do not want to lose their contracts by employing unregistered refugee workers because of the control mechanisms of international firms.

However, while Syrian refugees may not be working in the visible first tier of the supply chain, union executives are unsure about employment conditions further down the supply chain.

> There are tiers in the supply chain which are out of sight. The parent companies usually work with one company. The company that receives the order has his subcontractor; and this may go on to several more subcontractors down in the supply chain. The supply chain goes down, even passing beyond workshops to homes. Control down there is not possible.[4]

In the construction sector 36% of workers are unregistered and the unionization rate calculated over both registered and unregistered workers is 2.2%. Nearly all of the unionized workers work in public establishments, and trade union organization in private construction sector is almost nonexistent. The executive of one union organized mainly in the public construction states that none of the workplaces in which his union is organized employ Syrian workers.

> Syrians are mostly employed as day laborers in small construction sites. They may also be employed by some subcontracting firms. It may be the case of, for example, a construction company gives the plastering work to a sub-contractor who may be employing Syrians or Afghans.

In some cities where the Syrians live intensively, it seems that they have formed separate 'cheap labour markets' as a way of providing labour for construction works (Kaygısız, 2017). Fifty-nine of the 96 refugee workers who lost their lives in work place accidents in 2016 are Syrian with 37 deaths of refugee workers occurring in the construction sector (İşçi Sağlığı ve İş Güvenliği Meclisi, 2017).

Bakeries are among workplaces in food industry where Syrian refugees are employed commonly. Contrary to the situation in other sectors, in some bakeries where the bakeries branch of the Food and Auxiliary Workers' Union of Turkey (TEKGIDA-İŞ) is organized, informal Syrian workers are employed to do the unskilled jobs. In bakeries where the union is not organized the number of Syrian workers is much more and this has its negative effect on unionization efforts. In spite of insistent complaints to authorities by the union, undeclared Syrian labour in bakeries cannot be prevented.

An exceptional situation in which the Syrians under temporary protection came into contact with the unionized labour force and with the trade unions took place in Gaziantep and Adana in the framework of the 'cash for work' project, which was funded by the German International Cooperation Agency covering the period of July 2016–January 2017. Within the scope of the project, 500 Syrians in Gaziantep Metropolitan Municipality and 200 Syrians in Adana, Seyhan Municipality were employed in the Park, Garden and Green Areas Departments. The union organized in the municipality states that Syrian workers in these programmes are employed for short periods and cannot become union members.

Those unions that have not encountered Syrian refugees in their workplaces have not developed any policy concerning them, instead regarding the issue as a general policy area covered by the confederations. All the unionists we interviewed stated that they did not adopt any general congress decision on Syrian refugees, and that the issue had not appeared on the agenda of the union presidents' board. They did not take any solidarity actions with Syrian workers other than sending humanitarian aid materials on rare occasions, and they had received no request for contact from the refugees themselves. However, since the January 2016 adoption of the Regulation on Work Permits for Refugees Under Temporary Protection, these unions have begun to consider the possible effects of Syrian refugees on unionized sectors. Nevertheless, one year after the regulation, they still have not felt the need to engage in special work in this regard, as the registered employment of Syrians has remained extremely limited.

Regarding union documents, there are limited numbers of informative articles and other materials about Syrian refugees (Ela, 2016; Öz İplik-İş Sendikası, 2016). However, Syrian refugee problems are not covered as a separate topic in union educational materials. According to union

executives, refugee problems are excluded from the union's agenda because they are not seen as a priority for trade union activities.

Although low-wage informal Syrian labour is currently employed in micro or small enterprises rather than in firms where unionized workers are employed, employers use the presence of informal Syrian labour to counter union demands during collective wage negotiations. Hence, all the union executives argue for the formalization of Syrian labour to prevent such threats. One common complaint expressed by union leaders concerns ineffective labour inspection to identify unregistered Syrian employment. Public authorities seem to tolerate firms' employing Syrians informally.

Although union leaders say that Syrian refugees depress wages and working conditions, they still approve of the open-door policy applied to Syrian refugees. There is also a consensus that Syrians under temporary protection should only return to their country if they so wish.

> We have very high unemployment. But we should not blame Syrian refugees for our problems. America moved some stones in Syria and three million people came here. They work in Turkey, they have jobs, they marry their children here and they stay if they want to. Returning to Syria, it must be their decision.

