From social capital to social cohesion: Syrian refugees in Turkey and the role of NGOs as intermediaries

Özge Zihnioğlu & Müge Dalkıran

Published online: 09 Mar 2022.

Submit your article to this journal ⬀

Article views: 8120

View related articles ⬀

View Crossmark data ⬀

Citing articles: 16 View citing articles ⬀

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

From social capital to social cohesion: Syrian refugees in Turkey and the role of NGOs as intermediaries

Özge Zihnioğlu [a] and Müge Dalkıran[b]

[a]Department of Politics, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, United Kingdom; [b]Department of Area Studies, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey

ABSTRACT

Since the first Syrian refugees arrived in Turkey with the outbreak of the Syrian Civil War in 2011, NGOs have been a crucial actor in first distributing humanitarian aid and later facilitating refugees' access to education, employment, and healthcare services. More recently, as intercommunal tension between Syrian refugees and the Turkish community has been increasing, many NGOs shifted their focus in building refugees' social cohesion in Turkey. This study examines these efforts from a social capital perspective. We interviewed a total of twelve local/national, international and Syrian community-led NGOs working with refugees in İstanbul. We found that the intercommunal activities promoted by NGOs provide a space for both the Turkish and Syrian communities to meet, whose pathways would likely not cross otherwise. However, our study showed serious limitations in building bridging social capital as these activities attract participants already open to intercommunal dialogue and the language barrier hinders the sustainability of the relations. At the same time, however, we found that projects connecting refugees with people or institutions of authority have the potential to enhance social cohesion. These activities can facilitate refugees' adaptation to the national system, which in turn entails more stable and sustainable relationship with Turkish people.

Introduction

Since the start of the Syrian Civil War in 2011, Turkey has become one of the main destinations for Syrians seeking refuge, leading to a rapid surge in the number of refugees entering the country. Nevertheless, Turkish society has displayed a high level of support and sympathy for Syrian refugees over the years. However, intercommunal relations between Syrian refugees and the Turkish community have changed over time. Studies have detected a notable increase in intercommunal tension, with violent incidents rising threefold in the latter half of 2017, compared with the same period one year earlier (International Crisis Group, 2018). Indeed, a recent survey found that 48% of Turkish citizens perceived the Turkish-Syrian relationship to be among the

most tense of social relations in Turkey (INGEV, 2019). This situation has led to a growing scholarly interest in refugees' social cohesion and integration in Turkey.

Since the Syrian refugees first arrived in Turkey, civil society actors have been playing a major role in channelling support to and advocating for the rights of refugees. Their efforts have been important in the distribution of humanitarian aid to refugees, as well as in ensuring refugees' access to education, employment, and healthcare services. A few recent studies have explored the contributions of non-governmental organisations (NGOs) to refugees' social cohesion (Aras and Duman, 2018; Sunata and Tosun, 2019; Rottmann, 2021). Nonetheless, we identified the need to explore refugees' social cohesion from a social capital perspective. The aim of this study is to explore whether and how activities by NGOs for refugees in İstanbul produce social cohesion. To that end, we examined the activities of NGOs for Syrian refugees in İstanbul and explored the different types of social capital (bonding, bridging, and linking) produced. We, then investigated the implications of social capital on refugees' social cohesion. We found that NGOs conducted various intercommunal activities, connecting the two communities. Moreover, although these intercommunal activities have serious limitations in building bridging social capital, the relations that the NGOs intermediate between the refugees and institutions of authority may offer pathways to improve social cohesion by yielding both linking and bridging social capital. We broadly define social cohesion as the peaceful coexistence among the Turkish and Syrian communities in Turkey. Additionally, the NGOs' intermediary role is understood as the process through which the NGOs connect refugees with different actors that facilitate interaction and enable them to build linkages and relationships. Finally, drawing on Putnam (2000), we use social capital as connections among individuals available through relationships established in social networks that facilitate social trust and cooperation.

This study contributes to the field through addressing three research gaps. First, the literature regarding Syrian refugees has mostly focused on security, integration, and human rights (Akdemir, 2019). Initial studies following the outbreak of the Syrian Civil War and displacement of the Syrian population mostly focused on the legal status of Syrians (Soykan, 2012) and explored the urgent need for regulations on education, access to the labour market, and livelihood (İçduygu and Şimşek, 2016). This was followed by debates on Syrians' legal status and the implications of new legislation (Erdem, 2017). As the Syrian Civil War protracted, new debates such as Syrians having a more permanent status in the country (Erdoğan, 2016), schooling and the special needs of Syrian children became predominant in the literature (Tunç, 2015; Çelik and Erdoğan, 2017). There is still a lack of empirical work on issues concerning the role of international NGOs (INGOs) in terms of Turkey's social cohesion, with the limited research undertaken being subject to scaling limitations. While some studies have focused on specific neighbourhoods where various refugee-related NGOs have operated (e.g. Sunata and Tosun 2019), others have conducted their research in a wider geographic context, choosing different cities to examine the general opportunities and challenges facing INGOs when assisting Syrian refugees in Turkey. The scale of our fieldwork fills the gap between these two types of studies.

In addition, some scholars have thoroughly explored the lack of coherent integration policies (Rottmann, 2020). Others have analysed the challenges for the integration and/or harmonisation of Syrians in Turkey, with language barriers appearing as the foremost

problem in this setting (Levent and Çayak, 2017; Şimşek and Çorabatır, 2016). Moreover, the literature has often posed questions concerning the inclusion and exclusion of policies regarding Syrian refugees (Akçapar-Köşer and Şimşek, 2018; Biehl, 2017; Baban, Ilcan, and Rygiel, 2017; Göksel, 2014). Finally, following the work permits given under the framework of the Temporary Protection in 2017, we have observed a growing amount of literature regarding social cohesion in terms of Syrian refugees' access to the labour market and concerning Syrian entrepreneurs (İçduygu, 2016; İçduygu and Diker, 2017; Okyay, 2017; Kadkoy, 2020). This study adds a new dimension to these perspectives.

Second, studies on NGOs working in refugee-related areas in Turkey have increased considerably over the years. In its early phase, the literature on this topic was dominated by NGO reports on their activities concerning Syrian refugees in Turkey, such as the Research Centre on Asylum and Migration (İGAMDER) (2013) report on NGO activities in relation to Syrian refugees in the border cities, and Mavi Kalem's (2014) report on civil society activities in relation to Syrian refugees. Both reports highlighted the role of NGOs in assisting Syrian refugees and the challenges that NGOs faced while providing their services. A broader study by Erdoğan (2015) analysed the capacity and role of NGOs and described the differences between faith-based and human rights-based NGOs and their respective activities. Sunata and Tosun (2019) proposed a new typology for NGOs actively working on refugee-migrant-related issues in Turkey, and also demonstrated how religion and specific beliefs have acted as factors affecting the foundation and preservation of certain types of NGOs. Our study contributes to this literature.

