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ABSTRACT

Entering the 9th year of the Syrian Crisis, there are still more than 400 thousand school aged Syrian children considered ‘out-of-school’ in Turkey. Several previous studies as well as reports of International Organisations and Civil Society Organisations such as UNICEF and Support to Life argue that out-of-school Syrian children have formed part of the Turkish informal labour market. Restrained migration policies incorporated with the needs of global labour markets have caused precarisation of the migrant labour, and in the case of Turkey precarisation of migrant child labour as well. The aim of the current study is to critically analyse the strategies and interventions of this multilevel governance targeting migrant child labour. Hence, a qualitative research method was employed in order to answer the study’s research questions. First, document analysis was conducted to identify the multilevel institutional framework; and second, semi-structured in-depth interviews were conducted with selected informants working for International Organisations. By facilitating Carol Bacchi’s ‘What is the problem represented to be?’ (WPR) approach, each actor’s strategies and interventions directed to migrant child labour are scrutinised. While each actor by definition manages to identify the causes of (migrant) child labour, the strategies and interventions are constrained by the conventional migration management approach as well as the discourses of “the best interest of the child” and “fair trade”.

Keywords: Migrant Child Labour, Syrian Child Labour, Precarity, Multilateral Governance, Migration Management, Child rights, International Organisations
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Pursuing an education abroad and writing a thesis deemed to be a challenge by itself, and it is unlikely to be achieved without all kinds of support. During this journey I owe a great deal of gratitude to many people who supported me.

First, I would like to thank to all my professors at REMESO for their invaluable teachings and discussions they provided, which enriched and broaden my horizon. I wish we had more time, I still have a lot to learn. Amongst all, I especially would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Branka Likić-Brborić, without whom I could easily get lost. Thank you for your support, guidance and patience.

Returning back to academia abroad required many sacrifices for me, including financial instability and more importantly absence of immediate emotional support. I wish to thank to my best friend and partner, Orçun Yıldızca for his never-ending love, support and patience. Regardless of all the distances and challenges we had to endure, you never gave up on me. Thank you. I am also grateful to my big family in Turkey. I always felt their support with me. I should also acknowledge the invaluable support and friendship I found in Norrköping. This journey could be pretty rough without your company, but instead I found true friendships that will endure a life-time. Last but not the least, I appreciate the support of the Swedish Institute (SI), without which it would be impossible for me to come to Sweden and accomplish this study. I am grateful to SI for awarding me the scholarship to pursue my goal.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Active Labour Market Policy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALMP</td>
<td>Conditional Cash Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCT</td>
<td>The Directorate General of Migration Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGMM</td>
<td>Emergency Social Safety Net</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSN</td>
<td>The European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFMD</td>
<td>The Global Forum on Migration and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTF</td>
<td>Global Task Force on Child Labour and Education for All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAK-İŞ</td>
<td>The HAK-İŞ Trade Union Confederation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>International Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPEC</td>
<td>International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoFAL</td>
<td>The Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoFLSS</td>
<td>The Ministry of Family, Labour and Social Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoFSP</td>
<td>The Ministry of Family and Social Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoH</td>
<td>The Ministry of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoI</td>
<td>The Ministry of Interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoLSS</td>
<td>The Ministry of Labour and Social Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoNE</td>
<td>The Ministry of National Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoYS</td>
<td>The Ministry of Youth and Sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>National Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHCHR</td>
<td>Office of United Nations High Commission for Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PICMME</td>
<td>The Provisional Intergovernmental Committee for Movement of Migrants from Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBPPF</td>
<td>Time-Bound Policy and Programme Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESK</td>
<td>The Confederation of Turkish Tradesman and Craftsmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TİSK</td>
<td>The Turkish Confederation of Employer Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOBB</td>
<td>The Union of Chambers and Commodity Exchanges of Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TÜRK-İŞ</td>
<td>The Confederation of Turkish Trade Unions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVET</td>
<td>Technical, Vocational Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>United Nations High Commission for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTP</td>
<td>Under Temporary Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFCL</td>
<td>Worst Forms of Child Labour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INTRODUCTION

Reporter: Do you have a dream?
Ali: No, I don’t have a dream.
Reporter: You don’t?
Ali: No, I don’t.
Reporter: What do you want?
Ali: I don’t want anything.
Report: Don’t you wish for anything?
Ali: Nothing.

Ali was a 10-year-old boy working for less than US$ 1 per day in 2015, when a reporter from CNN-Turk asked him these questions. He was surprisingly fluent in Turkish, having been one of many children who fled to Turkey from Syria, some with their parents or relatives whereas some were as unaccompanied minors. As with many migrant children in Turkey, Ali had to find work in order to contribute to his family’s survival. Although child labour is not a new problem within the Turkish economy, it has been dramatically heightened by the Syrian refugee crisis that started in 2011. It is at such a point that a child gives up dreaming, losing their childlike spirit, imagination and expectations for the future. Bearing in mind Ali’s disheartenment, we as adults, parents, decision-makers, and researchers need to realise that we have almost failed to accomplish our duty in assuring we address the best interests of children.

One can suggest that within the context of neoliberal globalisation and the related dynamics of the global labour market (Wise, 2015), that the problem of child labour has also become even more complex than previously considered. The inherited child labour problem in Turkey, with its multifaceted complexities, has been now fuelled by the dynamic of forced migration. In the trajectory towards global governance, global and multilateral actors’ and decision-makers’ responses to conflicts, wars, humanitarian crises, and migration have proved inadequate (Likić-Brborić, 2018). Moreover, the policies attuned to neoliberal globalisation have on numerous occasions exposed individuals, groups and in this case children and migrant children to extreme levels of precariousness and vulnerability (Bauder, 2005, Likić-Brborić and Schierup, 2015, Lewis et al., 2015).

Several International Labour Organisation (ILO) reports and studies have identified the driving forces behind child labour, with poverty, migration, lack of access to social protection, education and essential needs as the most salient (2017, IPEC, 2013, 2010a). The double

1 Excerpt from an interview with a 10-year-old boy named Ali, who arrived in Istanbul from Syria in 2015. The interview was conducted by Ezgi Cankurtaran for CNNTurk. For the full interview see: https://www.cnnturk.com/video/turkiye/10-yasindaki-ali-ile-ailesine-yardim-yagmuru
vulnerability of migrant children due to their legal status and consequent likelihood for inaccessibility to social services, is also highlighted as a critical impetus for child labour (ILO, 2010b). The need for child labour increases during crises following the drastic reduction of living standards, loss of income and/or resources together with lack of social protection due to budgetary constraints of both national and provincial governments (IPEC, 2013). Furthermore, the ILO suggests that migrant child labourers are subjected to worse conditions through receiving lower levels of pay and by working longer hours, and associated as a cause for higher school dropout rates, and higher mortality rates than local child labourers (2010a).

Unfortunately, the existence of child labour and it becoming an ever more complicated issue is now a commonplace global phenomenon.

The latest ILO report (2017) claims that as of 2016, there are 152 million children in child labour globally, of which 88 million are boys and 64 million are girls. In the same report, ‘national income’ was presented as one of the indicators of child labour, where lower national income was associated with higher percentages of child labour. Notwithstanding, the report also showed that 56% and 1.3% of children in child labour globally are living in middle-income and higher-income countries, respectively (Ibid., p. 33). Consequently, child labour is not only a low-income country phenomenon, but a global social problem, and this is in spite of several international initiatives and collaborations intent on eradicating the ‘worst forms of child labour’ (WFCL). Most recently, within the scope of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) Target 8.7, global actors like the ILO and United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) have committed to work on WFCL as well as other exploitative forms of work, namely dangerous and hazardous work, in collaboration with various countries where the WFCL are present. Similarly, the Turkish Government and its ministries have been working against child labour together with the ILO, UNICEF as well as with other International Organisations (IO).

Although there are many refugee/migrant ‘success stories’ projected by the IOs, the circumstances that led many migrant children and their families to make hard decisions that ended up with them being deprived of their basic human rights cannot be ignored. Since 2011, both the Turkish Government and IOs have been working together in various areas ranging from education, health, and protection to labour market integration in order to respond to one of the biggest humanitarian crises of our era. However, as of May 2019, there are still in excess

---

In the report the countries are grouped into four categories according to their 2015 gross national income per capita. The income ranges are: low-income (US$ 1,045 or less), lower-middle-income (US$ 1,046-4,125); upper-middle-income (US$ 4,126-12,735), and high-income (US$ 12,736 or more) (ILO, 2017, p. 32).
of 500 thousand school-aged Syrian children in Turkey not enrolled to any education institution. As a result, these children are at significant risk of engaging in child labour. Unfortunately, no recent official data exists on either child labour in general or the targeting of migrant children in Turkey. The available reports and research indicate that considerable numbers of these children have already been employed in precarious works, just like the boy Ali. In a report published by Eğitim-Sen (Education and Science Workers’ Union), they argued that there are almost 2 million child-workers in Turkey, with Syrian children being those at most risk (2018).

Eight years following the unfolding of the Syrian Crisis, the inability to address the needs of these migrant children raises questions about the implementation of policies and interventions thus far. Such policies need to be scrutinised against an understanding of structural conditions and determinants that led Ali and many others like him to engage in child labour. Of course, that implies reconsidering problematisations of migrant child labour, together with the interventions conducted to date and action taken to address the issue, in order to understand the policy failures and root causes of the identified ‘problems’ (Bacchi, 2009).

**Aim of the Study and Research Questions**

The current study aims to present the existing multilevel governance frameworks and strategies of IOs against child labour; specifically, migrant child labour, and to critically analyse if and how their implementation complies with global discourses of social justice, equality and human rights within the context of Turkey. More specifically, the aim of the current study can be rephrased as the identification and critical analysis of the agendas, strategies, and practices of the Turkish Government and the United Nations’ (UN) Agencies, whose mandates mainly focus on the protection of children, labour rights, and migrants. Ergo, UNICEF, the ILO, and the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) are identified as the three main stakeholders who are actively working along with the Turkish Government and its ministries in the fight against child labour. Additionally, they are also promoting access to education for the affected children, as well as the integration of migrants under the status of temporary protection.

In pursuit of identifying the strategies, policies, and discourses regarding child labour, and specifically the child labour of Syrian migrants in Turkey, the research questions of this thesis are as follows:

- What are the national and international institutional frameworks targeting child labour?

3 The calculation will be explained in the next section.
• What are the main legal instruments, strategies, and intervention areas of International Organisations against child labour that target children under temporary protection in Turkey?
• How do Turkish national authorities and international organisations that operate in Turkey problematise migrant child labour?
• What are the main challenges and obstacles facing these IOs in realising their mission?

Disposition of the Thesis

In order to meet the aim of the thesis and answer the research questions, the thesis is organised as follows. First, there follows a presentation on the multilevel governance of child labour and the definition of child labour, followed by the specification of the child labour problem in Turkey, both before and since the start of the Syrian crisis. Next follows a presentation of relevant previous studies, and then the theoretical approach and methodological considerations are introduced. After that, the results of the analysis are presented, which is followed by a concluding discussion.

Towards Multilevel Governance Addressing Child Labour

International Initiatives and Conventions in relation to Child Labour

The history of child labour is often recollected to the days of Western industrialisation. At the time of the rise of the West’s industrialisation, child labour also increased, especially in countries like the UK. With the influence of labour movements accompanied by changes in the perception of the child and childhood in Western modernisation, social protection and child protection often went hand in hand. The international actors started to flourish and also met around this perspective of protecting children from work and dangerous environments. Even today, the dominant global discourse regarding the realisation of human rights of children is constituted upon the notion of ‘protection’. Similarly, within today’s socioeconomic contexts, child labour is framed and responded to by many national and international actors.

Forced migration is one of the more prominent humanitarian crises that affects children more than anyone, and results in serious rights violations including engaging with the WFCL. Therefore, there have been several attempts at the global level to protect the rights of children, and specifically to address the problem of child labour in order to realise the best interests of children globally. Yet, if one wishes to understand today’s global political actions to assure children’s human rights and the fight against child labour, first the significant influence and

4 UNICEF, ILO, and IOM
sanctions of the United Nations Convention on Rights of the Child (UNCRC) should be acknowledged.

Towards UNCRC

The road to UNCRC was a long one that took many years to ensure its comprehensiveness. Following the industrialisation period in the North, as with many others such as those in servitude, migrants, non-citizens, the undeserving poor and the working class, children were also subjected to severe and harsh conditions within the established systems, and often found themselves exploited as a source of cheap labour (Cunningham, 2000). As the pioneer of industrialisation, the UK’s experience with child labour and anti-child labour movements heavily influenced other countries in Europe at the time, and also went on to shape the perspectives adopted today. As it dwelled in the UK, child labour and movements against it were significantly associated with general labour movements, the proliferation of universal education, and changes in the conception of ‘childhood’ (ILO, 2007). Consequently, laws and initiatives towards child protection and welfare were initiated; however, the major game-changer came right after the First World War (WWI).

In 1919, Eglantyne Jebb together with her sister were trying to raise a voice on behalf of children devastated by WWI and founded Save the Children. In the same year, the ILO was introduced within the scope of the Treaty of Versailles, together with a specific focus on the elimination of child labour by prioritising education (ILO-IPEC, 2015). With the leadership of Eglantyne Jebb, a group of people working on child rights came up with Declaration of Geneva in 1924, one of the reference documents of the UNCRC, aiming to protect children all over Europe who had been severely affected by the global conflict (Milne, 2008). Although, the initiative to have a universal child rights treaty started in the early 20th century, the process was interrupted due to the outbreak of the Second World War (WWII) and the heightened political atmosphere during the war which was followed by oscillated priorities of the international forum in the war’s aftermath. The CRC was adopted by the United Nations in 1989, and it was then signed in 1990. As of 2019, 196 nation states have acknowledged their responsibilities and legal obligations such as placing domestic measures as well as enabling responding legislations

5 For further information visit: https://www.savethechildren.org.uk
6 As explained in the UN Glossary cited from the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties 1969: “Adoption” is the formal act by which the form and content of a proposed treaty text are established. As a general rule, the adoption of the text of a treaty takes place through the expression of the consent of the states participating in the treaty-making process, where, “the signature” does not establish the consent to be bound. However, it is a means of authentication and expresses the willingness of the signatory state to continue the treaty-making process. “Ratification” defines the international act whereby a state indicates its consent to be bound to a treaty if the parties intended to show their consent by such an act’. For further information visit: https://treaties.un.org/pages/Overview.aspx?path=overview/glossary/page1_en.xml#adoption
to enforce the rights recognised in the CRC together with providing steady reporting on the implementations and results by ratifying the treaty (OHCHR, 2019). The only nation state that did not ratify but signed the CRC is the United States.

Towards Most Recent Conventions on Child Labour

Prior to the adoption of UNCRC, the ILO had introduced several conventions aiming to reduce and regulate child labour in addition to supplementary collaborations with other UN agencies like the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) and UNICEF. In fact, the ILO emphasised the importance of education even in the earlier versions of its conventions. The most advanced version of its predecessors, Convention 138 and Recommendation 146 on the Minimum Age for Admission to Employment, which was signed in 1973, specified the minimum age in relation to the age of completion of compulsory education. However, the convention did not receive much recognition and by 1976 it had only managed to gain 14 signatures from countries in Europe (ILO, 2007). The adoption of UNCRC in 1989 and The World Summit for Children held in 1990 once again highlighted global attention on child rights and facilitated platforms for advocacy on child labour. As one of the outcomes of the World Summit, the International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) was launched in 1992, with the aim of mobilising a global movement against child labour by exposing the practices of child labour, advocating against those practices on social and political platforms, and taking action and providing technical support where needed (Ibid., p. 21).

The early interventions of IPEC targeting child labour and out-of-school children were composed of technical assistance, outreach and educational interventions concentrated around non-formal education approaches (ILO-IPEC, 2015). However, the reflections derived from the work highlighted the significance of ensuring children’s access to formal education. The effectiveness of the strategy constructed around formal education in combating child labour was also supported by the outcomes of the ILO’s joint efforts with UNICEF in Sialkot Pakistan (Ibid., p. 12). However, there were other studies which indicated slightly opposing outcomes in contrast with the arguments intertwined with persistent focus on formal compulsory education

The conceptual and the binding level of each status is explained by United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner (UHCHR) as: ‘A “State party” to a treaty is a State that has expressed its consent, by an act of ratification, accession or succession, and where the treaty has entered into force (or a State about to become a party after formal reception by the United Nations Secretariat of the State’s decision to be a party). A “Signatory” to a treaty is a State that provided a preliminary endorsement of the instrument and its intent to examine the treaty domestically and consider ratifying it. “No action” means that a State did not express its consent’. For further information visit: http://indicators.ohchr.org/Stock/Documents/MetadataRatificationStatus_Dashboard.pdf
as the ultimate tool to combat child labour by global actors; thereby suggesting a focus shift to children working in the most hazardous and exploitative work through a realigned priority (Myers et al., 1998). Following these arguments, Convention 182 and Recommendation 190 concerning the Worst Forms of Child Labour were adopted in 1999. With this new convention, the framework of the worst forms of child labour were defined in Article 3 and responsibilities such as the identification of local and national practices and measures to be taken to eliminate the worst forms of child labour were delegated to the state parties.

Towards Sustainable Development Goals Target 8.7

In 2003, with the participation of multiple UN Organisations and other global actors such as the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), UNESCO, the ILO, UNICEF, the World Bank (WB), Education International (EI), the Global March Against Child Labour first Inter-Agency round table on Child Labour and Education was held in New Delhi, which then led to the formation of the Global Task Force on Child Labour and Education for All (GTF) to work on child labour by identifying and reporting on the problems. The main goal and strategy adopted in later conferences, i.e., The Hague in 2010, was to eliminate child labour by 2016 by mainly focusing on the expansion of free quality education for all children in addition to providing access to vocational or technical education, where appropriate and consistent with relevant international labour standards. Although, the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) did not target child labour directly, Goal 2 (achieving universal primary education) was considered as a long-term developmental intervention. The achievements were notable nonetheless, but as in all other MDG targets, not all the gaps were met. By 2015, a total of 57 million children of primary school age were still not in the school system and the proportion of out-of-school children increased up to 36% in countries affected by conflict in 2012 (UN, 2019).

The successor of MDGs, Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) also do not have a separate goal for eradicating child labour, yet covered the topic with a commitment under Goal 8 – ‘Promote inclusive and sustainable economic growth, employment and decent work for all’. More specifically, the commitment for the elimination of child labour is studied within the scope of Target 8.7, which dictates: ‘Take immediate and effective measures to eradicate forced labour, end modern slavery and human trafficking, and secure the prohibition and elimination of the worst forms of child labour, including recruitment and use of child soldiers, and by 2025 end child labour in all its forms’ (ILO, 2017). The strategic move to locate child labour under Goal 8 should be acknowledged as the reflection of a comprehensive approach adopted for handling the root causes of the issue. Hence, child labour is also associated with
Decent Work Agendas, with the help of which employment creation, social protection, rights at work, and social dialogue are aimed to be facilitated (ILO, 2018).

**Definition of the Child Labour and the Worst Forms of Child Labour**

The United Nations Convention on Rights of the Child (UNCRC), Convention 182 and Convention. 138 constitute the foundation of conceptual and policy frameworks of global actors against child labour and the very definition of child labour and its worst forms. Although, the UNCRC does not present a detailed instruction on child labour, it has several other articles that describe and ensure children’s health, physical and mental development, education, protection, well-being and the best interests of the child. The first article of the UNCRC (1989) clearly identifies individuals below the age of 18 as children. In addition, Article 32 calls for state parties to issue the necessary regulations, enabling policies and providing legal structures to protect the children from economic exploitation and affiliation with any kind of work that may interrupt a child’s education or be harmful to a child’s health, or their physical, mental, spiritual, moral or social development. Parallel with UNCRC, the ILO-IPEC defines child labour as any work that deprives children of their childhood by either hindering their regular attendance to education or requiring school attendance in combination with heavy and prolonged work, by harming a child’s physical and psychological health and development, as well as any work that is mentally, physically, socially or morally dangerous or harmful to a child. Yet, it was also made clear that not all work performed by a child can be classified as child labour. Activities that do not prevent children from enjoying their rights are seen as being even healthy and progressive in terms of child development. The most recent conventions and accompanying recommendations, C182 and R190 on the WFCL (1999a, 1999b), as well as C138 and R146 concerning minimum age for admission to employment, provided detailed descriptions of the worst forms of hazardous works (1973a, 1973b), corresponding measures to be taken by governments, and the setting of minimum-age limits for certain type of jobs. See Table 1 for definitions of WFCL and hazardous works.

Table 1—Worst forms of Child Labour and Hazardous Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Convention 182, Article 3 – WFCL</th>
<th>Recommendation 190 – Hazardous Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) All forms of slavery or practices similar to slavery, such as the sale and trafficking of</td>
<td>(a) work which exposes children to physical, psychological or sexual abuse;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children, debt bondage and serfdom, as well as forced or compulsory labour, including forced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or compulsory recruitment of children for use in armed conflict;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) the use, procuring or offering of a child for prostitution, for the production of pornography</td>
<td>(b) work underground, underwater, at dangerous heights or in confined spaces;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or for pornographic performances;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) the use, procuring or offering of a child for illicit activities, in particular for the</td>
<td>(c) work with dangerous machinery, equipment and tools, or which involves the manual handling or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production and trafficking of drugs as defined in relevant international treaties;</td>
<td>transport of heavy loads;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) work which, by its nature or the circumstances in which it is carried out, is likely to</td>
<td>(d) work in an unhealthy environment which may, for example, expose children to hazardous substances,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harm the health, safety or morals of children, are within the framework of worst forms of child</td>
<td>agents or processes, or to temperatures, noise levels or vibrations damaging to their health;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>labour.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) work under particularly difficult conditions, such as work for long hours or during the</td>
<td>(e) work under particularly difficult conditions, such as work for long hours or during the night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>night or work where the child is unreasonably confined to the premises of the employer.</td>
<td>or work where the child is unreasonably confined to the premises of the employer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Extracted from C182 and R190 (ILO 1999a; 1999b)

As per C138, the minimum age for children to work is defined as 16 years old, provided that they are well-instructed on the type of assignment and receive all the required vocational training on the required tasks and are adequately protected. This limit can be reduced to 14 years old in certain cases. Besides, the convention also allows children to be employed when aged 13-15 years if the type of light work is not considered harmful to their health and/or their development, and provided that it does not affect their attendance to school. Overall, the main purpose of these conventions and recommendations are to move forward, and to eliminate child labour by providing some universal standards and delegating responsibilities to the parties who ratified the documents. However, certain limited flexibility such as reducing the minimum age for the employment of children in some sectors is afforded to developing countries in consideration of their existing lack of established socioeconomic infrastructure.

