

# 1 Introduction

*Soner Barthoma and Önver A. Çetrez*

---

‘What’s past’, as the famous line in Shakespeare’s *The Tempest* has it, ‘is prologue’. Just as this edited volume is being compiled in mid-2021—some six years after the 2015 refugee emergency— developments in Afghanistan and the Belarus-Polish border appear once again to be laying the path for a new migration emergency. The past undoubtedly weighs heavily on many Western and refugee-receiving countries as they prepare for a new influx of refugees from the region while promising not to repeat earlier ‘mistakes’. The situation in Afghanistan lays bare in no uncertain terms precisely how foreign intervention can exacerbate state failure and trigger waves of migration. It also showcases the moral failure of intervening powers in failing to heed the complexity of the cultures they encounter or take responsibility for the social, political and economic consequences of their interventions.

This volume takes up the challenge of providing a comparative understanding of migration regimes and practices and their consequences for political systems and the people who have fled their homelands due to conflict, war and poverty between 2011 and 2020. Empirically, the chapters included in this volume are based on the research conducted in 11 countries (Iraq, Lebanon, Turkey, Greece, Italy, Hungary, Austria, Poland, Germany, the UK and Sweden) within the framework of the Horizon 2020 RESPOND project (2017–2021), funded by the European Commission.

RESPOND is a comprehensive study of migration governance in the wake of the 2015 Refugee Emergency, which has long been constructed as a ‘crisis’ in policy discourses. This ‘crisis’ has foregrounded the apparent vulnerability of European borders, the tenuous jurisdiction of the Schengen system and broad problems with the multilevel governance of migration and integration. One of the most visible impacts of the refugee crisis has been the polarization of politics in European Union (EU) member states and the policy (in)coherence among them in responding to the crisis and its aftermath.

RESPOND studied the migration phenomena from a holistic perspective at macro, meso and micro levels, enabling the researchers involved in this project to understand the connections between policies, practices and experiences through a narrative that is constructed through five thematic fields: 1) border management and security, 2) refugee protection regimes, 3) Reception policies, 4) integration policies, and 5) conflicting Europeanization. Each thematic field reflects a juncture in the migration journey of refugees.

Taken together, the thematic fields offer a holistic view of policies, their impacts and the affected actors' responses to them.

Migration governance is about controlling borders and security, but it is also about defining who will be allowed 'in' and who will be kept 'out'. The responses of the actors involved and their interactions matter for the outcomes of the policies. We observe that in the face of the 2015 Refugee Emergency, policy-making has been stretched and polarized between *the particular* (the development of 'more efficient' measures to tackle the mass movement of people across borders) and *the universal* (the preservation of the foundational 'normative principles' of the global governance of migration).

RESPOND's focus has been on the Eastern Mediterranean route, especially the mass migration triggered by the Syrian civil war from 2011 onward. The countries included in the project and the target refugee populations have been selected accordingly. The selection was also guided by the significance of the chosen cases as the source, transit, and destination countries. The source countries we studied were Syria, Iraq and Afghanistan. The transit countries were Turkey, Lebanon, Greece, Italy, Poland, and Hungary. Finally, the destination countries were Germany, Sweden, the United Kingdom and Austria. An important note here is the absence of examples of 'transit only' countries. Instead, given that conditions change quickly, countries that start as spaces of transit become, after some time, destinations for some migrants to settle more or less permanently. Turkey is one such case.

## Method

RESPOND applied a mixed methodology, combining legal and policy analysis of textual material with an ethnographic study conducted among refugees in 11 countries as well as with stakeholders working in the field of migration in all these countries. As for the overall sampling in each country, researchers conducted a minimum of 15 interviews on the meso level (with stakeholders from a range of government agencies—including law enforcement, customs and border officials, the coast guard, and migration agencies—and civil society actors—such as lawyers, opinion leaders, NGOs, trade unions, and concerned residents and citizen groups

On the micro level of individual refugees and asylum seekers, we sought interviews with a minimum of 60 individuals in the larger receiving countries (Germany, Sweden, Turkey, Greece, Lebanon, Iraq) and 30 interviews in smaller receiving countries (Italy, Austria, UK, Poland), with variations when needed. Each country team chose the two or three most salient refugee groups for the period 2011–2018. We practised a flexible sampling strategy within this general sampling plan, as the needs for each research cluster (i.e.,

work package) and country were context-specific. For example, a stronger emphasis was put on integration issues in destination countries, whereas in transit countries, the focus was more on *border and protection issues*. Furthermore, each country team operationalized the criteria based on this overall sampling strategy and developed its own sampling document. As an example, the 2016 Turkey–EU deal set the time frame for interview selection in Turkey.

