

EXPERIENCING CLASS DIFFERENCES:
THE CASE OF SUBCONTRACTED CLEANING WORKERS IN METU
DORMITORIES

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

BY

ÖZNUR ERDEMLİ

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND PUBLIC
ADMINISTRATION

SEPTEMBER 2012

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Prof. Dr. Raşit Kaya
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.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Necmi Erdoğan
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Necmi Erdoğan (METU, ADM) _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Helga Rittersberger-Tılıç (METU, SOC) _____

Dr. Barış Çakmur (METU, ADM) _____

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.

Name, Last name: Öznur Erdemli

Signature :

ABSTRACT

**EXPERIENCING CLASS DIFFERENCES:
THE CASE OF SUBCONTRACTED CLEANING WORKERS IN METU
DORMITORIES**

Erdemli, Öznur

M.S., Department of Political Science and Public Administration

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Necmi Erdoğan

September 2012, 187 Pages

This thesis aims at examining the class experiences of subcontracted cleaning workers who work in student dormitories on the METU campus. It focuses on the working conditions of workers and control mechanisms in the dormitories in terms of their effects on class consciousness and future dreams of the workers. In addition, the study examines how workers experience class as a matter of self-respect in their workplaces, how they cope with haughtiness of students, the managers and the regular employees, how they explain social inequalities and whether they accept them as legitimate. The role of gender in workers' everyday lives is also mentioned. The study argues that university dormitories on the METU campus with their fragmented labor regime, and managerial tendencies, which treat the students as customers, are significant places for the observation of how class differences are experienced by the subcontracted workers. In regard to these issues, the field research of the study was conducted through semi-structured in-depth interviews with 23 subcontracted cleaning workers in 12 different dormitories on the METU campus.

Keywords: class, despotic control, dormitories, subcontracted cleaning workers, students.

ÖZ

SINIFSAF FARKLILIKLARIN DENEYİMLENMESİ: ODTÜ YURTLARI TEMİZLİK İŞÇİLERİ ÖRNEĞİ

Erdemli, Öznur

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Necmi Erdoğan

Eylül 2012, 187 sayfa

Bu tez ODTÜ yurtlarında çalışan taşeron temizlik işçilerinin sınıf deneyimlerini incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu doğrultuda, yurtlardaki çalışma koşulları ve denetim mekanizmalarının işçilerin sınıf bilinci ve örgütlenme eğilimleri ile gelecek hayallerini nasıl etkilediğine odaklanmaktadır. Ayrıca, işçilerin işyerlerinde sınıf meselesini nasıl bir özsaygı meselesi olarak deneyimlediğini, öğrencilerin, yöneticilerin ve kadrolu çalışanların uygunsuz davranışları ile nasıl baş ettiklerini, toplumsal eşitsizlikleri nasıl anladıklarını ve bunların meşruiyetini ne ölçüde kabul ettiklerini incelemektedir. İşçilerin gündelik hayatında toplumsal cinsiyet rollerinin yerinden de bahsedilmektedir. Bu çalışma, ODTÜ yerleşkesindeki öğrenci yurtlarının bölünmüş işgücü yapısı ve öğrencileri müşteri olarak gören yönetim eğilimleri ile sınıfsal farklılıkların gündelik hayatta işçiler tarafından nasıl deneyimlendiğini görmek açısından önemli bir bağlam sunduğunu iddia etmektedir. Bu konular doğrultusunda, ODTÜ yerleşkesindeki 12 farklı yurttaki çalışan 23 temizlik işçisi ile yarı-yapılandırılmış derinlemesine mülakatlar gerçekleştirilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: sınıf, despotik denetim, yurtlar, taşeron temizlik işçileri, öğrenciler.

To My Mother

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There is contribution of many people in this thesis. Without their collaboration it would be impossible for me to implement the thesis. First of all I want to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Necmi Erdoğan who has supported me patiently and has encouraged me throughout my graduate study. I am also grateful to my examining committee members Helga Rittersberger-Tılıç and Barış Çakmur for their reading and precious comments.

I wish to express my gratitude to the all workers who accepted my proposal of interviewing despite their intensive working hours and lack of time and also referred me to their friends in other dormitories.

To my families the one into which I was born and the one which I have chosen I owe my deepest gratitude for their indispensable support. I dedicate this study to my mother Aynur who has accepted me as I am and supported me in various ways all through my life. Special thanks to my fiance Mehmet Akif Yardımcı. I could not accomplish this thesis without his understanding and encouragement during my stressful days. I also want to thank Sanem Yardımcı, Fadime Yardımcı, Şebnem Yardımcı, Utku Bora Geyikçi, Semih Sapmaz, Seher Sağıroğlu, Esra Can, and Selda Paydak for their willing support and encouragement throughout the whole process. I am deeply grateful to Robert West who patiently proofread my thesis in a very limited time.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ	v
DEDICATION	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Objective of the Study.....	1
1.2 Theoretical Framework.....	4
1.3 The Research Method.....	14
1.4 Outline of Chapters.....	16
2. TRANSITION OF LABOR REGIME AND SOCIAL HIERARCHIES IN TURKEY.....	18
2.1 Job Insecurity in Turkey.....	18
2.2 The Working Class and Unionization in Turkey.....	23
2.3 Expansion of Subcontract Work in Turkey.....	29
2.4 Literature on The Working Class and Class Encounters in Turkey.....	33
2.5 Concluding Remarks.....	40
3. THE SUBCONTRACT LABOR REGIME IN METU DORMITORIES.....	42
3.1 Historical Background of Labor Regime in METU.....	42
3.2 Despotism Control Mechanisms in the Dormitories.....	47
3.3 Job Insecurity and Fear of Job Loss.....	59
3.4 Absence of Belief in Collective Action.....	67
3.5 “Realistic” Future Dreams.....	77
3.6 Concluding Remarks.....	84
4. CLASS ENCOUNTERS IN THE METU DORMITORIES.....	86
4.1 Sharpened Social Hierarchies in the METU Dormitories.....	86
4.2 The Search for Respect.....	112
4.3 Gender and Class in the Dormitories.....	127
4.4 Concluding Remarks.....	134
CONCLUSION.....	137

REFERENCES.....	153
APPENDIX A: INFORMATION ABOUT THE INTERVIEWEES.....	159
APPENDIX B: DRAFT OF THE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS.....	161
APPENDIX C: AN EXAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS.....	163
APPENDIX D: TEZ FOTOKOPİ İZİN FORMU.....	187

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objective of the Study

The neo-liberal transition starting in the 1980s has brought significant consequences in terms of the way class hierarchies are experienced and expressed in Turkey. Within the context of this transition, the labor regime has been changing so as to include precarious forms of employment in both public and private institutions in an accelerating manner. These forms of employment have made the workers more powerless and defenseless vis-à-vis flexible market norms because they have brought job insecurity and the loss of acquired rights in terms of social insurance while taking away the workers' power to organize and struggle.

The neo-liberal transition has brought two important consequences particularly in terms of universities. First, the educational apparatus has been changed according to the logic of neo-liberalism. Before that transition, formal education used to be a social right provided by the state and therefore it could play a role of a tool that enables the working class to move up the social ladder. However, with the commodification of education and privatization of schools, education has been losing that role. Within this context, the university campuses as well as the primary educational institutions have been losing their 'poor' student population. Secondly, the labor regime on the university campuses has also changed so as to include precarious forms of employment. In particular, the practice of subcontracting has started to be used in an accelerating manner in the provision of cleaning, accommodation, security and / or nursing, in both private and public university campuses and faculties in Turkey. This has increased the number and proportion of subcontracted workers in the universities.

The neoliberal transition, which has transformed the educational apparatus and labor regime in university campuses, also shapes the perception regarding the subcontracted workers and their relations with the students, managers and regular employees. While the cities have been redesigned so as to prevent class encounters, the working class has been losing its moral weapons based on ‘inner beauty’, as societal attention to working class has been replaced by middle class elitism, which attributes to the working classes images of dirt, bad smell and danger. This transition is more visible on private university campuses. In Sabanci University dormitories, for instance, the supervisors do not approve of the subcontracted cleaning workers’ intimacy with the students and they warn the workers not to talk to students unless students talk to them. Moreover, on the campus, there is a minor road for the workers, separate from the major road used by the students in order to prevent the encounter between the two.

The practice of subcontracting entered the METU campus in the 1990s initially in areas of cleaning and tea making and until 2005, there was only one subcontractor company on the campus. Since 2005, there have been two: one is responsible only for the EBI Foundation’s dormitories and institutions, and the other is responsible for the other 15 dormitories, as well as the academic and administrative buildings, and the environment. Today, there are 12 public and 2 private student dormitories and 3 guest houses on the METU campus. 662 subcontracted cleaning workers work and approximately 7000 students stay in total.

On the METU campus, the subcontracted workers are subjected to continuous discrimination. The subcontracted workers are not allowed to use the health center, sports center, swimming pool or nursery school, and they have to pay three times as much as than the civil servants in the cafeteria¹. In 2009, the subcontracted workers’ entry to the spring festival area was prohibited because they were ‘spoiling the area’ as company supervisors told them. In terms of usage of

1. <http://kafm.metu.edu.tr/index.php?sayfa=fiyatlar&durum=tabldotfiyat>

personnel buses also, the subcontracted workers are subjected to humiliating gazes and attitudes of the regular employees on the basis of the former's inferiority. In the dormitories, in particular, the managers treat them differently than the other subcontracted personnel on the information desk; intimacy between workers and students should be kept at a minimum level, and they are subjected to haughtiness and humiliating attitudes of the personnel and students. Within this context, the Middle East Technical University campus and in particular the student dormitories on it have been chosen as the field of this study because they enable one to observe how class differences are experienced and continuously reconstructed in the interaction of the subcontracted workers with the regular employees, the managers, the other subcontracted personnel, and the students.

The study claims that subcontracted workers can experience class differences in their workplaces and it aims at analyzing to what extent class hierarchies have gained a sharper tone on the METU campus. In this respect, this study focuses on the labor regime on the METU campus, its impacts on the class consciousness of the subcontracted cleaning workers, their thoughts about unionization and collective action, and how their future dreams are shaped by material conditions. It also examines how workers experience class as a matter of respect, how they cope with the haughtiness of the regular employees, the managers, other subcontracted personnel and the students, how they understand and explain social hierarchies, whether they accept these hierarchies as legitimate and to what extent and how they can resist them. The role of patriarchal ideology in these workers' everyday lives is also handled.

The basic purpose of this study is to obtain an idea about the class consciousness and perception of class hierarchies of the subcontracted cleaning workers in METU dormitories within the context of the sharpened tone of class hierarchies as a result of the neo-liberal transition. The basic problem of this study is to reveal how subcontract labor regime based on fragmentation and stratification among the workers affects the subcontracted workers' class consciousness, and how the

workers experience class as a matter of respect in their encounter with the managers, the regular employees, and the students.

The main questions of this study are therefore to what extent the subcontract labor regime allows the subcontracted workers to develop class consciousness out of shared experiences, how the workers perceive the unionized struggle, on what basis their future dreams and expectations are constituted, how subcontracted workers perceive class differences, how they react to the humiliating attitudes in the dormitories and on what basis they could establish their self-respect.