In summary, our fieldwork results show that affiliated unions have not yet placed refugee issues on the trade union agenda. Union-level responses focus on the negative effects of Syrian refugees on the labour market while humanitarian considerations remain secondary. Unions demand that, in order to overcome these adverse effects, formal employment of Syrian refugees should be ensured so that they do not compete with local labour in a race to the bottom. Like the confederations, unions seem to accept that Syrian refugees are here to stay in Turkey.

At the workplace level, there is an exclusionary and occasionally hostile attitude towards Syrian refugees, in contrast to the rhetoric of solidarity at the confederation and, to a lesser degree, union level. The first reason for such attitudes is the adverse effects of informal Syrian refugee employment on Turkey's labour market, which is also expressed at the level of union administrations.

When we asked union executives about the attitude of union members in the workplace towards Syrian refugees, they all agreed grassroots' attitudes were very negative. For example, one unionist described the reactions of union workers in the textile sector as follows:

> In fact, textile workers see Syrian workers as a potential danger. Not skilled, but unskilled workers are upset. Are we to be laid off, will they subcontract our work to a workshop employing informal Syrian labour? As the number of refugees increases, the uneasiness also increases.

One trade union education expert says that union members at the workplace level approach Syrian refugees with prejudice and hostility:

> As a trade union educator I tell them about the root causes of the refugee problem, and I say that Syrian workers, as part of the working class, are victims of this crisis. But the workers are not looking at it in terms of class brotherhood but only in terms of their influence on their daily lives. In some border towns with large Kurdish and Arab ethnic local populations, the relative tolerance of workers to Syrian refugees can only be on ethnic grounds. Workers of Kurdish origin can become more supportive of Kurdish refugees. Local Arab workers show more sympathy to Arab refugees. Islam does not emerge as a major axis of solidarity in workers' attitudes towards Syrian refugees. Positions in the world of labour, i.e. class solidarities, are completely ignored.

In our focus group interviews with members in workplaces, union members although they are of different political opinions declared their strong disapproval of government's open-door policy. Concerns regarding security and social cohesion were as pronounced as concerns regarding negative labour market effects of Syrian refugees. Exclusionary and sometimes hostile attitudes were also

evident. The rhetoric emphasized in this regard is to claim that Syrians fled to Turkey instead of fighting to defend their homes, land or families. The following is repeated by many: 'We fought to the last for our country in the war of liberation. Our grandfathers struggled with imperialism and did not leave these lands. Syrians have abandoned their homeland instead of fighting.'

These workers also strongly criticize EU policies on Syrian refugees, Turkey's 2013 readmission agreement with the EU and the 2015 Joint Action Plan.

> Europe is very sensitive when it comes to human rights, but when it comes to refugees, it does not defend their rights. They treat Turkey like a dumping ground. Our people here are worthless, their people are valuable. They want to take the qualified Syrians, the doctors, the engineers; the unqualified ones, they want to send them back to us. They say, let us give you money, visa exemptions so on … The politicians are negotiating these deals. They live in the better parts of the city, seeing the Syrian refugees while they are begging or collecting paper. They settle the refugees in our neighborhoods. They are sealing a monetary bargain on our backs while we are suffering all the trouble here. I mean the politicians.

Union members do not support policies to include Syrian refugees in the labour market. The general belief is that they work for low wages and take the jobs of the local workforce. Even the 'jobs' of local beggars are taken by Syrians. It is thought that unregistered work, which is already widespread in Turkey, will spread even more, and that the secondary labour market, which is already segmented, will become further fragmented, with Syrians forming the lowest segment due to their lack of skills and 'unsuitable' work ethic.

The workers' negative reactions to Syrian workers also apply to Syrian businessmen and other high income groups who took refuge in Turkey's major cities, bringing their financial assets during the first phase of the civil war. This was so pronounced that there were frequent comments on how villas in Sapanca, a touristic region in Turkey, were being bought up by Syrians, and that rich Syrians were living luxurious lives in Istanbul. Syrian small business owners are also considered as competitors with local small businesses.

Union members also prejudicially compare the work performance of ethnically Turkish immigrants from Bulgaria and the Balkans to Syrian refugees, despite never actually encountering them in their workplaces. Thus, whereas they have no complaints about these Bulgarian and Balkan immigrants because they are 'hardworking' and 'disciplined', Syrians are seen as 'lazy' and 'lacking business ethics'.

