

**SOCIAL NETWORKS AND URBAN INTEGRATION OF BULGARIAN  
TURKISH IMMIGRANTS OF 1989 AND AFTER: THE CASE OF  
YENİBOSNA, İSTANBUL**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO  
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES  
OF  
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY**

**BY**

**BÜLENT COŞGUN**

**IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR  
THE DEGREE MASTER OF SCIENCE  
IN  
THE DEPARTMENT OF  
URBAN POLICY PLANNING AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS**

**JANUARY 2005**

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

---

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata  
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of  
Master of Science in Urban Policy Planning and Local Governments

---

Assoc. Prof. Dr. H. Tarık Şengül  
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully  
adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science

---

Prof. Dr. Melih Ersoy  
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Melih Ersoy

Assoc. Prof. Dr. H. Tarık Şengül

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Helga Rittersberger Tılıç

---

---

---

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Bülent Coşgun

Signature :

## ABSTRACT

### SOCIAL NETWORKS AND URBAN INTEGRATION OF BULGARIAN TURKISH IMMIGRANTS OF 1989 AND AFTER: THE CASE OF YENİBOSNA, İSTANBUL

Coşgun, Bülent

M.S., Department of Urban Policy Planning and Local Governments

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Melih Ersoy

January, 2005, 121 Pages

In this thesis, it is aimed to investigate to what extent Bulgarian Turkish immigrants of 1989 and the following years, integrated to the urban life and to analyze the role of their social networks in this process. In this respect, demographic, socioeconomic variables and migration process, social networks and organized and political behaviour of the immigrants have been evaluated in a comparative perspective with Turkish rural migrants in order to understand their difference in urban integration levels. Economic, social and political levels of urban integration of immigrants have been analyzed and the findings of two different age-groups were compared on these levels to see the generational difference in urban integration. A total of 140 members of the association “Bulgaristan Türkleri Deliorman Kültür Derneği” were interviewed in Yenibosna for this purpose. Contrary to assumptions, they couldn't easily integrate to the urban life in Turkey because they came from a country, which is different in ideological, economic, social and cultural aspects. The most important difference was political and ideological, since they were raised in a country, which was socialist in that period before immigration. They formed a strong community to cope with the difficulties in the new environment. Although they became successful in economic integration to a certain extent, they couldn't integrate socially and politically in the same way.

Keywords: Immigration, Urban Integration, Social Networks.

## ÖZ

### 1989 YILI VE SONRASI GÖÇEDEN BULGARİSTAN TÜRKLERİNİN TOPLUMSAL İLİŞKİ AĞLARI VE KENTLE BÜTÜNLEŞMELERİ: YENİBOSNA İSTANBUL ÖRNEĞİ

Coşgun, Bülent

Yüksek Lisans, Kentsel Politika Planlaması ve Yerel Yönetimler Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Melih Ersoy

Ocak, 2005, 121 Sayfa

Bu tezde, 1989 yılı ve sonrasında Türkiye'ye göç eden Bulgaristan Türklerinin kentle bütünleşme düzeylerinin araştırılması ve göçmenlerin toplumsal ilişki ağlarının bu süreçteki rolünün analiz edilmesi amaçlanmıştır. Bu bağlamda göçmenlerin demografik, sosyoekonomik değişkenleri, göç süreci, toplumsal ilişki ağları ve örgütsel ve siyasal davranışları Türkiye'deki kır kökenli göçmenlerin kentle bütünleşme düzeyleriyle karşılaştırmalı olarak ele alınmış ve farklılıkları anlaşılmasına çalışılmıştır. Göçmenlerin kentle ekonomik, sosyal ve siyasal düzeyde bütünleşmeleri iki farklı neslin bu düzeylerdeki bulguları karşılaştırılarak analiz edilmiştir. Bu amaç için Yenibosna'daki "Bulgaristan Türkleri Deliorman Kültür Derneği"nin 140 üyesiyle görüşme yapılmıştır. Beklentilerin aksine, göçmenler Türkiye'deki kentsel yaşama kolay entegre olamamışlardır çünkü geldikleri ülke siyasal, ekonomik, sosyal ve kültürel açıdan farklıdır. Göçten önceki dönemde sosyalist bir ülkede yetişmiş olduklarından iki ülke arasındaki en önemli fark siyasal ve ideolojiktir. Göçmenler yeni çevrede karşılaştıkları güçlüklerle başetmek için güçlü bir komünite oluşturmuşlardır. Bulgaristan göçmenleri ekonomik açıdan belli ölçüde kente entegre olmayı başarmalarına rağmen sosyal ve siyasal yönden benzer şekilde kentle bütünleşememişlerdir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Göç, Kentsel Bütünleşme, Toplumsal İlişki Ağları

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I express my sincere appreciation to Prof. Dr. Melih Ersoy for his supervision throughout the research. Thanks go to the other department member Prof. Dr. Tark Şengül for his suggestions. I would like to express my special gratitude to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Helga Rittersberger Tılıç for her guidance and suggestions.

I also thank to all the members of the association with whom the field study was conducted. They shared their time and feelings with me and gave sincere replies to my questions. I feel gratitude to Reyhan and Nasih who are also immigrants, for their contribution during the field research. I would like to thank Dr. Nihat Kuşku, the head of the Association for his enthusiasm and the valuable information he gave to me.

I also thank Cenap Yolođlu for his help to overcome the difficulties I lived because of distance since I work in İstanbul. I would also like to thank my workmates Mustafa Tuzcu and İlker Salar for their encouragement to finish my thesis.

I am grateful to my girlfriend Nevcihan Çabik for her encouragement, support and help during the study. I would like to thank my uncle Dođan Özkan for the motivation and encouragement he gave me to start and finish the study. Finally I would like to present my special thanks to my family for their love and support.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>PLAGIARISM.....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>ABSTRACT.....</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>ÖZ.....</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS.....</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES.....</b>	<b>x</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>CHAPTER</b>	
<b>1. CLASSICAL THEORY OF URBANIZATION, CRITICISMS AND THE CONCEPT OF COMMUNITY.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1.1 Classical Theory of Urbanization and Rural-Urban     Typologies.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1.2 Criticisms of Classical Theory of Urbanization.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>1.2.1 Third World Reality.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>1.2.2 Community Studies.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>1.2.2.1 Abu-Lughod: The Egyptian Case             of Migrant Adjustment to City Life.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>1.2.2.2 Oscar Lewis: The Mexican Case of             Urbanization without Breakdown.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>2. IMMIGRATION, IMMIGRANT NETWORKS AND THE QUESTION OF URBAN INTEGRATION.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>2.1 Definition of Migration.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>2.1.1 Forced Migration.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>2.2 Immigrant Social Networks.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>2.3 The Question of Urban Integration.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>2.4 A Brief History of Immigration of Ethnic     Turks from Bulgaria.....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>2.5 Social and Cultural Adaptation of Immigrants in Turkey.....</b>	<b>34</b>

2.6	Migrant Adaptation in Turkish Case.....	37
<b>3</b>	<b>FIELD STUDY.....</b>	<b>44</b>
3.1	The Problem and the Aim of the Field Study.....	45
3.2	The methodology of the Field Study.....	45
3.3	Findings.....	46
	<b>3.3.1 Socio-demographic Characteristics</b>	
	of Immigrants.....	46
	3.3.1.1 Age.....	47
	3.3.1.2 Birth Place.....	48
	3.3.1.3 Education.....	49
	3.3.1.4 Marital Status.....	52
	3.3.1.5 Number of Children.....	53
	<b>3.3.2 Socio-Economic Status of Immigrants.....</b>	<b>54</b>
	3.3.2.1 Employment Situation.....	55
	3.3.2.2 Membership to Social Security Institutions.....	58
	3.3.2.3 Expectations of Immigrants from	
	the Future .....	59
	3.3.2.4 Housing and Ownership Patterns .....	61
	<b>3.3.3 Immigration Process and Material and Moral</b>	
	<b>Ties of Immigrants to Bulgaria.....</b>	<b>64</b>
	3.3.3.1 Immigration Process.....	64
	3.3.3.2 Spatial Concentration of Immigrants.....	66
	3.3.3.3 Problems Faced After Migration	
	and in the City.....	66
	3.3.3.4 Relations of Immigrants with Bulgaria	
	and Relatives in Bulgaria.....	68
	3.3.3.5 Immigrants Perception of Life in Bulgaria and	
	in Turkey.....	71
	<b>3.3.4 Operation of Social Networks.....</b>	<b>.73</b>
	3.3.4.1 Social Networks in Finding	

Accommodation.....	74
<b>3.3.4.2 Social Networks in Finding</b>	
<b>Employment .....</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>3.3.4.3 Social Networks in</b>	
<b>Monetarial Necessity.....</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>3.3.4.4 Social Networks in Social Relationships</b>	
<b>and Solidarity.....</b>	<b>84</b>
<b>3.3.5 Organized and Political Behaviour</b>	
<b>and Access to Urban Services of Immigrants.....</b>	<b>92</b>
<b>3.4 Evaluation of the Field Study.....</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>4. CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>106</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY.....</b>	<b>111</b>
<b>APPENDICES.....</b>	<b>115</b>
<b>A: ALAN CALISMASININ ANKET SORULARI.....</b>	<b>115</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

### TABLES

1. The Social Statuses of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants.....	32
2. The Destination Places of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants.....	33
3. Occupation of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants In Turkey.....	34
4. Frequency Distribution of Present Age of Immigrants.....	47
5. Frequency Distribution of Age of Immigrants At the date of Immigration.....	48
6. Frequency Distribution of Birthplace of Immigrants.....	48
7. Frequency Distribution of the Relationship between Educational Situation and Age Groups of Immigrants at the date of Immigration.....	50
8. Frequency Distribution of Educational Status of Immigrants.....	50
9. Frequency Distribution of Educational Status of Immigrants' Spouses.....	51
10. Frequency Distribution of Employment Status of Immigrants' Spouses.....	52
11. Frequency Distribution of Merital Status of Immigrants.....	52
12. Frequency Distribution of Number of Children.....	53
13. Frequency Distribution of Family Type.....	54
14. Frequency Distribution of number of children of Immigrants who married in Turkey.....	54
15. Frequency Distribution of Employment Situation of Immigrants.....	55
16. Frequency Distribution of the Relationship between Employment Situation and Monthly Incomes of Immigrants.....	56
17. Frequency Distribution of Occupation of Immigrants Prior to Immigration .....	57
18. Frequency Distribution of Current Occupation of Immigrants.....	58
19. Frequency Distribution of Social Security	

Institution of Immigrants.....	59
<b>20.</b> Frequency Distribution the Change in the Economic Situation of Immigrants Compared to the Past.....	60
<b>21.</b> Frequency Distribution of the Immigrants Thought in their Future Economic Situation.....	60
<b>22.</b> Frequency Distribution of House Ownership Patterns of Immigrants.....	61
<b>23.</b> Frequency Distribution of the Relationship between House Ownership Patterns and Monthly Incomes of Immigrants.....	62
<b>24.</b> Frequency Distribution of the Relationship between House Ownership Patterns and Age Groups of Immigrants at the date of Immigration .....	63
<b>25.</b> Frequency Distribution of House Type of Immigrants.....	64
<b>26.</b> Frequency Distribution of the Year of Immigration.....	64
<b>27.</b> Frequency Distribution of Reasons of Settlement in İstanbul .....	65
<b>28.</b> Frequency Distribution of first Person/s to come to İstanbul.....	65
<b>29.</b> Frequency Distribution of Districts Immigrants Reside.....	66
<b>30.</b> Frequency Distribution of Problems Faced just After their Arrival.....	67
<b>31.</b> Frequency Distribution of Current Problems of Immigrants.....	67
<b>32.</b> Frequency Distribution of Whether Immigrants Want to Return Bulgaria.....	68
<b>33.</b> Frequency Distribution of Reasons of not Returning to Bulgaria.....	69
<b>34.</b> Frequency Distribution of Reasons of Going to Bulgaria.....	70
<b>35.</b> Frequency Distribution of Frequency of Going to Bulgaria.....	71
<b>36.</b> Frequency Distribution of Absence of Things From the Life In Bulgaria.....	72
<b>37.</b> Frequency Distribution of Things that Make Immigrants	

most Pleased with to Stay in Turkey.....	73
<b>38.</b> Frequency Distribution of the Way of Finding the First House of Immigrants.....	74
<b>39.</b> Frequency Distribution of the Relationship between the way of finding the First House and Age Groups of Immigrants at the date of Immigration .....	75
<b>40.</b> Frequency Distribution of the Way of Finding the Current House of Immigrants.....	76
<b>41.</b> Frequency Distribution of the Relationship between the way of finding the Current House and Age Groups of Immigrants at the date of Immigration .....	77
<b>42.</b> Frequency Distribution of the Way of Finding the First Employment of Immigrants.....	78
<b>43.</b> Frequency Distribution of the Relationship between the way of finding the first employment and Age Groups of Immigrants at the date of Immigration .....	79
<b>44.</b> Frequency Distribution of the Way of Finding Current Employment of Immigrants .....	80
<b>45.</b> Frequency Distribution of the Relationship between the way of finding the Current employment and Age Groups of Immigrants at the date of Immigration .....	81
<b>46.</b> Frequency Distribution of People Immigrants Borrow Money from.....	82
<b>47.</b> Frequency Distribution of the Relationship between from Whom Money is Borrowed and Age Groups of Immigrants at the date of Immigration .....	84
<b>48.</b> Frequency Distribution of Close People Immigrants Stay with in the Same Neighborhood .....	85
<b>49.</b> Frequency Distribution of People Regarded as Hemsehri for the Immigrants .....	86
<b>50.</b> Frequency Distribution of the Relationship between	

People Regarded as Hemsehri and Age Groups of Immigrants at the date of Immigration.....	87
<b>51.</b> Frequency Distribution of the Immigrants’ Type of Relationship with other Social Groups.....	87
<b>52.</b> Frequency Distribution of the Relationship between Type of Relationship with other Social Groups and Age Groups of Immigrants at the date of Immigration .....	88
<b>53.</b> Frequency Distribution of People Immigrants Visit Most As a Family.....	89
<b>54.</b> Frequency Distribution of the Relationship between People They Visit Most As a Family and Age Groups of Immigrants at the date of Immigration .....	90
<b>55.</b> Frequency Distribution of Benefits of Living with Hemsehri within the Same Neighborhood .....	91
<b>56.</b> Frequency Distribution of Characteristic of Membership to the Association of Immigrants.....	93
<b>57.</b> Frequency Distribution of the Relationship between Characteristic of Membership to the Association and Age Groups of Immigrants at the date of Immigration.....	94
<b>58.</b> Frequency Distribution of Reason of Membership to the Association of Immigrants.....	95
<b>59.</b> Frequency Distribution of the Relationship between the Reason of Membership to the Association and Age Groups of Immigrants at the date of Immigration.....	96
<b>60.</b> Frequency Distribution of whether the Imigrants voted or not in the last local election.....	97
<b>61.</b> Frequency Distribution of to whom the Immigrants Voted for in the last Local Election.....	98
<b>62.</b> Frequency Distribution of If Immigrants Have Relationships with Political Parties.....	98
<b>63.</b> Frequency Distribution of If Municipal Services is Sufficient.....	99

**64.** Frequency Distribution of the Reason of Insufficiency of Municipal  
Services.....100

## INTRODUCTION

According to modernization perspective, having a progressive and evolutionary approach underdeveloped countries would undergo the industrialization and modernization processes of the west and the cities of these countries would be industrialized and have an integrated urban culture.

In Turkey since 1950's, several studies had been made investigating the adaptation process of migrants, "urban integration of villagers" and "villagification of the urban". (Arslanoğlu, 1998) According to Erman (1998), rural migrants were expected to assimilate into urban society leaving their rural and traditional values. Nevertheless they were found to be unsuccessful and remain rural. This failure to become an urbanite was seen as social and cultural marginality. Rural migrants were assumed to integrate to the city by adapting to the city life and finding a job. On the contrary it was seen in 1990's that there wasn't an urban integration in that sense from the beginning of the rural-urban migration. A part from the dominance of an urban culture what was observed was the production of localities in the squatters. (Arslanoğlu, 1998). Erman (1998) suggests that "the dichotomous approach 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".

In this context, the change in the definition of urban integration comes to the agenda. The city is a place of a pluralist culture. So, those who make use of the opportunities provided by the city rather than those who integrate to the urban culture should be said to integrate to the urban life. In this approach the emphasis is on the ratio of share obtained from the opportunities of the city. What is important here is the establishment of mechanisms based on learning to benefit from the opportunities of the city through compromise. Social, cultural and economic relationships (social networks) of the migrants could reproduce the local identities and they help getting access to opportunities of the city. (Arslanoğlu, 1998). In this thesis the concepts of "urban integration" and "urbanity" are understood in this sense.

A part from the rural-urban migration, Turkey also faced with an international migration wave of ethnic Turks mostly from the Balkan countries. As Kirişçi (1996) notes, the biggest number of immigrants has come from Bulgaria to Turkey since 1945. Additionally, in the year 1989 the largest collective civilian migration after World War II as estimated by the international humanitarian organizations was that of Bulgarian Turkish immigration. The immigrants received a warm welcome from the Republic of Turkey as they expected. İstanbul was the second mostly preferred city by them after Bursa. They were provided accommodation temporarily in the beginning to ease their adaptation. The immigrants were assumed to adapt to the new environment easily because they were Turkish. However, they were brought up in a different political, social, cultural and economic environment. They lived in a socialist country and they were subjected to assimilation policies that made them live under pressure for years. So it is free from doubt that, adaptation and integration patterns of immigrants would be different from those of Turkish rural migrants. Accordingly they have to be evaluated in a different manner taking into consideration their background and their social and cultural characteristics.

Although there are lots of studies concerning the integration of rural migrants to the urban life in Turkey, there are very few studies focusing on the integration problem of immigrants to the urban life. Thus, it is aimed in this thesis to fill this gap of the question of integration of immigrants to the urban life by analyzing their social networks. It is important to handle the issue of integration of immigrants in a different way from Turkish rural migrants since they came from an entirely different setting. For this purpose, a district Yenibosna found in Istanbul where migrants from different regions of Turkey as well as Bulgarian Turkish immigrants live has been chosen for the field study. It was thought that a settlement having a heterogeneous social structure would be more available to study since it would be easier to observe the attitude of immigrants to establish relationships with others.

Solidarity networks of the urban migrants are tools to cope with the difficulties of urban life. Economic difficulties and the feeling of loneliness are the main reasons that make them use these networks as adjustment mechanisms. These are social and

cultural resources, migrants use for adaptation and they give way to particular social relationship patterns and life styles in urban integration. According to some who see urban integration as integrating to the urban culture, this is just a temporary process before becoming an urbanite. They see the solidarity networks of migrants as a source of lack of adjustment to city life. This view is an extension of modernization perspective, taking urbanization as a unilinear and one-way evolution leaving no room for varied cultural adaptations to urban life. Such an approach is rooted in the theoretical assumptions of the rural-urban typology, which assumes a difference in the rural and urban culture in the way people think, feel, behave and organize their activities. (Phillips, 1996)

This is why in the first chapter, some theoretical and conceptual considerations of classical urban sociology regarding urbanization are taken as starting point. First of all, the views of Tönnies and Durkheim who used polar contrasts to explain social change are summarized. Then, main premises of Simmel and Wirth are discussed as attempts of conceptualizing the city on its own. Critics of the classical urbanization theories including urbanization in the third world are the next subject. Finally, community studies as a concept and then two popular community studies are discussed.

In the second chapter, migration and migrant/immigrant networks are examined. Next, immigrant social networks and the question of urban integration with the related concepts to it are discussed. Then, the levels of urban integration, which are material/systemic, political and social integration, are discussed. A brief history of immigration of Bulgarian Turks and the social and cultural adaptation of the immigrants are considered to have an understanding of the overall historical, social and cultural context of immigration. In the final section, urban integration of Turkish migrants is reviewed to make a comparison with Bulgarian Turkish immigrants.

In the third chapter, the findings of the field study are evaluated. In the field study, socio-demographic characteristics, socio-economic status of immigrants,

immigration process and material and moral ties of immigrants to Bulgaria, operation of social networks in finding accommodation and employment as well as material necessity and social relationship and solidarity and organized and political behavior of the immigrants are discussed. In the part of the evaluation of the field study, the findings are summarized and they are analyzed in the framework of economic, social and political integration to the urban life.

The field study was carried out in Yenibosna, Istanbul in July and August 2004 where Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 settled. The respondents were chosen among the male members of the association called “Deliorman Bulgaristan Türkleri Kültür Derneği” with 140 persons who migrated in 1989 and after. Data collection was made by a questionnaire, which was designed on the basis of a literature review made on the subject. Before beginning the field study the association was visited several times in order to gather information about the immigration process, problems they face, their life style etc. Then the questions were prepared by using the questionnaires used in related studies and by the information obtained from the immigrants.

At the beginning of the survey, the sample was selected by snowball method among the members of the association. Later, since it was aimed to compare the level of integration of two different age groups, a quota sampling was used to balance the samples' age group.

