RESEARCH ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS

The Refugee Integration Industry: Stakeholder Power, Market Logic, and the (De)Humanisation of Refugee Labour

Mustafa F. Özbilgin[1] (iD) | Dimitria Groutsis[2] (iD) | Joana Vassilopoulou[1] (iD) | Cihat Erbil[3] (iD)

[1]Brunel Business School, Brunel University of London, London, UK | [2]University of Sydney Business School, Sydney, Australia | [3]Department of Business Administration, Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli University, Ankara, Turkey

Correspondence: Mustafa F. Özbilgin (Mustafa.Ozbilgin@brunel.ac.uk)

ABSTRACT

This paper theorises the refugee integration industry by examining how institutional configurations and stakeholder arrangements shape labour market integration outcomes for refugees in Germany and Turkey. Drawing on Spender's theory of industrial recipes, we conceptualise the integration industry as a network of public, private and third-sector actors governed by competing logics of humanitarianism and market efficiency. Through a comparative case study approach based on more than 200 policy, institutional, and civil society sources, we demonstrate how power asymmetries and economic imperatives systematically marginalise refugees' human agency, producing both humanising and dehumanising effects. We introduce a fourfold typology of (de)humanitarianism, indifference, assimilation, integration and multiculturalism models that reveals how different national and organisational contexts mediate the moral, economic, and political tensions at the heart of refugee labour market integration. Despite stark contrasts in governance models and economic capacity, both countries institutionalise forms of exclusion that limit meaningful participation and recognition. Our analysis advances the theoretical understanding of the refugee integration industry as a contested and relational space where policy, discourse and institutional practice interact to shape refugee subjectivities and futures. In doing so, we call for more reflexive, inclusiv, and agency-centred approaches to integration that foreground social justice and co-determination.

1 | Introduction

Employment is a cornerstone of refugee integration, underscoring a mutually reinforcing relationship between labour market participation and broader societal inclusion (Castles et al. 2001; Ager and Strang 2008). In this paper, we focus on the institutional and stakeholder support mechanisms that shape refugees' access to employment through what we conceptualise as the refugee integration industry. This industry comprises a network of public, private and third-sector actors, including government bodies, businesses, NGOs and community organisations, tasked with managing refugee settlement and labour market integration. Drawing on Spender (1989) theory of industrial recipes, we define this as an emergent field where economic imperatives, humanitarian principles, and institutional logics intersect to produce both humanising and dehumanising outcomes.

While the integration industry is often framed as a humanitarian endeavour, we argue that it is predominantly driven by a market logic that privileges employer and state interests over refugees' human agency (Collins et al. 2018; Ng and Metz 2015).

Building on the work of Ng and Metz (2015) and Naccache and Al Ariss (2018), who explored how corporate social responsibility and institutional structures shape refugee employment, we extend these insights by theorising the integration industry itself as a contested space of power asymmetries. Our comparative study of Germany and Turkey reveals how stakeholder arrangements in both countries, despite their institutional differences, tend to institutionalise dehumanisation by subordinating refugee inclusion to economic and political agendas. This critique forms the foundation of our theoretical contribution: a typology of (de)humanitarianism that unpacks the moral, institutional, and material consequences of integration practices.

The United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR 2024) states that more than 35 million refugees are fleeing from persecution and danger, crisis and war, to a haven. Specifically, refugees are individuals compelled to leave their home country due to the threat or experience of persecution. They seek to secure fundamental human rights and safety rather than seeking economic gain. When fleeing, they leave their homes, possessions, loved ones, and communities behind. Some escape suddenly, without preparation, and many endure severe trauma, torture, or mistreatment. Their path to safety is typically dangerous, with many risking their lives to find protection. Returning home is not an option unless the conditions that forced their departure are resolved (Elie 2014). The majority hail from developing countries and find refuge in neighbouring low- and middle-income countries, with the most significant number settling in Turkey, which is hosting some 3.5 million refugees. However, when considering unregistered refugees, estimates suggest the total number is more than 3.5 million. As of 2024, Germany remained the only high-income country among the top 10 refugee-hosting nations (World Bank 2024). Ten countries host 60% of refugees (UN News 2018). As Turkey and Germany have welcomed the most significant proportion of refugees over the last 10 years as a consequence of the Syrian conflict and war in Ukraine, they provide a valuable contrast to the machinations of the integration industry (Refugee Council Australia 2018). The war in Ukraine has altered the ethno-racial composition of refugees in Europe, with integration efforts favouring Ukrainian refugees while excluding Syrian and other groups for ethno-racial and religious reasons (Wiśniewski et al. 2024).

This paper presents the first theoretical exploration of the institutional arrangements for the post-adjustment of refugees as an integration industry. This industry has become an essential intermediary for refugees' potential employment and economic integration. We question what we see as the (de)humanitarianism guiding the integration industry by examining the relationship between stakeholder arrangements and refugees in post-arrival integration. To this end, we systematically examine the approach to refugee settlement and integration in Germany and Turkey. We introduce and extend the theory of the refugee integration industry, delineating its boundary conditions and illustrating its unintended consequences for the humanisation and dehumanisation of refugees' human potential in their labour market participation (Goerzen et al. 2024).

Germany and Turkey represent contrasting refugee integration landscapes. As the highest recipient of refugees in the EU, Germany has developed a well-structured integration framework emphasising stakeholder coordination and formal labour market inclusion. Turkey, meanwhile, hosts the largest refugee population globally but relies on more fragmented, emergent integration efforts shaped by geopolitical considerations and constrained by economic limitations. These contextual differences are crucial to understanding how their respective integration industries operate and their varying impacts on refugees' humanisation and dehumanisation experiences. In the following section, we define humanitarianism and dehumanisation to foreground our investigation of the integration strategies implemented at the local level to benefit refugees. In addition to drawing attention to refugees, we also place this industry front and centre by examining how it is discussed more generally in the business, management and migration scholarship. We then turn to the case of refugee post-arrival integration in two distinct country settings. We conclude by identifying the (de)humanitarian implications surrounding this industry and providing recommendations for future research.

2 | A Recipe for Post-Arrival Integration: From Humanitarianism to Dehumanisation

While humanitarianism centres on care, rights, and moral obligation, dehumanisation exposes the darker underbelly of integration practices. In what follows, we examine how discourse and institutional arrangements may reproduce refugee exclusion under the guise of humanitarianism in the post-arrival integration efforts. In line with Spender (1989) notion of industry recipes, we take a context-specific and locally-sensitive approach to explain and understand the integration industry. Recipes are the roles and practices of actors within and outside this industry. Spender (1989: 6) cautions that: 'recipes are merely suggestive about the consequences of following them, though they also imply cautions against ignoring them. However, they say nothing about the consequences of following different lines of action'. That is, recipes offer the analyst a (rough) road map for understanding the industry. We extend this schema by exploring the intended and unintended consequences of distinct industry 'recipes' and the role, nature, responsibilities and consequences of integration intermediaries in specific country contexts and the stakeholders within these industry networks. We draw on Freeman's definition of stakeholders, which includes: 'any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of' a particular objective (Freeman 1984, 25). In the case of refugees, stakeholders include those who can affect or are affected by their integration outcomes. Stakeholders can include, but are not limited to, community networks (ethno-specific and broader); migrant resource centres/NGOs; government (national and supra-national agencies); human resource management (HRM) peak bodies/managers; recruiters; education institutions; trade unions; employers; online platforms, local communities and refugees to name but a few. MNCs also play a role within the integration industry as private-sector stakeholders, mainly through corporate social responsibility initiatives that influence refugee labour market integration. While peak supranational bodies and governments endorse the rule of (inter) national law

and convention (Derksen and Teixeira 2023), the suite of local and context-specific stakeholders outside these ingredients remains unguided by regulatory arrangements beyond loose hegemonic markers of integration.

Human mobility and settlement remain the preserve of sovereign states (Gammeltoft-Hansen 2014). For refugees, however, the 1951 Refugee Convention draws attention to the particular circumstances defining the refugee movement and the humanitarian responsibilities of the receiving country. The UNHCR reports that there are 146 state parties to the Convention. Countries that do not want to attract or settle refugees often refuse to sign the convention. While Germany and Turkey are signatories to the 1951 Convention on Refugees, their acceptance of this group is nothing short of extreme in its distinctiveness and the loose guiding principles from the UNHCR neither challenge nor transcend sovereign codes of conduct once the refugee has found safety in another country. Humanitarian responsibilities, guided by supranational principles, stop upon entry into a country (Christopher 2023).

While humanitarianism is founded on legal convention, as noted above, it can also be described conceptually/discursively (Fassin 2010). As a concept, it prompts an emotional reaction: one of benevolence, charity, welfare, and compassion. It manifests through discourse and imagery that feed into the broad (social change and solidarity) and narrow (localised integration) meanings. As such, 'humanitarianism shapes people's lives, relationships, and communities'.

Like humanitarianism, dehumanisation is linguistically enacted and emotively driven. In contrast, though, dehumanisation distinguishes groups of people in migration (Haslam et al. 2005; Leyens et al. 2007). Oh (2019), for instance, brings this to light by stating that migrants and refugees are the other, a homogenous group of faceless non-citizens. Dehumanisation stands in contrast to humaneness, granting importance to members of one's group. Instead, dehumanisation judges the other as lacking in human qualities and attributes, reducing them to a resource at best or a worthless sub-human at worst, failing to recognise them, value their diverse identity characteristics and grant them human status (Bales and Mayblin 2018; Haslam et al. 2005; Leyens et al. 2007).

