

Research Design for “Intercultural Violence” (WP8)

Macedonia, Greece, Cyprus, Romania

Katerina Kolozova

Bobi Badarevski

“Euro-Balkan” Institute for Social Studies and Humanities Research:
Department of Gender Studies (Research Center in Gender Studies)



Ge.M.I.C.

Gender, Migration and intercultural interaction
in South-East Europe (www.gemic.eu)

GEMIC (WP8) - Synthesis Research Design - Macedonia, Greece, Cyprus, Romania

Table of Contents

1.	State of the Art Literature Review on “Intercultural Violence”	4
1.1.	Theory and Methodology	4
1.2.	Research Methods	8
2.	Topic Area of Research	10
2.1.	Goal of the research	10
2.2.	Hypothesis	10
2.3.	Objectives	10
3.	Basic Outline	11
3.1.	Basic premises and concepts	11
3.2.	Basic research questions	11
3.3.	National case Studies	12
3.3.1.	Macedonia	12
3.3.2.	Greece	12
3.3.3.	Cyprus	13
3.3.4.	Romania	13
4.	Research Methodology	13
4.1.	Data collection (e.g. questionnaires, participant observation, focus groups etc.)	13
4.1.1.	Oral history	13
4.1.2.	In depth interviews	14
4.1.3.	Focus groups	14
4.2.	Data analysis and interpretation (e.g. discourse analysis, content analysis, statistical analysis etc.)	14
4.3.	Timeframe of research	14
5.	Research Team per Partner	17
5.2.	Greece	17
5.3.	Cyprus	17
5.4.	Romania	17
6.	Background Reading	17

1. **State of the Art Literature Review on “Intercultural Violence**

One of the main challenges that this research on violence sets for itself is understanding the gap between theoretical discourse and the one used in policy documents and activist reports. The latter reside on certain discursive commonalities since they are in constant dialogue, constant communication based on a shared language. On the other hand, the contemporary theoretical work on violence remains confined to the academic commentarism and there is little reference to policy and activist documents as discourse that should be tackled as such. References to the political reality of the moment are there. Still they hold the status of mute “facts,” referred to in the work of authors such as Butler (2006), Anijar (2003) and Agamben (1998), and are yet rarely subject to discourse analysis.

Scientific discourses on violence which are not aimed at policy analysis and which are not utterly theoretical represent legal, psychological and other specialist studies based on empirical research but offering very little conceptual material that could enable us to arrive to a more fundamental understanding of the phenomenon of violence. In other words, when a debate on “what violence actually is” starts it remains entrapped in scholastic interpretations of Arendt (1970), Butler (2004; 2006), Agamben (1998), Derrida (2001) or Benjamin (1986), whereas the empirical analysis of violence taking place rarely raises the question of what defines violence as such.

In this research package one of our tasks will be to confront this question and to attempt to propose answers while relying on relevant policy-related documents, reports and activist accounts. In other words we will examine theoretical considerations on violence from Hannah Arendt (1970) and Walter Benjamin (1986) to Butler (2006) and Agamben (1998) by way of confronting them with the accounts of activists, policy makers and with the personal accounts of individuals who have been subjected to a gendered and culturally founded violence. The comparative analysis of both discourses – the theoretical and the empirical – will enable us to test the validity of ruling concepts in each of the discourses respectively.

Still the main tool of empirical analysis will be the field research to be conducted within this work package. Empirical interrogation should provide us with personal narratives that are as detached as possible from the dominant, normative discourses, that are as much as possible an idiolect which should therefore enable us to use those accounts as the test of validity (and legitimacy) of concepts and discursive constructs which possess theoretical and political authority today. One of the axiomatic presuppositions of this research is that no one can evade the discourse of normativity in a way that she or he would be able to situate her/himself outside of it. Still the latter does not exclude the possibility that the subject can fail to find her/himself interpellated by the dominant discourse (Althusser 1971; Butler 1997), and can assume a subversive stance by precisely failing to perform the identity role prescribed by the instance of Normativity (Butler 1997). Personal accounts that are acquired through the oral history method, i.e., that are not structured in a way which would reflect the conceptual framework of the researchers, but are narratives of oneself whereby the teller is the authority, her/his truth is the one of highest legitimacy

(even if it is in collision with all that is considered a "normal discourse"), entail this subversive possibility.