We applied an inclusive approach to the legally and politically defined terms applied to those we interviewed between 2011 and 2018 (early arrivals 2011–2014 and late arrivals 2015–2017)—namely, ‘refugees’, people ‘under subsidiary protection’, those with ‘special status’ and ‘residence permits’, and ‘internally displaced populations’. However, we limited the sampling to people originating from conflict areas who had been part of ‘mass migration’. We also focused on the Eastern Mediterranean route, with flexibility in some countries. In total, we ended up with 539 interviews with refugees.

Another sampling criterion was the distinction between centre and periphery, which allowed us to cover a diversity of migrant circumstances and contingent experiences. Furthermore, gender was underscored to ensure as equal a balance as possible between women and men in the sample. Age groups were also identified to ensure we included the experiences of younger, middle-aged, and older individuals. However, for ethical reasons, we excluded children and youth under the age of 18 and individuals who could not independently express themselves due to illness or poor health, mental impairment, or similar vulnerable condition.

The project draws on an impressive amount of empirical material gathered in 11 countries, including macro- (policies), meso- (implementation/stakeholders), and micro-level (individuals/asylum seekers and refugees) data. The most significant data source in the project is the interviews. We conducted 539 interviews with refugees and asylum seekers, the majority being between 27–50 years old, married, and with a higher secondary or tertiary education. Of the refugees we interviewed, 293 were from Syria, 61 from Iraq, 58 from Afghanistan, and 127 from other countries. The gender divide was 316 men and 218 women (5 interviewees gave no information about gender). We also conducted more than 210 interviews with stakeholders.

The empirical material covered four major themes, each linked to a work package: the migration journey and border experiences (Work Package 2), protection regimes and experiences during the application for asylum (Work Package 3), experiences during the reception period (Work Package 4), and integration experiences, including education, working, living, health, and belonging (Work Package 5). The interviews were conducted using a semi-structured format, with central themes guiding the interviews and flexibility for adjustment to fit each interview situation best.

Additional data produced through the project includes two larger surveys, one in Turkey (n=789) and one in Sweden (n= 639), both using convenience sampling (Work Package 7), legal and policy material providing historical context and background (Work Package 1), and media material and policy documents (Work Package 6). Analysis was conducted following the best-fitting method to address the given research questions, including textual analysis, cultural analysis, political claims analysis, and legal and policy analysis. For the textual analysis, we first applied an overall coding of the data according to the research themes (Work Packages 2–5); each thematic or country report followed up with further coding to elicit finer details. Roundtable discussions with stakeholders, observations, Kino eye material, art collection, and a documentary round out the empirical data sourced for the project.

It is our sincere hope that all the RESPOND project data—most of which is open access and in different formats—will prove useful as primary and secondary data for other researchers, government authorities, local actors, and stakeholders. The material from the project is further described in the Data Management Plan (DMP) and follows the general guidelines on FAIR data management. The principles of research ethics pertaining to human participants, enshrined in the Declaration of Helsinki of 1964, are central to all empirical studies. These principles cover informed consent, how participants are treated and protected (including ensuring that their well-being precedes any scientific interest and balancing the risks and benefits for participants), and ensuring the research has positive consequences for society. We established general ethical guidelines for the project, which were adjusted by the country teams to their specific requirements. Ethical approval was applied for and granted by the specific ethics board in each country.

Concerning the research ethic of positive consequences for society, the RESPOND project has maintained compelling societal relevance and a demonstrable impact. For example, all country and comparative reports have included specific policy or program recommendations. In addition, the project has issued several policy briefs and a final press release (see the appendix) that presents the main findings linked to actionable policy recommendations. All reports and other types of publications produced within this project can be accessed via the project's website ([www.respondmigration.com](http://www.respondmigration.com)).

One of the challenges of this cross-national research has been at the comparative level. Even though RESPOND issued clear guidelines for sampling, coding, and report writing, there are limitations and variations in the data gathered and coded by 14 different partners in 11 countries. One is the unavoidable but challenging use of different languages to gather data. With this comes the need for translation into English, either during the interview or when transcribing significant parts of the material, lowering the level of validity from one context to another. Additionally, the coding was performed by each country team separately. Although it was done with detailed proce-

dures for inter-rater reliability in mind, there are still limits to a qualitative approach. However, such limitations arise in every complex comparative study on any topic. The critical consideration is to be transparent in highlighting limitations and reflecting on their impact on the findings.