1.2 Theoretical Framework

In this thesis, the concept of class will be used in its Marxist sense. The main argument of this study is that class differences become apparent "in status distinctions that rank individuals and groups on scales of social honorability rather than in terms of economic interest alone" (Swartz 2011, 212). Therefore, in order to analyze the main questions of the thesis, I will employ the theoretical framework developed by Marx, Burawoy, Thompson, Bourdieu and Sennett.

For Marx (1998, 6), "the history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles." Therefore, in his analysis, the analytical priority is on the class struggle rather than social classes. This indicates two facts, as Özuğurlu (2008, 24) discusses. First, social classes can only be understood within the relations in terms of certain forms and mechanisms of obtaining surplus value. Secondly, class categories are historical formations which can only be understood within a certain process.

Marx evaluates classes in terms of the ownership of the means of production, and defines two basic class categories as those who own the means of production, and those who do not. In capitalism, the former is named as the capitalist class and the latter as the proletariat. Those who do not own the means of production have to sell their labor power to the capitalists in order to support their lives. One of the central arguments is that the proletariat produces things which are not relevant to

their needs and which are not determined by them. The disengagement between labor power and the necessary means of production to realize that power causes exploitation through the creation of surplus value, which would be the profit of the capitalists.

Due to the domestic competition for capital, the owners of the means of production are in need of labor power to increase profit by obtaining more surplus value. The pressure coming from the struggle of capital against the proletariat also leads capital to establish more control over labor power through the production process. The increase of surplus value is only possible by extending working hours or increasing the productivity of labor power. Capital in that sense tries to keep labor power under systematic control through mechanization and the division of labor.

Owing to the extensive use of machinery and to the division of labor, write Marx and Engels (2008, 36), the work of the proletarians has lost all individual character, and, consequently, all charm for the worker. This makes them a class separated from the other classes on the basis of their obligation to sell their labor power, while these mechanisms alienate the workers from control of the production process, allowing their stricter control by the capitalist.

The labor process is the central focal point in Marx's analysis of capitalism, because it is the starting point of not only the production of surplus value but also the domination relations. In that sense, Burawoy (1982, 15) develops his concept of labor process, which has two inseparable components, namely *relations of production* and *relations in production*. 'Relations of production' refers to the relations between those who produce the surplus and those who expropriate it. It defines a particular way of distributing and appropriating labor time and its product. Relations in production, on the other hand, are the relations of the shop floor into which workers enter, both with one another and with management.

Burawoy (1982, 15-16) talks about the need for political structures as necessary mechanisms that guarantee the reproduction of the relations of production. A particular mode of production defines a corresponding mode of politics. The production of things is also production of an experience of relations of production. With the expression of Özuğurlu (2008, 48-49), therefore, the labor process is economic in terms of production of goods, political in terms of production of social relations, and ideological in terms of production of experiences concerning these relations.

Referring to the ideological and political structures in the labor process, Burawoy develops the concept of “the production / labor regime”. Regimes of labor can be analyzed in two categories, namely despotic and hegemonic, because control in processes of labor has a complex and contradictory structure which includes both consent and coercion. It follows that the regimes in which coercion predominates over consent are despotic, and those in which consent prevails without excluding coercion are hegemonic (Burawoy 1985; 126).

Following on this point, the role of production relations in the construction of the working class as a revolutionary power is addressed in Marxism. What the individuals are coincides with their production, both with what they produce and with how they produce (Marx & Engels 2010, 39). In other words, thoughts about material conditions come after the conditions themselves. However, as Marx and Engels (2010, 75) put forward;

“The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas, i.e. the class which is the ruling material force of society, is at the same time its ruling intellectual force. The class which has the means of material production at its disposal has control at the same time over the means of mental production, so that thereby, generally speaking, the ideas of those who lack the means of mental production are subject to it.”

Economic conditions make the people workers and define them on the basis of a common position in the relations of production, which gives them a common interest vis-à-vis capital. This makes them a class-in-itself. Whenever the workers

realize the antagonistic structure between their class interest and that of the capitalists and have consciousness they become a class-for-itself.

At this point, the analysis of class by Thompson will provide us with a useful context. For Thompson (2006), class is a relationship embodied in real people and in a historical context:

"By class I understand a historical phenomenon, unifying a number of disparate and seemingly unconnected events, both in the raw material of experience and in consciousness. I emphasize that it is a *historical* phenomenon. I do not see class as a 'structure', nor even as a 'category', but as something which in fact happens (and can be shown to have happened) in human relationships." (p. 39-40)

This emphasis on the historical and relational aspect of class leads him to argue that class happens when some men, as a result of common experiences, feel and articulate the identity of their interests as between themselves, and as against other men, whose interests are different from (and usually opposed to) theirs (Thompson 2006, 40). Within this context, class struggle precedes class in the sense that the relations of production distribute people into class *situations*, that these situations entail essential objective antagonisms and conflicts of interest, and that they therefore create conditions for struggle (Wood 1982, 49). He makes a distinction between class situations and class formations and argues that;

"Class formations emerge and develop 'as men and women *live* their productive relations and experience their determinate situations, within "the *ensemble* of the social relations", with their inherited culture and expectations, and as they handle these experiences in cultural ways'." (Thompson 1978, 150; cited in Wood 1982, 49-50).

The analysis of class made by Thompson is useful in understanding class consciousness of the subcontracted cleaning workers and their tendencies to struggle.

A discussion of the transformed nature of capitalism is also needed, referring to its effects on the working class. The major concept concerning the transformed nature of capitalism in the last four decades is precarization. Precariousness has been becoming the standard of newly emerging, flexible forms of employment

under globalized capitalism. Job insecurity has had multidimensional impacts on those who have to spend their work lives and lives by selling their labor power. Gery Rodgers (ESOPE 2004, 46; cited in Öztepe et. al. 2012, 128) conceptualizes a four dimensional process of precarization with a temporal, organizational, economic and social dimension. The temporal dimension indicates the certainty concerning the permanency of employment. The organizational dimension refers to the workers' individual or collective control over work, working conditions, working time, working plans / schedules, workload, and health and security conditions. The economic dimension is about the sufficient amount of payment and increase in wages. Lastly, the social dimension indicates the existence of precautions of legal, collective or traditional protection from unfair discharge, discrimination and unusual working. Precarization refers to workers' loss of control over their work in terms of all these dimensions.

Within the context of global capitalism, in the highly industrialized countries, the level of employment in the manufacturing industry decreased as the production process was carried to countries where labor was cheap, social rights regarding employment were not operated in practice and rights to organization were not recognized. There emerged reserves of cheap labor in the service of capital which served as a dissuasive factor against the social rights demands of workers. This created an international division of labor and divided the labor force on a global level (Uyanık 2008, 214).

It is also discussed that the labor market has been divided into two between a small, qualified, unionized labor force, whose members work in capital-intensive industries, and a crowded and unqualified peripheral labor force, working in labor-intensive industries and subject to job insecurity, low payment and low status (Uyanık 1999, 3; cited in Öztepe et. al. 2012, 132). The former has a lower possibility of being subjected to precarization compared to the latter, although it is not completely immune.

To continue with the effects of the transformed capitalism on class cultures and the everyday lives of the working class, Bourdieu's analysis of class will be referred to here. His study is important for my study, since I will refer to some of his concepts such as cultural capital, symbolic capital, symbolic power / violence, and habitus.

Bourdieu is centrally concerned to transcend the antinomy of structure and agent by establishing a multidimensional stratified social reality. He conceives that together with class structure based on mode of production, there is a need to look into the stratified social world whose class structure is embodied in the social practices of its agents.

Bourdieu dissociates from Marxism by relating capital with non-material sources of power. Therefore, he extends the idea of capital to all forms of power, whether they be material, cultural, social, or symbolic (Swartz 2011, 108). Accordingly, individuals and groups use various cultural, social and symbolic resources in order to maintain and enhance their positions in the social order. Bourdieu (1989c, 375; cited in Swartz 2011, 108-9) conceptualizes such resources as capital when they function as a 'social relation of power', that is, when they become objects of struggle as valued resources. Within this framework, he develops specific concepts of various types of capital, and unequal distribution of those capitals with regard to their quantity, relative density, and their changing position in relation to time. In this context, this thesis attempts to analyze to which types of capital the interviewed workers refer in their perception of class differences in their relations with students and regular employees.

Bourdieu (1986a, 243; cited in Swartz 2011, 110) generally mentions four types of capital: economic (money and properties), cultural (cultural goods and services including educational credentials), social (acquaintances and networks), and symbolic (legitimation). This extension of capital to different forms is useful in the analysis of the encounter of the subcontracted cleaning workers with the

students and regular employees since we are interested in the mentality that rules the way class hierarchies are experienced and expressed.

Despite the fact that Bourdieu is centrally concerned with power and domination, his concept of capital is not linked to the theory of exploitation in the sense of Marxian understanding which points out extracting surplus value or a dynamic of capital accumulation. However, a key contribution of Bourdieu to the concept of labor is that power resources are constituted by a much broader range of types of labor (political, religious, familial) and they can be transformed one into another under certain conditions and at certain rates. Indeed, Bourdieu's sociology focuses centrally on the study of how and under what conditions individuals and groups practice strategies of capital accumulating, investing, and converting various kinds of capital in order to maintain or enhance their positions in the social order (Swartz 2011, 110).

Bourdieu's conceptualization of cultural capital mainly aims at claiming that culture can become a source of power. While he analyzes the concept, he states that three forms of cultural capital exist. The first is embodied state which refers to the long-lasting dispositions of mind and body. The accumulation of cultural capital in its embodied form begins in early childhood. It requires "pedagogical action": the investment of time by parents, other family members, or hired professionals to sensitize the child to cultural distinctions. The acquisition of cultivated dispositions presupposes "distance from economic necessity" and therefore translates original class-based inequalities into cultural differences. The investment of inherited cultural capital returns dividends in school. Those who have large amounts of incorporated cultural capital are rewarded and those who have not are penalized (Bourdieu, 1989c, 48-81; cited in Swartz, 2011, 112).

Cultural capital secondly exists in an objectified state which refers to goods such as books, art works whose usage requires specialized cultural skills. Finally, the third form is the institutionalized state which refers to the system of formal education. Bourdieu attaches great importance to the growth, in the advanced

societies, of the higher educational system and the role it has come to play in the allocation of status. Since educational credentials have increasingly become necessary for the gaining of access to desirable positions in the job market, it becomes essential for parents to invest in a good education for their children so they can reap the “profit” in the job market. This process of investment involves the conversion of economic capital into cultural capital, which is a strategy more readily available to the affluent. According to Bourdieu, cultural capital is becoming more and more the new basis of social stratification (Bourdieu and Boltanski 1977, 33; cited in Swartz 2011, 113). This discussion will be helpful in analyzing the workers’ expectations of the future for their children.

Bourdieu develops the concept of habitus in order to answer how action follows regular statistical patterns without being a product of the obedience to rules, norms or conscious intention. With claims to transcend the classic dualism between structure and agency, the purpose of the concept of habitus is to suggest that the socialized body (which one calls the individual or person) does not stand in opposition to society; it is one of its forms of existence (Bourdieu 1980c, 29; cited in Swartz 2011, 139).

