Tahire Erman

BECOMING "URBAN" OR REMAINING "RURAL": THE VIEWS OF TURKISH RURAL-TO-URBAN MIGRANTS ON THE "INTEGRATION" QUESTION

The mass migration from rural areas to larger cities in the Third World and the rapid social changes entailed by this transformation have attracted the attention of social and political scientists since the 1950s. The problematic issue of the "integration" of rural migrants into the urban society and the changes this transformation has brought about have long been among the most studied questions. Yet they still call for more research to increase our understanding of the phenomenon, particularly in our era, which is witnessing radical shifts from earlier times in terms of social, economic, and technological characteristics. The question of "integration to what?" becomes important in political and practical terms. In the 1950s, when mass migration to cities started, the answer to this question seemed quite clear. The cities were the places of the modernizing elites, especially in the case of Ankara, the capital of the modern Turkish Republic. As in other Third World countries, the modernizing bureaucratic and military elites of the early republic, who had assumed the role of transforming the society into a modern, Western one, regarded the city as an effective means for the acculturation of its inhabitants to modern–Western values and ways of life. The modernization theory, which maintains a dichotomy between rural and urban, supported this idea. Rural migrants were expected to assimilate into urban society oriented to the West and to become "true urbanites" by discarding their rural and traditional values and lives and by adopting the lifestyles and values of the modernizing urban elites. They were often seen as failing to do so and thereby remaining rural.[1] And this failure to become an urbanite was defined as social and cultural marginality.[2] Over the years, the dichotomous approach dominating the earlier studies of rural-to-urban migration has been replaced by one that increasingly acknowledges the diversity in the migrant population and their varied degrees of urbanity and rurality. It has been agreed that migrants may carry both rural and urban features at the same time or develop a synthesis out of the combination of the two.[3]

Furthermore, through chain migration, as migrant populations increased to make the established urbanites a minority in some cases, and as migrants created their own

Tahire Erman is Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Bilkent University, Ankara 06533, Turkey.

communities with their own ways of life and values (communities which have often been criticized as the replica of the village in the city), and developed their own ways of dealing with the public sphere (such as *hemşehrilik*,[4] clientalism), the question of "integration to what?" has become rather vague. The migrant population has been increasingly stamping its presence onto the city in physical and social terms, and the migrants have become major actors in politics, especially in local politics. In the course of time, the city has produced its subcultures.[5] Recently, as the result of the growing consciousness about diversity and ethnic identities in the world, a critical approach to the question of "who and what is urban?" is developing. This has the potential of freeing the definition of an urbanite from the monopoly of the Republican elites. Making the picture even more complicated, the fairly recent emergence of Islamic elites, who provide an alternative way of life with a different approach to the regulation of the public realm and alternative sets of values and norms to Western ones, has created the possibility of new definitions of who and what an urbanite is, and hence new answers to the question "integration to what?"

Besides, the idea that the distinction between rural and urban is becoming rather blurred today is being discussed in some academic circles. In the beginning of the mass migration to cities, a physical as well as a cultural boundary existed between the two. However, this may not be true anymore. There is increasing communication between rural and urban areas due to improved transportation and chain migration. Villagers visit their relatives who are now settled in the city, and migrants visit their relatives living back in the village. Some villagers work part-time in the city and part-time in the village; they may even have houses both in the city and the village. They send their children to the city to stay with their relatives while they attend school. Moreover, there is the increased socializing effect of the media, especially TV, in rural areas, informing villagers about the city. Thus, today we can talk about the "protrusion of the city culture into village life" as one reporter said. On the other hand, we can also talk about the reproduction of village life in the context of the city, especially in the case of squatter settlements. As the result of chain migration and the tendency of migrants from the same region or village to cluster in the same squatter neighborhood, the values and norms, and to a lesser degree the ways of life, of the village are preserved in the city. Despite all these arguments in academic circles, "rural" and "urban" continue to represent two very different modes of existence for common people, particularly for rural-to-urban migrants.[6]

In addition to the problem of defining what it is that newcomers to the city are to be integrated into today and the complexities involved in defining the concepts of rural and urban, any "integration" phenomenon is complex and multi-sided. It has both structural and contextual components. The investigation of this question requires both macro-level structural analysis and micro-level in-depth research. Further, the political implications of any study of integration makes such a study susceptible more than ever to "unscientific" influences, such as one's own political preferences, socio-economic standing, and personal experiences. Bearing in mind these problems in investigating the "integration question," this author aims to proceed by revealing the experiences of individual migrants after she has grounded herself in a specific socio-physical context. Thus, the focus in this article is on individual migrants and their thoughts and feelings. However, this does not mean denying the role of structural factors (such as the rate of economic growth of the country, the employment

rate, social policies adopted by governments, or institutional arrangements) in shaping migrants' experiences. The missing voices of migrants from the Turkish social-science literature, and the fact that, although migrants have been at the center of arguments (either blamed for "ruralizing" cities or defended as the victims of the prevailing socio-economic system), they have rarely had the opportunity to express themselves, all justify such a focus on the individual migrant. The article attempts to bring out the views of the rural-to-urban migrants themselves and let migrants speak in their own voices. This is important particularly in the context of their self-identification, since the question of whether migrants remain rural or become urban has often been addressed from an outsider's perspective (a social scientist's, a politician's, an established urbanite's), ignoring migrants' own definitions of themselves, and more important, their reasons for these definitions. The article specifically addresses the questions of whether Turkish rural migrants define themselves in rural–urban terms—if yes, which ones consider themselves urbanites (*şehirli*) and which ones consider themselves villagers (*köylü*), and for what reasons. It particularly attempts to interpret the meanings that lie in their responses regarding feeling oneself to be an urbanite or a villager in the city.

Further, this study, by acknowledging the differential experiences of migrant women and men,[7] poses the question as to whether and in what ways female migrants are different from male migrants in their lives in the city and in the strategies they use while establishing their lives in the urban environment. Again acknowledging the diversity in the migrant community, it incorporates both those migrants in squatter settlements and apartment districts, as well as first- and second-generation migrants. It attempts to find out whether those migrants who live in apartments feel more integrated within the city as opposed to those who live in squatter settlements, and whether first-generation migrants display more rural features and tend to define themselves as villagers, while second-generation migrants define themselves as urbanites and seem more a part of the urban society.

While investigating these questions, the article, with a particular focus on the views of the migrants themselves, seeks an answer to the integration/non-integration question of rural migrants who now constitute the majority in the metropolitan cities of Turkey.

METHODOLOGY

The findings of this article are part of the author's dissertation research carried out in Ankara for a Ph.D. degree at the Graduate School of the City University of New York. The primary objective of the research was to answer the question of whether rural-to-urban migrants were becoming "urban" or remaining "rural," and what this meant. To accomplish the research objective, an ethnographic study was carried out in Ankara. This enabled the author to observe migrants' behavior closely and to gain insight into their lives. Participant observation and formal and informal interviews were employed. The author rented a *gecekondu*[8] in Çukurca, a relatively established *gecekondu* (squatter) settlement close to the city lying on the slopes of a hill in the south of Ankara, and resided there for more than five months. Frequent visits were paid to an apartment district developing out of a *gecekondu* settlement[9] (Bağçılar, a lower–middle-class district), which was walking distance from Çukurca. A migrant

woman who once lived in the *gecekondu* which the author rented in Çukurca and who recently moved to an apartment in Bağçılar became the key informant for the research. The relatives of the key person who lived in the established middle-class district next to the research site in transition (Esat) were also visited. The author participated in weddings, circumcision and engagement ceremonies, birthday parties, and picnics. The research sites were visited several times in the following years.