Finally, because of their subordinate status both as migrants and as women, female migrants are highly vulnerable to labor exploitation and ill-treatment. Over the past 40 years, female migrants have been almost as numerous as male migrants. In 1960 there were 35 million female migrants and 40 million male migrants; by 2000, the gap between females and males remained about the same, 85 million female migrants versus 90 million male migrants[1]. The UN Special Rapporteur on Migrants report that the "labour exploitation of migrants is analogous to slavery." [2] She remarked that "worldwide, millions of migrants have provided information on acts of violence and ill-treatment." In her report to the UN General Assembly she stated that there has been a "continuous deterioration in the human rights of migrants."

Migration and trafficking as a form of gender based violence should also be seen as part of a complex and shifting continuum, short and long-term, voluntary and involuntary. Movement intended to be temporary may become permanent; migration undertaken voluntarily may later become forced; and those who have been trafficked may later choose to remain in the place of destination[3]

1. **Theory and Methodology**

According to Lacanian psychoanalysis (Lacan 1973; 1999) as well as to other schools of psychoanalysis, psychology and studies of trauma (Tietjens Meyers 1997) is an instance of sheer experience – an instance at which the language, discourse or signification fail. In this respect, drawing on the psychoanalytical legacy – in particular, the Lacanian – Judith Butler proposes a thesis according to which the experiences of trauma that are not transferable through dominant discourses, that constitute personal narratives which are unintelligible since they do not gain meaning in discourses of normativity (2004 25, 27), undergo a process of derealization (27). To suffer a trauma and as a "victim" – the one who has been subjected to a traumatic experience and demands recognition in order to gain solidarity and compensation (= "justice") – be rendered unreal, is to undergo a double process of traumatic affliction. Contemporary constructivist social theory (including post-colonial theory) and post-Lacanian psychoanalysis, thematize the silent suffering of those whose trauma is invisible, unintelligible in dominant discourses, of those whose losses and experiences of grief that are deprived of the status of realness (Spivak 2003, 24-28). Violence inasmuch as it is sheer trauma is also an instance which is by definition beyond discourse and language. It is only after living out a trauma that one can commence constructing a narrative of it which aims to rationalize or simply attribute meaning to the painful experience (Friedman, 1997). What Butler warns us about is that there are experiences of trauma which do not find meaning, legibility in the discourses we commonly share, that are widely exchangeable – in the discourses of normativity and of normality Butler 2006, 33-36).

Here we will be making a parallel with the "anomalous" status of victim of a trafficked woman or an illegal migrant, of those on the margin of Norm in the double sense of the word – normativity and law in legal sense.

The structural laws of the “intelligible discourses” render these losses meaningless, since they cannot be *named* – and, hence, ascribed value – in a universally legible way, as prescribed by the globally dominant model of Normativity. The state of being deprived of a meaning, of being absent from “What-Makes-Sense” is an experience of a sense of being deprived of reality. Meaningless is unreal in the – inescapably – eikonically constituted reality. These losses and grieves are not represented, not talked of, and it is impossible to publicly mourn them (Butler 2006, 37-39) – they are not inscribed into the collective narrative, into the imaginable reality. They are banned access from the reality that can be imagined and talked of. By not naming them they have been rendered unreal. The oppression is not only political. At this point it becomes ontological.

In order to gain access to reality one ought to gain access to the legible discourses. One’s voicing about one’s pain, grief and loss ought to acquire legibility within the existing discourses or render meaningful and legitimize one’s dissonant (“subaltern”) discourse (Spivak 1999, 308-311).

The suffering of violence which remains “mute,” or when constructed a personal narrative of fails to achieve unequivocal or “clear” meaning, i.e., to attain intelligibility, is that instance of trauma which undergoes a process of de-realization. In this case the experience of trauma and the working of violence are twofold. The “anomalous status” of victim of a woman subject to trafficking who displays certain “ideological complicity” with the trafficker is precisely that instance of trauma and constant experience of being subjected to violence, which nevertheless fails to be mediated through the discourses of normativity/normality. This is a sort of suffering which acquires with great difficulty the legitimacy to be considered as such, or rather, its legibility as grievance; and the woman who is subject to this category of violence gains the status of victim only when and if she demonstrates certain “repentance” (e.g., denouncing her status of sexual worker). The latter is sometimes “ritually” demonstrated through legal procedures: in some countries the woman that has been trafficked has to refrain from prostitution (working for traffickers) for a certain period of time in order to acquire the status of witness in a legal process.