The lack of clarity surrounding what integration is and how it functions in policy and practice is evident in the plethora of literature, which focuses on (i) the process taken to arrive at integration/acculturation (see, for instance, Diedrich and Omanović 2023); the (contested) spectrum of hegemonic frames of reference and the associated discourse surrounding this (see e.g., Cui et al. 2025; Modood 2018); and the local-specificity (Glushkova et al. 2025) and cultural-sensitivity of the term and its associated reality (see for instance Emilsson 2015; Ng and Metz 2015).

Such nuanced differences offer essential insights into integration—as a process, a discourse, as a spectrum and as a localised and unique manifestation of a society's history. Underscoring these contributions is the lens through which we explain and understand the relations between the refugee and the integration broker or intermediary. While critics of

dehumanisation note that the literature focuses on the purveyor of dehumanisation (Bastian and Haslam 2011), for our purposes, examining the industry allows us to evaluate how and whether or not the institutional arrangements as assessed through the industry policies, objectives, discourse and outcomes meet the humanitarian needs and interests of the refugees. That is, drawing attention to the objectives and practices of the integration industry allows us to interrogate the degrees of (de)humanitarianism informing the 'recipe' of this industry.

Recent conceptual advancements highlight the complexity and fluidity of integration. Maj et al. (2025) demonstrate the significance of refugees' history and intersectional identities in understanding their integration. Spencer and Charsley (2021) offer a processual understanding of integration, challenging static notions, while Phillimore (2021) underscores the importance of opportunity structures, including policies and stakeholder dynamics, in shaping refugee outcomes. Ozgoren et al. (2025) explore the emancipatory potential of refugees, adding to the positive framing of the integration debate. Our study builds on these insights but uniquely contributes by connecting these contextual structures to the (de)humanising tendencies embedded in the refugee integration industry's stakeholder relationships.

Ideally, refugee integration involves staged adaptation and integration over time supported by a sustained, two-way relationship between the refugee and specific stakeholders/stakeholder arrangements in the destination country (Korac 2003). This approach highlights the importance of a network of stakeholder arrangements in constructing the support required for post-arrival integration. Ager and Strang (2008) extend this with their multi-level perspective of integration, comprising ten domains covering civic and economic adjustment, for instance (Ager and Strang 2008; Montgomery 1996; Kallenbach et al. 2013). While the contribution of these studies is evident, the process of dehumanisation in the linkages between the outside and within the workplace, and the workplace and the intermediaries furnishing these arrangements is overlooked in the process of post-arrival integration, as are the varieties of integration modes and the relations between the refugee and the various stakeholders. These works often miss the face, story, status, and identity, which could humanise refugees. As such, there are some glaring gaps in these analyses. We build on these insights by disentangling the role of the integration industry and evaluating the (de)humanising elements of the policies, practices, and discourse that inform post-arrival support.

We explore configurations and a range of intermediaries, along with their competing agendas, within two distinct illustrative examples: Germany and Turkey. These countries offer interesting points with vastly differing approaches to refugee integration management set within different macro contexts. We employ a comparative case study approach to evaluate the integration industry's key pillars: multiple stakeholder arrangements and interests, refugee post-arrival employment integration, and the locally sensitive and context-specific hegemonic boundaries. The case-study approach provides in-depth insights into a particular instance's specific dynamics and contextual factors, allowing for a detailed understanding of the phenomena under investigation (Eisenhardt and Graebner 2007). To this end, we conducted a

purposeful and extensive examination of publicly available primary and secondary sources, including (i) an evaluation of the defining contours of integration in each country to contextualise the hegemonic frame of reference, the discourse, the spectrum and process of integration; (ii) an assessment of policy and government reports surrounding integration over time and particularly so since 2015; (iii) and an examination of media documents, data, online platforms, industry, non-government agency and business reports.

3 | Methods

We employ a theoretical exploration and a comparative case study approach (Bartlett and Vavrus 2017) designed to interrogate the power structures, stakeholder roles, and institutional dynamics contributing to the (de)humanising effects identified within the refugee integration industry. Our document analysis included more than 200 policy and institutional documents from 2015 to 2025, such as The Federal Office for Migration and Refugees in Germany (BAMF) annual project atlases, Turkish Directorate General of Migration Management bulletins, and reports from the European Commission on Turkey's integration funding framework (See Table 1 for an outline of documentary evidence collated). Documents are in English, German, and Turkish. This timeframe captures the critical period of refugee influxes driven by the Syrian conflict and the war in Ukraine, alongside the corresponding policy responses in the two

countries. These documents were purposely selected based on relevance, recency, and their capacity to illuminate refugee integration policies, labour market participation frameworks and stakeholder involvement.

We collected data from international organisations, such as UNHCR and the World Bank, to obtain quantitative insights into refugee demographics and labour market participation. We examined national policy documents and reports from government bodies in Germany and Turkey to understand the legal and institutional frameworks governing refugee integration. We reviewed over 50 peer-reviewed journal articles to establish a theoretical foundation, particularly on integration policies, stakeholder dynamics and dehumanisation. Additionally, we incorporated media reports and industry publications to capture public discourse and practical challenges. We evaluated all sources' credibility, relevance and ability to address the research objectives, selecting only those that met these criteria.

We conducted a qualitative document analysis (Morgan 2022; Prior 2008). We organised the data thematically, focusing on institutional frameworks, stakeholder roles and public discourse, and coded them to identify patterns of humanitarian and dehumanising tendencies across the two country cases. Our thematic analysis revealed key patterns across Germany and Turkey that informed the development of the (de)humanitarianism typology. Emerging themes included institutional frameworks, stakeholder engagement, labour market access,

TABLE 1 | Organisation and source of policy documents and reports reviewed (2015–2024).

Country	Organisation/source of documents	Year(s)	Relevance
Germany	Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (BAMF)	2017, 2018	Assesses scope, funding and effectiveness of integration courses and maps stakeholder engagement across Germany
	German Bundestag	2018	Evaluates refugee employment data and legislative responses
	German Association for Human Resource Management (DGFP)	2017a, 2017b	Analyses employer perspectives, language skills and credential recognition
	Eurostat	2016, 2022	Provides EU-level comparative data
Turkey	Ministry of Family, Labour and Social Services (MoFLSS)	2017	Sets out Turkey's national framework for refugee integration
	Presidency of Migration Management (PMM)	2016, 2023	Tracks refugee numbers, policy shifts and programme developments
	EU–Turkey Facility for Refugees	2016, 2023	Details EU financial support for refugee integration in Turkey
	Turkish Employment Agency (İŞKUR)	2018, 2022	Focuses on vocational training, permits and job matching
	ILO and UNHCR (Ankara Office)	2016, 2018	Explores challenges and policy implementation around formal employment
Both	European Commission	2016, 2018, 2019	Provides insights into transnational policy dynamics and conditionalities
	UNHCR	2024	Monitors refugee protection standards, provides statistical updates and evaluates integration outcomes across both contexts

public and political discourse and refugee agency. We identified subthemes, such as the degree of policy coordination, the role of trade unions and NGOs, formal versus informal employment opportunities, public attitudes and the extent of refugee participation in decision-making. In Germany, structured policies, active stakeholder coordination and formal labour market access aligned with assimilationist and integrationist models, while in Turkey, fragmented governance, reliance on informal economies and limited stakeholder coordination reflected the indifference model. Across both cases, refugee agency and voice were largely absent, with only isolated NGO-led initiatives hinting at a multicultural approach. These thematic insights collectively shaped the fourfold typology of indifference, assimilation, integration, and multiculturalism, highlighting how power asymmetries and market logic influence refugee labour market integration's (de)humanising outcomes (see Table 2).

For a comparative analysis of Germany and Turkey, we unpacked how national contexts influence the industrial recipes of

TABLE 2 | Data structure.

Theme	Subthemes/data points	Observed in case(s)	Link to Typology Model
Institutional frameworks and policies	– Presence/absence of formal integration policy – Coordination between stakeholders – Legal rights and permits for refugees – Funding mechanisms	Germany and Turkey	Assimilationist (Germany) Indifference (Turkey)
Stakeholder engagement	– Role of government ministries – Trade unions' involvement – NGO/CSO support – Employer practices – HRM bodies, educational bodies	Germany: High coordination Turkey: Fragmented, NGO-dependent	Integrationist (Germany) Indifference (Turkey)
Labour market access	– Formal vs. informal employment – Qualification recognition – Language barriers – Work permit accessibility	Germany: Formal, regulated Turkey: Informal, precarious	Integrationist (Germany) Indifference (Turkey)
Public and political discourse	– National political rhetoric on refugees – Media portrayal – Public attitudes – Impact of ethno-religious factors	Germany: Mixed, welfare vs. fear Turkey: Predominantly negative	Assimilationist (Germany) Indifference (Turkey)
Historical and socio-political context	– Long-standing approaches to immigration (e.g., guest worker legacy in Germany, Turkey as transit country) – Multicultural policy history	Both cases	Assimilationist (Germany) Indifference (Turkey)
Humanitarian rhetoric vs. market logic	– Funding priorities (economic integration vs. long-term inclusion) – EU influence (e.g., Turkey-EU deal) – CSR initiatives by companies	Both cases	Assimilationist, integrationist, indifference (both cases)
Refugee agency and voice	– Refugees' role in shaping policies – Inclusion in decision-making – Representation in public debate	Weak in both	Multicultural model (emergent only in isolated NGO-led initiatives)
Outcome: Employment and settlement experience	– Formal job access – Deskilling, underemployment – Exploitation in informal economy – Pathways to citizenship – Experiences of discrimination, stigma	Both cases	Indifference, assimilationist, integrationist (depending on subtheme)

refugee integration, shaped by power asymmetries, top-down labour market participation designs, and the unintended (de) humanising consequences of these efforts. We organised data into categories aligned with the study's analytical framework, drawing on Spender's theory of industrial recipes and the concept of dehumanisation. By identifying themes such as institutional frameworks, labour market access, stakeholder roles and public discourses, we examined the similarities and differences between Germany's structured and coordinated integration frameworks and Turkey's emergent and fragmented approach. Our analysis integrated findings from policy reports and statistical data sets to accurately represent institutional and economic contexts. We also incorporated insights from academic studies to add theoretical depth, linking these findings to broader discussions on refugee integration and its sociopolitical consequences.