The second dimension of the reaction of union members to the Syrian refugees is a profound sense of cultural difference. Language is one important factor that strengthens this sense of cultural difference. Syrians are also perceìved as people with a different way of life, culturally distinct from Turks. One worker expressed his strong reaction to the Syrian refugees by saying that 'I cannot think of working side by side with them on the assembly line'. None of the workers responded positively to the question of whether their shared religion provided a certain cultural closeness with Syrian refugees.

The third dimension of the union members' reaction to Syrian refugees concerns security issues. One aspect of this is that there may be extensions of different Syrian terrorist organizations among Syrian refugees. Another aspect is the social conflicts that emerge with Syrian refugees living in communities and establishing their own internal solidarity. One common complaint is that 'Syrian refugees are involved in crimes such as violence, theft, smuggling and prostitution, they disrupt the social morals and social peace.' The fact that there have been conflicts between the local population and Syrian refugees in various Turkish cities, and the frequent media coverage of these fights, increase these urban security concerns.

Finally, union members are strongly opposed to social spending on Syrian refugees. Common objections included claims like

> Turkey has its own poor, they should get help before the Syrians; local people cannot get medical services because of Syrians in the hospitals; and scholarships are given to Syrian university students while our children are in need of financial support.

In sum, the rhetoric of unionized workers about Syrian refugees is far from expressing solidarity; in fact, it is exclusionary and even somewhat hostile. They oppose the government's open-door policy on the grounds that Syrian refugees damage the labour market conditions for local people, and that their presence causes security problems and social unrest. There is also strong resentment about the EU's refugee policies. The reactions of union workers in this regard are not different from society in general (Erdoğan, 2014). Although the majority of Syrian refugees are Sunni Arabs, this has not encouraged any perception of proximity based on religion or sect. The labour market effects and social issues seem to be the equally strong determinants behind the exclusionary attitude at the work place level.

## Conclusion

Turkey became a 'migrant receiving' country from the mid-1990s and trade unions in Turkey faced the issue of irregular migrant labour employed under very poor working conditions with low wages. Trade unions both at the central and the work-place levels had a lenient attitude towards migrant workers based on humanitarian considerations but did not include migrant workers in their trade union agendas.

After 2011 with the Syrian refugees coming to Turkey en masse, creating urban refugee cities and entering the labour market as low-skilled, low-paid informal workers, the phenomenon of irregular migrant work in Turkey has entered a new phase. With this turn in the migration history of Turkey, while the solidaristic discourse at the confederal level is preserved, hitherto lenient attitude of the trade unions towards migrant labour at the work-place level turned to negative.

There are no significant differences between the three trade union centres concerning their response to the Syrian refugee labour.

Ideology doesn't seem to be a variable shaping union responses to Syrian refugees. Despite their ideological divergencies, all three confederations have a solidaristic discourse at the confederal and to a lesser extent at the sectoral level. This can be explained partly by the trade union culture of solidarity which in time becomes an independent element with its own internal dynamics for the maintenance of trade union activities (Logue, 1980) and partly by the defining role of the open door policy of the government as the main institutional actor in migration policy which is inevitably endorsed by the trade unions on humanitarian grounds.

The labour market conditions is an important variable shaping the policy response of trade unions. All three confederations together with their affiliated sectoral unions express concern about the negative effects of the large number of Syrian refugees on the labour market. They support the inclusion of Syrian workers in the labour market however through registered employment on equal pay and equal working conditons with local workers and call for effective implementation of labour laws and regulations. Feeling the pressure in their sectors, affiliated unions foreground the negative effects of Syrian refugees on the labour market while humanitarian considerations remain secondary.

Unions are not active figures, whether in the formulation of the migration policies of the country or in organizing and supporting migrant workers. Sectoral trade unions rarely coming across Syrian refugee workers in enterprises they are organized, don't feel the need to develop any special policy in

this regard and consider the issue as a policy area that should be addressed by their confederations. One factor which explains this lack of action is the limited power that trade unions have in society and in national socio-economic decision-making. Trade unions in Turkey lost significant power, in both membership and political influence during the neo-liberal transformation of Turkish economy. They don't have the institutional capacity to be active figures regarding migrant workers.[5] The trade union type is another variable behind this lack of action. Trade unions in Turkey are mainly organized in the public sector or in bigger private sector enterprises where the employment of Syrian workers is exceptional. Syrian workers employed informally in small enterprises remain outside the organizational inclusion line of trade unions as in the case of local informal workers.