This article is primarily based on the qualitative analysis of the responses of 144 informants (105 women and 39 men, 108 living in *gecekondu*s and 36 in apartments, 67 Alevis[10] and 77 Sunnis) to a set of questions in the formal interviews which were tape-recorded, except for a few cases when the informants objected to it, and on the observations of the author during her time at the research sites. The questions included whether the informants considered themselves urbanites or villagers and why; what they thought a villager and an urbanite to be; whether they preferred to live in the city or in the village and whether in an apartment or in a *gecekondu*, and why; how they felt about living in the city; in the cases of those who maintained their relations with the village, how they felt about visiting the village; how often and for what reasons they interacted with the city; and finally what they thought a modern person to be. Further information was obtained in daily conversations and discussions with the informants on the relevant issues. Taking the photographs of the informants and their homes provided a valuable source of information as well as a means of approaching people.

In the following sections, the informants first are grouped in terms of their self-identifications regarding rural–urban, which inform us about their subjective feelings of inclusion or exclusion in the urban society. While doing so, the points the article makes are grounded in the narratives of the informants and the author's own observations based on her direct participation in the informants' lives. It attempts to discuss and interpret the informants' responses in terms of the structure of Turkish society and its historical inheritance. This is followed by an attempt to identify some of the factors that shape their feelings of urbanity–rurality.

REMAINING RURAL: "I CONTINUE TO BE A VILLAGER *(KÖYLÜ)*"

The majority of the migrants in this study, women and men, and the residents of both apartments and *gecekondu*s, considered themselves villagers despite the many years they had spent in the city, and, in the case of second-generation migrants, they considered themselves as people with a rural origin (*köy kökenli*) (49.5%). They stated various reasons for their continuing self-identification as villagers, which can be grouped around two major themes.

Strong Community-Orientedness of Rural Migrants and Rural–Urban Identification

Chain migration characterizes Turkish rural-to-urban migration. As a result, those who move from the same village or region tend to cluster in the same neighborhood (usually squatter settlements), and hence those who share a common past and culture form their communities of rural origin in the city. The existing research on rural migrants in cities demonstrates the significant role the migrant community plays in

the lives of individual migrants.[11] It is common knowledge today that it is through other migrants that the newcomers find jobs and places to stay.[12] This community existence based on common origin and culture is extended through *hemşehri* networks in the city. In research carried out in Umraniye, Istanbul, being a member of a *hemşehri* network was found to be one of the major determinants of the social mobility of migrants. Even those who moved to the city without any education, skills, or capital experienced social mobility by using their *hemşehri* networks.[13]

Further, the migrant community acts as a means of granting an identity to the migrant in the cosmopolitan atmosphere of the city. In Turkey, *hemşehrilik*[14] operates as a mechanism of membership to a particular group of people with similar origins. If *hemşehrilik* is regarded as an identity category for migrants, separating migrants ("us") from others ("them"), the first requirement for membership is being a rural migrant in the city.[15] "For those living in *gecekondu* settlements, *hemşehrilik* mainly becomes a means of separating the established urban population from the population of rural origins."[16] In order to be a part of the migrant community, and to continue to be so, and thereby to be able to use the services and support (economic, social, and psychological) provided by it, individual migrants may feel the need to emphasize their associations with their rural backgrounds. In addition, they may end up spending most of their time within the *hemşehri* network.

The findings of this project support this assertion. Many informants said that they would not consider themselves urban because of their frequent contacts with the "villagers in the city" (mostly kin and *hemşehri*), and among them there were relatively better-off migrants who improved their financial situations over the years and moved to apartments from *gecekondu*s. Women who are traditionally expected to be active in and responsible for maintaining relations with relatives particularly emphasized this point. A long-term, better-off migrant woman living in the apartment her family owned emphasized the role of the rural community in making her feel like a villager, "You cannot break up with the rural community. I mean, I am with my villagers more than with anyone else. I cannot break up with them, so I cannot say, 'I have become a true urbanite.'"

Those migrants who experienced economic betterment and wanted to integrate into the urban middle classes without breaking their ties with their kin and villagers felt the need to prove to other migrants that they were not changed.[17] They emphasized their adaptations to the urban context when they were with urbanites, and to the rural context when they were with "our own people." Based on the strategy they use in establishing themselves in the city, we can call this group "moving up without rejecting."

The continuing identification with the village also has an ethical dimension. This is particularly strong in the case of those first-generation migrants who moved to the city in their late adulthood, and more so in the case of Alevis. They felt strongly that one should not deny one's origin, saying, "I would never turn my back on my past life. I would never forget it, never deny it"; "We cannot lose our origin. We are villagers, and this does not change wherever we live"; "I never think of myself as an urbanite. I am a villager. I was born in the village. I cannot deny my village past."

In brief, we can say that migrants support one another psychologically as well as socially, not to mention materially and through contributions in terms of physical labor and information. Further, the migrant community acts as an identity group. All

this fosters rural identity. This is particularly true in the case of Alevis. The strong community-orientedness among the Alevis requires continuing identification with their recent past—the village.

In addition to the close relations among migrants in the city, their continuing relations with their villages and villagers act to prevent migrants from considering themselves urbanites. A considerable number of migrants in this research paid visits to the village (including older people visiting the village after their retirement, and young people visiting the village after they developed an interest in their rural origin). Some kept their land and got shares from crops; they went to the village to work on the land. Some visited the village to spend religious holidays with their relatives or to attend wedding ceremonies and funerals. Some also spent their vacations in the village, "enjoying fresh air and being close to nature," and "socializing with old friends."

When they visited the village, many tried to fit in. This has important consequences, particularly for women. Women are required to dress in accordance with the village codes, and this usually means making profound changes in dress and manner, covering their body and hair. A modern-looking high-school student (a second-generation migrant) talked about her attempts to fit in when she visited the village as follows, "In the village, you have to cover your arms and hair. I don't wear stretch pants there like the ones I am wearing now. I don't wear any make-up. I wear pyjamas under my dress."

In brief, visits to the village, during which they are drawn back into the rural culture, constitute another reason given by the informants for their continuing identification as rural people. On the other hand, frequent contacts with the village do not necessarily mean that migrants do not try to adapt to the city. A middle-aged, long-term migrant woman talked about her adaptation both to the village and the city, "I consider myself a villager. Yet I become an urbanite or a villager depending on where I am. For example, this summer when I was in the village, I covered my hair until I came back. And on my second day in the city, I had my hair cut, put on make-up, and became an apartment lady. When I arrive in the village, I become a villager, and when I come back to the city, I adapt to the city."