## CHAPTER I

### CLASSICAL THEORY OF URBANIZATION, CRITICISMS AND THE THIRD WORLD REALITY

#### 1.1 Classical Theory of Urbanization and Rural-Urban Typologies

Classical urban theory is based on polar contrasts between two types of social organization and human personality. The classical urban theorists interpreted the changes occurring in the society similarly and explained them, as inevitable evolutionary developments from one form of social organization to another such as from rural to urban, from small-scale to large scale, from religious to secular etc. They used ideal types to express these polar contrasts such as the rural and urban types of society. According to these theorists using rural-urban typologies, the development from rural to urban type of society is unilinear, inevitable and irreversible. Simple rural life and complex modern society are the two ends in the development process and there is a continuum among them. (Philips, 1996)

Reissman, (1964) summarized the terms used by some classical sociologists in their attempt to describe the society using polar contrast approach in a table:

<b>Author</b>	<b>Rural or Non-urban</b>	<b>Urban</b>
	<b>Category</b>	<b>Category,</b>
Becker	Sacred	Secular
Durkheim	Mechanical Solidarity Solidarity	Organic
Maine	Status	Contract
Redfield	Folk	Urban
Spencer	Military	Industrial
Tönnies	Gemeinschaft	Gesellschaft
Weber	Traditional	Rational

Tönnies' "Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft" is the most well known dichotomy. He tried to explain the transformation of traditional forms of community life in Western Europe. His typology was between two forms of social organization namely between Gemeinschaft (community) and Gesellschaft (society). After the distinction he drew between two forms of social organization, other typologies came after it such as pattern variables formulated by Parsons and the folk urban typology by Redfield and Wirth. According to Tönnies, Gemeinschaft is the "lasting and genuine form of living together", Gesellschaft is a "multitude of natural and artificial individuals the wills and spheres of who are in many relations with and to one another, and remain nevertheless independent of one another and devoid of all mutual familiar relationships". In Gesellschaft, every person strives for that which is to his own advantage and he affirms the actions of others only in so far as and as long as they can further his interest. (Mellor, 1977)

In Gemeinschaft, people are bound together by common values, traditions and blood ties and are linked by reciprocal binding sentiment whereas in Gesellschaft there is a lack of close ties and human relations, rest on contracts and laws but not binding sentiment. Attachment to land and neighborhood is replaced with attachment to money. In Gesellschaft, people measure all values in terms of money. Gemeinschaft is represented by small rural communities where people know each other and their place in the social system. Gesellschaft is represented by large urban centers where people don't know one another and their place in the society is changeable. In the end he says that the negative consequences of Gesellschaft can be lessened but cannot be reversed in to the perfect unity of human wills found in the rural community. (Philips, 1996)

Durkheim described the rural-urban shift in terms of changes in social bonds among people or social solidarity by using the terms organic and mechanical solidarity. In mechanical solidarity, people are not atomized and they are homogeneous in their thoughts and feelings. In organic solidarity, which is found in urban industrial society, people are not similar to each other, the collective conscience such as shared

beliefs, values, sentiments and morality weakens and individuality is stimulated by the division of labor. For Durkheim, the shift of the western civilization from mechanical to organic solidarity was inevitable. The change was from a homogeneous social organization having a unity of thought, beliefs and manners to the unity consisting heterogeneous people and functional interdependence.

For Tönnies, *Gemeinschaft* was natural but *Gesellschaft* was artificial but according to Durkheim both societies having mechanical and organic solidarity are natural forms. The unity of the urban society by functional interdependence as a result of division of labor replaced the unity of homogeneous rural society. The evolution from the rural, mechanically solid society to urban-industrial, organically solid society weakened the collective conscience by specialization and functional differentiation of the society and contracts and a belief in the individual replaced the collective conscience. (Philips, 1996)

Tönnies and Durkheim explain the change over time in the pattern of social life as a consequence of a growing rationality and an expanding division of labor. What distinguishes the analysis of Simmel from them is that although he explains the effects of size, division of labor and the money economy in the society, he also sees the city as a causal factor in itself in the description of the change of the social life. This difference mainly comes from his emphasis in the sociology of number. Therefore Simmel's essay may be regarded as an attempt to theorize the city itself. Wirth's essay is the extension, modification and development of Simmel's essay on metropolis for developing a theory of city. He tried to escape from confusing urbanism with industrialism and modern capitalism. (Saunders, 1986)

## **1.2. Criticisms of Classical Theory of Urbanization**

Pahl (1968), notes that the central areas of cities display patterns of life differing what Wirth and others have suggested. A number of studies carried out, showed that "urban villages" existed in the centers of cities in which there were a high social cohesion and a prevalence of primary contacts However, according to Wirth and

others, central areas of large cities were seen to be at one polar extreme of the rural-urban continuum. The findings of the studies realized in the centers of cities suggest that the characteristics of urban life postulated were not applicable to the urban villages. It is necessary to set forth Wirth's ideas about the existence of rural ways of life in cities before passing to criticisms of rural urban-typologies.

Saunders (1986) emphasizes that the existence of urban villages is not inconsistent with Wirth's theory. The terms "urban villages" by Gans and "ruralization of the city" by Lughod is encompassed by Wirth, for he argues that increased density leads to creation of a "mosaic of social worlds" by congregation of similar race, class, status etc. Additionally, as mentioned above, Wirth emphasizes that folk ways of life may be found in cities because previously dominant patterns of life do not end completely by urban growth. On the other hand, existence of the characteristics of urban culture is explained by the dominance of the city over its hinterland.

Therefore Saunders finds critics of Wirth's theory unjust concerning urban villages. He adds that even if the findings of these studies don't support Wirth's theory, what should be done is to criticize the usefulness of his concepts rather than completely refusing his theory.

Several criticisms have been raised against rural-urban dichotomy. First of all, duality of the model is criticized. Numerous paired hypotheses are used to describe the urban and the rural pole. It is suggested that the characteristics of urban pole is the reverse of rural pole as in the organization disorganization paired variable. (McGee, 1975) Lewis, who studied Mexico, found that organization disorganization hypothesis is not valid for that case. In that study, the findings suggest that a society can both have characteristics such as high degree of homogeneity and individualism together. Therefore, the empirical evidences are contrary to major hypotheses. Foster (1965), has found many urban personality characteristics in rural society. According to him, peasant societies have an "image of limited good" meaning; an individual can have a good life only at the expense of others. Peasants don't trust of others and they find cooperative behavior dysfunctional. Therefore individualism is seen among

peasants. (Foster, 1965 qtd. in Phillips, 1996). Gans, in his study of an Italian-American working class community in Boston found an urban village having social intimacy rather than alienation and loneliness among people living there.

Another criticism is that the typologies are deterministic. It comes from the nineteenth century Darwinian worldview of unilinear, one-way evolution. Varied cultural adaptations of people to urban life are overlooked. Hauser (1967), suggests that the so-called typologies were taken as generalizations based on research rather than tools to be utilized in research. Investigators tried to conform their findings to the typologies rather than seeking deviations from them. In turn, diachronic conclusions were drawn from synchronic observations. Therefore the concepts were used in a neo-evolutionary way by seeing folk and urban ways of life as different stages in the development of societies.

Wirth suggested that size, density and heterogeneity are the key determinants of urban life. However he was criticized because the very same characteristics could be explained as a result of technology, industrialization, economic rationality etc. that were linked with urban life. Therefore mainly his theoretical adequacy rather than mode of conceptualization is questioned. Gans and Pahl criticized him in this respect.

Gans' first criticism is that Wirth's statements were about the inner city and can't be generalized to the entire urban region. He suggests that life in outer city and suburban regions does not display an anonymous and impersonal character. He called these relationships as quasi-primary, that is the relationships are more intimate than secondary contact but more formal than primary contact. Second, Gans finds the three variables set forth by Wirth as determinants of urban life inadequate. For him "residential instability" provides a more adequate explanation of patterns of life whether in the city or in the countryside. Wirth sets forth that the three variables brings about some social consequences. Gans notes "a significant proportion of the city's inhabitants were, and are isolated from the consequences by social structures and cultural patterns which they either brought to the city, or developed by living in it"(Gans, 1968 qtd. in Saunders, 1986).

According to Gans, under certain social and cultural factors size, density and heterogeneity affects the quality of social relationships. If people don't have the chance to choose where to live, then residential instability of their neighborhoods will determine their ways of life. To clarify this point he classifies five types of inner city residents. First cosmopolitans who are students, intellectuals and professionals choose to live in the inner city since it is near the cultural center. Young unmarried and childless couples constitute the second group. They choose to live in the inner city until they start a family. The first two groups are detached from the inner city due to either their interests lying in the outer region or their temporary location. The third group is urban villagers who continue some of their rural habits and life styles in the city and thus unaffected by the surrounding urban environment. Therefore urban villagers like the first group are not affected from the social consequences Wirth suggested because they are not detached from their surrounding environment. So Wirth's three variables become less effective when there is a greater choice available. Then for Gans, choice as a way of life replaces the determinants of ways of life in the analysis of social relationships in the city. Sociological variables of "class and life cycle" are the most important factors in the explanation of variations in social relationships. Accordingly size, density and heterogeneity loses their importance as explanatory variables in his analysis. Consequently if ways of life are explained by the factors of class and life cycle rather than "the ecological attributes of the settlement" then it is not possible to formulate a sociological definition of the city and in turn, one can not talk about an urban or suburban way of life. (Saunders, 1986)

Pahl (1968), supports Gans's argument stating that patterns of social relationships in any locality can be understood by the analysis of social structure. For him, concepts such as urban and rural cannot be used as explanatory variables and notes that "any attempt to tie particular patterns of social relationships to specific geographical milieux is a singularly fruitless exercise". Pahl added some factors, besides class and life cycle such as "divisions between traditional residents and newcomers and the different patterns of social networks between locals and cosmopolitans" He added

the spatial analysis that is the interaction between local and national in understanding the social life in any locality. Stacey, used the term “local social systems” and argued with Pahl that the relationships between the local and national rather than the view that, localities’ being urban or rural determines the pattern of social life.

Dewey notes that variations in the size of human settlements leads to some sociological consequences set forth by Simmel, Wirth and other writers but only size can not be a factor in explaining the urban or rural culture. So he finds these social consequences as having incidental importance and states that cultural theories of urban-rural differences are “real but relatively unimportant”

Saunders draw the conclusion that there is no distinctively urban culture and finds the work of classical urban sociologists insufficient to call a specifically urban social theory. Size of human settlements is just one among several factors and a social psychological theory is thus needed involving the inclusion of spatial factors among other factors. (Saunders, 1986)

On the other hand, Castells, identifies urban culture as it is presented is neither a concept nor a theory but rather a myth recounting the history of human species ideologically (Castells, 1977). According to him, the theories developed regarding urban culture are based on this myth and uses the key words of modernism for the social forms of liberal capitalism in an assimilated and ethnocentric way. He admits that cultural specificities are found in certain social environments, however he finds the town country distinction in explanation of social relationship patterns insufficient and thinks that one must look to the social structure as a whole to explain the mode of social life. He opposes to the “purely empirical correlation between a cultural content and its spatial seat”. (Castells, 1977)

### **1.2.1 Third World Reality**

Some scholars criticize the typologies because it is ethnocentric and thus fails to approximate reality. It is assumed that the patterns and processes of urbanization, industrialization and capitalism will be lived universally just like in Western Europe. However the evidences from other parts of the world are contrary to this view. The case of China may be given as an example since, industrialization in China is faster than urbanization (Philips, 1996)

Hauser, (1967) in the same way viewed the ideal-type constructs as products of Western writers, pointing out the departures in reality from the ideal-type constructs in less-developed regions of the world. He applied the main characteristics set forth by the ideal-type constructs to Asian cities, which were less developed regions. He tested whether the characteristics of urban and rural ways of life are applicable to those cities and compared the actual characteristics of the urban and rural areas of the less developed countries with those of expected characteristics of the urban, which were developed by Wirth and Redfield. Finally he reached to the conclusion that they are not valid theories for the third world cities. There are several other cases investigating rural-urban differences in non-Western regions. Edward Bruner's work on Toba Batak in Medan Sumatra suggests that the characteristics of life in transition to rural areas are not same as in Western society. Abu-Lughod (1961) found out as a result of her study in Cairo city that, dichotomy is invalid in Egypt and many other less developed countries. McGee (1975) is of the same opinion depending on his study in Kuala Lumpur city.

McGee, (1975) calling attention to the differences between developed and underdeveloped world notes that cities are to be understood in the wider socioeconomic system in the context of underdeveloped world in which each country is affected in a different manner by the other socioeconomic systems. According to him, taking the city as independent variable means saying that the symptom has caused the disease. Rather, the city must be seen as a system in the process of wider socioeconomic changes. Therefore an understanding of the condition of

underdevelopment is necessary in the analysis of underdeveloped countries' cities. Frank (1967) finds theories envisaging the repetition of the Western experience totally incorrect since the condition of underdevelopment is caused by the impact of capitalism and can only be understood through considering its continuing relationship with capitalism. (Frank, 1967 qtd. in Saunders, 1986).

Lewis (1967) proposed developing indices of the degree of urbanization to differentiate cities. For him, cities provide a wider range of alternatives than non-urban areas in terms of “types of work, housing, food, clothing, educational and medical facilities, modes of travel, voluntary organizations, types of people and so on”. If these are characteristics of cities, different sectors of the population within cities can be classified according to the degree of provision of these alternatives. If some people in the city have fewer alternatives regarding clothing, food, type of work etc, than that sector of the population is said to have a lower degree of urbanization. The scale of urbanization can be applied to all settlement types in addition to the cities. Therefore he sees two sides of the urbanization coin, one of which is the amount and the variety of services and the other is the degree different sectors of the population benefits from these services. That is, two cities having the same urbanization index in terms of variety and the amount of services may be different regarding the availability of these services for the different sectors of the population. At this point he refers his study in Mexico City and tells that a majority of people living in the urban Mexico have a lack of access to urban services. They have a low degree of education and literacy, don't belong to labor unions, don't have a social security etc. Therefore although these people live in the city, they are not urbanized. Consequently the poor in all cities of the world are less urbanized than the wealthy people. (Lewis, 1967 qtd. in Saunders, 1986).

### **1.2.2 Community Studies**

It is explained above that from Tönnies to Wirth “ecological determinacy” was the dominant approach in the description of social life in cities. That is, physical changes such as increases in population, density and heterogeneity would inevitably lead to a

loss of community. Many of the community studies undertaken in urban areas have reached to findings contrary to this belief. Nisbet (1966) notes that, community encompasses relationships having “ a high degree of personal intimacy, emotional depth, moral commitment, social cohesion and continuity in time”. To him community is “a fusion of feeling and thought, of identity and commitment, of membership and volution, it may be found in, or given symbolic expression by, locality, religion, nation, race, occupation or crusade”(From Abu-Lughod, 1991)

Community studies differ from ecological investigations in their general approach and methodology. Anthropological field research methods are used by sociologists and anthropologists in community studies. The methodology is sometimes called ethnography, in which researchers live for a period of time in the area of research and learn the life styles of people by experiencing themselves. So observation is the generally used method rather than questionnaires and quantitative techniques. Scope of community studies therefore is limited by the sub area of cities and neighborhoods having a relatively homogeneous population living in a discrete physical space. It is impossible to study the ways of life in a large city at the same time. Community studies are done in residential districts providing access to researchers. Therefore poor, segregated on the basis of race and ethnicity, locally ordered and homogeneous communities were studied rather than rich, diversified, diffuse or externally oriented and heterogeneous ones. (Abu-Lughod, 1991)

Community studies are done to investigate the lifestyles of different sections of the society and by doing this, the validity of the theoretical assumptions are tested. In the following part, two popular community studies conducted in cities of underdeveloped world (Cairo and Mexico respectively) aimed at questioning the assumptions of urbanization theories especially for the underdeveloped world will be discussed.

### **1.2.2.1. Abu-Lughod: The Egyptian Case of Migrant Adjustment to City Life**

Abu Lughod (1961) in her study carried out in Cairo tried to identify the adjustment patterns of migrants to the requirements of urban life. In the beginning of her study she points out to the assumptions and hypotheses of rural-urban dichotomy and then argues that according to this approach “a hypothetical villager is to be dropped, unarmed in to the heart of urban Cairo to assimilate or perish. He is to be granted no cushions to soften his fall”. She finds the assumptions of conventional theory invalid both for the developed and the developing countries. The reason of the invalidity of this theory for the developing countries cities like Cairo comes from the fact that a great deal of people comes from the rural hinterlands of the country therefore these migrants are not assimilated in the urban life but they shape the culture of the city while adjusting to it.

At the time of the study, one third of Cairo’s population was village migrants. When these village migrants first enter the city they try to find settlements whose physical and social characteristics are similar to those of their villages. In Egypt and other industrializing countries there is a similar pattern of initial settlement of rural migrants. The migrants make the first contact with a friend or a relative from his original village and spend the first few nights there. Then, more permanent settlements are found in the same neighborhoods, which result in concentration of migrants from certain villages. Additionally he is not the only newcomer to the city but as the Cairo case shows a lot of migrants come to the city within a short period of time. This migration process leads to the “formation of small conclaves of ex-villagers sharing a common past in the village and a similar and often simultaneous history of adaptation to the city”. In the area where they have chosen to settle, streets are not used for wheeled traffic, thus allowing them to use the streets to realize the rural functions such as “pathway, meeting place, and playground and fettering area for animals”

In the economic adjustment process, there has been a substantial change in the nature of work life. Migrants were engaged in agriculture before they left their villages. In

the city the work is more difficult, regular in time and usually less solitary than rural life. While there is the possibility that in a large scale factory, people from diverse social origins come together and establish relations on a secondary type, since firms in Cairo employ few persons often within the same family the work force display a homogeneous social structure. As well as the way that they find their first settlements, they depend on their compatriots to find their first jobs. Consequently the migrants are not isolated from their villagers both residentially and in their work life.

Abu Lughod, argues that contrary to Wirth's hypotheses, the culture of Cairo can not be characterized by "anonymity, secondary contacts and the other attributes of urban life" and indeed migrants in Cairo are "active creators of a variety of social institutions" the function of which is to protect migrants from isolation and anomie. Additionally the protection of the personal relationships is important in Middle Eastern culture even at a sacrifice of privacy.

Cairo's migrant population is not composed by not only one community. The people from different communities reside, work and recreate in separate areas but it is not possible to talk about anonymity within the community.

While informal social associations such as village benevolent societies are widespread, formal social institutions like labor unions, civic associations and political groups are not developed in Cairo.

Coffee shops for men play an important role in providing mutual assistance for employment and news from the village are exchanged. On the other hand, there is not any informal social association for women and the social role for women is reduced in the city thus confining them to immediate neighborhood more than men.

Consequently the life style of migrants shows that the presumptions of rural-urban dichotomy envisaging a passage from rural to urban pole by the migration process

does not hold true for Cairo as well as other underdeveloped countries cities. (Abu-Lughod, 1961)

#### **1.2.2.2 Oscar Lewis: The Mexican Case of Urbanization without Breakdown**

Lewis (1952) questioned the validity of rural-urban continuum theoretical model by his study on the change of the way of life of people who have migrated from the village of Tepoztlan to Mexico City. He suggested that this model was inadequate for the study of cultural change and needed drastic revision. Then he located some of the families who have migrated from that village and studied life of these families in Mexico City. He was after finding out what happened to these people who had gone to live in Mexico City. He notes that rural sociologists in United States did the most comparable to his work. The main concern in these studies is the cause, rate, direction and the amount of migration, factors of selectivity and occupational accommodation. They mainly emphasize the negative aspects such as personal maladjustment, breakdown of family life, decline of religion considering the adjustment process of migrants to city life. (Lewis, 1952)

The study of urbanization in Mexico City proves that urbanization without breakdown is possible contrary to the other studies. The findings of the research show that the migrants were not disorganized and did not experience a culture shock. He didn't find any personal anonymity and isolation among these families as postulated by Wirth.

Tepoztecs live in three types of housing. These are the apartment house, separate houses and vecindads in which the poor people live. Vecindads played a shock absorber role for the migrants by providing a similar cultural environment with that of their villages. The conditions of vecindads resembles to those of the houses in village. These are one-storey dwellings around a courtyard having a communal water fountain in the center and one or two toilets for a number of families. These constitute a community in the city and forty-four percent of Tepoztecan families live in vecindads. Vecindads and neighborhoods in which these people live breaks up the

city in small communities providing cohesiveness and such a more easily adaptation to city life. Primary relations are common in this environment. People spend most of their lives within these single communities having face-to-face relationships and lifetime friendships resembling a social life in the village. There are strong relations in this colonia. Marriages were made among people living in the same colonia or adjoining ones. Coming together in times of emergency and regular visits at other times are common practices.

The average size of the households is larger in the city than in the village and the percentage of extended families is higher in the city. The family life is found to be stronger in the city. There were fewer cases of divorce and separation. There weren't any cases of persons living alone and abandoned mothers or children. Therefore one could not talk about a family disorganization in the city rather; there was an increase in the cohesiveness of the families against the difficulties of city life. On the other hand, solidarity in the village is only seen in times of emergency and crisis.

Dietary patterns are similar to the village in spite of the rise in the incomes of the migrants. They continue their food and eating habits in the city. Another continuing tradition is having household pets. A large percent of Tepoztecan own pets and some feed farm animals in the city.

The ties with religion is not weakened, indeed became more catholic and disciplined. There wasn't a decline in church attendance and in religious practices. Tepoztecan send their children more regularly to Sunday school.

Tepoztecan continue their ties with their villages and the ties did not seem to weaken with increase in years away from it. The most important evidence showing their faithfulness to the village is that some migrants having lived more than thirty years expressed themselves as Tepoztecan first and Mexican second.

Both the rural life and migrants' life in the city share common characteristics, which may be called as "culture of poverty". Other similar characteristics with that of rural

life were illiteracy and low level of education, political apathy, limited membership and participation to both formal and informal associations.

After he had completed his study on Tepoztecan living in Mexico City, he decided to test the findings by doing a further research by non-Tepoztecan families. He chose two lower class housing settlements namely vecindads and he reached to similar findings, which supported the earlier study.

Lewis on the basis of this research suggests that, referring to the rural-urban dichotomy, generalizations about urbanization may be culture bound and needs reexamination by another empirical studies. He thinks that careful studies in smaller universes should be made in order to escape from a priori statements about the city as a whole.

At the end, he concludes by saying that “urbanization is not a simple, unitary, universally process but that it assumes different forms and meanings, depending upon the prevailing historic, economic and cultural conditions. (Hauser, Schnore; 1965)

## CHAPTER 2

### IMMIGRATION AND IMMIGRANT NETWORKS AND URBAN INTEGRATION

#### 2.1 Definition of Migration

The definition and measurement of “migration” is difficult since it is a term involving spatial and time dimensions. To be called migration, a movement must be both across a political or administrative boundary and involve a change of usual residence. (Bilsborrow, 1996) For Parnwell (1992), migration involves the permanent or quasi-permanent relocation of an individual or group of individuals from a place of origin to a place of destination. He made a typology of migration involving spatial, temporal and motivational dimensions. This classification formed a wide variety of terminology of migration type, on the basis of the dimension considered. With respect to the motivational dimension, migration is divided into two categories, which are voluntary and involuntary movements. When the movement is voluntary, the mover has a more or less free choice concerning whether or not to leave, whereas the mover has no such freedom of choice in involuntary movement. Since Bulgarian Turkish immigration is an involuntary movement at least as the beginning of it concerned, this type of movement will briefly be explained. Vasileva (1992) argues that the immigration of 1989 seems to be a political migration and the emigrant Turks should be called refugees and asylum seekers.