A growing scholarly debate concerning the role of civil society in social cohesion and integration has emerged concerning the extent to which civil society bolsters integration through complementing the actions of governments, focusing on various challenges and unsuccessful policies and practices as revealed in a wide range of case studies in countries such as Sweden, Germany, Netherlands, Myanmar and Turkey (see, for instance, Aras and Duman, 2018; Easton-Calabria and Wood, 2020; Lundberg et al., 2011; Tan, 2020). Through providing a detailed analysis of how local, refugee-led, and international NGOs have helped mediate social cohesion between Turkish and Syrian communities in Turkey, this study contributes significantly to this literature.

Third, scholarly interest in Turkish civil society has grown considerably since the early 2000s. Specifically, while some studies have conducted a broader analysis (e.g. Heper and Yıldırım, 2011), others have undertaken issue-based investigations, including on gender (Eslen-Ziya and Kazanoğlu, 2020), ecology (Paker et al., 2013), external funding (Zihnioğlu, 2020), and refugees (Sunata and Tosun, 2019), with all of them focusing on Turkish NGOs. Additionally, new forms of civic organising that developed after the Gezi Protests in 2013 have been explored (e.g. Akçalı, 2018; Ramazanoğulları, 2021; Zihnioğlu, 2019). This article expands on this literature through focusing on refugee-related work, on refugee-led organisations, and on INGOs active in Turkey.

We employed qualitative fieldwork data in relation to NGO activities. For data collection, we conducted face-to-face, in-depth, semi-structured interviews with representatives of twelve NGOs located in İstanbul between August 2019 and September 2020 (see Annex 1). İstanbul was chosen for our fieldwork as it hosts the largest number of Syrian refugees in Turkey (Directorate General of Migration Management, 2021). İstanbul is also the most favoured city among Syrian refugees to live and work in (Doğan et al.,

2020, 134), making it more relevant with respect to building social capital. In the interviews, we asked questions regarding their activities involving refugees. Specifically, we examined who the participants or beneficiaries were, how the refugees targeted were selected, the intercommunal relations observed during the activities, the challenges that arose, and how those challenges were managed. The interviews were conducted in Turkish and English and each lasted for an hour on average. To evaluate whether the activities generated or reinforced varied types of connections, and to explore their implications on social cohesion, we interviewed NGO representatives not only working with refugees or on refugee issues but also those working in diverse areas such as mental health, ecology, business and humanitarian aid. We also interviewed NGO representatives working at divergent levels (i.e. international, local (Turkish), and Syrian community-led NGOs). Since no officially confirmed list of NGOs working with refugees is available, we used elements of purposive and snowball sampling based on earlier research (e.g. Sunata and Tosun, 2019). We also reviewed NGO websites and publications to collect possible background information. For data analysis, we used thematic content analysis regarding social capital and its types. This study was approved by the University of Liverpool's ethics committee (reference no 6381). The participants were informed about the study's aims, methods, and ethical considerations through an information sheet. They were specifically assured that confidentiality would be maintained, that participation in the study was entirely voluntary and that they could withdraw at any time, and that informed consent would be considered to have been given with the signing of the consent form.

This paper is divided into five sections. Following this introduction, we include a theoretical framework for the data analysis; specifically, we outline the concepts of social capital (including its three types: bonding, bridging, and linking), and social cohesion. As regards social cohesion, we explain how it has been operationalised for our research. Section three provides background information on Syrian refugees and the related work of civil society in Turkey. In section four, using evidence from the fieldwork, we identify different types of social capital that are intermediated by the NGOs' activities and discuss their benefits and limitations in building bonding, bridging, and linking social capital and social cohesion. The concluding section provides insights into the implications of these activities and social capital on social cohesion.

Social capital and social cohesion

Since the 1980s, the concept of social capital has gained influence across numerous disciplines, including sociology, economics, and public health (Szreter and Woolcock, 2004; Lin, 2001; Song, 2010). Accordingly, there have been multiple definitions for this term. Coleman (1988) conceptualised it as a resource for action focusing on the family and community. Putnam (1993, 2000) defined it in the context of civic engagement that involved norms of cooperation, reciprocity, and mutual trust, and this understanding of the term has influenced various studies in the social sciences. For our study aim (i.e. examining refugees' social cohesion), we deemed Putnam's definition of social capital to be the most useful. Accordingly, the use of social capital in this study should be understood as connections among individuals that become available through

relationships established in social networks that facilitate social trust and cooperation (Putnam, 2000; Woolcock, 1998).

Scholars have also identified three primary different types of social capital: bonding, bridging and linking social capital (Gittell and Vidal, 1998; Putnam, 2000; Woolcock, 1998). These *types* of social capital have also been referred to as its *dimensions* (Woolcock and Narayan, 2000), *functions* (Gilbert et al., 2013), and *forms* (Schuller, 2007), all of which are synonyms for the same understanding. This conceptual refinement is particularly helpful for our study, which explores the social capital that NGOs intermediate for refugees.

Bonding social capital refers to relationships within a group or community with a high degree of similarity in some specific areas (Putnam, 2000); it describes connections among people who typically know one another, have close relationships, and interact frequently. Accordingly, it usually develops among people from similar backgrounds or with similar interests, often implying closed networks (e.g. family, close friends, and neighbours) (Claridge, 2018: 2). According to Putnam (2000: 22), the relations in bonding social capital are inward- looking in nature, reinforcing exclusive identities and homogenous groups. Studies have shown that bonding social capital can provide support to people suffering from personal, emotional, or socioeconomic hardships (Hawkins and Maurer, 2010). At the same time, excessive levels of bonding may evoke bias, the notion of outgroups, and exclusion (Claridge, 2018: 3). Hence, although bonding social capital may be an important source of social support for refugees, its utility for social cohesion is less clear; this aspect warrants further examination.

Bridging social capital describes the associations among people who have shared interests but who also have dissimilar socio-demographic characteristics (e.g. age, ethnic group, or class) (Pelling and High, 2005; Szreter and Woolcock, 2004: 655). Hence, the links in bridging social capital come from weaker network connections (e.g. more distant friends, associates, and colleagues). This type of social capital allows people to exchange information and build consensus despite having diverging interests (Adler and Kwon, 2002; Stone and Hughes, 2002). Accordingly, it tends to increase tolerance and acceptance among people with weaker links (Paxton, 2002), making it particularly relevant for our examination of refugees' social cohesion with the host Turkish community. Similar to this distinction between bonding and bridging social capital, Lin (2001: 47) delineated actor interactions as either homophilous or heterophilous: the first occurs among actors with similar resources (e.g. wealth, reputation, power, and lifestyle), while the latter occurs among actors with dissimilar resources.