Through this comparative analysis, we synthesised diverse data sources to create a coherent understanding of how Germany and Turkey represent contrasting examples of refugee integration industries. We ensured that the findings captured the complexity of institutional arrangements, public attitudes, funding mechanisms and stakeholder roles while remaining anchored in the study's aim of addressing the power dynamics and dehumanising elements that shape refugee experiences.

4 | Findings

We set out our findings by comparing Germany and Turkey as distinct cases, examining how institutional structures, labour market dynamics, and stakeholder engagement shape integration and (de)humanisation of refugees. We identified key themes by analysing policy frameworks, economic conditions, and the roles of various actors in both countries. Our approach highlights the tensions between humanitarian narratives and market-driven imperatives, showing how different industrial recipes produce varied (de)humanising effects. By applying Spender (1989) theory of industrial recipes, we critically assess how hegemonic discourses, economic demands, and historical approaches to migration shape integration efforts. This analysis enables us to uncover the systemic contradictions within refugee integration industries and propose pathways for a more equitable and sustainable approach.

5 | Contested Hegemonic Frames of Refugee Management: The Case of Germany

While Germany has received refugees since the 1970s, the number of people seeking and granted refugee status has risen consistently over the last few decades. The so-called refugee crisis in the summer of 2015 recently saw the highest influx of refugees into Germany (BMI, 2017; Eurostat 2019; Statista 2018). This approach has been a litmus test for refugee entry, employment and settlement, set within a context of divided public opinion. On the one hand, the public has displayed a welcoming sentiment for and solidarity with refugees (Stern 2015; Zeit 2015). Equally welcoming has been the response of business leaders, declaring the arrival of working-age refugees as an opportunity to address the growing labour

shortages in Germany. Business leaders have long been arguing that some sectors are suffering from a shortage of workers, and the long-term effects permanently damage the economy to an estimated €30 billion.

On the other hand, there have been doubts about refugee's ability to integrate, borne of historical perceptions surrounding minority ethnic integration throughout Germany's history of immigration. For instance, a recent study found that over 54% of the population held negative attitudes towards refugees (Zick et al. 2019). These doubts, however, have been allayed by the positive refugee employment outcomes (Deutscher Bundestag 2018), which some argue are directly linked to Germany's integration management policy (Gürtzgen et al. 2017; Luyken 2018).

Integration has been a topic of discussion and debate in Germany for many decades, and there is consensus among the civic community and policymakers that the integration of ethnic minorities has failed (Woellert et al. 2009), mainly of the visibly Muslim-minority population. More specifically, this group's alleged unwillingness to integrate into German society holds them solely responsible for their 'failure' to build the human and social capital needed for success in the mainstream German labour market and, more broadly, German society (Vassilopoulou 2011). When examining the workplace, it is safe to say that there has been a weak response to integration measures. For instance, according to Günter Piening, Germany's Integration Commissioner, who held the position for a decade, there is no need to recognise workplace race equality in the German context (MIGAZIN 2012). Consequently, issues related to ethnic diversity at the workplace level fell outside the diversity management portfolio. Moreover, promoting multiculturalism has not received policy or political currency in the broader German context (Vassilopoulou et al. 2014). Underscored by such a challenging context, the recent influx of refugees has paradoxically fueled positive changes (Federal Office for Migration and Refugees BAMF 2017; Degler and Liebig 2017; Eurostat 2016).

Since 2015, integrating refugees has emerged as a significant industry, giving rise to a web of intermediary stakeholders responsible for facilitating the integration process. Annually, the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (BAMF) sponsors many integration projects across Germany. Many of these projects focus on creating opportunities for refugees and locals to meet and interact on a social level while forging a two-way and ongoing dynamic between refugees and the broader society. A search of the 2018 project atlas displayed over 120 projects across Germany focusing on refugees and hundreds more focusing on diversity, migrants and ethnic minorities (Federal Office for Migration and Refugees BAMF 2018). Most of these projects happened in local clubs and organisations, which set local communities as a significant stakeholder in the integration industry. However, only some of these projects focus on integrating refugees into the labour market. Diedrich and Omanović (2023) highlight refugees' challenges in integrating into labour markets, often due to systemic barriers and inadequate support. The key focal point is societal integration, not the workplace level.

Other beneficiaries of such funding include integration course providers, of which, according to a list on the BAMF website,

there are over 8000 officially approved agencies across Germany, including a mix of welfare agencies, local clubs and organisations, Volkshochschulen (partly state-funded education institutions), trade unions and private language schools. The government spent almost 4 billion euros on so-called integration courses alone between 2016 and 17. Between 2015 and 2017, the government spent 43.25 billion euros on refugee-related programmes (Focus 2018). The integration industry provides an essential service but is also a big business.

Trade unions have emerged as important stakeholders and, like businesses, view the arrival of refugees as an opportunity to address labour shortages while countering Germany's demographic challenges and fulfilling efficient labour market integration. Correspondingly, unions aim to stop businesses from undermining existing labour standards while fostering anti-racism policies and practices in organisations. The main aim of unions is to optimise the government's refugee management system (Bergfeld 2017). For instance, trade unions have been pushing for policy changes regulating the entry of refugees into the labour market, particularly lobbying around simplifying the recognition of formal qualifications held by refugees. Regarding more specific examples, IG Metall, the powerful metalworker's union, has been calling for a sustainable refugee policy while coordinating language courses in their headquarters delivered on-site (IGM 2016). Another large trade union body, ver.di (2016), has taken a more hands-on approach, developing several practical measures to foster the integration of refugees into the labour market. One example involves ensuring Telekom, the largest telecommunications company in Germany, employs 100 refugees as apprentices annually. These are a few examples of the wide range of trade union refugee integration activities at the workplace level, which have emerged since 2015.

A recent initiative on workplace adjustment, which goes beyond simply labour market entry, has established a joint stakeholder refugee management effort between trade unions, industry chambers, employers and works councils (Giertz et al. 2016). According to a study by the German Association for Human Resource Management (DGFP 2017a), businesses are very committed to integrating refugees into the labour market. They plan to expand on refugee employment and training—creating a clear link between integration policies outside and within the workplace. The DGFP noted that over 70% of HRM professionals questioned on refugee integration indicated that their companies actively employ refugees and seek to create a seamless workplace adjustment process, specifically through internships and efficient qualifications accreditation pathways. Sixty-five percent of the companies surveyed indicated they intend to hire refugees actively as trainees, interns and permanent employees.

The service industry is exceptionally committed to facilitating the integration of refugees into the labour market. However, those who hire them have indicated that refugees need more language skills (91%), have insufficient professional qualifications (45.9%) and have unclear responsibilities and services on the side of government authorities (45.1%). According to investigations undertaken by the German Association for Human Resource Management (DGFP 2017b), there is a pressing need to improve the pathways to language acquisition

for refugees and establish better coordination between public agencies and the workplace level, particularly about flexible and more efficient qualifications recognition.

Since 2015, the DGFP and its member companies have called on politicians, the administration, industry chambers, and other related parties to coordinate refugee labour market integration (DGFP 2017b). Indeed, with much support from civil society and different stakeholders involved in the post-arrival adjustment process, Germany has reacted relatively swiftly in developing a coordinated system that builds a bridge between stakeholders within and outside the workplace level. The fact that Germany has a shortage of workers due to demographic change, supported by a healthy economy, are factors that have combined to create a favourable context to foster the labour market integration of refugees. However, while the orchestrated effort needs to be acknowledged as relatively successful, particularly considering that the last 5 years required swift action, one has to note the relevance of the agency of refugees (which often remains overlocked) in the integration process. Their desire to live, work and settle in Germany has been profound.

In contrast to Germany, the Turkish case below spotlights different aspects of the integration industry, which has consequences for the refugees.