**Child Labour in Turkey**

The most significant attempt to focus on child labour was initiated in 1992 in partnership with the ILO. Turkey was one of the six countries where IPEC, as the ILO’s most well-known operational programme on child labour, was conducted between 1992 and 2007. It was carried out with the strong support of each national government as well as through collaboration with an increased number of stakeholders over the years such as employers’ and workers’
organisations, other international and government agencies, the private sector, community-based organisations, NGOs, the media, parliamentarians, the judiciary, universities, religious groups as well as the children themselves and their families (ILO, 2008).

Throughout the ILO-IPEC project, several improvements were accomplished in different areas; one such example being the establishment of a database dedicated to the child labour force in collaboration with the Turkish Statistical Institute (TurkStat), through the application of Child Labour Surveys (CLS). Another example would be the improvements made to legal regulations following the ratification of several international conventions on child labour such as ILO Conventions 138 and 182. Following that, the WFCL priority areas were identified as the informal labour market, children working on the streets, and paid work within the agriculture sector; other than family labour within the context of Turkey. Diverse capacity-building activities were carried out targeting various partners to enhance the implementation of new rules and regulations against child labour. Specific importance was given to referrals to the education system. Accordingly, sensitisation activities were conducted in order to highlight the importance of education and the negative effects of child labour. It was during this period, with the support of the World Bank (WB) and the ILO, that the National Conditional Cash Transfer (CCT) system was initiated to promote referrals to education and to provide essential financial support to families. Together with delivering income generation support such as vocational training to the families of working children, a comprehensive approach was adopted (ILO, 2008).

It has been reported that with the help of IPEC and after that a National Time-Bound Policy and Programme Framework (TBPPF), the number of working children aged between six and 17 years fell from ‘2,269,000 (15.2% of that age group) in 1994 to 1,630,000 (10.3%) in 1999, and then to 958,000 (5.9%) in 2006 and 893,000 in 2012’ (ILO, 2008, Republic of Turkey Ministry of Labour and Social Security, 2018). It should be noted that no further data has been published by TurkStat since 2012. However, the numbers mentioned in the latest report only count children who are working in paid labour, and therefore may underestimate the socially constructed gender roles and its effect on girls. Hence, girls who are not attending school but are working as domestic labourers are not represented in the data. Therefore, it should be noted that there are another 503 thousand children who are engaged in household-related unpaid employment (chores) while not attending school, which is in addition to the 893 thousand children employed in some form of economic activity (TURKSTAT, 2013). More recently, TBPPF has been revised and updated and turned into a National Programme which covers the period between 2017 and 2023 by the Ministry of Labour and Social Security (MoLSS).
**Child Labour in Relation to the Syrian Crisis in Turkey**

The conflict in Syria, as one of the largest humanitarian crises in recent times has affected Syrian migrant children more than any other group, and has been the cause of irreversible loss of years from their childhood and from their future. Reports have been published by UNICEF, the ILO and other organisations that have highlighted the increasing number of Syrian refugee children forced into child labour in the Lebanon as well as in Turkey (ILO-IPEC, 2015, Watkins and Zyck, 2014, UNICEF, 2017a, United States Bureau of International Labour Affairs, 2016). Although child labour in Turkey has a long history of its own, the current situation has deteriorated with the arrival of huge numbers of Syrian refugees as well as due to several structural, economic and social reasons (Yalçın, 2016).

According to statistics from the Directorate General of Migration Management (DGMM), as of May 2019 more than 3.5 million Syrian refugees have been granted temporary protection in Turkey, and there is a high probability that there are considerable numbers of unregistered refugees as well. As can be seen from Table 2, the clustered data asserts the number of children under temporary protection (UTP) (0-18 years) as 1,657,933, of which 1,149,581 are of school age (5-18 years), while only 643,058 are actually reported as being enrolled in schools according to the Turkish Ministry of National Education (MoNE) (see Table 3) (2019, 2019).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Groups</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4 years</td>
<td>262,862</td>
<td>245,490</td>
<td>508,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 years</td>
<td>254,731</td>
<td>239,801</td>
<td>494,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14 years</td>
<td>199,370</td>
<td>184,956</td>
<td>384,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-18 years</td>
<td>148,265</td>
<td>122,458</td>
<td>270,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-18 years</td>
<td>865,228</td>
<td>792,705</td>
<td>1,657,933</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 - Number of Syrian children (aged 0-18 years) in Turkey Under Temporary Protection

Source: Based on data from DGMM’s website (Republic of Turkey Ministry of National Education Directorate General Lifelong Learning Directorate of Education in Migration and Emergencies, 2019)

In order to avoid inconsistency within Table 2, some additional explanation is required. The enrolment numbers according to the MoNE includes 17,073 children enrolled in open-high schools, which is a form of distance education. However, Table 2 considers these children to be ‘out of school’, since their attendance and attainment cannot be validated. In addition, enrolment to an open-high school does not prevent child employment. Therefore, they are seen as ‘at risk’ and considered to be ‘out of school’ within the scope of the current study.
Table 3 - Education Statistics of Syrian Children in Turkey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th># Enrolled Syrian Children</th>
<th># School-Aged Syrian Children</th>
<th># Out-of-School Syrian Children</th>
<th>Enrolment Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-primary</td>
<td>32,198</td>
<td>95,094</td>
<td>62,896</td>
<td>33.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary (4 years)</td>
<td>365,535</td>
<td>382,748</td>
<td>17,213</td>
<td>95.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Secondary (4 years)</td>
<td>173,252</td>
<td>300,458</td>
<td>127,206</td>
<td>57.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Secondary (4 years)</td>
<td>54,449</td>
<td>269,236</td>
<td>214,787</td>
<td>20.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>625,434</td>
<td>1,047,536</td>
<td>422,102</td>
<td>59.71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on data provided on the LLL DG, and MoNE’s websites, 2019

One concern amongst many others, is the welfare of the 506,523 children who are left behind for one reason or another. Out-of-school children are facing and/or are on the verge of the worst forms of rights abuses like child labour and child marriages (UNICEF, 2017b). As previously mentioned, the most recent data available on child labour in Turkey is from 2012, and it is not certain whether Syrian migrant children were included in these numbers. Although there are no comprehensive studies or recent formal statistics available with disaggregated data on Syrian refugees and child labour in Turkey, several small-scale studies and reports have repeatedly shown that Syrian children have been found working in several sectors such as textiles, manufacturing, furniture making, shoemaking, seasonal agriculture, service, small-scale industry, and in households as unpaid family labour (Lordoğlu and Aslan, 2018, Dedeoğlu et al., 2018, Support to Life and Bilgi University Center for Migration Research, 2016, Harunogullari, 2016, Erdoğan and Uyan Semerci, 2018, United States Bureau of International Labour Affairs, 2016). Therefore, a closer look into the situation of child labour in Turkey and the interventions that target it with a focus on migrant children is of particular importance.

Previous Studies

Perspectives on Child Labour

Recalling some of the world literature classics like David Copperfield and Oliver Twist from Charles Dickens may be sufficient to gain an initial understanding of child labour in the global North. Likewise, the image of a boy on a busy city street or at a train station holding up the daily newspaper and calling out the latest headlines in some television period drama elicits some basic awareness of the issue of child employment. Alternatively, what about the girl from the Swiss Alps called Heide who had no shoes in Johanna Spyri’s novel? These examples are characters reflected by Western authors, but no doubt there are many stories of children living in other parts of the globe that unfortunately inherit similar archetypes of abuse and

10 The numbers from MoNE presented in Table 2 are based on numbers the DGMM published in April 2019, while the numbers in Table 1 and within the text refers to data the DGMM published in May 2019. Therefore, the numbers and calculations between these tables and the text may not correspond 100%.
exploitation. It is obvious that inequalities and rights abuses were not just recently invented, or suddenly became popular subjects of academic research, literature or part of modern civil society.

The feelings we had for Ali after reading his interview or for David, Oliver or Heide, while reading of their tragedies and hardships, would surely be triggered by our own understanding of how a childhood should have been lived. Moreover, it is also affected by how we comprehend the injustices of the society just like the authors themselves, Dickens and Skype, who were moved by their own perceptions together with the realities of the era in which they lived. Similarly, our approach towards child labour is also very much dependant on how we perceive being a ‘child’ and ‘childhood’.

In the same way, there is debate between scholars as well as global actors depending on their standpoints and respective conceptualisations of the child and childhood, and consequently of child labour in order to realise children’s human rights. In particular, UNCRC and other conventions related to child labour, such as C182, are also the subject of these debates. More specifically, it has been extensively discussed that the perspective adopted by UNCRC and approaches against child labour by the ILO and other Western initiatives are based on the ‘Northern’ or ‘Western’ conceptualisation of the ‘child’, and thus reflects the reality of the ‘Western’ childhood (Imoh et al., 2018). Industrialisation was led by the global North and developed certain paths to what is today called ‘Western modernity’, and constitutes several different elements such as the accumulation of capital, the restructure of the nucleus family concept, labour movements, and emphasis placed on education for all (Cunningham, 2000). As previously mentioned, this very experience of the North, steered conceptualisations of the child and childhood, as well as the perception of child labour, and therefore has guided the handling of these issues from a Western point of view. Thus, this specific debate is part of a wider background discussion on how the ‘child’ and ‘childhood’ are conceptualised within the discourse of Western modernity (Close, 2009).

How the term ‘child’ is recognised also constitutes the standpoint for the advocacy, policy proposals as well as the action plans carried out by stakeholders and decision-makers. Not surprisingly, discussions on whether a ‘child’ is a capable individual for their agency to be acknowledged comprehend to similar discourses over the years for women and ethnic minorities on the basis of their need for protection and so-called incapacity to fulfil their needs (Liebel, 2008). The groundings of how the child and the human rights of children are structured and perceived are not dissimilar to how different perspectives of citizenship are constructed. Similar tendencies of liberal, republican, and neoliberal ideologies and the way that they
conceptualise ‘citizenship’ and the essentials of whom can be considered as a citizen, as well as what makes a person a citizen under which obligations and criteria, also frame the status of the child. For example, there are perspectives supporting the idea that a child is a citizen in the making; therefore, in order to have capable and good citizens in the future, education as being one of the social rights has an essential weight in their arguments. (Marshall and Bottomore, 1992). There are also scholars in favour of acknowledging the agency of the child by portraying how children are already realising their potential and capacity to fulfil the required responsibilities of being a full member of society (Lister, 2008). A more vibrant and critical argument on the political orientations of social policies towards children was made by Jens Qvortrup. In his continued studies, he analyses the attitudes and interventions of governments on the way of achieving child rights and how dispositions identify whether childhood is simply a path to adulthood or that the child herself is the entity of focus, i.e., the best interest of the child is placed at the centre of the discourse. Qvortrup (2009) simply refers to this status dilemma of the child as ‘human-becoming’ versus ‘human-being’.

The debate on how the child and their status should be recognised is essential to defining the reference point for all policies related to children and to the drawing of a road map for achieving the best interests of the child. There is another dimension in relation to this perspective, and this requires the deconstruction of ‘the best interests of the child’. Originally, the principle of ‘the best interests of the child’ constitutes the third article of the UNCRC and calls for all decision-makers and stakeholders to act by complying with this principle to ensure they follow the articles of the UNCRC, and in favouring child-centred/friendly policies (UNCRC, 1989). Although all nation states which signed and/or ratified the UNCRC have reached consensus on adopting its principles, still the definition of what is ‘the best interest of the child’ per se is blurry at best and can be interpreted differently from case to case. As expected, this concept is not neutral or independent of preidentified ideals, norms and presuppositions of what is termed ‘modern child’ or ‘modern childhood’.

Accordingly, the literature on child labour follows a similar pattern (Myers, 2001, Myers et al., 1998). On the one hand there are questions related to what is the best for the child, and what kind of practices and childhood experiences serve best for healthy child development as well as for the well-being of the child, whilst on the other hand there are concerns as to what kind of engagements hinder the phase of childhood and harm the child. These are matters of spirited debate where serious clashes can be seen and have been significantly discussed by numerous scholars. According to Myers (2001), Boyden and Bourdillon (2015), and Liebel (2008), childhood and child development cannot be deduced to a simple form, and that
socioeconomic contexts as well as the historical heritages of each geography may lead to different forms of childhood requiring different means of intervention in order to realise the rights of the child (Imoh et al., 2018). For example, how ‘work’ is defined and the assumption of whether working in any shape over education is harmful for a child’s physical and mental health as well as their development need to be reconsidered. Depending on the various determinants across the different cultural contexts, children develop different abilities, skills, ways of living, and also coping mechanisms. Therefore, while work can be considered as an interruption to education in some contexts where formal education in schools is seen as the main educational channel, in others it is seen practically as the best source of essential skills not learnt at school (Myers et al., 1998). In the same article, the authors also highlight the flows of the existing education structures and question their effectiveness in addressing the needs of working children:

Beyond promoting social and economic mobility, education of the right kind can inform children about the risks of work and about their rights generally, can empower them to stand up for themselves in cases of abuse, and exploitation, and can provide them with viable alternatives to the drudgery of inappropriate work. It can prepare them to the more effective defenders of their own best interests. The question is to what degree education realizes this potential for working children, or at least meets their minimum needs and expectations. (Myers et al., 1998, p. 14)

The perspectives of the global South are critical of the approaches embraced and reinforced by the global North along with International Organisations working on child rights, specifically on child labour (Reddy, 2016). That is not to say that critical scholars are diminishing the efforts made globally, but taking a stand where there are impracticalities or harm caused by the implementation of prescriptions of the global North relying on purely their own experiences, i.e., the West’s experience with child labour (Imoh et al., 2018). In the same chapter, Bourdillon clears the conceptualisation of child labour as:

tension between two aspects of children’s work. On the one hand, work is a fundamental human and social activity and, therefore, has a place in children’s lives and development; on the other hand, work demanded of children can be abusive or hazardous and can damage their physical, social, and cognitive development (Bourdillon, 2018, p. 36).

This latter criticism has its grounding on how child labour is conceptualised by the UN, including how the best interests of the child are perceived in terms of which rights are of more importance above others. Similarly, the way the ‘fight against child labour’ has been legitimised and conducted and the goals set to ‘eliminate’ child labour globally have received reactions from both children’s movements as well as scholars from the global South. This response is on
the basis of endorsing Eurocentric ideals of children, ignoring the realities of the global South which is highly associated with colonial history, reproducing the binaries of childhoods falling back on inferior-superior, developed-undeveloped oppositions as well as marginalising the delegates of working children from 33 countries across three continents (Reddy, 2016, Sanghera, 2016). More precisely, the criticism is directed towards C138 and C182 as being impractical and ignorant of child workers in the global South. Similarly, there are criticisms against the suggested criminalisation of the work children carry out under a certain age as outlined in C138 and C182, as well as against the sanctions on employers, on the basis of causing increased misfortune by pushing children to engage in activities that are both insecure and illicit, and thus ending up in an even more vulnerable position (Imoh et al., 2018).

In concluding this section, the following is a quotation from the works of Reddy (2016), and sets the proposed approach taken for the current study:

The real reasons why these children work, the predicament of their families and communities and the impact of global consumerism on the poor are swept under the carpet of liberal reform, and the prosperous world turns a blind eye to the increasing marginalization and disempowerment of these children. (2016, p. 63)

**Recent Studies on Syrian Child Labour in Turkey**

This section focuses on recent studies that specifically target the analysis of child labour issues affiliated to Syrian migrant children UTP in Turkey. Unfortunately, studies focusing on the participation of Syrian migrant children in the Turkish labour market are limited, just as seen with the research on child labour in Turkey in general. Statistics and numbers that explain the situation of child labour as well as the interventions implemented in Turkey are therefore presented as a separate chapter.

Most of the studies that mention the presence of Syrian child workers concentrate on the integration of Syrians into the labour market. For example, one comprehensive study by Lordoğlu and Aslan (2016) describes changes in the Turkish labour market between 2011 and 2014 across five Turkish cities located on or close to Turkey’s southern border with Syria, namely Gaziantep, Hatay, Şanlıurfa, Mardin, and Kilis. The findings of the study also indicate that Syrians are heavily engaged in the informal labour market due to lack of work permits, whilst at the same time needing any kind of income in order to sustain life. An explanation

---

11 In 1996 the International Movement of Working Children drafted the ‘Kundapura Declaration’ (see http://www.concernedforworkingchildren.org/empowering-children/childrens-unions/the-kundapur-declaration/) in India, in which they framed their demands, concerns for international organisations to take into consideration, while shaping policies that directly affect working children. For further information visit the related chapter in the study of Reddy (2016).
offered by one of the informants provides certain insight about the situation and how it is being handled at the local level:

Once, during a meeting that was held by the governor’s office (Mardin) with the participation of local employers, what inculcated was: “It is better for these people (Syrians) to work unregistered (illegally in the informal labour market) instead of them getting involved in crime or stealing”. That is to say, the eyes are shut to their illegal work. Similarly, if any illegal Syrian workers are encountered during a workplace inspection, it is also ignored. If the number of Syrian workers is less than 30% in a workplace, we tolerate and do not penalise the employer. (Lordoğlu and Aslan, 2016, p. 804)

One of the significant points the study highlights is the heterogeneity of Syrians in terms of their income level as well as their skills. According to the research, Syrians residing in these five cities have different skills levels, and those with higher skills like stonemasons receive a similar salary to Turkish citizens working in similar conditions. However, it is also suggested that a significantly high number of Syrians work in menial jobs that do not necessarily match their education or skills. The paper argues that the sectors where Syrians are employed varies in line with the capacity of the economic activities of the residing city. Within the scope of the study in question, the sectors where Syrians are most heavily employed are mentioned as being construction, seasonal agriculture, restaurants, grocery shops, and textiles. Yet, in either case, Syrians are working within the informal labour market which naturally places them in a vulnerable position. Child labour is also mentioned where unemployment rates are the highest, as in the case of Kilis.

A more recent study also supports the same perspective and amplifies the analysis by stating that Syrians are not only employed within the informal labour market, but that they are also left with precarious jobs that are generally not wanted or fulfilled by Turkish citizens. This is also referred as 3D (dirty, dangerous, demeaning) jobs, which often insinuates long working hours, an unhealthy working environment, and where children and women are the most vulnerable groups who are often subjected to these kinds of jobs (Aygül, 2018). Although the study does not specifically talk about child labour, it provides a clear picture on the Turkish labour market tendencies and coping mechanisms, together with trade-offs for both Syrian refugees and governmental bodies, which puts forward certain suggestions as to the labour market structure.

There have been a series of studies and reports on seasonal agricultural workers where unregistered labour is regularly used. As proven by the studies initiated by Kalkınma Atölyesi, one of the strongest civil society organisations, the most common form of work organisation is based on households; in other words, it is not the individuals, but the family as a whole who are
often employed in seasonal agricultural jobs. Therefore, child labour is highly prevalent in this sector. One research conducted by Dedeoğlu and Kalkınma Atölyesi, in 2015-2016, was titled ‘The current situation of migrant workers in seasonal agriculture in Turkey’ (2016). Within the scope of their research, 110 interviews were conducted in the first stage of their research across 13 provinces of Turkey where seasonal agricultural activities were deemed the most significant. In the second phase, surveys were conducted in 266 households in Adana (a city in southern Turkey some 150km west of the Syrian border) in order to understand the living and working conditions of Syrian migrants (Kalkınma Atölyesi, 2016). In addition, several semi-structured interviews took place with Syrian workers, employers and other relevant actors.

Following this research, Dedeoğlu, published an essay in 2018 entitled ‘Migrant Workers in Turkish Agriculture: Rivalry of the Poor and Antagonism’, where she discussed the place of Syrian migrant labour in the agricultural sector in relation to other ethnic minorities working in the sector for a number of years. Dedeoğlu’s results supported the arguments of an earlier essay by Kavak (2016, p. 35), where she discusses the vulnerable nature of being migrants posits Syrians at the lower segments of the labour market, blocking any grounds for negotiation, forcing them to accept undesirable working conditions, and what she refers to as being in a situation of hyper-precarity. Both studies acknowledge the inherent destiny of child labour within the seasonal agricultural sector due to the lack of sectoral regulation, socially constructed gender roles, and the familial need to bring money into the household.

A more recent research on child labour in the seasonal agricultural sector was conducted by Dedeoğlu et al. (2018), and reveals the reasons for the presence of child labour in the sector, which is also identified as one of the most hazardous types of work by the ILO (1999a), as financial difficulty, poverty, unemployment, lack of education, and extended families. Additionally, the perception of ‘child’ is also another pertinent factor. It was highlighted that during the field research, the answers of one middleman to the question of whether any child was employed for the harvest or not was a direct ‘no’. However, through follow-up questioning, it was established that his ‘no’ indicated that children were seen as those aged 11-12, but that children above 14 years of age were not perceived as being children and therefore accepted as suitable labour for the job (Dedeoğlu et al., 2018, p. 17).