Linking social capital (Szreter and Woolcock, 2004) describes the respect and trusting relationships that people build with institutions or people who occupy a relative position of power or authority. In that sense, linking social capital denotes a different type of social capital resulting from connections with people and institutions beyond the community-level, which is central to bonding and bridging social capital. Studies show that a lack of linking social capital (e.g. links to law enforcement officers, social workers, or healthcare providers) has a major bearing on the welfare of disadvantaged communities (Narayan, 2000; Krishna, 2002). Nonetheless, unlike bonding and bridging social capital, establishing linking social capital is often more difficult, especially for disadvantaged groups standing outside societal power structures. Accordingly, it is common for NGOs to work with disadvantaged communities to serve as intermediaries to help build linking social capital.

It is debated whether social capital is an individual asset, a collective asset, or both (Carpiano, 2005; Coleman, 1988). While NGO activities are often focused on small segments of refugee communities, the framework of social capital is more useful when focused on the actions of individuals in relation to their communities (Hawkings and Maurer, 2010: 1779). Hence, we consider that social capital is useful conceptually in approaching both individual and collective fields of actions as it can be viewed as an asset in either field.

Recent refugee studies have frequently referred to the concepts of social cohesion, integration, and harmonisation. These concepts are often produced in different contexts reflecting various priorities (Erdoğan, 2020: 12). We prefer to use the concept of social cohesion because, as Demireva (2017) explains, it is usually associated with togetherness, tolerance and harmonious coexistence, which is particularly relevant in contexts of intercommunal tension such as that in Turkey.

Following the definition of Erdoğan (2020), this study understands social cohesion to refer to the peaceful coexistence of foreigners (Syrian refugees) and the host (Turkish) community, which provides a broad yet helpful means of examining NGO activities regarding the cohabitation of Turkish and Syrian refugee communities as well as the intercommunal relations that NGOs intermediate. This definition is particularly relevant in the Turkish context involving intercommunal tension and it accords with definitions used by humanitarian and development organisations. The World Food Programme (2020: 5) defines social cohesion as the 'absence of social tension between refugees and host communities', while the World Bank (2015: 11) describes it as the non-existence of 'widespread issues with social tension, violence and conflict'. Moreover, the trust level between social groups is considered to be an important indicator when defining and measuring social cohesion by these organisations (de Berry and Roberts, 2018), as well as linking the concepts of social cohesion and social capital. In particular, bridging social capital with an emphasis on consensus and harmonious interaction by different groups can be seen as 'in some senses, the practical tool to achieve social cohesion' (Zetter et al., 2006: 22).

Syrian refugees in Turkey

Following the outbreak of the Syrian Civil War, Turkey adopted an open-door policy toward Syrian refugees. This policy turned Turkey into the country with the world's largest refugee population. According to the latest figures of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) (2021), 3.6 million Syrians and approximately 330,000 asylum seekers of other nationalities reside in Turkey. Moreover, less than 2% of the Syrian refugees live in the Temporary Accommodation Centres, indicating that more than 98% live across Turkey. These refugees have been shown to be concentrated in the south-eastern cities of the country, including Gaziantep, Urfa, and Hatay, and metropolitan cities, such as İstanbul, İzmir, and Bursa. Currently, İstanbul hosts the largest number of Syrian refugee populations in Turkey, with a total of 524,497 (Directorate General of Migration Management, 2021).

Although Turkey is a state party to the 1951 Refugee Convention and its 1967 Protocol, Turkey has not yet lifted its geographical restrictions concerning refugees, which prevents those coming from outside Europe from being granted refugee status in Turkey.

Moreover, owing to the lack of legislation on international protection in Turkey, the 1994 Regulation, titled the 'Procedures and Principles related to Possible Population Movements and Aliens Arriving in Turkey either as Individuals or in Groups Wishing to Seek Asylum either from Turkey or Requesting Residence Permission in order to Seek Asylum from Another Country', was for a long period the only document regulating migration movements. Nevertheless, at the time of the Syrian Civil War, the 1994 Regulation was not applied to Syrian nationals. Accordingly, the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Health issued secondary legislations within their competencies to provide aid to and address the different needs of Syrian nationals, which meant that the legal protection of Syrian nationals remained ambiguous between 2011 and 2014 (Şimşek and Çorabatır, 2016: 61). New legislation was adopted to deal with this issue: the Law on Foreigners and International Protection, No. 6458 (hereinafter, LFIP), which came into effect in April 2014. Within the LFIP, Article 91 regulates 'Temporary Protection' in the case of a 'mass influx situation'. Following the implementation of the LFIP and to clarify applications of Article 91, the government passed the 'Temporary Protection Regulation' in September 2014, which stipulated that only Syrian nationals, stateless persons, and refugees from Syria who were displaced owing to the events of 28 April 2011 were to be provided with temporary protection. In addition to the LFIP and the Temporary Protection Regulation, different ministries have promulgated various forms of secondary regulations and administrative directives to clarify the implementation of various policies regarding refugees in relation to healthcare, higher education, and work permits (Şimşek and Çorabatır, 2016: 66-67).

This temporary protection status grants Syrian refugees access to the main public services in Turkey, such as healthcare, education, and the labour market. Regarding word choice in the LFIP, it does not use the term 'integration', preferring to use the concept of 'harmonisation' instead; this word choice was intended to strengthen the social inclusion of the refugees (UNHCR (2020), 3RP Turkey Country Chapter, 2020-2021, 4; Şimşek and Çorabatır, 2016: x). Within this framework, to promote mutual harmonisation between persons under temporary and international protection and the local community, Turkey further adopted a National Harmonisation Strategy and Action Plan in 2018.