6 | From the Waiting Room to Permanent Settlement: The Case of Turkey

Turkey has been a destination for movements of migrants and refugees throughout its history. Conflicts and political turmoil in neighbouring countries and its location as a bridge between Europe, Asia and Africa have historically made Turkey a valuable transit point and a waiting room for refugees (İçduygu and Yükseker 2012). Turkey's conventional policy has been to protect those who take refuge in it as a temporary transit point before making their way to third countries; additionally, it also acts as a haven until refugees can return home. Most recently, there has been a seismic shift in the dominant approach to refugee mobility, with Turkey becoming the final destination point, a country for permanent settlement of refugees. Two critical periods have characterised Turkey as a haven for refugees. First in 1979, following the Iranian revolution when 1.5 million Iranians entered Turkey; and since 2014, following the Syrian conflict, it has hosted some 3.7 million refugees (UNHCR 2019), with a smaller proportion entering from other war-torn locations (UNHCR 2018). Despite Turkey's economic challenges and what has been, until recently, a lack of protective regulation and integration infrastructure, the UN agency has praised it for the colossal efforts made to host and settle refugees, mainly from Syria. Moreover, it has offered better refugee support than most other West European countries regarding refugees' economic and workplace integration, enabling them to work and establish businesses in Turkey (The Economist 2018; Ozgoren et al. 2025). While dominant narratives often portray refugees as economic burdens or passive recipients of aid, recent evidence challenges this view. Mahia et al. (2020) demonstrate that, when granted even limited access to labour markets and entrepreneurial opportunities, Syrian refugees in Turkey have made a measurable impact on growth,

employment, and investment, raising critical questions about the underlying rationale of restrictive integration policies. Further, Ozgoren et al. (2025) demonstrate that Syrian refugee entrepreneurs have a positive impact on their own communities and wider society in Turkey through their social, economic and cultural emancipatory influence. The large flow of refugees from the Syrian conflict has significantly transformed Turkey's traditional national policy trend as a key transit point, and with this turn has come the establishment of the first integration policy (Düvell 2018; Unutulmaz 2019). The refugee agreement made with the EU in 2016 consolidated this policy turn. The agreement determined that Turkey would (i) serve as a buffer to stop the refugee influx into Europe, (ii) ensure the legal integration of Syrian refugees, and (iii) improve the conditions of refugees in Turkey. Crucially, the agreement involves the transfer of 6 billion Euros to Turkey for refugee integration (European Commission 2019). While EU funding has been an essential sweetener in forging the turn in Turkish policy, understanding its political context provides deeper insights into the complex divisions surrounding refugee integration and post-arrival adjustment. The ruling party in Turkey, the Justice and Development Party (AKP), has been an ardent supporter of refugees who are primarily in support of the AKP's conservative political agenda. Opposition parties thread a spectrum of welcoming, cautionary and anti-integration lines about refugees in Turkey, which remains polarised between serving as a waiting room and a final home for refugees.

Paradoxically and despite the overt and very vocal support by the government and national agencies for refugees and the popular discourse surrounding Turkey's efforts, the social acceptance of refugees is very low where the public considers them as foreigners who steal their jobs, potential criminals, and responsible for the decline in their local communities (Akbulut-Yuksel et al. 2024; Toğral Koca 2016; Erdoğan and Semerci 2017). Within such a context, access to formal employment is limited (Norman 2020). For those with skills and qualifications, there are insurmountable barriers to accessing the local labour market in a commensurate position (ILO 2016). These obstacles, underscored by a hostile social milieu and an economy built on informal arrangements, impede the mobility of refugees into the core and formal Turkish labour market. Add to this the poor infrastructure surrounding language training and the barriers to workplace and social adjustment post-arrival are compelling (İçduygu 2016; Kayaoglu and Erdogan 2019). As such, the vast majority of refugees, particularly those with skills and qualifications, remain unemployed, deskilled and underemployed (İngev 2017; Simsek and Koser Akcapar 2018), motivating a move to a third country when and where possible; or employment in the informal economy (Kaymaz and Kadkoy 2016).

Regarding the latter point, it is essential to note that the vast proportion of Turkey's economy runs on informal and unrecorded bases with no social welfare infrastructure. Refugees appear to be significant contributors to the informal sector (Butera and Ertorer 2020), which puts them in direct competition with Turkish nationals who are used to commanding higher wages. The perception of competition for jobs and welfare benefits is an example of what fuels social tensions between Turkish society and refugees (İçduygu and Diker 2017).

The multicultural environment in Turkey is underdeveloped at a macro level, creating a social milieu that limits the integration of refugees into work and broader community life (The Economist 2017). Despite the policies for economic liberalisation since the 1980 s, Turkey has primarily remained closed to migrant and refugee workers as settlers. Refugees' workplace adjustment in Turkey remains constrained by informal economies, structural exclusion, and political ambivalence (Nimer and Rottmann 2021; Osseiran 2020; Ozgoren et al. 2025). Recent regulations challenged Turkey's lack of a multicultural work culture. Since 2016, a date which has coincided with the large and continuing influx of Syrian conflict refugees, foreigners can obtain a work permit (*turquoise card*) valid for 1 year and requires annual renewal. Furthermore, the right to an indefinite licence to work and live in Turkey can now be granted to those who obtain long-term residency or those who have remained on a legal work permit (8 years or more).

As of 2017, there were 87,000 foreigners with work permits in Turkey, and the largest share of these was by Syrians, who comprised 13,000 permit holders. As noted by İçduygu and Diker (2017), refugees invariably gain access to the Turkish labour market when it is a cost–benefit to the employer, forming a cheap, easily substitutable and fragile labour reserve (Simsek and Koser Akcapar 2018). The implications of this approach to post-arrival adjustment are significant. Şimşek (2018) touches on the weak social bridge between Turkish society, the workplace level and refugees, highlighting the dominating intransigence of Turkish society toward refugees where, as a consequence, they face discrimination in all aspects of life and acute difficulties in post-arrival adjustment as they languish in the peripheral and secondary labour market. The fault line between Turkish society and Syrian refugees deepens with moral panics, fueled by the nationalist media, which claims that Syrian refugees now have greater rights and better conditions than native Turks in Turkey.

To address this fragile state, non-government organisations (NGOs) have served as judges and bridges between refugees and the Turkish labour market (Şimşek 2018), a role supported by EU funding, which has been particularly important in steering the refugee integration agenda. Sunata and Tosun (2019) show that a diverse range of locally active NGOs in Turkey have taken on key roles in providing essential services and creating social spaces for refugees, particularly in urban areas where state capacity remains fragmented. For instance, local and international NGOs partner with central and municipal governments to facilitate a needs-based approach to assisting refugees with their post-arrival workplace integration (Çebi 2017). Notably, though, as Bélange rand Saracoglu (2020) state, NGOs work within the context of the Islamic-conservative framework of the ruling government and, as such, are limited in terms of what they can achieve as critical actors in the integration industry (see also Mackreath and Sağnıç 2017).

The variety of approaches required to assist with the post-arrival integration and workplace adjustment of refugees from different cultures, backgrounds and contexts is now part of Turkey's national refugee management policy. Yet, these efforts remain restricted and fragmented, contradictory and tense due to the sheer size, divergent and complex composition of the

refugee population and the limited nature of Turkey's domestic economic resources. As a result, the various stakeholders include ministries, government agencies, parliamentary commissions, NGOs, supranational organisations such as the World Bank, businesses and employers, all under the watchful eye of the EU, driving divergent and, at times, conflicting agendas while the needs of refugees remain peripheral and unfortunately neglected (İçduygu 2016; MoFLSS 2017).

Despite a long history of serving as a waiting room for refugees, the last few years have moved Turkish policy and practices towards the integration of refugees into Turkish workplaces and society, with a corresponding industry emerging to support this process. However, the inspiration for these political and economic shifts in the integration of refugees remains hotly contested among key political interest groups and critical stakeholders in Turkey. Recent studies show that Turkish refugee policy is characterised by hyper-precarity, where the status of refugees is permanently negotiated and contested (Nimer and Rottmann 2022; Imrie-Kuzu and Özerdem 2023).

7 | Discussion

This discussion situates our findings within the broader literature on refugee integration, highlights critical insights, and offers implications for future research and policy development Our comparative analysis reveals that Germany's integration industry benefits from institutional coordination and economic investment, whereas Turkey's system remains fragmented and shaped by political contingencies. The labour market dynamics differ significantly, with Germany facilitating formal employment opportunities while Turkey's approach pushes many refugees into informal and precarious work. These structural differences also influence public perceptions, with Germany framing refugees as potential contributors to the economy, while in Turkey, they are often viewed as burdens or competitors. Comparative analysis of Germany's and Turkey's integration industries reveals key differences in institutional coordination, stakeholder involvement and socio-political conditions shaping refugee integration. Table 3 summarises these differences and their implications for refugees' (de)humanisation.

As demonstrated in our findings, the Turkish case spotlights distinct structural characteristics of the integration industry, that is, its reliance on informal economies, fragmented governance, and politically contingent stakeholder engagement. These features result in heightened precarity, legal ambiguity, and limited workplace-level support for refugees. In contrast to Germany's more institutionalised but assimilationist model, Turkey illustrates a mode of (de)humanitarianism in which humanitarian discourses are selectively mobilised while integration mechanisms remain underdeveloped and economically exploitative. These empirical differences underscore our theoretical contribution: that national variations in stakeholder configurations may produce similar outcomes of dehumanisation, albeit through different industrial recipes.

Building on the foundational literature on dehumanisation (Haslam et al. 2005; Leyens et al. 2007) and ethnic and religious diversity and inclusion (Modood 1998), we propose a novel typology of four models of (de)humanitarianism that captures how refugee integration industries institutionalise dehumanisation or humanisation through stakeholder behaviours and institutional arrangements. Several analytical concepts offer us the ability to explain and understand the degrees of (de) humanitarianism enacted by the integration industry.

The first is the indifference model, most clearly observed in Turkey's informal economy. In this model, refugee labour remains largely unregulated, precarious and marginalised, with minimal institutional oversight or protections (Can 2025). Refugees are treated as an expendable workforce, lacking access to formal employment rights or structured pathways to integration.

The second model, the assimilationist model, is dominant in the German context. Here, integration policies are designed with the implicit expectation that refugees will conform to the existing socio-cultural norms of the host society (Berg 2025). Rather than recognising the diverse backgrounds and experiences of refugees, this approach prioritises their adaptation to pre-established frameworks, often neglecting the agency and specific needs of the refugees.

The third is the integrationist model, which emerges most notably in Germany through the active involvement of trade unions and other intermediary actors (Berg 2025; Lienen and LeRoux-Rutledge 2022). These stakeholders support refugee integration by facilitating language acquisition, vocational training, and advocacy for fair labour conditions. This model recognises the potential contributions of refugees, aiming to incorporate them into the labour market while providing targeted support to ease their transition.