Habitus results from early socialization experiences in which external structures are internalized. To explain why inegalitarian social arrangements make sense to both dominant and dominated, Bourdieu employs the concept to emphasize the class-based character of socialization. Habitus derives from the predominantly unconscious internalization –particularly during early childhood- of objective chances that are common to members of a social class or status group; and therefore brings about a unique integration dominated by the earliest experiences statistically common to members of the same class (Bourdieu 1977c, 79; cited in Swartz 2011, 148-9). This puts power and its legitimation at the heart of the functioning and structure of habitus, since habitus involves an unconscious calculation of what is possible, impossible, and probable for individuals in their specific locations in a stratified social order. The relation to what is possible is a relation to power (Bourdieu 1990h, 4; cited in Swartz 2011, 152).

Bourdieu also dissociates from traditional Marxism with his emphasis on the role of symbolic forms and processes in the reproduction of social inequality. For Bourdieu, the traditional Marxist emphasis on class structures determined by the position in the relations of production underestimates the importance of the symbolic dimension of power relations. Bourdieu asserts that social classes are not simply given in reality, but are contested identities that are constructed through struggle over what is ‘the legitimate vision of the social world and of its divisions’ (Swartz 2011, 207). Therefore class boundaries depend on the relative symbolic power of particular groups to impose such a vision. This refers to the fact that class identity is a matter of perception and conception as well as being materially constituted, in other words, to a symbolic dimension of class struggle.

Within this context, Bourdieu argues that the cement of class relations in contemporary capitalism is the establishment of domination through legitimation. He defines it as ‘symbolic power’ (or violence, domination) and the purpose of this concept is to emphasize how the dominated accept the conditions of domination. He thinks of symbolic power as “*world making power*,” for it involves the capacity to impose the “legitimate vision of the social world and of its divisions” (1987f, 13; cited in Swartz 2011, 129). Therefore, the institutionalization of social classes is dependent on the relative symbolic power of each group to impose their visions of the divisions in society as legitimate.

The differences in the volume and content of forms of capital create differences in habituses, which also create differences in lifestyles and tastes, which are defined in relation to each other. As a result, the taste and lifestyle of the dominant class establish symbolic power over the working class. Bourdieu conceptualizes the taste of freedom of the dominant class vis-à-vis the *choice of necessity* of working class (Swartz 2011, 232-245). In that sense, class struggle is a struggle for symbolic and social classification made in order to monopolize the legitimate visions of the social world (Bourdieu 1990c, 180; cited in Swartz 2011, 215).

Class struggle in other words is more and more a struggle for investments in educational and symbolic capital.

While Bourdieu's concepts tell us more about the way to establish legitimate hierarchy, Sennett, in his studies, focuses on the impacts of the legitimate hierarchy under modern capitalism on the self-perception of working class people. Within this context, he argues that capitalist society takes away the working class person's feeling of self-worth and leaves him / her with a problem of healing a doubt about him / herself. Sennett and Cobb (1993) analyze the everyday lives of working class people to identify class signals that make people feel inadequate.

As they argue;

“Class society takes away from all the people within it the feeling of secure dignity in the eyes of others and of themselves. [...] The result of this, we believe, is that the activities which keep people moving in a class society, which make them seek more money, more possessions, higher-status jobs, do not originate in a materialistic desire, or even sensuous appreciation, of things, but out of an attempt to restore a psychological deprivation that the class structure has effected in their lives. In other words, *the psychological motivation instilled by a class society is to heal a doubt about the self rather than create more power over things and other persons in the outer world.*” (Sennett and Cobb 1993, 170 - 171)

Sennett and Cobb also observe the working class people in their study in terms of their reactions to social hierarchies. The feeling structure they describe is similar to that of the subcontracted workers in this study. They write;

“All these people feel society has limited their freedom more than it has limited that of middle-class people [...] but they are not rebellious in the ordinary sense of the word; they are both angry and ambivalent about their right to be angry.” (Sennett and Cobb 1993, 79)

Sennett (1998) also writes about the difference between character and personality in order to emphasize the direct impacts on people's character of work under new capitalism, which is characterized by flexibility, instability and based on the principle of “no long term”. Character is expressed by loyalty and mutual commitment, or through the pursuit of long-term goals, or by the practice of delayed gratification for the sake of a future end. In that sense, the changes characterizing new capitalism can be destructive; eroding the sense of sustained

purpose, integrity of the self, and trust in others and makes it difficult for the majority of workers who face uncertainty to make long term commitments and to shape a “narrative” for their future. Consequently, Sennett (1998, 138) argues that;

“One of the unintended consequences of modern capitalism is that it has strengthened the value of place, aroused a longing for community. All the emotional conditions we have explored in the workplace animate that desire: the uncertainties of *flexibility*, the absence of deeply rooted trust and commitment, the superficiality of teamwork, most of all the spectre of failing to make something of oneself in the world, to get a life through one’s work. All these conditions impel people to look for some other scene of attachment and depth. That is why “a regime which provides human beings no deep reasons to care about one other cannot preserve its legitimacy”.”

Within this context, the thesis focuses on how the subcontracted cleaning workers experience class differences when they encounter students and regular employees, and what kind of strategies they use in order to cope with their humiliating and degrading attitudes. Furthermore, the interviews with workers would be helpful to explore how they interpret social hierarchies, how they explain their causes, how they feel about class differences, and whether they legitimize them or not.

1.3 The Research Method

In regard to these main questions of the study, the field research of the thesis was conducted through a semi-structured in-depth interview method on the basis of snowball sampling with 23 subcontracted cleaning workers in the 7 public dormitories, 3 guest houses and 2 private dormitories on the METU campus. Six of the workers were working for the EMSA², which provides the workers with annual leave rights, whereas the rest were working for the BİGA, which does not give that right to its workers. The number of female workers was 15 and that of male workers was eight. This difference was related with the unwillingness of male workers to be an interviewee.

Due to the workers’ fear of losing their jobs, trust was centrally important for them in accepting to have an interview with me. Therefore, I started with the workers in my own dormitory and continued with those to whom they sent me. 14

2. The names of the subcontractor companies were changed in order to ensure confidentiality.

male and five female workers declined to have interview with me. This limited the multiplicity of the interviewees. Accordingly, the number of male workers and that of young workers below the age 30 are limited in the study. Also, all the dormitories could not be included in the study on an equal basis.

The study does not include the cleaning workers in the academic and administrative buildings. It also excludes the subcontracted workers in the cafeteria. Furthermore, the study also does not analyze the thoughts and representations of the students, the managers and the regular employees on social hierarchies, as this would exceed the scope of this study. I restricted myself to the subcontracted cleaning workers in the dormitories in order to analyze the experience of the class encounter between the workers and the students.

I also restricted myself to elaborating on certain questions I have asked to interviewees. These questions can be collected under following topics: demographic information about workers; working conditions in METU and in their previous work experiences; their thoughts about job insecurity and non-unionization; trust and solidarity relations among the workers; how they give meaning to the hierarchical structure which is reconstructed in their relationships with students and personnel; and how they cope with haughtiness of students and the personnel. Specifically, the effectiveness of gender roles in their everyday lives and in their perception about work is also addressed. Appendix B notes a draft of the interview questions.

Interviews with workers were conducted individually and lasted around an hour for each worker (although some lasted for as long as two hours) and were tape recorded in order to keep and transcribe their experiences in their own words. I interviewed the respondents privately as far as possible, in order for them to be comfortable and also to prevent their colleague from distracting them and / or becoming involved in their answers (although two interviews were conducted with a colleague present). In addition, all quotations in the text are verbatim, but some have been condensed for easier reading. In Appendix A, a table notes the

respondent's demographic, educational, familial and work information. All respondents' names were changed to ensure confidentiality.

It is to be noted that the arguments and findings of this study cannot be generalized as they are based on the very limited number of interviewees, two third of whom are women. There are also so many variables that may influence the answers of the workers such as sex, age, marital status, and her / his dormitory, her / his experience in the dormitories, etc. However, if 'individual behavior is a certain specification of a collective history of a group or a class' (Bourdieu 1984; cited in Bora 2005, 27), due to the collective internalization of the possibilities common for that social class or status group (Swartz 2011, 148), it should be kept in mind that the position of each worker vis-à-vis the social hierarchies, and their way of understanding and coping with them are related to their class positions.

1.4 Outline of Chapters

The study consists of five chapters. In this chapter, the main objective of the thesis and the importance of evaluating the object of the study have been specified. The methodology of the research has been presented with its scope and limitations. In addition, the main theoretical framework of this study, which is shaped on the basis of the works of Marx, Bourdieu and Sennett, has been presented.

In Chapter 2, the general picture in Turkey concerning the transition in the labor regime on the basis of neo-liberal doctrines is drawn. The transition of precarious employment forms, and in particular subcontracting practice, from exception to rule in Turkey, and the unionization patterns of working class in Turkey are addressed. The sharpening tone of the way class hierarchies are experienced and expressed is also discussed in the light of the arguments of the relevant literature regarding the class encounters in Turkey.

In Chapter 3 and 4, I dwell upon the working conditions and the relations of the subcontracted cleaning workers in METU dormitories. In Chapter 3, the transition of labor regime on the METU campus, the despotic labor regime in the

dormitories and its impacts of the solidarity and unity among the workers, the workers' perception about collective action and unionization, and their 'realistic' future dreams and hopes are the main focal points. All of these issues will be supported by the experiences of the workers through their own narratives.

In Chapter 4, the encounter of the subcontracted cleaning workers with the students, the managers and the regular employees is analyzed with references to the workers' own narratives. The target of this analysis is to reveal how the subcontracted cleaning workers experience social hierarchies in their workplace, how they develop strategies to cope with the humiliating and degrading attitudes of students and the regular employees, how they perceive social hierarchies and whether they accept them as legitimate or not. This chapter is also concerned with the patriarchal gender roles in terms of their effect on the (re)construction of hierarchical structures at home.

Finally, chapter 5 will offer a summary of the evaluation of the findings of the research.

CHAPTER II

TRANSITION OF LABOR REGIME AND SOCIAL HIERARCHIES IN TURKEY

This chapter will begin with the elaboration of job insecurity and in particular subcontracting practice in Turkey within the context of neo-liberal transition. The process of the expansion of job insecurity will be discussed with reference to legal processes. I will also focus on the unionization patterns of the working class in Turkey. I will refer to both internal and external reasons for the low unionization tendencies of workers with examples from different cases. In addition, I will examine the transition of experiencing class encounters and social hierarchies in Turkey with reference to relevant literature.

2.1 Job Insecurity in Turkey

The process of the institutionalization of job insecurity in Turkey, as around the world, dates back to the neo-liberal transition starting with the 1980s. Onyejekwe (2004, 26-27) argues that neo-liberalism is a set of economic policies that have become widespread during the last three decades or so, and its main points include the rule of the Market; the cutting of public expenditure for social services, the reduction of the safety-net for the poor; deregulation, which is to reduce government regulation of everything that could diminish profits, including the protection of the environment and safety in the workplace; privatization which results in the concentration of wealth even more in a few hands and the public paying more for its needs; and the elimination of the concept of “The Public Good” or “Community” and its replacement with “individual responsibility”, hence pressuring the poorest people in a society to find solutions to their lack of health care, education and social security all by themselves – then blaming them, if they fail, as “lazy” (Martinez and Garcia, 1997; cited in Onyejekwe 2004, 27).

In this process, in order to establish the continuity of free market domination the rules are eliminated, the labor market is destroyed and de-unionized and a cheap labor force is the main aim. Through flexible employment policies, the workers' power of collective bargaining has been taken from them. This process has taken place in a global context. Western countries have gone through a technological renovation and Fordist mass production has been replaced by flexible production processes (Ecevit 1997, 31-32).