These women are reduced to bare life, embodiments without a human face, similar to the illegal migrants in many European states waiting for either their deportation or for gaining access to the country, deprived of a number of freedoms among which that of movement. Their suffering is one with which a “normal” person cannot identify. Among them are the desire to escape from an unhappy marriage or a violent husband, the search for new relationship opportunities, or as means to escape family pressure to marry (as is often the case with lesbians)[\[4\]](#). Because of their subordinate status both as migrants and as women, female migrant workers are highly vulnerable to exploitation and ill-treatment. This research examines the debates and issues concerning intersections between women migrant workers' experiences of specifically gender-based violence and violations of their more generalized workers', human, and citizenship rights. These people’s personal narratives remain unintelligible, illegible, without the recognizable face of humanity. In the imaginary, of those who embody the discourses of normativity, illegal migrants are people who hardly possess the status of “human” and are reduced to “bare life” (Agamben 1998, 100, 121-122).

Their subjection to violence is one that hardly incites solidarity, empathy – they are hardly “human” (Butler 2006, 42).

Butler claims that vulnerability is a precondition of humanity (2006, 43-44), and that it could, therefore, be the foundation of solidarity. This claim implies that the suffering of pain, the state of subjection to violence is an experience one can always identify with, sympathize with and become the foundation of solidarity beyond discursive legibility. The implication is that reference to sheer violence and vulnerability can provoke solidarity prior to any discursive construction of meaning around it.

The key questions that we should pose ourselves in this research study are:

1. Is the status of “victim” in the case of a trafficked woman or an illegal migrant (of those bare lives without a recognizable face of humanity) obscured by the stipulations of normality and morality in the dominant discourses of today?
2. How can the status of “victim” be rethought so that the violence committed upon a trafficked woman or an illegal migrant can be legible for what it is – violence?
3. Institutional/ized and inter-cultural gendered violence from the perspective of labor migrants (focus on women, and several other forms of gendered marginality, such as single migrant mothers and representatives of sexual minorities; : focus on women and on the mother-child relations
4. Addressing the issue of gendered cultural exclusion/violence of national/ethnic and cultural minorities
5. Exploring the experience of women with children (both legal or illegal) labor migrants, both of single and of married women, addressing the issue of gendered cultural and social-economic exclusion/violence
6. Addressing the issue of gendered and hetero-normative cultural exclusion/violence

Based on the conceptualizations of “bare life,” if we propose that the notion of “victim” is reconfigured to mean “somebody vulnerable who has been subjected to violence,” can we expect to create greater “legibility” of these persons’ sufferings?

1. Can we expect the latter to provide a greater sense of solidarity by those embodying the discourse of normality?
2. Is the status of “victim” – stripped off moralization and reconfigured into “somebody vulnerable who has been subjected to violence” – necessary for raising public and institutional awareness in order to be able achieve wider mobilization of a society in combating trafficking?
3. Can we, by insisting on narratives that aim to convey the sheer experience of violence and trauma, arrive to a discourse on the trauma suffered by “anomalous victims” that will be intelligible to the representatives of the discourses of normativity and normality?

One of our chief tasks will be to apply the conceptual and discursive means created in this way (as stated in question 6.) for critical rereading of the legal and policy texts of authority in EU and our respective countries in a way that will enable us to propose new policies for combating trafficking and reducing as much as possible the experiences of trauma.

This task can be accomplished only on the basis of a prior empirical research that will enable us to discover the nexuses and different forms of violence, both physical and discursive (including the political and cultural meta-discourses), mechanisms of affliction of violence and of rendering it invisible (de-realized) for the relevant institutions and organizations. The results of the empirical research aiming to identify the constitution/structure of (sub)cultures of violence will enable us to prioritize issues to be addressed by through adequate policies according to the criteria of vulnerability and degree and form of perpetuated violence.

In other words, we should be able to establish certain cartography of violence and propose policies issuing from it, and, through that, propose a new perspective on the problem of trafficking and illegal migration. The latter means a perspective that stipulates the problem as one of vulnerable social groups instead of a problem of illegality and crime.