Finally, the multicultural model remains underdeveloped in Germany and Turkey but shows signs of emerging within specific NGO-led initiatives, particularly in Turkey (Bogado and Wolf 2024; Cevik 2025). This model positions refugees as active participants and co-creators in shaping their integration pathways, emphasising mutual adaptation, recognition of diversity, and the fostering of inclusive environments. However, institutional and political constraints currently limit its broader implementation in both contexts. While our typology of (de) humanitarianism is grounded in the comparative cases of Germany and Turkey, its analytical dimensions offer a transferable framework for examining integration regimes in other national and regional contexts where similar stakeholder dynamics and market logic are at play.

While Germany's integration industry follows a relatively coordinated approach to refugee integration, defined by connections between the various stakeholders and refugees, supported by an economically favourable macro-level climate, there are tensions and contradictions in terms of the dominant discourse which weaken the ties between the stakeholders in this industry and particularly so between them and the refugees whom they are servicing. Furthermore, our examination highlights the importance of favourable and demand-driven labour market conditions, which fuel a positive discourse. At the same time, the hegemonic frames of reference echo the historical focus on assimilation and a lack of integration at the workplace level. It

TABLE 3 | Comparative analysis of refugee integration industries in Germany and Turkey.

Dimension	Germany (assimilation and emerging integration)	Turkey (indifference and emerging multiculturalism)
Institutional framework	A structured, formalised framework guided by national policies such as the Integration Act (2016) and managed by BAMF. Integration projects receive significant funding and follow a top-down assimilationist model, with some integrationist features in stakeholder coordination.	An indifferent and fragmented framework shaped by the EU-Turkey deal (2016). Managed primarily by DGMM, policies remain reactive and politically driven rather than structurally integrationist. Some multicultural elements emerge through NGO initiatives.
Government role	The federal and regional governments coordinate refugee integration, funding over 8000 integration course providers. Policies aim to integrate refugees into the labour market but reinforce assimilationist expectations of cultural adaptation.	The central government plays an inconsistent role, with municipal governments and NGOs filling gaps. Policies reflect indifference, with minimal structural support for long-term refugee inclusion.
NGOs and community organisations	Over 120 active integration projects focus on civic engagement, language skills, and employment assistance. NGOs collaborate with local clubs, Volkshochschulen and religious groups, reinforcing an integrationist model within an assimilationist structure.	NGOs play a crucial role in service provision, often compensating for state inaction. While largely constrained by political alignment, some organisations promote multiculturalist initiatives through partnerships with municipalities and international donors.
Multinational corporations (MNCs)	MNCs contribute through CSR initiatives, such as Telekom's apprenticeship programme (100 refugee apprentices per year) and Siemens' skills training schemes. HRM peak bodies promote refugee hiring within an assimilationist workplace model.	MNC involvement is limited, driven primarily by international pressure. Some firms informally employ refugees, often in precarious conditions, reflecting an indifferent and unregulated approach.
Trade unions	Highly active, with IG Metall and Ver.di providing training, lobbying for qualification recognition, and advocating anti-discrimination measures. Trade unions support an integrationist approach within an overall assimilationist labour market framework.	Trade unions have minimal influence over refugee employment due to the dominance of the informal economy. Some efforts address exploitation, but stakeholder coordination is weak, reinforcing indifference to workplace integration.
Labour market access and barriers	Formal employment pathways exist, supported by policies and economic incentives, yet qualification recognition and language barriers persist. Workplace integration remains largely assimilationist, prioritising economic adaptation over diversity.	Refugees are predominantly confined to the informal sector, with legal work permits rarely granted. Bureaucratic barriers and social exclusion maintain an indifferent model, with limited movement towards multiculturalism via local NGO initiatives.
Funding and economic drivers	Significant public investment (~€43 billion from 2015–2017), including €4 billion for integration courses. Economic motivations align with labour shortages, reinforcing an assimilationist economic model that integrates refugees as workers rather than citizens.	Heavily reliant on EU funding (~€6 billion), with limited domestic investment. The economic rationale is driven more by political negotiations than demographic needs, sustaining an indifferent model with emerging multiculturalist funding strategies through NGOs.
Public and political discourse	Initially welcoming (Willkommenskultur), but later shifted towards scepticism. Refugees are framed as both an economic resource and a social challenge, reflecting an assimilationist policy narrative.	Public attitudes are largely negative, with media-driven moral panics reinforcing xenophobic perceptions. Government messaging is supportive at times but fluctuates based on EU relations, sustaining an indifferent and exclusionary discourse.
Stakeholder coordination	Multi-stakeholder coordination is well-established, involving BAMF, trade unions, MNCs, NGOs and local governments, supporting an integrationist model within an assimilationist structure	Coordination is fragmented, with weak collaboration between key players such as the central government, large NGOs, and EU donors. Limited cross-sector engagement reflects an indifferent integration model.

(Continues)

TABLE 3 | (Continued)

Dimension	Germany (assimilation and emerging integration)	Turkey (indifference and emerging multiculturalism)
Refugee agency and participation	Refugees follow structured employment pathways but have little agency in shaping integration policies. Workplace adaptation expectations reinforce assimilationist pressures.	Refugees have minimal influence in policymaking and rely on NGOs for support. The dominance of the informal economy and lack of formal mechanisms sustain an indifferent and exclusionary approach.

is telling to note that in 2020, over 50% of refugees are in qualified employment, and just 5 years after they arrived in 2015 speaks for itself (Tagesschau 2020). In contrast to Germany's integration industry, Turkey's approach is limited, scattered, disconnected and hampered by an unfavourable economic context. The industry in Turkey is emerging and is very much the product of a supranational imposition and, of course, a demand fueled by the recent significant influx of Syrian conflict refugees.

In both countries, the populist discourses of the ruling parties supported and showcased the integration of refugees through the collaboration of various institutional stakeholders while informed by hegemonic frames of reference, which often counter the dominant discourse. The reality for refugees within these two distinctive contexts plays out very differently. Still, as we see it, more needs to be done to strengthen the links between the integration industry and the refugees themselves, a pursuit which can only happen if the mounting of this industry recognises the particular circumstances which define refugee status and social justice principles. Drawing on Ortlieb and Ressi's (2022) research, we suggest that tailored support mechanisms are essential to effectively address refugees' unique challenges, thereby facilitating a smoother and more inclusive integration into the workplace and society. Currently, such arrangements are largely market-driven and serve the goodwill of the stakeholder, potentially yielding outcomes that are often at odds with the refugees' optimal interests (Marens 2010). This neglect is evident in failing to address credential recognition, language barriers, cultural adaptation and legal precarity. While some refugees enter formal employment, many remain in precarious work due to bureaucratic restrictions and discrimination. Workplace-level integration also receives little attention, leaving refugee experiences of inclusion or exclusion largely unexamined.

The rise of an intermediary industry to support the post-arrival workplace entry and integration of refugees has perplexed business and management scholars, who have traditionally focused on labour migrants (Groutsis et al. 2020, 2023; Hajro et al. 2023; Özbilgin et al. 2024). In privileging a particular type of migrant, the literature surrounding the integration of refugees and the corresponding industry supporting this process generally and their workplace integration and adjustment typically focus on specific support services targeting deficits, including language instruction, education and general assistance with finding employment. Consequently, there has been little understanding of the diversity of needs surrounding refugee post-arrival adjustment and the broad and varied industry

and its related stakeholders that have emerged to serve these needs. The market imperative guides the industry recipe rather than a social justice argument. In short, we argue that the integration industry for refugees has different industrial recipes determined by contextual and locally sensitive criteria but largely devoid of a spirit of inclusion, an even distribution of power, and a two-way dynamic in the process of integration between the refugees, the stakeholder and the broader society.

What lessons can we draw from the two distinct country contexts we explored? Germany and Turkey are interesting as the two illustrative examples sit at either end of the economic spectrum; however, they have been collaborating on refugee integration. Remarkably, connecting these two distinctive country cases has been the political will and leadership discourses in the ruling governments that have engendered major transformations in national policies and practices surrounding the integration of refugees. As such, our analyses show the significant role that governments, leadership, the politics of the day, communities, workplaces, and work-related agencies, such as trade unions and HR peak bodies, can play in shaping refugee integration. We also identify that political will needs to be and is often supplemented with stakeholder engagement. In the case of Germany, this manifests through an extensive network of stakeholders, including, for instance, businesses, HR professionals, trade unions and NGOs; in the Turkish case, this has remained focused on a few large NGOs. In both countries, the main barrier to post-arrival integration is the hegemonic frames surrounding the historical treatment of refugees. Drawing on the above spectrum, we identify an awkward connection between the German and Turkish examples, emphasising refugees fitting in or assimilating into the broader socio-cultural milieu. For instance, in Germany, for decades now, the notion of integration has been dominated by an assimilationist approach to integration: the aim being to assimilate immigrants, refugees and ethnic minorities while ensuring the mono-cultural society is maintained (Geißler and Pöttker 2006). Little has changed despite the tinkering at the sides as a result of the business benefits. In the German case, the refugee integration benefits the German economy, which demands labour to address shortages. In the Turkish case, the integration of refugees benefits aspects of the conservative ruling government agenda. In both cases, there are only minor elements of a co-determined outcome in the post-arrival integration process, raising questions and concerns about the sustainability of such an approach that impedes the agency and choice of the refugee. That is, in both cases, the approach to integration is one-way and assimilationist and neglects the diverse and emic intersections (Tatli et al. 2012) and needs of

the refugee population. Although the arrival of Syrian-conflict refugees has transformed national policies and dented public opinion, the sustainability of the integration of refugees remains on a tightrope of tensions between divergent political debates, professional controls, economic and geopolitical interests, and social divisions in both countries. In such a context, we note that strong political will for stakeholder engagement within and outside the workplace level is the way forward for effective management of the integration industry and a shift in the dial from assimilation to integration and multiculturalism. The main difference between the two countries regarding stakeholders being/not being ready makes Turkey less of a waiting room and Germany an object of desire for integration (despite the problems pronounced by refugees). While refugees can be financially included by establishing small businesses (Shinnar and Zamantılı Nayır 2019) providing a pathway to societal integration (Şimşek 2019), integration actors in Turkey are not adequately prepared and resourced to offer full coverage since they are limited to public institutions and a small number of NGOs. The fledgling legitimate integration industry in Turkey has a long way to go.