While we see a convergence of policies between the confederations and sectoral unions, articulation between central union structures and the work-place level is lacking. Members at the workplace level oppose Syrian refugees with an exclusionary and somewhat hostile attitude, alleging that they damage the labour market, security and social life. Union members strongly oppose the government's open door policies and allowing Syrians to join the labour market. Culturally, they almost build an imaginary wall between themselves and the refugees. This exclusionary attitudes can be explained by two sets of variables: First is the economic and labour market conditions. Syrian workers easily join the labour market as the lowest stratum of unregistered employment, alongside Turkey's sizable irregular local labour force. Union members are deeply worried about the negative impact of the refugee labour on the employment, wages, working conditions and bargaining power of local labour. Social spending on Syrian refugees has created a perception in the union members that they are competing with refugees for limited resources for housing, education, health and social assistance. Second set of variables relates to social aspects. The sheer number of Syrian refugees coupled with their settlement in working class districts of urban spaces creates a distinct set of cultural difference in the union members who share these spaces with the Syrians. Union members, guarding their relatively secure and stable conditions do not share the positive attitudes expressed at central union structures.

## Notes

1. I am grateful to the trade union executives and members who spared their time to share their views, experiences and suggestions with me.
2. In 2006 ICFTU merged with the World Confederation of Labour to form the International Trade Union Confederation.
3. Turkey applies a geographical limitation to the 1951 Refugee Convention and non-Europeans are not allowed to apply for refugee status in Turkey. Syrian nationals who came to Turkey due to events in Syria after 28 April 2011 are provided with temporary protection and are not officially considered as refugeees.
4. For a survey on Syrian refugees in Turkish garment supply chains, see Business and Human Rights Resource Centre (2016).
5. Turkey took over the Chairmanship of the Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD) as of July 1st, 2014, causing expectations that Turkish trade unions, facing the enormous challenge of irregular migrant labour, would actively participate in Civil Society Days and become critical contributors to the agenda. However, despite the intensive efforts of a team of researchers from Turkey on GFMD and civil society, trade unions were almost non-existent in the 2015 GFMD process.

## Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the co-editors Raul Delgado Wise and Branka Likic-Brboric of this special issue as well as Carl-Ulrik Schierup for their invaluable comments on earlier drafts of this paper. I also thank the anonymous reviewers who contributed to the refinement of the paper with their suggestions.

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

## Notes on contributor

*Seyhan Erdoğdu* is Professor of Department of Labour Economics and Industrial Relations at Ankara University (retired). She got her PhD in Labour Economics and Industrial relations from the same University. Her academic interests are international trade unionism, international labour migration and precarious working patterns.

## References

AFAD. (2016). *Turkey response to the Syrian crisis*. Retrieved from https://www.afad.gov.tr/en/2601/Turkey-Response-to-Syria-Crisis

Agtas, Ö. B., Sauviat, L., & Amler, B. (2007). *Why not organising? Trade unions and precarious migrant workers in Germany, South Korea and Spain*. Retrieved from http://www.global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/master_theses/Germany/MA_Thesis_ozge_beate_luciole.pdf

Akgündüz, Y. E., van den Berg, M., & Hassink, W. (2015). *The impact of refugee crises on host labor markets: The case of the Syrian refugee crisis in Turkey* (IZA Discussion Paper No. 8841). Retrieved from http://ftp.iza.org/dp8841.pdf

Beets, G., & Willekens, F. (2010). The global economic crisis and international migration: An uncertain outlook. *Vienna Yearbook of Population Research*, *2009*, 19–37.

Betts, A. (Ed.). (2011). *Global migration governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Briggs Jr., V. M. (2001). *Immigration and American unionism*. New York: Cornell University Press

Business & Human Rights Resource Centre. (2016). *Syrian refugees in Turkish garment supply chains*. Retrieved from https://businesshumanrights.org/sites/default/files/160131%20Syrian%20Refugee%20Briefing%20FINAL.pdf

Castles, S. (1990). *Labour migration and the trade unions in Western Europe*. Centre for Multicultural Studies, University of Wollongong, Occasional Paper 18, 1990, 19. Retrieved from http://ro.uow.edu.au/cmsocpapers/17