2. Research Methods

Collecting personal narratives of those who have suffered the violence of trafficking and of the status and the experience of being illegal migrant, whereby the narrator is encouraged to retell her/his story in a manner that would be as authentic as possible. These will be one of the ways to render these people's individual voices present. In order to render them as "legible," as "intelligible" as possible in their individual uniqueness, the women and also men who will offer their personal narratives should be encouraged to avoid moral self-condemnation or self-justification and to avoid the grand political narrative. This can be achieved through the method of oral history which is based on a sense of sharing established between the researcher and the person who offers her account of personal history. In oral history, the hierarchy of researcher (subject of research) and the researched (object of research) ought to be abolished, overcome – and the process of sharing becomes even more important than the aims of the research itself (Ritchie 2003).

In our thematic work package violence, personal accounts based on the oral history method will be comparatively read together with the major EU and national legal and policy documents. The purpose of this comparative reading is conducting a discourse analysis that will convey the ways in which the former destabilizes the latter. But also we should be interested in exploring what happens when we read comparatively in the other way around: namely, to investigate the ways in which the dominant discourses constituting the legal and policy texts to be analyzed destabilize the personal accounts (de-legitimize and de-realize them).

In addition to the oral history method and to the discourse analysis of documents, for the purposes of the proposed comparative discourse analysis, it will be necessary to also conduct in depth interviews with professionals and activists working with victims of trafficking and illegal migrants, as well as with representatives of institutions dealing with these issues.

Policy related texts, legislation, international documents such as conventions and charters that we would need to subject to the proposed discourse analysis is the following will convey the institutional stipulation of notions deemed universal, such as "humanity," "life," "dignity," "violence," "freedom," etc. In this respect, the project will try to provide deep discursive and comparative analysis of a number of documents (Covenants, Declarations, Conventions and Laws) which are found to be of great international and national importance. All of these documents will not be only legally analyzed, but also brought into relation with theoretical texts (Agamben, Butler, Benjamin, Derrida) in order to provide reciprocal critical perspectives on both sides. The theoretical insight will attempt to problematize the dominant notions of what is considered to be human, victim of human trafficking, a migrant, a subject to violence. In other words, to critically re-think the prevailing notions of the so called political and juridical subjects in order to open the field of the "human" towards other forms of identity and lives which are not considered as such, and whose position of victims and the violence perpetuated on them is not considered as such.

In this regard, an analysis on the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (1948) will try to emphasize the limits of the notion of the human (**Article 1** "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood") defined in terms of dignity, reason and consciousness and will contest the ideological background and the exclusionist strategies which are being implied. These main parameters stand in discrepancy with the further definitions and articles (such as Article 6: *Everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law*) while deconstructing the system's coherence and opening interpretative possibilities.

In terms of the national legislation, by a discursive analysis of the legal documents we will investigate the constraints that these legal stipulations impose to everyone whose protection cannot be guaranteed because of the bareness of his/her existence and the lack of his/her recognition as legal subject or citizen.

2. **Topic Area of Research**

1. **Goal of the research**

To study violence in relation to gender, migration and intercultural interaction. One of the main challenges that this research on **violence** sets for itself is to tackle the question of the gap between theoretical discourse and the one used in policy documents and activist reports. In this research package one of our tasks will be to confront this question and to attempt to propose answers while relying on relevant policy-related documents, reports and activist accounts. The comparative analysis of

both discourses – the theoretical and the empirical – will enable us to test the validity of ruling concepts in each of the discourses respectively. To explore implications of application of the concept “invisible trauma of the victims of the migrational violence” on the major international, EU and national legal and policy documents.

2. Hypothesis

Introducing the concept of “invisible trauma of the victims of migrational violence” will provide better understanding of intercultural migrational violence, and will to propose new policies for combating trafficking and reducing as much as possible the experiences of trauma in the context of intercultural violence.

3. Objectives

1. To examine theoretical considerations on violence, migration and intercultural relations.
2. To analyse the current situation of human rights, migration, intercultural relations, trafficking and related issues.
3. To collect data on the issue of human rights, migration, intercultural relations, trafficking and related issues.
4. To analyze the legal and policy texts of authority in EU and our respective countries in the light of meanings of victim’s personal narratives.
5. To analyze and evaluate measures, campaign and assistance on preventing rising awareness and assisting of the victims of violence.
6. To propose new policies for combating trafficking.

3. Basic Outline

1. Basic premises and concepts

The three main premises that underline this research are:

- There is invisible trauma of the victims of the violence. Metaphor of invisibility can mean “silent”, “silenced”, “unspeakable” trauma, but only relative to the contexts and perspectives, i.e. dominant discourse on migration and trafficking.