8 | Conclusion

This paper explored the role of the integration industry, with a specific focus on key stakeholders such as government agencies, trade unions, MNCs and NGOs in shaping refugees′ labour market integration in Germany and Turkey. Our key theoretical contribution is the development of a typology of (de)humanitarianism with four models that reveal how integration industries, despite appearing benevolent, may reproduce exclusion and diminish refugee agency through institutionalised asymmetries. Although developed through the cases of Germany and Turkey, the typology of (de)humanitarianism offers a conceptual tool that may be adapted to future comparative studies of refugee integration industries, particularly in contexts where economic imperatives intersect with humanitarian narratives. By theorising the refugee integration industry through the lens of stakeholder dynamics and power asymmetries, our study highlights the need for policy and practice to shift towards models that foreground refugee agency, equitable participation, and human potential. We demonstrate that political will is foundational, enabling stakeholders to act as arbiters for refugee integration within and outside the workplace. The various stakeholders in the integration industry, from trade unions to HR practitioners, government agents and NGOs, can thread together general interaction and work-related adjustment. Creating a community of shared practice around post-arrival integration with refugees is an essential first step.

Furthermore, sharing stories on the challenges and opportunities experienced by drawing on the diversity of refugee talent can also play an important role in disrupting negative public attitudes and shifting perceptions of refugees as unwilling to integrate. Shifting perceptions and public attitudes is critical, considering that, for example, in the case of Germany, refugees are faced with refugee-specific stigma and discrimination, which they experience during the job search process, as well as when in employment, which can lead to depression and anxiety (Baranik et al. 2018). Such barriers also threaten refugees′

fundamental identity needs for worth, distinctiveness, continuity, and control (Wehrle et al. 2018), which may be particularly important for their well-being, particularly in light of their mobility from war-torn countries into supposedly safe havens and lives.

Future research could investigate the diverse needs of refugees with a particular focus on the extent to which they feel they are using their full potential (Morillas 2023) and particularly if this has resulted in material outcomes in the form of securing meaningful jobs that reflect their qualifications. Acknowledging the agency of refugees and giving them an active role in the development of the process of post-arrival adjustment can aid in creating a better method of labour market integration at the workplace level and more broadly (Forde and MacKenzie 2010) and can also have a positive impact on their well-being overall. Second, we noted that the German approach to integration relies on a multi-stakeholder approach, compared with the Turkish case, which largely depends on three disparate stakeholders (critical players in the informal economy, NGOs, and the government). In both cases, however, the focus is mainly on stakeholder arrangements outside the workplace. More research needs to be undertaken to examine the links between the various stakeholders at different levels of analysis and a central focus on the links between stakeholders located within and outside the workplace. Finally, to go beyond integracism, defined as a specific interpretation of integration containing implicitly racist assumptions (Tatli et al. 2012), we must engage more critically with the notion of integration and post-arrival adjustment. In many countries, including our two cases, the notion of integration remains firmly stuck on the assimilation of refugees into the dominant culture rather than creating a basis for shared acceptance, a co-determination of structures and policies, and a positive recognition of diversity. The implications of this entrenched systemic bias require further investigation, particularly in terms of the implication of such bias on practices and processes in, within and between the societal and organisational levels. Given their transnational reach and capacity, MNCs can also play a more significant role in setting benchmarks for inclusive employment practices, supporting skills development and engaging in long-term CSR initiatives to facilitate refugee workforce integration.

References

Ager, A., and A. Strang. 2008. "Understanding Integration: A Conceptual Framework." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 21, no. 2008: 166–191.

Akbulut-Yuksel, M., N. Mocan, S. Tumen, and B. Turan. 2024. "The Crime Effect of Refugees." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 43, no. 2: 472–508.

Bales, K., and L. Mayblin. 2018. "Unfree Labour in Immigration Detention: Exploitation and Coercion of a Captive Immigrant Workforce." *Economy and Society* 47, no. 2: 191–213.

Baranik, L. E., C. S. Hurst, and L. T. Eby. 2018. "The Stigma of Being a Refugee: A Mixed-Method Study of Refugees' Experiences of Vocational Stress." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 105: 116–130.

Bartlett, L., and F. Vavrus. 2017. "Comparative Case Studies: An Innovative Approach." *Nordic Journal of Comparative and International Education (NJCIE)* 1, no. 1: 5–17.

Bastian, B., and N. Haslam. 2011. "Experiencing Dehumanization: Cognitive and Emotional Effects of Everyday Dehumanization." *Basic and Applied Social Psychology* 33, no. 4: 295–303.

Bélanger, D., and C. Saracoglu. 2020. "The Governance of Syrian Refugees in Turkey: The State-Capital Nexus and Its Discontents." *Mediterranean Politics* 25, no. 4: 413–432.

Berg, M. 2025. "Refugee Integration in Germany: The Interplay of Othering, Digital Exclusion, and Identity Negotiation." *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 26: 1–20.

Bergfeld, M. 2017. "Germany's Willkommenskultur: Trade Unions, Refugees and Labour Market Integration." *Global Labour Journal, 2017* 8, no. 1: 83.

Bogado, N., and T. Wolf. 2024. "The CDU and the Leitkultur Debate: An Analysis of Angela Merkel's Integration Discourse Before and After the 2015 Syrian Refugee Crisis." *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 25, no. 4: 2123–2141.

Butera, A. C., and S. Ertorer. 2020. "Restrictive Asylum Policies and Reflections in the Labour Market: The Cases of Italy and Turkey." *Current Challenges in Migration Policy and Law* 9: 9–32.

Can, Ş. 2025. "Refugees as 'Projects': Humanitarian Responses to Displacement and Refugee-Led Organisations in Southern Turkey." *Journal of Humanitarian Affairs* 6, no. 1: 24–37.

Castles, S., M. Korac, E. Vasta, and S. Vertovec. 2001. "Integration: Mapping the Field." Report, Centre for Migration and Policy Research and Refugee Studies Centre, University of Oxford.

Çebi, E. 2017. "The Role of Turkish NGOs in Social Cohesion of Syrians." *Turkish Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*: 135–170.

Cevik, H. 2025. "From Open Doors to Closed Minds: The Transformation of Perceptions Toward Syrian Refugees in Turkey." *Journal of Race, Ethnicity, and Politics*: 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1017/rep.2024.35.

Christopher, D. 2023. "Seeking Sanctuary: Housing Undocumented Immigrants." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 42, no. 4: 1065–1091.

Collins, J., C. Reid, D. Groutsis, K. Watson, and D. Ozkul. 2018. "Syrian and Iraqi Refugee Settlement in Australia." In *Public Seminar on Responses to Syrian-Conflict Refugee Settlement in Australia, Canada, Finland, Germany, New Zealand, Sweden, and the UK. Sydney: University of Technology* (Vol. 14).

Cui, C., Y. Zhang, and X. Mu. 2025. "Unpacking Migrants' Social Integration: The Mediating Effect of Hierarchical Migration in the Context of China." *Habitat International* 158: 103337.

Degler, E., and T. Liebig. 2017. "Finding Their Way. Labour market integration of refugees in Germany." OECD. http://www.oecd.org/migration.

Derksen, M., and C. Teixeira. 2023. "Refugees and Religious Institutions in a Mid-Size Canadian City." *Population, Space and Place* 29, no. 5: e2653.

Deutscher Bundestag. 2018. "Flüchtlinge am Arbeitsmarkt. [Refugees in the Labour Market.]" https://www.bildungsspiegel.de/news/auf-die-schnelle-kurzmeldungen/2936-fluechtlinge-am-arbeitsmarkt.

DGFP. 2017a. "Medieninformation: Studie: Hohes Engagement bei der Integration von Flüchtlingen. [High Commitment to Refugee Integration – Study Press Release.]" https://www.dgfp.de/aktuell/dgfp-medieninformation-studie-hohes-engagement-bei-der-integration-von-fluechtlingen/.

DGFP. 2017b. "Hürden abbauen: die integration geflüchteter in den betrieblichen alltag erleichtern! [Removing Barriers: Facilitating the Integration of Refugees Into Everyday Work Life]" Herausgeber Deutsche Gesellschaft für Personalführung e. V.

Diedrich, A., and V. Omanović. 2023. "Lost n Transitional Space? Organising Labour Market Integration for Highly Skilled Refugees in the Welfare State." *European Management Review* 20, no. 3: 530–542.

Düvell, F. 2018. "From Migration Transition to Integration Challenge." *New Perspectives on Turkey* 58: 179–200.

Eisenhardt, K. M., and M. E. Graebner. 2007. "Theory Building From Cases: Opportunities and Challenges." *Academy of Management Journal* 50, no. 1: 25–32. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2007.24160888.