##### 2.1.1 Forced Migration

Forced migration is a type of involuntary movement and defined as: "A general term that refers to the movements of refugees and internally displaced people (those displaced by conflicts) as well as people displaced by natural or environmental disasters or development projects (Loughna, 2004). As suggested in the definition, there are three types of forced migration classified according to the cause of the movement. These are conflict-induced displacement, development induced

development and disaster induced development. This type of movement occurs when people are forced to flee their homes because of one or more of the following reasons and the state authorities are unable or unwilling to protect them. The reasons that force people to move in a conflict situation are “armed conflict including civil war; generalized violence; and persecution on the grounds of nationality, race, religion, political opinion or social group” (Loughna, 2004). The people in such situation will flee across international borders in search of refugee while some of them may seek asylum under international law and some may choose to remain anonymous because of the fear that they may not be granted asylum and will be returned to the country they fled from. A refugee is defined in the 1951 United Nations Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees as “ a person residing outside his or her country of nationality, who is unable or unwilling to return because of a “ well founded fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a political social group, or political opinion”. According to the 1951 Refugee Convention asylum seekers are “people who have moved across international borders in search of protection, but whose claim for refugee status has not yet been determined”

## **2.2 Immigrant Social Networks**

Massey (1993) defines the migrant networks as: “sets of interpersonal ties that connect migrants, former migrants and non-migrants in origin and destination areas through ties of kinship, friendship, and shared community origin”. He argues that these networks increase the possibility of international movement lowering the costs and risks of movement and by increasing the expected net returns to migration. Migrant networks are a form of social capital facilitating the access of migrants to the labor market. According to the network theory, after reaching a certain number of migrants, the networks reduces the costs and risks of movement which increases the intention to migrate and thus causes additional movement which further expands the network and so on. While the first migrants do not have social ties to draw upon, the migration is costly for them. By kinship and friendship structures formed after reaching a certain number, each new migrant creates social ties with a set of people who facilitate gaining access to employment and give assistance at the point of

destination. Furthermore international migration becomes attractive as a strategy for risk diversification again by putting a destination job within easy reach of most community members and thus making emigration a reliable and secure source of income.

In general, one can speak of the importance of networks in providing general information, financial support to facilitate the move, helping with initial expenses and settlement, securing employment, procuring housing, psychological support, and the maintenance of long distance ties with the community of origin (Menjivar 2000; Goza 1994; Grasmuck and Pessar 1991; Tilly 1978; Lomnitz 1977 qtd.in Goza 2003). For Tilly (1990), social networks are dynamic and evolving social relations, which are important in organizing and directing the flow of information, labor and products between migrant sending and migrant receiving communities.

Migrants mostly move to places where they have relatives and friends. Their shelter and food needs will be met for a while, they will be introduced to the new environment, and further they will be helped to earn their livings. This is why people from the same village, region and ethnic group are encouraged to form residential clusters. People of common origin although residentially dispersed, frequently maintain close ties. (Gilbert; Gugler, 1992) Ethnic identity is an important factor not only for the survival of rural practices but also for being a response to the difficulties of survival in a competitive urban economy in which economic opportunities are scarce. Ethnic identity provides a degree of monopoly of jobs and clients and maintains relations based on trust. (Roberts, 1978) Roberts, looking from an economic perspective suggests that individuals use the available social and cultural resources in an economically uncertain environment and adopt a particular pattern of coping with the difficulties of urban life. In their attempt to cope with these difficulties they employ resources such as capital, social relationships, educational and other skills.

Lack of extended family ties is compensated with nuclear family members and close relatives in the city. Friends, neighbors and workmates are treated as sister, brother

or other kin. This type of behavior is mostly seen among poor first generation urban dwellers that are dependent on support networks. In case of emergency or when there is a need of money or assistance people ask the help of kin even though the state as in China provides a subsistence floor. In periods of unemployment migrants call on the help of kin for job contacts. Working together with the kin is also a common practice in the commercial network to find scarce goods. (Gilbert; Gugler, 1992)

As mentioned above, migrants develop strategies to cope with the difficulties they face in the new environment. These strategies are individualistic when the migrant depends on his own resources and initiative and group oriented as explained by social networks namely the relations with kinsmen or fellow villagers for assistance. (Graves and Graves 1974 qtd. in Gmelch, Zenner 1988)

A migrant in search of housing may either find it on his own or depend on kinsmen to assist him. In establishing friendships a migrant may try to establish relations with the other members of the urban society or he may choose to have relations among his own kind namely kinsmen, fellow villagers or co ethnics.

Migrants use both individual and group oriented strategies. It can be said that individualistic strategies are seen more among his own kind namely kinsmen, fellow villagers or co ethnics. Voluntary associations are among the group-oriented strategies. They strongly support the migrants, psychologically and economically. The voluntary association gives the migrant a sense of belonging, provides financial assistance when necessary and organizes social activities. (Gmelch; Zenner 1988)

The migrants have to extend this network and include strangers in order to adapt urban life. The number of social relationships of an individual or family with non-kin inside or outside the neighborhood of residence depends on the income level of the family, the location of their neighborhood, age and the type of work of family members with other factors such as recency of arrival in the city and number of prior contacts (Roberts 1978). He found in his Guatemala study that older people did not travel much outside the neighborhood and expected the visit of neighbors and others.

Poverty was found to be a factor that prevented the external visits because of travel costs. People living in neighborhoods closer to the center, made more visits outside their neighborhood than people living in peripheral locations since it was more costly and time consuming to get to the center. Besides, it was found hard to maintain extended relationships for those who were more recent migrants and those without prior contacts.

According to many researchers, immigrants provide the resources available to the use of their kinfolk and the information gathered by the contacts of kin reduces the risk of migration. These researchers have mainly concentrated on examining the negative and positive effects of immigrant adaptation and they adopted the assumption that the networks always provide a haven for immigrants. Menjivar (1995), questions the validity of the assumption in her study conducted on recent immigrants of Salvadorians, Vietnamese and Mexicans to California to seek the sustainability of kinship networks and their breakdown in a comparative perspective. She suggests that Salvadorians' kinship-based networks have a greater tendency to break down upon arrival than those of Vietnamese and Mexican immigrants. That is although both groups rely to a great extent on their social networks to make their U.S. bound journey, Salvadorians' networks weaken during resettlement while Vietnamese and Mexicans' networks continue to be viable sources of support upon arrival. Menjivar compares the structure of opportunity in the receiving context for these groups and suggests the existence of three factors, which shape the structure of opportunity upon arrival. These factors are the state's reception to migrants which helps immigrants in their housing and psychological problems; local labor market opportunities; and the receiving community including the history of the previous and the present migration flows and the internal dynamics of the migrant group. Vietnamese benefit from the state assistance upon arrival facilitating their economic adaptation, which strengthens the community ties and in turn sustains the already strong kinship ties among them. Mexicans do not have access to state assistance as Vietnamese but they have a long migration history having maintained informal ties through which immigrants have access to resources such as labor market opportunities. On the other hand for the Salvadorans case, they don't have state help

and a great deal of immigrants are not documented. Besides, since they don't have a long history of migration like Mexicans, they couldn't have created strong informal ties. Menjivar concludes that because of the above factors, the reciprocity of the networks is undermined thus leading to the weakening of social ties among Salvadorian immigrants.

### **2.3 The Question of Urban Integration**

The problem of "urban integration" has been among the most studied issues till the beginning of mass migration from rural to urban areas. The concept of integration is a comprehensive one including economic, social, political, cultural, and spatial as well as psychological aspects of the society. Such a comprehensive concept could be made clear by examining the related concepts with it.

*Acculturation* is a broader term including integration and defined as "culture change that results from continuous, first-hand contact between two distinct cultural groups". (Redfield 1936, qtd.in Berry, 1992) *Adaptation* is used by Berry (1992) to refer to both the strategies during acculturation and outcomes of it. For Berry, these strategies are *adjustment*, *reaction* and *withdrawal*. In the case of adjustment "changes in the individual are in a direction which reduces conflict between the environment and individual by bringing one into harmony with the environment"(Berry, 1992). So adjustment is a positive strategy and is most intended by the term adaptation. In the case of reaction direction of change is towards retaliating against the environment increasing the congruence or fit between two. As a third adaptation strategy in the case of withdrawal, the direction of change is towards reducing pressures from the environment. As the name implies, the group or individual removes from the adaptive arena either by forced exclusion or by voluntary withdrawal.

On the other hand, Berry (1992), discusses four options as acculturation strategies, which are *separation/segregation*, *marginalization*, *assimilation* and *integration*.

The option of separation or segregation occurs when there are no substantial relations with the larger society accompanied by a maintenance of ethnic identity and

traditions. Segregation is the case when the dominant group tries to keep people in their place whereas in the separation option, the acculturating group or the non dominant group desires to maintain a traditional way of life outside full participation in the larger society leading to an independent existence.

In the option of marginalization “groups lose cultural and psychological contact with both their traditional culture and the larger society (either by exclusion or withdrawal)”. Berry, finds marginalization difficult to define precisely because it is accompanied by a good deal of collective and individual confusion and stress related with the term acculturative stress which is characterized by striking out against the larger society and by feelings of alienation and loss of identity.

Assimilation is another option of acculturation strategy. It is defined by Patterson (1963) as: “complete adaptation by the immigrant or more usually by the minority group or by individual members of it to the values and patterns of the receiving society.” Bookman (1997) sees assimilation as the acceptance of another’s culture while losing one’s own traditional characteristics. According to Berry (1992) assimilation can take place by way of absorption of a non-dominant group into an established dominant group or by way of merging of many groups to form a new society, as in the “melting pot” concept.

The last and the most desired acculturation strategy for both groups is *integration*. Patterson (1963), uses the term with cultural pluralism equally and defines it as: “a stage in which the incoming group as a whole, through its own organizations, adapts itself to permanent membership of the receiving society in certain major spheres of association, notably in economic and civic life”. For Berry (1992), in integration cultural identity of the non-dominant group is preserved and the group becomes an integral part of the larger society. In an integrated society there are a number of ethnic groups cooperating within a larger social system. What differs integration from other strategies is that as Bookman (1997), argues, integration stresses what the groups have in common rather than their differences. Therefore it can be said that integration is the

desired strategy of adaptation to establish peaceful relationships among the groups in the society. .

Urban integration takes place at three levels, which are material or systemic, political and social integration. (Göschel, 2001)

The first level of urban integration is material or systemic integration. It is concerned with integration into working life and the labor market and involves “ all systems of social security” based on individual paid employment in most modern states. Göschel (2001), sees historically the classical European city which fits to this integration level and it is made possible by individual economic activities, in the form of “citizen by participation in economic life”

The second level of modern (urban) integration, which is political integration, is made also possible by citizen participation in economic life and also by a citizen able to “becoming integrated into democratic forms of political decision-making, self-administration and exercise of power”

The writer discusses the third level of integration, which is social integration by comparing the characteristics of urban and rural societies. The level of integration “in informal relationship networks, in neighborhoods, friendships and mutual assistance relationships” is called social integration. These kinds of relationships are not based on ancestry, status, family or religious allegiance like rural societies but based on freely made selection.

Göschel, (2001) argues that the three levels he discusses are typically urban because of their partial nature and independence of the three levels from each other. He thinks that urban integration can never completely embrace the individual and integration and disintegration in one level does not mean exclusion or inclusion on any or all other levels as in the case of functionalist and normative approaches. Thus, urban integration takes place in differing degrees and a failure of integration in one level does not mean a total disintegration.

Castells (1997) criticizes the functionalist and demographic and geographical empiricism and proposes the protection of local identities and provision of integration to a wider social identity without giving harm to local identities. (Castells, 1996; qtd. In Armağan, 2003)

In Turkey, mass migration from rural to urban areas came to the scene after the World War II. in 1950's, with the structural change in agriculture. The migrants by the process of chain migration clustered around big cities in squatter settlements. At the beginning the integration of these "urban villagers" was seen as a question of time. The migrants would get used to urban life and learn the urban culture in time. The adopted approach for solution was that of modernization theory depending on rural-urban dichotomy. As Erman (1998) suggests, rural migrants were expected to assimilate into the urban society and become "true urbanites" leaving their traditional values and lives and adapt to the lifestyle and values of the modernizing urban elites. The migrants were seen to be unsuccessful in adapting to the urban life in this sense and remain rural. The failure to become an urbanite was explained as social and cultural marginality. (Erman, 1998) Over the years, it was seen that the expected integration of the migrants weren't realized. In the course of time through chain migration migrants clustered in the same neighborhoods in which they created communities with their own ways of life and values and to some extent village life was reproduced in the city. In this context as Erman (1998) suggests the question of "integration to what" and "who and what is urban" has become rather vague, compared to the previous approach. The dichotomous approach governing the earlier studies (see chapter 1) has been replaced by a view in which diversity in the migrant population and varied degrees of urbanity and rurality was adopted. In this view the migrants may have rural and urban characteristics at the same time or have a synthesis combining the features of the two. According to Ersoy (1985) how the rural migrants cope with and adapt to urban life is important and he takes integration in this sense. He doesn't accept the view that the cities have a homogeneous structure and the process of integration with this structure is a one-dimensional and one-way relationship. On the contrary, the process of integration doesn't reproduce

homogeneity but differences are reproduced. Different individuals may pursue different strategies to integrate and to cope with the urban life and all these strategies may be successful in the same way. So there is not a general urban culture, which is valid everywhere and in this sense, it is meaningless for the migrants to integrate to it. However, it is meaningful to take part in the services, organizations and institutions of the city. From this standpoint, Ersoy (1985) finds integration in this sense closer to the concept of “articulation” in which emphasis is given to the composition formed of mutual relationship rather than resemblance and similarization of parts.

Similarly, Arslanoğlu (1998) notes that a change in the definition of urbanization comes to the agenda. In this approach a pluralist culture accepting the coexistence of local groups in the cities is adopted. There is a pluralist culture in the city where different local groups coexist. The people who use the opportunities of the city rather than who integrate to the urban culture can be said to integrate to the urban life. So the mechanisms developed by the migrants emerging out of the social, economic and cultural relationships when they take part in the opportunity structure of the city, can reproduce the local identities and be instruments to get access to urban opportunities. (Arslanoğlu, 1998)

It is worth noting that the factors that affect the level of urban integration derived from the earlier studies. The length of stay in the city is an important factor for the migrants’ adaptation to urban life and participation of them to the formal and informal institutions of the city. In some studies, the determinatory role for urban integration is the position of the social class of the migrants and distribution of economic power. (Ersoy, 1985) For Şenyapılı (1981) to have a secure job and owning a house is more effective than the length of stay for urban integration. (Quoted by Ersoy, 1985). Other factors to determine the degree of urban integration are social status and education. People having a higher social status and higher level of education will more easily integrate to the city because these features facilitate coping with urban life.

## **2.4 A Brief History of Immigration of Ethnic Turks from Bulgaria**

The settlement of ethnic Turks in Bulgaria dates back to the 14th. century with the expansion of Ottoman Empire westward. In 1878, Bulgaria became an independent state and with 1877-1878 Russian war the migration wave started. Until that time nearly half of the population of Bulgaria was composed of Ethnic Turks. The percentage of ethnic Turkish population in Bulgaria was nearly 20% in 1887, 12% in the first quarter of 20th. century, 9,7 % in 1949, 9% in 1965 and 10,3% in 1989. (Kirişçi, 1996; Zhelyazkova, 1998) After the establishment of a communist regime in 1944, between 1945 and 1990 the emigration of Bulgarian Turks took place as a consequence of Bulgarian governmental policy towards the ethnic identity of Turks. As Kirişçi (1996) notes, the new regime aimed to change Bulgaria from a “traditional agrarian multi ethnic society to a modern, industrialized and ethnically homogeneous socialist country”. The existence of a large population of Turkish minority was a source of insecurity for Bulgarian authorities. Especially presence of Bulgaria and Turkey in opposing camps in the cold war period was an additional factor of insecurity. In this era, ethnic Turks in Bulgaria were subjected to assimilation policies of Bulgarian government. Ethnic Turks were tried to assimilate by banning Turkish in schools, closing mosques, forcing Turks to migrate in the country and changing their names with those of Slavic ones. Opposition of Turks against the assimilation efforts made Bulgarian authorities force the Turks to leave the country in order to maintain the balance between the Turkish and Bulgarian population. In accordance with this general aim, they implemented policies such as unification of the education system, restriction of religious practices and centralization of agricultural production. It is obvious that the Turkish community was mostly affected because the Turkish population was mainly composed of farmers and before this period; they were free in practicing their religion, language and traditions.

These developments led to the first mass exodus in 1950. Between January 1950 and November 1951 154.393 Bulgarian Turks were forced to migrate to Turkey. Since the migrants were generally farmers, they were settled on state land in western and central Anatolia and in Thrace region of Turkey. Between 1968 and 1978 with the

agreement of Bulgaria and Turkey on the reunion of separated families nearly 130 thousand people migrated to Turkey. (Zhelyazkova, 1998)

The second and the largest mass exodus came about in 1989. Prior to this mass migration, similar developments with the migration in 1950-1951 occurred. An intense assimilation campaign again, started in 1984 as banning the wearing of traditional Turkish dress, speaking Turkish in public places and a forced name changing campaign afterwards. (Kirişçi, 1996). These assimilation campaigns gave way to mass protest actions demanding the recovery of their names and other rights. At last, the solution found by the Bulgarian government was to open its borders with Turkey. Thus, between June and August 1989 311.862 people fled to the Turkish border which was the largest collective civilian migration following World War II. as estimated by the international humanitarian organizations.

Vasileva (1992) argues that the motives behind the mass migration in 1989 were not solely escaping from the violence or of religious, cultural and moral character. What attracted Bulgarian Turks to migrate a part from violation of basic rights was the higher standard of living in Turkey and the promise of a better life. According to Vasileva, it is this motive that differs the last migration wave from the previous ones although they both have similar political character. For some immigrants this economic reason is the determining factor to stay in Turkey although violation of their basic human rights in Bulgaria has come to an end.

In march 1990 after the fall of Zhivkov's regime, the former names of the Bulgarian Turks were restored and teaching in Turkish was made possible. After these developments many Turks decided to remain in Bulgaria and by May 1990, more than 130.000 ethnic Turks returned to Bulgaria. (Kirişçi, 1996). Dimitrova (1998), suggests that depending on unofficial records, from June 1989 till the beginning of 1997 400-450 thousand people settled in Turkey and this immigration today continues in the form of immigrant visas, tourism and illegal migration.

The social status of the immigrants shows that the largest group is workers with the percentage of 31,2 including technicians, master workmen and ordinary workers. Then comes the group of salaried Professional workers consisting teachers, physicians, qualified nursing and other medical stuff, etc. Obviously these two groups were the most advantageous ones getting a job in Turkey.

**Table 1:**The Social Statuses of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants Prior to Immigration

<b>Social Status</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Workers	67 313	31.7
Salaried/professional workers	22 518	10.6
Free professions	19 217	9.0
Pensioners	9 468	4.4
Females on Maternity leave	37 740	17.8
Students	51 431	24.2
Disabled	302	0.1
Other	4 699	2.2
Total	212 688	100

Source: KUBAN, Doğan. 1990, “Büyük Göç ve Anavatan (Nedenleri, Boyutları, Sonuçları)”, Ankara

The Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants chose to settle in regions where their relatives who had come mainly in 1950-1951 and 1968-1978 migration waves. As the table shows, the newcomers preferred to settle mostly in Marmara and Aegean Regions where previous immigrants lived.

**Table: 2** The Destination Places of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants in Turkey

Regions (Sea of Marmara and the Aegean)	1950-1951 Immigrants		1952-1988 Immigrants		Total Immigrants	
	Families	Persons	Families	Families	Persons	Families
Bursa	3 493	14 616	8 335	3 493	14 616	8 335
<b><i>Istanbul</i></b>	<b><i>3 831</i></b>	<b><i>11 644</i></b>	<b><i>9 881</i></b>	<b><i>3 831</i></b>	<b><i>11 644</i></b>	<b><i>9 881</i></b>
Izmir	2 123	10 141	2 751	2 123	10 141	2 751
Tekirdag	1 846	7 719	2 006	1 846	7 719	2 006
Eski sehir	1 600	7 009	1 912	1 600	7 009	1 912
Kirkalari	1 646	7 230	1 067	1 646	7 230	1 067
Manisa	1 885	7 961	603	1 885	7 961	603
Ankara	1 565	6 016	608	1 565	6 016	608
Kocaeli	727	3 478	967	727	3 478	967
Total	20 809	84 941	28 924	20 809	84 941	28 924

Source: KUBAN, Doğan. 1990, “Büyük Göç ve Anavatan (Nedenleri, Boyutları, Sonuçları)”, Ankara

In May 1990, after the big excursion, it was found out that of all 126.029 active persons only 67.292 had managed to begin work. (Dimitrova, 1998). As presented in the below table most of them became workers including agricultural and industrial workers with 30,6 and 26,6 percent respectively. The people found work in the service sector come next with the percentage of 14,2.

Table 3: Occupation of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants In Turkey

<b>Status</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Per cent</b>
Agricultural workers	20 762	30.6
Industrial workers	17 907	26.6
Office workers	824	1.2
Services	9 542	14.2
Pensioners	499	0.7
Technicians	4 970	7.4
Health care	1 239	1.8
Free professions	6 293	9.3
Teachers	3 722	5.5
Servants	1 494	2.2
Disabled	40	0.5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>67 292</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: KUBAN, Doğan. 1990, “Büyük Göç ve Anavatan (Nedenleri, Boyutları, Sonuçları)”, Ankara

While official statistics as presented in the table shows that nearly half of the active immigrants could find a job, the data obtained from the vilayet administration from the inquiry conducted in 1990 entitled “The Migration and the Motherland” indicates that nearly 100.000 people managed to begin work. This is an important data revealing the fact that more than one person in each family could find a job.