This process has been established in non-industrialized countries, which were in the middle of a debt crisis at the time, through structural adjustment policies led by the IMF and the World Bank. These policies aimed at integrating the non-industrialized countries into the re-organization of capital in the global market. For Turkey, an export-led growth model was adopted for this process of integration into the global system. With the Decisions of January 24, the relations of production were re-designed on the basis of free market rule. With the aim of breaking the collective power of the working class, limitations on the rights to unionization, collective bargaining, and strike were added to the Constitution of 1982. During the 1980s, the public sector was scaled down as privatization increased. As a result of privatization, significant violations of workers' rights followed; wages decreased, collective redundancy increased, employment shrank, and unionization was weakened.

Within the context of our discussion, labor relations also changed, and flexible forms of employment without job security, which could not be subjected to labor law, expanded. Flexibility and job insecurity brought fragmentation of the working class and fear of losing their jobs condemns the workers to silence, removing their power to struggle.

Regarding job security, Labor Law 1475 was in force after 1971. According to this law, employers had the right to terminate the labor contract under conditions which were not suitable to rule of manners and good intention, without declaring

beforehand or paying compensation (Koç 2003, 215). In 2002, Job Security Law 1473 was passed which put certain conditions on terminating the labor contracts. However, in June 2003, Labor Law 4587 was passed and this law was contrary to contract no 158 of the International Labor Organization (ILO) which had been accepted by Turkey in 1994.

According to Labor Law 4587, job security includes those workers who are working under a labor contract for an indefinite period in workplaces employing 30 or more workers, and those who have been working for more than six months (Şafak 2007). This law constricted the scope of influence of job security because employers escape from their legal liabilities through signing temporary labor contracts, subcontracting practices, artificially fragmenting the workplace, and employing workers for less than 6 months. According to the data on scales of workplaces in Turkey in 2005, 2.3 million from a total of 4.8 million workers with social insurance were left out of the scope of job security since they worked in workplaces which had fewer than 30 workers (Şafak 2007).

With this law, job security has been destroyed to a certain extent. Moreover, the law has expanded subcontracting practice so as to include main tasks in its Second Article, recognized hiring worker with Seventh Article, protracted the trial period with its 15th Article and allowed private employment offices with 90th Article.

Before the 1980s, there were basically two types of personnel in the public sector namely civil servants and workers, defined in articles 4/a and 4/d of Law no. 657 on Public Servants. Public servants were major and permanent workers. Workers on the other hand, might be temporary (working less than 6 months) or permanent workers (working with a labor contract for an indefinite period to do major works of public sector). However, following the transition in the 1980s, these two categories lost many of their rights and public services started to be delivered through temporary and contracted personnel defined in the articles 4/b and 4/c of the law.

Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, attempts were made to remove the civil servant status and public worker status. Through policies of limiting the personnel recruitment and encouragement or even enforcement towards retirement, the extent of the employment in the public sector was subjected to reduction (Güler 2003, 18).

As a continuation of this tendency, in 2004, Decree Law no. 217 was put into legislation stating that, those who used to work as a temporary or permanent workers and became unemployed as a result of privatization would be employed based on article 4/C of Law no. 657, if they were not to receive pension fund or old age pension from any social insurance institution. In practice, those who were subject to article 4/C were employed as temporary or contracted personnel in the public sector.

Within the context of a series of easy and quick privatizations, the workers who became unemployed before retirement age were distributed to public institutions. They were forced to work there for minimum wages, with temporary labor contracts, and for long hours without overtime payment. Their contracts were renewed every year and this job insecurity has been introduced for workers and public servants (Soner 2010, 201-202). As a result, employment of new, qualified personnel who were to have job security decreased in public sector and this created a cheap and de-unionized labor force without job security (Erdem 2010).

Between the years 1986-2007, in the public institutions that were to be privatized, it is estimated that total employment decreased by at least 250,000 as a result of practices such as retirement, early retirement, and not hiring new workers but rather making the remaining workers work more (Mütevellioglu and Işik 2009, 179; cited in Mütevellioglu 2010, 159).

Among the public servants in Turkey, the number of contracted workers increased 83 % in three years from 2007 to 2010. The number of those who were subject to

4/c status also shrank from 70 thousand to 18 thousand in the same three years which means that the labor contracts of more than 50 thousand temporary personnel were not renewed. The next target of the government seems to be to pass other public servants initially to 4/c status, and then discharge them; and to pass those who have job security to contracted status (Sönmez 2010, 185).

Job insecurity has been a necessary condition of neo-liberalism. As a result of the neo-liberal transition in Turkey, the rates of unemployment have increased as they have all over the world. Even between the years 2002-2007 when there was an abundance of liquidity and economic growth was 7% on average, there was no increase in the rates of employment (Sönmez 2010, 174-175).

Job insecurity has also increased through the increase in precarious forms of employment. Peripheral countries like Turkey prepared legal infrastructures for cheap, de-unionized and obedient labor forces in order to attract international capital to invest in them. According to the data for 2003, there were 16 million wage laborers in Turkey, 14 million of whom were workers and the rest were public servants. Among the workers in the public and private sector, only 4.8 million were insured and only 700,000 among them were unionized and subject to collective bargaining. 50,000 personnel in the public sector were replaced by some of the tasks done by the public servants before and this number has been increasing. All in all, 65% of the wage laborers in Turkey were devoid of job security.³

According to data from the Turkish Statistical Institute on April 2012, 38.8 % of total employment, 9.5 million workers, worked without social insurance or job security. The official number for the unemployed was 2.5 million, which is less than the number of the workers without job security.⁴ This data shows the general tendency to increase of profits through the expansion of job insecurity.

3. http://www.sendika.org/yazi.php?yazi_no=381

4. <http://petrol-is.org.tr/haber/issizden-fazla-guvencesiz-5968>

Last but not least, The National Employment Strategy 2012-2023 is the latest concrete form of the effort of institutionalizing flexibility as capital demands. In this document, it states that the inflexibility and high costs of the labor force are defined as the main reasons for increasing unemployment. Attempts are made to solve unemployment through tools of neoliberal logic such as easiness of the subcontracting system, private employment offices, employment contracts of indefinite duration, new flexible forms of employment such as home-working, teleworking, and work sharing, and a severance pay fund. As a result, the process of adaptation to neo-liberalization continues and it can be said that attempts have been made to legalize and institutionalize job insecurity in the last ten decades (Özveri 2012).

2.2 The Working Class and Unionization in Turkey

In Turkey, trade unions did not emerge as a result of violent conflicts among clashing class interests as in Western Europe. In the 19th century, several workers' organizations were established but they were not influential over the economic and political order. In the 20th century, production was based on agriculture and industry was not developed. Therefore, trade unions which correspond to the organization of factory workers were weak in the Ottoman Empire. In 1936, the first Labor Law was accepted, and the state was recognized as the only authority in organizing work life. In 1947, the Law on Trade Unions was accepted which would create a zero-sum game between the workers and employers (Yorgun, 2005; 138-140).

The history of unionization in Turkey may be examined in three periods. The organization and enlargement process between the years 1946-1960, the re-organization and golden age between 1960-1980, and the period after 1980 (Yorgun, 2005; 140). In the first period, the first unions were organized under legal protection. During the second period, the working class became bigger with the rural-urban migration; the most influential trade unions namely TÜRK-İŞ (Confederation of Turkish Trade Unions), DİSK (Confederation of Progressive

Trade Unions of Turkey), and the HAK-İŞ Confederation were established, and trade unions started to demand economic rights. Important rights such as strike were gained with collective bargaining. However, in the 1980s, the golden era of capitalism ended and the following transformation brought violent competition, a new international division of labor, and new, flexible forms of organization of production with technological developments.

Following the military coup in 1980, all the collective bargaining agreements were suspended. All the confederations except for TÜRK-İŞ and all the trade unions were closed. Prohibitions and restrictions on the rights to unionize and collective bargaining were imposed. The tools of the unions to claim workers' rights and their power to bargain collectively were seized. As a result of the systematic attack on labor by the state and capital, moreover, the production process and working class were fragmented. A structural unemployment problem and normalization of job insecurity posed a threat to the workers and pacified them. With a strong ideological campaign of neo-liberalism, also, the belief in the collective interest and the power of the working class and, therefore, belief in unionization were weakened.

In this process, however, the trade unions have failed on collective bargaining and striking and they have been passive about organizing the struggle. Due to proletarianization and loss of property together with the expansion of flexible forms of employment, all kinds of differences among the laborers had the potential to turn into conflict. In Turkey, as a result, the trade unions had to face dual crises regarding representation. While their actual and potential membership base melted, their power to bargain was also challenged.

In Turkey, the only tool of the organization of the working class is the trade union, and the only basis of struggle is the collective bargaining system. Although the number of workers has increased compared to the 1960s and 1970s, the rate of unionization has decreased. In 1983, the number of unionized workers was 2.5

million, in 1998 1.5 million, and in 2003 700,000.⁵ Following the 1990s, the number of workers subject to collective bargaining was about 829,000 in 1989 which fell to 259,000 in 2005, further decreasing the effect of the bargaining. The number of strikes and the striking workers also fell stably from the 1990s onwards. Between the years 2003-2005, the number of the workers who attended any strike was nearly 2500.⁶

The fall in the ratio of unionization is the consequence of both the neo-liberal transformation and legal prohibitions and enforcement mechanisms against unionization, and also the crisis of representation of the trade unions. Trade unions' lack of power, strict bureaucracy, decadence, vertical organizational structure and lack of communication with the members feed this crisis of the unions. Due to these internal factors, the neo-liberal campaign against the trade unions has gained acceptance among the workers themselves because of the internal factors (Uçkan & Kağnıcıoğlu 2009, 36).

To begin with, the rural-urban migration starting from the 1950s and 1960s created a group of people, who remained in the middle of both peasantry and modernity in the cities. The absence of feeling of belonging to the city and increasing poverty with the transformation in the 1980s corroded the solidarity relations of these migrants with their families, relatives and townspeople in the city. They tried to compensate for the deficiency of state services through ethnic or religious organizations. All these processes prevented the emergence of a form of politics and solidarity based on social class (Uçkan 2005, 64).

With the neo-liberal attack on ideologies based on class, and the emphasis on the individualistic approach, which is based upon self-confidence and acting collectively only due to instrumental reasons, corroded the tendencies of unionization (Uçkan 2005, 70-71). In two studies made with the workers in the

5. http://www.sendika.org/yazi.php?yazi_no=381

6. http://www.sendika.org/yazi.php?yazi_no=3408

manufacturing industries in Eskişehir and Kocaeli, the majority of the workers defined themselves on the basis of their religious or ethnic identities, rather than that of social class (Urhan & Selamoğlu 2008, 180; Uçkan & Kağnıcıoğlu 2009, 45).

Secondly, the power and efficiency of trade unions regarding the protection of workers' rights is limited in the eyes of the workers. Although the trade union has a positive image especially for the workers without job security or a union, the workers tend not to believe that trade unions are powerful enough to provide its members with security against unemployment. According to a study made in İstanbul and Kocaeli (Urhan 2005, 77), more than half of the workers working in the manufacturing industry think that trade unions do not struggle to protect and develop workers' rights.