Elie, J. 2014. "Histories of Refugee and Forced Migration Studies." The Oxford Handbook of Refugee and Forced Migration Studies, 23–35.

Emilsson, H. 2015. "A National Turn of Local Integration Policy: Multi-Level Governance Dynamics in Denmark and Sweden." *Comparative Migration Studies* 3: 1–16.

Erdoğan, E., and P. U. Semerci. 2017. *Attitudes Towards Syrians in Turkey-2017*. Istanbul Bilgi University-Center for Migration Research.

European Commission. 2019. "The EU Facility for Refugees in Turkey." https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/news_corner/migration_en.

Eurostat. 2016. "Country Factsheet: Germany 2016." European Migration Network. https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/11a_germany_country_factsheet_2016_en_0.pdf.

Eurostat. 2019. "Asylum Statistics." https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Asylum_statistics#Main_countries_of_destination:_Germany.2C_France_and_Greece.

Fassin, D. 2010. "Inequality of Lives, Hierarchies of Humanity: Moral Commitments and Ethical Dilemmas of Humanitarianism." In *Government and Humanity*, edited by I. Feldman and M. Ticktin, 238–255. Duke University Press.

Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (BAMF). 2017. "Integrated Refugee Management." http://www.bamf.de/SharedDocs/Anlagen/EN/Publikationen/Broschueren/broschuere-integriertes-fluechtlingsmanagement.pdf?__blob=publicationFile.

Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (BAMF). 2018. "Laufende Integrationsprojekte zum Stand 01.04.2018." http://www.bamf.de/SharedDocs/Anlagen/DE/Downloads/Infothek/Integrationsprojekte/projektatlas-2-quartal-2018.pdf?__blob=publicationFile.

Focus. 2018. "Bericht: Die bisherigen Kosten der Flüchtlingskrise in Deutschland. [Report: The Previous Costs of the Refugee Crisis in Germany.]" https://www.focus.de/politik/deutschland/aufnahme-und-integration-bericht-die-bisherigen-kosten-der-fluechtlingskrise-in-deutschland_id_8949358.html.

Forde, C., and R. MacKenzie. 2010. "The Ethical Agendas of Employment Agencies Towards Migrant Workers in the UK: Deciphering the Codes." *Journal of Business Ethics* 97, no. 1: 31–41.

Freeman, R. E. 1984. *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*. Pitman.

Gammeltoft-Hansen, T. 2014. "International Refugee Law and Refugee Policy: The Case of Deterrence Policies." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 27, no. 4: 574–595.

Geißler, R. and Pöttker, H. 2006. "Mediale Integration von Migranten. Ein Problemaufriss." In Integration durch Massenmedien. Medien und Migration im internationalen Vergleich. 13–44. transcript.

Giertz, J.-P., M. Maschke, and N. Werner. 2016. *MBF-Report - Mitbestimmung Als Notwendige Bedingung Für Integration*. Hans Boeckler Stiftung.

Glushkova, T., L. Kemppainen, A. Kouvonen, S. Wrede, I. Pietilä, and T. Kemppainen. 2025. "Migration and Diverse Belongings in a

Neighbourhood Context: Population-Based Study of Older Russian-Speaking Migrants in Finland." *Population, Space and Place* 31, no. 1: e2877. https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.2877.

Goerzen, A., C. G. Asmussen, and B. B. Nielsen. 2024. "Global Cities, the Liability of Foreignness, and Theory on Place and Space in International Business." *Journal of International Business Studies* 55, no. 1: 10–27.

Groutsis, D., J. Vassilopoulou, O. Kyriakidou, and M. F. Özbilgin. 2020. "The 'New' Migration for Work Phenomenon: The Pursuit of Emancipation and Recognition in the Context of Work." *Work, Employment and Society* 34, no. 5: 864–882.

Groutsis, D., J. Vassilopoulou, M. Ozbilgin, Y. Fujimoto, and M. Mor Barak. 2023. "From the Editors—Migration Management: Introduction and Overview." *Academy of Management Discoveries* 9, no. 2: 117–124.

Gürtzgen, N., A. Kubis, and M. Rebien. 2017. "Geflüchtete kommen mehr und mehr am Arbeitsmarkt an (No. 14/2017). [Refugees Are Increasingly Arriving in the Labour Market.]" IAB-Kurzbericht.

Hajro, A., C. Brewster, W. Haak-Saheem, and M. J. Morley. 2023. "Global Migration: Implications for International Business Scholarship." *Journal of International Business Studies* 54, no. 6: 1134–1150.

Haslam, N., P. Bain, L. Douge, M. Lee, and B. Bastian. 2005. "More Human Than You: Attributing Humanness to Self and Others." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 89: 937–950.

İçduygu, A. 2016. "Turkey: Labour Market Integration and Social Inclusion of Refugees. European Parliament." Policy Department A: Economic and Scientific Policy.

İçduygu, A., and E. Diker. 2017. "Labor Market Integration of Syrian Refugees in Turkey: From Refugees to Settlers." *Journal of Migration Studies* 3, no. 1: 12–35.

İçduygu, A., and D. Yükseker. 2012. "Rethinking Transit Migration in Turkey: Reality and Re-Presentation in the Creation of a Migratory Phenomenon." *Population, Space and Place* 18, no. 4: 441–456.

IG Metall (IGM). 2016. "Sofortprogramm Für Eine Solidarische Flüchtlingspolitik—So Hilft Die IG Metall Jetzt Flüchtlingen. [Immediate Programme for a Solidarity-Based Refugee Policy – How IG Metall Is Now Helping Refugees.]" https://www.igmetall.de/sofortprogramm-fuer-eine-solidarische-fluechtlingspolitik-17093.htm.

İnsani Gelişme Vakfı (İngev). 2017. "Suriyeli Mülteci Hayatlar Monitörü. [Syrian Refugee Lives Monitor.]" http://ingev.org/kutuphane/ingev-raporlar/suriyeli-multeci-hayatlar-monitoru-degerlendirme/.

ILO. 2016. "Suriyeli isci, isveren ve girisimcilerin isgucu piyasasinda karsilastiklari sorunlar ve sozum onerileri calitayi genel degerlendirme. [Workshop Report: Challenges and Proposed Solutions Faced by Syrian Workers, Employers and Entrepreneurs in the Labour Market.]" https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/—europe/—ro-geneva/—ilo-ankara/documents/meetingdocument/wcms_533055.pdf.

Imrie-Kuzu, D., and A. Özerdem. 2023. "Keeping Syrian Refugees in Turkey Is Not a Good Idea: A New Concept of 'Reluctant Local Integration'." *Third World Quarterly* 44, no. 7: 1606–1624.

Kallenbach, S., K. S. Lee, S. Downs-Karkos, and M. Beaubien Taylor. 2013. *Adult Education and Immigrant Integration: Networks for Integrating New Americans (NINA)*. World Education, Inc.

Kayaoglu, A., and M. M. Erdogan. 2019. *Labor Market Activities of Syrian Refugees in Turkey*. Economic Research Forum.

Kaymaz, T., and O. Kadkoy. 2016. "Syrians in Turkey: The Economics of Integration." In Al Sharq Forum Expert Brief. More Information.

Korac, M. 2003. "The Lack of Integration Policy and Experiences of Settlement: A Case Study of Refugees in Rome." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 16, no. 4: 398–421.

Leyens, J. P., S. Demoulin, J. Vaes, R. Gaunt, and M. P. Paladino. 2007. "Infra-Humanization: The Wall of Group Differences." *Social Issues and Policy Review* 1, no. 1: 139–172.

Lienen, C. S., and E. LeRoux-Rutledge. 2022. "Refugee Identity and Integration in Germany During the European 'Migration Crisis': Why Local Community Support Matters, and Why Policy Gets It Wrong." *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies* 22, no. 4: 697–713. https://doi.org/10.1080/15562948.2022.2098445.

Luyken, J. 2018. "Angela Merkel Was Right About Refugee Integration, Says German Business Federation Chief." https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2018/12/14/angela-merkel-right-integration-figures-show-400000-refugees/.

Mackreath, H., and Ş. G. Sağnıç. 2017. Türkiye'de Sivil Toplum ve Suriyeli Mülteciler [Civil Society and Syrian Refugees in Turkey]. Helsinki Yurttaslar Dernegi.

Mahia, R., R. de Arce, A. A. Koç, and G. Bölük. 2020. "The Short and Long-Term Impact of Syrian Refugees on the Turkish Economy: A Simulation Approach." *Turkish Studies* 21, no. 5: 661–683.

Marens, R. 2010. "Speaking Platitudes to Power: Observing American Business Ethics in an Age of Declining Hegemony." *Journal of Business Ethics* 94, no. S2: 239–253. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-0754-8.

Maj, J., A. Hamza-Orlinska, I. Sytnik, A. Stopochkin, and M. Özbilgin. 2025. "Misrecognition and Labor Market Inclusion of Refugee Mothers." *Gender, Work & Organization* 32, no. 2: 653–672.

MIGAZIN. 2012. "Deutschland ist von einer Anerkennung der Einwanderungsgesellschaft noch weit entfernt. [Germany Still Far from Recognising Itself as an Immigration Society.]" https://www.migazin.de/2012/06/27/deutschland-ist-von-einer-anerkennung-der-einwanderungsgesellschaft-noch-weit-entfernt/.

Ministry of Family, Labour and Social Services (MoFLSS). 2017. "Labour Statistics 2017." https://www.ailevecalisma.gov.tr/media/3372/yabanciizin2017.pdf.