## Findings

When we started this project four years ago, our point of departure was to study migration from a holistic perspective. The underlying goal was to understand the connections between policies, practices and experiences along the migration journey of individuals. Therefore, in different work packages, we applied this methodological framework and studied the many steps and dimensions of migration, including legal and policy frameworks of migration governance, border and protection regimes, as well as reception and long-term integration of immigrants. Our guiding framework drew on the *metaphor of the journey* as the individual migrant experiences it. We also focused on the consequences of migration for discourses of Europeanization.

Looking back, the primary contribution of this project has been the way it foregrounds the nexus between the individual, yet patterned (in terms of origin, gender, age), experiences of refugees and the broader policy and legislative frameworks with which they interact. The three levels of analysis that the RESPOND research has engaged show how legislation and policy filter down into implementation processes and are then felt and experienced by refugees themselves. The simultaneous charting of these different scales, underpinned by the dual-methodological approach of interviews and policy mapping, tells an expansive story of migrant journeys towards full participation in host societies, constrained by *de jure* and *de facto* policies and practices.

The results of the RESPOND project and its thematic work package lend themselves to concrete conclusions and key messages, which we want to point out.

***A shift from a civic welcoming approach to a hostile one.*** In the initial phase, policy responses to the unprecedented scale of human movement in 2015–2016 were oriented to the perceived ‘emergency’ underway. We witnessed some remarkable examples of civic spirit and solidarity in acts of welcome shown to people fleeing war zones (see Chapters 8, 9 and 10). However, over time—indeed, rather quickly—this welcoming approach swung toward one of opposition if not outright hostility (see Chapters 8, 9 and 10). With the formidable articulation of far-right populist discourses, opposition to immigration became a salient political issue in many countries (see Chapter 4). Consequently, the policy responses shifted towards the se-

curitization of migration: countries strengthened their borders, built fences and applied stricter migration control regimes.

***Governance of migration through migration control regimes.*** Tightening entry rules, introducing hard external borders and externalizing migration control regimes have become the new *modus operandi* for migration governance. Simultaneously, many countries have introduced more restrictive regulations for immigrant integration at the domestic level, driven by a rationale of deterrence. Restrictive policies should be understood in the context of the rise of populism, in which migration is constructed as the main scapegoat of all societal failures (see Chapters 2 and 3).

***Governance failure.*** In the aftermath of the crisis, migration policy has increasingly been informed by nationalist agendas (see Chapters 2, 3, 4 and 7). Thus, when it comes to the global governance of migration, we have observed a massive failure to develop joint solutions to ongoing problems, resulting in the weakening of global governance structures and fragmented and divergent practices.

***Two contrasting trends in migration governance: ‘renationalization’ and ‘externalization’.*** Our study focused on a period (2011–2018) in which the governance of migration was very much affected by the climax of the ‘crisis’. It was in this sense an example of ‘crisis governance’. Crisis constitutes a (radical) rupture in the status quo or established governance structures. In our research, this has been reflected in an increasingly fragmented legal framework, a high level of ad hocism in legal and political practices, dysfunctional institutions in the face of crisis and emergencies, and decoupling of practices in the governance of migration (see Chapter 2). Overall, we have observed two contrasting trends in migration governance—‘renationalization’ (in line with the rise of right-wing populism) and ‘externalization’, such as remote-control migration policies, the so-called ‘hotspot approach’, and bilateral agreements with frontline states/neighbouring countries (see Chapter 2).

***Protracted transitionality and extended EU waiting rooms.*** Another important conclusion is that in the aftermath of the 2015–2016 migration ‘crisis’, European migration and asylum regimes have created the conditions of what we call protracted transitionality. We observed this especially in frontline states, where refugees were physically and emotionally trapped in ‘waiting rooms’, living desperately in *legal limbo* under precarious conditions and uncertainty (see Chapters 2, 5, 7, 16 and 18). There is a wealth of research pointing to the detrimental consequences of such conditions on the mental health and well-being of individuals and families (see Chapters 11 and 16).

***Lack of understanding.*** Our research has also revealed the deep gap between (migration) policies and people (refugees). The policies analysed during the research generally pay little heed to why people want to migrate, nor

do they seek to understand the root causes and main drivers of migration at structural and individual levels. Thus, migrant agency is overlooked. While refugees are objectified and isolated during the asylum procedure, once granted asylum in the settlement/integration process, they are expected to abruptly transform into ordinary members of society and integrate rapidly and seamlessly into the system. In our understanding, this is one of the main shortcomings of the integration policies deployed in migration governance (see Chapter 16).