Furthermore, in 2015 and 2016, the Joint Action Plan and the European Union (EU)-Turkey Statement were promulgated, with the EU providing six billion euros to support the needs of refugees in Turkey. Projects funded by the EU include, inter alia, supportive efforts to ensure refugees' access to healthcare, education, and integration into the labour market (European Commission, 2020). Nevertheless, policy ambiguity eventually arose in this context, creating challenges for the integration of Syrian refugees and leading to precarious situations (Ilcan et al., 2018). For example, there are practical problems facing refugee integration that range from registration (long delays in registration) to language barriers (low levels of proficiency in Turkish), which pose hindrances for Syrians to exercise their rights, including rights to legal protection, healthcare, and education. Studies have highlighted that, in addition to basic needs (e.g. language learning, healthcare, education, and employment opportunities), social connections are also important for the integration of refugees and locals (Easton-Calabria and Wood, 2020; Doğan et al., 2020). In research led by the Municipality of İstanbul, the most prominent reasons for Syrian refugees to settle in İstanbul were identified as employment opportunities, social connections, and the feeling of security (Doğan et al., 2020: 16).

As the refugee situation in Turkey developed, the number of NGOs and INGOs working on refugee-migrant-related issues increased, particularly in the provinces where the Syrian population was concentrated. Indeed, NGOs played a crucial role in providing refugees with basic services, humanitarian aid, and supporting capacity development in terms of registration, legal assistance and repatriation, education and language learning, and employment and livelihood (Aras and Duman, 2018).

In the early phase of the Syrian Civil War, in 2011, NGOs and INGOs mainly conducted humanitarian aid programmes to respond to the refugees in coordination with the Disaster and Emergency Management Presidency (AFAD). Then, in 2014, the Turkish government promulgated the Temporary Protection Law, which aimed to ensure temporary protection to Syrian refugees through promoting an open-door policy, protection from forced return, and the provision of fundamental needs. Accordingly, we may infer that NGO projects focusing on humanitarian aid after 2014 in Turkey were initially conducted in line with the Temporary Protection Law policy. Nevertheless, over time, their projects diversified and began to cover other areas, including education, employment, and social cohesion. In particular since 2015, developing social cohesion has formed part of entered the NGOs' agendas and they have started conducting projects that complement state policies, for example, in education where the state has enabled Syrians to access education and NGOs have developed anti-bias training for teachers and students. NGOs have also started providing professional training to Syrian refugees, which has facilitated their access to labour markets and complements the relevant regulations. This complementary role of NGOs in the refugee crisis has been bolstered by international funding channelled through the NGOs, such as the EU's Facility for Refugees in Turkey for which the NGOs are among the implementing partners (Landell Mills, 2021: 25)

Therefore, NGO activities in Turkey since the Syrian Civil War moved from crisis response to state welfare support and finally to support the social cohesion of refugee communities. Indeed, one study has shown that NGOs have emerged as the main actors for the promotion of societal integration, being involved not only in basic service provision but also in creating social connections between local and refugee communities (Rottmann, 2021: 210).

Results and discussion: activities for refugees of NGOs in İstanbul

Intracommunal activities

Some organisations that we interviewed carry out activities only involving Syrian refugees; this was particularly the case with Syrian community-led NGOs that provide continuous support to Syrian refugees in Turkey. One such organisation administrates dormitories for Syrian youth and provides scholarships to them for study at Turkish universities because many of them cannot afford the cost of living in İstanbul; additionally, their families often live elsewhere in Turkey. This NGO also promotes educational, cultural, and sports activities aimed at bringing Syrian youth in İstanbul together, providing a platform through which these students can interact frequently. Another Syrian community-led NGO provides shelter for Syrian women who have lost their husbands in the Civil War. These women have their own living spaces, which they share with their

children, but they often socialise with and support one another. Their children attend Turkish schools and receive Qu'ran and Arabic lessons provided by the NGO in their free time. Moreover, other local NGOs in Turkey have opened community centres to provide Syrian families and their children with a safe environment in which to spend their time and attend training. Some NGOs run group therapy sessions for Syrians. All these activities have helped Syrians to further their intracommunal social connections. Although these people may not share a past connection, these activities have helped nurture closer intracommunal relations and foster closed networks. Consequently, these intracommunal activities tend to be inward looking in character and contribute to developing bonding social capital.

Intercommunal activities

In addition to intracommunal activities, the interviewed NGOs described various activities they promote to integrate the Turkish and Syrian communities. These activities aim at building mutual understanding, tolerance, and acceptance between these two communities, fostering bridging social capital exchanges.

Specifically, some activities have involved direct interventions to improve intercommunal ties. One local NGO brings together the host community and the refugee community through mediation training, 'so that they can better understand one another and provide resolution to disputes around them […] how to find solutions to problems resulting from the refugee crisis, ensuring that the two communities can face them' (NGO 1). Another NGO focuses on mitigating discrimination against refugees through designing games for primary school children to help address discrimination at school, as well as other games for training medical students to improve their skills in interacting with patients, including refugees, without suffering discrimination. These efforts are important because discriminatory behaviour can significantly impede these communities in connecting and exchanging with one another. Therefore, addressing discrimination not only improves intercommunity integration but also enhances bridging social capital.

Except for Turkish lessons, which are targeted exclusively at the refugee community, there is a growing tendency among NGOs to design and implement refugee-related activities for mixed groups of Turkish and Syrians. Activities such as student clubs, camps for children and the youth, sewing courses, cooking workshops for women, trips, social activities, conferences, meetings, competitions, vocational skills, and other types of training have been promoted for the general public among these communities. One NGO organised joint music bands with Turkish, Syrian, Afghan, and Iranian participants. These mixed-group activities increase bridging social capital as they facilitate information exchange, potentially increasing mutual tolerance and acceptance.

Moreover, some activities are targeted not only at people but also at companies. One NGO matched Turkish and Syrian small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), bringing them together under a mentoring programme where the Turkish SME was supposed to provide mentorship to the Syrian SME for several months. This initiative was aimed at helping the latter better adapt to Turkish business and employment markets. Another programme also matched Turkish and Syrian SMEs to initially introduce these companies to each other and, if possible, to facilitate business collaboration. Overall, these

activities are often designed as tools for NGOs to promote integration between the Turkish and Syrian communities. As one representative described it, NGOs mostly create 'a space for socialisations where different communities come together and learn from one another, focusing on issues such as skill and information sharing' (NGO 2).

Some larger NGOs even have specialised staff devoted to creating spaces linking the local community and refugees. One NGO representative reported that, in such spaces, 'a different dynamic emerges. Whether they are Turkish, or Syrian, or Afghan, they see the possibility of doing something […] coming together to do something' (NGO 1). Another representative said that, in these spaces, they 'don't feel that you are a foreigner, a refugee' (NGO 1).