As this example demonstrates, although many migrants identify with the village, this does not mean that they stick solely to rural values and ways of life. Rather, they adopt some urban values and behavior while preserving some rural ones. Alan Gilbert and Josef Gugler[18] write:

The commitment many migrants have to their community of origin may be taken to suggest that they remain peasants at heart, that they do not become urbanites. . . . Though migrants are used to rural modes of behavior and frequently hold rural values, they also have varying degrees of familiarity with urban conventions of behavior and ways of thinking. . . . Adopting urban patterns of behavior does not mean forgetting how things were done at home. Working-life migrants will continue to behave in urban or rural ways as the situation demands.

In addition to their visits to the village, migrants receive visits from the village. These visits check on the changes in migrants, including the outward appearances of migrant women. A young modern-looking woman who moved to the city five years ago talked about this as follows:

Once when I was cleaning the house, I saw my brother-in-law climbing up the hill. He had just come from the village to visit us. I was wearing a dress with short sleeves, and my hair was uncovered. I was afraid that he would see me like that. I rushed into the house, changed my dress and covered my hair.

This quotation shows the significant role of the rural community, be it in the city or in the village, in the lives of migrants. It acts as a means of material and psychological support in the new environment, as well as a mechanism of social control, especially in the case of women. This often results in the continuing self-identification of migrants as villagers. We can say that the closer the relationship of migrants with the migrant community, the more they feel themselves to be villagers. As we will see later, in the section on "Becoming Urban," gender plays an important role in it.

In order to be able to answer the question of the rural–urban identification of migrants, in addition to the relationship of migrants with other migrants and villagers (the rural side), it is necessary to investigate their relationship with established urbanites. This is the other side of the coin—that is, the urban side.

Modernizing Urban Elites and Rural-to-Urban Migrants:
An Uneasy Relationship

Research on Turkish society points to the role of the bureaucratic and military elites in the modernization project carried out by the state,[19] more strictly in the early Republican era. The elites attempted to transform the society into a modern, secular, and democratic one oriented to the West, and they tended to legitimize their "leadership" in this transformation via the evolutionary–positivist view of development in which those "who know the truth" (those who are educated about the "laws of society") have the responsibility "to go to the masses" to educate them.[20] Some political scientists regard the elites as the motor of social change toward a democratic and secular society,[21] whereas others criticize "the problem of elitism" in Turkish society, by which they mean "a tendency of a small, privileged sector to dominate society, and consciously or unconsciously to regard its domination as legitimate and desirable because of the cultural or intellectual inadequacy it attributes to non-elite elements."[22] Ilter Turan[23] expands further on the issue, saying that "one might anticipate that the urban, educated elites continue to subscribe to an elitist ethic." A recent study on the class structure of Turkish society points to the continuation of the highly exclusive nature of the Turkish upper classes, despite some mobility between social strata due to economic growth and structural change.[24] On the other hand, today these classes face an increasing challenge by the Islamist elites in the context of a rising political Islam as a competitive socio-political project.

Although the increasing differentiation among the urban elites (modernized secular and Islamic elites, as well as the bourgeoisie) and their competition for political power should be acknowledged, this research shows that, in their definitions of urban elites, rural migrants tend to regard them as a single group that shares the characteristics of the modernizing elites. A major group of informants defined modern people as those who "grew up in the city, are well-educated, have refined manners (*görgülü*)," "speak in a refined way (*nazik, kibar*)," "are ahead of other people," "are

wealthy, have power," "dress well and follow fashion," "live in luxurious apartment districts, drive expensive cars."

Based on this, we can point out two major characteristics of the urban elites mentioned by the informants that distinguish them from rural migrants. The first is the "higher qualities" the urban elites have in terms of their culture, knowledge, education, and the like[25] (the relatively high number of Alevis who have been loyal supporters of the reforms carried out by the Turkish Republic may have played a role in this), and the second is their advantage in terms of material resources and power. These two factors seem to contribute to the continuing identification of migrants with the village. It is interesting that while first-generation older migrants emphasized the first point, second-generation, younger migrants emphasized the second. Several migrants who moved to the city in their middle age felt unqualified to be urbanites because of their "inability" to speak like urbanites. Many (mostly first-generation migrants) believed that they could not socialize with urbanites. "You cannot be with those who are ahead of you, you cannot enter their community (*toplum*). You can only enter the community of those who are at your own level." A few said they could not be friends with urbanites because "we cannot live a free life like urbanites. We are conservative in our looks, in our behavior." Despite what the informants said, the author observed a general willingness among migrants to form social contacts with urbanites. On the other hand, as Metin Heper[26] says, "More evident during the earlier migration period, urbanites have never fully accepted and welcomed the 'new urbanites.'" The second-generation migrants often attributed their feelings of belonging to rural society to the attitudes of urbanites, who, they said, did not accept migrants as being like them and held them in low esteem. For example, a young woman attending high school in the central city and living in a *gecekondu* complained a follows:

Of course, I don't think of myself as an urbanite because, for example, the students in my school, those high-society urbanites, make me feel rural. I am not different from them. But they see me as different, make me feel different. . . . We are not in a position to define ourselves because we belong to lower strata. Other people make that definition for us. They look down on us after defining us as rural.

Another high-school student talked about the tension between "them" (the lower-class migrant youth) and "the others" (the upper-class urban youth) as follows:

Of course, we experience exclusion. Look at the Çankaya (an upper-class district) youth who imitate Western culture. They definitely pretend that our people do not exist, they reject them. I cannot be friends with them. I cannot listen to the same music they listen to. Yet, I can live together with them if I am put in a room, but they cannot live with me. Why? Because they are conceited, they put on airs, they are inclined to look down on people like me.

Young second-generation migrants in the *gecekondu* settlement spoke of their poor living conditions as preventing them from living and feeling like urbanites. A young woman who rented a *gecekondu* complained in a resentful voice, "I definitely think of myself as a villager. I don't know, in order to be an urbanite, I should live like an urbanite in every way. I don't eat out or go places. I don't go to movies. I don't have the money to do all of this." Another *gecekondu* tenant, a man in his late

twenties working as a men's-room attendant, was also extremely frustrated with his life, saying, "I feel I am a villager because I cannot keep up with urbanites. If I had money, I could. Urbanites buy new clothes all the time; they follow the latest fashions. I wear everything for many years."

As these quotes demonstrate, in the case of the young people who grew up in the city, the social and economic distance between urban elites and themselves prevent them from considering themselves urbanites.

Among the second-generation migrants, a tendency to (re)identify themselves with the village as a conscious individual choice is emerging. This tendency can be regarded as a reaction of the migrant youth to their conditions in the city, to the "competitive" and "individualistic" urban society, as a young woman put it. They do not live in the protective (cocoon-like) environment of the migrant community which their parents enjoyed in return for their community-centered lives and loyalty to the community. A young second-generation migrant woman who was a state employee and a committed leftist, living by herself in the one-room *gecekondu* she rented, said that she identified herself with the village because she did not want to be a part of the "alienating" urban society:

There is sharing in the village; the relations are warm there. In the city, nobody knows anyone else, nobody asks how you are doing. This is because of the economic system—people have to work hard all day to make a living, and they get too tired or are short of time to see each other. On the other hand, in the village, they work together in the fields, helping one another.