Parallel to that, the institutions that the people in Turkey trust most are the military (89.6%), the presidency (69.8%), and Turkish Grand National Assembly (63.7%) according to research done in 2008 (Uçkan & Kağnıcıoğlu 2009, 46). The most trusted institutions for the workers were similarly military forces, the presidency and law courts according to research done in Eskişehir in 2008, while the workers had an undecided and negative attitude towards trade unions (Uçkan & Kağnıcıoğlu 2009, 47).

Third is the pragmatic, cautious and reconciliatory relations of the unions with the state. In Turkey unions emerged as institutions within the system, under state control, rather than ideological institutions, as in some parts of Europe. As a result, trade unions in Turkey tried to remain in good relations with the biggest employer, namely the state; and tried to produce solutions by mutual consent rather than putting pressure on the state (Kutal 1997, 262; cited in Urhan 2005, 68). These defensive tendencies of trade unions and their dependence on the state caused the decrease in trust in trade unions.

Related to that point, distrust in unions is also related to the organizational structure within them. In Turkey, trade unions have a centralist and vertical structure which is not open to participation. This, together with the desire of union leaders to remain in their position, causes serious problems for intra-union democracy. When the exclusionary representation tendencies of trade unions, which aim at keeping their own members in their body are added to these two, the ratio of unionization decreased (Urhan 2005, 68-70).

Fifthly, the information of the non-unionized laborers about unions is limited because the source of information is membership. This causes, in addition to lack of knowledge, misinformation and prejudices about unions which are more difficult to erase. Although the workers should tend to be unionized, due to both fear of losing their job and their ignorance about unions, they could not be unionized (Urhan 2005, 74-75).

The ineffective and pragmatic structure of the trade unions in Turkey came to light during TEKEL resistance.⁷ The struggle was pushed off on to the TEKEL workers themselves, who were left alone by the unions and confederations as well as the leftist movement. While Hak-İş and Memur-Sen (Confederation of Public Servants Trade Unions) took a pro-government stance, the temporary protests of Türk-İş and other confederations, such as ‘starting work 1-2 hours late’, were not effective. The support of trade unions therefore remained at the level of logistics (Bürkev 2010, 20-21).

Last but not least, the de-unionization efforts of the employers and violation of the right to unionization in practice feed the workers’ distrust in trade unions. In Turkey, ILO contract no 98 regarding organization and collective bargaining was accepted in 1952, and also ILO contract no 87 regarding freedom of union and

7. As a result of the privatization of the alcohol and cigarette departments of TEKEL in 2008, many units of production were closed and nearly 80% of the workers were laid off. Those workers became unemployed before retirement, and it was suggested by the government they be sent to public entities under 4/C status. That meant they would work with temporary labor contracts, minimum wages, and without using their acquired rights. TEKEL workers rejected working under 4/C status and they started a 78-day struggle in Ankara for their rights, rejecting therefore negotiation with the government about the conditions under 4/C status.

protection of the right to organization was accepted in 1992. In 2004, in addition, the supremacy of international over national law was accepted. However, a strong resistance against unionization has existed in Turkey in the sense that the right to unionization of those except for wage earners has not been recognized, and preventions of the public servants' right to strike have continued (Çelik 2009, 163; cited in Taşkıran 2011a, 3).

In addition to violation of international contracts, physical violence against unionized workers, severance and discrimination due to reasons of membership of a union, the prevention of union protests by the government and / or employers are among the common practices in Turkey (Köse 2009, 383 in Taşkıran 2011a, 4). Each year, more than 10 thousand workers are fired from their jobs because of their membership of unions under DİSK and Türk-İş which is a legal right (Bakır & Akdoğan 2009, 92-93 in Taşkıran 2011a, 5). Producing vilifying discourses about unions and union activities is also another common strategy of employers to control and dissuade the workers from unionizing (Bakır & Akdoğan 2009, 90 in Taşkıran 2011a, 11). Taşkıran (2011a, 11) in research done in a public hospital with 30 subcontracted cleaning workers observes that workers are discouraged from unionizing through discourses about the political aims of the union which are composed of Kurdish and leftist unionists. She also writes that increasing the workload of the unionized workers, constantly changing their unit, blacklisting the workers, and threatening not to renew the workers' labor contract are other strategies to intimidate the workers (Taşkıran 2011a, 11-12).

Parallel to that, the stance of the Justice and Development Party during the TEKEL resistance was towards pressuring and isolating the TEKEL workers, indeed. Taking courage from the weak appearance of workers' movements, the government kept its threats alive throughout the whole process. In the cities, the organization of Justice and Development Party developed a siege policy against the workers and their families (Bürkev 2010, 22).

In the light of the discussions above, it can be said that the absence of trust is the most important reason for the workers not to unionize. This issue is caused by both external factors such as unemployment and job insecurity which weaken the power and efficiency of trade unions, and more importantly, the internal factors of trade unions which drag the workers to uncertainty. This indicates a need for change in the organization of trade unions in order to produce quick and effective solutions to the flexibility and insecurity of the labor market and to re-develop the workers' trust in them.

2.3 Expansion of Subcontract Work in Turkey

Subcontracting is a flexible form of employment which has been increasingly adopted by both private and public sectors around the world and in Turkey. It is a way for the employers to maximize profits under high competition because there are significant differences between the subcontracted workers and the regular employee in terms of wages, worker's health and safety, working conditions and social rights, as Gökbayrak argues (2008, 118-120). The expansion of subcontracting practice first of all damages job security which discourages the subcontracted workers from demanding their rights due to fear of losing their jobs. Secondly, job insecurity resulting from subcontracting practice also affects negatively the ratio of unionization among the subcontracted workers. Thirdly, because of de-unionization, the subcontracted workers are not subject to collective bargaining so they earn only the minimum wage and cannot benefit from overtime pay and perquisites. Their social insurance charges are also not paid regularly. Fourthly, subcontracting decreases the standards of workers' health and safety and creates vulnerability to risks at the workplace. The fragmented structure of the production process, lastly, causes fragmented relations among the workers, and decreases solidarity among them.

Today, as a result, in Turkey as in the other parts of the world, subcontracting has been increasingly adopted in both private and state sectors and not only in auxiliary works but also the main works of the institutions and companies.

In Turkey, subcontracting has been among the most important and commonly used tools to use a cheap and de-unionized labor force (Şen 2006, 11). Throughout the 1980s, subcontracting practice increased in both the private and public sector. In the 1990s, not only the auxiliary works but also main works of private and public institutions started to be given to subcontractor companies (Koç 2001, 3-7). It can also be said that subcontracting as a form of precarious employment has been institutionalized through legal regulations. Although Labor Law 4857 can be said to limit the application of subcontracting by stipulating certain terms, the flexible and abstract expressions regarding those conditions are open to exploitation.

According to law number 4857, a subcontractor is defined as anyone who undertakes to carry out work in *auxiliary tasks* related to the production of goods and services or in a certain section of the main activity due to operational requirements *or* for reasons of technological expertise in the establishment of the principal employer (Labor Law 4857). In that phrase, there is no condition for one employer to use a subcontractor for its auxiliary works (Güzel 2010, 24-25). Similarly, in the continuation of the sentence, the phrase "...due to operational requirements *or* for reasons of technological expertise", is a subjective and uncertain phrase which can have many different interpretations. Güzel and Şen argue that it is not necessary for three of the conditions to exist at the same time for some work to be given to a subcontractor (Güzel 2010, 22-23; Şen 2006, 92-94). In that case, moreover, subcontracting may easily be legalized on the basis of the "due to operational requirements" condition in that article, because the logic of the capital accumulation is maximum profit with lowest investment and subcontracting practice gives employers this opportunity by decreasing the costs of labor force.

The uncertain and flexible phrases regarding subcontracting practice in Labor Law are insufficient to impose sanctions in favor of the workers over the companies and public institutions. While in the private sector subcontracting practice both increased and expanded to the main tasks of companies from the

second half of the 1980s onwards; in the public sector, it was increasingly adopted both in auxiliary and main tasks (Koç 2001, 11-12).

In the public sector, the number of the subcontracted workers' was 174,857 in 2010. Only in health sector, the number of subcontracted workers was 62,127, while this rose to 119,800 in 2011, which became 150 thousand when the university hospitals were added.⁸ In 2010, in the Ministry of Health there were 108,242 subcontracted workers. It was followed by the Social Services and Child Protection Agency with 10,239 workers and by the General Directorate of Highways with 7,429 workers. In the municipalities, there were 1.5 million subcontracted workers which constituted 22% of the total labor force. In only one of the subcontractor companies among 17 in the Ankara metropolitan municipality, there were 4,000 subcontracted workers.⁹ Among the 43,973 educational institutions under the Ministry of National Education, 26,425 of them have no permanent workers (DİSK-AR, January 2011).

The private sector, on the other hand, has a darker picture regarding subcontracting practice. In Tuzla, 27,000 workers among 30,000 in total are subcontracted. 71.4 % of the shipbuilding sector has been subcontracted. In the construction sector, 1.1 million among 1.5 million workers are subcontracted.

In total, subcontracting practice has expanded to 60 % of all the sectors. According to the data from April 2012, in Turkey there are 498,000 subcontracted workers in the public sector, while there are 320,000 in private sector.¹⁰ The expansion of subcontracting practice in the public sector reflects the fact that the social state has been fading, and even the main works of the state are being done with the logic of profit maximization.

8. <http://www.tekgida.org.tr/Oku/5269/Rakamlarla-Turkiyenin-Isci-Gercegi-3>

9. http://www.genel-is.org.tr/diger_incele.php?id=MzQ3

10. <http://www.kamusirketpersonelleri.com/tr/?efirmam=haberana&HaberID=203&KatID=10&SubCatID=7>

The same logic also approaches the precautions of workers' health and safety as elements of cost. Within that context, the expansion of subcontracting practice increased the fatalities among workers. Between 1988 and 2008 in Turkey, 30,000 workers died at workplace although protective technical opportunities developed (Çelik 2008, 141). Gökbayrak (2008, 119), in her article about the privatization of public services, also indicates that the ratios of the workplace accidents among the subcontracted workers in the municipalities are higher than for the other employees. She says that the subcontractor companies in the municipalities are devoid of basic protection and control mechanisms in terms of workers' health and safety and workplace doctors, and a significant portion of the subcontracted workers are unaware of these mechanisms (Gökbayrak 2006; cited in Gökbayrak 2008, 119).

Despite the obvious negativities of subcontracting practice in terms of workers' rights, it has been facilitated in Turkey, as required by the logic of neo-liberalism. 'The simultaneous existence of the three conditions' has been intended to be changed to 'the existence of one of the conditions' with the Law Draft on Occupational Health and Safety prepared in 2010 (Taşkiran 2011a, 6). If that this draft is accepted, subcontracting practice, which is already widespread in both private and public sector will expand further and more rapidly. The National Employment Strategy 2012-2023, aims to eliminate the separation between the main employer and subcontractor, in order for the subcontracted workers to be subject to the rights of collective bargaining. However, this does not change the dominant tendencies of the law makers, which is to institutionalize job insecurity.

In the light of all these discussions, it can be said that the development of subcontracting practice following the transformation in the 1980s is a result of the return of the basics of wild capitalism. In that context, it has been used in an accelerating manner in Turkey, to increase profits by decreasing cost of production and to break the collective power of the working class by de-unionizing it. As a result, it has brought significant losses of social rights and

worsened the working conditions for the subcontracted workers. The proposed regulations, on the other hand, do not seem to ameliorate the rights and working conditions of subcontracted workers.