## **2.5 Social and Cultural Adaptation of Immigrants in Turkey**

The social and cultural adaptation of immigrants is determined by factors such as age, professional skills, education and cultural level and the help of relatives or friends who had immigrated to Turkey before. (Vasileva, 1992). Obviously it was easier to adapt to the new environment for those who have relatives or close friends in Turkey. It is also easier for those who have higher education and qualification to find jobs.

For a long period of time Bulgarian Turkish immigrants were seen as foreigners and called as “göçmen” or “muhacir” by the local population. (Andreas, 1989 qtd. in Vasileva, 1992). Some people interviewed for the study above, told that the local people and even the previous immigrants did not treat them as equals and said that they called them like infidels (gavurlar) and Bulgarian. So the local people including the other immigrants from Bulgaria did not readily accept the immigrants.

There was a growing interest in the labor force coming from Bulgaria in the local labor market. In their attempt to overcome the difficulties and the psychological stress caused by their refugee status, they were ready to work hard, extra-time and for a low payment. They did inferior jobs such as cleaners, lavatory washers, did all types of work in restaurants, hotels etc. On the other hand this facilitates their economic and social adaptation but on the other hand they were called as intruders for the local people for they thought the immigrants took their jobs. (Dimitrova; Zhelyazkova, 1998).

The immigrants brought with them a specific cultural and life-style pattern, which may facilitate and harden the adaptation of them. One of the difficulties between the immigrant community and the local people was about their attitude to religion. The refugees in Bulgaria suffered a lot because of the restriction of religious rights and protection of their traditional culture. So they expected to have comfort in their spiritual life. The main difference in their attitude to religion was that the immigrants adopted a more secular way of life although Islam had an important position in their lives in playing a key role for the ethnic and cultural survival of their community for example the immigrants do not find it necessary to interrupt their work or home pursuits for a five times pray a day while some people stop working to pray. While immigrants secular attitude especially regarding job makes them attractive and competitive for employers, this way of life makes the social adaptivity of them more difficult in their labor or neighborhood environment.

Another difference between the local and immigrant communities is the position of women in the society and attitude towards women. The immigrant women are

generally educated, have a profession, emancipated from the traditional rules and are adequate and equal family partners. However local women usually even if they are educated become housewives and thus become a passive member of the society. On the other hand the immigrant women tries to realize their personality and stands side by side with her husband in the struggle to overcome the difficulties they face. The women and also the children of the immigrant families do not hesitate to participate into the workforce. Due to this difference among women in different communities the female immigrants feel lonely and isolated because they could not find many women from the local people in the social life and similarly they cannot find friends among the local women. Female immigrants state that they could not find the open heartedness as they had in Bulgaria. So they maintain friendships with other Bulgarian Turkish immigrants or with other immigrant women from other Balkan countries. They don't want to be provocative and shock the local women, but they try to have compromise with others but this does not change the reality that they are dissatisfied and isolated.

Ethnic Turks prefer the marriage of their sons and daughters with those of other Bulgarian Turkish immigrants which is thought to be more successful, stable and free of conflicts. Concerning the interpersonal communication among children and teenagers, the immigrants' children are faced with conservatism of morals and isolation and segregation in relations based on sex differences. The local social rules that they have to learn seem to them old-fashioned, outmoded and irrational.

On the other hand, the refugees' relationships with their workmates was cold. First, the immigrants were seen as intruders because as mentioned above the local people think that they caused loosing of their jobs. Second, the immigrants worked hard and extra time and took their colleagues tasks. So the immigrants felt that they were more hardworking and found others lazy. Third there was the difference of then socialist Bulgaria's work principles and that of Turkey's with the iron discipline and very powerful status of the employers.

The above differences mentioned between the immigrant and the local communities inevitably gave way to a certain self-isolation of the immigrant community, which makes them feel lonely and emotionally deprived. The immigrants note that social life is not like it was in Bulgaria and thus find local people less communicative, less hospitable, colder and more cautious in their social relationships.

## **2.6 Migrant Adaptation In Turkish Case**

The studies carried on rural to urban migrants in Turkey show that they are not isolated and they continue their ties with their place of origin. Other studies also indicate that in order to survive in the city, they establish social networks. (Güneş-Ayata 1991) Social networks of migrants in squatter settlements are mainly based on kinship ties. Migrants also make use of their hemsehri ties in order to adapt to the city environment. Hemsehri are people who came from the same region, but who live outside their place of origin. (Güneş-Ayata 1991) Hemsehri has a place between relative and non-kin and it is like kinship an ascribed rather than achieved position.

When the migrants decide to migrate, they gather information either by going themselves or by their acquaintances about the place of arrival, what they will face in the city, how long will it take to get a job and how and where they will accommodate. Those migrants, who don't have the possibility to have information regarding these problems, learn urban life to some extent from the radio, TV etc. So migrants do not feel alienation or anomie in the city by the information they obtained prior their migration. (Şenyapılı, 1978)

After their decision to migrate they settle in neighborhoods where their relatives and hemsehri also live. As Ayata (1991) suggests, like the others researchers on the subject the squatter settlements are segregated by hemsehri groups since they are strange to the urban society. The rural migrants prefer to have relationships with the groups that are most similar to them who are mostly relatives. (Lloyd, 1979; qtd. in Ayata, 1991) Social networks including the relatives and hemsehri are important in

finding a house, getting a job and having social and material assistance.(Karpat, 1976; Şenyapılı, 1978; Ersoy, 1985; Ayata, 1991)

It is a common finding in studies of rural urban migration in Turkey that over time with the increase in the duration of residence, dependence on social networks decreases and migrants establish relationships with outsiders. With the increase in the duration of residence migrants begin to solve their problems by themselves rather than depending on social networks. On the other hand the characteristics of the problems faced, change and while the rate of problems in housing and employment falls, economic difficulties gain importance (Şenyapılı, 1978)

The relations of migrants with their villages display a similar pattern of change. In the initial phase of migration they visit their villages mostly because of the material needs but over time they go to their villages to see their relatives. Accordingly, the migrants visit their villages less frequently and stay there shorter.

A widely shared belief by the researchers about the migrants is that although the rate of usage of urban institutions and participation to the modern organizations increases it is not sufficient to maintain urban integration.

Although dependence of social networks decreases over time it does not seem that they will lose their importance. The communal life gives the migrants a sense of psychological security and belongingness and group identity. (Karpat, 1976) On the other hand, they define their identity by their community of origin. This identification helps the migrants to differentiate others and thus relate them with other groups, which in turn helps their integration. (Ayata, 1991)

Here a comparison of the findings from some studies carried out in Turkey regarding the operation of social networks on various matters will be made.

Karpat (1976), in his study of three Istanbul neighborhoods, found that migrating to Istanbul, building a house and finding a job revolved around kinship and hemsehri ties. After the migrants have arrived in Istanbul the traditional system of mutual help

and assistance maintained the newcomers with shelter and employment. Men managed to find jobs within a relatively short period of time after their arrival. He found that almost half of the male migrants found a job within 15 days. 40 percent of the men found the jobs through their own efforts. The extent of migrants' relations with city dwellers shows their intention to integrate and identify themselves with the city. Of the male respondents 58 percent indicated that they had relations with relatives and old village friends and 39 percent mentioned that they had relations with new city acquaintances. Women didn't choose to have relations with friends from the village because of personal rivalries and fear of gossip.

Karpat (1976) found that the migrants believed to survive through their own resources although not rejecting the importance of having relatives who were instrumental in helping their migration and settlement in the city. They relied on friends and relatives but still they didn't trust them which stems from the fact that they experienced individualization and competition in the city. He suggests that the trend of change among Turkish squatters is determined by economic factors and their underlying philosophy. Near half of the men and the unmarried was found to have established friendships with people in the city outside of their settlement. Besides 68 percent of the new friends were found on the worksite whereas 21 percent of them were new acquaintances on various occasions and only 11 percent of the new friends were from their native origin. These findings show that they developed rather extensive relations with city people.

Concerning the migrants' visit to the village and their attachment to it, it was found that their ties with the village continue. They visit their villages and receive visitors from the village. Their reasons to visit their village are to see their relatives, to maintain family traditions, to circumcise their children, to get married and to help their relatives with the fieldwork.

The findings suggest that concerning contact with the city they did not form a closed community. Another evidence supporting this view is that older squatters those who stayed longer in the city were less attached to their relatives and tried to have new

friends from the city dwellers. Accordingly the majority of the migrants desired closer relations with city people. Karpat (1976) argues, depending on the findings that, kinship relations played an important role in the initial phase of migration and settlement but “rational, interest-oriented relations with outsiders” came to be prevalent.

He concludes that the sense of community and solidarity has not disappeared but changed due to their interaction with urban life. Although the communal culture loses its intensity, it provides group solidarity, mutual assistance, protection, a sense of belongingness and a basis for common political and civic action to secure the settlements’ physical survival. The settlements are not fully integrated to the city but they are in a tendency to integrate to the city by adaptation of urban physical amenities and through social and cultural adaptation.

Şenyapılı, (1978) in her study by using relations between economic, social and physical spaces aimed at proposing a multisided and theoretical approach model to the problems of the marginal sector and the squatters which are the reflection of it in physical space. In this model, she tries to explain the dependent variables and social Networks in other spaces by independent variables identified in the economic space.

Şenyapılı, (1978) in her study of a squatter settlement in Istanbul Gültepe suggests that the migrants before deciding to migrate gather information about things such as what they will face, how much will it take to get employment and how and where they will accommodate in the city either by their acquaintances or through their own efforts by going to the city to gather information. Therefore they do not feel alone and alienated when they arrive to the city. The migrants make use of the social networks composed of their relatives and hemsehris in finding the job and the house and they benefit from material and social assistance provided by them. Relatives have an important place in the lives of the migrants. An overwhelming majority of the migrants have relatives in Istanbul and 33 percent of them stay in the same neighborhood with relatives in Gültepe. In time they establish relationships with the city dwellers in order to integrate to urban life. She found that most of the migrants had new acquaintances from their neighborhood and work place. Besides an

important portion of the migrants had familial relations with the new acquaintances. The migrants made 45% of the new acquaintances from the work place and 44% of them met with their best three friends in the workplace. So she argues that the new acquaintances made in the work place reflects to the physical space and the reverse is not through. This indicates that the relationships established are more based on economy than physical space. A comparison of the results she reached in finding the first and current jobs points to the evolution of relationships with kins, hemsehri and acquaintances in time. The ratio of those who found the first and current jobs by the help of relatives and acquaintances fell down indicating less reliance on them through time. The migrants increasingly solve the problems they face without the help of acquaintances by the information they obtained in the city.

As migrants' period of stay increases and as they integrate to the city, the importance of acquaintances decreases and they increasingly solve the problems themselves. The ratio of those who solve problems of housing and employment falls but the problem of economic difficulties gain importance. The majority of the migrants meet their monetary needs by way of their relatives and hemsehri.

In the study, it was found that although migrants have intensive ties with their village, the relationship type changed from economic to the reason of visiting the relatives in the village.

The squatters do not use much, the specific institutions of the city but they use organizations, which gives the image of their integration to the urban life and provides their participation to the consumer market.

Şenyapılı (1978) concludes that to evaluate the process of urbanization through an integrated approach, the process must be handled in an integrity of spaces. In such integrity of spaces, the relations in the economic space are determinatory and independent variables. Economic space also determines the relations in the social space. The migrants are segregated in the social space within an area determined by

the economic space. These sub-spaces in the social space can't transform into integration in the socio-spatial dimension.

Ersoy (1985), in his study, on the migrants who came from İskilip and settled in Ankara examined the level of integration of migrants to city life. A majority of the respondents in his study had contacts with a relative or a hemsehri prior their migration as set forth by other studies in Turkey. He notes, a majority of the migrants indicated that four of the most visited five families consist of relatives and hemsehri.

Concerning the frequency of visit to their place of origin 85% of the migrants visited their place of origin at least once a year and while the ratio of visits fall with the length of stay in the city it did not change much indicating the key role played by the social relationships in migrant's life. On the other hand Ersoy (1985), found that the majority of the migrants had visitors from the original residence once a year and it did not change over time with the duration of residence. Almost half of the migrants helped their relatives and hemsehri in the initial phase of migration and the tendency to help to the newcomers rise significantly by the increase in the length of stay. Furthermore, migrants asked for help of their relatives in case of a difficult situation. It was also found from the study that membership ratio to urban organizations and institutions rose with the increase in the duration of residence in the city.

In sum Ersoy (1985), argues that the new migrants developed strong, living and active social network which even though decreased through time, did not lose its importance.

According to an extended survey conducted in the squatter settlements in the selected regions of Turkey it was found that social networks did not lose its importance in time but continue to be important mechanism in supporting migrants similar to other studies carried out in Turkey. (Gökçe, 1993). After their arrival they stayed with their relatives for a while and they were given assistance in finding a place to live and getting a job. In finding and building the house more than half of the squatters did so

through their own efforts and resources. According to Gökçe (1993), what made the squatters use their own resources are the forceful conditions of the life and individualization because of that. Similar findings were found regarding the assistance in finding the employment the majority of the migrants found employment by themselves. The assistance of relatives comes next both in finding the house and employment.

Kinship ties were most intensely used in marriage. More than half of the migrants took assistance in their marriage. Migrants also utilized these ties to a large extent in borrowing and lending money. It was found that there were three basic ways to reproduce kinship relations, which are intermarriage among relatives, clustering of relatives in a residence and sustaining the frequent face-to-face relations with relatives. As to the intermarriage, a quarter of all the migrants married with his/her close or distant relatives whereas intermarriage rose for the migrants living in less developed regions of Turkey. In addition it was found in the survey that 68,3% of the migrants had relatives in their neighborhoods having frequent visiting among them.

Neighborhood ties came after the kinship ties for the migrants. It was suggested that the neighborhood despite its intensity is an area of assistance, which was spontaneous, short in time and traditional. The migrants saw the neighbors as close as their relatives.

Concerning the membership of migrants to modern organizations it was found to be so low compared to the strong ties of the social networks.

In sum, it was found in the study that the squatters can be regarded as urbanites and they have a strong desire to integrate to the urban life. On the other hand they form a sub culture and they have a specific class position concerning their rural origins, patterns of integration, clustering in the city and place of them in the labor market.

### **CHAPTER 3**

#### **FIELD STUDY**

In this chapter it is intended to examine the operation of social networks and the level of integration of Bulgarian Turkish immigrants who migrated in 1989 and after, living in Yenibosna Istanbul. For this purpose, firstly the problem, aim and methodology of the field study and then the findings of the questionnaires will be considered.

A few things have to be mentioned about Yenibosna and why Yenibosna was chosen as an area of field study. Yenibosna is found within the borders of Bahçelievler district of Istanbul. After Yenibosna was opened to industrialization with 1970's there was an enormous rise in population, which made it closer to the size of a medium scale province. Its population was 170 thousand according to 1990 population census. Settlement areas and worksites are very close to each other. The majority of the migrants chose to settle in Yenibosna since it is near to the worksites and accommodation. The inhabitants are mainly from low-income groups. There is a heterogeneous social structure consisting of migrants from the Thrace, Central and East Anatolia from Turkey as well as immigrants from Bulgaria and other Balkan countries. On the basis of the provinces the migrants are from Sivas, Malatya, Erzurum, Bayburt, Siirt, Nevşehir, Tokat, Kastamonu, Erzincan and Şanlıurfa. (Armağan, 2002)

What made me chose Yenibosna as an area of field study on urban integration of Bulgarian Turkish immigrants is that the heterogeneous social structure the settlement make it a more suitable place to analyze the integration process of the migrants by investigating the relationship patterns of them with other groups. Thus it would give a chance to see whether the immigrants live isolated or have relationship with other social groups.

### **3.1 The Problem and the Aim of the Field Study**

There is a vast body of literature examining the question of urban integration and the role of social networks of migrants in Turkey since 1950's. Several studies have been on squatter settlements examining migrant adjustment and integration and disintegration to urban life. However there are few studies concerning the adaptation and integration problem of ethnic Turkish immigrants settled in Turkey. Integration problems of immigrants must be handled in a different manner from Turkish migrants because they lived in a different social, cultural and political environment. Therefore differences between Bulgarian Turkish immigrants and Turkish migrants should be taken into consideration in investigating their adaptation and integration problems.

Thus, the problem of the field study is to analyze to what extent Bulgarian Turkish immigrants integrated to the new setting and to understand the nature and role of their social network in this integration process. The concern of the field study is to question the strength of their social network by analyzing its role in maintaining solidarity on various aspects of social life. The degree of access of immigrants to the opportunities of the city will be given special emphasis as urban integration is understood in this sense.

### **3.2 The Methodology of the Field Study**

The field study was carried out in Yenibosna, Istanbul in July and August 2004 where Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 settled. The respondents were chosen among the male members of the association called "Deliorman Bulgaristan Türkleri Kültür Derneği" with 140 persons who migrated in 1989 and after. Data collection was made by a questionnaire, which was designed on the basis of a literature review made on the subject. Before beginning the field study the association was visited several times in order to gather information about the immigration process, problems they face, their life style etc. Then the

questions were prepared by using the questionnaires used in related studies and by the information obtained from the immigrants.

At the beginning of the survey, the sample was selected by snowball method among the members of the association. Later, since it was aimed to compare the level of integration of two different age groups, a quota sampling was used to balance the samples' age group.

### **3.3 Findings**

The findings of the research are categorized under five general headings namely, sociodemographic characteristics of the immigrants, socio-economic status of immigrants, immigration process, operation of social networks of immigrants and organized and political behavior and access to urban services of the immigrants.

In this chapter after discussing the characteristics of the immigrants and their immigration process, it is aimed to analyze the immigrants at three levels. These three levels are economic (material), social and political integration of them to the urban life. These levels are discussed to understand the specificity of Bulgarian Turkish immigrants by comparing the findings of the immigrants and Turkish rural migrants on the subject. To analyze the tendency of integration of immigrants, the situation of two different age groups are considered.

#### **3.3.1 Socio-demographic Characteristics of the Immigrants**

In order to understand the sociodemographic composition of the respondents; age, birthplace, education, marital status and number of children are taken into consideration. These are important variables for the integration to the urban life.

### 3.3.1.1 Age

Among the sample taken from the association, it is found that 32,9% of them are between the ages 45-54, 24,3% of them are between the ages 35-44 and 23,6% of them is within the youngest age group of 25-34.

**Table 4:** Frequency Distribution of Present Age of Immigrants

Age	Frequency	Percent
25-34	33	23,6
35-44	34	24,3
45-54	46	32,9
55-64	20	14,3
65 +	7	5,0
Total	140	100,0

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

As to the age of immigrants at the date of immigration, we see that 45% of them are between the ages of 10-29 and 49,3% of them are between the ages of 30-49. From now on, the findings of the age groups of 10-29 and 30 and above will be compared under some titles so as to point out the difference among the two generations regarding the adaptation to the new environment and the utilization of social networks.

**Table 5:** Frequency Distribution of Age of Immigrants At the date of Immigration

<b>Age</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
10-19	34	24,3
20-29	29	20,7
30-39	49	35,0
40-49	20	14,3
50 +	8	5,7
Total	140	100,0

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

### 3.3.1.2 Birth Place

Deliorman, the region located in the north of Bulgaria taking its name from the dense forests found there, is composed of the provinces Razgrad, Shoumen and Targovishte. An overwhelming majority of the immigrants (92,1%) stated that they came from Shoumen. In Kuban’s study carried out in 1990 it was found that 9,66% of the overall immigrants came from Shoumen. (Dimitrova, 1998) These figures convincingly demonstrate that the people interviewed who came mostly from Shoumen clustered in one neighborhood. It was not asked in the questionnaire whether they came from the rural parts of Shoumen or not but we learned from the informal talks that a majority of them moved from the rural parts of Shoumen.

**Table 6:** Frequency Distribution of Birthplace of Immigrants

<b>Birth Place</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Shoumen	129	92,1
Other Provinces	11	7,9
Total	140	100,0

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

### **3.3.1.3 Education**

Educational status of the immigrants is an important variable to affect their urban integration level as discussed in Chapter 2.

As can be seen from the table below, the respondents have a high level of education compared to the average education level in Turkey. It was found in Gökçe's (1993) study that, of the male migrants interviewed, 12,4% of them were illiterate, almost half of them were primary school graduate and nearly 25% of them were secondary and high school graduates.

In our study, of a total of 140 respondents, only 2(1,4%) of them are illiterate which is much lower than Turkish people on average. Furthermore 48,6 % of them is found to be high school and 35,7% of them is found to be secondary school graduates. The high level of education can be explained by the fact that the state in Bulgaria was providing the social services to a great extent including education. Indeed education up to some level was made obligatory in Bulgaria.

**Table 7:** Frequency Distribution of the Relationship between Educational Situation and Age Groups of Immigrants at the date of Immigration

Educational Status	Age Groups at the Time of Immigration					Total
	10-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50 +	
Illiterate	0	0	2	0	0	2
	,0%	,0%	100,0%	,0%	,0%	100,0%
Literate	0	0	1	0	0	1
	,0%	,0%	100,0%	,0%	,0%	100,0%
Primary School Graduate	1	1	2	1	1	6
	16,7%	16,7%	33,3%	16,7%	16,7%	100,0%
Secondary School Graduate	11	8	14	10	7	50
	22,0%	16,0%	28,0%	20,0%	14,0%	100,0%
High School Graduate	19	19	24	6	0	68
	27,9%	27,9%	35,3%	8,8%	,0%	100,0%
University Graduate	3	1	6	3	0	13
	23,1%	7,7%	46,2%	23,1%	,0%	100,0%
Total	34	29	49	20	8	140
	24,3%	20,7%	35,0%	14,3%	5,7%	100,0%

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

**Table 8:** Frequency Distribution of Educational Status of Immigrants

Educational Status	Frequency	Valid Percent
Illiterate	2	1,4
Literate	1	,7
Primary School Graduate	6	4,3
Secondary School Graduate	50	35,7
High School Graduate	68	48,6
University Graduate	13	9,3
Total	140	100,0

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

We are faced with similar results when we look at the educational statuses of the respondents' spouses. Of a total of 123 valid answers 51,2 % of them are secondary school and 39% of them are high school graduates and only one among all is found to be illiterate. These results show a remarkable difference especially with those female migrants coming from the rural parts of Turkey. It was found in Gökçe's (2003) study that 19,7% of the women was illiterate, 46,3% of them was primary school graduates and nearly 20% of them were secondary and high school graduates. These figures point out to a large difference between Bulgarian Turkish immigrants and Turkish migrants in Turkey with respect to educational situation.