Many interviewees reported that most participants in these NGO activities had not previously met any members of the other community. Subsequently, the Turkish and Syrian communities not only worked together during the activities but also chatted and came to know one another during breaks. Thus, some of these activities showed a clear positive effect on establishing exchanges between the Turkish and Syrian communities. One NGO representative reported that the Turkish participants said that they 'thought that [the Syrian refugees] entered the universities without an exam, we thought they got different scholarships, but we saw that [the reality] is nothing of the kind' (NGO 9). Another NGO representative noted that they 'have heard a lot of times [from the Turkish participants] that "we had not had a Syrian friend or imagined the Syrians as being only like those that I see on TV"' (NGO 6).

One NGO representative described how reluctant Turkish and Syrian women had been towards one another's food at the beginning of a cooking workshop:

> Then, around the table, they slowly began to open up […] They became more curious and asked more questions to the translator […] Initially, they would not say nice things, but then there was a process; they were [all of a sudden] giving recipes, learning one another's cuisine. Later, they loved one another's cuisine. They started to look more positively toward each other (NGO 2).

Other NGO representatives reported similar experiences in which women had initially kept their distance and had not wanted to come together:

> However, as we progressed with these activities, a very different communication was developed. For instance, they started 'sister' families. In one of the provinces, the families [from different communities] started to become voluntary sister families with one another […] Then, these families started introducing their children, their spouses [to one another] (NGO 3).

In some cases, the representatives reported that young people continued the relationships that they had established through the NGO activities by 'inviting one another to each other's universities' activities; they met outside […] we contributed to strengthening the communication among the young people' (NGO 3). Several NGO representatives also highlighted that it was easier to break down prejudices in the children, while activities also often helped correct erroneous perceptions about their respective communities among adults.

Nevertheless, intercommunal activities also showed serious limitations. First, many interviewees reported that the participants mainly comprised those already open to dialogue with the other community prior to the activities. One representative reported that

when the NGOs make a call for an intercommunal activity, 'a Turkish or a Syrian who does not believe in social cohesion will not come' (NGO 4). Indeed, some NGO representatives noted that, on learning about possible Syrian participation, some Turkish participants would react negatively, stating 'then count us out. If there are refugees then we are definitely not in this project' (NGO 9). Some NGO representatives mentioned that they advertised activities through regular channels, such as posters, leaflets, and social media, which served to attract those already interested. Other NGO representatives reported using institutional or personal networks to advertise activities, which for some was a common practice. Furthermore, the interviewees highlighted that it was mainly Turkish people who were less open to establishing intercommunal relations and that considerably fewer Turkish people tended to be involved than Syrians (NGO 3, NGO 11). These factors constrained the activities' potential for change.

Language barriers hindered the effectiveness of activities. Some Syrian refugees have learnt Turkish over the years but language learning can be a slow process filled with episodes of failure. Moreover, many refugees live in multilingual neighbourhoods and cities, lessening the urgency to reach fluency in Turkish (Catarci et al., 2020). Additionally, our interviewees noted that Syrian refugees worked for long hours, so 'they don't have any time for other things, even to learn the Turkish language' (NGO 5). Sometimes, in activities targeting university students or children, these language barriers could be overcome by using a common language (e.g. English for university students and Turkish for children). However, in most cases, NGOs described their activities as bilingual, conducted in both Turkish and Arabic. The language barrier not only limited interaction between the two communities during activities, encouraging dependence on translators, but also risked that connections made during the activities would be one-off episodes; thus impeding the transformation of connections into social capital.

The NGO representatives also reported that their NGOs faced sustainability issues. Most NGOs depend on external funds for their projects, and many interviewees pointed to the EU's diminishing interest in providing such funding and the Turkish government's growing control of external funds for refugee projects (NGO 3, NGO 6), leading to reduced funding and smaller NGOs. This development is in contrast with the earlier exponential growth in NGOs, with a consequent reduction in intercommunal projects. Indeed, we found that a major concern was the absence of the mainstreaming of social cohesion. Although some NGOs said that their projects were open to everyone subject to some criteria (e.g. age or location), there was often a lack of advertisement in Arabic concerning available activities or of translators for the activities, rendering refugee participation less likely, which further impeded the NGOs in supporting social cohesion.

Activities with persons or institutions of authority

Numerous NGOs have initiated projects focused on establishing and improving relations between Syrian refugees and people or institutions of authority. One theme common to these projects has been the entry of Syrian entrepreneurs and business owners into Turkish business space.

Several NGOs provide capacity-building training to Syrian entrepreneurs and business owners, including modules on official dealings for businesses in Turkey.

Some NGOs have also helped with new startups in their relations with relevant state agencies, such as the tax office, particularly during the initial stages of these relations. NGOs have also supported the establishment of links between Turkish chambers of commerce and business associations, aiming at improving Syrians' employability and their companies' adaptation to the Turkish market and economy.

One NGO has aimed to improve Syrians' relations with authorities by explaining to them their rights and duties. With the support of local authorities, this NGO has opened several social protection desks, where lawyers, doctors, psychologists, social workers, and translators provide information and guidance for Syrians on a diverse range of issues such as school enrolment, marriage, identity problems, security, and judicial processes in Turkey. This NGO and its collaborators have guided Syrians on where to go, whom to contact, and how to deal with relevant institutions.

Other NGOs have focused their activities on local state agencies through explaining current legislation on refugees to stakeholders in these agencies and providing training on the bureaucratic challenges faced by refugees. One NGO has organised coordination meetings among local stakeholders, including local NGOs and INGOs, as well as among local and international authorities active in the region where the NGO promotes its activities. In these meetings, stakeholders discuss refugees' affairs, problems, and solutions, clarify what everyone is doing, and who has responsibility for what. One NGO representative described the initial problem:

> There are various agencies working in the provinces, but they are [these agencies] not aware of one another. I come and say something to the refugee, [then] he or she says something, he or she [representative of another agency] also says something, but that agency does not know me and I do not know what they are doing. The refugee comes both to me and also to them. There is serious information pollution (NGO 3).

NGO activities focusing on people or on institutions of authority are important because they can help in developing a trusting relationship between those in authority and the refugees, leading to the development of linking social capital. These activities are also important because they can facilitate refugee adaptation to the official system and acquisition of an official status within the national system. This official status, in turn, enables the development of more stable and sustainable relations with Turkish people, which may spill over into building bridging social capital and enhancing social cohesion. One interviewee explained that, when refugees do business in a sector, 'despite the language barrier, they can come together [with Turkish companies] to do business, partner in a business, or enter into supply chain relations' (NGO 1). Hence, our study participants suggested that the business environment can help break down community-based prejudices, allowing for greater social cohesion. This process was described in the following excerpt from an interviewee:

> If you are going to the tax office with a Turkish person, this is already very important; or if you are selling something to a Turkish person coming to your shop, or vice versa; or if you can supply your goods from a Turkish or a Syrian. These are the most important drivers of social cohesion in daily life. You do business together; you start to connect to one another through certain relations; bonds in an ecosystem […] the things that connect are actually the essential processes for people's lives to move on […] if I buy my textile from you [a Syrian], when exporting, someone comes and provides consultancy concerning my export; all of this system triggers [social] cohesion (NGO 7).