2.4 Literature on the Working Class and Class Encounters in Turkey

The studies regarding the workday experiences of workers in Turkey are very limited in number. The academic literature about the working class in Turkey either deals with trade unions and political organization of workers or is concerned with the development of working class movements and unionization within a historical context. What these two have in common is that they focus on the organized workers and working class movements, rather than the everyday life practices of workers (Yazıcı, 1996; Koç, 1998; Güzel, 1993; Sülker, 2002; Sülker, 2004; Sülker, 2004; Yaraşır, 2006; Akkaya, 2008). The majority of the studies reflect the dominant working class perception which is limited to the organized segments of the working class examined vis-à-vis capitalism's dynamics.

Differing from these studies, the study of Quataert and E. J. Zürcher (1998) is a detailed history of labor which focuses both on the unionized working class and the unorganized workers, and also both on the small sized production sector workers as well as workers in large factories, within the period from 1839 to 1950. In addition, the works of Boratav (2004), and Nichols & Suğur (2005) are directed toward understanding the changes for and the reactions of labor to the changing dynamics of capitalism and the changes in the big picture of the distribution of resources, based on research in İstanbul in the former and in the seven biggest factories/companies in Turkey in the latter.

Out of the dissatisfaction caused by the fact that the research on the working class in Turkey has remained limited to the organized working class mainly working in the big-scale factories, some other academic studies have been born. (Geniş 2006, Özügürlü 2008, Berber 2003, and Koçak 2009). The study of Geniş (2006) aims to involve different segments of the workers into his analysis while Özügürlü

(2008) emphasizes the role played by local production and the workers there within the process of the globalization of capitalism.

Studies concerning the experience of the class encounters in Turkey are also limited in number. Directly related with class encounters in Turkey, the studies about the experiences of household cleaning women regarding the encounter with the middle class employer women (Kalaycıoğlu & Tılıç 2000, Bora 2005, Özyeğin 2005), the series of articles written by Erdoğan concerning class encounters in Turkey (2000, 2010a, 2010b, 2012a, 2012b, 2012c), and the study of Erdoğan et al. (2007) about urban poverty can be counted.

Kalaycıoğlu and Tılıç (2000) examine the relationship between the charwomen and their employer women in the household cleaning service. They argue that urban, middle class women prefer to transfer domestic work for money to another woman, who is generally rural, uneducated and unqualified, in order to equalize their conditions in the labor market to that of men.

They start their study with an examination of the position of women in the labor market and assert that women are pushed into the informal sector due to crises of capitalism. The women who migrated from rural to urban areas initially held on to their patriarchy; however when the family became impoverished, they had to work in the labor market. Since they did not have the necessary qualifications and educational capital demanded by the market, they had to work in the informal sector.

Household cleaning service in particular has a specific form of employment, that is, in the private area of the middle class women. In that sense the relation between the charwomen and the middle class women is not an entirely rational labor relation. In the specific cultural tradition of Turkey, they conceptualize this relationship as a 'pseudo-kinship relation'. Within this context, the charwomen are sensitive about humiliation rather than heavy working conditions and they expect to be trusted and seen as family. In that sense they conclude that the

modernization process in Turkey is contradictory rather than being a linear process. These rural women experience both wage labor which is the basic feature of modernism, and at the same time they apply tradition in the sense that they experience their relationship with employer women in a paternalist way as a pseudo-kinship relation.

The class conflict between the two women in that context is latent and finds an expression in the cultural norms and daily practices. Within this context, while the charwomen see their employers as successful on the basis of their educational capital and high status jobs, they reject the legitimacy of middle class values on the basis of cultural and moral values.

In terms of patriarchal gender roles, the writers argue that working in the labor market does not necessarily change the domestic division of labor. Since domestic work is still seen as women's work, a double-burden on these women's shoulder remains. Charwomen within the same context see their wages unworthy, as additional to that of their husbands. However, working in the labor market makes the domestic decision-making process more democratic.

The study of Özyeğin (2005) also deals with the women, who live in squatter houses and janitor flats, working in the household cleaning service. She agrees with Kalaycıoğlu & Tılıç in the sense that the duality of modern/traditional is not sufficient to analyze the specific and complex process of modernization in Turkey. Janitory does not allow the peasant migrants to modernize, reminding them their place by stigmatizing them. Household cleaning service is not entirely modernized either, and the process of transition of peasant women to working class women is a complex one, which has not been completed. She argues that the charwomen and the employer women do not permit the establishment of rationalized labor relations by sharing the assumption that domestic labor is carried out for love not for money.

Within this context, the middle class employer women invest their labor and time in hygienic areas of domestic work such as cooking and child care, while the dirty work based on brute force is left to the charwomen. However, charwomen resist this kind of polarization through their efforts to be seen as the chamberlain of the house rather than a traditional servant or proletarianized cleaning worker, which shows similarity to their demands to establish a pseudo-kinship relation.

Last but not least, regarding household cleaning services, Bora (2005) examines their role in the establishment of different forms of femininity. Within this context, she argues that different femininities (re)produce their subjectivity in their relations in the daily experience within the context of household cleaning. The boundaries are set with references to body politics, discourses about hygiene, and perceptions of morality. In this negotiation process of establishment of subjectivities, the symbolic capital of the charwomen is constituted by resourcefulness, prudence, and self-sacrifice vis-à-vis parasitic, lazy, wasteful, and unskilled middle class women.

What is called the ‘imaginary kinship relation’ by Kalaycıoğlu and Tılıç is called maternalist strategies by Bora, according to which the middle class woman acts as a mother or sister because it is an intimacy work. However, Bora observes that these strategies have been replaced by difference strategies based on distance and avoidance of physical contact as a result of the individualization of middle class women. In both of them, the relations between the charwomen and employer women are in the context of class differences; however, in the former these differences are latent while in the latter they are underlined. This refers to the transition of the experience of class hierarchies in Turkey against the lower classes.

Erdoğan (2000) observes a similar transition of social hierarchies based on the transition from the fact that equerry practice had once made a wound in the public conscience to the accelerating tendencies of lower-middle classes to employ charwomen in Turkey. He argues that class relations are more and more relations

of smell, based on the emerging need of the middle classes to underline hygiene as a result of the fact that a working class woman has come too close.

Erdoğan et al. (2007) analyze the impacts of the transition of the way social hierarchies are experienced and expressed on the emotional world of the poor-subalterns in terms of class, gender, nationalism and religiosity. Erdoğan (2007b, 30) explains that the global processes of late capitalism (global market discipline, flexible accumulation, multiculturalism, pluralism, etc.) and the neo-liberal orthodoxy, which is in interaction with these processes, and dominates Turkish politics, have produced new forms of social exclusion and marginalization processes. With the rise of Özalism, the inequalities of income distribution were sharpened, social insurance and welfare expenditures fell dramatically, and social policies and programs were damaged. On the other hand, efforts have been made in order to naturalize social and class hierarchies. As a result, the egalitarian-just elements of cultural heritage have been dissolved and excluded from the political and cultural conscience. These processes have reproduced the socially peripheral position of subalternity in a specific way.

Within the context of transformation of class encounters in Turkey, Erdoğan chases the traces of the sharpening tone of social hierarchies in the guarded communities, media, public schools, social networking sites and the memoirs of capitalists. In his first article, entitled 'The Daughter of the Doorman' (2010a), he refers to the pressure upon the working classes to speak with middle class language as a result of the sharpening tone of social hierarchies.

In his third article, entitled 'The Intellectual and (Cleaning) Woman' (2010b), he examines the shameless expressions of social inequalities by the intellectuals as a result of rising class elitism. He reminds the reader that class relations are smell relations based on the fact that the intellectuals or capitalists (2012c) think firstly of smell when they are to think about working classes.

In his fourth article, about public schools (2012a), he mentions about the fact that as a result of the commodification of educational apparatus, education has lost its function to be a means of moving up the social ladder. The neo-liberal logic is internalized in the public schools in which the students are divided on the basis of their families' income. This re-establishes the dangerous image of the lower classes even in the corridors of public schools. In his fifth article, he analyzes how the envisagement of the bourgeoisie is shaped within the context of the transition of class relations in Turkey.

This transition has significant consequences for the representations of the working class of themselves and the others. The traditional discourse of the working class based on the dualities of inside/surface, soul/appearance concerning the subalterns has been the basis of folk narratives and Yeşilçam movies. Accordingly, the subaltern has an invisible inner beauty, ability, and intelligence (Erdoğan 2007b, 38). However, with the neo-liberal transition, the working classes started to lose their inner beauty. Moreover, the schema based on the duality of soul/appearance has been replaced by images of dirt, bad smell, and crime and danger concerning the working class. In his article about 'apaches' (2012b), he sees a break in the discourses of the working class, as a result of the sharpening tone of class hierarchies, since Apaches accept the dominance of appearance vis-à-vis the soul.

Erdoğan argues that the minds of the lower classes are not yet completely captured by the dominant ideology. In order to understand the representations of social hierarchies in the minds of the urban poor, the study of Erdoğan et al. (2007) analyzes the hidden injuries the social inequalities and hierarchies caused in the poor, and the relations of the poor with the political processes on the basis of the narratives of the poor themselves. With the transition of images about poverty and the poor and their association with dirt and danger, the symbolic violence of social hierarchies increased for the poor. However, the minds of the poor are not entirely captured by the dominant images, and they refer to morality and good manners vis-à-vis the economic and educational capital of 'the rich'.

Within the same context, in the studies about class encounters, the writers emphasize the routine resistance (Özyeğin 2005, 166), arts of resistance (Bora 2005, 178) and tactics (Erdoğan 2007b, 39-43) of the lower classes in order to protect their respectability. Accordingly, the lower classes escape without leave through lying, taking revenge, gossiping, pretending to obey, betrayal, showing patience until their work is done, endurance, dividing the self as the real person and as a performing individual, etc. What all of these tactics have in common is that they emphasize the active role of the lower classes in their relations with the upper / middle classes although their tactics do not change the underlying contradiction between the dominant and the subordinate.

In the light of the arguments of these studies, we may claim that class hierarchies have been sharpened in Turkey after the neo-liberal transition starting in the 1980s. This transition has paved the way for a dual process in terms of class encounters. First, as a result of the transition in the labor market, precarious forms of employment have expanded to absorb the labor of the unqualified lower classes migrating from rural areas. The cities were reconstructed based on a physical separation between lower classes and middle / upper classes. Not only were the districts of working classes and middle/upper classes separated during this process, but also common places in which these classes would encounter and interrelate with each other were almost completely destroyed. (Gürbilek 2001, 68-69).

The second process was about the transition in the cultural reflections regarding class hierarchies and the working class, who started to be seen as invaders in the cities and are more and more associated with dirt, bad smell, and crime. Within this context, the moral weapons of the subalterns based on the egalitarian elements in traditional culture, such as conception of all people's being servant to the same God in heterodox Islam, have been weakened (Erdoğan 2000). This increases the symbolic violence of class hierarchies for the working class.

2.5 Concluding Remarks

In this chapter, the transitions both in the labor regime and in the experiencing of class hierarchies in Turkey have been my main focal points. Within this context, I have discussed how precarious forms of employment and in particular subcontracting practice have been more and more applied both in public and private sectors, and the legal restrictions have been eliminated in Turkey. Both internal and external obstacles also prevented the workers from developing trust in unionization and collective action. De-unionization of new forms of employment and violence of employers and the government against the unionized workers as well as decadence of trade unions based on their pragmatic cooperation with the state, and inadequacy to communicate with the workers paving the way for the emerging prejudices of the workers were important obstacles to unionization. These obstacles make the workers more powerless vis-à-vis market norms which have been more and more insecure.