- The theoretical, legal, political and public Reality of person’s identity as a victim is based on discursive construction.

- Victimization of migrants and victims of trafficking is a process not sum of events.

The concept of invisible trauma

The mute, silent suffering of those whose trauma is invisible, unintelligible in dominant discourses – of losses and experiences of grief that are deprived of the status of realness (Butler 2004, 27).

The concept of trafficking

By the concept of trafficking we refer not only to women trafficked for sexual exploitation, but also to other forms of trafficking related to illegal migration, which is not necessarily reduced to women, but also involves men, and children. The focus of this study is the gendered aspects of trafficking/illegal migration.

The concept of victim

To suffer a trauma and as a “victim” – the one who has been subjected to a traumatic experience and demands recognition in order to gain solidarity and compensation (= “justice”) – be rendered unreal, is to undergo a double process of traumatic affliction.

The concept of imaginary and discursive construction

Unless a person’s loss is not recognized as human – according to the imaginary of humanity that informs our normativity/normality – in a way that a “normal” representative of a society could identify with, it is impossible to publicly mourn or sympathize with that loss.

The concept of usefulness

It is highly improbable to create policies and activist initiatives against trafficking if the ordinary representative of normativity/normality fails to identify with the trauma, pain, the feeling of being afflicted by violence experienced by a trafficked woman.

2. Basic research questions

- Can one render the narratives of those subjected to intercultural and gendered violence be heard in their own “voice”?
- How can the perspectives of different individual experiences (reflecting different collective identities, or rather gendered cultural identities) of those subject to cultural and gendered violence help re-evaluate the normative discourses of the European nation-states and the EC’s relevant institutions?
- How does the one subjected to the – always already gendered – cultural violence perceive the dominant culture from her (his) different and subaltern (rather than victim’s) perspective?

- Where does the institutional/ized violence lie in the view of those culturally marginalized, such as national minorities, or subject to utter cultural exclusion based on their migrant status, and in particular gendered migrant status?
- Where does the institutional/ized violence lie in the view of those socially and culturally excluded on the basis of the fact that they have been victims of human trafficking?
- To explore the debate surrounding sex work and trafficking in relation to the question of violence and address academic and policy issues in relation to these seemingly antithetical perspectives on gender , migration and violence.
- How can the perception of those subject to intercultural and gendered violence, of the socially and culturally excluded in a form that I always already gendered, help review European policies on migration, culture and gender in the sense of introducing new concepts (terminology), identifying new objectives and methodologies tailored for the needs of not only the European states but also for those subjected to gendered cultural violence?
- To what extent can the interviewed subjects' personal narratives be considered "free" from all pressure from the official mainstream discourse (especially in the case of subjects interviewed in an institutional context like a shelter/ camp, etc.)?
- How migrant women are vulnerable to become victims of violence in their everyday interactions)

3. **National case Studies**

1. **Macedonia**

Topics: The case study will focus on the processes of victimization in the context of migration from the perspective of internally trafficked women (from the Eastern to the Western part of Macedonia, and vice versa) and national/ethnic and cultural minorities addressing the issue of gendered cultural exclusion/violence.

2. **Greece**

Topics: The case study will focus on the discourse of violence with regards to two distinct groups of migrant women who have been both subject to public debate: trafficking victims and migrant cleaners working in private companies. The study will explore the continuities and contradictions involved in the treatment of different women as victims of intercultural violence

3. **Cyprus**

The Cyprus project will focus on two groups vulnerable to multiple levels of violence: migrant women who fall victims of sex trafficking and migrant single mothers. The first group has been identified in the local literature as a high risk group but the factors that contribute to the growing problem of trafficking are still under-researched. The second group, in order to understand better the daily processes that produce and reproduce violence in the lives of migrant women we will study the case study of a communal day care centre where single migrant mothers leave their children in order to go to work. This is a context of extreme marginalization with women who have gone through many levels of violence. We will focus on how the women interact with each other and their children.

4. **Romania**

In its study of the discourse of violence, the Romanian team will focus on two categories of subjects, namely: (a) Romanian migrant women who either settled their residence abroad (they married foreign citizens) or only work temporarily there. (Some of these women occasionally return home to see their families and then they could be interviewed.);(b) Romanian women who were victims of human trafficking currently benefiting from assistance granted by Romanian authorities and/ or NGOs. Interview and official (legal/ political) discourse analysis will allow underlining the similarities and, respectively, dissimilarities between the discursive practices in terms of which the identity of these two categories of victimised women is constructed and represented.