Çalışma ve Sosyal Güvenlik Bakanlığı [Ministry of Labour and Social Security]. (2016). *Temmuz İşkolu İstatistiklerinin Konfederasyon ve Bağımsız Sendikalara Göre Dağılımı* [Distribution of July 2016 Industry Statistics by Confederation and Independent Trade Unions]. Retrieved from https://www.csgb.gov.tr/media/3577/2016_temmuz_01.pdf

Carpio, X. V., & Wagner, M. (2015). The *impact of Syrians refugees on the Turkish labor market*. Retrieved from http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/505471468194980180/The-impact-of-Syrians-refugees-on-the-Turkish-labor-market

Ceritoğlu, E. H., Gürcihan-Yüncüler, B., Torun, H., & Tümen, S. (2017). *The impact of Syrian refugees on natives' labor market outcomes in Turkey: Evidence from a quasi-experimental design*. Retrieved from http://www.tcmb.gov.tr/wps/wcm/connect/7b999ec4-0b4a-4779-af7d-3971df7f7b52/wp1705.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CACHEID=ROOTWORKSPACE7b999ec4-0b4a-4779-af7d-3971df7f7b52

Directorate General of Migration Management. (2017). Retrieved from http://www.goc.gov.tr/icerik6/temporary-protection_915_1024_4748_icerik

DİSK. (2015). *DİSKAR*. Issue 4. Retrieved from http://disk.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/DiSKAR_4.SAYI-KAPAKLI.pdf

DİSK. (2016). *DİSK 15. Genel Kurulu Sonuç Bildirgesi* [DİSK 15th general congress declaration]. Retrieved from http://disk.org.tr/2017/03/disk-15-genel-kurulu-sonuc-bildirgesi/

Dreyfus, M. (2000). The emergence of an international trade union organization 1902-1919. In M. van der Linden (Ed.), *The international confederation of free trade unions* (pp. 26–72). Bern: Peter Lang.

Ela, E. D. (2016). Mülteciler Geldi, Hoş mu Geldi [Refugees came, are they welcome]. *TÜRK-METAL*, April Nr. 201, 30–32.

Erdoğan, M. (2014). *Syrians in Turkey, social acceptance and integration research*. Retrieved from http://www.hugo.hacettepe.edu.tr/HUGO-REPORT-SyriansinTurkey.pdf