One of the studies conducted by Harunogullari (2016) targeted the labour market affiliation of refugee children in Turkey, and was restricted to the Kilis Province, which is located on the border with Syria and inhabiting by more Syrians than Turkish citizens (Republic of Turkey Ministry of Interior Directorate General of Migration Management, 2019). Due to the socioeconomic structure of Kilis, employment opportunities as well as social services are
not as developed as in other provinces within the same region of Turkey. The research aimed to understand the motives behind the increases seen in child labour amongst refugee children residing in Kilis, and to provide sensible solutions to the problem (Harunogullari, 2016). Within the study, the research team interviewed 55 boys and seven girls (62 children in total) who were all aged between eight and 17 years old, and who were working in various jobs such as errand boys, waiters, apprentices at patisseries, or at restaurants, bakeries, small electrical shops, clothes shops, in textiles, workshops within the small-scale local industry, as well as rubbish or plastic collectors. It was noted that for some jobs, the content and environment of the work, and also with certain employers, caused an unhealthy work environment as well as being physically and psychologically hostile. According to the study, the main three reasons for working were to support the family, to be able to meet their own personal needs, and being the only breadwinner in the family. One particular question on children’s desire to work raised significant attention. In total, 52% of the children questioned stated that they sought work because of the hardships that their family faced due to poverty, while 48% said that they worked based on their family’s demand. Another significant indicator from the study was the high proportion of refugee children aged eight to 16 years working in the small-scale local industrial area. According to the Guild of Chamber of Merchants and Craftsmen in Kilis, there were some 100 refugee children working in this area, although there were only 10 Turkish citizen children working in the same jobs. Additionally, some 150 refugee children were also reportedly working within the organised industrial zone. Needless to say, all the working refugee children formed part of the informal labour market, leaving them both unprotected and vulnerable. Overall, the study manages to describe and prove the effect of child labour on refugee children in various aspects such as the interruption of education, psychological and physical harm, challenges with integration, exploitation, and an overall feeling of helplessness. According to the study’s findings, the primary reason for child labour within the refugee child population in Kilis was described as a lack of their parents access to the local labour market, unemployment, decreases seen in humanitarian assistance, as a potential for cheap labour, the lack of regulations, social norms on gender roles, and migration accompanied with poverty.

Although the reasons listed throughout the study are well supported by various scholars, the inherent weaknesses and failures of the study are hidden within its conclusion. Up until the conclusion, the approach was child-centred and the analysis of the responses was executed from a perspective that was almost critical on rights violations. However, in the concluding part of the study, the suggested interventions and foreseen solutions such as filling the labour market gap not favoured by Turkish citizens with Syrian workers, or those who do not want to go back
to their home country and wish to stay in Turkey, situates the study outside of a rights-based argument. Besides, neither the presence of an informal labour market, in other words the characteristics of dual labour market, nor the existing problem of child labour in Turkey prior to the Syrian refugees’ arrival were problematised by the study. Whilst all of the identified reasons were indeed relevant, most have only secondary impacts in comparison to the serious structural problems along with neoliberal economic policies pursued; all of which were left untouched by the study.

Another more recent study was conducted as a pilot research on Syrian children working in the informal labour market in Istanbul (Erdoğan and Uyan Semerci, 2018). The pilot study aimed to find determinants other than poverty that made children enter the labour market. In the study, 2,763 households across 37 neighbourhoods within two districts of Istanbul were visited and interviews were conducted with 301 working children (54 girls and 247 boys), as well as with their parents. The results of the study were found to be no different to previous research. The main areas of child work were identified as sellers in bazaars, as either apprentices or assistants/helpers in textile workshops, shops, production/repair shops, or as hairdressers. The working conditions were described as heavy, unsafe, and required long working hours without any health service provisions within the workplace. As was expected by the researchers, 72% of the children stated that they were working due to financial reasons and the need of the family, while the second most common reason was their academic failure at school (Erdoğan and Uyan Semerci, 2018, p. 114). The study analysed working children in 4 statistical groupings according to their age as either 12-15 years or 16-18 years, and by their attendance or non-attendance to school for each age group. This level of aggregation provided inferences about the different reasons for school dropouts as well, since most dropouts were seen in the 4th group who were not attending school. In other words, the children who participated in the study and were classified under the 4th group were 16-18 years old and on average had been working for 3.6 years, while the same group also stated that they had failed their classes at school. This may point to the types of issues that they faced while attending school in Turkey. Another significantly important outcome of the study was that not all children who were working had failed in school. Problems regarding the illegality of working conditions and the informal labour market were acknowledged by the scholars; however, due to the limited size of the pilot study, no recommendations were put forward as to suggested solutions, except for the need for a more comprehensive study to be conducted in the future.

The common perception of all the studies in understanding the motivations and reasons behind Syrian children’s participation in the Turkish labour market can be listed as poverty
fuelled by lack of access to social rights, i.e., social protection via social security, employment, education as well as experiencing being a ‘migrant’ who is deprived of legal rights, and the absence of sufficient regulations or policies enabled along with the necessary legal apparatus. Yet, little emphasis has been placed in the literature on the duality of the labour market. In her article, Yalçın (2016) was reminiscent of Turkey’s prolonged experience with child labour, which goes back to long before the arrival of the Syrian refugees. She emphasised the informal labour market as one of the main reasons behind Turkey’s failure to eliminate child labour.

The informal and insecure nature of the labour market is one of the underlying reasons for the prevalence of child labour among refugees in Turkey. (Yalçın, 2016, p. 92)

Yet, none of the studies and/or scholars provided adequate emphasis either on this structural problem and how it is functioning at the global level, the fostering of global neoliberal policies, or the migration policies of the Turkish government enforced up to that point. Thus, the literature’s collective approach and analysis in solving the problems of child labour caused by poverty remain wholly insufficient. Although analysis of both Lordoğlu and Aslan (2016), Lordoğlu and Aslan (2018) and Aygül (2018) emphasised poverty, marginalisation, and lack of access to the formal labour market due to being a migrant, there was a lack of theoretical engagement in relation to precarisation, structures of accessing social rights or, in other words, welfare regime of Turkey, and problematization of citizenship versus migrant status, as well as the global labour market regime when the focus is moved to child labour. The studies of Kavak (2016) and Dedeoğlu (2018) problematised the economic structures, but while structuring their arguments around precarity, however, their focus was not directly on migrant child labour per se. In most of the studies, when child labour was examined, the discussions were focused mostly on how children were deprived of their rights by not being able to attend school, being engaged in hazardous work where their health and development were negatively affected, and their labour was as a coping mechanism for their poverty situation. Although, these perspectives are valuable and they managed to reflect rights abuses as well as the vulnerability of households due to economic difficulties, they remained largely descriptive in terms of explaining what is happening in the field and associating them with UNCRC, C182 or C138 within the discourses constructed around the dichotomy of being developed versus less-developed. Therefore, the aforementioned studies were unable to problematise the reasons of child labour through any comprehensive approach. While the reasons of child labour were well presented, the next step was not taken to question what the prevailing factors were that created the enabling environments for child labour. Therefore, the studies did not question the strategies and policies
implemented on migration management, education, or labour market integration, and whether or not they were sufficiently beneficial to compensate for and/or eradicate the conditions that led to migrant child labour becoming a coping mechanism for poverty. Neither is presented a critical analysis of the failures of national and multilateral strategies against child labour, nor the promotion of the rights-based migration regime including the human rights of the child.

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE AND METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Theoretical Perspective

Migration is certainly not a new phenomenon and migrant workers have been the subject of ‘changing modes of labour differentiation’ throughout the history of capitalism (Castles, 2015). Neoliberal globalisation and related changes in the migration regimes have also instigated the configuration of global labour markets and precarisation of work. At the same time, there has been an energised social mobilisation towards the human rights of migrants (Schierup and Jørgensen, 2016, Likić-Brborić and Schierup, 2015, Anderson, 2015). In tandem with the political twist towards neoliberal economies, organised labour movements and social welfare provisions have declined. Within the context of European welfare states, citizenship has been the main apparatus that facilitates full access to rights. Therefore, groups with different exclusionary legal statuses such as migrants, asylum seekers, and refugees are the most affected by this rearrangement which is also referred to as recommodification by de- and reregulation, due to the restricted protection granted by their subordinated legal statuses in contrast with citizenship (Balibar and Scott-Railton, 2015). In particular, this systematic lack of protection constitutes one of the essential notions of the current study; to understand how the neoliberal political economy together with the recent global governance of migration influences the dynamics of migrant child labour in Turkey. More specifically, the perspective of political economy of migration and global migration governance provides an enriched approach for understanding the structures that feed the precarisation of migrants in Turkey (Senses, 2016, Baban et al., 2017), and reproduce the concomitant determinants of child labour, like unemployment, poverty, and lack of access to social assistance. Therefore, the main discussions that guide the current study and endeavour are constructed around the theories of the political economy of migration and precarisation as well as global governance of migration and management.
**Political Economy of Migration and Precarisation of Labour**

The concept of précarité was first used by Bourdieu in 1963 in his study to identify irregular workers and to differentiate them from permanent workers in Algeria (Waite, 2009). Since then, the term has evolved within the contexts in which it has been used. Not so different from Bourdieu’s conceptualisation, precarity is also used to refer to the certain conditions of work that are peculiar to flexibility, insecurity, low pay, instability, irregularity, informality, which are induced by the changing dynamics of economy, class structure and citizenship within the European welfare states (Standing, 2011). Furthermore, precarity and precarisation have also been discussed within the context of welfare states in relation to lack of labour rights and social protection that were gained through the history of labour movements at the national level (Casas-Cortés, 2016). Therefore, the conceptualisation of ‘precarity’ also inherits the discussions on the entitlements of certain rights and social protection that are granted through citizenship within the context of social welfare states in Europe. In other words, precarity is linked to employment and working conditions, where there is a lack of rights and social protection in relation to their accessibility through citizenship in European welfare states, which were significantly affected by neoliberal policies. Different groups with different levels of protection through citizenship, welfare and workfare have been affected by precarisation at different levels.

The discussion around precarity and migrants points to multiple dimensions. According to Schierup and Jørgensen (2016), one aspect of this relation is seen within the political economy of migration that is shaped by neoliberal economic and political structures within and between core, periphery, and semi-periphery, but particularly in core capitalist countries. Another aspect highlighted by Schierup and Jørgensen is social inclusion-exclusion on the basis on citizenship status, which is again discussed in relation to access to rights.

Moving on from this perspective, once the *social rights* described by Marshall and Bottomore (1992), such as the right to work is granted through citizenship, it is inevitable for excluded groups to have alternative coping mechanisms. In other words, when ‘formality’ is granted through citizenship, non-citizens are automatically restrained from accessing both the regular labour market and the inherent labour rights. Consequently, the informal economy presents itself to immigrants as informalisation from above (Slavnic, 2010). Hence, migrants with different statuses who are entitled to limited access to certain rights, even in some cases deprived of their basic human rights and protection, are facing the harshest circumstances within the informal economy. As Bauder (2005) argues, the vulnerability of migrants would well serve the neoliberal capitalist system, therefore their vulnerability itself is in fact valuable.
Without having any labour rights and social protection in the absence of the support from unions to stand together with other migrant workers and have common grounds for a “class for itself”, migrant labour has the significant potential to become an unprotected reserve army of labour, which functions in several ways in favour of capitalism (Wise, 2015). In other words, as discussed by numerous scholars, the politics of migration management underpinned by neoliberal labour markets and welfare regimes set the grounds for the precarisation of migrant labour. This perspective composes the very core of the theoretical framework of the current study by presenting the social and economic structures that migrants, and more specifically migrant children, are subjected to in Turkey. By having limited access to certain social services such as health, education and social assistance, and being deprived of fundamental human rights such as a right to employment, Syrian refugees are facing some of the worst conditions of living in Turkey. Their proclaimed temporary protection status fails to protect them from market exploitation. Moreover, the uncertainty of their migrant duration and their very future forces them to depend upon informality, which eventually carries the precarisation to another level.

According to Waite, precarisation has a more comprehensive scope that goes beyond the conditions of unsecured, flexible, low paid, and low-skilled employment, either within the informal or formal labour market (Lewis et al., 2015). In her own words ‘Precarity refers to those who experience precariousness, and thus conjures life worlds that are inflected with uncertainty and instability’ (Waite 2009 in Lewis et al. 2015, p.581). More precisely, it is discussed that there are multiple enforcing structures which contribute to the precarisation of migrants and exposes them to the potential for extreme exploitation. The uncertainty of legal status on the basis of duration, conditions and the risk of deportability put migrants in peril and in a helpless situation in the face of their employers in terms of not having grounds for any kind of negotiation (Anderson, 2015). By constructing the conditions of no choice, migrants are forced to work in the lowest segments of the labour market without rights, protection, or security, and are often subjected to extreme exploitation. Thus, with no future predictability and ‘unfree labour’, migrants fall into a vicious cycle for survival. This extreme precariousness is also referred to as ‘hyper-precarity’ (Lewis et al., 2015). In the case of Syrian refugees in Turkey, it is the uncertainty of their status as guests versus refugees, if not their deportability which is also not completely out of the equation as well. In addition, limited access to human rights and livelihoods, as presented earlier, constitutes the conditions of hyper-precarity for Syrian refugees in Turkey. Therefore, discussions presented by Lewis et al. on precarity and hyper-precarity are considered to be illuminating for the case of migrant child labour as being part of ‘unfree labour’ and the perpetual wheel of ‘survival cycle’(2015).
The current study argues that within the context of Turkey, the particularities and structural differences Turkey has due to its historical and developmental experiences should be taken into consideration while discussing social inclusion and exclusion as well as employment within the informal economy on the basis of citizenship. More specifically, *citizenship* per se may provide essential explanations of the problems faced by migrants in the global North, and therefore it is insufficient to try to explain the case of Turkey with its position in the neoliberal capitalist world, and likewise the dialectical relationship between migration, informalisation and precarisation. Unlike the global North, due to its structural characteristics, Turkey has significantly more experience with both the informal sector and precarity. As elaborated by Wise (2015), informalisation and precarious working conditions have always been present in the global South, due mostly to the global division of labour.

Therefore, while approaching the subject of migrant labour, informalisation and precarity within the context of Turkey, it is important to maintain an awareness of the contextual as well as structural differences. More specifically, unpaid family labour, the informal economy and employment, as well as self-employment are defined as the main characteristics of the Turkish labour market (Buğra and Keyder, 2006, p. 212). The market-oriented economic strategies, which implies deregulation, flexibilisation and has given way to subcontracting, instability, and insecurity has ended up with declining formal employment opportunities in Turkey (Buğra and Keyder, 2006). Hence, having a large informal economy from the outset, informal employment has been an obstacle to having strong labour movements, unionisation and political influence, and has resulted in low rates of decommodification. This situation has worsened with neoliberal globalisation (Erdoğan and Şenses, 2015).

Differently from the global North, global neoliberal policies did not create informalisation, but have reinforced the structures of informality as well as the expansion of the informal economy and precarisation via undocumented employment as an inherent structural feature (Erdoğan and Şenses, 2015). Similarly, the relation of immigrants and informal economy should be addressed differently in the case of Turkey, as well as for (migrant) child labour. The decline in formal employment in Turkey has increased the informal economy and employment has become a significant attraction factor for irregular immigrants (Toksöz and Ünlütürk Ulutaş, 2012). While the same discussions in the global North are centred around the causality relation between neoliberalism and the informal economy, it may not always be the case. The conditions of immigrants affiliated with the informal sector in Turkey have been soundly explained by Şenses (2016). Prior to the mass arrival of Syrian refugees in Turkey, the majority of irregular immigrant workers were composed of women working in domestic care.
services (Erdoğdu and Şenses, 2015). According to their study, irregular migrant labour is mostly concentrated in the textiles/garments, agricultural, food processing, construction, tourism, and care service sectors. In both of these studies, Şenses and Erdoğdu argue that all immigrants who arrived either with aspirations to find work or to seek asylum have become entangled in Turkey’s informal employment and therefore subjected to exploitation due to their vulnerable position based on their residency status (Erdoğdu and Şenses, 2015, Şenses, 2016). Continuing in the same perspective, it is the very same structure which created the demand for migrant child labour. Hence, the main issue within this context is, if the implementation of human and migrant workers’ rights to support refugee welfare is possible at all, it raises the issue of emerging global migration governance.

**Global Migration Governance and Migration Management Approach**

In order to understand the position of migrant labour and specifically (migrant) child labour within the informal labour market in Turkey, it is necessary to take a closer look at global migration governance and the accompanying migration regimes. Although informalisation of the labour market is not intrinsic to migrant labour in Turkey, migrants are at the core of the precarisation due to their inferior position, as presented in the previous section. Therefore, theoretical discussions on how global migration regimes are intertwined with global labour market regimes through global governance and hierarchies within, provides grounds for discourse by IOs on child labour and migrant’s integration into the labour market. This perspective helps the current study in two respects: first, understanding the dynamics of the global governance of migration in relation to global labour markets in terms of positioning migrant labour in the Turkish labour market; and second, understanding how normative and institutional governance render ‘human rights’, ‘labour rights’ and the ‘rights of the child’, specifically, as an approach to (migrant) child labour in Turkey. In other words, the theory of global governance elaborated by Clarke and Edwards (2004) is used to facilitate the current study in order to position the strategies and discourses of IOs working on labour, migrant, and child rights in Turkey.

The shift from government to governance with the support of increasing power of different regional and global bodies such as the European Union (EU), the World Bank (WB), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the UN is both the response and outcome of globalisation. Global governance is described by Clarke and Edwards (2004, p. 6) as ‘the set of normative, social legal, institutional responses and other process and norms, which shape and in some cases even regulate and control the dialectical interplay of globalisation and fragmentation’. They examined global governance as three interdependent facets, which were
normative, technical (i.e., scientific and social), and institutional. In Likić-Brborić and Schierup (2012, p. 6) their conceptualisation of normative governance was explained as a ‘set of ideas and ethical principles that shape a vision of an international regime’, while technical was referred to as ‘scientific and social mechanisms and arrangements that enhance multilateral and transnational solutions to global challenges and problems’. Lastly, the institutional dimension consists of a multiplicity of actors including citizens, international organisations, corporations, nation states, as well as public policy networks and their interactions at different levels within a multi-layered system constructed around norms and institutional arrangements (Ibid).

However, the power structures based on global neoliberal economy are reflected in ‘asymmetrical hierarchy’ within the global governance system, which significantly influences decisions taken by multilateral structures such as the OECD is led by the G7 (Ibid). Hence, both the identification of the economic, social and political problems and the perspectives to be adopted for potential solutions are significantly shaped by the most powerful countries that support free trade and a business-friendly development approach. However, the resulting asymmetric governance has not adequately addressed the protracted precarisation of labour in the globalised economy (Likić-Brborić and Schierup, 2012).

Yet, it is also discussed that there is no coherent approach for global governance on migration. More precisely, the recent migration crisis (Syrian nationals entering Europe, Turkey, the Lebanon etc.) has challenged the existing refugee regime due to the conflicting interests of neoliberal capitalism and rights-based approaches. In the absence of a comprehensive global governance regime for migration, different global actors have developed their own approaches based on their own priorities. The most powerful global actors like the World Trade Organisation (WTO), multinational corporations (MNC), the WB and developed nation states have all pursued a free market-oriented, demand-based model which disregards basic human rights. Whereas, due to their mandates, IOs like the ILO and the UN High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) adopted a rights-based discourse and approach to migration. Relying on the discussion of Geiger and Pecoud (2014) and Kunz et al. (2011), Likić-Brborić (2018) provided a frame in which different categories of migrants are associated with various IOs in line with their area of expertise. According to this frame, the ILO and the Office of the UN High Commission for Human Rights (OHCHR) is responsible for migrant workers and for monitoring their rights. Additionally, the UNHCR protects refugees and asylum seekers, while the IOM is accountable for facilitating the mobilisation of economic migrants who are subjected to the demands of the global labour market (Likić-Brborić, 2018). It is discussed that with the influence of the asymmetric global governance rivalry between two
approaches dispositioned the ILO and UNHCR, while it made room for the IOM to promote negotiated rights with a pro-development discourse on migrant management. One critical point within this debate is how development discourse of circular migration has since translated into a refugee regime. It is claimed that ‘between and within multilateral organisations and governments and littered by conventions and declarations, which have mostly failed to impact on real politics and policies in national contexts’ (Schierup et al., 2015, p. 56) is a result of this conflict between human rights approach versus politics of economic development.

These discussions are highly relevant to this study in terms of comprehending the strategies and discourses of three specific IOs, namely the ILO, the IOM and UNICEF, together with the national government of Turkey on migrant child labour, which elucidate migration regimes that are shaped by demands of the global neoliberal labour market. Furthermore, these discussions will also help the study to situate strategies and interventions carried out by these IOs in order to promote the human rights of migrants and to fight against the practices of migrant child labour.

Methodological Considerations and Analytical Approach

Method and Research Design

The study aims to critically analyse the strategies and programmes applied in the field of child labour concerning Syrian children UTP in Turkey through global governance apparatus as explained in the first chapter of this study. In order to meet the aim of the thesis and to answer the research questions, qualitative research methods were employed. For the first stage of the study, document analysis was conducted. Drawing on the document analysis, a multilevel institutional framework is presented and then analysed in terms of dealing with the issue of (migrant) child labour, including the current strategy of the Turkish government. In addition to the document analysis, quantitative data based on different reports and publicly available formal statistics were mostly used in the identifying of the problem. As the second stage of the study, semi-structured in-depth interviews were conducted with selected informants working with the aforementioned IOs.