However, we observed certain limitations in the NGOs' activities for establishing linking social capital. First, their role in establishing linking social capital is indirect. Some NGOs act as information providers, guiding refugees to the right people or institutions, or explaining their rights and duties in the country. Other NGOs act as intermediaries and facilitators for establishing connections, for example, through accompanying refugees into public institutions and/or providing refugees with transportation and translators.

Second, our interviewees remarked that attitudes towards refugees in Turkish public institutions varied significantly. One NGO representative noted that local officials in Hatay province were telling refugee entrepreneurs that they 'do not give permission [to refugees] to establish a company; you [refugee] cannot get a tax certificate from [us]; you [refugee] cannot get trade certificates from [us]' (NGO 1). Meanwhile, the local authorities in the neighbouring province of Gaziantep employed Arabic-speaking staff to assist refugees and had opened a help desk in the chamber of commerce. Our study participants also noted that some Turkish business associations 'were reluctant to promote Syrians' [formal] employment in member companies as they benefitted from their cheaper, informal employment' (NGO 1). While such relationship issues seemed to vary by person and institution of authority, they were not isolated cases and are likely to adversely affect the development of linking social capital.

Conclusion

We consider that our findings can enhance our understanding of the work of NGOs with refugees and of issues confronting the development of social cohesion among refugees. Promoting refugee social cohesion has become more urgent among NGOs. While some NGOs had organised intracommunal activities, including Turkish classes, most intracommunal activities were isolated and formed a small part of the total number of activities. Although such Turkish classes are not intrinsically intercommunal,[1] they indirectly help refugees establish horizontal and vertical relations with host communities. Therefore, Turkish classes should be seen as an activity that reinforces bridging and linking social capital, rather than bonding social capital. NGOs have also sought to build bridging social capital using intercommunal activities to bring Turkish and refugee communities together and improve social cohesion. It would appear that intercommunal activities have indeed provided space for both communities to meet in situations where otherwise their paths would not likely have crossed. Such activities may have helped the two communities confront various misconceptions concerning each other, overcome their prejudices, and discover commonalities, as well as provide an opportunity for relationships to form, especially among Syrians who want to establish links with Turkish people. This positive impact may also extend beyond the immediate outcome, particularly with younger participants; they may share their positive experiences with their family, which may positively influence their families' beliefs. In this sense, we consider that the activities proposed and implemented by the NGOs have clearly contributed to establishing connections and exchanges between the two communities.

However, building bridging social capital requires sustained relations, and these aforementioned activities may be limited in bringing about long-term change, possibly owing to language barriers. Additionally, our study showed that these activities and how they are advertised tended to attract people who were already open to intercommunal dialogue prior to the activities. Therefore, NGOs in their current approach (whether

necessitated by cost or implemented by choice) are unlikely to be reaching or including participants with very low levels of tolerance toward outgroups. Their approach curtails the potentially transformative impact of such activities on social cohesion.

However, our data also showed that NGO activities often provided Syrian refugees with a connection to people or institutions of authority, which offered them pathways to be incorporated into the national system and opportunities for relations to develop between these people or institutions of authority and the refugees. These activities also helped refugees develop more stable and sustainable connections with Turkish people, gradually building bridging social capital. This process was most clearly exemplified in relation to Syrian business entrepreneurs After beginning to work together with their Turkish counterparts around a common interest, their business connections may eventually lead to distinctive intercommunal bonds that foster opportunities for information exchange and building acceptance towards each other, which would enhance social cohesion. Thus, we posit that a peaceful coexistence between refugee communities and host communities in one segment of life (i.e. work) bears the potential to facilitate a peaceful coexistence in other aspects of life. Therefore, NGOs should focus their efforts on finding issues that are of common interest to both Syrian refugees and the Turkish community. They should design their activities in a way that will bring the two communities together around these issues. Concurrently, the policy-makers and the local authorities should facilitate refugee participation in the national system, particularly in relation to education system and work.

However, in some cases, negative attitudes of people or of institutions of authority toward Syrian refugees may impede the transformation of these connections into trusting relations, hindering the building of linking social capital and inhibiting the process of creating and sustaining a peaceful coexistence. We hence see space for the government to propose a clear and long-term official policy regarding the future of Syrian refugees in Turkey. The current absence of a clear direction at the higher political level allows varying and conflicting approaches to develop at lower levels of authority, posing additional complications for NGOs in seeking to improve social cohesion in Turkey.

As Syrian refugees in Turkey are scattered across various cities, with some still living in camps, it was beyond the scope of this study to examine the work of NGO in all these places. We sought to mitigate this limitation through focusing our study on İstanbul as the city most favoured by refugees to live and work in. In addition, we included in our study those NGOs and INGOs with insight and experience gained from working with refugees living in other cities. Future research should investigate the work of NGOs and its implications on the social cohesion of refugees in other areas, in particular the border cities and camps where refugee life and relationships with the Turkish community may differ.

Geolocation information

The research was conducted in İstanbul, Turkey.

Note

1. Turkish classes may be offered to numerous and varying refugee communities with differing native languages, but the term 'intercommunal' is used here in relation to Turkish and Syrian (or other) refugee communities.

ORCID

Özge Zihnioğlu 🆔 http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6596-1994

References

Adler, P. S., and S. W. Kwon. 2002. "Social Capital: Prospects for a New Concept." *The Academy of Management Review* 27 (1): 17–40.

Akçalı, E. 2018. "Do Popular Assemblies Contribute to Genuine Political Change? Lessons from the Park Forums in Istanbul." *South European Society and Politics* 23 (3): 323–340.

Akçapar-Köşer, S., and D. Şimşek. 2018. "The Politics of Syrian Refugees in Turkey: A Question of Inclusion and Exclusion Through Citizenship." *Social Inclusion* 6 (1): 176–187.

Akdemir, A. 2019. "Syrians in Turkey: A Review of Literature." *International Journal of Cultural and Social Studies* 5 (1): 323–336.

Aras, B., and Y. Duman. 2018. "I/NGOs' Assistance to Syrian Refugees in Turkey: Opportunities and Challenges." *Journal of Balkan and Near East Studies* 21 (4): 478–491. doi:10.1080/19448953.2018.1530382.