Erdoğan, M. (2017). *Urban refugees from 'detachment' to 'harmonization' Syrian refugees and process management of municipalities: The case of Istanbul*. İstanbul: Marmara Belediyeler Birliği Kültür Yayınları.
Erdoğan, M., & Ünver, C. (2015). *Perspectives, expectations and suggestions of the Turkish business sector on Syrians in Turkey*. TİSK-HUGO. Retrieved from tisk.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/goc-rapor-ing.pdf.
Erdoğdu, S., & Şenses, N. (2015). Irregular migrant labour, trade unions and civil society organizations ın Turkey. In C.-U. Schierup, R. Munck, B. Branka Likic-Brboric, & A. Anders Neergaard (Eds.), *Migration, precarity and global governance challenges for labour* (pp. 177–196). London: Oxford University Press.
Ford, M. (2004). Organizing the unorganizable: Unions, NGOs and Indonesian migrant labour. *International Migration*, *42*(5), 99–119.
Freeman, G. P. (1979). *Immigrant labor and racial conflict in industrial societies: The French and British experience 1945-1975*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Gökbayrak, Ş, & Erdoğdu, S. (2010). Irregular migration and trade union responses: The case of Turkey. *İş, Güç: Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi*, *12*(2), 89–114.
González-Enríquez, C., & Triandafyllidou, A. (2009). Introduction: Comparing the new hosts of Southern Europe. *European Journal of Migration and Law*, *11*, 109–118.
Gorodzeisky, A., & Richards, A. (2016). Union members' attitudes towards immigrant workers: A 14-country study. *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, *22*(1), 23–38.
HAK-İŞ. (2015a). *Mesleki eğitim yoluyla mültecilerin sosyal entegrasyonu projesi* [Social integration of refugees through social integration]. Retrieved from http://www.hakis.org.tr/icerik.php?sayfa=25
HAK-İŞ. (2015b). *HAK-İŞ 13. Genel Kurul Kararları* [HAK-İŞ 13th general congress decisions]. Retrieved from http://www.hakis.org.tr/haberler.php?action=haber_detay&id=1093
HAK-İŞ. (2016). *Report best practices of integratıon of Syrian migrants to employment market of Turkey*. Retrieved from http://www.hakis.org.tr/uploads/files/goc-raporu-en-oy.pdf
Hardy, J., Eldring, L., & Schulten, T. (2012). Trade union responses to migrant workers from the 'new Europe': A three sector comparison in Norway, Germany and the UK. *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, *18* (4), 347–363.
ICFTU. (1983). *Report of thirteenth congress*. Brussels: Author.
ICFTU. (1999). *Migration and globalisation: The new slaves*. Brussels: Author.
İNGEV İnsani Gelişme Vakfı. (2017). *Syrian refugee livelihood monitor – summary assessment*. Retrieved from http://ingev.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/Syrian-Refugee-Livelihood-Monitor-Summary-Assessment.pdf
İşçi Sağlığı ve İş Güvenliği Meclisi. (2017). *2016 yılında en az 96 göçmen işçi yaşamını yitirdi* [In 2016 at least 96 migrant workers lost their lives]. Retrieved from http://www.guvenlicalisma.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&id=149&Itemid=236
Kaygısız, İ. (2017). *Suriyeli Mültecilerin Türkiye işgücü Piyasasına Etkileri* [The Effects of Syrian Refugees on the Turkish Labour Market]. İstanbul: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.
Konuk, B. B., & Tümen, S. (2015). *Immigration and prices: Quasi-experimental evidence from Syrian refugees in Turkey*. Retrieved from http://www.tcmb.gov.tr/wps/wcm/connect/TCMB+EN/TCMB+EN/Main+Menu/PUBLICATIONS/Research/Working+Paperss/2016/16-01
Logue, J. (1980). *Toward a theory of trade union internationalism*. Kent, OH: Kent Popular Press.
Lüthje, B., & Scherrer, C. (2001). Race, multiculturalism and labour organizing in the United States: Lessons for Europe. *Capital & Class*, *25*, 141–171.
Marino, S., Penninx, R., & Roosblad, J. (2015). Trade unions, immigration and immigrants in Europe revisited: Unions' attitudes and actions under new conditions. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *3*, 1, 178. doi:10.1007/s40878-015-0003-x.
Milkman, R. (2000). Immigrant organizing and the new labor movement in Los Angeles. *Critical Sociology*, *26*, 59–81.
Milkman, R. (Ed.). (2006). *Organizing immigrants: The challenge for unions in contemporary california*. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.
Navruz, M., & Çukurçayır, M. A. (2015). Factors affecting changes in perceptions of Turkish people towards Syrian refugees. *International Journal of Social Sciences*, *IV*(4), 75–85.
Ness, I. (2005). *Immigrants, unions and the new US labor market*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple Unions Press.
ORSAM. (2015). *The economic effects of Syrian refugees on Turkey: A synthetic modelling*. Ankara: ORSAM.

ÖZ İPLİK-İŞ Sendikası. (2016). *Öz İplik-İş Sendikası 'O' isimli kısa film* [Öz İplik-İş union short film 'O']. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_HPiWMtlDB0

Penninx, R., & Roosblad, J. (2000). *Trade unions, immigration and immigrants in Europe, 1960-1993: A comparative study of attitudes and actions of trade unions in seven west European countries*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Toksöz, G., Erdoğdu, S., & Kaşka, S. (2012). *Irregular labour migration in Turkey and situation of migrant workers in the labour market*. Ankara: International Organization for Migration.

TÜRK-İŞ. (2015). Başkanlar Kurulumuz Toplandı [Meeting of union presidents]. *TÜRK-İŞ Dergi*, *402*, 15.

Uğraş, G. (2016). Suriyeli Mülteci Krizine Sendikal Bakış [Trade union view on Syrian refugee crisis]. *TÜRK-İŞ Dergi*, *407*, 55–59. Retrieved from http://www.turkis.org.tr/TURK-IS-Dergisi-407-sayi-d1197

UNHCR. (2017). *Urban refugees*. Retrieved from http://www.unhcr.org/urban-refugees.html

Watts, J. (2002). *Immigration policy and the challenge of globalization. Unions and employers in unlikely alliance*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Wrench, J. (2004). Trade union responses to immigrants and ethnic inequality in Denmark and the UK: The context of consensus and conflict. *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, *10*(1), 7–30.

Zincone, G., Penninx, R., & Borkert, M. (Eds.). (2011). *Migration policymaking in Europe: The dynamics of actors and contexts in past and present*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.