The transition initiated by neo-liberal logic has also changed the way class hierarchies are experienced in Turkey. As the working class becomes insecure and de-unionized and loses its acquired rights, its respectability has also been damaged. Within this context, the literature concerning the transition of social class encounters in Turkey has been briefly examined. Accordingly, the neo-liberal transition has brought a significant change in the mentality that rules the way class differences are experienced and expressed in Turkey. The lower classes are more and more associated with dirt, bad smell and danger in contrast to traditional schema based on separation between soul and appearance emphasizing their inner beauty, which was the core of the folk narratives. This transition has weakened the symbolic power of the moral weapons of subalterns, and the symbolic violence of class differences has started to be felt more strongly by them.

Therefore we may conclude that the main reason behind the fact that the working class has become more insecure in terms of workers' rights, more defenseless and

powerless vis-à-vis the market conditions and less respectable in the eyes of society is the neo-liberal transition. The expansion of precarious forms of employment, losses of acquired rights, de-unionization on the one hand and negative images attributed to them on the other are the indicators of this transition, not the results of it. Within this context, it is important to emphasize the ways the working class in Turkey resists accepting the legitimacy of social hierarchies, since the neo-liberal transition has not ended yet. The following two chapters will discuss the impacts of this transition on the METU campus and the relevancy of negative images about the lower classes with an emphasis on the subcontracted cleaning workers' moral weapons.

CHAPTER III

THE SUBCONTRACT LABOR REGIME IN METU DORMITORIES

Job insecurity has become the principal characteristic of precarious forms of employment which are the only choice for the lower classes migrating from rural areas due to financial reasons. Therefore job insecurity, which has become chronic for the people in this study, needs to be analyzed with its effects on these people's emotional world. This chapter, in this sense, will begin with an elaboration of the labor regime on the METU campus, with a historical perspective. Then, the subcontracted workers' thoughts and feelings about the dominance of insecure jobs and fear of job loss in their lives will be examined. The fragmentation and stratification necessitated by the nature of subcontracting practice and despotic control mechanisms at METU will also be discussed within the context of their damage to the trust and solidarity feelings among the workers in a way to make the working conditions heavier. Lastly, the effects of this general context on the future dreams and hopes of the subcontracted workers will be mentioned.

3.1 Historical Background of Labor Regime in METU

The neo-liberal transformation starting in the 1980s has brought negative consequences in terms of the labor rights and working conditions at METU as well as in Turkey. Before the 1980s, all the workers worked as staff of METU either permanent or temporary. The contract of the latter was made for one year and renewed every year. The workers were unionized under Sosyal-İş and they were subject to collective bargaining; their wage was more than that in the Central Bank, and they could use all the rights to compensation and annual leave.

In January 1983, however, all the permanent academic and administrative workers were forced to resign first and then to pass to public servant status or to leave. In this period, 400 people submitted their resignations from METU. Those who stayed lost their rights to collective bargaining, and their wages decreased.

During the 1990s, a despotic regime of labor in the sense discussed in the previous chapter started to be established on the METU campus. Subcontracting practice entered the campus initially in works such as cleaning and tea making. A limited number of workers were employed in the cleaning work of the departments and they were contracted for one year. They were forced to quit at the end of the year, and then to re-apply. This removed the right to compensation and annual leave.

In the first half of the 2000s, there were mass lay-offs in METU during summer times. The subcontracted workers were given leave without pay and some of them might not be called back in the new semester. Those who stayed on the campus in summer time on the other hand were sent to several places on the campus different than their own regular workplace and worked without social insurance during summer time. After the protest march of the subcontracted workers in 2009, which will be discussed below in detail, there have no longer been mass lay-offs but rather workers were sent to different places on the campus and forced to work without social insurance in summer time.

In 2003, the condition to have graduated from at least high school and to attend an interview to be employed as subcontracted cleaning worker was first started. Before that time, workers of all levels of education were employed just by filling in a form, in case of the need for cleaning workers. After 2003, however, interviews by the directorate of dormitories and the chief of internal services started.

Until 2005, there was only one subcontractor company in the 17 METU dormitories. In 2005, this company lost its tender, and the workers of this

company were laid off after they were paid compensation. After that, this company became responsible only for the EBI dormitories operated by the METU Foundation. Another subcontractor company won the tender and became responsible for all the other dormitories.

There have been two subcontractor companies responsible for these dormitories since 2005. The second subcontractor company, however, has been changing its name or one of its business partners and re-opening every year under a different name, forcing the workers to renew their job applications. This kills the workers' right to compensation and annual leave since the time they have worked cannot accumulate. The first company on the other hand continues to give the workers their right to annual leave; however, it no longer pays their compensation pension.

During summer 2009 the subcontracted workers of the company, responsible for all the dormitories except for EBI ones, organized a protest march throughout the campus because they were not allowed to use their accumulated annual leaves. After the march, 5 days casual leave, which became 9 days with the weekends, were given to the workers as a temporary solution. The workers also took the university and the subcontract company to court. Although they could not gain their annual leave right, and they were fined 1,200 TL each to both the university and the subcontractor company, the court's decision was significant in the sense that it found the Rectorate of METU conjointly responsible as the main employer.¹¹

Subcontracting practice has important consequences on the METU campus in terms of the solidarity and collectivity of the workers. It has divided the labor force into two, namely the regular employees (memurlar) –who work under METU- and subcontracted workers (şirket elemanları) –who work for the subcontractor company- similar to a distinction between core and peripheral labor force.

11. Public Declaration of Middle East Association of Instructors, October 2010.

Subcontracted workers are not allowed to use the sports center, cafeteria or nursery school or to have a sticker for their cars. More importantly, they are not allowed to use the medical center on the METU campus. We have said that subcontract work brings negative conditions to the workers in terms of their health and workplace safety, since workers' health is a subject of savings within the logic of capital. The most extreme example of this general tendency has been seen in the Tuzla shipyards and the deaths of subcontracted workers.¹² METU campus is not immune to this general tendency. Accordingly subcontracted workers are prohibited from using the medical center on the campus. Before subcontracting, there was a doctor working under contract in the medical center for the cleaning workers. However, after subcontracting began, there has been one doctor who comes only at the lunch breaks on Tuesdays and Thursdays for the subcontracted workers.

Some workers told me that they were given medical attention as emergency cases. Akif told me that when EMSA was the only subcontractor company on the campus, laundry bleach poured on his eye and he was taken to Atatürk Hospital by the ambulance of the medical center after the initial medical intervention there. Gülenay also said that she used to use the emergency service in MEDİKO at the time. However, Dilge told me that a cabinet door in a dormitory room recently fell on the head of one cleaning worker and the medical center on the campus did not do anything, and she was taken to another hospital by her friends. Şükriye, who has an atrial septal defect¹³ in her heart, is therefore right to worry about their deprivation of health service on the campus:

12. According to the report prepared by the Tuzla Shipyards Region Monitoring and Investigation Commission, which is available at <http://www.ikkistanbul.org/site/downloads/tersaneler.pdf>, in the Tuzla shipyards, 90 % of the main work is done by the subcontractor companies. As a result, workers' health and workplace safety are provided in cheap and improper ways. As a result, between 2001 and 2008 years, 44 subcontracted workers lost their lives in workplace accidents in the Tuzla shipyards.

13. Atrial septal defect is characterized by a defect in the interatrial septum allowing pulmonary venous return from the left atrium to pass directly to the right atrium.

“Mesela sađlıktan yararlanamıyoruz biz burda. Varınca řirketsin, bakmıyoruz diyolar. Geen bana bandırol vermediler řirketsin biz bakmıyoruz diye. Peki, burda ama sađlık kuruluđu bi tek bura var. Hadi dűřtűm, acil kanamalı geldim, kafam kanıyo, n’apcaksın? Bakmıycaksın. Mesela bu benim kafama ok takılıyo.”¹⁴

These contradictory narratives of the workers show that there is no fixed regulation about the subcontracted workers’ health and safety in METU. In addition, Dilge, who has close friends on the information desk in the medical center, told me that she heard that one of the head doctors in the medical center recently said that he would not examine the subcontracted workers so they had better not come there. It can therefore be claimed that the regime has been getting more and more discriminatory towards the subcontracted workers.

In addition to these discriminating regulations, the regular employees had priority to use the personnel buses vis-à-vis the subcontracted workers, as will be discussed in detail in the following chapter. METU provides all its employees with the facility of personnel buses which brings them to METU in the mornings and take them back to their places after work. In return for this service, a certain amount of the wage of only the subcontracted workers is cut whereas the other employees do not pay.

Initially, there was no written regulation about any right given to the regular employees to use the buses primarily, but it evolved to the emergence of a *de facto* priority in time. Objections by the subcontractor company to this priority based on the demands of subcontracted workers, and even a physical fight between one subcontracted worker and a regular employee, as witnessed by some interviewees, followed. After that the METU administration, as a solution, gave priority to the regular employee in using the buses. This priority was abandoned after complaints by the workers of the subcontracted company; however, the de

14. “For example, we cannot use medical center here. When we go, they say ‘you are subcontracted, we do not examine you’. Last year they didn’t give us banderole because they were not examining us. Well, here Mediko is the only health institution. Say I fell and came to Mediko bleeding, what will you do? You won’t examine me. This worries me a lot.” řűkriye, interviewed at METU, 2011.

facto priority of the regular employee still remains. İsmail, who has been working in the METU dormitories for fifteen years, compares the previous regime of labor in METU with that after subcontracting:

“Belki eskidenmiş burası iyi. 81’den önce burası Küçük Almanya’yımiş. Çift maaş alıyolarmış. Şimdi bura şey ya sürgün yer! İnsanların hakkını vermiyolar, işte yol parası yok, adam seni hor görüyo, memur geliyo sana şöyle bakıyo, şirket hıh aman... Yazı yazıyo Odtü işte rektörlükten, neymiş şirket elemanları oturamaz işte ne “Yerleşkemizde memura öncelik tanınır”. Bak! Bu ne demek ya! Böyle saçmalık olabilir mi?”¹⁵

As a result of the advent of subcontracting practice on the METU campus, it can be said that the labor force was divided into those who work under the university and those working under the subcontractor company. The latter were subject to great loss of acquired rights, and this loss was only to be increased with the establishment of a despotic subcontracted regime of labor which will be discussed in detail in the following part.

3.2 Despotic Control Mechanisms in the Dormitories

In the first chapter, we mentioned the distinction between relations of production and relations in production developed by Burawoy. Referring to the latter, he had developed a concept of ‘labor regime’ to emphasize the political and ideological factors in the production process which reproduce relations of production. We have also said that labor regimes can be either hegemonic or despotic, in the latter of which coercion overwhelms consent of the workers. Within this context, the current subcontract labor regime in METU campus can be said to have a despotic structure.