Based on the research topic and the research questions, qualitative research methods were deemed to be the approach most suited to the current study, since the study mainly aims to find silences and unproblematised areas within the strategies implemented that target migrant child labour. More specifically, the research aims to scrutinise the strategies and policies implemented in the area of migrant child labour within the context of Turkey. Accordingly, the discourses and problematisations evidenced in the policy documents and strategies of the
Turkish government and the IOs constitute the main source of data. Furthermore, semi-structured in-depth interviews with the IOs were used as the most appropriate method to complement this research due to their flexible and dynamic structure in terms of providing sufficient flexibility for the interviewees to reflect their own positions and experiences, which may not be derived simply from an examination of policy documents (Taylor et al., 2016, p. 102).

**Identification of International Organisations and Interviewees**

As mostly used in case study research design, while focusing on certain groups, events, situations as well as organisations that share a common ground and agenda on the identified phenomenon; in this research as well, *purposeful sampling* was identified as the method for selecting the informational sources (Fred and Beverly, 2008). Relying on previous studies in terms of pre-identified causes of child labour, and the theoretical framework of this study, the main international actors actively working in Turkey were identified in line with the mandates and focus areas for each organisation. Accordingly, UNICEF, the ILO, and the IOM were selected as the main IOs whose strategies and interventions could be analysed to cover the areas of rights of the child, child labour and labour rights, as well as migrant rights and integration.

Following the identification of the three IOs, respective employees working at the IOs Turkey country offices were contacted via e-mail and/or telephone. Overall, five informants from three IOs were approached and each agreed to be interviewed. The informants were diverse in terms of their area of expertise and managerial levels. More specifically, in order to address the research questions in terms of emphasis on both strategic and technical aspects of the interventions, it was decided to conduct multiple interviews with the ILO and UNICEF. Accordingly, one technical staff member working as a social policy national officer and one holding a managerial position as an international professional at UNICEF agreed to take part in the study. Two national staff members from the ILO were identified based on the thematic areas they were working on, namely child labour and labour market. Finally, one international staff member from the IOM was identified based on his position and respective experience on the Turkish case.

**Data Collection and Ethical Concerns**

As previously mentioned, the data collection method was specified as semi-structured in-depth interview. The interview protocol and a set of predefined open-ended questions were prepared in order to address the research questions. A total of five semi-structured in-depth interviews were conducted with representatives of the IOs working in the field. Four face-to-face
interviews were conducted, two with representatives of UNICEF, one with a representative of the IOM, and one representative of the ILO, while one telephone interview was conducted with a representative of the ILO due to conflicting schedules. All four face-to-face interviewees agreed to the interview being audio-recorded, while the telephone interviewee declined. Aside from audio-recording, researcher notetaking was also used, especially for the telephone interview. All of the participants were provided with clear information about their rights as study participants and the appropriate ethical concerns through the interview protocol (see Annex 1). In addition, all of the participants provided specific consent to the researcher to use the data collected for the purpose of research for this thesis. In terms of their anonymity, the names of the interviewees were changed and are only referred to using pseudonym letters.

The length of the interviews was planned to be limited to 1 hour; however, two out of the five interviews lasted around 80 minutes, which lengthened the transcription process. Yet, in the two longer interviews, the interviewees digressed to talk about silences and other unspoken areas which added considerable value as data, and was therefore more appreciated than criticised. Following the interviews, the audio-recordings were transcribed verbatim and then the recordings were subsequently deleted.

**Reliability and Validity**

Although reliability and validity are key checkpoints mostly relevant to quantitative research methods, in qualitative research too, the reliability of the dataset as well as the validity of the methodology are of significant importance in supporting the trustworthiness and rigor of the whole study (Golafshani, 2003). The redefined conceptualisations of reliability and validity support the qualitative researcher with better mediums, whilst helping them to achieve better understandings of social constructs. In reference to Johnson (1997), Golafshani explained how refined understanding of reliability and validity works within the context of qualitative research as follows:

…to acquire valid and reliable multiple and diverse realities, multiple methods of searching or gathering data are in order. If this calls for the use of triangulation in the constructivism paradigm, then the use of investigators, method and data triangulations to record the construction of reality is appropriate.

(Golafshani, 2003, p. 604)

Accordingly, as presented earlier, a variety of sources were employed in the current study which benefits the research. The primary informational sources can be listed as government policy documents, formal statistics published by government institutions, reports from different stakeholders working actively in the field of (migrant) child labour and migrant
labour, together with previous research from the literature. In addition, in-depth semi-structured interviews were conducted with selected informants from IOs in order to fill any knowledge gaps and to elicit silences that were not found in the examined documents.

Overall, in line with the aim of the study, i.e., to critically analyse the strategies and policies implemented against migrant child labour, as outlined in the first chapter, employing multiple sources of information was chosen in order to facilitate the identification of constructed discourses and problematisation of migrant child labour in Turkey. This approach is further expanded upon in the following sections.

**What is the Problem Presented to be? (WPR Approach)**

The first part of the analysis uses the “‘What is the problem presented to be?’” approach’, which is known in short as the WPR Approach, and was developed by Bacchi (2009) to be utilised for the purposes of policy analysis. The WPR approach is based on the post-structuralist ideology and constructs its method upon Foucauldian conceptualisation of governmentality and discourse. More specifically, in reference to Foucault, Bacchi explains the concept of “governmentality” as a medium that “operates at the level of population and utilises such means as social and economic policy to ensure security and order” (Bacchi, 2009, p. 27). Therefore, the approach suggests interrogating the problematisations rather than the problems themselves, through scrutinising the premises and effects of the problem presentations they contain. In particular, the WPR approach aims to illuminate how the governance in general is carried out by experts and professionals through enacted laws and legislation. The main tools used for governing societies such as policy proposals, legislation and laws are also seen as the essential instruments that identify the problems and/or social-problems by developing the response areas to intervene in certain ways.

However, this process itself can also reproduce assumptions, social values, and norms, as well as socially constructed structures regarding the problem to be presented. By refocusing on and deconstructing the problematisation process itself, the approach tries to redefine reflections on policy papers. In other words, the WPR approach helps to revisit how the problem is understood and thus how the problem is represented. In doing so, the WPR approach provides the space to question any assumptions that were taken for granted and therefore inherited within government policies, and/or policy proposals of multiple stakeholders. Therefore, it is a critical mode of analysis. From this perspective, the WPR approach fits perfectly to analyse the normative and institutional global governance practices that have been translated into strategies and interventions conducted in response to the issue of migrant child labour in Turkey.
In order to facilitate this critical mode of analysis on the problem in question taking place in respective policies, the WPR approach brings forward six essential questions, which is also known as the WPR Chart (see Annex 1) (Bacchi and Goodwin, 2016). Accordingly, for the current study, amongst the six the following three questions of the WPR approach were identified as the main analytical tools of the study:

**Question 1:** “What is the problem (e.g., of ‘gender inequality’, ‘drug use/abuse’, ‘economic development’, ‘global warming’, ‘childhood obesity’, ‘irregular migration’, etc.) represented to be in a specific policy or policies?” (Bacchi, 2009, p. xii)

**Question 2:** “What deep-seated presuppositions or assumptions (conceptual logics) underlie this representation of the ‘problem’ (problem representation)?” (Bacchi, 2009, p. xii)

**Question 4:** “What is left unproblematic in this problem representation? Where are the silences? Can the ‘problem’ be conceptualised differently?” (Bacchi, 2009, p. xii)

These three main questions were applied firstly to the key policy document in force, i.e., the National Programme (NP) developed in Turkey that targets the elimination of child labour in Turkey. Subsequently, the same set of questions were used to analyse the strategies and programmes implemented by each IO represented in this study. The basis of information regarding strategies and programmes were derived through interviews and published reports. In doing this, the WPR approach enables the current study to understand how migrant child labour and the determinants of it were problematised and presented within the context of Turkey.

With the help of the WPR approach, the challenges and the weaker points of the policies along with the intervention areas of the IOs were also identified. After identifying how migrant child labour has been problematised in Turkey and responded to with the help of various activities, projects and policies, unproblematised areas and/or aspects which were not included within the scope of the interventions were also presented. By presenting the challenges, concepts, binaries embodied within problematisation process, and by highlighting the unproblematised and/or silenced aspects of child labour amongst migrant children in Turkey, the discourses were manifested in terms of their connection to the theoretical framework.

**ANALYSIS**

Prior to the analysis of the strategies and policies adopted and implemented against child labour in general, and those specifically targeting the Syrian children in Turkey, it is important to
present the main institutional frameworks of and key actors involved in the policies addressing child labour in Turkey in general, and migrant child labour in particular.

Secondly, it is also crucial to identify the migrant child as a category and then to analyse the term ‘child labour’, since it is the primary ‘problem’ identified for the current study. Then, this chapter analyses how the problem of child labour is conceptualised and addressed in the Turkish National Programme on Elimination of Child Labour and elaborates on the interventions of each IO on the subject matter through their strategic programmes in collaboration with the Government of Turkey, via which the identified underlying causes of child labour can then be analysed.

**Multilevel Governance, Institutional Frameworks and Key Actors**

**Addressing Child Labour in Turkey**

Within the context of Turkey, the institutions, legal framework, and policies targeting child labour with a specific emphasis on WFCL, have been identified in the latest policy document, the National Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour in 2018 by the Turkish Ministry of Labour and Social Security (MoLSS); which is now called the Ministry of Family, Labour and Social Services (MoFLSS). The main governance actors aside from the MoFLSS, involved in the governance of child labour are the MoNE, the Ministry of Interior (MoI), the Ministry of Development (MoD), the Ministry of Youth and Sport (MoYS), the Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock (MoFAL), the Ministry of Health (MoH), TurkStat, trade unions, occupational chambers, local authorities such as governorates and municipalities, IOs such as the ILO and UNICEF, NGOs, and also universities.

As of 2019, Turkey has ratified three international conventions (i.e., UNCRC, C182, and C138) which sets forth the international standards on child rights and child labour, as previously discussed. Following the adoption of these international agreements, a series of enhancements and changes were carried out legislatively to accommodate the requirements and provide enabling structures for their implementation.

**Table 4: International Agreements and Collaborations on Child Labour**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International Agreements</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Responsible Agency</th>
<th>Turkey’s Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNCRC</td>
<td>Identifies the rights of the child relying on the principles, e.g., the best interest of the child</td>
<td>All UN Agencies, but UNICEF has the leading role</td>
<td>Ratified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C138 and R146</td>
<td>Minimum Age for Admission to Employment</td>
<td>Issued by ILO; supported by various UN Agencies (e.g., UNICEF, UNESCO)</td>
<td>Ratified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worst Forms of Child Labour and Hazardous Work</td>
<td>Issued by ILO; supported by various UN Agencies (e.g., UNICEF, UNESCO)</td>
<td>Ratified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C182 and R190</td>
<td>Provides equal opportunities to men and women with productive, fair income, secured employment in a secure workplace that is accompanied by social protection for families to enable personal development, freedom of organisation, and participation in decision making and thus reduce poverty.</td>
<td>Issued by ILO</td>
<td>Not implemented in Turkey. Turkey does not have a DWA Country Programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG Alliance Target 8.7</td>
<td>Joining forces globally to end child labour, forced labour, modern slavery and human trafficking</td>
<td>Under the secretariat of ILO; composed of various UN Agencies, IOs and Countries</td>
<td>Turkey is not one of the partners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

12 For further information visit:  
and/or https://www.alliance87.org/  
13 https://www.alliance87.org/partners/
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Legal Framework</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Responsible Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turkish Constitution</td>
<td>Article 50 states that nobody can be employed in jobs that are not in line with their age, gender, physical and psychological statues and special protection together with measures in working conditions of those individuals would be provided.</td>
<td>All institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour Law (No: 4857)</td>
<td>Regulates the minimum working age as 15 years, and in special conditions as 14. Regulates the working conditions as well as education standards.</td>
<td>MoFLSS and MoNE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code of Obligations Law (No: 6098)</td>
<td>Regulates the annual leaves for working children.</td>
<td>All institutions for monitoring and referrals to the authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Law (No: 1593)</td>
<td>Regulates the working conditions for children as the Labour Law. There are inconsistencies with two Laws and Labour Law is predicated.</td>
<td>MoFLSS and MoH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duties and Authority of Police Law (No: 2559)</td>
<td>Under protection of children, Article 12 states that children under the age 18 years cannot be employed in places such as bars or nightclubs, or places where alcoholic drinks are served.</td>
<td>MoI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Training Law (No: 3308)</td>
<td>Identifies the age limits and conditions of vocational training.</td>
<td>MoNE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Education and Education Law (No: 222)</td>
<td>Article 59 prohibits working by children that are not continuing primary education, and regulates the conditions of work for children attending primary education.</td>
<td>MoNE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Protection Law (No: 5395)</td>
<td>Has measures for protection towards children working on the streets and children or juveniles at risk of being pushed into a life of crime.</td>
<td>MoFLSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45512797-10.06-E.3243629 Circular No: 2016/5</td>
<td>Increased access to educational services for the children of seasonal agricultural workers, nomadic or semi-nomadic families.</td>
<td>MoNE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Programme, MoLLS

Table 4 and Table 5 show the international agreements and the initiatives that are currently in place to address child labour, and the laws and regulations that refer to child labour from aspects such as the prohibition of child labour, minimum age for employment, working conditions, the right to education, access to vocational education, and education opportunities for migrant children, as well as the institutions responsible for policy implementation based on the given legal framework. Although not presented in the National Programme, the arguments this thesis will present also include additional structures that target migrants, more specifically
individuals who are under temporary protection (UTP). Therefore, Table 6 is based on the national regulations and legislation that directly focus on individuals UTP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Legal Framework</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Responsible Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Permits for foreigners under temporary protection regulation (No: 6575)</td>
<td>Regulates the conditions, length, rules and principles of how work permits will be given to individuals under temporary protection.</td>
<td>MoFLSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Protection Regulation (No: 6203)</td>
<td>Determines the procedures and principles pertaining to temporary protection and the scope of accessible services.</td>
<td>DGMM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Services for Foreigners Circular (No: 2014/21)</td>
<td>Coordinates and describes education services for foreigners who fled to Turkey due to war and crises. (In the circular ‘UTP’ was not mentioned on purpose as applicable to all refugee children)</td>
<td>MoNE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Who is the Migrant Child?

As presented in the introduction, the aim of the current study is to understand the IOs’ strategies and policies implemented in the area of child labour, and specifically those targeting migrant children due to their compounded vulnerability. At this point it is necessary to acknowledge that in addition to Syrians migrants and refugees, there are some 368,000 individuals of other nationalities (e.g., Afghani, Iraqi, and Iranian), of which 32% are children, registered with the UNHCR in Turkey (UNHCR, 2019). Predominantly though, the migrant population in Turkey is Syrian with almost 3.6 million people, of which 45% are children (Republic of Turkey Ministry of Interior Directorate General of Migration Management, 2019). However, covering all the working children with a migrant background is not possible due to two reasons. First is the lack of available disaggregated data based on legal statuses of individuals. In fact, there is a significant gap in accurate and up-to-date data on child labour in general and on migrants in particular, which was highlighted several times during the interviews with the ILO’s representatives.

The need for information and data…this is actually essential…It is also very crucial to have regional and sectoral research, which would support the database [on child labour]. This gap needs to be closed to have better response models and effective actions to be realised. (Interviewee B. ILO, 2019, March 21)

Well, there is no data regarding Syrians on TurkStat. In any case, the state has the data, they should have it, but it is not shared. We are also working with migrants other than Syrians, and this is a real
The second reason is the limited number of interventions that have targeted children of various migrant backgrounds. In other words, different legal statuses like international protection, temporary protection, or irregular migrant; each of which have different levels of access to certain rights and services. Accordingly, the intervention areas of IOs and identified target groups are also affected by these statuses one way or another. Due to the arrival of large number of displaced individuals across the Syrian border into Turkey, different kinds of policies were developed at the national level such as the introduction of ‘under temporary protection’ (UTP) as a status in 2013, with respective changes applied in the Foreigners and International Protection Law (Number 6458). In line with Law 6458, the Temporary Protection Regulation (Number 6203) was also enacted in 2014. However, this regulation mainly covers individuals, who entered to Turkey from the Syrian border after 28 April, 2011. Therefore, individuals and groups who crossed the Turkish border through a second country and/or before the date stated in the regulation were not deemed to be covered by the status of temporary protection and thereby had even less access to rights and services from the Republic of Turkey. This is critical for several reasons, but here it is mentioned for its exclusionary tendency in grouping people. The exclusion prolongs at several levels such as the lack of representation of individuals and/or groups in government datasets referring to people who fled from Syria to Turkey, access to rights and services, and not being able to reach out to certain groups whose statuses are not marked as ‘under temporary protection’. The latter is also valid for IOs, since they are mainly working with the Turkish Government and the target population is often identified as ‘Syrians under temporary protection’.

Another similar aspect relates to earmarked funds given by donors. Since the Syrian crisis and its catastrophic consequences including the forced mass migration of Syrian citizens had raised international awareness and interest, the funds given by various donors aimed only to respond to the Syrian Crisis by reaching out to groups that were officially identified by the authorities. This issue was also brought up by one of the interviewees from the ILO, while the informant was referring to the response areas and how the target groups were determined:

Since, there is no direct source of funding coming from the UN to Turkey, there is always this fundraising/finding situation. So, for which subject you get the funding? –for Syrians– well, then let’s [as a UN agency] orient ourselves to Syrians. (Interviewee A. ILO, 2019, January 18)
Despite the best efforts of the IOs in being inclusive to the fullest extent possible, the biggest target group by far remains Syrians UTP. For the aforementioned reasons, Syrian children UTP will be referred to as ‘migrant children’ within the scope of the current study. Yet, it is also argued within this study that regardless of their legal status and/or country of origin, the experience of being a migrant child worker has similar motivations and driving factors. Therefore, by taking a closer look at Syrian migrant children engaged in the Turkish labour market, it is aimed to shed light on common problems and challenges that other groups potentially experience as well.

**National Programme on Elimination of Child Labour**

As previously mentioned, the Turkish Government’s National Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour is the main policy document developed by the MoLSS in 2018. The policy identifies the main strategies as well as the action points to be followed to eradicate WFCL, children working on the streets, children working within heavy industry or dangerous jobs, and children working in the seasonal agriculture sector, other than as family labour, and to decrease child labour in other sectors to below 2% by 2023 in Turkey (Republic of Turkey Ministry of Labour and Social Security, 2018). It is understood from the introduction of the National Programme (NP) that it is a product of a multi-participatory process. The document acknowledges the contributions of multiple-partners such as government line ministries and governmental agencies, together with the Union of Chambers and Commodity Exchanges of Turkey (TOBB), the Confederation of Turkish Tradesman and Craftsmen (TESK), the Confederation of Turkish Trade Unions (TÜRK-İŞ), the HAK-İŞ Trade Union Confederation, the Turkish Confederation of Employer Associations (TİSK), the Union of Turkish Agricultural Chambers, certain international organisations, civil society organisations, and also universities. Accordingly, the NP document also delineates the roles and responsibilities of each institution and actor present in the field. In addition, as reiterated and referred to several times by the informants representing the ILO and UNICEF, the current projects and action points carried out by both IOs in relation to child labour are significantly tied to the National Programme and the cooperation of MoLSS. Following recent structural changes within the ministries, MoLSS is now known as MoFLSS.

---

Actually, MoLSS is our natural partner, meaning we are cooperating with them in all areas in which we are working. (Interviewee B. ILO, 2019, March 21)

UNICEF here has worked within and through national systems rather than let’s say substituting service delivery of the state. So, because there was a legal framework in Turkey which allowed national services to be extended to the refugee children and their families, UNICEF’s strategy has been to support the extension so as to make it a reality. (Interviewee D. UNICEF, 3 January 2019)

Therefore, it is important to understand how child labour and its determinants are problematised within this NP document before looking at the IOs’ interventions and activities on migrant child labour. Therefore, this study will scrutinise each of the suggested strategies and action points given in the NP.

What is the Problem of Child Labour Presented to be in the National Programme?
The policy document starts with a short summary of child labour studies and their achievements in Turkey, which started with IPEC-ILO and was then followed by TBPPF as previously mentioned. In this way the document constructs the discourse that reflects the conceptual and legal frameworks of child labour, and the recognition of WFCL within the context of Turkey, along with other priority areas directly associated with international conventions like ILO C182, as well as with the laws and regulations in force that emphasise the right to education.

According to the National Programme, the main causes of child labour are identified as poverty, lack of access to education, rural-urban migration, unemployment amongst adult members in the family, traditional social norms, lack of regulations and implementation, employers’ demand of child labour, and irregular migration (Republic of Turkey Ministry of Labour and Social Security, 2018). In order to address these causes, the NP identified the following seven strategic areas and the respective leading agencies and institutions responsible for each action.

- Measures for Implementing and Updating the Regulation and Legal Arrangements
- Measures for Strengthening the Existing Organisational Structures and Creating New Organisational Structures
- Measures for Increasing Awareness
- Measures for Ensuring the Participation of the Social Partners and the Community
- Measures for Education and Improvement
- Measures for Elimination of Poverty
- Measures for Extension of Social Protection and Social Security Network

The matrix (see Error! Reference source not found.) presents the strategies and the activities of each institution aiming to address migrant child labour. The matrix was developed
in order to demonstrate which activities have managed to address the root causes of migrant child labour in Turkey. Accordingly, the first row represents the root causes of (migrant) child labour in Turkey, which were discussed previously; whereas, the first column shows the main four actors identified within the scope of this study. The information used in the matrix is either derived from the NP policy document and the reports of each respective institution, or as data extracted from the interviews conducted in this study. The highlighted parts show the activities that are specific to labour market integration of the migrants UTP. The analysis of the strategy presented in the NP document was conducted using the matrix.