The high level of education of women finds its reflection in the high ratio of the working women.(58,3%). The missing data is because some respondents' being single and undetermined responses. On the contrary in a study conducted on the migrants from Malatya who settled in Ankara, only 20% of the migrants' spouses were working.(Tekşen,2003) According to Gökçe's (1993) study 14,2% of the women respondents were working. Therefore there is also a high difference regarding employment of Turkish migrants and Bulgarian Turkish immigrants.

**Table 9:** Frequency Distribution of Educational Status of Immigrants' Spouses

Educational Status	Frequency	Valid Percent
Illiterate	1	,8
Literate	6	4,9
Primary School Graduate	63	51,2
Secondary School Graduate	48	39,0
High School Graduate	5	4,1
University Graduate	123	100,0
Missing	17	
Total	140	

Source: Field Research, "Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul", 2004

**Table 10:** Frequency Distribution of Employment Status of Immigrants' Spouses

<b>Employed or Not</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Yes	67	58,3
No	48	41,7
Total	115	100,0
Missing	25	
	140	

Source: Field Research, "Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul", 2004

### 3.3.1.4 Marital Status

It is found that 82,9 % of the people interviewed is married and 13,6% of them is single. 12,8 % of the married respondents was married after the date of immigration to Turkey.

**Table 11:** Frequency Distribution of Marital Status of Immigrants

<b>Marital Status</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Married	116	82,9
Single	19	13,6
Widow or Divorced	5	3,6
Total	140	100,0

Source: Field Research, "Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul", 2004

A striking finding of the survey is that all of the persons whether they married before or after their arrival married with a Bulgarian Turkish immigrant. In contrast to this finding, like other scholars Karpas(1976) found in his study a definite trend towards marriages outside the group of immigrants. So it can be suggested that the immigrants interviewed are forming a closed community regarding their attitude to marriage. Moreover we learned through the survey that they never marry with their relatives. They even reacted to such a question and from then on, the question was changed and their attitude in marriage with

hemsehris was asked. On the contrary, there are many cases of in-marriage among relatives in the squatter settlements of Turkey. In Gökçe's (1993) research it was found that 25 % of the migrants were married with their relatives. The in-marriage rate was found even higher in the less developed regions of Turkey. These results point to an important difference in their attitude to marry with their relatives and with people outside their community among the Bulgarian Turkish immigrants and the migrants in Turkey.

### 3.3.1.5 Number of Children

The majority of the immigrants(62,2%) have two children and 21% of them have one child. So an overwhelming majority of the respondents have two children at most. Missing data is due again to respondents who are not married and a few undetermined answers.

**Table12:** Frequency Distribution of Number of Children

Number of children	Frequency	Valid Percent
1	25	21,0
2	74	62,2
3	13	10,9
4	6	5,0
8	1	,8
Total	119	100,0
Missing	21	

Source: Field Research, "Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul", 2004

Concerning the family type, it is found that most of the families (%77,1) were of nuclear type, which conforms to the general trend in urban areas. If we compare the ratio of family type and the number of children with Turkish migrants we are faced with similar findings.

**Table 13:** Frequency Distribution of Family Type

<b>Family Type</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Nuclear Family	108	77,1
Extended Family	27	19,3
Others	5	3,6
Total	140	100,0

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

On the other hand the immigrants who married after their arrival stated that they have either one child or two children which points to their integration efforts to urban life.

**Table 14:** Frequency Distribution of number of children of Immigrants who married in Turkey

<b>Number of Children</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
1	10	55,6
2	8	44,4
Total	18	100,0
Missing	3	

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

### **3.3.2 Socio-Economic Status of Immigrants**

Socio-economic status of immigrants is an important indicator of the migrants’ urban integration. In this part employment situation, occupational structure, income level, membership to the social security institutions, expectations of them from the future, as well as housing and ownership patterns will be examined.

### 3.3.2.1 Employment Situation

The employment situation of the respondents is composed of waged-salaried (67,6%), self employed (21,6%), retired (7,2%) and unemployed (3,6%). By looking at the low level of unemployment we can suggest that they could easily find a place for themselves in the labor market despite the difficulties they faced with, during and after the immigration process.

**Table 15:** Frequency Distribution of Employment Situation of Immigrants

<b>Employment Situation</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Waged-Salaried	94	67,6
Self employed	30	21,6
Unemployed	5	3,6
Retired	10	7,2
Total	139	100,0
Missing	1	

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

When we consider the employment situation by the income level on household base we see that almost half of the waged-salaried have an income level between 501-1000 millions and 18,7% of them have an income level between 1001-1500 millions. It is also found that a majority of the respondents families’(72,7%) earn between 500 to 1500 millions a month. The relatively high level of income of the immigrants’ family comes from the fact that although not asked to the respondents the number of individuals working in the family is high. The high ratio of employment among women and children supports this fact. The immigrants do not hesitate to work even in inferior jobs.

**Table 16:** Frequency Distribution of the Relationship between Employment Situation and Monthly Incomes of Immigrants

Employment Situation	Monthly Income of the Total Household						Total
	0-500	501-1000	1001-1500	1501-2000	2001+	Missing	
Waged-Salaried	1	46	26	15	4	2	94
	,7%	33,1%	18,7%	10,8%	2,9%	1,4%	67,6%
Self employed	2	8	12	5	1	2	30
	1,4%	5,8%	8,6%	3,6%	,7%	1,4%	21,6%
Unemployed	0	2	2	0	1	0	5
	,0%	1,4%	1,4%	,0%	,7%	,0%	3,6%
Retired	0	1	4	2	0	3	10
	,0%	,7%	2,9%	1,4%	,0%	2,2%	7,2%
Total	3	57	44	22	6	7	139
	2,2%	41,0%	31,7%	15,8%	4,3%	5,0%	100,0%

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

When the occupations of the sample population before and after immigration are compared we can argue that since they were forced to immigrate without a prior plan and preparation they have to work in relatively unskilled jobs. Before immigration 21,01% of them worked as drivers ,15,9 % of them worked as industrial workers and 12,31% of them worked as agricultural workers and 7,2 % of them worked in the state cooperative.

**Table 17:** Frequency Distribution of Occupation of Immigrants Prior to Immigration

<b>Previous Occupation</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Farmer	17	12,31
Worker In State Cooperative	10	7,2
Tradesman	3	2,17
Worker	22	15,9
Public Servant	1	0,72
Student	29	21,01
Self Employed	7	5,07
Sportsman	1	0,72
Driver	29	21,01
Administrator	2	1,45
Agricultural Technician	2	1,45
Unemployed	1	0,72
Not Working	29	21,01
Total	138	100
Missing	2	

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

At the time of the survey a large percentage of them(44,3%) indicated their occupation as worker. The ratio of those who stated their occupation as driver is close to the ratio before immigration. The rise in the percentage of the occupation of worker including industrial or office workers might be associated with the fact that those working in agriculture, state cooperative and those who were students at the time of movement probably started to work as industrial or office workers in Istanbul. So it can be argued that the people working in agriculture and in state cooperatives experienced a structural change with respect to their occupational status.

**Table 18:** Frequency Distribution of Current Occupation of Immigrants

<b>Current Occupation</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Tradesman	16	11,42
Retired	9	6,43
Worker	62	44,3
Unemployed	6	4,28
Public Servant	4	2,86
Student	1	0,71
Self Employed	5	3,57
Driver	37	26,42
Total	140	100

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

### **3.3.2.2 Membership to Social Security Institutions**

Of the sample population 67,6 % of them indicated that they have social security from S.S.K, which is in line with the ratio of workers. What attracts attention here is the percentage of those without social security(22,1%), which is much more than the ratio of unemployed. This finding reveals the fact that some immigrants accepted to work without the provision of social security in the face of bad economic conditions.

In sum, the findings about the socioeconomic status of immigrants indicate that they are in a tendency to integrate to the city economically. The low rate of unemployment, relatively high level of income and the high ratio of women participation into the workforce are indicators for such an effort. In this way, as Göschel(2001) suggests, the economic level of urban integration is maintained to some extent. Their relatively high level of income makes possible their usage of urban services and thus facilitates their integration as Şenyapılı (1978), suggests.

**Table 19:** Frequency Distribution of Social Security Institution of Immigrants

<b>Social Security Institution</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Retirement Fund	4	3,1
SSK	89	67,9
Bağ-kur	9	6,9
None	29	22,1
Total	131	100,0
Missing(Not Working)	9	

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

### **3.3.2.3 Expectations of Immigrants from the Future**

The change in the economic condition of the immigrants before immigration up to now is an important factor in their adaptation and integration process. The survey findings show that most of the immigrants(82,1%) see their present economic situation better than it was in Bulgaria; whereas only a small minority (2,1%) stated that their economic situation is worse than in the past. On the other hand, some 15,7% of them does not see a change in their economic situations. These findings show that the immigrants in question adapted well to the new environment in economic sense. The successful economic adaptation of people who came forcefully before 15 years at most can be evaluated as an important development.

**Table 20:** Frequency Distribution the Change in the Economic Situation of Immigrants Compared to the Past

<b>Change In the Economic Situation of Immigrants</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Better	115	82,1
Worse	3	2,1
No change	22	15,7
Total	140	100,0

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

**Table 21:** Frequency Distribution of the Immigrants Thought in their Future Economic Situation

<b>Immigrants’ Thoughts about Change of their Economic Situation in the Future</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Better	81	57,9
Won’t change	7	5,0
No idea	52	37,1
Missing	140	100,0

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

We can’t mention that they are much optimistic about their economic future compared to the economic development compared to the past. This time 57,9 % of them believes that their economic position will be better whereas 37,1% of them have no idea of it. The high level of unemployment and uncertainty of Turkish economy gave way to such answers.

### 3.3.2.4 Housing and Ownership Patterns

Concerning the house ownership pattern, majority of the respondents(80%) own a house , 12,9% of them are tenants and 7,25% of them do not pay any rent because they stay with their fathers or sons.

**Table 22:** Frequency Distribution of House Ownership Patterns of Immigrants

<b>House Ownership Pattern</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
House owner	112	80,0
Tenant	18	12,9
Relative's Ownership	1	,7
Others	9	6,4
Total	140	100,0

Source: Field Research, "Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul", 2004

The below table displays that with the increasing income level, percentage of those who own a house rises while the percentage of tenants falls. This points to the strong relationship between the ownership patterns and household's monthly income.

It can be suggested that the ratio of houseownership is relatively high compared to their period of stay in Istanbul. The house ownership ratios found in studies carried out in Turkey by Karpat (1976), Şenyapılı (1978) and Gökçe (1993) are 49%, 84% and 62,6% respectively. The high ratio of house ownership among Bulgarian Turkish immigrants may be explained as follows. The population movement inside the country was limited by the socialist regime of Bulgaria. They could not move wherever they wanted, so they developed a strong attachment to their area of settlement . According to them their land is where their home is found. So they gave the first priority to own a house. On the other hand attaching too much importance to own a house made them cut their

expenses for education, social needs etc. This gave way to a delay of their integration to urban life.

**Table 23:** Frequency Distribution of the Relationship between House Ownership Patterns and Monthly Incomes of Immigrants

House Ownership Pattern	Monthly Income of the Household						Total
	0-500	501-1000	1001-1500	1501-2000	2001+	Missing	
House owner	3	44	37	19	5	4	112
	100,0%	77,2%	84,1%	86,4%	83,3%	50,0%	80,0%
Tenant	0	11	3	2	1	1	18
	,0%	19,3%	6,8%	9,1%	16,7%	12,5%	12,9%
Relative's Ownership	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	,0%	,0%	2,3%	,0%	,0%	,0%	,7%
Others	0	2	3	1	0	3	9
	,0%	3,5%	6,8%	4,5%	,0%	37,5%	6,4%
Total	3	57	44	22	6	8	140
	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%

Source: Field Research, "Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul", 2004

**Table 24:** Frequency Distribution of the Relationship between House Ownership Patterns and Age Groups of Immigrants at the date of Immigration

House Ownership Pattern	Age Groups at the Time of Immigration					Total
	10-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50 +	
House owner	22	24	46	17	3	112
	19,6%	21,4%	41,1%	15,2%	2,7%	100,0%
Tenant	11	4	3	0	0	18
	61,1%	22,2%	16,7%	,0%	,0%	100,0%
Relative's Ownership	0	0	0	0	1	1
	,0%	,0%	,0%	,0%	100,0%	100,0%
Others	1	1	0	3	4	9
	11,1%	11,1%	,0%	33,3%	44,4%	100,0%
Total	34	29	49	20	8	140
	24,3%	20,7%	35,0%	14,3%	5,7%	100,0%

Source: Field Research, "Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul", 2004

When the ownership patterns and the time of immigration is considered we see that among the homeowners, 41% of them belongs to the I. group but in contrast among the tenants only 16,7% of them belongs to the II. group. Thus, it can be argued that as expected there are more tenants and less homeowners among the younger immigrants than the older ones at the date of immigration. Furthermore almost all of the immigrants stated that they live in apartment houses indicating the settlement type of the neighborhood in which they live. No one in our sample lives in squatter settlements.

**Table 25:** Frequency Distribution of House Type of Immigrants

House Type	Frequency	Valid Percent
Apartment House	139	99,3
Detached	1	,7
Total	140	100,0

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

### **3.3.3 Immigration Process and Material and Moral Ties of Immigrants to Bulgaria**

#### **3.3.3.1 Immigration Process**

In the sample population the majority of them (77,1%) came to Turkey in 1989, 12,9% came in 1992 and the remaining came in different years from the years 1989 till 1996 in smaller numbers.

**Table 26:** Frequency Distribution of the Year of Immigration

Year of Immigration	Frequency	Valid Percent
1989	108	77,1
1990	4	2,9
1991	5	3,6
1992	18	12,9
1993	2	1,4
1994	1	,7
1995	1	,7
1996	1	,7
Total	140	100,0

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

If we analyze the reasons of settling in Istanbul we see that a great majority of them(91,4%) chose to live in Istanbul in order to be closer to their relatives and

hemsehris. This result is supported by the fact that 92,9% of the immigrants did not settle in other provinces of Turkey before coming to Istanbul.

**Table 27:** Frequency Distribution of Reasons of Settlement in Istanbul

<b>Reason</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Presence of Relatives	128	91,4
Employment, Education, Health and Social Opportunities	12	8,6
Total	140	100,0

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

To the question of “whom you immigrate to Turkey with” more than half of the respondents stated they came with their wives and children, 31,4% of them stated that they came with their parents and his brothers and sisters and 12,1% claimed they came on their own. On the other hand, nearly half of the immigrants’ families’ were the first to come to Istanbul among their close relatives whereas 10,8 % of them indicated that their grandfathers were the first residents in their families. This finding supports the immigrants’ reason of settling in Istanbul because of their relatives’ previous immigration.

**Table 28:** Frequency Distribution of first Person/s to come to Istanbul

<b>First Comers</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Grandfather	6	4,3
Father	30	21,6
Me	28	20,1
They as a family	66	47,5
Others	9	6,5
Total	139	100,0
Missing	1	

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

### 3.3.3.2 Spatial Concentration of Immigrants

All of the interviewed people said that they live in Yenibosna. Concerning the districts, an overwhelming majority of the immigrants(92,1%) live in Çobançeşme where the association is also located, and 7,15% of them live in Fevzi Çakmak district. It can be derived from this finding that these people are clustered in one neighborhood where previous immigrants settled, in order to facilitate their utilization of social networks.

**Table 29:** Frequency Distribution of Districts Immigrants Reside

District	Frequency	Valid Percent
Çobançeşme	129	92,1
Fevzi Çakmak	10	7,1
Zafer	1	,7
Total	140	100,0

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna İstanbul”, 2004

### 3.3.3.3 Problems Faced After Immigration and In the City

The comparison of the problems that the migrants encountered in the initial period of their immigration and the problems that they face now are important regarding their level of adaptation and integration to urban life in Turkey. We can understand from the expressions of the interviewed immigrants quoted by Dimitrova(1998) that the local people were surprised , saw the immigrants inferior , did not accept them as equals and sometimes called them “gavur” and “Bulgarian”. As Vasileva(1998) notes that in spite of the official demonstration of goodwill and friendliness, the immigrants were regarded as foreigners and the local people called them “muhacir” and “göçmen”. Moreover there were linguistical and cultural problems among immigrants and the local people.

We can see similar results in our study. The respondents experienced problems such as exclusion because of being seen as foreigners (47,9%), housing (20%)

,economic problems ( 14,3%), cultural adaptation problem (10,7%) and 7,1% of them claimed that they faced no problems.

**Table 30:** Frequency Distribution of Problems Faced just After their Arrival

<b>Problems Faced Just After Immigrants Arrival</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Accommodation	28	20,0
Economic	20	14,3
Exclusion	67	47,9
Cultural Adaptation	15	10,7
None	10	7,1
Total	140	100,0

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

When we examine the problems that the immigrants live today we see that the problems shifted from cultural basis to economic problems. Today they do not have a feeling of exclusion or lack of cultural adaptation with the local people. Moreover %30 of them did not report any problem. Regarding the changes in the type of problems through time, we can mention that the problem of adaptation decreased in time but economic problems became prominent as for the local population.

**Table 31:** Frequency Distribution of Current Problems of Immigrants

<b>Current Problems of Immigrants</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Economic Problems	73	52,14
Cultural Adaptation	4	2,86
None	42	30,0
Others	21	15,0
Total	140	100,0

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

#### **3.3.3.4 Relations of Immigrants with Bulgaria and Relatives in Bulgaria**

The immigrants' relations with Bulgaria including their ties with their relatives and friends in Bulgaria and physical, economic, cultural as well as psychological connection and attachment to Bulgaria as a country play an important role in their adjustment to life in Turkey. Therefore some questions were contained in the questionnaire to measure the strength of their ties to Bulgaria. Almost all of the respondents do not want to return to Bulgaria. This shows that Bulgaria is no more an alternative place to live for the immigrants.

The immigrants do not want to return although Bulgaria will become a full member of EU in 2007. The immigrants who came to Turkey in 1989 will take advantage of this opportunity since they were given the right of citizenship of Bulgaria after the fall of Jivkov's government.

Here, some information will be given regarding the immigrants' legal status in Turkey. As mentioned above, all of them who came to Turkey in 1989 have both Bulgarian and Turkish citizenship. Turkish Republic did not give the right of citizenship automatically to those immigrants who came after 1989. To get the citizenship right they had to carry the citizenship conditions which is applied to all foreigners to be Turkish citizen. So Turkey put visa requirement to Bulgarian citizens who intended to come to Turkey. In the year 2001, Turkey abolished the application of visa to Bulgarian citizens and gave them three month long residence permit to find a solution or at least facilitate their situation. The immigrants in this position have to leave and re-enter to Turkey in order to extend their residence permit. 17000 of all the Bulgarian Turkish immigrants residing in Turkey have this problem and it could not be solved yet.

In our sample 128 of a total of 140 respondents (91,4%) have Turkish citizenship. The ones who are not Turkish citizen (8,6%) legally can't vote as will be touched upon in the later sections.

**Table 32:** Frequency Distribution of Whether Immigrants Want to Return Bulgaria

<b>Intention to Return</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Yes	2	1,4
No	138	98,6
Total	140	100,0

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

As to, why they don't want to return, a majority of them (77%) claimed that they are used to living in Turkey pointing out to their economic and social adaptation and some (22,3%) stated that Turkey is their motherland indicating they do not feel like foreigners compared to their situation in the initial period of immigration. Furthermore almost none of the respondents apart from one of them point pressure against Bulgarian Turks in Bulgaria as a reason of not returning.

Their strong attachment to the land where their home is found as set forth above may be an additional factor of their not intending to return to Bulgaria.

**Table 33:** Frequency Distribution of Reasons of not Returning to Bulgaria

<b>Reasons not to Return</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Still There is Repression In Bulgaria	1	0,7
We are accustomed to Turkey	107	77,0
Turkey is Our Motherland	31	22,3
Total	139	
Missing	1	

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

Even though they do not want to return to Bulgaria in order to live there, they maintain their relations with Bulgaria. They go there to see their relatives and friends(60,71%), for holiday and recreation(22,14%), for business(8,57%) and for extending the residence permit as mentioned above.

**Table 34:** Frequency Distribution of Reasons of Going to Bulgaria

<b>Reasons of Going to Bulgaria</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Visiting Relatives and Acquaintances	85	60,71
Holiday and Recreation	31	22,14
Business	12	8,57
To extend the residence permit	12	8,57
Other	22	15,71
Total	140	100,0

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

For the Turkish case as pointed out in Chapter 2 in the initial years of migration the migrants visited their villages for the purpose of material needs but over time they go to their villages to see their relatives and have recreation less frequently and for shorter periods of time.

As Zhelyazkova (1998) suggests that the immigrants have a continuing desire to keep in touch with Bulgaria in whatever way possible. The immigrants have an emotional affiliation and strong attachment to their home country where they were born and raised. For Zhelyazkova (1998) the immigrants do not hate the Bulgarian people and do not blame them for the repression against them prior to their immigration but on the contrary they show sympathy for the Bulgarian people because of the difficulties they faced in the period of transition of Bulgaria to market economy.

Considering the frequency of travel to Bulgaria we see that near half of the respondents go there once a year, 17,9% of them go there once a month and 17,1% of them stated that they never go to Bulgaria.

When we compare their visiting the original residence with those of Turkish migrants we see that although the immigrants have relatives in Bulgaria they could not go there as frequently as Turkish migrants go their villages due to distance and difficulties arising from visa requirements etc. Since some of them (8,6%) do not have Turkish citizenship.