Modood, T. 1998. "Anti-Essentialism, Multiculturalism and the 'Recognition' of Religious Groups." *Journal of Political Philosophy* 6, no. 4: 378–399.

Modood, T. 2018. "Pointing to a Multicultural Future: Rethinking Race, Ethnicity, Religion and Britishness." In *Public Commissions on Cultural and Religious Diversity*, 47–70. Routledge.

Montgomery, J. R. 1996. "Components of Refugee Adaptation." *International Migration Review* 30, no. 3: 679–702.

Morgan, H. 2022. "Conducting a Qualitative Document Analysis." *Qualitative Report* 27, no. 1: 64–77.

Morillas, M. 2023. "The Terms of Inclusion: How Migrant Professionals Negotiate Inclusion in Organizations." https://www.hhs.se/globalassets/media-imagesdocuments/documents/library/dissertations/dissertation-2023-to-2024/miguel-morillas/combined-miguel-morrias.pdf.

Naccache, P., and A. Al Ariss. 2018. "The Forced Migration Crisis and the Role of European Corporations: A Point of View." *European Management Review* 15, no. 4: 589–596.

Ng, E. S., and I. Metz. 2015. "Multiculturalism as a Strategy for National Competitiveness: The Case for Canada and Australia." *Journal of Business Ethics* 128: 253–266.

Nimer, M., and S. B. Rottmann. 2021. "Migration Regime and 'Language Part of Work': Experiences of Syrian Refugees as Surplus Population in the Turkish Labor Market." *Critical Sociology* 47, no. 4–5: 763–776.

Nimer, M., and S. B. Rottmann. 2022. "Logistification and Hyper-Precarity At the Intersection of Migration and Pandemic Governance: Refugees in the Turkish Labour Market." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 35, no. 1: 122–138.

Norman, K. P. 2020. "Migration Diplomacy and Policy Liberalization in Morocco and Turkey." *International Migration Review* 54: 01979 18319895271.

Oh, R. 2019. "Dehumanization, Immigrants, and Equal Protection." *California Western Law Review* 56, no. 1: 103–134.

Ortlieb, R., and E. Ressi. 2022. "From Refugee to Manager? Organisational Socialisation Practices, Refugees' Experiences and Polyrhythmic Socialisation." *European Management Review* 19, no. 2: 185–206.

Osseiran, S. 2020. "The Intersection of Labour and Refugee Policies in the Middle East and Turkey: Exploring the Dynamics of 'Permanent Temporariness'." *Civil Society Review* 4, no. 2: 94–112.

Özbilgin, M., C. Erbil, and A. Dipalma. 2024. "Migrant DIversity: Introducing the Migrant Diversity Category to Diversity Management." In *Research Handbook on Migration and Employment*, edited by G. Meardi. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Ozgoren, C., M. Karatas-Ozkan, M. Ozbilgin, R. Kamasak, E. Sayin, and J. Vassilopoulou. 2025. "Refugee Entrepreneurs: Typologies of Emancipation and Impact." *International Small Business Journal*: 02662426241311052. https://doi.org/10.1177/02662426241311052.

Phillimore, J. 2021. "Refugee-Integration-Opportunity Structures: Shifting the Focus From Refugees to Context." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 34, no. 2: 1946–1966.

Prior, L. 2008. "Researching Documents: Emergent Methods." In *Handbook of Emergent Methods*, edited by S. N. Hesse-Biber and P. Leavy, 111–126. The Guilford Press.

Refugee Council Australia. 2018. "UNHCR Global Trends 2017—How Australia Compares With the World." https://www.refugeecouncil.org.au/global-trends-2017/.

Shinnar, R. S., and D. Zamantılı Nayır. 2019. "Immigrant Entrepreneurship in an Emerging Economy: The Case of Turkey." *Journal of Small Business Management* 57, no. 2: 559–575.

Şimşek, D. 2018. "MÜLTECİ ENTEGRASYONU, GÖÇ POLİTİKALARI VE SOSYAL SINIF: TÜRKİYE'DEKİ SURİYELİ MÜLTECİLER ÖRNEĞİ. [Refugee Integration, Migration Policies, and Social Class: The Case of Syrian Refugees in Turkey.]" *Sosyal Politika Çalışmaları Dergisi* 18, no. 40/2: 367–392.

Şimşek, D. 2019. "Transnational Activities of Syrian Refugees in Turkey: Hindering or Supporting Integration." *International Migration* 57, no. 2: 268–282.

Simsek, D., and S. Koser Akcapar. 2018. "The Politics of Syrian Refugees in Turkey: A Question of Inclusion and Exclusion Through Citizenship." *Social Inclusion* 6, no. 1: 176–187.

Spencer, S., and K. Charsley. 2021. "Reframing 'Integration': Acknowledging and Addressing Five Core Critiques." *Comparative Migration Studies* 9, no. 1: 18.

Spender, J. C. 1989. *Industry Recipes*. Basil Blackwell.

Statista. 2018. "Germany Is Home to the Most Refugees." https://www.statista.com/chart/14494/germany-is-home-to-the-most-refugees/.

Stern. 2015. "Deutschland sagt: Refugees welcome! [Germany Says: Refugees Welcome!]" https://www.stern.de/politik/deutschland/so-herzlich-heisst-deutschland-die-fluechtlinge-willkommen-6437006.html.

Sunata, U., and S. Tosun. 2019. "Assessing the Civil Society's Role in Refugee Integration in Turkey: NGO-R as a New Typology." *Journal of refugee studies* 32, no. 4: 683–703.

Tagesschau. 2020. "Fünf Jahre nach der AnkunftHälfte der Flüchtlinge hat einen Job. [Five Years After Their Arrival, Half of the Refugees Have a Job.]" https://www.tagesschau.de/wirtschaft/arbeitsmarkt-fluechtlinge-103.html.

Tatli, A., J. Vassilopoulou, A. A. Ariss, and M. Özbilgin. 2012. "The Role of Regulatory and Temporal Context in the Construction of Diversity Discourses: The Case of the UK, France and Germany." *European Journal of Industrial Relations* 18, no. 4: 293–308.

The Economist. 2017. "The New Neighbours: Turkey Is Taking Care of Refugees, But Failing to Integrate Them." https://amp.economist.com/europe/2017/06/29/turkey-is-taking-care-of-refugees-but-failing-to-integrate-them.

The Economist. 2018. "Syrian Refugees Find Turkey More Welcoming Than Western-Europe." https://www.economist.com/europe/2018/08/23/syrian-refugees-find-turkey-more-welcoming-than-western-europe.

Toğral Koca, B. 2016. "Syrian Refugees in Turkey: From "Guests" to "Enemies"?" *New Perspectives on Turkey* 54: 55–75.

UN News. 2018. "Global Compact on Refugees: How Is This Different From the Migrants' Pact and How Will It Help?" https://news.un.org/en/story/2018/12/1028641.

UNHCR. 2018. "Turkey Fact Sheet." https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/01.-UNHCR-Turkey-Fact-Sheet-August-2018.pdf.

UNHCR. 2019. "Registered Syrian Refugees." https://data2.unhcr.org/en/situations/syria/location/113.

UNHCR. 2024. "UNHCR Regional Refugee Response Plan 2024." https://migrant-integration.ec.europa.eu/library-document/unhcr-regional-refugee-response-plan-2024_en.

Unutulmaz, K. O. 2019. "Turkey's Education Policies Towards Syrian Refugees: A Macro-Level Analysis." *International Migration* 57, no. 2: 235–252.

Vassilopoulou, J. 2011. "Understanding the Habitus of Managing Ethnic Diversity in Germany. A Multilevel Relational Study." Doctoral diss., University of East Anglia.

Vassilopoulou, J., K. Jonsen, M. Özbilgin, and A. Tatli. 2014. "Multiculturalism at Work: Examples From the UK and Germany." In *Diversity Ideologies in Organizations*, 269–279. Routledge.

ver.di. 2016. "Arbeitsmarktintegration von Flüchtlingen—Was Passiert Bei Ver.di? [Labour Market Integration of Refugees – What Is Happening at ver.di?]" https://arbeitsmarkt-und-sozialpolitik.verdi.de/ueber-uns/nachrichten/++++5e6b41e4-b5f5-11e5-b86f-525400248a66.

Wehrle, K., U. C. Klehe, M. Kira, and J. Zikic. 2018. "Can I Come as I Am? Refugees' Vocational Identity Threats, Coping, and Growth." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 105: 83–101.

Woellert, F., S. Kröhnert, L. Sippel, and R. Klingholz. 2009. Ungenutzte Potenziale: Zur Lage der Integration in Deutschland, 91. DEU.

World Bank. 2024. Labor Market Integration of Refugees in Germany: New Lessonsafter the Ukrainian Crisis. https://documents.worldbank.org/pt/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/099016304302411714.

Wiśniewski, R., B. Szejgiec-Kolenda, P. Duma, E. Maruniak, and T. Komornicki. 2024. "Refugees From Ukraine in Poland—Differentiation of Spatial Distribution and Impact on Demographic Structures." *Population, Space and Place* 30: e48.

Zeit. 2015. "Deutsche heißen Flüchtlinge willkommen. [Germans Welcome Refugees.]" https://www.zeit.de/politik/2015-09/fs-fluechtlinge-deutschland.

Zick, A., B. Küpper, and W. Berghan. 2019. Verlorene Mittefeindselige Zustände: Rechtsextreme Einstellungen in Deutschland 2018/19 [Lost Centre – Hostile Conditions: Right-Wing Extremist Attitudes in Germany 2018/19]. Herausgegeben für die Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung von Franziska Schröter. Dietz. Bonn.