In general terms, the main approach of the strategy mostly relies on soft policies15 (Kennedy et al., 2011, p. 44) such as the strengthening of existing structures as well as additional supportive organisational schemes introduced as capacity-building and awareness-raising activities. Through these main key strategies; with the increased awareness on child labour amongst various stakeholders, and enhanced coordination accompanied by the implementation of existing and new structures, it is aimed to realise sufficient capacity to fight against (migrant) child labour. Therefore, one aspect of how the problem of (migrant) child labour is represented in the strategy can be gathered around the criminalisation of child labour through inspections and penalising as well as lack of enforcement of the existing structures.

The approach to sensitisation that targets multiple stakeholders including the decision-makers and high-level executive hints at the need for further acknowledgement of the presence and the effects of child labour and the corresponding political will for more efficient and immediate action on the issue in Turkey (Republic of Turkey Ministry of Labour and Social Security, 2018, pp. 68-70). Besides, the attempt at increasing the presence of civil society organisations (CSOs) and their partnership with various stakeholders working on child labour can be interpreted from two perspectives. The first is positive on the basis of providing more space for CSOs in decision making. The second is an impression on the necessity of having CSOs integrated within the programme for funding coming from the EU and/or potential UN agencies (which is also a part of the strategy) (Republic of Turkey Ministry of Labour and Social Security, 2018, pp. 71-72). In other words, problems are seen at two levels; 1- lack of funding, 2- need for further multilateral cooperation.

The strategy places a strong emphasis on education. However, the part that foresees referrals to vocational education targeting working children and children at risk of engaging in

15 ‘On the one hand implementation can be directed by legislation and regulator monitoring with the possibility of sanctions for non-compliance (“hard” policy) or it can come in the form of recommendations, education campaigns and strong advocacy (“soft” policy”). (Kennedy et al. 2011, p. 44)
WFCL (Republic of Turkey Ministry of Labour and Social Security, 2018, pp. 73-74) is controversial on the basis of the problematisation of lack of attendance and/or enrolment to regular formal education. It is assumed that the reason for children’s non-attendance to regular formal education is because they are working. Nevertheless, the underlying reason is because they need to support their families by either working in a paid job or by being a domestic labourer in the family home. Therefore, child labour as being a secondary symptom of the poverty, is reflected as a primary reason of not attending to regular formal education. Furthermore, by providing direct referrals to vocational training, strategy paves the road for the regularisation of the child labour.

The main strategic moves addressing poverty focus on supporting small- and medium-scale enterprises (SMEs) in order to accommodate job opportunities for seasonal agricultural workers, and in emigration to cities from where people migrate to for seasonal agricultural employment. This also includes encouraging families of working children to engage with entrepreneurship as an income generating activity. Another activity that targets families in the strategy is the provision of vocational training and the prioritising of their employment. Together with an emphasis on entrepreneurship, the ‘need’ for vocational training puts the responsibility of finding ‘employment’ on the shoulders of the families of child workers by implying the reasons for their unemployment as being individual incapability and fault. In addition, the problematisation of poverty is only exacerbated with unemployment.

The NP document highlights the need to ‘strengthen the mechanisms for promoting education for poor families’, although, ‘mechanisms are not clarified and fail to connect to National Conditional Cash Transfers Programme (CCT) for education’. (Republic of Turkey Ministry of Labour and Social Security, 2018, pp. 75-76).

Lack of employment opportunities and high risks of poverty as well as the absence of social networks leave disadvantaged groups and migrants predominantly reliant upon social welfare protection. Therefore, adopting comprehensive social protection schemes covering all groups becomes crucial for the provision of basic needs and to ensure human dignity. However, the activities suggested within the strategy claims there to be a lack of awareness on the existence of services amongst the public. Therefore, the measures intended for social protection are mainly composed of capacity building targeting social workers, elevating coordination between different institutions providing social assistance, and information dissemination on existing social assistance programmes. One suggestion was made for the enhancement of social protection programmes targeting children, yet no specification was provided. In addition, for children working in the seasonal agricultural sector, increased access provision to healthcare
services was projected (Republic of Turkey Ministry of Labour and Social Security, 2018, p. 77).

Overall, although there were some hard policies aiming to enhance enforcement, the primary strategies put forward to address child labour were mainly composed of soft policies due to the poor problematisation of poverty, unemployment, and lack of access to education, as well as issues of social protection. Therefore, the main activities identified in the strategy which are limited to capacity building, sensitisation and awareness raising, are seen to be ineffective active labour market policies (ALMP) that fall short of addressing the root causes of child labour.

**What Remains as Unproblematised in the National Programme?**

Poverty and the dynamics of different kinds of migration were included in the scope of child labour, and which were briefly explained in the general discussion. This indicates a positive improvement towards adopting a comprehensive approach in the problematisation of child labour and its causes. Poverty is presented as one of the primary reasons of child labour, while the determinants of poverty in Turkey are also listed as ‘unemployment, unequal income distribution, economic crisis, inefficient use of national resources, rapid population growth, migration, unplanned urbanisation, and the informal economy’ (Republic of Turkey Ministry of Labour and Social Security, 2018). Therefore, the fight against poverty is also highlighted as one of the key areas of interest along with other measures such as increasing access to quality education, sensitisation in combating against child labour, and achieving the set goals of the 7-year period (Republic of Turkey Ministry of Labour and Social Security, 2018, p. 57).

There are two main weaknesses of the NP. First, it lacks the sanctioning power because it involves too many institutions and administrations which have different reporting lines. The second weakness of the NP as a strategy document, is its inability to present strategies that address the very root causes of child labour that the document itself identifies from the outset. From this perspective, there is an inconsistency between the conceptualisation of child labour, along with its causes, and the developed strategy as a response plan. Depending on the activities identified within the strategy there are several areas that are left as unproblematic.

The strategy suggests an alternative educational system that would retain child labour without problematising. The whole structure that led the children into the labour market and precarisation of child labour within the apprenticeship programmes or education system was also largely ignored. Another unproblematised area is the unequal distribution of income, as
well as the Emergency Social Safety Net (ESSN\textsuperscript{16}) targeting refugees UTP, which is only mentioned in the general text of the document, whilst not being included in the strategic actions. As an ad hoc social assistance programme, ESSN is not structured within the national system and its sustainability is in question once EU funding is withdrawn. In that respect, the issue of exit-strategy and the alternative social assistance programmes within the national system for migrants UTP in terms of addressing the measures elevating poverty and child labour are not discussed.

In contrast with the problematisation on the basis of lack of information about the available social protection schemes in the policy document, according to TurkStat’s latest statistics for 2017, a total of 13,847,000 individuals received one or more types of social assistance provided by the Turkish Government, via the Ministry. Again, according to TurkStat, the poverty rate in 2017 was 20\% and the number of people living in poverty was 15,864,000 (TurkStat, 2019b). When the number of beneficiaries and the number of the poor is compared, it is expected that most of the poor have access to social assistance programmes. Therefore, it is unlikely to assume that the available services are just inadequately publicised.

Another untouched area was the dual labour market structure. There was no problematisation on the existence of the informal labour market or the informal labour force. The only sector for which the \textit{registration of informal labour force} was set as an activity was seasonal agriculture. The association is constructed between employers’ employment preferences and their lack of awareness and/or information on the illegality of their actions. Yet, Turkey’s position within the global economy and global labour market was ignored. This position also forces employers to seek cheap labour in order to sustain their place in global competition (Wise, 2015). Similarly, the effectiveness of the ALMPs such as vocational training suggested for increasing employability amongst the parents of working children was not questioned. Generally, vocational training and different training services failed to increase employment or impact on the informal labour market (World Bank, 2013, p. 20). Due to rising unemployment in Turkey, these do not address or adequately support unemployed native workers in finding paid employment. Therefore, it is improbable that the interventions would actually help migrants to find legitimate paid jobs. Besides, no specific emphasis was given to

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{16} The Emergency Social Safety Net (ESSN) is funded by the European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO), through World Food Programme in Turkey and in cooperation with the Turkish Red Crescent with the support of the MoFLSS. The ESSN programme provides monthly payments to refugee households, eligible according to demographic criteria identified within the scheme. Currently, the programme supports 1.4 million refugees in Turkey (Essn. 2019. \textit{ESSN Card} [Online]. Available: https://www.essncard.com/about-card/ [Accessed]. For further information on the ESSN programme, visit: https://www.essncard.com/about-card/}
the granting of work permits. Although, it is said that no obstacle exists to Syrians applying for a work permit in Turkey, the obligations and requirements to obtain a work permit persist as a barrier.

All the unproblematised areas in the labour market have strong associations with the new global migration regime. In other words, the strategies foreseen for the Syrian refugees’ integration into the Turkish labour market were also based on the same migration development discourse which repeatedly ignores the root causes of irregular migration as well as precarity which is caused due to a lack of access to rights and protection within the neoliberal global economy. In the absence of effective and sanctioning rules and regulations with fully dedicated implementers, migrants UTP in Turkey with no protection are the target of Turkey’s informal labour market (Wise, 2015).

The strategy of the document in reaching out to migrant child labour is clearly constructed around increasing their access to education. One step further, the policy document is by definition inclusive, and acknowledges the existence of migrant child labour by having clear statements such as the following:

The fight against the problem of foreign child labour is carried out through the mechanisms that facilitates the integration of migrants into work life, livelihoods, and referral to education. It is aimed that without any discrimination, all children can benefit from all policies and measures identified within the “National Programme for Fighting Against Child Labour” covering the period 2017-2023. (Republic of Turkey Ministry of Labour and Social Security, 2018, p. 57)

In spite of having an inclusive discourse, the particularities and the problems that migrants face, for example accessing the labour market, were not specified or addressed. Therefore, in practice, migrants were not the actual target of the strategy. There were no referrals found to migration policies, work permits, social protection, or any specific statement aiming to reach migrant child workers under any of the seven strategies. In other words, migrant child labour is treated in the same way as Turkish child labour, which is both good and bad at the same time. It could be good, if they could only pinpoint the structural problems that create the conditions for child labour in the first place; but apparently the strategy fails to address those, for example, by suggesting neoliberal active labour market policies (ALMP), which fail

---

17 According to the latest statistics announced by the MoFLSS, the number of Syrians UTP granted work permits is just 20,966. Considering that the working-age population (15-65 years) of Syrians UTP in Turkey is over 2 million, according to the DGMM Republic of Turkey Ministry of Interior Directorate General of Migration Management. 2019. TEMPORARY PROTECTION-February 2019 [Online]. Available: http://www.goc.gov.tr/icerik6/temporary-protection_915_1024_4748_icerik [Accessed]., the total number of individuals granted work permits remains extremely low.
to address the unemployment problems of Turkey. It is also bad, since a unified strategy cannot
be sufficiently adequate to respond to migrant child labour without placing specific emphasis
on the dynamics of global migration in general, and on national migration policies in particular.
Yet, migrant children who have the most vulnerable and precarious position due to their
precarious and elusive statuses, was only mentioned twice with the word ‘migrant’, and only
four times with the status of ‘under temporary protection’ in the entire document with any
specific emphasis. The only time migrants were referred to within the scope of the strategy
tables was with the word ‘migrant’ in Table 6 which envisions the prioritisation of special
groups including migrants accessing services. The identified activities under Table 6 are those
previously discussed, where the reflection of neoliberal policies is seen in finding jobs by
putting the responsibility on the shoulders of the individuals, as well as skills development to
increase the employability of the migrants.

Hence, being migrant as a status and what kind of limitations this status realises in terms
of accessing basic needs and services was not addressed. Therefore, what was discussed in
terms of the informal labour market is also valid for migrants. Furthermore, as Bauder (2005)
argues, being deprived of rights and protection puts migrants even more vulnerable position.
Reflection of this argument in Turkey as previous research suggested migrants and migrant
children were preferred by employers as cheap sources of labour and employed in 3D jobs not
favoured by Turkish workers (Lordoğlu and Aslan, 2016, Lordoğlu and Aslan, 2018). It does
not give specific emphasis to migrants. It is therefore expected that migrant child labour will
be addressed by one of the most prominent and powerful organisations having the mandate to
address migration.

**IOM’s Position on Migrant Child Labour in Turkey**

The IOM, formerly known as the Provisional Intergovernmental Committee for the Movement
of Migrants from Europe (PICMME), was founded in 1951 following the WWII in order to
assist European countries in the resettlement of some 11 million displaced persons following
the war. In 2016, the IOM, as the leading international organisation for migration, became the
‘related organisation’ of the UN. As the leading agency on migration, the IOM mainly focuses
on operational challenges of migration management, social and economic development through
migration, ensuring the human dignity and well-being of migrants, as well as understanding
migration issues by establishing collaboration with its partners (IOM, 2019b).

Following the Gulf War, the IOM opened its first office in Turkey in 1991 in order to
facilitate the resettlement of Iraqi refugees, and then at a later stage its activities evolved to
migration management programmes. In 2004, Turkey became a member of the IOM, by which the partnership of the Republic of Turkey and the IOM gained a level of formality. Since then, the IOM has worked closely with Turkey in drafting the Law of Foreigners and International Protection and during the establishment of the DGMM under the Ministry of the Interior in 2013 (IOM, 2019a).

However, migrant child labour has not formed part of the operational framework of the IOM in Turkey. Although during the semi-structured interview conducted as part of the current study, the informant from the IOM mentioned an earlier attempt at focusing upon Afghani migrant children working in the seasonal agricultural sector with the support of the Norwegian Government in 2014-2015, due to operational limitations that was closely bound to the government’s strategy in that the focus was directed more towards a harmonisation programme for Syrian refugees.

In 2014-2015 we had a project supported by the Norwegian Government, which mainly looked at Afghani migrant children… So we do have a kind of activity on child labour, but the problem is whatever we are doing it should be in line with the policy of the government. (Interviewee E. IOM, 8 January 2019)

The informant also explained why the IOM does not have a particular focus on migrant child labour. As an intergovernmental organisation, it can only provide technical assistance if required to do so by the government (Interviewee E. IOM, 8 January 2019). When the IOM’s perspective on the current situation of migrant child labour in Turkey was sought, the answer was similar to the answers received from the other agencies, which was pointing out the lack of coordination between line ministries.

…and the problem is who set the rules for migration? It is the DGMM. Who is responsible for implementing child policy on migrant? It is the MoFSP. Therefore, I think the problem…might be the lack of institutional coordination between the body that is setting the priorities, which is the DGMM, and the body which is implementing or who is taking care of this part, which is the MoFSP…but the added value now could be that the Ministry of Labour and the Ministry of Family have merged. (Interviewee E. IOM, 8 January 2019)

Even though the IOM does not directly work on migrant child labour, it still stands as an important actor of this study due to its intensive collaboration with central and local authorities for the integration of migrants and refugees in Turkey. As unemployment, poverty, lack of access to social assistance were identified as the main causes of child labour, the IOM’s strategies and its support in those areas targeting migrants provided some insight on their problematisation of how ‘being a migrant’ would add to the enabling conditions of the child
labour issue. More specifically, the strategies and interventions aimed at Syrian migrants’ integration into the labour market may explain how the IOM sees the problem of unemployment and lack of access to livelihoods.

**How is the Problem of Syrians’ Integration in Turkey’s Labour Market Represented by the IOM?**

The IOM’s strategy to respond to the Syrian crisis in Turkey was explained according to three pillars by the informant interviewed from the IOM (Interviewee E. IOM, 8 January 2019):

- Humanitarian assistance for the most vulnerable Syrians;
- Building humanitarian development nexus;
- Working with government institutions in capacity building.

For the sake of the context in relation to migrant child labour, this part will focus on the humanitarian development nexus and capacity building, since integration-related activities are carried out under these two pillars. However, it should also be noted that these two pillars are not distinct levels of intervention, but rather that they go hand-in-hand and support the overall achievement of the shared goal. While on the one hand the projects and models are being developed under the humanitarian development nexus, at the same time the required capacity is being built or supported within the institutions which will be responsible for the ownership, implementation, monitoring, and or referrals on the other.

For example, the Ministry of Labour has established a new DG [Directorate General] on international labour. One of our responsibilities on this was to build capacity of the inspector of this DG, and to provide them with all the technical skills related to labour migration. How the labour migration should be implemented; what things are based on the international expertise and standards etc. So, capacity building is something that we will do. (Interviewee E. IOM, 8 January 2019)

The main purpose of the humanitarian development nexus is presented as seeking ways to help Syrians to be self-reliant via integration into the Turkish labour market:

Here we are mainly looking at how to make Syrians self-reliant in Turkey through access to the labour market, through on-the-job training, and through livelihood activities.

So, the ways of being self-reliant are seen as the basis for access to the Turkish labour market and with income-generating activities by the IOM. In order to achieve this primary activity in Turkey in collaboration with the MoLSS, the IOM encourages entrepreneurship amongst Syrians as well as the formation of Turkish-Syrian business partnerships. As reiterated by the IOM’s informant who was interviewed for the current study, the central motive of this EU-funded project is to support Syrian entrepreneurs and to invest in them by providing them
with the appropriate mentorship, skills and some small grants for them to enhance their business plans, while at the same time monitoring their integration into the labour market (Interviewee E. IOM, 8 January 2019). This stands as an example of neoliberal labour market policies, which places the responsibility of being employed and the blame for not having the merits for employment upon the individuals themselves. Therefore, this also reproduces the same discourse about ‘low employability’. This exact approach was also endorsed by the NP, as presented in the previous section, as well as by the EU, while approaching the integration of migrants into the labour market within the EU (European Commission, 2016).

It was also shared by the IOM interviewee that the IOM supports integration to the formal labour market in line with ethical and legal considerations. One activity that they are conducting in promoting this perspective is a job placement programme, within which the IOM plays an active role in assisting the process of obtaining work permits for migrants. This facilitation is actualised through two major contributions. As conveyed by the informant, on the one hand the IOM subsidises the migrant’s salary for the first 3 months, including payment of social security premiums, of Syrian employees that a company is willing to employ, and also assists the employer throughout the work permit application process.

Here our role is to facilitate the work permit. So, if the company identify that they need 100 Syrians to work with them because of x, y and z, our role would be in facilitating this…First of all by paying the salary of the employees 3 months in advance, so that the company does not pay…Including the social security [premium]. Second, we are the one responsible for obtaining the work permit. So, we are telling the company to which website they will to go, to which website they will register. And if we find any problem in this registration, our responsibility is directly report to Ministry of Labour so they can make the system much better. That’s how we are supporting when it comes to [Syrians gaining] access to the labour market. Because, at the end of the day, if I am an employer, why do I need the hassle of all this and lose my time and energy to employ a foreigner? Our role is [therefore] to facilitate this through our technical expertise and our team so that they can help them in the registration process. (Interviewee E. IOM, 8 January 2019)

This business-friendly intervention on the ground aims to address the problems of the dual-labour market, which indicates an acknowledgement of the structural problems and the IOM’s perspective and the source of their problematisation. One aspect of the problematisation of Syrian migrants’ integration to the labour market is seen as Turkish employers’ reluctance in employing Syrians due to the complicated work permit process. The other aspect is the financial incapacity of the employers to formalise their business with registered employees. However, regardless of how supportive the attempt is, it remains a substitution that will be present for the short term, yet cannot address the solution of the structural problem in the long
run. So, the question of whether or not the outcomes of these intervention will persist, once it stops, have yet to be considered. Here some might oppose with an argument that, whether or not solving the structural problems of the labour market is even part of the mandate of the IOM.

Nevertheless, apart from this, the capacity-building activities of the staff within the Ministry for inspection also suggest the problematisation of lack of implementation and referrals for good practices in the field.

…it comes with a financial burden as well. We try; sometimes we go to people and say, “Okay, you have your business, but it is not registered. Can you register it?” They say “I can register it, but how much would it cost me?” It will cost a lot of money because it is not only a single registration. That means that you are regularizing all the employees that means you need to pay their social security which is not that easy for small businesses or for businesses that are done with very low skills. But what we are doing is that we are trying to work together with the MoLSS in order to see how we can cooperate on this. (Interviewee E. IOM, 8 January 2019)

Yet, the scale of the programme is relatively small, when the total population of Syrians in Turkey is considered. Up until now, the IOM has reached out to some 170 Syrians and placed them into jobs in various sectors like commerce and textiles, depending on which province they are living in.

To summarise, the main intervention areas targeting Syrian’s integration into the Turkish labour market can be listed in three areas, which are smoothly integrated into the Turkish Government’s own strategy on how to reach to the families of working children. One is through capacity-building activities that target government institutions for the improved implementation of existing structures, as well as for enhancing the policies. The second is the advocacy for entrepreneurship programmes as a means of livelihood creation for migrant families. Third is as facilitator to increasing the formal employment opportunities for Syrians by subsidising the initial employment costs of Syrians for employers, and actively supporting the work permit application process.

**What is Left as Unproblematic by the IOM?**

Although the IOM managed to problematise the challenges around integration to the labour market, their intervention model remains limited in terms of scale and also inherits questions on long-term impacts together with end results. In addition, both the financial and operational sustainability of the programme have not been problematised. It seems that as long as the programme is ongoing and funded, that the IOM can continue delivering the programme. Yet, this kind of intervention does not have the purpose of either solving the problem of a dual-structured labour market, nor the legal framework and migration policies that identify the
conditions for obtaining work permits for migrants, as well as the obligations directed to employers to employ migrant workers.