4. **Research Methodology**

4.1. Data collection (e.g. interviews, participant observation, focus groups etc.)

1. **Oral history**

Collecting personal narratives is the main proposed methodological tool; in its form of, it is best suited to reflect the cultural historical context and provide pertinent perspective on the basis of which critique of existing policies and recommendation for new ones can be undertaken.

Oral history is about personal experiences, personal memories and or individual histories that capture the wider cultural-historical context rendering it legible through that particular, individual account. It should take the format of a very individual, personal storytelling whereby the interviewee leads the process (choosing the topics she addresses, the details she would like to establish and fix memories of, the intimately sensitive topics she would herself choose to address), and the interviewer channels it by way of respecting the narrative course proposed by the interviewer. The interviewer should be able to inspire and encourage the interviewee by channeling the storytelling in the direction of being as informative as possible of the

cultural-historical context. In this process there is no relation of hierarchy between the interviewer (the scientist) and the interviewee (the "object" of research). To the contrary, this process is considered as mutual sharing between the interviewer and the interviewee. Women's oral history allows women to speak about difficult realities that are impossible to articulate in other contexts and the process is empowering for both the interviewers and the women being interviewed (Peto 2001). The interviewees' personal histories can be published under an alias.

2. **In depth interviews**

In depth interviews that are semi-structured and allow the interviewee to introduce topics, focus, are also a method quite similar to oral history and appropriate for it.

3. **Focus groups**

Focus groups of people that are subject to gendered cultural and social exclusion due to being minority or members of migrant community, debating issues of national and European policies on migration, gender and intercultural relation, as well as the realities and policies related to trafficking, can also be very informative in acquiring relevant answers to the proposed questions.

Focus groups of professionals, experts of administration and NGO activists, debating issues of national and European policies on migration, gender and intercultural relation, as well as the realities and policies related to trafficking, can also be very informative in acquiring relevant answers to the proposed questions.

2. **Data analysis and interpretation (e.g. discourse analysis, content analysis, fieldwork data analysis etc.)**

Critical discourse analysis

Critically rereading of the legal and policy texts of authority in EU and our respective countries in the light of meanings of victim's personal narratives. In our thematic work package violence, personal accounts based on the oral history method will **be comparatively read and analyze** together with the major EU and national legal and policy documents.

The purpose of this comparative reading is conducting a discourse analysis that will convey the ways in which the former destabilizes the latter.

But also we should be interested in exploring what happens when we read comparatively in the other way around: to investigate the ways in which the dominant discourses constituting the legal and policy texts to be analyzed destabilize the personal accounts (de-legitimize and de-realize them).

3. **Timeframe of research**

Collecting personal narratives:

1. **Phase 1 (December 2008-March 20th 2009):**

This is the most demanding and longest part of the process because finding women who are prepared to share their life story, in particular those who have been trafficked and live under the protection of a shelter, is very difficult. For this reason, in the case of trafficked women, one needs to seek assistance of the professionals and activists who work in the shelters, and who are able to convince the interviewees their personal stories are not going to be in any way related or even relevant for eventual legal processes they are involved in.

One always has to be able to obtain a sufficient number of personal narratives in order to be able to select out of this number the stories that are indeed rich in terms of information that depicts and explains the wider cultural-historical context.

Step 1 Identifying the possible interviewees, establishing communication with and obtaining agreement for recording personal narratives (oral histories);

Step 2 preparing the official forms of consent and of written guarantee on the part of the researcher about preserving anonymity of the interviewee and that the material will not be used in any eventual legal process. Most importantly: apart from the written and signed forms of consent and agreement, it is crucial to gain their trust and explain the purpose of interviewing – the process of establishing this mutual trust and the desire to share a personal narrative is what makes this method feminist.

Content of sharing is negotiated in this period as well as the possibilities of obtaining visual material (photographs, videos, etc.)

In the case of trafficked women, assistance of the professionals and activists who work in the shelters is crucial.