**Table 35:** Frequency Distribution of Frequency of Going to Bulgaria

<b>Frequency of Going to Bulgaria</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Very Frequent	1	0,7
Once a Week	6	4,3
Once a Month	25	17,9
Once a Year	66	47,1
Seldom	6	4,3
Never	24	17,1
In Cases When Necessary	12	8,6
Total	140	100,0

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

### **3.3.3.5 Immigrants Perception of Life In Bulgaria and in Turkey**

The things that immigrants feel absent in their lives in Turkey compared to their lives in Bulgaria tell us a lot about the issues that slow down their adaptation and integration to the new social environment. It is found that they feel the absence of things such as cleaning, lack of green areas, which are the basic problems of Istanbul. Educational opportunities, health services and social rights are the other features they look for. They feel the level of social relationships

insufficient because they mainly come from the rural parts of Bulgaria where there were warm and intimate relationships. On the other hand, the largest group of respondents (31,4%) stated that they feel nothing absent from their lives in Bulgaria. We can suggest that the reason for giving such an answer is to point out to the importance of staying in the motherland where they are free from the pressure and violence they suffered in Bulgaria.

**Table 36:** Frequency Distribution of Absence of Things From the Life In Bulgaria

<b>Things that are Missed in Bulgaria</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Education	14	10,0
Economic Situation	7	5,0
Social Opportunities	16	11,4
Social Relationships	26	18,6
Cleanliness and Fresh Air	25	17,9
Others	8	5,7
None	44	44,0
Total	140	100,0

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

Likewise the subjects that the immigrants are pleased at most in Turkey supports the answers of the above question. An overwhelming majority (87,9%) of the respondents stated that they feel mostly happy because they live in their motherland. This finding is in line with the main reason of escaping from the pressure and violence in Bulgaria. In the second place they indicate the superiority of job opportunities. Education in Turkish and living in an Islamic country are also indicated as sources of happiness to live in Turkey.

**Table 37:** Frequency Distribution of Things that Make Immigrants most Pleased with to Stay in Turkey

<b>Reasons of Pleasure to Stay in Turkey</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Turkeys' being their Motherland	123	87,9
Chances of Children Having Education in Turkish	1	,7
Economic Opportunities	12	8,6
Turkeys' being an Islamic Country	2	1,4
Total	138	100,0
Missing	2	

Source: Field Research, "Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul", 2004

### **3.3.4 Operation of Social Networks**

As discussed in Chapter 2 social networks are important mechanisms to cope with the difficulties of urban life. They can be instruments to integrate to the urban life in the sense that they provide points of access to the opportunities of the city . In this part the role of social networks in finding accommodation, employment, monetarial necessity and in social relationship and solidarity will be examined.

### 3.3.4.1 Social Networks in Finding Accommodation

In our research we asked the immigrants how they found their first houses. Of a total of 139 respondents 48,2% of them found their first house by the help of their relatives and 19,4% of them found it by their hemsehris and 20,1% of them did so through their friends. On the other hand 7,9% of the immigrants found their houses from the real estate. The category of friends is not much a distinguishing one in the sense that the immigrants mainly establish friendships with their hemsehris.

**Table 38:** Frequency Distribution of the Way of Finding the First House of Immigrants

<b>Way of Finding the First House</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
By the Help of Friends	28	20,1
By the Help of Relatives	67	48,2
By the Help of Hemsehris	27	19,4
From the Real Estate	11	7,9
Me	6	4,3
Total	139	100,0
Missing	1	

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

When we examine the table displaying the way of finding their first house with respect to the age groups at the time of immigration we see that in the I group 53,8 % of them found their first houses through their relatives and 33,3% of them found it through their hemsehris. The younger immigrants who are expected to use more formal channels utilized the networks more than II. Group. The proportion of the usage of real estate among younger immigrants(36,3%) supports these results

**Table 39:** Frequency Distribution of the Relationship between the way of finding the First House and Age Groups of Immigrants at the date of Immigration

Way of Finding the First House	Age Groups at the Time of Immigration					Total
	10-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50 +	
By the Help of Friends	7	5	11	5	0	28
	25,0%	17,9%	39,3%	17,9%	,0%	100,0%
By the Help of Relatives	18	18	19	6	6	67
	26,9%	26,9%	28,4%	9,0%	9,0%	100,0%
By the Help of Hemsehris	5	4	10	6	2	27
	18,5%	14,8%	37,0%	22,2%	7,4%	100,0%
From the Real Estate	2	2	6	1	0	11
	18,2%	18,2%	54,5%	9,1%	,0%	100,0%
Me	2	0	3	1	0	6
	33,3%	,0%	50,0%	16,7%	,0%	100,0%
Total	34	29	49	19	8	139
	24,5%	20,9%	35,3%	13,7%	5,8%	100,0%

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

To examine the effect of duration of residence on the ways to find the houses, the question of how they found their present houses is asked. With the increase on the duration of residence it is expected that the role of more official ways such as newspaper and real estate would be higher. Indeed, of all the respondents, the ratio of finding the current house by way of real estate rose from 7,9% for the first house to 42,1%. Moreover finding the house by the help of relatives fell from 48,2% for the first house to 26,4%. As displayed in the below table, there is not a considerable difference in the younger and older immigrants at the date of immigration in finding the current house.

**Table 40:** Frequency Distribution of the Way of Finding the Current House of Immigrants

<b>Way of Finding the Current House</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
From the Paper	11	7,9
By the Help of Friends	13	9,3
By the Help of Relatives	37	26,4
By the Help of Hemsehris	3	2,1
From the Real Estate	59	42,1
Me	17	12,1
Total	140	100,0

Source: Field Research, "Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul", 2004

**Table 41:** Frequency Distribution of the Relationship between the way of finding the Current House and Age Groups of Immigrants at the date of Immigration

Way of Finding the Current House	Age Groups at the Time of Immigration					Total
	10-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50 +	
From the Paper	0	1	7	2	1	11
	,0%	9,1%	63,6%	18,2%	9,1%	100,0%
By the Help of Friends	5	3	3	2	0	13
	38,5%	23,1%	23,1%	15,4%	,0%	100,0%
By the Help of Relatives	8	7	11	8	3	37
	21,6%	18,9%	29,7%	21,6%	8,1%	100,0%
By the Help of Hemsehris	1	1	1	0	0	3
	33,3%	33,3%	33,3%	,0%	,0%	100,0%
From the Real Estate	17	12	21	6	3	59
	28,8%	20,3%	35,6%	10,2%	5,1%	100,0%
Me	3	5	6	2	1	17
	17,6%	29,4%	35,3%	11,8%	5,9%	100,0%
Total	34	29	49	20	8	140
	24,3%	20,7%	35,0%	14,3%	5,7%	100,0%

Source: Field Research, "Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul", 2004

In finding the first house it was found in Gökçe's (1993) study that more than half of the migrants found it through their own efforts and 34,1% of them got the help of relatives. In Erder's (1995) study dependence on relatives and hemsehris is nearly equal to dependence on more formal channels in finding the first house. In Tekşen's(2003) study 53,75 % of the migrants from Malatya who settled in Ankara found the first house by their relatives and hemsehris. In Turkish case as Tekşen's (2003) research indicates, dependence on relatives and hemsehris fell down to 45% with the increase in duration of residence. Şenyapılı (1978), found in her study that half of the migrants found their houses by way of acquaintances (relatives and hemsehris) and 42% of them found it through their own efforts. So it can be argued that dependence on social networks in finding the first house

among immigrants is more than Turkish migrants in general. However in our study usage of relatives and hemsehris as channels in finding house fell down to a considerable extent compared to Turkish case. This finding points out to faster integration of immigrants in finding the current house compared to Turkish case.

### 3.3.4.2 Social Networks in Finding Employment

As to how the immigrants found their first jobs we see again a predominance of the usage of hemsehris and relatives as channels. In finding the first job 35,7 % of the respondents found it by their hemsehris, 22,9% of them found the first job by their relatives and 22,1% of them took the assistance of their friends. Therefore a relatively high portion of the immigrants(58,6%) relied on their hemsehris and relatives in finding their first jobs. On the other hand, 17,1 % of them found the job through their own efforts.

**Table 42:** Frequency Distribution of the Way of Finding the First Employment of Immigrants

Way of Finding the First Employment	Frequency	Valid Percent
By the Help of Hemsehris	50	35,7
By the Help of Friends	31	22,1
By the Help of Relatives	32	22,9
By the Help of Neighbors	3	2,1
Me	24	17,1
Total	140	100,0

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

When we evaluate the difference in two generations regarding job finding, again we do not see any differentiation among them.

**Table 43:** Frequency Distribution of the Relationship between the way of finding the first employment and Age Groups of Immigrants at the date of Immigration

Way of Finding the First Employment	Age Groups at the Time of Immigration					Total
	10-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50 +	
By the Help of Hemsehris	10	10	19	9	2	50
	20,0%	20,0%	38,0%	18,0%	4,0%	100,0%
By the Help of Friends	7	8	12	2	2	31
	22,6%	25,8%	38,7%	6,5%	6,5%	100,0%
By the Help of Relatives	9	6	8	6	3	32
	28,1%	18,8%	25,0%	18,8%	9,4%	100,0%
By the Help of Neighbors	1	1	1	0	0	3
	33,3%	33,3%	33,3%	,0%	,0%	100,0%
Me	7	4	9	3	1	24
	29,2%	16,7%	37,5%	12,5%	4,2%	100,0%
Total	34	29	49	20	8	140
	24,3%	20,7%	35,0%	14,3%	5,7%	100,0%

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

As mentioned above, it is expected that the ratio of the usage of urban institutions would rise with the increase of length of stay. In our research as expected, the percentage of those who claimed that they found their present jobs through their own efforts rose to 52,4% from 17,1% for the first house. The second frequently used way of finding the job is by the help of friends(29%).Friendship becomes a more distinguishing category as immigrants adapt to the new environment in time. So in this sense, the ratio of the help of friends in finding the job pointing to the extension of the networks is more meaningful now.

**Table 44:** Frequency Distribution of the Way of Finding Current Employment of Immigrants

<b>Way of Finding the Current Employment</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
By the Help of Hemsehris	5	4,0
By the Help of Friends	36	29,0
By the Help of Relatives	17	13,7
By the Help of Neighbors	1	,8
Me	65	52,4
Total	124	100,0
Missing	16	

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

When the age at the time of arrival is considered we see that 66,7% of those in the I. Age group found their current jobs by their friends but only 33,3% of those in the II. age group found it by the help of friends. Thus it might be argued that duration of living makes a greater impact on the people who were younger when they came to Turkey regarding the adaptation to the new environment.

**Table 45:** Frequency Distribution of the Relationship between the way of finding the Current employment and Age Groups of Immigrants at the date of Immigration

Way of Finding the Current Employment	Age Groups at the Time of Immigration					Total
	10-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50 +	
By the Help of Hemsehris	0	1	4	0	0	5
	,0%	20,0%	80,0%	,0%	,0%	100,0%
By the Help of Friends	10	14	8	4	0	36
	27,8%	38,9%	22,2%	11,1%	,0%	100,0%
By the Help of Relatives	3	2	7	5	0	17
	17,6%	11,8%	41,2%	29,4%	,0%	100,0%
By the Help of Neighbors	0	0	1	0	0	1
	,0%	,0%	100,0%	,0%	,0%	100,0%
Me	20	12	24	7	2	65
	30,8%	18,5%	36,9%	10,8%	3,1%	100,0%
Total	33	29	44	16	2	124
	26,6%	23,4%	35,5%	12,9%	1,6%	100,0%

Source: Field Research, "Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul", 2004

When we examine the Turkish case in finding the first and current employment we see that reliance on hemsehris and relatives decreased through time (Şenyapılı,1978) According to Erder (1995), more than half of the immigrants made use of channels depending on the origin,21,7% of them used formal channels and another 27% of them found their current jobs by themselves. According to Tekşen (2003), the migrants who got the help of relatives and hemsehris in finding the first and present jobs were 40% and 39% and those who found the jobs by themselves were 25,7% and 30,9% respectively.

So it can be suggested that Bulgarian Turkish immigrants used the social network more than Turkish migrants in finding the first job but reliance on the social network in finding the current job decreased to a considerable extent when compared to Turkish rural migrants. Therefore it can be suggested that Bulgarian

Turkish immigrants adapted the new setting faster than Turkish migrants in finding the job through time.

The way of obtaining the house and employment may be evaluated under material or systemic level of urban integration as set forth by Göschel(2001). It can be said that the immigrants are in a great effort to integrate to the urban life regarding their material needs. They also make use of social networks for this purpose. So they want to benefit from the opportunities of urban life in their material needs both by using more formal ways and social networks. In this sense they can be said to integrate to urban life regarding their material needs.(Arslanoğlu,1998;Ersoy,1985)

### 3.3.4.3 Social Networks in Monetarial Necessity

From whom the immigrants borrow money in case of need also gives an idea about the strength of the social networks. The respondents borrow money from their relatives (50%), workmates (15%) and hemsehris (6,4%).On the other hand, more than a quarter of them withdraw credit from the bank. The relatively high ratio of borrowing money from the workmates and withdrawal of credit from the bank points out to a tendency of relying more on secondary relations and usage of formal institutions in case of monetarial need.

**Table 46:** Frequency Distribution of People Immigrants Borrow Money from

<b>People Most Visited</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Workmates	21	15,0
Neighbors	1	,7
Hemsehris	9	6,4
Relatives	70	50,0
From the Bank	39	27,9
Total	140	100,0

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

In accordance with the expectations the immigrants in the I. age group rely more on their workmates and use the bank as a channel more frequently whereas those in the II. group rely more on relatives and hemsehris when they need money. The lowest level of solidarity with the neighbors in borrowing money as in the cases of assistance in finding house and employment indicates that the level of solidarity with other social groups is weak.

We see a similar attitude between Turkish migrants and Bulgarian Turkish immigrants in borrowing money. Şenyapılı(1978) found that 62% of the respondents in her study borrowed money from relatives and hemsehris. In Gökçe's (1993) study 42,6% of them meet their monetarial needs from relatives and hemsehris and 23,3% of them borrow money from their workmates. On the other hand in Tekşen's (2003) study 54,2% of the migrants get money from relatives and hemsehris and 26% of them get it from the bank. So a high ratio of Bulgarian Turkish immigrants usage of bank in monetarial necessity when compared to Turkish rural migrants indicates that on average, they use more formal channels in case of borrowing money. This finding supports their attempt to maintain material/systemic integration to urban life.

**Table 47:** Frequency Distribution of the Relationship between from Whom Money is Borrowed and Age Groups of Immigrants at the date of Immigration

Way of Meeting Money Need	Age Groups at the Time of Immigration					Total
	10-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50 +	
Workmates	7	6	5	3	0	21
	33,3%	28,6%	23,8%	14,3%	,0%	100,0%
Neighbors	0	0	1	0	0	1
	,0%	,0%	100,0%	,0%	,0%	100,0%
Hemsehris	2	3	3	1	0	9
	22,2%	33,3%	33,3%	11,1%	,0%	100,0%
Relatives	12	11	27	12	8	70
	17,1%	15,7%	38,6%	17,1%	11,4%	100,0%
From the Bank	13	9	13	4	0	39
	33,3%	23,1%	33,3%	10,3%	,0%	100,0%
Total	34	29	49	20	8	140
	24,3%	20,7%	35,0%	14,3%	5,7%	100,0%

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

#### 3.3.4.4 Social Networks in Social Relationships and Solidarity

Concentration of the migrants from the same origin in one neighborhood is the general trend, which is found by a number of studies conducted in squatter settlements. (Karpat 1976, Şenyapılı 1978, Gökçe 1993). In our study, we see a similar trend among Bulgarian Turkish immigrants in Yenibosna. It is found that 63,6% of them has relatives and 35% of them have hemsehris in their neighborhood. Pointing the existence of relatives and hemsehris as the reason of choosing Istanbul explains the clustering of immigrants spatially.

**Table 48:** Frequency Distribution of Close People Immigrants Stay with in the Same Neighborhood

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Relatives	89	63,6
Hemsehris	49	35,0
Workmates	1	,7
None	1	,7
Total	140	100,0

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

The respondents who see the immigrants from Balkans their hemsehris think that they share a common fate with them and those who regards all Turkish people hemsehri is because their satisfaction of presence in their motherland Turkey. According to Erder,(1995) the identity of hemsehri is a matter of perception. In her study, she asked the respondents the number of hemsehris they had and found that they gave very different numbers according to their perception. She suggests that the perception of the number of hemsehris, which is linked to the identity of hemsehri, is determined by the original place, quantity and quality of migration and the meaning of hemsehri relations for the respondents. For Bulgarian Turkish immigrants’ different reasons other than Turkish rural migrants determine their perception of hemsehri due to above reasons. Those who see all Bulgarian Turkish immigrants their hemsehris comes from the fact that common problems forced them to leave Bulgaria. Accordingly, the rate of regarding only the people coming from the same region as hemsehri is well below the migrants in Turkey due to above reasons.

**Table 49:** Frequency Distribution of People Regarded as Hemsehri for the Immigrants

<b>Who is Hemsehri</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
People Coming from the Same Province	16	11,5
All Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants	58	41,7
All Immigrants from Balkans	48	34,5
All Turkish People	17	12,2
Total	139	100,0
Missing	1	

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

When the perception of immigrants who were at different age groups at the time of immigration are considered, we can see from the table that those in the I. age group see people coming from the same province (62,6%) and all Turkish people (58,8%) as their hemsehri. Whereas the immigrants in the II. Age group continues their attachment to other Bulgarian Turkish immigrants (58,6%) and other immigrants from Balkans (50%) more than the younger immigrants. These findings point to an increasing tendency of the immigrants to see other people who are from the larger social circles more close to them as they extend their understanding of hemsehri outwards. So considering these data younger immigrants can be said to be more inclined to integrate to the urban life socially, compared to the older immigrants.

**Table 50:** Frequency Distribution of the Relationship between People Regarded as Hemsehri and Age Groups of Immigrants at the date of Immigration

Who is Hemsehri	Age Groups at the Time of Immigration					Total
	10-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50 +	
People Coming from the Same Province	5	5	4	1	1	16
	31,3%	31,3%	25,0%	6,3%	6,3%	100,0%
All Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants	9	11	25	9	4	58
	15,5%	19,0%	43,1%	15,5%	6,9%	100,0%
All Immigrants from Balkans	12	10	16	8	2	48
	25,0%	20,8%	33,3%	16,7%	4,2%	100,0%
All Turkish People	7	3	4	2	1	17
	41,2%	17,6%	23,5%	11,8%	5,9%	100,0%
Total	33	29	49	20	8	139
	23,7%	20,9%	35,3%	14,4%	5,8%	100,0%

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

**Table 51:** Frequency Distribution of the Immigrants’ Type of Relationship with other Social Groups

Type of Relationship	Frequency	Valid Percent
No Problem Among Them	70	50,0
Neither Good nor Bad	57	40,7
No visit when Unnecessary	13	9,3
Total	140	100,0

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

As to the type of relationship of the immigrants with other social groups, half of them stated that they do not have any problem among them, 40,7% of them are more distant by saying their relationships are neither good nor bad and 9,3% of the respondents see others when it is necessary. When we consider the

generational difference in establishing relationships with others as presented in the below table we can say that there is not an important difference among them. When these findings are considered together with the answers given to the question of “who is regarded as hemsehri” according to the different age groups, it can be stated that although they have a tendency to see others closer to them, they are not yet in a position to establish warmer relationships with other groups. In the case of Turkish rural migrants, they are more ready to have relations with others as pointed in chapter 2.

Therefore we can say that immigrants formed a closer community compared to the migrants in Turkey in their relationships with others.

**Table 52:** Frequency Distribution of the Relationship between Type of Relationship with other Social Groups and Age Groups of Immigrants at the date of Immigration

Type of Relationship	Age Groups at the Time of Immigration					Total
	10-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50 +	
No Problem	14	16	28	11	1	70
Among Them	20,0%	22,9%	40,0%	15,7%	1,4%	100,0%
Neither Good nor	16	9	18	7	7	57
Bad	28,1%	15,8%	31,6%	12,3%	12,3%	100,0%
No visit when	4	4	3	2	0	13
Unnecessary	30,8%	30,8%	23,1%	15,4%	,0%	100,0%
Total	34	29	49	20	8	140
	24,3%	20,7%	35,0%	14,3%	5,7%	100,0%

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna İstanbul”, 2004

In our sample population, 76,4% of them claimed that they most frequently visit their relatives and hemsehri and 18,6% of them stated that they most frequently visit their workmates as a family. The frequency of visiting workmates might be misleading since a majority of the respondents claimed having hemsehri in the workplace, thus having relationship with the workmates does not point to an effort in developing relations on a secondary type outside their social network.

**Table 53:** Frequency Distribution of People Immigrants Visit Most As a Family

<b>People Most Visited</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Workmates	26	18,6
Relatives	101	72,1
Hemsehris	6	4,3
Neighbors	7	5,0
Total	140	100,0

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

According to the age groups at the time of arrival we see that 40,6% of those in the I. group and 51,4% of those in the II. group sees mostly their relatives. Additionally, 57,7% of the immigrants in the I. group and 42,3% of the immigrants in the II. group visits mostly their workmates. In spite of the fact that visiting mostly workmates is not a clear indicator of an effort in having relationship with people a part from their community of origin it may be suggested that there is a tendency towards such relations. So it can be derived from these findings that the younger people at the time of arrival visits their relatives less and visits their workmates more than those who were older at the time of arrival.

When we compare these findings with Turkish case we see that Turkish migrants were more open in establishing relations with city people. As mentioned in the 2. chapter Karpat (1976) suggested that although kinship relations played an important role in the initial phase of migration, relations outside their community became prevalent through time. It was found in his study that the migrants have more relations with new friends (39%) than relatives (32%) and old village friends (26%). Şenyapılı (1978) found that the place of meeting with the best three friends were worksite (44%), neighborhood (17%) and the place of origin(13%). So she suggests in her study that relationships established are more based on economic than physical space for the migrants.