In fact, Syrians’ integration into the Turkish labour market inherits challenges that are independent of each other, which further complicates the situation. Although this problematisation was not present in the strategies and/or activities put in action by the IOM, the structural obstacles were presented, as follows, as one of the challenges faced:

The second barrier in terms of the integration is that… okay, so you want to integrate people into the labour market, but what is the absorption capacity of the labour market in a country where the unemployment rate is 11%, where Turkish people working in the informal sector is 30%. All of these are challenges unrelated to the presence of the Syrians. Here we go back to the structure. The structure is like that. So, these are the challenges you will be facing in terms of a competition. (Interviewee E. IOM, 8 January 2019)

There is also another dimension in relation to the Syrians’ participation in the informal labour market. It is not only the ‘informalisation from above’, enabled by the state and corporations, but also ‘informalisation from below’, generated as a result of individuals’ coping mechanisms (Slavnic, 2010). In the case of Syrians working in the informal economy in Turkey, there are migrants who prefer not to work in the formal labour market due to the minimum wage being considered too low for survival. Instead, they prefer working within insecure jobs and keep their status eligible for receiving social assistance support for Syrians UTP, i.e., from the Emergency Social Safety Net (ESSN). The informant interviewed from the IOM expressed this situation as follows:

For the social assistance, if we are talking about ESSN then they do have the right as long as they are within the criteria. And that’s where the dilemma is, between access to labour and access to assistance; because so many people do not want to enter the formal labour market in order not to lose the assistance they are receiving. And that has been the dilemma of the MoLSS, saying ‘we have to stop the social assistance and people should go to work’, which is fine as a statement, but if we stop the ESSN, can the government give access to the labour market to these people? What is the absorption capacity of the market? Because in theory it is perfect. Let’s stop the social assistance, do not give people what they have been receiving and let them find work. But can they work? Where they can work? So, these are the questions that they do not have answers to. (Interviewee E. IOM, 8 January 2019)

Overall, the activities carried out to facilitate the integration process of Syrians are based on ephemeron, ad hoc interventions, which lack any long-term permanent effect. Therefore, the problem of sustainability remains a major challenge. Another point that interventions could not cover are the structural problems of the labour market, which directly affect the migrants and
put them in a precarious position. As the lead agency on migration management and having a mandate of advocating for the rights of the migrants, it is expected that the IOM would be more vocal and persistent in addressing the gaps within the system, and the challenges they are facing on migrants’ integration to the labour market. The limitation on interventions of the IOM could have originated either because they are bound by frameworks defined by the government along with the ‘relative power’ of the IOM as a UN agency, which limits the space for advocacy and intervention; or perhaps the IOM’s choice of implementing activities of soft policies are in fact intentional. Also stated by the interviewed IOM informant, being an intergovernmental agency and having the status as a ‘related agency’ to the UN places the IOM in a somewhat different position. This differentiated status affords the IOM a certain flexibility in its approach to migration management. Therefore, while having increased responsibility and visibility on the global migration management regime, implementing neoliberal ad hoc interventions with limited emphasis on migrants’ rights, specifically migrants’ labour rights, positions the IOM in a grey area. Furthermore, the IOM’s discourse on migration for development, and business-friendly labour market strategies are also questioned against its role of being a facilitator for labour mobility that favours the needs of the neoliberal global labour market with negotiated limited labour rights (Likić-Brborić, 2018). Although, the challenges of the Turkish labour market such as informality, low wages, unsecure working conditions have been significantly observed and analysed by the IOM, no solid solutions have been provided that have ensured migrants’ rights.

The ILO is another UN agency that is also responsible for ensuring migrants’ rights and labour rights through the Decent Work Agenda. Therefore, in the following sections, this study will also scrutinise the ILO’s interventions on migrant integration into the Turkish labour market. In addition, the lack of emphasis placed on migrant child labour by the IOM could be addressed by UNICEF and the ILO. Accordingly, the next section analyses the interventions of UNICEF in addressing child labour as the lead agency for realising the rights of children.

**UNICEF’s Position on Migrant Child Labour in Turkey**

Based on UNCRC, UNICEF’s mandate\(^{18}\) is to ensure and enhance the well-being of children and child rights globally. To this end, UNICEF works in collaboration with multiple stakeholders such as civil society organisations and governments in more than 190 countries and territories worldwide. Specifically, the programmes carried out by UNICEF target

\(^{18}\) All the information given in this section was derived from UNICEF’s official website, with no additional comments or analysis added. For further information visit: https://www.unicef.org/
achieving the best interests of children, especially the most vulnerable, disadvantaged or discriminated such as children with special needs or those affected by rapid urbanisation, environmental or manmade disasters. One of the leading founding purposes of the Agency was to subdue the adverse effects and barriers as a result of poverty, violence, disease and discrimination that hinder children’s chances to have the best start in life, since it is believed that ‘proper care at the youngest age forms the strongest foundation for a person’s future’ (UNICEF, 2019a).

**What is the problem of child labour represented to be by UNICEF in Turkey?**

The presence of UNICEF in Turkey has a history reaching back more than 65 years. In terms of its operational modality, Turkey stands as a unique case for UNICEF. Only in Turkey does UNICEF have two operating offices with different missions: (1) a National Committee responsible for promoting child rights and Fund raising from individuals and the private sector, and (2) a Country Office implementing programme cooperation in key areas of child welfare (UNICEF, 2019b). Alike in other countries, Turkey’s Country Office (TCO) operates on the basis of 5-year country programmes that are discussed, agreed, and signed by the Turkish Government. The most recent country programme cooperation covers the period 2016 to 2020, with a specific focus on social inclusion, resilience strengthening, child rights’ monitoring, and promoting gender equality targeting both Syrian and Turkish children in Turkey (Support to Life and Bilgi University Center for Migration Research, 2016). Within the scope of the latest country programme, UNICEF is working with multiple partners including line ministries, civil society organisations, and other UN agencies.

TCO’s response in relation to the Syrian crisis was first directed to supportive measures and providing technical assistance to the Turkish Government with 6-month short-term response plans in the early years of the Syrian Crisis, and relied upon the expectation that the crises could be resolved. However, together with the worsening situation in Syria and the vast increase in the number of Syrian refugees that entered Turkey, the need for the Agency’s support also increased exponentially. Currently, as explained by the one of the informants of UNICEF who was interviewed, the TCO’s approach to the Syrian crises and their strategies have shifted from an emergency response to a developmental approach. The problems of Syrian children such as their lack of access to formal education, school dropouts, child marriages, and child labour are acknowledged by the TCO and considered as problems that can be better resolved through long-term, sustainable approaches. Besides, it is said that some of the identified problems like child marriages and child labour are not unique to Syrian children as the problems pre-existed for other children living in Turkey as well. The programme’s
activities, which run in cooperation with the ministries, are also based on this perspective as well.

I think UNICEF, like the government of Turkey and many other actors, would not have anticipated that the Syrian Crisis would go on for so long…. So, obviously at the beginning of the crisis back in 2012, decisions were made more on a short-term timeframe and short-term planning horizon. And this was very much the government’s orientation, this was even seen appeals of the UN were 6 months response plans. So, people were planning on a 6-month basis, and then slowly that went to a 1-year and then now a 2-year planning cycle… So, it’s really almost now more of a development challenge than it is a humanitarian crisis as it was in 2011-2012 once people started arriving. (Interviewee D. UNICEF, 3 January 2019)

I would say we do not have a separate strategy for child labour. A multipronged strategy, working both upstream and downstream with employers and with policymakers, and also the service provision to families at risk. And what we have to do is make those accessible to both the refugees and also Turkish families. (Interviewee D. UNICEF, 3 January 2019)

When UNICEF’s understanding on the child labour issue in Turkey is questioned, one informant in a managerial position who was interviewed contextualised the child labour issue for both migrant and Turkish children as a developmental problem, describing it as follows:

It [child labour] is one of the development challenges that Turkey has faced historically, and something that UNICEF has worked on for a long time with the Turkish Government and with other authorities. As you know, Turkey has made big progress on their own child labour problem, particularly since the late 90s. But there is a persistent number of Turkish children who are still involved in WFCL. The Syria crises changed that dynamic significantly by… I mean, what we see are Syrian families in a lot of ways mirroring the repeating patterns of poor, socioeconomically marginalised Turkish families, both what kind of work they do, what industries they work in, and how they migrate within Turkey from the Southeast to the larger cities in the west. Lots of repeated patterns there so we know, you know a lot of the policies and interventions that help to reduce child labour for Turkish citizens could also work for refugees of course there are also a lot of additional barriers. (Interviewee D. UNICEF, 3 January 2019)

The tendency seen in the development discourse in associating child labour with the level of economic and/or human development, causes reproduction of binary conceptualisations. Yet, this approach has been challenged by several scholars such as Imoh et al. (2018), as well as by the latest global report published by the ILO emphasising that child labour is a global problem affecting all countries, including within the developed world (2017). Yet, similar discourse has also been observed in the ILO’s report on the IPEC-Turkey implementation, in terms of associating economic development with child labour. To avoid
repetition, the problematisation of this kind of analysis will be addressed in the next section, in which the implementations of the ILO are scrutinised.

Moreover, the interventions and activities on UNICEF are also in line with the NP. It was confirmed by the interviewed informants that almost 40 of the priorities identified within the NP are supported by UNICEF. In addition, it is clearly stated that according to UNICEF, whilst the NP is sufficient on paper, the implementations need still to be realised (Interviewee C. UNICEF, 3 January 2019).

The national action plan [NP] for the elimination of child labour [in Turkey] is a relatively strong framework. So, we are not saying that there needs to be a new framework or national policy. We want to see that policy implemented at the various levels. So, we are not in discussion with the government for a new policy framework for a new document, because the current document seems adequate. There is obviously one gap which is the regulation of the agricultural labour sector, this is one of the reasons that child labour persists within the sector. (Interviewee D. UNICEF, 3 January 2019)

Therefore, it is of no surprise that all the activities carried out by UNICEF on (migrant) child labour goes hand-in-hand with the NP in Turkey. As can be seen in Error! Reference source not found. of the Appendices, all of the identified activities are supportive of the national strategy in terms of the expansion of vocational education, capacity building for ministries and other actors in order to enhance the existing implementations. Yet, UNICEF TCO had adopted a multi-sectoral approach in responding to the issue of child labour in Turkey by having complementing programmes in child protection, social policy, and also in the education sectors all at the same time.

Since it [child labour] is an intersecting area, on the one hand I am responsible for social policy, but in UNICEF Turkey, it is not only the social policy section which has programmes targeting child labour. Other sections working in the field such as education and child protection are also complementing the child labour programme. (Interviewee C. UNICEF, 3 January 2019)

In spite of the comprehensive approach, the various activities carried out within different sectors against child labour are mostly routed in supporting the access of migrant children to formalised education. There is no doubt that this approach is grounded from the UNCRC, C182 and C138, which repeatedly strongly emphasised the role of education. Similarly, UNICEF’s TCO has an extensive Education Programme with which several outputs are working towards the enhancement of educational services by focusing, for example, on safe, child-friendly learning spaces, supporting volunteer Syrian teachers with cash incentives, and through providing parents with school kits and conditional cash transfers by supporting the MoNE and the MoFLSP in expanding the national system for refugees (UNICEF, 2017b).
There are also interventions aimed at supporting the national education system through capacity building and programme development in order to increase the adaptation of Syrian children to the Turkish education system, and thereby addressing one of the pre-identified reasons of child labour that was indicated by several research studies (Harunogullari, 2016, Erdoğan and Uyan Semerci, 2018).

Another area UNICEF focuses on within education is technical and vocational education and also training (TVET), which is also in line with the NP of the MoFLSS. Both of the UNICEF informant interviewees stated the importance of UNICEF’s collaboration on TVET at different levels with the MoNE, as the service provider in education, as well as the referral body for apprenticeships and internships; and with the MoFLSS as the monitoring authority. It is argued that due to perceived dysfunctionality of the type of education provided, in terms of the potential financial return following the completion of regular compulsory education, accompanied by other financial difficulties, children tend to drop out from school and become engaged in child labour (Interviewee D. UNICEF, 3 January 2019). In other words, the strategy of promoting vocational and technical education relies upon the idea of providing alternative educational opportunities that respond to the needs of the labour market, while ensuring safe, healthy on-the-job training to children, which is believed to increase their access to the labour market following their graduation from school.

The other thing I think is the relevance of education, because there is also the demand factor both from parents and young people themselves. Is the education they are getting that is relevant, that is it going to bring economic progress to the family? So, there is some more… And then we are starting to engage, which is not something we have done before with TVET, because you know there is a need to the education system between secondary school to offer more kind of 21 century skills and relevant learning for young people so that they want to stay in school (Interviewee D. UNICEF, 3 January 2019).

When we look into our collaboration with the MoNE, since it is the coordination of teachers within Vocational and Technical Education who refer students to businesses/workplaces, we provide training that reaches out to approximately 800 teachers… At this point, in terms of enhancing the existing system, the integration of vocational and technical education into the formal education system that happened in 2016, has been a positive development. (Interviewee C. UNICEF, 3 January 2019)

In relation to the betterment of the vocational and technical education system, UNICEF is also working on awareness-raising activities as well as training for staff from both the MoFLSS and the MoNE, along with the employers of migrants. More specifically, in collaboration with the Confederation of Craftsmen and Tradesmen (TESK), which is an occupational institution for small- and medium-scale businesses, training is provided to
employers who provide apprenticeships and internships to the students of vocational and technical education institutions. This is one of the points for UNICEF where the problematisation of child labour in relation to vocational trainings is visible. According to one of the informants interviewed from UNICEF, there is a misconception about apprenticeships and child labour in Turkey. According to the new system, students receiving vocational and technical education are supposed to go to school for 5 days each week, and while they are passing from the 10th grade to the 11th grade, they attend compulsory apprenticeship programmes. However, as stated by the interviewee, the perception that employers have with regards to apprenticeships and students do not align with the rules and regulations in place. Therefore, students are often treated as workers, rather than apprentices, and subjected to unnecessarily harsh conditions. In order to overcome this situation and also to raise awareness as to the negative effects of child labour, legal penalties as well as the development of an internal control mechanism is required; and UNICEF is working on this with TESK.

There were some newspaper stories falsely claiming that “apprenticeships instigated the child labour”, which was incorrect. In fact, the situation was not quite like that. However, the rationale behind such arguments held some truth. The children working in the businesses/workshops are treated beyond the limits given in the apprenticeship regulations, and these children are employed whilst being deprived of their rights granted by the state via the vocational education regulations, so from that point of view they are child workers. (Interviewee C. UNICEF, 3 January 2019)

Since this is an area where apprenticeships exist, the one aspect that will help the apprenticeship system to improve within the workshop, would be to change the perception, and correctly explain that the children are attending the workplace for apprenticeships or internships, but are actually students who are there to learn the job, but not to become child workers... So we [UNICEF] are also working on this. (Interviewee C. UNICEF, 3 January 2019)

Similar to the activities undertaken by TESK, UNICEF also works with TOBB in targeting larger businesses and supply chains. In addition, through child-friendly city programmes there are collaborations with more than 100 municipalities with a specific focus on children working on the streets and supports them by investing in capacity-building activities (UNICEF, 2017b, p. 28).

Another area in which UNICEF works to tackle child labour is evidence-based policy development. For this component, the agency works closely with local NGOs such as Kalkınma Atölyesi, which has extensive field experience in the sphere of child labour research. The main idea behind these collaborations, which were expressed by one of the interviewees, is to understand the driving factors and dynamics behind child labour, especially within the seasonal
agricultural sector, and then be able to propose solutions addressing such factors. It is also the aim to mobilise NGOs, and to enhance their collaboration with the Turkish Government.

Aside from our partnership with the government, we have collaborations with NGOs in the field of seasonal agriculture as one of the WFCL. Now we are trying to combine those two. One of them [NGOs] is Kalkınma Atölyesi… We are gathering evidence together to support evidence-based policy development across all areas [of child labour], but specifically for the seasonal agricultural sector… We are trying to understand the structural reasons that lead to the need for child labour in seasonal agriculture… and we are also trying to understand actors like the middlemen in agriculture and their roles… (Interviewee C. UNICEF, 3 January 2019)

Overall, by having a multi-sectoral approach, UNICEF is able to problematise child labour from various aspects, including social and child protection, education, enhancing existing structures, and increasing coordination between the actors. From this perspective, it could be said that UNICEF has managed to problematise the main determinants of child labour, and to come up with responsive interventions through collaborations with various ministries. However, their activities have also been limited to the enhancement of existing mechanisms. Furthermore, as also seen in the NP, direct referrals to vocational education targeting working children, and together with investments for the enhancement of the vocational education system, provides an insight as to ‘what is identified as the best interests of working children’. By looking into the activities carried out by UNICEF, the problem of migrant child labour is represented as the result of insufficient and inadequate educational services, a lack of implementation of policies and a lack of coordination between different institutions responsible for the monitoring and execution of laws and regulations, a lack of awareness with the employers themselves, and finally, a lack of financial resources available for the families of working children, especially for migrants.

What is left as Unproblematic by UNICEF?

Even though UNICEF has a comprehensive approach to child labour and its reasons, there are still some areas left unproblematic. To begin with, although UNICEF’s main emphasis on child labour is constructed around the right of access to quality education, it is understood that alternative education systems are also within the agenda of UNICEF, which can be seen as an improvement considering the criticisms levelled by some scholars like Imoh et al. (2018). Yet, it is hard to say that the shift towards the advocacy of enabling educational services (TVET) are being adopted due to the acknowledgement of different childhoods, or because it is a quick and functional solution to reducing the number of migrant child workers, which is also endorsed by the government.
Yet, the quality of the education given by TVET is not questioned. Evaluating the quality of education given in this area is not within the scope of this thesis, and is also not an area of expertise of the researcher. However, pointing out unquestioned areas is also one of the goals of this thesis. Although there have been several reports that have questioned the quality of education provided by vocational and technical education institutions, and accompanied by several reports on how children within the apprenticeship programmes are being exploited, supporting the policies that envision the directing of migrant working children and/or migrant children at risk of engaging in child labour to vocational and technical education is problematic. Furthermore, it is an education system that does not have a positive social recognition, which was also brought up by one of the UNICEF’s informants: ‘The perception of vocational and technical education in Turkey has always been negative, as it is globally in general’ (Interviewee C. UNICEF, 3 January 2019). This is a reminder of Anderson’s 3D jobs example (2015), as also in the labour market, migrants often end up with the jobs and education services least desired by the native population. Supporting this perspective, it was also conveyed by one of the UNICEF informants that employers were experiencing difficulties in finding apprentices amongst Turkish children, although it is not clear whether or not they were referring to child workers or apprentices within the education system. Yet, this indicates an area that is less preferred and not adequately filled by established residents.

There is a fine line between the apprentice and the child worker. Employers may say that they were unable to find children to work with them in order to teach them the job, and thereby raise and train them. There are quite a number of employers who say that they could not find apprentices either… After the Syrian Crisis… when we go into the field, the employers are sharing the same thing; saying that they were unable to find Turkish children to employ… “Turkish children are not coming to us, so now we find Syrians” – referring to both adult and child labour. They are responding to the needs of the semi-skilled labour force (ara eleman) for the small-medium scale businesses. (Interviewee C. UNICEF, 3 January 2019)

The functionality of vocational education in Turkey, and its relation to the labour market in terms of whether it really provides better access to the labour market, has not been questioned that much. Statistics on the unemployment rates of vocational high school graduates indicates that attainment from this type of education is not helping individuals to find jobs (TurkStat, 2019a). Although, one of the intervention areas is dedicated to the improvement of the technical education system, the current reports indicate that apprentices are subjected to exploitation and precarisation. Therefore, presenting vocational education as a solution to child labour stands as a problem in itself. The structural problem of vocational education in Turkey and its reflections
on children has been brought up in one of the reports published by the Progressive Trade Union, i.e., DISK as follows:

For example, apprentice workers are granted social security that covers only health and safety within the workplace, but the regulations in relation to wage and other social rights are insufficient… The implementation of apprenticeships that take place mostly within the private small-scale businesses, rather than within public institutions, exposes children to irregular and unsecured working conditions… This structure, the erosion within the apprenticeship culture, actually paves the way for child workers to become part of the irregular and unsecured working environment, and can lead to the further exploitation of child labour within the new capitalist mode of production. (DISK and Genel-İş Sendikası, 2017, p. 5)

Yet, another unproblematised aspect in relation to this strategy is its potential future effect. Would directing certain groups into certain types of education that could provide jobs only within certain sectors and segments of the labour market cause further marginalisation of these groups within the labour market and in society at large? At this point, the discussion once again moves to social justice and equal opportunities. Therefore, before identifying the referrals along with coming to a conclusion on the choices of the child and/or their families on their preferences, either in following a path that goes through the ‘regular’ education system, or focusing upon vocational and technical education, the circumstances that may lead them to such a decision should first be examined. In other words, without responding to the circumstances that forces migrants to make less than desirable choices, it is hardly possible to talk about social justice or equal opportunities. The question raised at this juncture is, **Should the decisions taken under a lack of opportunity be termed as a choice or a demand?** This is the same question directed towards child labour, and has led IOs to handle the child labour issue together with its determinants. **If the decision of engaging in child labour is not seen as a welcome choice, but as a necessity that emerges as a mere consequence of reasons such as poverty, adult unemployment, lack of access to services, or by simply being a migrant etc., then how is choosing to go into vocational or technical education for the same reason seen as a demand to be acknowledged?**

Although, there is a lack of emphasis on other aspects like national social protection schemes targeting migrants, or challenges seen in the labour market integration within interventions, they were actually quite well-defined during the interviews.