Baban, F., S. Ilcan, and K. Rygiel. 2017. "Syrian Refugees in Turkey: Pathways to Precarity, Differential Inclusion, and Negotiated Citizenship Rights." *Journal of Ethnic Migration Studies* 43 (1): 41–57.

Biehl, K. S. 2017. "Inclusive Exclusion? The Regulation and Experience of Citizenship in a Space of Irregular Migration in Istanbul." In *Within and Beyond Citizenship*, edited by R. G. Gonzales, and N. Sigona (Der.), 80–92. Londra ve New York: Routledge.

Carpiano, R. 2005. "Toward a Neighborhood Resource-Based Theory of Social Capital for Health: Can Bourdieu and Sociology Help?" *Social Science & Medicine* 62 (1): 165–175.

Catarci, M., Gomes, M. P., and Sávio Siqueira. (2020). *Refugees, Interculturalism and Education*. London and New York: Routledge.

Çelik, C., and S. Erdoğan. 2017. How to Organize Schools for Integration of Syrian Children in Turkey: Constructing Inclusive and Intercultural Institutional Habitus in Schools." *Mirekoc Policy Brief Series*.

Claridge, T. 2018. "Functions of social capital – bonding, bridging, linking." *Social Capital Research*. https://www.socialcapitalresearch.com/what-is-bridging-social-capital/.

Coleman, J. 1988. "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital." *American Journal of Sociology* 94 (S1): S95–S120.

De Berry, J. P., and A. Roberts. 2018. Social Cohesion and Forced Displacement: A Desk Review to Inform Programming and Project Design." *The World Bank*. https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/125521531981681035/pdf/128640-WP-P163402-PUBLIC-SocialCohesionandForcedDisplacement.pdf.

Demireva, N. 2017. *Immigration, Diversity and Social Cohesion*. Briefing, The Migration Observatory, University of Oxford. https://migrationobservatory.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/Briefing-Immigration-Diversity-and-Social-Cohesion.pdf.

Directorate General of Migration Management. 2021. "Geçici Koruma." https://www.goc.gov.tr/gecici-koruma5638.

Doğan, N., R. Süleymanoğlu-Kürüm, E. A. Bekaroğlu, and M. Cin. 2020. IBB Goc Arastirmasi." https://www.ibb.istanbul/Uploads/2021/5/istanbul-Goc-Arastirmasi-2020-05-06.pdf.

Easton-Calabria, E., and J. Wood. 2020. "Bridging, Bonding, and Linking? Syrian Refugee-led Organisations and Integration in Berlin." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 47 (19): 4308–4326. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2020.1788928.

Erdem, B. 2017. "Geçici koruma statüsündeki Suriyelilerin sosyal, siyasi ve vatandaşlık hukuku bakımından Türkiye'deki durumları." *Public and Private International Law Bulletin* 37 (2): 332–351.

Erdoğan, M. M. 2015. *Türkiye'deki Suriyeliler: Toplumsal kabul ve uyum*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Erdoğan, M. M. 2016. "Syrians in Turkey: From Emergency Aid Policies to Integration Policies." *Foreign Policy* 42 (2): 25–56.

Erdoğan, M. M. 2020. *Syrians Barometer 2019: A Framework for Achieving Social Cohesion with Syrians In Turkey*. Ankara: Orion.

Eslen-Ziya, H., and N. Kazanoğlu. 2020. "De-democratization under the NewTurkey? Challenges for women's organizations." *Mediterranean Politics* 27 (1): 101–122. doi:10.1080/13629395.2020.1765524.

European Commission. 2020. "EU Signs Final Contracts Under the €6 Billion Budget of the Facility for Refugees in Turkey." https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/news_corner/news/eu-signs-final-contracts-under-€6-billion-budget-facility-refugees-turkey_en.

Gilbert, K. L., S. C. Quinn, R. M. Goodman, J. Butler, and J. Wallace. 2013. "A Meta-Analysis of Social Capital and Health: A Case for Needed Research." *Journal of Health Psychology* 18 (11): 1385–1399.

Gittell, R. J., and A. Vidal. 1998. *Community Organizing: Building Social Capital as a Development Strategy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Göksel, G. U. 2014. The Theory of Recognition and The Integration of Immigrants. PhD thesis. University of Colorado.

Hawkins, R. L., and K. Maurer. 2010. "Bonding Bridging and Linking: How Social Capital Operated in New Orleans following Katrina." *British Journal of Social Work* 40: 1777–1793.

Heper, M., and S. Yıldırım. 2011. "Revisiting Civil Society in Turkey." *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies* 11 (1): 1–18.

İçduygu, A. 2016. *Turkey: Labour Market Integration and Social Inclusion of Refugees*. Brussels: Directorate General for Internal Policies Policy Department A: Economic and Scientific Policy.

İçduygu, A., and E. Diker. 2017. "Labor Market Integration of Syrian Refugees: From Refugees to Settlers." *The Journal of Migration Studies* 3 (1): 12–35.

İçduygu, A., and D. Şimşek. 2016. "Syrian Refugees in Turkey: Towards Integration Policies." *Turkish Policy Quarterly* 15 (3): 59–69.

İGAMDER. 2013. *Report on the Activities of Non Governmental Organisations for Syrian Refugees in Turkey*. Ankara: İltica ve Göç Araştırmaları Merkezi- İGAM. https://igamder.org/uploads/belgeler/IGAMSuriyeSTK2013.pdf.

Ilcan, S., K. Rygiel, and F. Baban. 2018. "The Ambigous Architecture of Precarity: Temporary Protection, Everyday Living, and Migrant Journeys of Syrian Refugees." *International Journal of Migration and Bordres* 4 (1/2): 51–70.

INGEV. 2019. Syrian Perception Research and Invitation from İNGEV to Use Social Cohesion Language Against the Danger of Othering and Antagonising." *Press Bulletin*. https://ingev.org/press-bulletin/Syrian-Perception-Research.pdf.

International Crisis Group. 2018. *Turkey's Syrian Refugees: Defusing Metropolitan Tensions*. Europe Report No. 248. Belgium: International Crisis Group.

Kadkoy, O. 2020. "Syrian Entrepreneurs in Turkey: Emerging Economic Actors and Agents of Social Cohesion." In *Turkey's Political Economy in the 21st Century*, edited by E. D. Parlar, 115–129. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Krishna, A. 2002. *Active Social Capital: Tracing the Roots of Development and Democracy*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Landell Mills. 2021. Strategic Mid-Term Evaluation of the Facility for Refugges in Turkey 2016-2019/2020. Final Report Volume 1. https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/strategic_mid-term_evaluation_main_report.pdf.