***The agency of refugees and hope.*** With its focus on the micro level and anthropological gaze, RESPOND has consistently viewed newcomers as full agents and sought to shed light on their lived experiences. Thus, the research has focused on how they navigate through highly complex asylum and border regimes to reach their destinations, the multiple coping strategies they activate along the journey and how they negotiate their rights and space in a new country (see Chapter 16). These are all very notable manifestations that foreground the agency of newcomers in both the migration journey and the settlement process. People migrate to find a remedy to the ‘existential crisis’ that they find themselves in. Here, ‘hope’—both at individual and collective levels—is the central ground sustaining their resilience and explains how they tackle and overcome the many hardships faced during the migration journey.

***Well-being, trauma and the policy-making process.*** Refugees, the subject of integration, usually carry the baggage of traumatic experiences. Their traumas are exacerbated during the journey and post-migration stressors, triggered by everyday life experiences and their encounters with society and institutions in the new country. However, the psychosocial well-being of refugees has seldom been the driving criterion in Western countries in which settlement expectations are primarily developed with an eye toward rapid labour market integration. Still, more than half of our participants report being unemployed, and the same number of participants have experienced discrimination in the labour market. In this regard, RESPOND research lays bare the close connection between the health and well-being of people arriving in a new country and social determinants during their integration (see Chapter 11).

***Migration and homelessness.*** One of the most interesting conclusions of our research is the light it has shed on the dialectical relationship between migration and settlement in the context of home/homeland and homelessness. When people migrate, they burn their bridges, leaving everything—their homes, extended family, and a lifetime of memories—to start a journey to unknown shores or pre-imagined destinations. Despite the strong emphasis on the political discourse on return migration, this journey is usually a one-way trip. In this journey, ‘home’ becomes a central marker for settlement and safety, a safe zone to imagine the future in which the experienced homelessness and precarities come to an end (see Chapters 17 and 18).

## Structure

The volume is structured in four parts, consisting of both comparative and single-case studies, following the same holistic framework applied in the RESPOND research, which we believe is a promising heuristic lens for studying migration in a comprehensive manner. Bordering policies communicate with protection and reception policies as well as integration policies. As observed in this research, the externalization of migration policies dovetails with restrictive approaches to reception and integration policies. Understanding the dialectic relationship between all these migration-related policy fields is needed to contextualize change in policies and analyse the relationship between policies (macro level), practices (meso level) and individual and group experiences (micro level).

**Part I** sheds light on the European migration regime and focuses on new bordering practices and their consequences for the discourse on Europeanization. Veronica Federico and Paola Pannia's contribution offers a comparative legal analysis of migration governance across countries, highlighting trends and similarities, as well as differences and relevant inconsistencies in the response to mass migration. The chapter begins by illustrating the complexity and hypertrophy in the legal framework concerning migration and asylum/international protection in all RESPOND countries, with lawmakers frequently resorting to secondary legislation. The analysis then explores the variety of actors involved in the multilevel and subsidiary-based management of migration flows. Their analysis reveals that given the lack of a solid architecture of national migration policies backed by adequate coordination, control and monitoring systems, and stable economic resources, the interaction among different actors frequently becomes a synonym for fragmentation and discrimination.

The chapter by Sabine Hess, Lena Karamanidou, and Bernd Kasperek revisits bordering policies and analyses the 'summer of migration' of 2015 as a watershed moment for border management and migration control in the European Union. Since then, we have seen some noticeable shifts in terms of border management and migration control legal frameworks, policies and practices across Europe, at both the European and national levels. The authors argue that since 2015, the logic of borders has intensified and expanded. This shift is evidenced by new policies and practices (at both the EU and member-state levels) and by the proposals contained in the New Pact on Migration. Moreover, they suggest that the logic constituting the border as the primary instrument of responding to migratory movements is seeping into the wider governance of migration and asylum.

In their comparative study of the Europeanization discourses of seven EU member states, Ivan Josipovic, Umut Korkut, James Foley, Ursula Reeger, and Tarik Basbugoglu show how contestation over migration has influenced



discursive constructions of ‘Europe’ in mainstream politics and media. Drawing on post-functionalist theories of European order, the authors shed much-needed light on the growing politicization and contestation in areas of EU governance that had previously been depoliticized at the national level. This analysis is then extended to examine the impact of contestation on European self-understanding at the supranational level.