2. **Phase 2 (March 20th 2009 – June 20th 2009)**

Collecting the narratives: interviewing/sharing personal histories in number and categories as follows (presented according to partners' topics and main research questions)

Macedonia

The Macedonian team will collect:

- 5 personal narratives^[5] (as concrete outcomes/deliverables) of representatives of national/ethnic and cultural minorities addressing the issue of gendered cultural exclusion/violence;
- 3 personal narratives of internally trafficked women

Greece

The Greek team will collect and analyze:

- -Interviews with victims/survivors of trafficking and migrant women cleaners who have been subjected to different forms of violence (5-10 depending on the access)
- -Texts on the subject (including court proceedings and newspaper articles)

Cyprus

The Cypriot team will collect:

- 4 Oral Histories with victims of trafficking
- 4 Interviews with victims of trafficking
- 1 Focus group discussion with victims of trafficking

Romania

The Romanian team will collect:

- 4-5 interviews with Romanian migrant women;
- 2-3 interviews with victims of trafficking currently under the protection of specialized shelters and/ or state institutions.[\[6\]](#)

3. Phase 3 (June 20th – August 30th 2009)

Organizing focus groups and interviews with professionals and other relevant actors in all of the partner countries:[\[7\]](#)

- Focus group discussions about people that are subject to gendered cultural and social exclusion due to being minority or members of migrant community, debating issues of national and European policies on migration, gender and intercultural relation, as well as the realities and policies related to trafficking, can also be very informative in acquiring relevant answers to the proposed questions.
- Focus group discussion of professionals, experts of administration and NGO activists, debating issues of national and European policies on migration, gender and intercultural relation, as well as the realities and policies related to trafficking, can also be very informative in acquiring relevant answers to the proposed questions.

•

Macedonia

- Organizing focus group and interviews involving professionals, administration experts and NGO activists (approximately 6-10 interviews)

Greece

- Organizing focus groups; and interviews with NGO professionals, police and lawyers (approximately 20 interviews)

Cyprus

- 5 Interviews with professionals
- 1 Focus group discussion with professionals
- Fieldwork observations and informal interviews with single migrant mothers

Romania

- Organizing one focus discussion involving professionals, administration experts and NGO activists; 10 interviews with representatives of state institutions and NGO professionals

1. **Phase 4 (August 30th 2009 - October 30th 2009)**

- Analysis of the field research material;
- In accordance with the above, re-evaluating or upgrading/enriching the theoretical frame of interpretation or conceptualization of issues.
- Critical reading of policy document from the stand point of the chief realizations that come from the field research

5. **Research Team per Partner**

5.1. Macedonia

Katerina Kolozova, Bobi Badarevski, Viktorija Borovska, Slavco Dimitrov

5.2. Greece

Nelli Kambouri, Pavlos Hatzopoulos

3. **Cyprus**

Miranda Christou, Zelia Gregoriou, Josie Christodoulou, Sylvia Michael

4. **Romania**

Dr. Gabriela Iuliana Colipcă; Prof. dr. Michaela Praisler; Dr. Steluța Stan; Lidia Mihaela Necula.

6. **Background Reading**

Agamben, Giorgio (1998) *Homo Sacer*. Stanford California: Stanford University Press.

Althusser, Louis (1971) "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses" in *Lenin and Philosophy*. New York and London: Monthly Review Press

Arendt, Hannah (1970) *On Violence*. Orlando (Florida): Harvest Books.

Anijar, Gil (2003) *Arab/Jew: The History of the Enemy*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