Levent, F., and S. Çayak. 2017. "Türkiye'deki Suriyeli Öğrencilerin Eğitimine Yönelik Okul Yöneticilerinin Görüşleri." *Hasan Ali Yücel Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi* 14 (1): 21–46.

Lin, N. 2001. *Social Capital: A Theory of Social Structure and Action*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lundberg, Erik, E. Amnå, P. Brundin, and E. Bozzini. 2011. "European Civil Societies and the Promotion of Integration, Leading Practices from Sweden, Great Britain, the Netherlands and Italy." In *Social Rights, Active Citizenship and Governance in the European Union*, edited by T. P. Boje, and M. Potucek, 121–133. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft.

Mavi Kalem. 2014. "Suriyeli Mülteciler Alanında Sivil Toplum" Çalıştayı Raporu. http://mavikalem.org/wp-content/uploads/Suriyeli-M%C3%BClteciler-Alan%C4%B1nda-ST%C3%96ler-%C3%87al%C4%B1%C5%9Ftay%C4%B1-Raporu_28.05.2014.pdf.

Narayan, D. 2000. *Voices of the Poor*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Okyay, A. S. 2017. "Labour Marker Integration of Syrian Refugees in Germany and Turkey: Challenges and prospects." *Global Turkey in Europe Working Paper 18*.

Paker, H., F. Adaman, Z. Kadirbeyoğlu, and B. Özkaynak. 2013. "Environmental Organisations in Turkey: Engaging the State and Capital." *Environmental Politics* 22 (5): 760–778.

Paxton, P. 2002. "Social Capital and Democracy: An Interdependent Relationship." *American Sociological Review* 67 (2): 254–277.

Pelling, M., and C. High. 2005. "Understanding Adaptation: What Can Social Capital Offer Assessments of Adaptive Capacity?" *Global Environmental Change* 15 (4): 308–319.

Putnam, R. D. 1993. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Putnam, R. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Ramazanoğulları, H. 2021. "After the Protest: Istanbul Park Forums and People's Engagement in Political Action." *Social Movement Studies*: 1–17. doi:10.1080/14742837.2021.1894550.

Rottmann, S. B. 2020. "Integration: Policies, Practices and Experiences – Turkey Country Report," RESPOND - Multilevel Governance of Mass Migration in Europe and Beyond Project (#770564, Horizon2020) Working Paper Series. https://www.respondmigration.com/.

Rottmann, S. B. 2021. "Geçici Koruma Altındaki Kişilerin Entegrasyonu." In *Koruma, Kabul ve Entegrasyon: Türkiye'de Mültecilik*, edited by Ayhan Kaya, Susan Beth Rottmann, N. Ela Gökalp Aras, and Zeynep Şahin Mengücek, 191–205. Istanbul: İstanbul University Publications.

Schuller, T. 2007. "Reflections on the use of Social Capital." *Review of Social Economy* 65 (1): 11–28.

Şimşek, D., and M. Çorabatır. 2016. "Challenges and Opportunities of Refugee Integration in Turkey." *Research Centre on Asylum and Migration (IGAM)*. https://tr.boell.org/sites/default/files/hb_rapor_duezlt_1904173.pdf.

Song, L. 2010. "Social Capital and Psychological Distress." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 52 (4): 478–492.

Soykan, C. 2012. The New Draft Law on Foreigners and International Protection in Turkey. *Oxford Monitor of Forced Migration* 2 (2): 38–47.

Stone, W., and J. Hughes. 2002. "Social Capital: Empirical Meaning and Measurement Validity." *Australian Institute of Family Studies*. Research Paper No 27.

Sunata, U., and S. Tosun. 2019. "Assessing the Civil Society's Role in Refugee Integration in Turkey: NGO-R as a New Typology." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 32 (4): 683–703.

Szreter, S., and M. Woolcock. 2004. "Health by Association? Social Capital, Social Theory, and the Political Economy of Public Health." *International Journal of Epidemiology* 33 (4): 650–667.

Tan, N. F. 2020. A Study on the Potential for Introducing A Community Sponsorship Program for Refugees in Sweden." *UNHCR*. https://www.unhcr.org/neu/wp-content/uploads/sites/15/2020/12/UNHCR-Study-on-Community-Sponsorship-Program-in-Sweden.pdf.

Tunç, AŞ. 2015. "Mülteci Davranışı ve Toplumsal Etkileri: Türkiye'deki Suriyelilere İlişkin Bir Değerlendirme." *TESAM Akademik Dergisi* 2 (2): 29–63.

UNHCR. 2020. 3RP Turkey Country Chapter 2020–2021. https://data2.unhcr.org/en/documents/details/74179.

UNHCR. 2021, June. "UNHCR Turkey Operational Update." https://data2.unhcr.org/en/documents/details/87641.

Woolcock, M. 1998. "Social Capital and Economic Development: Toward a Theoretical Synthesis and Policy Frame- Work." *Theory and Society* 27: 151–208.

Woolcock, M., and D. Narayan. 2000. "Social Capital: Implications for Development Theory, Research, and Policy." *World Bank Research Observer* 15 (2): 225–249.

World Bank. 2015. "Turkey's Response to the Syrian Refugee Crisis and the Road Ahead." https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/23548/Turkey0s0respo0s0and0the0road0ahead.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y.

World Food Programme. 2020. Social Cohesion in Turkey: refugees and the host community." July 2020. https://reliefweb.int/report/turkey/social-cohesion-turkey-refugees-and-host-community-online-survey-findings-rounds-1-5.

Zetter, R., D. Griffiths, N. Sigona, D. Flynn, P. Tauhid, and R. Beynon. 2006. *Immigration, Social Cohesion, and Social Capital: What are the Links?* London: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Zihnioğlu, Ö. 2019. "The Prospects of Civic Alliance: New Civic Activists Acting Together with Civil Society Organizations." *Voluntas* 30(2): 289–299.

Zihnioğlu, Ö. 2020. *EU-Turkey Relations: Civil Society and Depoliticization*. London: Routledge.

Annex 1: List of Interviewed NGOs.

Name of the NGO	Level of Organisation
Birlz Association	Local/national
Damascus Orphanage Association	Syrian community-led
Habitat Association	International
Himma Youth Association	Syrian community-led
Human Advocacy and Brotherhood Association (ImkanDer)	Local/national
INGEV Foundation	Local/national
International Blue Crescent	International
Refugees' Association	Local/national
Spark Association	International
Support to Life Association	Local/national
World Academy for Local Government and Democracy (WALD)	International
Yuva Association	Local/national