Up to now, we have seen the reasons that led the majority of the rural-to-urban migrants to identify themselves as villagers. On the other hand, in this study there were also migrants who identified themselves a urbanites.

BECOMING URBAN: "I HAVE BECOME AN URBANITE (ŞEHİRLİ)"

In this study, just about one-fifth of the informants considered themselves urbanites (20.2%). Among them, there were a couple of better-off migrants, and the rest were mostly young second-generation migrants, living either in apartments or in *gecekondus*. Interestingly, several recent migrant women living in *gecekondus* also identified themselves as urbanites. Neither being new in the city nor living in *gecekondus* prevented them from claiming urban identities. The following section elaborates on these two groups—namely, the better-off migrants and young migrants.

The Role of Economic Resources: Is It Easier for Better-Off Migrants to Feel Themselves to Be Urbanites?

Different from the other upwardly mobile migrant families who are called "moving up without rejecting," there were a couple of upwardly mobile families in the research who held a strong aspiration to assimilate fully into modern urban society and to be accepted by the higher urban classes as members, to belong to the "bourgeoisie," as a relative of such a family called it. They tended to reject their rural origins and deliberately kept themselves away from other migrants, hiding their past

peasant identities. We can call this group "moving up by rejecting." The detailed information obtained on such a family through their relatives reveals the contempt the family held for rural people.[27] It appears that the favorable economic situation of this family when compared with that of many other migrants enabled them to be independent of villagers and migrants in the city. This potential, when meshed with the desire to be assimilated fully into the upper urban classes resulted in their rejection of their relations with other migrants and villagers. The negative image of rural migrants among the urbanized upper classes seems to be one factor operating in the migrants' rejections of their rural connections in their desire to be "true urbanites." Another factor may be the concern on the part of well-off migrants not to share their social and economic advantages with their kin and *hemşehri*s.

In the case of the young migrants, the ways in which they identified themselves differed on the basis of gender. While the young men said they considered themselves urbanites because "I grew up in the city" (the case of second-generation migrants) or because "I got used to living in the city" (the case of first-generation migrants), those young women who openly said they were urbanites emphasized personal desire and determination as necessary to become an urbanite. Particularly interesting is the case of young women living in *gecekondu*s, presented in the following section.

The Role of Gender: Is It More Difficult for Migrant Women to Feel Themselves to Be Urbanites?

This research has revealed that gender plays a significant role in the process of the migrants' establishing their lives in the city and in their self-definitions as rural–urban. This is particularly true in a Muslim country such as Turkey, where "classic patriarchy"[28] dominates society and where many norms and roles are largely based on gender, more so in the traditional society than in the modern one. For many Turkish women, life is organized around families. Migrant women are "protected" against the "dangers of the outside world" (i.e., the city) by their male kin, particularly in the case of young women from conservative families who are expected to stay inside their immediate physical environment.[29] Also, as we have seen, visits to and from the village act as a strong control mechanism over the lives of migrant women, including the way they dress. On the other hand, migrant men enjoy freedom to spend their time in the places outside the neighborhood, working, or in their free time wandering, in the city. Accordingly, it could be said that while migrant women do not have anything but their housing environment and their kin and neighbors as the basis for their self-identities, migrant men have their occupations and occasionally interactions with the more established urbanites at work, as well as their interactions with the established parts of the city as the basis for feeling themselves to be urbanites.

Especially in the case of *gecekondu* women, feeling oneself to be an urbanite is not easy: Their housing environment is almost exclusively inhabited by rural migrants. Thus, they have to make deliberate attempts to prove to others, and more importantly to themselves, that they are urbanites. Many of those young women living in the *gecekondu* settlement who identified themselves as urbanites had frequent quarrels with their neighbors, and some isolated themselves from them ("younger discon-

tented modernizers"). They held strong feelings against *gecekondu* areas, which they identified with rural migrants. They stressed the superiority of apartment areas in terms of the quality of their residents and praised apartment residents as cultured, educated, and well-off urbanites, while they criticized their *gecekondu* neighbors as uncultured, backward, and too fond of gossip. Although they were renting *gecekondu*s, they definitely wanted to live in apartments as soon as possible. They believed that once they moved to an apartment district, they would become fully integrated into the urban society. This group of young women can be called "*gecekondu* residents by necessity" due to the fact that they lived in *gecekondu*s because they had no other choice at the time.

They also disliked the village and tried to avoid visiting it. They said they did not fit in when they stayed in the village, and many complained about the attention and criticism they received from villagers.

These women stressed the significance of the determination and desire of a person to become an urbanite. A second-generation migrant woman emphasized this point as follows:

It is not only where the person is born that makes him or her an urbanite. It is the desire and determination of the person to become an urbanite that counts. Some people are born in the village, they move to the city and fit in, whereas some others live in the city all their lives, yet they cannot fit in—they live under the influence of their families.

One of these women, who had moved to the city several months earlier when she had married a migrant man from her village, explained why she considered herself an urbanite as follows: "Up to now I lived in the village because I had no other choice. I didn't live there of my free will. I have always had a strong desire to live in the city. I never consider myself a villager, I am definitely an urbanite." Another young woman who had moved to the city recently with her brother after she had a serious fight with her father mentioned that she considered herself an urbanite despite the fact that she lived in a *gecekondu*. "I think of myself as an urbanite. Since I now live in the city, never mind the fact that I live in a *gecekondu*, never mind the fact that I have recently moved from the village, I consider myself an urbanite."

These women can be called "urbanites by determination" due to the emphasis they placed on personal determination to become an urbanite. Further, the strategy that these young women used in their attempt to become "true urbanites" includes them in the "moving up by rejection" category. Yet, in contrast to the better-off migrants in this category who lived in middle-class apartment districts and who had cut off their relations with the rural community, these young women in the *gecekondu* settlement lacked the economic resources enjoyed by the better-off migrants that enabled them to distance themselves physically from the rural circle. Instead, they distanced themselves psychologically from the rural community through their quarrels and isolation. They were young and still had hopes of becoming "true urbanites" if they were determined enough.

These young women stressed the importance of outward appearance in becoming urban, and they cared a great deal for their outward appearances.[30] As a rule, they looked modern in their stretch jeans and fashionable clothes and were easily noticeable in the neighborhood. They usually sat crossing their legs. When the author was

taking their photographs, they were highly concerned about minor details about the way they looked, asking her to wait until everything was set properly. They were eager to meet the author, probably because of their desire to form contacts with established urbanites. They invited her to their homes, sometimes insisting that she visit them.[31]

The young men in this group also had modern appearances, many wearing jeans. The male *gecekondu* residents who identified themselves as urbanites, unlike the women, were usually on good terms with their neighbors. To these men, considering themselves urbanites yet living in a *gecekondu* settlement seemed not to be as disturbing as it was to the women. They spent most of their time outside the neighborhood, using the city's anonymous public spaces, whereas these spaces were usually out of reach for migrant women who were much more confined to their immediate neighborhoods.

Those young men living in apartments were also on good terms with their relatives of rural background. Yet they tended to keep a distance from them. In this respect, they were different from those young women who were inclined to consider themselves rural because of their rural families and their predominantly rural social circle, despite their modern looks and frequent interactions with the city. These men were also different from the young women who openly said they were urban and confronted their rural kin and neighbors, as well as their families who forced them to stay inside the migrant community.