Eva Papatzani, Nadina Leivaditi and Electra Petracou’s chapter critically discuss the grid of legislation, policies, discourses, practices, institutions, and actors that shape the governance of movements and configure borders from the global to the local scale by focusing on the Greek island of Lesbos. The authors argue that specific geographic areas have moved to the epicentre of global migration governance, emerging as important border sites configured by a complex ensemble of policies and actors at multiple scales. In the same vein, Andrea Terlizzi’s chapter explores border management and external migration control policy in Italy between 2011 and 2018 by tracing the role of narratives in the policy-making process. According to the author, evidence shows that policy-makers have constantly pointed to the excessive migratory pressure and ‘illegal’ immigration as the main issues at stake. Moreover, Terlizzi shows how the dominant policy narratives have revolved around the discursive nexus of humanitarianism and securitization.

Chapters in **Part II** discuss the fragmented implementation of refugee protection regimes in the wake of the 2015 refugee emergency. In their comparative analysis Ela Gökalp-Aras, Electra Petracou, Zeynep Şahin Mencütek, Eva Papatzani, and Nadina Leivaditi look at the implementation of international protection policies (especially asylum procedures and refugee protection) in the EU as well as in non-EU countries and underline four findings that are evident across country cases: 1) a highly restrictive and complex legal framework; 2) the proliferation and fragmentation of forms of protection and asylum procedures; 3) the ambiguous role of multiple actors; and 4) the failure of the hotspot approach and the Dublin Regulation.

In his critical assessment of existing policies and practices in migration governance, Nils Holtug shows how the refugee emergency has revealed that the European refugee regime provides inadequate protection for refugees. This chapter provides a normative account of refugee protection, explains the moral basis for refugee protection, explains how, in light of the previous two points, the present refugee scheme in the EU offers inadequate refugee protection. The focus of this analysis is border policies, the hot spot approach, border externalization and, more generally, non-arrival measures. Finally, the chapter proposes a ‘solution’ to the refugee crisis that is designed to meet the triple aim of providing basic protection for all refugees, not imposing excessive costs on particular destination countries, and removing the incentive for nation-states to partake in a race to the bottom as regards being unattractive for refugees.

In their joint contribution, Sabine Hess and Alexander-Kenneth Nagel deconstruct the prevalent myth of German exceptionalism by embedding it in a wider picture of asylum politics in Germany. They argue that the almost unanimous framing of the large-scale arrival of refugees in Europe in 2015–2016 as the ‘European refugee crisis’ set the ground for a humanitarian approach to governance under ‘emergency’ conditions. This approach undermined existing legal regimes through ad hoc policies and measures in the name of restoring public order. The chapter also shows how the political discourse quickly turned towards perceiving the situation as a ‘state of emergency’ in Germany in the aftermath of the so-called refugee crisis.

The chapter by Ayhan Kaya, Ela Gökalp-Aras, Zeynep Şahin-Mencütek, and Susan Rottmann offers an overview of Turkey’s responses to refugee immigration between 2011 and 2018 with a specific emphasis on the policy fields of border management, protection, reception, and integration. Their analyses illustrate that Turkey’s open-door policies and border management practices initially revolved around the principle of humanitarianism, which later transitioned to a politics of deterrence and securitization. The authors detail the shift from welcome and hospitality to reluctance in reception and the permanent protection of Syrian refugees. Despite lacking an official national integration programme and the rise of a return discourse (to Syria) among public officials and the media, Syrians are gradually integrating into all major areas of society in Turkey.

Turning to Sweden, Karin Borevi and Önver Çetrez analyse refugee integration and psychological health in light of the macro-level conditions of post-2015 policy changes. Using the Adaptation and Development after Persecution and Trauma (ADAPT) model, the authors analyse the concerns for safety/security, bonds/networks, justice, roles/identities, and existential meaning, as expressed by participants (n=61) in Sweden. They conclude that uncertainty in legal status and temporary residence, including related dimensions in the ADAPT model, have adverse health consequences. They also conclude that health issues warrant much more attention in the development of new protection and integration policies.