**Table 54:** Frequency Distribution of the Relationship between People They Visit Most As a Family and Age Groups of Immigrants at the date of Immigration

People Most Visited	Age Groups at the Time of Immigration					Total
	10-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50 +	
Workmates	10	5	9	2	0	26
	38,5%	19,2%	34,6%	7,7%	,0%	100,0%
Relatives	21	20	36	16	8	101
	20,8%	19,8%	35,6%	15,8%	7,9%	100,0%
Hemsehris	2	0	3	1	0	6
	33,3%	,0%	50,0%	16,7%	,0%	100,0%
Neighbors	1	4	1	1	0	7
	14,3%	57,1%	14,3%	14,3%	,0%	100,0%
Total	34	29	49	20	8	140
	24,3%	20,7%	35,0%	14,3%	5,7%	100,0%

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

The reasons of spatial concentration of the respondents is further supported by the answers as to the benefits of living together as displayed in the table 55 Those who mentioned the protection of their culture (60,7%) as the most important benefit of living together probably did so because they perceived it as the main element in keeping them together rather than the material needs

**Table 55:** Frequency Distribution of Benefits of Living with Hemsehris within the Same Neighborhood

<b>Benefits of Living with Hemsehris within the Same Neighborhood</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Protection of Culture	85	60,7
Being Not Alone	12	8,6
Material and Moral Assistance	41	29,3
Useless	2	1,4
Total	140	100,0

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

As a level of urban integration social integration is an important factor for the immigrants. So they create their own communities with their own ways of life and values in order to have a psychological security and belongingness and group identity .(Karpal, 1976; Erman, 1998) So communal solidarity has an important and necessary role for their integration to the urban life. As Ayata, (1991) suggests, by these social ties they define their identity and differentiate themselves from the others. On the other hand, to make contact and to develop ties with other city residents provide an exposure to different ways of thought, manners and speech, which have profound educational impact on the migrants.(Karpal, 1976). Additionally success in the city is dependent on effective social network, which must include strangers to reach other social, economic and cultural resources in the city. So it can be argued that limiting the contact with people in the community means missing to utilize the opportunities of the city, which in turn means a failure in urban integration. In light of these arguments, for the immigrants’ case it can be said that although there is an increase of readiness to establish relationships with others in the younger generation still they do not prefer to have relationship with other city residents other than economic reasons when it is not necessary. So they can’t be said to integrate to the urban life socially.

### **3.3.5 Organized and Political Behavior of Immigrants and Access to Urban Services of Immigrants**

As Göschel (2001) pointed out, there is a level of urban integration, which is called political integration as touched upon in chapter 2. According to Karpat (1976) politics plays a role of intensifying communication and social mobilization and facilitating the migrant's participation in city affairs and thus speeding up their integration into an urban environment. In this section organized and political behavior of immigrants will be investigated and we will try to find out where Bulgarian Turkish immigrants stands considering political integration to urban life.

As set forth in the 1.chapter by examining the main theoretical considerations of modernization perspective, with the weakening of community ties the individuals will seek to be involved in voluntarily formed institutions. By taking part in such voluntary associations they will have a feeling of self-belongingness and protect their individuality. These groupings also prevent the formation of a total control over the individual. In our survey conducted among the members of an association an overwhelming majority of the members of a total of 140 persons indicated that they pass their free times whereas only 4,3% of them stated to be active members. If we add those who said they are only members we see that 90% of them are passive members.

**Table 56:** Frequency Distribution of Characteristic of Membership to the Association of Immigrants

<b>Characteristic of Membership</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Passing Free Time	107	76,4
Participating Its Activities	8	5,7
Only Member	19	13,6
Active Member	5	3,6
Have Duty in Administration	1	,7
Total	140	100,0

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

When the age groups at the time of immigration are considered as can be seen from the table there is not a noteworthy difference among them regarding the characteristic of membership to the association.

**Table 57:** Frequency Distribution of the Relationship between Characteristic of Membership to the Association and Age Groups of Immigrants at the date of Immigration

Characteristic of Membership	Age Groups at the Time of Immigration					Total
	10-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50 +	
Passing Free Time	28	23	33	16	7	107
	26,2%	21,5%	30,8%	15,0%	6,5%	100,0%
Participating Its Activities	3	1	3	0	1	8
	37,5%	12,5%	37,5%	,0%	12,5%	100,0%
Only Member	3	4	10	2	0	19
	15,8%	21,1%	52,6%	10,5%	,0%	100,0%
Active Member	0	0	3	2	0	5
	,0%	,0%	60,0%	40,0%	,0%	100,0%
Have Duty in Administration	0	1	0	0	0	1
	,0%	100,0%	,0%	,0%	,0%	100,0%
Total	34	29	49	20	8	140
	24,3%	20,7%	35,0%	14,3%	5,7%	100,0%

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

As to the reasons of their membership 120 persons(85,7%) of a total of 140 indicated that the association gives the opportunity to get together with their hemsehris. This finding is in line with the characteristic of their membership. Only 12,1% of them stated that it is helpful to solve their problems and another 2,1% of them finds it helpful in finding employment.

If we examine the reasons of membership, of different age groups at the time of immigration we can see that although those in the I. Age group stated reasons that are more instrumental as solving the problems and finding an employment, these are far from representing the sample population since they are small in numbers . So it can be said that though there is a difference for the younger immigrants the general picture shows that they use the association as a place to come and see their hemsehris and enjoy their time.

Hence we can suggest by looking at the samples' approach that the membership to the association cannot be evaluated as a well indication of political integration. This finding is also in consistency with that of Ersoy's (1985) study suggesting that the membership to modern organizations did not go beyond a passive membership among migrants who came from İskilip and settled in Ankara.

**Table 58:** Frequency Distribution of Reason of Membership to the Association of Immigrants

<b>Reasons of Membership</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Giving Opportunity to Get Together With Hemsehris	120	85,7
Helpful to Solve the Problems	17	12,1
Helpful in Finding an Employment	3	2,1
Total	140	100,0

Source: Field Research, "Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul", 2004

**Table 59:** Frequency Distribution of the Relationship between the Reason of Membership to the Association and Age Groups of Immigrants at the date of Immigration

Reasons of Membership	Age Groups at the Time of Immigration					Total
	10-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50 +	
Giving Opportunity to Get Together With Hemsehris	29	23	41	20	7	120
	24,2%	19,2%	34,2%	16,7%	5,8%	100,0%
Helpful to Solve the Problems	3	6	7	0	1	17
	17,6%	35,3%	41,2%	,0%	5,9%	100,0%
Helpful in Finding an Employment	2	0	1	0	0	3
	66,7%	,0%	33,3%	,0%	,0%	100,0%
Total	34	29	49	20	8	140
	24,3%	20,7%	35,0%	14,3%	5,7%	100,0%

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

When we consider the political and voting behavior of the respondents it can be suggested that they do not have a tendency to participate in political process. It is found that 87,8% of the respondents voted in the last local election. The relative low level of voting is due to accidental and external factors. Some could not vote because they don't have a Turkish citizenship.

**Table 60:** Frequency Distribution of whether the Immigrants voted or not in the last local election

<b>Voted or not</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Yes	122	87,8
No	17	12,2
Total	139	100,0
Missing	1	

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

A majority of them (83,6%) did not want to mention their political party choices. They hesitated to indicate their political preferences due to an inherent fear of losing their acquisitions because they suffered a lot from the problems they lived in Bulgaria and at last they gave an order to their lives. So they feel indebted to Turkey and they don't want to be a source of problem by apparently indicating their political preferences. If we look at the preferences of those who indicated their choice we see that they voted mostly for the nationalist and rightist parties. They lived under pressure for a long time in Bulgaria which pushed them to a more nationalist and conservative stand and political orientation.

**Table 61:** Frequency Distribution of to whom the Immigrants Voted for in the last Local Election

<b>Voted or not</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
ANAP	2	1,4
DSP	1	,7
MHP	8	5,7
AKP	7	5,0
GP	5	3,6
Not Mentioned	117	83,6
Total	140	100,0

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

It was also found from survey data that almost all of the respondents do not have a membership to a political party. The ratio of political party membership among Turkish rural migrants is higher than Bulgarian Turkish immigrants. The ratios of membership to political parties in Karpat’s (1976) and Gökçe’s(1993) studies are 14% and 21,9% respectively. The low level of interest in organized behavior and political participation of immigrants comes from the fact that they lived under the socialist regime in Bulgaria and they don’t have a democracy and organization culture in the form of capitalist system. They were outside the political sphere and remained passive citizens in Bulgaria. It seems that they are still away from organized behavior and political participation.

**Table 62:** Frequency Distribution of If Immigrants Have Relationships with Political Parties

<b>Related or not</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Yes	2	1,4
No	135	97,1
Not Mentioned	2	1,4
Total	140	100,0

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

Another question asked to the respondents in order to measure their sensitivity about the physical environment in which they live was their satisfaction level with the urban infrastructure and the quality of urban services provided by the municipality. It was found that an overwhelming majority(78,8%) of the Bulgarian Turkish immigrants are satisfied with the quality of urban services. This finding that the urban services is adequate is doubtful in the sense that those respondents who are not satisfied with urban services(21,2%) pointed out the inadequacy of the services in a reactionary manner.

**Table 63:** Frequency Distribution of If Municipal Services is Sufficient

<b>Sufficient or not</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Yes	108	78,8
No	29	21,2
Total	137	100,0
Missing	3	

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

The points that they find unsatisfactory are inadequate infrastructure, lack of investment to their district, cleaning services, provision of water and deficiency of green areas as presented in the table 64. Therefore it can be argued that the respondents do not tend to actively participate in the solution of the problems by collective action in their neighborhood.

**Table 64:** Frequency Distribution of the Reason of Insufficiency of Municipal Services

<b>Reason of Insufficiency of Municipal Services</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Infrastructure	11	42,3
Water Provision	1	3,8
Cleaning Services	8	30,8
Inadequate Investment	5	19,2
Green Areas	1	3,8
Total	26	100,0
Missing	114	

Source: Field Research, “Social Networks and Urban Integration of Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 and after: The Case of Yenibosna Istanbul”, 2004

Therefore it can be argued considering the low rate of membership both to the association as a semi-formal organization and to political parties as formal organizations and their apathy regarding the provision of urban services points to their failure in political integration to urban life in Turkey.

### **3.4 Evaluation of the Field Study**

In the field study, the level of economic(material/systemic), social and political integration of the Bulgarian Turkish immigrants to the urban life was investigated in comparison with the experience of Turkish rural migrants. The role of the factors determining the level of integration is examined under five headings. In this analysis the affect of generational difference in integration is also evaluated.

In this part, the findings of the field study reached will be summarized by giving reference to the theoretical part as well. In the socioeconomic characteristics of the immigrants, their age, birthplace, education, marital status and number of children and family type are examined.

It was found from the survey data that the overwhelming majority of the respondents migrated from Shoumen, which is a province in the Deliorman region of Bulgaria. The immigrants and their spouses have a high level of education since they were brought up in a socialist country where basic social services including education were provided by the state. Accordingly, both men and women have a superior education level compared to Turkish immigrants coming from the rural parts of Turkey. It is noteworthy that the education level of younger immigrants fell in Turkey compared to those having been educated in Bulgaria. Immigrant women participate to the work force much more than female migrants in Turkey. It is expected that with the high level of education and working outside the house of women, would increase socio-cultural contacts and number of acquaintances. On the contrary in general, it was found that immigrants mostly have relations with their relatives as a family.

The majority of the immigrants' families were of nuclear type and the number of children is low. Immigrants had more extended families in Bulgaria but they adapted to urban life by having nuclear families as well as having less children in Istanbul. The rate of extended families of migrants was higher in their village compared to the rate of extended families of immigrants in Bulgaria.

All of the respondents' spouses are also Bulgarian Turkish immigrants. The immigrants never marry with their relatives. This is an important factor strengthening the social networks of immigrants. In the case of Turkey the ratio of marriage with hemşehris is high but lower than the ratio of immigrants. On the other hand, even though decreasing, in-marriage is still present among migrants in Turkey.

The unemployment rate among immigrants is low indicating their rapid integration in to the labor market. They work in jobs, which need less skill compared to their occupations in Bulgaria. Nevertheless their income level is relatively high. The level of income of the immigrants is relatively high compared to Turkish rural migrants because the number of individuals working in the family is more as the ratio of working women of immigrants' shows. They do whatever jobs they find which find

its reflection in the low level of unemployment. In Turkish case, there is a structural change with respect to their occupation from agriculture to informal jobs in cities. In general migrants' income level is higher compared to their income level in the village because this was the main reason that pushed them to cities whereas for the immigrants the main reason was political rather than economic.

The immigrants live in apartment houses and the majority of them are house owners. This finding is amazing in the sense that within a relatively short period of time they managed to buy a house. So it can be suggested that they also integrated rapidly to the housing market as well as the labor market. But on the other hand, as they gave the first priority to own a house, they cut their expenses in education, health and other social needs which in turn hardened their integration to the other levels of urban integration other than economic integration. The immigrants consider their economic situation better than the past but they are not such optimistic about their economic situation in the future.

The respondents migrate to Istanbul from the years between 1989 to 1996, but majority of them came in 1989. The main reason to settle in Istanbul was found to be the presence of their relatives.

It was found that there is a high level of concentration of immigrants in one district, Çobançeşme. Therefore of an overwhelming majority of the respondents coming from Shoumen clustered in Çobançeşme district. So with respect to spatial concentration the respondents form a closed community.

Although they faced problems such as exclusion, cultural adaptation and accommodation and economic problems in their initial years of immigration they see just the economic difficulties as the main problem now.

Almost all of them do not want to return to Bulgaria but they frequently visit their relatives living in Bulgaria. Since they mostly come from the rural parts of Bulgaria, they miss the clean air, green areas and warm relationships as well as educational

health and social service opportunities. These subjects slow down and harden the adaptation of immigrants. On the other hand they are happy to be found in Turkey since Turkey is their motherland and they live in an Islamic country.

Hemsehris and relatives play important roles in the initial years of immigration in finding the first house and job. We see a similar trend of high ratio of dependence on hemsehris and relatives among Turkish migrants. However there is a remarkable fall of rate of ratio of dependence on hemsehri and kinship ties for immigrants in finding the current house and job. Turkish migrants utilize the kinship and hemsehri ties less through time in finding the current house and job but decrease in dependence of them is not that much as the immigrants. When we consider the generational difference in finding house and employment, there is not a differentiation in finding the first and current house and the first job but younger immigrants at the date of immigration relied less compared to older ones in finding the current job.

In case of material need, immigrants use channels such as the bank and assistance of workmates, which points to a tendency of relying more on secondary relations. Younger immigrants also relied more on workmates and formal channels as the bank compared to older immigrants. Their attitude in borrowing money is similar to Turkish migrants.

An overwhelming majority of immigrants have relatives and hemmers in their neighborhood, which is consistent with the high level of spatial concentration. They mostly have relations with the community of origin. Younger immigrants establish relations with workmates and neighbor's more than older immigrants do. Therefore younger immigrants were found to be more open to contact with people outside their community.

Regarding their relationships with people outside their community, they don't want to make contact with them unless it is necessary for the immigrants.

In their relation to more formal institutions it was found that they have a passive membership to the association. They see the association as a place to pass their free times and get together with other immigrants. They don't participate to the political process apart from voting. They don't want to explain their political preferences. Those who indicated their preferences voted for more nationalist and rightist political parties. They find the urban services inadequate but do not mention it.

As Göschel (2001) suggested the first level of urban integration is material or systemic integration. This can also be called economic integration. When the findings are evaluated regarding the material integration we come up with the following results. The factors that affect the level of economic integration are the low rate of unemployment, relatively high level of income and the ratio of women participation of immigrants into the work force. Immigrant's thoughts about their economic situation, which is better than the past is an indicator of their tendency to economic integration. The findings show that they could find a place in the labor market. The high ratio of house ownership is another factor that facilitates economic integration. Concerning the operation of social networks in finding accommodation, employment and in monetarial necessity it can be suggested that more formal channels are used through time indicating their increasing efforts to integrate economically to the urban life. In general it can be said that Bulgarian Turkish immigrants are more inclined for economic integration compared to Turkish rural migrant and younger immigrants use more formal channels supporting their general tendency to integrate to the urban life economically.

The second level of urban integration is social integration to the urban life. The strength of social networks and the extent of relationships with the other city residents determine the level of social integration. If the immigrants live as a closed community and the relationships with others is limited they can be suggested to be unsuccessful in social integration since they miss the opportunity to benefit from the social relationships of the city.

The immigrants came from the province, Shoumen and they clustered in the neighborhood Çobançeşme. They came here for their relatives were also living here.

As a result, they live with their relatives and hemsehris in the same neighborhood. They mainly see Bulgarian Turkish immigrants and all immigrants from Balkans as their hemsehris. The immigrants state no problems with people from other groups but they don't prefer to have relationship unless necessary. The younger immigrants are more open to establish relationships with other groups but ratios are still lower than Turkish rural migrants. So it can be suggested that the Bulgarian Turkish immigrants live as a rather closed community and they can't be said to integrate to the city socially.

The political integration is the third level for urban integration. Their membership to the association has a passive character. They mainly use the association for getting together with the other immigrants. The rate of membership to the political parties is low. They voted generally for more liberal and nationalist parties in the last election. Similarly they do not intend to participate for the solution of urban services. The younger immigrants are more active but it is not sufficient to integrate politically to the urban life. On the other hand Turkish rural migrants are better integrated to the city politically, compared to the immigrants.

## CONCLUSION

The question of urban integration and the role of social networks in this process have been among the most studied subjects in the urban studies literature. Similarly in Turkey, with the mass migration in 1950's the issue of urban integration began to be discussed. When the rural migrants clustered around the cities in the same neighborhoods, it was seen as a question of time for these "urban villagers" to assimilate into the urban society by learning the urban culture. However, a part from assimilating into the urban society they created their own communities with their own ways of life. Then it was understood that the city is the place of pluralist culture and different localities were formed in the city. Those who make use of the opportunities of the city in one or another way would be accepted to integrate to the city. A part from Turkish rural migrants, there are also ethnic Turkish Immigrants mostly from Balkan countries. The Bulgarian Turkish immigrants constitute the largest group of immigrants living in Turkey. The mass immigration of Bulgarian Turkish immigrants in 1989, which is the largest collective civilian action, deserves a closer attention. Their integration problem to the urban life has to be dealt with in a different approach from that of Turkish rural migrants since "urbanization can assume different meanings and forms depending on the prevailing historical, economic and cultural factors" (Hauser; Schnore; 1965). Thus, the main question of this study is "to what extent Bulgarian Turkish immigrants integrated to the urban life and what is the role of their social network in this process".

To examine this question, in the first chapter, the theoretical framework of the urbanization, criticisms and the concept of community are drawn. The classical theory of urbanization is the basis of the view that urban integration is realized through assimilation into the urban culture. According to this view the development from rural to urban society is unilinear, inevitable and irreversible. The views of Tönnies, Durkheim, Simmel, and Wirth are discussed as classical urban sociologists. Then criticisms raised against rural-urban dichotomy approach. According to the theorists against rural-urban dichotomy, "urban villages" are formed in the city having folkways of life in the city. It is argued that the ideal-type constructs are not

applicable to the third world cities. An understanding of the condition of underdevelopment is necessary in the analysis of the underdeveloped world cities'. At the end of the first chapter, the findings of the two popular community studies carried out by Abu Lughod and Lewis are analyzed.

In the second chapter, migration and migrant/immigrant networks are examined. Since the Bulgarian Turkish immigration is a type of forced migration, it is discussed in the beginning of the chapter. Next, immigrant social networks are analyzed. In the following section, the question of urban integration with the related concepts to it is explained. After clarification of urban integration with definition of other related concepts, the levels of urban integration which are material/systemic, political and social integration are discussed. Then a brief history of immigration of Bulgarian Turks and the social and cultural adaptation of the immigrants are considered. In the last part of the second chapter urban integration of Turkish migrants are reviewed to make a comparison with Bulgarian Turkish immigrants.

In the third chapter, the findings of the field study are analyzed in line with the previous chapters. The findings of the field study are discussed under the headings namely socio-demographic characteristics, socio-economic status of immigrants, immigration process and material and moral ties of immigrants to Bulgaria, operation of social networks in finding accommodation and employment as well as material necessity and social relationship and solidarity and organized and political behavior of the immigrants are analyzed. It was found in the survey that the immigrants are integrated economically to some extent but their levels of social and political integration to the urban life are low compared to Turkish rural migrants. So they do not sufficiently benefit from the opportunities of the city.

In sum, the problems of the immigrants are twofold. On the one hand, they brought up in a socialist country, on the other hand they came to a country, which is different in social, cultural and economic aspects. So, the political as well as social, cultural and economic environment differs a lot between Bulgaria and Turkey. These variations between the two countries undoubtedly make the urbanization and urban

integration patterns of Turkish rural migrants and Bulgarian Turkish immigrants entirely different. Therefore a fully understanding of the nature of the social networks and the specific problems of the immigrant is necessary for a policy to be implemented aiming at full integration of Bulgarian Turkish immigrants. The assumption that they would integrate easily did not hold true.

Before making proposals that would facilitate their integration, it is necessary to determine their problems. They still have problems to adapt to the rules and principles of capitalism. Capitalism inevitably creates differences among people because of the harsh competition inherent in its nature. People, in the final analysis focus at realizing their interests, thus they are forced to be more individualistic, isolated and selfish. In the economic sphere, the employees have a powerful position. The immigrants have to obey the rules and be ready to work extra hours in the workplace. So they miss the social conditions, order and security in socialist Bulgaria. The education level dropped in the younger immigrants since the state in Turkey does not regulate the social life as in the socialist Bulgaria. They overcome the problem of isolation and individualization by creating strong ties of community. The communal culture as Karpat(1976) suggests, provides a common ground for achieving internal group solidarity, mutual assistance, protection and a sense of belongingness. On the other hand strong community ties of the immigrants hardens their social integration in preventing them to establish relationships with other city dwellers.

They don't have a tradition of organization and democratic culture. They had a limited area of movement in the political sphere in Bulgaria. So they could not develop a culture of democratic organization and political participation. These factors harden their political integration to the urban life.

Local governments have important roles for the solution of the above problems and thus provision of the immigrants' integration to the urban life. As Castells(1997) argues local governments should maintain services having collective consumption characteristics such as subway, roads and cultural activities. As Gökçe (1993)

proposes, the local governments should form community centers, cultural centers and solidarity and consultation centers. These types of institutions and facilities could facilitate coming together of immigrants with other groups and thus provide their getting closer to each other.