The conclusion to be drawn from the foregoing comparisons is that those women who make deliberate efforts "to become an urbanite" and who fight against things that are considered "rural," including their neighbors, kin, and villagers, feel themselves to be urbanites, whereas those women who have not experienced such struggle feel themselves to be rural, like their parents and neighbors. On the other hand, it is easier for migrant men to feel themselves to be urbanites due to the kind of relationship they have with the outside world: Considering themselves urbanites seems to conflict less with the rural origins of their families or with living in a *gecekondu* district than in the case of women. In other words, men become *flaneurs* without having to break with the norms of their communities of origin, whereas women have to break these rules, hence they experience a more confrontational path to modernity.

BEING IN-BETWEEN: "I AM NEITHER A VILLAGER NOR AN URBANITE"; "I AM BOTH A VILLAGER AND AN URBANITE"

One-fifth of the informants felt that they qualified fully neither as villagers nor as urbanites (20.2%). They were mostly young second-generation migrants who received higher levels of education and those migrants who enjoyed social mobility while maintaining their relations with the rural community. Some second-generation migrants complained about the discriminatory treatment they received both in the village and in the city, not being accepted in either of them. A young man who was educated in the city expressed his frustration in the following words: "When I am in the village, they say I am an urbanite, and when I am in the city, they say I am a

villager." A second-generation migrant woman, a high-school student living in the *gecekondu* settlement, explained her situation as follows:

I am not familiar with rural tasks, making dough and such things. So I cannot say I am a villager. Yet I cannot say I am an urbanite, either. I grew up in the city. But however hard I try, I cannot become an urbanite, not in the fullest sense. I didn't grow up in the village, yet I still carry the character of the village. I have learned its tradition from my parents. My environment is the village, those people who moved from the village. I am under their influence. On the other hand, I read, form other relations, learn from my friends in the city. Yet I don't think of myself as an urbanite. I don't think of myself as a villager, either. I mean, I am in-between, and I feel bad about it.

The same complaints mentioned by the women in the "remaining rural" category about socializing mainly with rural people and hence ending up feeling themselves to be villagers were repeated by those women in this "neither-nor" category who belonged to upwardly mobile families:

I can neither say, "I am a villager," nor can I say "I am an urbanite." I have been living in the city for many years. The neighborhood where we live is in the center of the city. So, of course, I have adapted to the city. But we cannot break up with our habits, our traditions, and most of all with our community. I am still in the same rural community.

There were also those who said they were both rural and urban (mostly first-generation migrants). In their case, the negative feeling of belonging neither to the village nor to the city took on a softer and positive tone: they considered themselves villagers when they were in the village and urbanites when they were in the city, or they said they were hybrids, carrying the character of both villagers and urbanites. They were optimistic for their future, particularly for their children's. This approach becomes particularly meaningful in the case of modern-looking, long-term migrants who live in apartments. They emphasized their adaptation to the city without turning their backs on to their villagers and other rural migrants, and hence they belonged to the "moving up without rejecting" category. They did not say they were urbanites—this would mean breaking their ties with the rural community. Yet, they did not see themselves exclusively as part of the rural community. One of these women, who enjoyed a higher socio-economic standing in her migrant circle, said as follows:

I moved from the village. I have a rural origin. I can speak rural dialect. I cover my hair like a villager and wear *shalvars*[32] when I visit the village. I try to adapt without any feelings of inferiority. But this does not mean that I don't adapt to the city. When there are modern people around, I adapt to them; I become modern. I change my dialect and speak properly as much as I have learned in the city, as much as I have educated myself.

BEING NONE OF THE TWO CATEGORIES: "WE ARE ALL HUMANS"

Only a few informants said they did not think of themselves or others in rural–urban terms (4.3%). Among them was a woman whose family held leftist views. She said, "I don't make any distinction between villagers and urbanites. After all, we are all humans. Some people said, 'Look, she has moved from the village,' and they look

down on her. I don't do this. We are all villagers. Is there anybody in the city without a rural origin? We all once moved from the village."

Another woman who once lived in an upper-class district and was frustrated with the distant attitudes of her previous neighbors also emphasized that she was a human rather than a villager or an urbanite:

I don't categorize people as villagers and urbanites. I think of myself as a human being. I try to improve myself. I read newspapers. When I find a book, I read it. Becoming an urbanite does not mean changing one's way of dressing and starting to wear make-up. What you have inside your head is important, and your effort to adapt to the society you live in is important. . . . Those who are established in the city also once moved from the village. At that time, Ankara was smaller than each of its districts.

A young leftist migrant man holding a university degree stressed the universality of human existence, "I am not a villager, nor am I an urbanite. I am a world citizen."

These migrants seem to be stressing this point as a reaction to the discrimination by urbanites against rural migrants. The political ideologies they hold or their first-hand experiences with urbanites on an equal status and the frustrations that have arisen from such experiences all seem to have sharpened these migrants feelings about the inequalities in the system.

AMBIVALENT CASES: "I AM AN URBANITE. WELL, ON SECOND THOUGHT, I AM A VILLAGER"

Despite the fact that many of the informants were clear and strong about whether they considered themselves villagers or urbanites, there were a few informants who were ambivalent in their responses (5.8%). A couple of them changed their responses during the interview or on another occasion. They first said they were urbanites, and later they agreed with other migrants and said they were villagers. Interestingly, they were long-term first-generation migrant women living in *gecekondu*s. For example, a middle-aged rural-looking woman first said, "Despite the way I am dressed [she was wearing *shalvars*], I still consider myself an urbanite. Why? Because I don't like the village. I moved to the city of my own free will." (She said this in a joking spirit.) Later, when other women present at the gathering started challenging her, she said, "Sure, we are all villagers." There were also a couple of younger women who did not openly say they considered themselves urbanites, but instead implied such an identity. "I cannot really say I am a villager. I did not grow up in the village. I do not know anything about rural tasks. Yet we are all villagers. But I don't know. I don't quite feel that I am a villager." These cases show the influence of the migrant community on individual migrants, now and then preventing them from saying openly that they are urbanites.

In the findings, apartment residence was mentioned by the informants to be an important feature of established urbanites. The section that follows elaborates on this issue and investigates whether apartment residence affects migrants' rural–urban identification and their level of integration to the city.

APARTMENT OR *GECEKONDU* RESIDENCE: DOES IT MAKE A
DIFFERENCE?