So, it [child labour] has to be grasped in an integrated way, particularly regarding fields such as in factories where there are a mixture of both Syrians and Turkish. It’s not our area of expertise in terms
of the labour market to be able to conclude if Syrian labour is displacing Turkish labour. This is just what we hear anecdotally. (Interviewee D. UNICEF, 3 January 2019)

Then we have issue of safety nets for refugee families and the support they will get right now with ESSN. How long would that last? Will there be a way to integrate Syrians at least the most vulnerable families into national social protection? Longer term this is a really hot debate right now because EU is saying ESSN is not go on forever. The Turkish system needs to take it up. And this is the issue, will refugees at least some 75% of them 50% of them who do not go back become a new kind of permanent underclass in Turkey or will we avoid that in investing in their access to services and social protection for them? Otherwise you might see… 10-15-20 years from now, you might see the numbers in Turkey go back you know the child labour numbers we had before, because of this new group. (Interviewee D. UNICEF, 3 January 2019)

Yet, it should be noted that these two areas, the labour market and social assistance (ESSN), in terms of their sustainability as well as social security that would provide certain coverage for social protection, are not UNICEF’s areas of expertise. UNICEF’s social protection interventions play a more complementary role like supporting the ESSN programme with CCT. Nevertheless, one question comes to minds, which is, ‘While having these problems identified, why does UNICEF not problematise the NP which fails to address these questions?’ From this point forward, taking a closer look at the ILO’s interventions may shed light on the pertinent gaps.

**ILO’s Position on Migrant Child Labour in Turkey**

At the global level, the ILO’s approach as well as conceptual and legal frameworks of child labour has been discussed in previous chapters. Hence, in order to refocus on its reflection in Turkey, it is better to start with a short overview on the review of IPEC and how the problem was defined and portrayed within the document by providing examples of intervention areas and specific programme activities carried out through the project.

With the help of IPEC, the ILO became a crucial actor and source of reference based on its financial and technical capacity. IPEC, supported the government together with its ministries in the identification and definition of specific roles and responsibilities shared amongst various counterparts as well as in the planning, implementation, and coordination required in the fight against child labour. By signing a Memorandum of Understanding with the Turkish Government, IPEC was implemented along with the biannual country programmes as a multi-sectoral strategy (ILO, 2008). As previously explained, the definition of child labour and the worst forms of child labour (WFCL) were based on UNCRC, C182, as well as C138. Moreover, elimination of child labour also constitutes one of the important facets of the ILO’s Decent
Work Agenda. Therefore, in approaching child labour the IOM aimed to adopt a multi-faceted perspective as well as a complementary approach in dealing with the problem issue of child labour. After the finalisation of IPEC, the ILO continued supporting the Turkish Government and its line ministries with ad hoc projects targeting mainly children engaged in seasonal agricultural work, which was identified as one of the WFCL. The ILO’s current project focuses on children working in the hazelnut harvesting operations in the north of Turkey.

Accordingly, the ILO’s intervention areas and projects targeting child labour have also been steered by the NP, with the purpose of supporting the government on shared goals. This is explained by the ILO’s informant as:

In fact, the Ministry of Labour is our natural partner, which means we develop cooperation with them in all the areas we work in. Currently, the Ministry of Labour and the Directorate General of Labour are our partners in a project on the elimination of child labour in seasonal hazelnut harvesting we are conducting… The strategy [of the ILO] mainly relies upon a multilateral approach together with coordination amongst institutions, the enhancement of legislation, the strengthening of databases and policymaking, and an advocacy on awareness. Besides, once the TBPPF was developed… it also constructed the framework of the action plans, which identified the roles and responsibilities of relative institutions under different titles of legislative improvements, various measures in education, health and poverty and so on. (Interviewee B. ILO, 2019, March 21)

**What is the problem of migrant child labour represented to be by ILO in Turkey**

This section focuses on both the interviews conducted with representatives from the ILO’s Turkey Office and also on a report prepared by the ILO that was published in 2008 entitled, ‘Ending child labour: A comprehensive review of Turkish Experience’. The report outlined the ILO’s approach to child labour in both a global and Turkish context, as well as presenting the interventions and support areas together with their respective outcomes. It is important to look at how the ILO problematised child labour during IPEC, since the interventions carried out through IPEC together with governmental efforts are currently referred to as being good practices, which can therefore be mirrored in today’s fight against increasing rates of child labour in Turkey (Republic of Turkey Ministry of Labour and Social Security, 2018).

Starting from IPEC, the ILO’s programme on child labour has focused on certain areas such as advocacy and policymaking, technical assistance and capacity building, referrals to education, awareness raising, and income generation (ILO, 2008). In parallel, the ILO’s approach embarked on its latest project shows a similarity with the one adopted during IPEC, which is relying on multi-sectoral cooperation and intervention. When the intervention strategy
of the latest project was raised during the interview held with the informant from the ILO, the pre-identified elements regarding child labour were stated as follows:

Education is a really essential tool for eliminating child labour, for both preventing children entering the labour market as well as keeping them in school once they have withdrawn from work… However, apart from that, the families’ access to a livelihood, regular and secure wages are just as important. We always say that it [child labour] should be approached by including the families… A multidimensional approach is critical. Education, developing anti-poverty policies as well as strengthened access to services are all permeable subjects… In order to achieve that, institutional capacity building is important to manage multilateral cooperation and coordination. (Interviewee B. ILO, 2019, March 21)

The scope of the rectifications placed within the legal frameworks and the policies are mostly restricted to the education sector, if not to regulate the terms and conditions of the type of works permitted for children to be employed within the scope of vocational training. This perspective suggests that the gap within the policies in approaching child labour is mainly reckoned to be filled by education policies. The activities put through targeting working children signify that education is seen as a replacement for work. It also unveils how the gaps are identified and located around the inaccessibility of educational services. Therefore, creating alternative education services outside of formal education is presented as a response to this acknowledged disparity. The aforementioned activities such as the provision of vocational training as well as further non-formal education to children engaged with the worst forms of child labour and hazardous work is also in line with the directives of C138 and C182, through which the aim is integration within safer work environments. This is actually an example for normative facets of the global governance, as suggested by Clarke and Edwards (2004). Since global actors give strong emphasis to education as the main tool for combating child labour, education is also adopted as the main strategic move in Turkey as well, which from time to time has disoriented the root causes of child labour within the context of Turkey.

The same perspective on education and how the recent regulations on education have affected child labour were also mentioned during the interview. One critical point noted was the emphasis given to the necessity of having consistency and conformity between and within laws and policies. Additionally, it turned out that aside from the inadequacy of the regulations, the challenge was positioned around the implementation of existing structures.

Actually, the legal basis was formed following the ratification of conventions 138 and 182… but you know the recent regulation of 4+4+4 [new regulation on compulsory education]. The harmonisation of all these things [regulations and laws] needs to be revisited, and for this there is a cohesive process. These kinds of practices are very important… in order to enhance the current legislation… at this point
Indeed, there are vibrant discussions around the outcomes of the most recent regulation (Law No. 6287) on compulsory education enacted in 2012, which increased the compulsory education from 8 to 12 years. Despite the increase in the number of years, the outcomes were not as desired by some due to several problematic areas such as 12 years within a structure divided into three levels. In other words, having separate institutions dedicated for each level of education, where the first 4 years constitute the primary education, the second 4 years lower-secondary education, and last 4 years secondary/high school education, created the risk of interruption rather than continuity. Amongst many criticisms, one highly disparaged aspect of this reform was the flexibility it affords for distance education for age groups that are supposed to be attending compulsory formal education. Several reports have been published by institutions such as Eğitim-Sen (Trade Union of Education and Science Labourers), and Eğitim Reformu Girişimi (ERG/Education Reform Initiative), within which recent statistics and situational analysis on the current (reformed) education system were presented. Eğitim-Sen argued that the 4+4+4 arrangement has caused a decline in enrolment rates, especially for girls, while they have a higher trend in enrolment to distance education. Another claim put forward by Eğitim-Sen was that higher dropout rates due to the scattered system have led to an increase in child labour (2018).

Another aspect to be considered is the latest Circular (No: 2016/5) issued by the MoNE on 21 March, 2016, which specifically regulates access to educational services for children of seasonal agricultural workers, as well as nomadic and semi-nomadic families. The regulation clearly identifies intervention in areas like mobilising the necessary financial and human resources to accommodate formal and non-formal education services for school-aged children, as well as providing alternative education modalities such as the facilitation of boarding schools and transported education. Yet, following the establishment of the 4+4+4 reform, the number of boarding schools reduced dramatically due to the Ministry’s policy on closing many of these schools, which were also praised by ILO’s report for their role in decreasing child labour during the life-span of IPEC (ILO, 2008, p. 29).

Therefore, it is clear that the viability of the directives given in the legislation for the children of seasonal agricultural workers are questionable due to conflicting policies. With the supporting reports, the semi-neutral response of the informant became clearer and hints were given on further incompatibilities within the policies. Hence, although the increasing access to education was set out as the main strategy in combating child labour, the reports provide
relevant claims that challenge the potential success of the changes introduced within the education sector.

Another, area of interest is the common activity of capacity building that has been mentioned several times in the discussions of the NP, IOM, and UNICEF’s targeting to enhance the implementation and execution of policies. One example for this is the efforts shown within the informal sector. For the elimination of child labour within the informal sector, the main approach was reliant upon close collaboration of workers’ and employers’ organisations, the MoNE, and local authorities supported by capacity-building activities at the local, provincial, and national levels, including the Labour Inspection Board of the MoLSS (ILO, 2008). Similarly, the most recent project that the ILO conducted on WFCL included a component on capacity building in order to enhance the implementation of existing rules and regulations, as well as to improve coordination between different institutions for the management of identification, withdrawal, and referral processes.

… the most important results we got from our field work […], shows that especially institutional capacity building together with the improvement in coordination is required... This [lack of coordination] became prominent both at local and national levels… Therefore, managing the coordination between these institutions constitutes one of the most significant aspects while we are working […]. In fact, support is needed in all areas, including education, healthcare, and social protection, while working an integrated approach which comprehends the child together with their family, and social environment, as well as targeting the employers. (Interviewee B. ILO, 2019, March 21)

According to the ILO, the lack of coordination between different institutions and lack of implementation of existing rules and regulations are another aspect of persistence of child labour. Actually, this point was also raised both by the IOM and UNICEF, as previously discussed.

The ILO interventions directed to unemployment were no different than planned by the NP and the IOM. One activity was related to ‘income generation’ that included skills training through which the employability of adults within families was expected to increase. The second activity area was developed around sensitisation and awareness raising regarding child labour and the importance of education. Through these informative pursuits, international and national ‘norms’, as well as legal sanctions on the right to an education and the negative effects of child labour, were intended to be spread and consequently induce a level of behavioural change (ILO, 2008, pp. 33-34).
The current interventions of the ILO also include similar measures like information dissemination and awareness-raising activities on the importance of education for both parents and employers in the seasonal agricultural sector, including targeting so-called middlemen and field owners with regards to child labour and the importance of education. When the ILO’s global approach is considered, and especially its emphasis on enhancing social security schemes and objectives on improving working conditions for parents as a complementary component in tackling the child labour problem, and how this approach has been integrated to the ILO’s Turkey Office’s response to child labour, it is clear that they simply were not involved. The reason was explained through the Ministry’s priorities as well as attitude towards seasonal agricultural work, which is also integrated into the NP.

We have sensitisation activities for the elimination of child labour… we reach out to families and we are working for sensitisation and to raise awareness on the issue amongst families. But we do not work on income generation directly and we do not provide any referral on that… It [social security schemes/improving working conditions] is covered within the National Programme in terms of supporting families with vocational training. So, it is seen from that perspective… Within the scope of our project, the families already have a working system and… we do not have any specific activity targeting them. Within this cycle, we are aiming to eliminate child labour, and to prevent them from entering into child labour and/or helping them to withdraw from it. (Interviewee B. ILO, 2019, March 21)

This answer actually explains a couple of things. On the one hand, it alludes to problem identification, and what is missing in approaching the root causes of child labour, while on the other hand, how the ILO as an IO pursues its global agendas differently due to the relative positioning in different country contexts.

**What is Left Unproblematic?**

It is understood that similar to the ILO’s global discourse against child labour, the focus was also placed on education in the case of Turkey. Specifically, education was presented as a replacement for work, including the provision of support mechanisms to uphold school attendance as well as enhancing information gathering and dissemination across the relevant partners both at the local and national level, which was endorsed with awareness-raising activities targeting families as well as employers. The government’s will and actions towards broadening social protection schemes and providing income-generating opportunities to the families of working children were also highlighted as a response to hardship due to poverty and unemployment. Yet, the extent, coverage, and eligibility of the ‘social protection provisions’, in addition to their effectiveness against child labour were unspecified. Therefore, whether or
not the aforementioned social assistance programmes were targeting or at least matching with the same households where child labour was seen is unclear. Moreover, although adult unemployment was identified as one of the contributing factors of child labour, no emphasis was given to this problem within the strategies of the ILO.

The major unproblematised area is migrant child labour. Unfortunately, currently the ILO has no agenda on approaching the issue of migrant child labour with any specific focus. Therefore, there has been no problematisation conducted on this subject.

We do not have any specific project in relation to child labour following the Syrian crisis… but our approach is to target both Syrians and host communities… it is the same approach we adopt in other projects like increasing the employability of Syrians, so we are targeting both groups. (Interviewee B. ILO, 2019, March 21)

A second interview was conducted with another employee of the ILO, who was specifically working on the labour market in order to understand the interventions directed towards the labour market integration of migrants in Turkey.

**What is the problem of Syrians’ integration in labour market in Turkey represented to be by ILO?**

The interventions carried out by the ILO for increasing access to the Turkish labour market for Syrian migrants were explained as four main pillars:

- Providing technical assistance to government agencies;
- Awareness raising for employers;
- One-on-one consultancy given to migrants, including obtaining work permits and increasing their employability;
- Providing financial support to employers.

...multiple mediums like providing technical assistance as well as raising the awareness of employers, together with one-on-one consultancy [to Syrians] to monitor the processes, and providing financial support to employers; we are trying to promote formal employment for Syrians. (Interviewee A. ILO, 2019, January 18)

Actually, we work through three or four intervention tools that are related to work life. One of these is on vocational knowledge and skills in order to increase their employability. (Interviewee A. ILO, 2019, January 18)

The activities presented each resemble the activities carried out by the IOM. Actually, it is understood that the activities and projects implemented by the IOM and the ILO are almost the same. In addition, none of the informants mentioned collaboration with other agencies in
pursuing a complementary programme. Therefore, in order to avoid repetition in problematising the same approaches that are also adopted by the ILO, this study will aim to show how the activities of the ILO and the IOM overlap with each other.

One of the activities that is similar to the IOM’s is the provision of technical assistance to the MoLSS/MoFLSS for capacity building, which targets the inspection board staff.

The ILO also has measures on capacity building for labour inspection. When we look at the enforcement component, training is given to labour inspection staff, including auditors. Somehow this is considered an attempt at capacity building. (Interviewee A. ILO, 2019, January 18)

Another duplication of activity is also seen in the project funded by the German Development Bank (KFK), which aims to encourage employers to have formal businesses with registered employees by providing financial subsidies to employers.

The employer considers the labour cost. We think that decreasing that cost will encourage employers to adopt formal employment/registered labour. This is also in line with the government’s strategy since they are also giving incentives for formal employment. Therefore, provided that formal employment is registered to the Social Security Institution (SGK) [within a workplace], some percentage of the social security premium is planned to be subsidised by the project. (Interviewee A. ILO, 2019, January 18)

It is clear that the problems regarding Syrian migrants’ integration into the Turkish labour market are observed by both the IOM and the ILO. Both agencies are trying to respond to the structural problems of the labour market with ad hoc interventions. However, both are unsustainable and therefore cannot provide a permanent solution to the issue. Besides, the repeated discourse of increasing employability by promoting entrepreneurship programmes and skills development via vocational training are also reflections of neoliberal ALMP. Furthermore, it stands as an example of the combination of normative and technical facets of global governance in relation to the governance of the global labour market. In relation to normative and technical governance, this discussion becomes even more relevant. In a recent study on the effectiveness of vocational training as a means of ALMPs in Turkey, it was discussed that even though these neoliberal policies were also promoted by the OECD and the EU, and could be functional in countries like Sweden due to their low-level unemployment, they may not have such a positive effect in a country like Turkey due to the inherent structural problems of the labour market (Osman Kürşat and Ecehan, 2017). Therefore, the research suggests that ALMPs should not be considered as the only tool to be adopted in approaching the unemployment problem of Turkey. This approach was also supported by the ILO’s informant as follows:
Therefore, while designing ALMP more detailed analyses are needed, and this is also what the EU states. [...] Active Programmes should be implemented by considering indicators like gender, age, and education level. Otherwise, any approach that calls someone for vocational training on turnery, and expects them to find a job by themselves may be disappointed, not only in the case of Syrians but as a general outcome. Or the employment incentives and [premium] subsidies; how effective are they? Or any created substitution effect; to what extent are they sustainable? These are being discussed at the macro level. So, when we consider Turkey, already the existing labour market was problematic, and then we consider Syria and there were distinct problems there as well. Therefore, once we directly implemented the existing ALMPs we had in our minds for targeting Syrians, from the beginning it was not hard to see that it would be difficult to bring about a positive outcome. This was realistic though; because already ALMPs are not useful in most cases, as they have really limited impact if not well-designed. (Interviewee A. ILO, 2019, January 18)

Moving on from this point, it is understood that although the technical staff working at these IOs such as the IOM or the ILO would have been aware of the structural problems, either their technical expertise was not taken into consideration in deciding the intervention models, or there were other mechanisms pushing them to promote ALMPs as a medium for migrant integration into the Turkish labour market. This also recalls the normative and technical governance (Clarke and Edwards, 2004) that overlooked the particularities of the local problems; and in the case of Turkey, neglected the pre-existing structural problems of the Turkish labour market as well as the migration policies. Thus, there were failures to problematise the root causes of migrant poverty, unemployment, and as a result, migrant child labour.

One of the problems identified by the ILO was the Turkish Government’s incapacity to collect data during the implementation of IPEC, so that collaborations and technical assistance were unable to be provided with a developing database on child labour. However, as previously discussed several times throughout this study, today there is still an issue with a lack of data. Hence, one question becomes apparent with regards to the reason for not having disaggregated data on child labour. Is it about not having the capacity or the tools to sustain the previously developed database, or is it about not having the political will to accomplish the goal?

SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING DISCUSSION

As mentioned in the previous sections, while discussing UNICEF’s contextualisation of child labour around developmental discourses, it is understood that the ILO also uses the same approach. More specifically, the part where child labour and WFCL was explained as a global problem was mostly discussed as a social problem that was seen in ‘transition economies’ and
economically poor countries. Comparisons and statistics were shared with regards to Latin America, the Caribbean, Africa, and the transition economies of Europe and Central Asia. Furthermore, the section concluded with a positive correlation between economic growth together with poverty reduction and the decline in child labour:

Child labour estimates cited in the 2006 Global Report suggest that the number of children engaged in hazardous work has increased in Africa, while a decline is recorded in the number of children working in the transition economies of Europe and Central Asia. These estimates indicate clearly that economic growth and poverty reduction linked with political commitment are essential to achieving significant progress in combating child labour. (ILO, 2008)

Although, statistically speaking, child labour and its worst forms could be seen, depending on how they are defined, more in semi-peripheries and peripheries, the most recent reports of the ILO admitted that child labour is not a problem limited to the ‘third world’ or only to ‘poor countries’, but rather it represents a global challenge that is also highly observable in what this study terms as the global North. Therefore, dichotomies like rich-poor and/or developed-undeveloped may not be pertinent to exemplify the relevant indicators. This argument was also supported by Myers et al. (1998) long before the ILO’s review on WFCL in Turkey, as the following except shows:

In countries such as Britain and the United States a significant proportion of children continue to work unprotected, often illegally, and sometimes in activities which present a serious threat to their health and well-being. The rich countries are nevertheless those who have most insisted that these same approaches be applied in developing countries (Myers et al., 1998, p. 6).

A similar approach is also seen where WFCL and its presence in Turkey is being discussed. Even though it is stated that there were various reasons attributable to the existence of child labour, those determinants were not specified. The only concrete statement given in describing the Turkish context in relation to the ‘nature’ of child labour referred to Turkey’s economic transition from an agricultural to an industrialised free market economic model.

Turkey is undergoing a transition from an agricultural-based to an industrialized free market economy. The phenomenon of child labour is caused by many related and interlinked factors and needs to be addressed from many different aspects. (ILO, 2008)

Then again, the aspects taken into consideration like the developmental status of Turkey, while discussing the characteristics of the Turkish case of child labour, gives indications of how the ILO problematises child labour and its reasons given throughout the document. There were a couple of aspects highlighted by the ILO as contributing positive
factors in decreasing child labour during the lifetime of IPEC. One emphasis was placed on Turkey’s economic growth and its rank being amongst the world’s 20 largest economies, and also its gross domestic production (GDP) per capita reaching US$ 5,482 in 2006 together with having 1% extreme poverty rate (ILO, 2008). Unfortunately, in the absence of the source of information used, it was not possible to re-evaluate the statement or perform a crosscheck. Yet, assuming this was an honest mistake, still, the analyses was lacking in further indicators like the GINI Coefficient, and Turkey’s poverty gap and unemployment rates, by which the poverty trend, as one of the leading reasons for child labour, could be understood in a better way. According to the GINI Index of the World Bank, Turkey had a value of 39.0 in 2008. Supporting this, according to TurkStat, the poverty rate and the poverty gap, where the risk of poverty stands for the 40% equivalised household disposable median income, were given as 10.1% and 23.7%, respectively, while the non-agricultural unemployment rate was given as 11.1% in 2008 (2019b). Similarly, another study that focused on poverty trends between 2003-2011 in Turkey also suggested that even though the economic growth experienced in the first decade of the 21st century contributed to a decrease in absolute poverty, it did not necessarily decrease the aggregate poverty for all subgroups due to a reduction in poverty based on an increase in the GDP rather than redistributive policies (Demir Şeker and Jenkins, 2015). In a similar manner, a reference is made to Aran et al. (2010) within the same study:

…they also found that poverty rates did not decline for everyone. For example, poverty rates were higher in 2006 than 2003 for individuals in large agricultural households, with a low level of education, and children. (Demir Şeker and Jenkins 2015, p. 4)

These additional indicators may also point to the increase of child labour in the trade sector, from 31,000 in 1999 to 65,000 in 2006, which was mentioned as one of the negative developments by the ILO, as well as the current increases seen today (ILO, 2008). Moreover, with agricultural work considered as one of the WFCL, it suggests the reoccurrence of coping mechanisms corresponding to the poverty levels for highly vulnerable groups such as ‘agricultural households with children and low-levels of education’.