The local governments could organize free time activities for different age groups. These can be sports and recreational facilities for the younger immigrants. For the women and older immigrants collective spaces in which activities satisfying their specific areas of interest could be created.

As membership to modern organizations and political parties is low, the immigrants are not integrated politically to the urban life. The development of rules of organized behavior is essential for this aim. The immigrants who are even members to the association display a passive membership. The activities of associations and NGO's established for the immigrants' collective interests should be supported financially. The immigrants should be encouraged to participate in these activities. Common grounds have to be formed to encourage the relationships of the Immigrant Associations and the other NGO'S. Associations are important mechanisms where the habit of development of usage of modern institutions, democratic values and culture.

As Gökçe (1993) suggests the neighborhood is an important setting for getting together of different groups in the framework of collective problems. So spaces in which collective problems of the neighborhood are discussed could be formed while the essence of the existing community structures are protected. This would help to establish a collective consciousness of neighborhood. In these spaces problems, solutions to these problems and ways of implementation should be determined. This would provide the different groups' and cultures' getting used to work together , coming closer of them and seeing the common denominators with each other. At the same time trying to solve problems would teach the laws of urban life, benefiting from them and evaluate the opportunities rationally.

Education has an important role in urban integration. By education, immigrants would learn the laws of modern life, gain capabilities to cope with the urban life and provide a common ground to get together and learn others culture and life styles.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABU-LUGHOD, Janet. 1961 “Migrant Adjustment to City Life: The Egyptian Case”  
The American Journal of Sociology, Vol.67, pp 22-32.

ABU-LUGHOD J. 1991, “Changing Cities: Urban Sociology”, Harper Collins  
Publishers,1991

ARMAĞAN, Mustafa. 2003 “Yamalı Çelişkiler Senti: Saraybosna’dan  
Yenibosna’ya” Cogito, Sayı. 35, Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

ARSLANOĞLU, Rana A. 1998 “Kent, Kimlik ve Küreselleşme”, ASA  
Yayınları,Bursa

AYATA, Ayşe G. 1991“Gecekondularda Kimlik Sorunu Dayanışma Örüntüleri ve  
Hemşehrilik”, Toplum ve Bilim, Sayı:52.

BERRY, J.W. 1992 “Acculturation and Adaptation in a New Society” Vol XXX-  
No:1

BILSBORROW, Richard E. 1996, “Migration, Urbanization, and Development: New  
Directions and Issues, UNFPA,

BOOKMAN, Milica Zarkovic. 1997 “The Demographic Struggle for Power.The  
Political Economy of Demographic Engineering in the Modern World” Frank  
Cass&Co. LTD. London.

CASTELLS, M. 1977 “Urban Question”, Arnold, London,

CASTELLS, M. 1997 “Kent, Sınıf, İktidar” (Çev. Asuman Erendil), Ankara

ERDER, Sema, 1995 “İstanbul’a Bir Kent Kondu: Ümraniye, İletişim, İstanbul

ERMAN, Tahire. 1998 “ International Journal of Middle East Studies, Vol. 30, Cambridge University Press. pp.541-561

ERSOY, Melih. 1985 “Göç ve Kentsel Bütünleşme”, Türkiye Gelişme Araştırmaları Vakfı, Yayın No:2, Ankara Üniversitesi SBF ve Basın Yayın Yüksekokulu Basımevi, Ankara

HAUSER ,M. Philip, SCHNORE, Leo F. 1965 “The Study of Urbanization”, John Wiley&Sons.

GILBERT, A ; GUGLER, J. 1992 “Cities, Poverty and Development”, Oxford University Press.

GÖKÇE, Birsen. (der) 1993 “Gecekondularda Ailelerarası Geleneksel Dayanışmanın Çağdaş Organizasyonlara Dönüşümü” Ankara, T.C. Başbakanlık Kadın ve Sosyal Hizmetler Müsteşarlığı Yayını Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.

GUGLER, J. “Cities in the Developing World:Issues, Theory, and Policy, Oxford University Press,1997

GMELCH, George; ZENNER, Walter P. 1988 “Urban Life Readings in Urban Anthropology Second Edition”, Waveland Press.

GOSCHEL, Albert. 2001 “Integration and the City” German Journal of Urban Studies, Vol. 40, No.1. Berlin

GOZA, Franklin. “Immigrant Social Networks: The Brazilian Case”, <http://www.bgsu.edu/organizations/cfdr/research/pdf/2004/2004-02.pdf>

KARPAT, Kemal. 1976 “The Gecekondu: Rural Migration and Urbanization, Cambridge University Pres, New York.

KİRİŞÇİ Kemal. 1996 “Post Second World War Immigration from Balkan Countries to Turkey” New Perspectives on Turkey, Vol.12, pp. 61-77

LEWIS, Oscar. 1952 “Urbanization Without Breakdown: A Case Study”,The Scientific Monthly, Vol.75, No1(July)

LOUGHNA, Sean. 2004 “ What is Forced Migration”,  
<http://www.forcedmigration.org/whatisfm.htm>

MASSEY, Douglas S. ; ARANGO Joaquin; HUGO Graeme; KOUAOUCI Ali;  
PELLEGRINO Adela; TAYLOR Edward J. 1993 “Theories of International  
Migration: A review and Appraisal” Population and Development Review, Vol., No.3,  
pp.431-466

Mc GEE, T. G. 1975 “The Urbanization Process in the Third World Explorations in  
Search of a Theory” ,G. Bell and Sons, London,1975

MELLOR, J. R. 1977 “Urban Sociology in an Urbanized Society”,  
Routledge&Kegan Paul, London.

MENJIVAR, Cecilia. 1995 “Kinship Networks among Immigrants: Lessons from a  
Qualitative Comparative Approach” International Journal of Comparative Sociology,  
Vol.30 ,Dec 1995, No.3-4.

PAHL, R. E. 1968 “Readings in Urban Sociology”, Pergamon Press.

PARNWELL, Mike. 1992 “Population Movements and the Third World”,  
Routledge, London

PATTERSON, Sheila. 1963 “ Dark Strangers: a sociological study of the absorption  
of a recent West Indian migrant group in Brixton, South London, Tavistock  
Publications., London.

PHILLIPS, E. Barbara. 1996 “City Lights Urban-Suburban Life in the Global  
Society” Oxford University Press.

ROBERTS, Bryan. 1978 “Cities of Peasants The Political Economy of Urbanization  
in the Third World” Edward Arnold.

SAUNDERS, Peter. 1986. “Social Theory and Urban Question”. 2nd Ed. ,  
Unwin&Hyman, London.

ŞENYAPILI, Tansı. 1978 “Bütünleşmemiş Kentli Nüfus Sorunu” ODTÜ, Ankara

TEKŞEN, Adnan. 2003 “Kentleşme Sürecinde Bir Tampon Mekanizma Olarak Hemşehrilik:Ankara’daki Malatyalılar Örneği” DPT, Ankara.

VASİLEVA, Darina. 1992 “Bulgarian Turkish Emigration and Return” International Migration Review, Vol. 26, No. 2, Special Issue: The New Europe and International Migration( Summer, 1992), 342-352.

ZHELYAZKOVA, Antonina; DIMITROVA, Donka. 1998 “Between Adaptation and Nostalgia: The Bulgarian Turks in Turkey, International Center for Minority Research, Sofia.

## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX A

#### ALAN ÇALIŞMASININ ANKET SORULARI

Anketi yapan kişi:

1.Doğum tarihiniz

.....

2.Doğum yeriniz

.....

3.Eğitim durumunuz (**Dikkat! bitirilen okul işaretlenecek**)

a ( ) Okuma-yazma bilmiyor

b ( ) Okuma yazma biliyor ama tahsili yok

c ( ) İlkokul mezunu

d ( ) Ortaokul mezunu

e ( ) Lise mezunu

f ( ) Yüksekokul-üniversite mezunu

4.Medeni durumunuz

a ( ) Evli (**5.soruya geçiniz**)

b ( ) Bekar (**11.soruya geçiniz**)

c ( ) Eşinden boşandı ya da eşi öldü

5.Eşiniz çalışıyor mu?

a ( ) Evet-Hangi işle meşgul?..... b ( ) Hayır

6.Eşinizin eğitim durumu (**Dikkat! bitirilen okul işaretlenecek**)

a ( ) Okuma-yazma bilmiyor

b ( ) Okuma-yazma biliyor ama tahsili yok

c ( ) İlkokul mezunu

d ( ) Ortaokul mezunu

e ( ) Lise mezunu

f ( ) Yüksekokul-üniversite mezunu

7.Eşiniz de Bulgaristan göçmeni mi?

a ( ) Evet b ( ) Hayır

8.Kaç yılında evlendiniz?

.....

**Dikkat! Çocuğu olmayanlar için 11.soruya geçiniz.**

9.Çocuk sayısı

Kız :.....

Erkek:.....

10.Çocuklarınızın eğitim durumu?(**Kız ya da erkek olduğunu ve sayısını belirtiniz**)

a ( ) Okul çağında değil(.....)

b ( ) İlkokul mezunu (.....)

c ( ) Ortaokul mezunu (.....)

d ( ) Lise mezunu (.....)

e ( ) Yüksekokul-üniversite mezunu(.....)

11.Şu anda evinizde kimlerle birlikte yaşıyorsunuz?

a ( ) Yalnız

- b( )Eşimle  
c( )Çocuklarım ve eşimle  
g( )Diğer.....  
12.Ne iş yapıyorsunuz? (Hangi kurumda ne iş yaptığınızı belirtiniz)  
.....

- 13.İşyerinizdeki statünüz nedir?  
a( ) Ücretli maaşlı(14.soruya geçiniz)  
b( ) Kendi hesabına,serbest (15.soruya geçiniz)  
c( ) İşsiz ara sıra iş bulduğunda çalışıyor(18.soruya geçiniz)  
d( )Emekli(22.soruya geçiniz)

14. Kaç yıldır bu işyerinde çalışıyorsunuz?  
.....

15. İşyeriniz hangi semtte bulunuyor?  
.....

16.İşyerinizde hemşehriniz var mı?

- a( )Evet-Kaç kişi?..... b( )Hayır

17.Aşağıdaki sosyal güvenlik kuruluşlarından hangisine bağlısınız?

- a( )Emekli sandığı b( )SSK c( )Bağ-kur

- d( )Hiçbiri e( )Diğer.....

**Dikkat! 18-21.sorular yalnızca işsiz olanlara sorulacak**

18.Şu anda geçiminizi nasıl sağlıyorsunuz?  
.....

19.Ne zamandan beri işsizsiniz?  
.....

20.Neden işsizsiniz?

- a( ) Mesleğim yok  
b( ) İş arayıp da bulamadığımdan  
b( ) Sosyal güvencesi olan bir iş bulamadığım için  
c( ) İşten atıldığım için  
d( ) Ücreti iyi bir iş bulmadığım için  
g( ) Yaşlılık nedeniyle  
h( ) Diğer.....

21.İşsiz kaldığınız sürelerde geçiminizi nasıl sağladınız?

- a( )Akrabalarım yardım etti g( )Karım çalıştı  
b( )Tanıdıklarımın borç aldım h( )Çocuklarım çalıştı  
c( ) Birikmiş paramız vardı ı( ) Tanıdıklar yardım etti.  
d( ) Evdeki bazı eşyaları sattım j( ) Geçici işlerde çalıştım  
e( ) Altın,ziynet eşyası sattım k( )Kira geliriyle geçindim  
f( ) Arsa,ev sattık l( )Diğer.....

**Dikkat!22-23.sorular yalnızca emeklilere sorulacak.**

22.Nereden emeklisiniz?  
.....

23.Şu anda çalışıyor musunuz?

- a( )Evet-Nerede?..... b( )Hayır

24.Hanenize giren toplam aylık gelir ne kadardır?

- .....  
25. Hangi mahallede oturuyorsunuz?  
.....
26. İkamet edilen evin durumu  
a( ) Sahibi  
b( ) Kiracı  
c( ) Lojman  
d( ) Bir yakınımın aittir, kira ödemiyorum  
e( ) Diğer.....
27. Aşağıdakilerden hangisine sahipsiniz?  
a( ) Ev d( ) Arsa g( ) Hiçbiri  
b( ) Araba e( ) Tarla h( ) Diğer.....  
c( ) Yazlık f( ) Dükkan
28. Oturulan konutun türü  
a( ) Apartmanda daire  
b( ) Müstakil ev  
c( ) Diğer.....
29. İstanbul'a ne zaman göç ettiniz?  
Yıl:.....  
Ay:.....
30. Nereden göç ettiniz?  
.....
31. Neden İstanbul'a yerleştiniz?  
a( ) Akrabalarım önceden buraya yerleştiğinden  
b( ) İş, eğitim, sağlık ve sosyal imkanlarının elverişli olması  
c( ) Memleketime yakın olması  
d( ) Diğer.....
32. İstanbul'a ailenizden ilk kim geldi?  
a( ) Dedem d( ) Ailecek ilk biz geldik  
b( ) Babam e( ) Diğer.....  
c( ) Ben
33. Buraya gelmeden önce ne iş yapıyordunuz?  
.....
34. İstanbul'a nasıl göç ettiniz?  
a( ) Tek başıma, bekar  
b( ) Akrabalarımınla  
c( ) Anne-baba ve kardeşlerimle  
d( ) Hemşehrilerimle  
e( ) Hanım ve çocuklarımla  
f( ) Diğer.....
35. Doğduğunuz şehirden çıktuktan sonra İstanbul'a gelmeden önce başka illerde kaldınız mı?  
a( ) Evet b( ) Hayır
36. Yenibosna'ya geleli kaç yıl oldu?  
.....
37. İstanbul'a geldiğinizde ilk işinize nasıl girdiniz?  
a( ) Hemşehrilerimin yardımıyla d( ) Komşularımın yardımıyla

- b( )Arkadaşlarımın yardımıyla olmadan,kendim  
c( )Akrabalarımın yardımıyla  
38.Şu anki işinize nasıl girdiniz?  
a( )Hemşehrilerimin yardımıyla  
b( )Arkadaşlarımın yardımıyla olmadan,kendim  
c( )Akrabalarımın yardımıyla  
39.İstanbul'daki ilk evinizi nasıl buldunuz?  
a( )Gazete ilanıyla  
b( )Arkadaşlarımın yardımıyla  
c( )Akrabalarımın yardımıyla  
e( )Hiç kimsenin yardımı  
f( )Diğer.....  
d( )Komşularımın yardımıyla  
e( )Hiç kimsenin yardımı  
f( )Diğer.....  
d( )Hemşehrilerimin yardımıyla  
e( )Emlakçı aracılığıyla  
f( )Diğer.....

40.Halen oturmakta olduğunuz evi nasıl buldunuz ya da nasıl satın satın aldınız?

- a( )Emlakçı aracılığıyla  
b( )Arkadaşlarımın yardımıyla  
c( )Akrabalarımın yardımıyla  
d( )Gazete ilanıyla  
e( )Hemşehrilerimin yardımıyla  
f( )Diğer.....

41.Oturduğunuz semtte (mahallede) hangi yakınlarınız var?

- a( )Akrabalarım  
b( )Hemşehrilerim  
c( )İş yerinden arkadaşlarım  
d( )Hiçbiri

42.Hemşehrileriniz en çok hangi mahallelerde oturuyor?

.....

43.Ailecek en çok kimlerle görüşüyorsunuz?

- a( )İş arkadaşlarımla  
b( )Akrabalarım  
c( )Aynı mahallede oturan hemşehrilerimle  
d( )Hemşehrim olsun olmasın komşularıyla  
e( )Diğer.....

44.Hemşehrilerinizle görüşme sıklığınız nedir?

- a( )Çok sık  
b( )Hafta da bir kez  
c( )Ayda bir kez  
d( )Senede birkaç kez  
e( )Bayramdan bayrama  
f( )Hiç görüşmem  
g( )Diğer.....

45. İstanbul dışında Türkiye'nin başka şehirlerinde yaşayan Bulgaristan göçmenleriyle de görüşüyor musunuz?

- a( )Evet  
b( ) Hayır

46.Kime "hemşehrim" gözüyle bakarsınız?

- a( ) Yalnızca göç ettiğim bölgede yaşayanlara,köylülerime  
b( ) Tüm Bulgaristan göçmenlerine  
c( ) Tüm Balkan göçmenlerine  
d( ) Tüm Türk vatandaşlarına  
d( ) Diğer.....

47.Hemşehrilerle aynı mahalle de oturmanın en önemli faydası aşağıdakilerden hangisidir?

- a( )Kültürümüzü koruruz  
b( )Yalnız kalmayız  
c( )Birbirimize her türlü maddi manevi yardımda bulunuruz

- d( )Diğer.....
- 48.Borç paraya ihtiyacınız olsa kimden, nereden alırsınız?  
a( )İş arkadaşlarımdan b( )Komşularımdan  
c( )Hemşehrilerimden d( )Akrabalarımdan  
e( )Bankadan kredi çekerim e( ) Diğer.....
- 49.Bulgaristan'a ne sıklıkla gidip geliyorsunuz?  
a( )Haftada bir kez b( )Ayda bir kez  
c( )Senede birkaç kez d( )Bayramdan bayrama  
e( )İşim olursa f( )Hiç gitmem
- 50.Bulgaristan'a giriş çıkışta bir sorun yaşıyor musunuz?  
a( )Evet-Ne tür sorunlar?..... b( ) Hayır
- 51.Bulgaristan'a daha ziyade ne için gidiyorsunuz?  
a( ) Tanıdık ve akrabaları görmek için  
b( ) Tatil ya da gezmek için  
c( ) Diğer.....
- 52.Mahallenizde sunulan belediye hizmetleri yeterli midir?  
a( )Evet(**54.soruya geçiniz**) b( )Hayır
- 53.Bu hizmetleri neden yeterli bulmuyorsunuz?(**önem sırasıyla belirtiniz**)  
a( ) .....  
b( ) .....  
c( ) .....  
d( ) .....
- 54.Üyesi olduğunuz Deliorman Bulgaristan Göçmenleri Derneğiyle ilişkiniz aşağıda sayacaklarımdan hangisine uygundur?  
a( ) Boş zamanlarımı geçiriyorum  
b( ) Faliyetlerine katılıyorum  
c( ) Sadece üyeyim  
d( ) Aktif üyeyim  
e( ) Yönetimde görev alıyorum  
f( ) Diğer.....
- 55.Bu derneğe üye olmanızda en önemli iki neden hangileridir?  
b( ) Hemşehrilerimle bir araya gelme fırsatı veriyor  
c( ) Sesimizi duyurmamıza, ortak sorunlarımızın çözümüne aracılık ediyor  
d( ) İhtiyacı olanlara yardım ediliyor  
e( ) İş bulmamda katkısı oluyor  
e( )Diğer.....
- 56.Çifte vatandaş mısınız?  
a( )Evet b( )Hayır
- 57.Bulgaristan'a geri dönmek istiyor musunuz?  
a( )Evet b( )Hayır(**59. soruya geçiniz**)
- 58.Bulgaristan'a dönmeyi neden düşünüyorsunuz?(**önem sırasıyla belirtiniz**)  
a( ) .....  
b( ) .....  
c( ) .....  
d( ) .....
- 59.Bulgaristan'a dönmeyi neden düşünmüyorsunuz?  
a( ) Orada hala baskı uygulanıyor  
b( ) Buraya alıştık,işimiz burada

- c ( ) Burası bizim vatanımız  
d ( ) Diğer.....
60. Bulgaristan'daki yaşantınızla karşılaştırdığınızda bugün en çok nelerin eksikliğini hissediyorsunuz?  
a ( ) .....  
b ( ) .....  
c ( ) .....  
d ( ) .....
61. Türkiye'ye göç etmiş olmaktan dolayı en çok neden memnunsunuz?  
.....
62. İlk göç ettiğinizde ne tür olumsuzluklarla karşılaştınız?  
a ( ) Kalacak yer problemi  
b ( ) Geçim sıkıntısı  
c ( ) Bize yabancı gözüyle bakıldı, dışlandık  
d ( ) Kültürel uyum sorunu  
e ( ) Diğer.....
63. Şu anda karşılaştığınız en önemli sorunlar nelerdir? (önem sırasıyla belirtiniz)  
a ( ) .....  
b ( ) .....  
c ( ) .....  
d ( ) .....
64. İlk göç ettiğinizde herhangi bir devlet kuruluşu ya da belediye size yardım etti mi?  
a ( ) Evet  
b ( ) Hayır
65. Devlet ya da belediye ne tür yardımlarda bulundular?  
a ( ) Kalacak yer sağladılar  
b ( ) Gıda yardımı yaptılar  
c ( ) İş verdiler  
d ( ) Okul malzemesi verdiler  
e ( ) Sağlık yardımında bulundular  
f ( ) Diğer.....
66. Buraya göç etmeden önceki ekonomik durumunuzla şu anki durumunuzu karşılaştırır mısınız?  
a ( ) Durumum düzeldi şimdi daha iyi  
b ( ) Durumum bozuldu, geçim sıkıntısı çekiyorum  
c ( ) Değişen bir şey yok
67. Gelecekte ailenizin ekonomik durumunun ne yönde değişeceğini düşünüyorsunuz?  
a ( ) Daha iyi      b ( ) Daha kötü      c ( ) Aynı      d ( ) Bilmiyorum
68. En son yapılan yerel seçimlerde oy verdiniz mi?  
a ( ) Evet-Hangi partiye?.....      b ( ) Hayır-  
Neden?.....
69. Bundan sonra yapılacak seçimlerde oy vermeyi düşünüyor musunuz?  
a ( ) Evet      b ( ) Hayır-  
Neden?.....

70.Oy verdiđiniz partiyle üyelik, delegelik ilişkiniz var mı?

a( )Evet                      b( )Hayır                      c( ) Söylemek istemiyorum

71.Mahallenizde yaşayan, Bulgaristan göçmenleri dışındaki insanlarla ilişkinizi nasıl tanımlarsınız?

a( ) Gidip geliriz, aramızda hiçbir sorun yok.

b( ) Ne iyi ne kötü

c( ) Gerekmedikçe görüşmeyiz

d( ) Diğer.....