Apartment life requires a better financial standing from the residents. Further, in
Turkish society, apartments represent the urban middle classes,[33] and thereby, when
compared with *gecekondu*s, apartment districts promise their migrant residents a bet-
ter social standing. Sencer Ayata[34] speaks of the meaning of moving to apartments
from *gecekondu*s not only as an indicator of economic progress but also of belonging
to the refined (*kibar*) social strata. He also mentions the tendency of *gecekondu*
residents to separate themselves from others, by defining "the others" as "urbanites,
the better-off, those in apartments."[35]

In this research, many informants were happy to move to apartments, which
represented for them a sign of success, a sign of making it in the city. "Apartment
residence seems to have given them the feeling that they had improved their social
status and become closer to the urban society."[36] However, for many migrants, this
did not mean feeling themselves to be urbanites. Many migrants interviewed did not
consider themselves urbanites, including the two women who had never lived in a
gecekondu area. As their reasons, they mentioned their closeness to their relatives
and friends of rural origin. Among the migrants who moved to apartments from
*gecekondu*s, there were young modern-looking women who continued to identify
themselves as villagers or as someone with a rural origin. For example, one such
woman, a high-school graduate and a government employee married to an engineer,
said, "I don't think of myself as urban. I was two when my parents moved to Ankara.
Yet when I was growing up, we socialized almost only with people from the village.
Many of our villagers came to stay with us. And I enjoyed the whole experience very
much."

The possible role of Alevism in the rural–urban identification of migrants living
in apartments should be mentioned. Since in this study the majority of those living
in apartments were Alevis (75%), the loyalty of Alevis to their community may
have decreased the potential of apartment residence in creating an urban identity.

It is evident that migrants do not start identifying themselves as urbanites merely
as a result of residing in apartments. Nor does residing in a *gecekondu* settlement
prevent people from considering themselves urbanites, although it makes it harder.
Several informants said they could not consider themselves urbanites because they
lived in *gecekondu*s. One of them said, "Since we live in *gecekondu*s, we are, of
course, less than others in terms of culture and everything else." And in the case of
the young women claiming to be urbanites ("urbanite by determination, *gecekondu*
resident by necessity"), they had to distance themselves psychologically from their
gecekondu neighbors in order to feel themselves to be urbanites. For these migrants
who identified with urbanites, living in a *gecekondu* area was a psychological burden
that was hard to carry. They felt bitter and resentful about their *gecekondu* existence.

Gecekondu residence seems to hinder the integration of rural migrants into the
city, both in practical and psychological terms, particularly that of women. Yet bear-
ing in mind the diversity among migrants,[37] we should accept this sentence with
reservation. Although residing in a *gecekondu* settlement, particularly one on the

periphery of the city, may isolate female residents, this isolation disappears to vary-
ing degrees depending on age, the stage in adult life (married or not, with or without
children, with young or grown-up children), family orientation (conservative or lib-
eral), and employment. On the other hand, moving to apartments does not necessar-
ily result in the increased integration of women into urban life. On the contrary,
rural migrant women may become even more isolated as their everyday environment
shrinks from the immediate neighborhood to the apartment interior.[38]

CONCLUSION

As we have seen, the migrant population displays diversity in its positioning vis-à-
vis the established urban society and migrant–rural community and its strategies for
social mobility in the new context. Some migrants reject their rural ties completely
in their claim to be "true urbanites"; many struggle to maintain a balance between
their old and new lives, remaining inside their rural community and taking advantage
of *hemşehri* and kin relations while making changes in response to the wider urban
society. And a few seem uninterested in the wider society outside their *gecekondu*
community of rural origin. Some are more integrated into the modern, urban society
than others, and among them there are those who can easily be mistaken for mod-
ernized established urbanites in terms of the way they look, behave, and interact with
the city. However, many continue to consider themselves villagers. The community-
orientedness of rural migrants, which brings into the picture the social control exer-
cised by the migrant community over individual migrants, affecting women profoundly;
their asymmetrical relationship with the established urbanites and the economic and
social distance between the two groups; and in several cases, the fact that they reside
in *gecekondu* housing are the significant reasons mentioned in various ways and con-
texts by the migrants themselves that account for their rural identifications.

The conditions that help maintain and reinforce a rural identity among migrants
may be summarized as follows:

1. when there is a significant discrepancy between rural and urban conditions, both in
terms of practical reality and ideological constructs, and being an urbanite is defined and
presented by urban elites in a way that excludes migrants, who are defined as inferior;
2. when migrants are socially and economically insecure in the city and need the protection
of their old environment (i.e., the rural community); and
3. when migrants lack economic, social, and political resources to take advantage of the
opportunities and services in the city.

In the earlier times of mass migration to cities, these three conditions were pres-
ent. Yet over the years some changes have occurred. The rapidly growing number of
migrants in cities has increased their bargaining power in the political realm. The
populism and clientelism that dominate the Turkish political scene have enabled
migrants, and especially *gecekondu* residents, to trade their votes and loyalty for easy
money and security in the city.[39] Migrants responded to their early social and eco-
nomic insecurity in their new environment by clinging together with their *hemşehris*
and kin; hence, they created their own society in the city within the already estab-

lished urban society. In the course of time, some migrants have improved their so-cio-economic positions, yet many still remain highly economically disadvantaged.[40] As the result of the increased communication among different social strata through the media (particularly TV), as well as increased consumerism in society, second-generation migrants especially now suffer not only from poverty but also from rel-ative deprivation. Further, the negative meanings attached to "being rural" or "being a *gecekondu* resident" in the earlier times are challenged today by the children of migrants.[41] This challenge faces the antipathy of the urban elites, leading to the polarization of the society.

Since the 1980s, as the result of increased individualism (individual success, in-dividual wealth) and competition in society, the diversification of economic activi-ties, unstability in the labor market, and decreased job security,[42] *hemşehri* networks have become selective, and their inclusive and cooperative nature is being replaced by self-interest-oriented motives.[43] Thus, migrants tend to trade off their loyalty to their community in return for their calculated individual gains, and the community accepts them if they are not seen as a continuous burden on the community. We can also observe the loosening of the tight relations among the kin, as well as among the different groups in the *gecekondu* community as *gecekondu* people need each other's help and support less at a later stage than during land occupation.[44] All this is cre-ating a structure that feeds from and produces conflict and antagonism.[45] Now inter-est-oriented relations based on common, usually rural, origin are formed.

In this rapidly changing atmosphere of the city, the responses of second-generation migrants to the city are quite different from their parents'. They feel more deeply their disadvantaged position in the city. They have higher educational levels and higher expectations. When these expectations are not fulfilled, and they are bound to be most of the time, this leads either to pessimistic submissiveness or violent rebel-lion. Moreover, in the 1990s ethnic identities are recognized and encouraged more than before in response to the globalization effects dominating our time. Likewise, local communities organized around religion have greatly increased in *gecekondu* settlements, and those based on Sunni Islam are more recognized by the politicians and bureaucrats than other groups (e.g., Alevis).[46] All this has caused some second-generation migrants to become more political in their ethnic identities than their par-ents. Identification as a rural person in the city as a category tends to be divided into ethnic–sectarian identities, such as Kurds, Alevis, and radical Sunni Islamists.

In the framework elaborated above, it is obvious that the meanings attached to "being rural–urban" are bound to be diversified. But as long as rural migrants are placed asymmetrically in the urban society in economic and social terms, as long as they feel economically exploited or socially excluded and denied social recognition as equals, as long as they cluster in *gecekondu* settlements, then the categories of "rural" and "urban" will not disappear; they will exist as a means of migrants' posi-tioning themselves against the urban elites, against those who are "wealthy," "priv-ileged," and "powerful," those who live "luxurious lives."

In addition to these macro-level factors that affect migrants' lives in the city, sev-eral personal factors affect the experiences of migrants. In the following section, based on the information presented in the previous sections, these factors are identified.