Actually, what is ignored by all the IOs as well as the MoFLSS, as the main responsible body in addressing the child labour issue in general and migrant-child labour in particular, is Turkey’s challenge with high rates of poverty and interconnected high rates of unemployment. Yet, Turkey is also mentioned as being a high-middle income country, based on its economic growth and GDP. Therefore, the high rates of poverty can only be explained through the unequal distribution of wealth within the country. This is also supported by the GINI
coefficient, as previously mentioned. Moreover, none of the actors reflected any intervention that addressed the working poor. It is generally assumed that poverty is only as a cause of unemployment, and that those who rely upon child labour are mostly unemployed, which in fact has been shown not to be accurate at all, when child labour in the seasonal agricultural sector is taken into consideration. Families may be working, but they may still be financially poor. It is argued that neoliberal policies have also been the instigator behind increased poverty amongst people working in the lower segments of the labour market, which has been fuelled and led by precarity (Erdoğdu and Kutlu, 2014, Bauder, 2005). Moreover, being a migrant in these circumstances only worsens the situation, as well as the level of precarisation with a lack of access to already limited social protection schemes and resources. In the absence of particular measures targeting migrant child labour and sustainable poverty alleviation policies covering all disadvantageous groups, plus insecure, low-paid employment within the lower sector of the labour market are recognised causes of hyper-precarisation (Schierup and Jørgensen, 2016, Lewis et al., 2015). It is important to have a comprehensive welfare regime while designing social protection schemes, since several research studies have indicated that the most disadvantaged groups that are deprived of their social rights, as Marshall and Balibar (1992, 2015) put it, are replacing the relatively more fortunate poor at the lowest segments of the labour market, which is referred to as rivalry of the poor (Dedeoğlu, 2018). In other words, if any groups are excluded from gaining access to the available social services and thereby realising their social rights, then these groups will constitute a new ‘vulnerable and valuable’ group under the neoliberal labour market (Bauder, 2005).

The other parameter that is not ignored yet inadequately addressed is the dual structure of the labour market in Turkey. The presence of a large informal labour market is one of the most prevalent causes of precarisation, since it is run through the deregulation of labour rights and the reregulation of neoliberal policies, which is highly affected by global labour markets (Wise, 2015). Perpetual presence of child labour in general and migrant child labour in particular is deemed unavoidable in the midst of such environment. Several research studies, which have been mentioned previously in this thesis, as well as the informants interviewed from the IOs, repeatedly stated the demand observed for migrant labour, and migrant-child labour in the worst cases due to the associated low cost to employers. In her article, Toksöz describes this situation as though ‘Official migration policies ignore these enterprises’ [small-sized enterprises that depend upon the informal employment of immigrants] and their need for low-cost, low-skilled workers due to a lack of supply from the native-worker pool for the jobs they have to offer (Toksöz, 2018, p. 782).
All of the aforementioned reasons identified for child labour are relevant. Therefore, all of the strategies adopted by the IOs and the Turkish Government are relevant to a certain extent; although are insufficient to resolve the core issues that lay behind the problem. Yet, none of them have truly questioned, why there is a demand for cheap, insecure, unprotected labour? or what is it that makes it possible to have “a demand” for cheap, insecure, unprotected labour? Furthermore, they also fail to see and acknowledge, why there is still space for precarisation in spite of the global agendas on social justice, sustainable development, and rights for all?

These questions are directly linked to formalisation and the structures of the global labour market. However, although there are global agendas on this very topic. None of the actors presented a constructive strategy in response to this problem. In terms of its mandate, it would not be expected that UNICEF would have an intervention on the issue. Yet, although the ILO has a global agenda on Decent Work for all, it has also failed to address this structural problem in Turkey both for the established population and also for migrants. One of the reasons for the ILO’s lack of strategies on informal labour market in Turkey is explained by its ‘not having’ a country programme on Decent Work Agenda in Turkey, according to one of the informants interviewed from the ILO (Interviewee A. ILO, 2019, January 18).

Up until now, governments and representatives of the Ministry did not show any will towards this topic [Decent Work Agenda], therefore we do not have a decent work programme; and this is a highly critical issue. We [the ILO], as with all UN agencies, have a primary role to support public [government] policies. I am not sure whether there are any UN agencies which stand against it. I suppose there are none [laughs]. Hence, we therefore support those programmes […] (Interviewee A. ILO, 2019, January 18).

Following this answer, the third parameter, which is global governance presents itself again. Nevertheless, it is not really possible to understand formalisation, global labour markets, and multilateral governance separately since they are highly interconnected. However, the point here is what is aimed to be achieved through global governance? If the ultimate aim is to achieve social justice by advocating rights for all, fairness, and sustainable development through the conventions, agreements and programmes induced by multilevel governance, then how is it made sure that it is achievable for all (countries) given the asymmetric hierarchy within the structure of global governance? In other words, on the one hand Turkey as a semi-periphery, is pushed to provide ‘cheap labour’ by the transnational companies/multi-national companies (TNC/MNCs) through various means of neoliberal modes of production and division of labour, like fragmented production process and subcontracting, while on the other it is trying to keep
small businesses up and running and to ensure that they maintain their competitive place in the national if not global market. Within all this, it is also expected from another line of multilevel governance to implement a decent work agenda and to ensure labour rights for all. This situation is a mere reflection of the conflict of interests between the different actors and as a result of asymmetric governance (Likić-Brborić and Schierup, 2012). As discussed by various scholars, the discourse of ‘fair globalisation’ is already shaped around ‘fair trade’ and incorporated into migration governance to facilitate the needs of the global labour market (Likić-Brborić and Schierup, 2012, p. 25). Within this governmentality, the space needed for rights-based approaches are reduced to soft policies. Moreover, international conventions and agreements as tools of so-called ‘hard policies’ are left unenforceable for institutions. In addition, in spite of the limited space for action, ‘the government’ is also facilitating neoliberal globalisation by re-enacting regulations, not having concrete or strong positions against the reasons of informality, shrinking social services, shifting to workfare and creating an alternative reserve army of labour by depriving migrants of their rights. That is not to claim that there is no space for the nation state to decide and act with a different approach, on the contrary, it is to support the view that the nation state is also one of the main actors that incorporates this economic development-oriented migration regime together with the discourses of neoliberal economy to maintain political power (Wallerstein, 2004). Similarly, it is of no surprise that the Turkish Government agreed to an EU deal in 2015, and repositioned Turkey as the border control instrument of the EU, for which it was granted three billion Euros for the integration of Syrian migrants in Turkey. However, the Turkish Government has not enforced the UN Convention on Migrants Rights for Syrians, even though Turkey ratified the convention in 2004. This was justified in simple terms by giving Syrians the status of UTP, and thereby considered as guests. Therefore, Syrians UTP are considered neither migrants nor refugees, they are simply left in limbo. Yet, who would accuse Turkey not implementing an international convention that is in force, while most of the migrant receiving countries of the global North have not even ratified the same convention, yet?

At the point of the 9th year of the Syrian war, it was said by one of the interviewed informants of UNICEF that the funding allocated for Syrian migrants in Turkey was shrinking, and that no large sum was expected to be given to Turkey to subsidise state spending to target poverty or specifically for tackling child labour (Interviewee D. UNICEF, 3 January 2019). It

19 For further information, visit: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000143557
was also stated that it was now expected from the government of Turkey that they would take over all the established programmes like CCT and ESSN and/or have them scaled up to accommodate the increase in Syrian migrants. However, within the recent economic crisis that Turkey is facing and with all the existing problems of poverty and unemployment as previously discussed, it is disputable whether or not it would be possible for Turkey to absorb and resolve such socioeconomic problems without a change of economic policy towards a redistributive approach. Again, it is contradictory that the eradication of poverty and decent work for all are within the SDG, yet it does not seem quite relevant for the UN to advocate it for Turkey.

[...]

Moving on from the role of the UN in Turkey, as indicated by the interviewed informant from UNICEF, it was stated in the discussion that UN agencies have more of a role of providing technical support and guidance in how to design programmes and spend the existing national resources in the most effective way. However, it is also questionable as to how efficient the UN agencies are at utilising the funding already at their disposal. Are interventions such as enforcing non-sustainable business-friendly neoliberal ALMPs that have been proven to be insufficient to solve the Turkish labour market’s problems, and initiating programmes that fail to address the root causes of child labour, good examples of the efficient usage of existing resources? One of the informants interviewed from the ILO provided a level of self-criticism on this same issue, as follows:

I have two observations with regards to the UN. One is its apolitical stance and the second is also a structural problem which is about funding. Since there is no direct source of funding coming from the UN to Turkey, there is always this fundraising/finding situation. So, for which subject do you receive the funding? – for the Syrians – well then, let’s orient ourselves towards the Syrians, then consider what is the most practical way to utilise the funding? – Let’s provide vocational training, language courses; well, let’s arrange some internships and so on [...]. I do not know, really, some impact assessment should be
carried out. At the end of the day we need to see how this high volume of funding and this many vocational training actually changes the lives of these people, or not. I think this is very important and urgent [laughs]. (Interviewee A. ILO, 2019, January 18)

The informant was referring to the UN’s impotent presence in Turkey in advocating and pressuring for the implementation of the conventions, agreements and initiatives for which it is vocal globally, like DWA. Yet, it is also discussed that DWA also was not implemented by the EU; on the contrary, DWA was challenged by austerity measures due to financial crises (Likić-Brborić and Schierup, 2012). On this point, the topic again comes back to multilateral governance and the hierarchies within global governance. One point is about how much space is left for nation state sovereignty within the global governance, and is this space on the same scale for each respective nation state? Another point is with regards to the financial resources of the UN Agencies, i.e., the source of funding. The main countries20 and institutions who provide funding for the Syrian crisis in Turkey can be listed as Germany, the UK, the USA, the EU, and ECHO (European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations), which all have their own restrictive migration policies. The dynamics of the donor and the corresponding interventions were brought up twice during the current study. On both occasions it was explained how earmarked funding was directly contributing to defining the extent of the interventions planned by the IOs. Besides, the normative migration management regime was also promoted through donors, which are clearly those states with the strongest economies.

Ultimately, the promotion of normative and institutional governance models is not only limited to labour market integration. It has been repeatedly shown throughout the current study, the strategies and interventions conducted in the fight against migrant child labour remained as the by-product of this normative approach, which in turn failed to address the root causes of the child labour. This normative approach that built up its strategy on increasing access to education in combating against child labour, was also criticised by scholars from the global South. The approach claims that the policies, which criminalise child labour in the name of ‘fair trade’, place children from the global South in an even more vulnerable position (Imoh et al., 2018). The same normative approaches and emphasis on ‘fair trade’ can be seen in UNICEF’s collaborations with both the TESK and TOBB, where their partnership discourse is structured

---

around ethical trade, and in keeping with international standards of fair trade through supply chains.

Another point raised by way of this critical approach is with regards to the interpretation of ‘the best interests of the child’, and its imagined hierarchy with the ‘rights of children’ (Imoh et al., 2018). However, child development is neither the area of expertise nor the scope of the current study. Therefore, any conclusion on ‘what is best for the child’ has been specifically avoided; although, the relevance of the critical approaches has been acknowledged.

In another direction, the case of migrant child labour in Turkey and its connection to ‘the best interests of the child’ was examined; this study argues that there is a double standard applied to migrant children. More specifically, the strategies and interventions provided on the ground by the IOs aim to place migrant working children and the migrant children at the risk of employment to the places left vacant by their Turkish peers in both the education system and in the labour market. However, the best interest of the migrant working children is decided upon in the absence of alternatives, but promoted within ‘the given circumstances’ of the informal labour market, a lack of rights, and a level of poverty that would only result in subordination and marginalisation of the migrant children if they were not retained in child labour. The increased emphasis on the ‘fair trade’ discourse and the decline in rights-based approaches, especially the lack of interest on DWA within multilevel governance, has significantly affected the approaches taken against child labour. Ergo, the most prominent interventions foreseen in providing secure employment, fair wage payment, and the enhancement of social security and social protecting schemes were left out. Consequently, (migrant) child labour has been governed with the normative discourses of the best interest of the child, with a specific focus on education and criminalisation through the discourses of fair trade, which obviously fail to address the issues of migrant child labour. Fundamentally, this failed attempt left ‘migrant child labour’ out categorically within the discourse of child labour in Turkey.

In conclusion, there are certain flows within the existing institutional framework of migrant child labour such as lack of political will, coordination between respective stakeholders, inconsistency in the rules and regulations pertinent to the fight against (migrant) child labour in Turkey. Figure 1 illustrates the multiplicity of the actors who are directly or indirectly associated with migrant child labour, and shows the main challenges that are identified by the current study. As can be seen in Figure 1, migrant child labour is situated at the centre and surrounded by the various actors as well as the relevant rules and regulations, with each line between explaining the relational status.
Lack of coordination and communication within different ministries and also between different stakeholders flags the challenges embodied within the existing governance model. Furthermore, the enacted rules and regulation to govern and respond the “identified problems of migration and child labour” proves to be incompatible and insufficient to address the root causes of the migrant child labour. The lack of implementation of the harmonized approach against (migrant) child labour brings about the question marks on political will, the government’s capacity and power for action that requires wholistic action of all concerned ministries. Amongst others, one question that comes to one’s mind is “What is the reason behind this lack of political will and capacity?”, which needs further inquiry and research that is beyond the scope of the current study.
**Figure 1: Organisational Scheme of Key Actors and Structures on Migrant Child Labour**

Institutional framework showing key actors and structures in relation to migrant child labour

- **Regulation 6575 on Work Permits for Foreigners Under Temporary Protection**
- **National Programme on Child Labour**
  - Ministry of Family, Labour and Social Services
  - Ministry of National Education
- **Temporary Protection Regulation 6203**
  - DGMM
  - ISKUR
- **MIGRANT CHILD LABOUR**
  - MO: ILO, UNICEF, WB etc.
  -/n
- **UNCRC C182 C138 DECENT WORK AGENDA SDGs**

**Key Actors and Structures**

- **Local Government**
- **Employers’ Associations**
- **Trade Unions**
- **Employers**
- **Researchers**
- **NGOs**
- **Donors**

**Programmes and Policies**

- Laws and Regulations on Formal and Non-Formal Education
- Conditional Cash Transfer for Education (CCT-E)
- Emergency Social Safety Net (ESSN)
- Circular No 2014/21 on Education Services for Foreigners

**Notes**

- Indicates national laws and regulations as well as international conventions, agreements
- Arrows directly or indirectly working on child labour
- Arrows actively working on child labour
- Indicates coordination and communication challenges
- Indicates coordination
- Indicates collaboration & challenges in sustainability and compatibility with related policies.
Lastly, the lack of emphasis placed on structural problems such as poverty due to unequal income distribution, unemployment, the informal labour market, and access to social rights indicate that none of the actors working on child labour in Turkey aimed to intervene in the root causes of Turkey’s migrant child labour problem. In other words, multilevel governance failed to adequately address the problem of migrant child labour in Turkey. More importantly, it has been largely ignored that the strategies and interventions that support the global migration regime, which is shaped by the needs of the global labour market, reproduces the conditions for the existence of migrant child labour and the precarisation of the migrant child. Therefore, unless ‘social justice for all’ is maintained, (migrant) child labour is likely to remain as one of the coping mechanisms for poverty.
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APPENDICES

Appendix 1

“WPR Chart: What’s the Problem Represented to be? (WPR approach to policy analysis)” (Bacchi, 2009, p. xii)

| Question 1: | What is the problem (e.g., of ‘gender inequality’, ‘drug use/abuse’, ‘economic development’, ‘global warming’, ‘childhood obesity’, ‘irregular migration’, etc.) represented to be in a specific policy or policies? |
| Question 2: | What deep-seated presuppositions or assumptions (conceptual logics) underlie this representation of the ‘problem’ (problem representation)? |
| Question 3: | How has this representation of the ‘problem’ come about? |
| Question 4: | What is left unproblematic in this problem representation? Where are the silences? Can the ‘problem’ be conceptualised differently? |
| Question 5: | What effects (discursive, subjectification, lived) are produced by this representation of the ‘problem’? |
| Question 6: | How and where has this representation of the ‘problem’ been produced, disseminated and defended? How has it been and/or how can it be disrupted and replaced? |
| Step 7: | Apply this list of questions to your own problem representations. |

### National Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies and Implementations of Turkish Govt &amp; IOs</th>
<th>Informal Labour Market</th>
<th>Unemployment</th>
<th>Poverty</th>
<th>Access to Education</th>
<th>Access to Social Protection</th>
<th>Legal Enforcement and Lack of Implementation</th>
<th>Lack of Coordination</th>
<th>Social Norms and Values</th>
<th>Migration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action targeting seasonal agricultural sector.</strong></td>
<td>- Entrepreneurship, SMEs and vocational training to increase employability.</td>
<td>- Improving access to basic services, prioritizing groups such as single parents, child workers, urban poor, which require special policies in accessing income generating and poverty alleviation activities, plus financial support.</td>
<td>- Promoting education via awareness-raising activities targeting families and employers.</td>
<td>- Capacity building amongst staff at different institutions.</td>
<td>- Awareness raising and information dissemination for existing social assistance programmes.</td>
<td>- Awareness raising on child labour and importance of education targeting staff at different institutions.</td>
<td>- Sensitisation via various media channels, training and meet-ups targeting stakeholders, e.g., families of working children, employers, trade unions, decision makers, politicians to raise attention to child labour.</td>
<td>- Sensitisation on child labour and importance of education targeting families of working children and employers.</td>
<td>- N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### UNICEF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies and Implementations of Turkish Govt &amp; IOs</th>
<th>Informal Labour Market</th>
<th>Unemployment</th>
<th>Poverty</th>
<th>Access to Education</th>
<th>Access to Social Protection</th>
<th>Legal Enforcement and Lack of Implementation</th>
<th>Lack of Coordination</th>
<th>Social Norms and Values</th>
<th>Migration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
<td>- N/A</td>
<td>- N/A</td>
<td>- Promoting education via various activities to increase access to quality formal and non-formal education for Syrian children and others.</td>
<td>- Supporting ESN with CCT-E.</td>
<td>- Advocacy on enhancement of education system.</td>
<td>- Awareness raising about child labour and the importance of education targeting staff at institutions such as TOBB, TESK, and MoFLSS, and collaboration with municipalities.</td>
<td>- Capacity building amongst staff at different institutions.</td>
<td>- Sensitisation on child labour and importance of education targeting families of working children and employers.</td>
<td>- N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ILO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies and Implementations of Turkish Govt &amp; IOs</th>
<th>Informal Labour Market</th>
<th>Unemployment</th>
<th>Poverty</th>
<th>Access to Education</th>
<th>Access to Social Protection</th>
<th>Legal Enforcement and Lack of Implementation</th>
<th>Lack of Coordination</th>
<th>Social Norms and Values</th>
<th>Migration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Providing financial subsidies to employers to encourage formal employment (of Syrian). Providing technical assistance to Syrian to obtain work permits - within scope of Syrian integration into labour market.</strong></td>
<td>- Supporting entrepreneurship, SMEs and vocational training to increase employability through business-friendly strategies - within scope of Syrian integration into labour market.</td>
<td>- N/A</td>
<td>- Referrals to education.</td>
<td>- N/A</td>
<td>- Advocacy for C138 and C182.</td>
<td>- Capacity building amongst staff at institutions, e.g., inspectors under MoFLSS for monitoring.</td>
<td>- Capacity building amongst staff at different institutions, within scope of Syrian integration into labour market.</td>
<td>- Sensitisation on child labour and importance of education targeting families of working children and employers, especially in seasonal agriculture.</td>
<td>- N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IOM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies and Implementations of Turkish Govt &amp; IOs</th>
<th>Informal Labour Market</th>
<th>Unemployment</th>
<th>Poverty</th>
<th>Access to Education</th>
<th>Access to Social Protection</th>
<th>Legal Enforcement and Lack of Implementation</th>
<th>Lack of Coordination</th>
<th>Social Norms and Values</th>
<th>Migration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Providing financial subsidies to employers to encourage formal employment (of Syrian). Providing technical assistance to employers in obtaining work permits - within scope of Syrian integration into labour market.</strong></td>
<td>- Supporting entrepreneurship, SMEs and vocational training to increase employability through business-friendly strategies.</td>
<td>- N/A</td>
<td>- School transportation support.</td>
<td>- Capacity building amongst staff at different institutions, e.g., inspectors under MoFLSS for monitoring.</td>
<td>- Capacity building amongst staff at different institutions.</td>
<td>- N/A</td>
<td>- Advocacy.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>