**Part III** includes chapters on different aspects of reception and integration policies. Ayhan Kaya and Alexander Nagel’s chapter illustrates how the period of reception has gradually become extended in a way that has created limbo situations in the lives of refugees and asylum seekers. Focusing on reception policies, practices and responses in several RESPOND countries, this chapter assesses similarities and differences among different cases by bringing the recurring themes to the fore. In their comparative analysis of the housing market in Germany and Austria, Ursula Reeger, Alexander Nagel, and Ivan Josipovic show how access to housing is a crucial factor for the structural integration of refugees. While asylum seekers in the EU are subject to reception systems that encompass housing and social benefits, receiv-

ing a title of protection marks a major juncture in refugees' lives as they need to find an affordable place to stay in a relatively short period of time.

Karolina Sobczak-Szelc, Marta Pachocka, Konrad Pędziwiatr, and Justyna Szałańska offer an overview of the integration of asylum seekers and refugees in Poland. The authors detail the absence of a coherent migration policy and an official strategy for integrating migrants in Poland. Several legal acts deal with different aspects of integration policy (usually limited to the beneficiaries of international protection) yet to varying degrees and in a fragmented manner. The authors discuss integration challenges experienced by asylum seekers and refugees in three specific areas: education, access to the labour market, and access to housing.

Based on an analysis of the Austrian legal framework regulating immigrant integration as well as a thematic analysis of interviews with affected individuals, Ivan Josipovic and Ursula Reeger provide a critical reading on how multicultural policies have given way to an assimilationist paradigm through the expansion of civic integration programmes. While the micro-level mechanisms underpinning the effects of integration policies have recently been theorized, they remain to be investigated empirically. This chapter contributes to closing this gap by studying the lived experiences of groups targeted by integration policy in Austria, a country that has traditionally pursued an assimilationist policy paradigm.

**Part IV** offers chapters discussing the agency of refugees, their belonging and vulnerabilities in the context of migration. Chapter by Önver Çetrez, Vasileios Petrogiannis, and Justyna Szałańska present the various degrees of refugee agency in three areas—the journey, civic participation, and health—and seeks to answer the question of the extent to which refugees exhibit agency against a backdrop of unfavourable external structural conditionings. Based on the empirical RESPOND interview data, the authors conclude that refugees are rarely seen as agents of their lives due to the involuntary nature of their migration and the limited scope of choices they have. Paradoxically, despite the many structural limitations refugees face and the many hardships they have experienced, there is also an expectation that they will integrate quickly into their new countries and that they will be able to demonstrate a considerable degree of agency. Although belonging is widely recognized as an essential component of refugee integration, there is a need for more comparative research to understand how belonging is created and maintained.

Susan Rottmann's chapter examines belonging in nine different country cases by investigating two domains. First, Rottmann shows that belonging is highly related to the specific social locations of individual refugees (i.e., their legal status, employment, ethnic background and gender). Second, she demonstrates that meso-level inclusion (either in existing organizations or via forming migrant-led organizations) matters for belonging. Finally, the chapter shows that a variety of conditions in the host country and character-

istics of migrants come together to increase or decrease belonging. In their chapter, Naures Atto and Soner Barthoma discuss the concept of vulnerability in the case of the forced displacement of Yazidis in the aftermath of the 2014 genocide perpetrated by ISIS. The authors conducted fieldwork<sup>1</sup> among Yazidi survivors of this genocide. Interview accounts also cover explicit descriptions of extreme violence or assault that the respondents faced. In an attempt to explain the Yazidis' enduring vulnerability, the authors draw on the idea of 'nested' traumas. Here, the authors point to the historical formation and sedimentation of specific traumas transmitted over generations. By introducing the term 'multilayered', the authors analyse the relationship between vulnerabilities produced and reproduced in different time zones and contexts. In the case of the Yazidis, the authors conclude that while living in a subordinated position in their homeland, their forced displacement has added a new layer to their earlier vulnerabilities. While producing subjective feelings of safety, equality and empowerment, the settlement context has made it possible for Yazidis to foster a non-national mode of belonging in these new spaces of settlement that provide them with the essentials they were deprived of in their homelands.

## Review process and copyright

All contributions to this edited volume were double-blind reviewed by external researchers.

Some chapters draw on previously presented sources, primarily from the RESPOND Working Paper series. The authors have the right to use or re-use portions of excerpts of their work, following proper referencing or acknowledgement.

---

<sup>1</sup> In this sensitive case, as with all RESPOND fieldwork, the interviews were conducted only after ethical approval was granted. During the fieldwork, it is important to note that the authors provided external professional support to their respondents (whenever it was needed) and created a safe space for the interviews. Directly after the interviews the data gathered was anonymized and this process was repeated during the coding process.