Factors Affecting the Experiences of Migrants and Their Feelings of Urbanity and Rurality

First, gender is a significant factor shaping migrants' experiences. Women and men adopt different strategies and face different sets of constraints in their lives in the city, and it is harder for women to feel that they belong to urban society. Whether or not migrant women work outside the home makes a difference. Holding paid jobs gives women some control over the family's income and a legitimate reason to leave the neighborhood.

The present age of the migrant is also important. As a rule, the younger the migrants, the better integrated they are. On the other hand, young second-generation migrants who have higher expectations are more keen and outspoken about their material and social disadvantages, and hence their lack of full participation in the urban society. Age has a gender dimension. More social control is exercised over the lives of young women than older ones, either preventing them from feeling themselves to be urbanites, or making them take a strong stand against the rural community in order to break away from it and its control over their lives.

The length of residence in the city is another factor. Although the longer time spent in the city does not necessarily make migrants feel themselves to be urbanites, it nonetheless familiarizes migrants with their new environment. However, it is interesting that young migrants who have migrated recently may more easily fit into the city than those older people who migrated in their middle adult age and who have been living in the city for many years, and being in the city briefly does not necessarily prevent newcomers from feeling themselves to be urbanites. The increasing communication between various parts of the country, including rural and urban areas, with the result that some migrants move to the city already equipped with necessary knowledge and attitudes, and the willingness of these immigrants to live in the city (particularly in the case of young women), seem to decrease the significance of the amount of time spent in the city. The fact that it is possible to live in the city as a rural person surrounded by other rural migrants—and in the case of women and the elderly, with limited access to the city—also contributes to it.

Ethnic–sectarian belonging is important in that the Alevi community, which seems less conservative and more open to change than the Sunni community, tends to exercise less social control over women, thus granting women greater mobility and more freedom. Further, Alevis experience a greater sense of communal cohesion as members of a minority, and thus belonging to the Alevi community may intensify the community-orientedness present in general among rural migrants and hence their feelings of rurality. In addition, the ideological orientations of migrants (leftists, Kemalist modernists, political Islamists) affect their attitudes toward the urban society and thereby their strategies of establishing their lives in the city and improving their social positions.

Gecekondu or apartment residence is another factor, with varied effects on women and men, younger and older people, those who work outside the home and those who do not, and those who are from conservative or liberal families.

It is not surprising to find that financial resources are a significant factor shaping the experiences of migrants. In the literature, this issue is well articulated.[47] It is also

strongly stated by the migrants themselves. But whether or not the favorable economic positions of migrants would lead to the rejection of rural people seems to depend largely on their class aspirations and whether they benefit or suffer from such ties in economic and social terms. Those who have ample financial resources may still feel themselves to be rural.

Higher education, although it improves adjustment to the city, does not necessarily make migrants feel themselves urbanites, particularly in the case of women who remain close to the rural community. They may be employed in the formal sector; they may look modern–Western; they may not have any problems using different parts of the city. And yet they may consider themselves villagers or someone with rural origins because they grew up inside the rural community. On the other hand, getting an education is seen by migrants, especially by Alevis, as an important means of social mobility.

In this attempt to identify some of the factors that affect the experiences of rural migrants and their feelings of rurality–urbanity, it has become evident that the factors involved in the process interact with one another and shape outcomes in complex ways. Thus, it would be too simplistic to single out several factors and say that they determine the experiences of migrants. Instead, studies that investigate the experiences of migrants in their new environment will benefit more from an approach that describes in detail the complex and mutual relationships among the various factors involved in a particular context. This article is a step toward this end.

NOTES

[1]J. Abu-Lughod, "Migrant Adjustment to City Life: The Egyptian Case," *American Journal of Science* 67 (July 1961): 22–32; W. Mangin, ed., *Peasants in Cities: Readings in the Anthropology of Urbanization* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1970), 45.

[2]J. Perlman, *The Myth of Marginality* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976), 93–131.

[3]For example, T. G. McGee, "Malay Migration to Kuala Lumpur City: Individual Adaptation to the City," in *Migration and Urbanization*, ed. Brian du Toit and H. I. Safa (Paris: Mouton, 1975), 143–78; Alan Gilbert and Josef Gugler, *Cities, Poverty and Development: Urbanization in the Third World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 158, 159.

[4]Translated as "compatriots from the same region" by J. White, *Money Makes Us Relatives: Women's Labor in Urban Turkey* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1994), 25.

[5]It is common to talk in Turkey about the "squatter culture" characterized by its arabesk music, which displays both pessimistic submissiveness and passive rebellion against the city. However, this definition carries with it the problems of an elitist approach—namely, established urbanites lumping together into one category all those who do not fit into their definition of urbanites.

[6]Tahire Erman, "The Meaning of City Living for Rural Migrant Women and Their Role in Migration: The Case of Turkey," *Women's Studies International Forum* 20 (March–April 1997): 263–73.

[7]Paul Stirling, "Cause, Knowledge, and Change: Turkish Village Revisited," in *Choice and Change*, ed. J. Davis (New York: Athlone Press, 1974), 191–229; Janet Bauer, "New Models and Traditional Networks: Migrant Women in Tehran," in *Women in the Cities of Asia: Migration and Urban Adaptation*, ed. J. T. Fawcett, S. Khoo, and P. C. Smith (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1984), 269–93.

[8]The name given to squatter houses in Turkey, it means "built overnight." The author rented the ground floor of such a house, which had one small room, a tiny kitchen, and a toilet.

[9]The "apartmentization" of Bağçılar gained momentum after the master plan for the area was completed in 1980.

[10]Alevism (Anatolian Shiis) is a sect in Islam that prescribes more egalitarian relations than main-stream Sunnism. Recent research in Turkey in which the data have been analyzed in terms of different religious sects demonstrates that Sunni *gecekondu* residents are more conservative, supporting traditional gender roles more often than do the Alevis: Birsen Gökçe, ed., *Gecekondularda Ailelerarası Geleneksel Dayanışmanın Çağdaş Organizasyonlara Donusumu* (The Transformation of the Interfamilial Traditional Solidarity in Gecekondu Settlements to Modern Organizations) (Ankara: Undersecretariat of Women and Social Services, 1993), 201. Kemal Karpat (*The Gecekondu: Rural Migration and Urbanization* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976], 119–21) found that Alevis formed an egalitarian society which was open to new ideas while preserving the sense of village solidarity and community.

[11]See, for example, Gilbert and Gugler, *Cities, Poverty and Development*, 159–61; Alan Duben, "The Significance of Family and Kinship in Urban Turkey," in *Sex Roles, Family and Community in Turkey*, ed. C. Kağıtçıbaşı (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982), 73–99; Peter Suzuki, "Village Solidarity Among Turkish Peasants Undergoing Urbanization," *Science* 132 (September 1960): 891.

[12]Ayşe Ayata, "Gecekondularda Kimlik Sorunu, Dayanısma Oruntuleri ve Hemşehrilik" (The Question of Identity, Support Networks and Hemşehrilik in Squatter Settlements), *Toplum ve Bilim* 51/52 (fall 1992–winter 1991): 89–101; Peter Suzuki, "Peasants Without Plows: Some Anatolians in Istanbul," *Rural Sociology* 31 (December 1966): 428–38.