- Benjamin, Walter (1986) *Reflections: Essays, Aphorisms, Autobiographical Writings*, New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1978. Rpt. Schocken, 1986.
- Butler, Judith (1997) *Psychic Life of Power: Theories in Subjection*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.
- ___ (2006) *Precarious Life: The Power of Mourning and Violence*. London/New York: Verso Books.
- ___ (2004) *Undoing Gender*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Creswell, John W. (2003) *Research Design, Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methodes Approaches*. London: SAGE Publications
- Derrida, Jacques (2001) *The Work of Mourning*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Duggan, Lisa (2000) *Sapphic Slashers: Sex, Violence, and American Modernity*, Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Dunaway, David K. (1996) *Oral History: An Interdisciplinary Anthology*, AltaMira Press.
- Friedman, Marilyn (1997) "Autonomy and Social Relationships: Rethinking the Feminist Critique." In *Feminists Rethink the Self*, ed. by Diana Tietjens Meyers. Oxford: Westview Press
- Hanssen, Beatrix (2000) *Critique of Violence: Between Poststructuralism and Critical Theory*, Routledge.
- Hollway, Wendy (2003) *Doing Qualitative Research Differently: Free Association, Narrative and the Interview Method*. London: Sage Publications
- Indra, Doreen (ed.) (1999) *Engendering Forced Migration: Theory and Practice*, New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Lacan, Jacques (1973) *Les quatre concepts fondamentaux de la psychanalyse*. Texte établi par Jacques-Alain Miller. Paris: Éditions de Seuil
- ___ 1999 (1966). *Écrits 1*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil
- Lowe, Jonathan E (1996) *Subjects of Experience*. Cambridge University Press
- Martin, Ruth, R.(1995) *Oral History in Social Work: Research, Assessment, and Intervention*. London: Sage Publications
- Maxwell, Joseph, A.(2005) *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach (Applied Social Research Methods)*. London: Sage Publication
- Passerini, Luisa (1990) "Mythobiography in oral history." In *The Myths we Live by*. Edited by Samuel, Raphael and Paul Thompson. Routledge
- Peneff, Jean (1990) "Myths in life stories." In *The Myths we Live by*. Edited by Samuel, Raphael and Paul Thompson. Routledge
- Perks, Robert (1998) *The Oral History Reader*, Routledge.
- Perks, Robert and Alistair Thomson (1998) *The Oral History Reader*. Routledge
- Peto, Andrea (2003) *Women's Stories. From History of Hungarian Women in Politics (1945-1951)* Columbia University Press.
- Portelli, Alessandro (1991) *The Death of Luigi Trastulli and Other Stories: Form and Meaning in Oral History*. SUNY Press
- Posadskaya-Vanderbeck, Anastasia and Barbara Engel (1997) *A Revolution Of Their Own: Voices of Women in Soviet History*, Westview Press.
- Quinlan, Mary Kay (2003) *The Oral History Manual*, AltaMira Press.
- Ritchie, Donald A. (2003) *Doing Oral History*, Oxford University Press.

Read, Peter(1998) "Presenting voices in different media: Print, radio and CD-ROM." In *The Oral History Reader*. Routledge

Scott, S at al. (2001) "Financial Costs of Social Exclusion: Follow-up Study of Antisocial Children into Adulthood," *British Medical Journal* no. 323, 191-196

Scheurich, James J. (1997) *Research Method in the Postmodern*. London: Routledge

Shulamit, Reinhartz (1992) *Feminist Methods in Social Research*. New York: Oxford University Press

Schultz, Debra (2001) *Going South: Jewish Women in the Civil Rights Movement*, NYU Press.

____ (1991) *Risk, Resiliency and Resistance: Current Research on Adolescence Girls*, National Council for Research.

Sharratt Sara and Ellyn Kaschak (eds.) (1999) *Assault on the Soul: Women in the Former Yugoslavia*, New York, London and Oxford: The Haworth Press, Inc.

Siebers, Tobin. 2001. *The Subject and Other Subjects: On Ethical, Aesthetic, and Political Identity*. University of Michigan Press

Sipe, Dan (1998) "The future of oral history and moving images." In *The Oral History Reader*. Routledge

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1999. *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason*. Harvard MA: Harvard University Press

____ 2003. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" In Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin (eds.) *The Post-colonial Studies Reader*. New York: Routledge, pp 24-28

Tietjens Meyers, Diana (ed.) 1997. *Feminists Rethink the Self*. Oxford: Westview Press

Thompson, Paul.(1978) *The Voice of the Past*. Oxford University Press

Vries de, Hent (ed) (1997) *Violence, Identity, and Self-Determination*, Stanford University Press.

18

[1] <http://www.migrationinformation.org/feature/display.cfm?ID=109>

[2] http://www.apwld.org/statement_migrants.htm

[3] <http://www.adb.org/Knowledge-Management/documents/heyzer-speech.pdf>

[4] INSTRAW, Feminization of Migration, 2007, <http://www.un-instraw.org/en/downloads/gender-remittances-and-development/working-paper-1-feminization-of-migration/download.html>

[5] Either oral history or unstructured in-depth interviews, either of the alternatives a methodologically coherent choice with the general theme and the main research questions.

[6] The range of interviewees may still slightly change depending on the success/ failure to establish communication with institutions and individuals relevant for this work package research and since most of the women to be interviewed are still subject to circular migration or may not be allowed by the institutional framework they are currently part of to attend a meeting of victims of gendered and intercultural violence, it may not be possible to unite them for a focus group discussion as well.

[7] The number of focus group and its composition is the researcher's choice, and it will vary from country to country based on their scientific judgment/decision and depending on the access of actors