[13]Sema Erder, *Istanbul'a bir Kent Kondu: Umraniye* (Istanbul: Iletisim, 1996), 292–93.

[14]In "Gecekondularda Kimlik Sorunu," 89–101, Ayata describes this concept as a flexible category of identity whose definition varies in relation to who the others are. In the presence of people from other villages, it becomes "people from our village"; in the presence of people from other towns, it becomes "people from our town"; and in the presence of people from other regions, it becomes "people from our region."

[15]In her empirical research carried out in a *gecekondu* district in Ankara mainly inhabited by people from the cities of Erzurum and Kars, Ayata ("Gecekondularda Kimlik Sorunu," 97) found the other requirements of membership in the *hemşehri* network of those from Erzurum to be belonging to the same Islamic sect (Sunni), speaking the same language (Kurdish), and being from the same region of the country (Eastern Anatolia). In the author's own research, the focus was not on these categories. Yet the exploratory nature of the research enabled these categories to emerge. The relatively large number of people in the research who identified themselves as Alevis (about 46.5%), which the author found as she became more embedded in the *gecekondu* community, revealed the significance of "Alevism versus Sunnism" as an identity category among rural migrants. But in contrast to Ayata's findings, which pointed to the cleavage of different ethnic and religious groups in different parts of the settlement and the tension among them, this author observed the efforts of many women to play down these differences. This may be due to the relatively heterogeneous nature of the settlement. As some people who once lived in the same community with their relatives and fellow villagers moved to apartments, new people from various parts of the country moved in. The Kurd-versus-Turk issue emerged only in one case: a woman from Sivas mentioned being a Kurd, and thus having Kurdish (not Turkish) as her native language, as preventing her from considering herself an urbanite.

[16]Ibid., 97.

[17]For example, a woman who moved to the city in her late thirties told her sister-in-law, who had moved to the city right after she got married, where her family had become better off, that she was now an urbanite because her family had sold the land in the village and owned two apartments in the city. The sister-in-law immediately objected, saying that she still considered herself a villager.

[18]Gilbert and Gugler, *Cities, Poverty and Development*, 158, 159.

[19]Levent Köker, *Modernleşme, Kemalizm ve Demokrasi* (Modernization, Kemalism and Democracy) (Istanbul: Iletisim, 1993), 11–23.

[20]Ibid., 223.

[21]Shmuel Noah Eisenstadt, *Patterns of Modernity*, 2 vols. (London: Frances Pinter Publishers, 1987), *Beyond the West*, 2:119.

[22]Frederick W. Frey, "Patterns of Elite Politics in Turkey," in *Political Elites in the Middle East*, ed. George Lenczowski (Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute, 1975), 43, cited by Ilter Turan, "The Evolution of Political Culture in Turkey," in *Modern Turkey: Continuity and Change*, ed. Ahmet Evin (Opladen: Leske Verlag and Budrich GmbH, 1984), 105.

[23]Turan, "Evolution of Political Culture," 105.

[24]Korkut Boratav, *Istanbul ve Anadolu'dan Sınıf Profilleri* (Class Profiles from Istanbul and Anatolia) (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfi Yurt Yayinlari, March 1995), 28–30.

[25]The author noticed a tendency among migrants to regard rural people as inferior to urbanites. Here are a couple of examples: "My granddaughter from the village who is visiting me speaks vulgarly like a villager"; "The people in this neighborhood damaged the fountain's pipes. This is no surprise to me. After all, they are originally villagers."

[26]Metin Heper, *Turkiye'de Kent Göçmeni ve Bürokratik Örğütler* (Urban Migrants and Bureaucratic Organizations in Turkey) (Istanbul: Ucdal, 1983), 57.

[27]The following is what the relatives said about the family: "they are conceited"; "they look down on *gecekondu* residents"; "they say villagers are backward"; "they are ashamed of their elderly parents who wear *shalvars*"; "they do not want to share their home and friends with us."

[28]Deniz Kandiyoti, "Bargaining with Patriarchy," *Gender and Society* 2 (1988): 274–90.

[29]Stirling, "Cause, Knowledge, and Change," 213.

[30]When the author visited one of these women in the *gecekondu* that she rented, she found her in a run-down room with a little old furniture around, blow-drying her hair in front of a broken mirror. The contrast between the well-dressed young woman with well-groomed looks and the poverty of the place was striking. It reflected the efforts that the woman made to dress well and look good, despite her severe financial problems.

[31]For example, when the author met one of these women in a neighbor's house, the woman insisted that the author stop by her house on her way back. She insisted that she would bake a cake (this is not common in the *gecekondu* settlement, because the ingredients are rather costly, and an oven is required). She did, but they could not eat it, because there was a power failure while the cake was baking.

[32]Traditional full pants gathered at the ankles.

[33]Sencer Ayata, "Toplumsal Çevre Olarak Gecekondu ve Apartman" (The Squatter House and the Apartment as Social Environments), *Toplum ve Bilim* 46/47 (summer 1989–fall 1989): 101–27; Mubeccel Kiray, "Apartmanlaşma ve Modern Orta Tabakalar" (Apartmentization and Modern Middle Strata), *Cevre* 4 (1979): 78.

[34]Ayata, "Toplumsal Çevre Olarak," 114–18.

[35]Ibid., 104.

[36]Tahire Erman, "Women and the Housing Environment: The Experiences of Turkish Migrant Women in Squatter (Gecekondu) and Apartment Housing," *Environment and Behavior* 28 (1996): 764–98.

[37]Ibid., 786.

[38]In the research, there were a couple of women in apartments whose families were very conservative. They were not even allowed to go to the local grocery store by themselves, though it was only a few buildings away.

[39]Exchanging votes for title deeds in squatter neighborhoods and sometimes selling their houses to contractors in return for several apartments has made some squatters quite wealthy in a brief period of time.

[40]The unemployment rate in cities reached 13 percent in April 1994; in October 1995, it was 10 percent: State Institute of Statistics, *Statistical Yearbook of Turkey 1996* (Ankara: SIS Publication, 1997), 280; many of the unemployed live in squatter settlements. In metropolitan cities, the wealthiest one-fifth of the population receives 57.2 percent of the national revenue, whereas the poorest one-fifth of the population receives only 4.8 percent of the national revenue: State Institute of Statistics, *Statistical Yearbook of Turkey 1996*, 629.

[41]Some of them have become quite popular in the music industry through their songs addressing these issues.

[42]Sencer Ayata, "Varoşlar, Catışma ve Şiddet" (Slums, Conflict and Violence), *Gorus* (June 1996): 18–22.

[43]Erder, *Istanbul'a bir Kent Kondu: Umraniye*, 291.

[44]Sema Erder, *Kentsel Gerilim* (Urban Tension) (Ankara: Ugur Mumcu Vakfi, 1997), 172.

[45]Ayata, "Varoşlar, Catişma ve Şiddet," 18–22.

[46]Erder, *Kentsel Gerilim*, 173.

[47]Tansi Senyapili, "Economic Change and the Gecekondu Family," in *Sex Roles*, 237–48.