In METU campus, the subcontracted work is despotic because first of all subcontracted workers work without job security, rights to compensation or annual leave. These conditions make them subject to the arbitrary demands of the managers. Secondly, the labor force is fragmented between the regular employee

15. “Maybe this place used to be good. Before 1981, this was a small Germany. People used to be paid double wages. Now, it is a place of exile! They don’t give people’s rights, no free transportat, people look down on you, regular employees see you inferior because you are subcontracted. METU Rectorate declares that subcontracted workers cannot sit (in personnel buses), ‘Priority is given to the regular employees in our campus’. Look! What’s that supposed to mean? How can this kind of nonsense exist?” İsmail, interviewed at METU, 2011.

as the core labor force with workers' rights, higher wages, social insurance and job security, and the subcontracted workers as a peripheral labor force. The former are made loyal to METU through making them feel that they are major parts of the university, while the subcontracted workers are not seen as part of the university and they are not allowed to use the facilities on the campus, in addition to violation of their rights. Thirdly, subcontracted workers themselves are fragmented among each other in the campus and the dormitories, and this destroys feelings of solidarity and collectivity among them. Fourthly, workers' unions are prohibited and all kinds of protest are made ineffective for the subcontracted workers because of the workers' fear of losing their jobs. Fifthly, in the dormitories, the students are treated as customers and their satisfaction is achieved at all cost. For that, emotional labor of the workers in addition to cleaning work is expected. The relation between the subcontracted cleaning workers and the students is also controlled from above within the same context of students' satisfaction. Sixthly, the subcontracted workers are the first people to be suspected in case of theft, and this makes them responsible for the security of the dormitories in order not to be blamed. Lastly, in the dormitories, the subcontracted workers are subjected to different versions of strategies aimed at dividing them, such as favoritism and demands to leak information about the other workers to the manager.

Job insecurity constitutes the most despotic element in cleaning work for those workers who have no luxury to lose their jobs due to financial restrictions. This fear revealed itself in the workers' reaction to having an interview with me. Nine workers from different dormitories declined an interview with me on the basis of the fear of losing their jobs. Half of the interviewees were also uncomfortable when answering the questions. Damla was disturbed when she let the dormitory manager's name slip during the interview. Eren, Nurcihan, and Mustafa were also careful about their words regarding the dormitory managers, and they mostly slide over those questions with general, facile answers. Three workers from the EBI dormitories asked me to conduct the interview outside of the dormitory where no one else from their dormitories could see us. Çiğdem jokingly reminded me about

her relatives in other dormitories against her fear from my sharing of her narratives, and said that they were numerous and stronger than me. Almost all the workers were initially cautious when answering the questions and only after my references to other workers' narratives, did they start to share valuable information.

The absence of rights to compensation and annual leave, due to the closure of the subcontractor company and its re-opening under a different name, are despotic features sourced by the very nature of subcontracting practice, as discussed above. In addition to that, subcontracted cleaning workers are set to running errands in addition to cleaning. They are asked to deliver/collect some documents to/from banks, the Post Office, President's Office and other dormitories; to carry equipment; and to do the yard work of the dormitories. Because they do not have job security, and they need this work, they have to do whatever is asked to them.

As Caner says;

“Burda en altta şirket olduğundan dolayı ezilen (taşeron) şirket (çalışanları). Yeri gelir özel işlerini de yaparız, postaneye gideriz, bahçeye bi şey dikilecektir dikeriz, benim işim değil mesela, yapmazsam yapmam. Ama kafayı takarsa takar, yapmak zorundayım.”¹⁶

Akif thinks that working under subcontract at METU is equal to being a slave;

“Bu ODTÜ’de onu da söylüyüm, şirket elemanını kole gibi görüyo. Bunu da not al yani duyulsun. Valla. Aynen öyle yani. Kole gibi görüyo. Bu gadar basit. Gene memuru da görüyo, hepsi! Ya çünkü her şeye adam koşturulur mu yapılacak işe? Ne olursa şirket elemanı. İstedığı gibi kullanıyolar yani. Bu kole olmak daha başka nedir yani?”¹⁷

16. “Here because the subcontractor company is at the lowest level, the subcontracted workers are oppressed. Sometimes we deal with their personal affairs, go to the Post Office, and plant something in the garden. It is not my duty, I may not do it. But (the managers) may be obsessed with me, therefore I have to.” Caner, interviewed at METU, 2011.

17. “At METU, let me tell you that too, and let it be heard, the subcontracted workers are seen as slaves. Take note of this, this be heard. Really. Exactly like this. They see us as slaves. It's this simple. Civil servants, all of them... Otherwise why are subcontracted workers asked to do all things? Whatever happens, call subcontracted workers. They use us as slaves. What else does being a slave mean?” Akif, interviewed at METU, 2011.

In addition to that, subcontracted workers are not usually given leave even for 1 hour, or they are deterred through bureaucratic procedures. Feride for instance told me that because she did not want to cringe with embarrassment in front of the manager making explanations, she did not ask for permission even to go to a parents' meeting at her son's school. Akif is also tired of the irregularity of the daily leave issue;

“O izin konusu da bizim burda sorunlu. Bi izin alıyon. İzin vermiyolar. O ona gonderiyo, o ona... Yazın bi izin alacam bi iki saat. Tee yurtlar müdürlüğüne git. Yurt müdürüne değil yurtlar müdürlüğüne!... Ya işte bu kadar şey, bu şeyler düzensiz yani.”¹⁸

The second feature of despotism in the subcontracted labor regime at METU is the fragmentation of the labor force between a core of civil servants and peripheral subcontracted workers. As Yücesan-Özdemir (2010, 43) argues, subcontracting practice causes fragmentation of the production process which may result in spatial fragmentation or may take place within the same workplace, which is much worse. If the inter-class hierarchies exist in one workplace, the main workers of the main company are subject to hegemonic control mechanisms, while the subcontracted workers are subjected to despotic ones. In the contracts made between subcontractor companies and main companies, therefore, clauses which prohibit the subcontracted workers having a tea break at the same time as the main workers, enter into the premises from the same door as the main employers, and use the same personnel buses often exist (Özveri 2008; cited in Yücesan-Özdemir 2010, 43). Similarly, at METU, the loyalty of civil servants is protected through making them feel that they are the major parts of METU, while subcontracted workers are deprived of campus facilities.

As a result, the relation of the subcontracted workers with their workplace is almost totally limited to their dormitories. Şükriye says;

“Ben hiç bilmiyorum, hiç tanımıyorum. Yemin olsun on senedir Odtü'deyim. Şu anda ottünün neresini bilirim? Rektörlük'ten yurdun

18. “The leave issue is also problematic here. You take permission, they don't give. The manager sends you to someone, that to another. I will take permission for one hour for example. Go to the directorate of dormitories. Not the dormitory manager, to the directorate of dormitories! It is this disorganized here.” Akif, interviewed at METU, 2011.

arasını... Yani yurttan servise, servisten yurda. Başka ottünün herhangi bi tarafını bilmiyorum. Ya hangi bölüm nerde mesela kimya bölümü nerde, elektrik bölümünü hiç birini bilmiyom. Sade ottüde çalışıyo musun? Çalışıyorum.”¹⁹

Thirdly, the subcontracted workers themselves are also fragmented across all the campus and in the dormitories. They work in the dormitories, the academic and administrative buildings, the shopping center, and in METU forest engaged in planting work. This fragmented structure prevents them from developing solidarity relations since they are unaware of each other’s working conditions. The workers in the dormitories also work on their own floors, in isolation from each other and the heavy workload generally prevents them from helping each other. The fragmented organization of work force and the heavy workload in general leave limited time and space for cleaning workers to develop trust and solidarity relations.

Within the dormitories, the subcontracted labor force is also stratified into three, namely the personnel on the information desk, the storehouse supervisors (only in the EBİ dormitories), and the cleaning workers. The personnel on the information desk are subcontracted as well, but they have to be university graduates, unlike the high school graduation condition for the cleaning workers. The personnel are also closer to the managers and even favored and protected by them. Based on their relatively higher educational and symbolic capital, they may treat the cleaning workers as if they are inferior. In seven of the dormitories, the subcontracted workers therefore complained about the superiority feelings of the personnel on the information desk and the storehouse supervisors despite both of these groups being subcontracted. Subcontracted cleaning workers in this context are disturbed by the personnel, who could send them on an errand, reprehend them, and who constantly control the work they do. This fragmented and stratified

19. “I don’t know, don’t recognize anything. I swear I’ve been at METU for ten years. Now, where do I know in METU? Only the places between the rectorate building and the dormitories. I mean from the dormitory to the personnel buses, from the buses to the dormitories. I don’t know any other parts of METU. Which department is where, for example where is the chemistry department or electric department? I don’t know. Only, do you work in METU? Yes, I do.” Şükriye, interviewed at METU, 2011.

organization of the labor force prevents the subcontracted workers from developing class consciousness out of their shared experiences. In other words, although the relations of production distribute the cleaning workers and the personnel on the desk into the same class situation in the sense that Thompson argues (Wood 1982, 49), because of the fragmented and stratified labor regime, a strong class consciousness cannot be developed by the subcontracted workers.

With de-unionized structure of subcontract work, fourthly, the workers are more and more pushed to passivity vis-à-vis the despotic control mechanisms. Adnan talks about the protest march referring to their defenselessness: “Sendikamız olsa daha güçlü çıkardı sesimiz. Yürüyüşte bizi işten çıkarsalar arkamıza bakamadan çıkar gideriz. Hiçbi şey diyemeyiz.”²⁰ In parallel to that, Nurcihan says that being unionized is being powerful and adds: “Taşeronsun. Bak ne diyorum bi konuşuyosun, iki susuyosun... Sendika olsa bu kadar olur mu? Sendika olsa küçük bir haksızlığın olsa gidip sendikaya bildiriyorsun, binlerce insan senin arkandan gelebiliyo seni desteklemek için.”²¹

Thinking that in Turkey, the workers’ union is the most commonly used tool of resistance by the working class, and that discovery of class consciousness grows out of the process of struggle, subcontracted cleaning workers also lose their major tool for the development of class consciousness as a result of de-unionization. This point will be discussed in detail under the third part.

Fifthly, the relations between the subcontracted cleaning workers and the students are subjected to control from above. The students are seen as the customers of the dormitories; their satisfaction must be attained at all cost. In that sense, the

20. “If we had union, our voice would be louder. If they discharge us because of the protest march, we will just leave. We cannot say anything.” Adnan, interviewed at METU, 2011.

21. “You are subcontracted. Look what I’m saying, you speak once but shut up twice. Would it be like this if there was a union? If there is a union, you go and inform the union in case of any injustice, and thousands of people might come to support you.” Nurcihan, interviewed at METU, 2011.

workers are expected to use emotional labor. They are warned about being smiling and kind towards the students, calling them by their names, climbing down and apologizing to the students whenever there is a problem even when they are right. Çiğdem says: “Eski daire başkanı her zaman derdi (öğrenciye) ismiyle hitap edin derdi, hani onun daha ruhunu okşar derdi.”²²

Feride also told me of a student who was disturbed by the noise of vacuum cleaner and reprimanded her. Feride was hurt and talked to the manager, but she received this reply:

“Dedi ki öğrencileri alttan alın dedi. Ders çalışıyorlar, işte finalleri var filan dedi. Sen dedi işte söyle dedi biz haftanın üç günü süpürgeye giriyoruz, girmemizi istemediğiniz zaman kapıya not yazın dedi. Çözümü de buydu! Zaten ben o azarı işitmişim yani bi kere. Söylesem ne söylemesem ne.”²³

The unquestionable priority of the students, who stay in the dormitories for a temporary process, makes the workers feel worthless as a worker of the dormitories.

Within the same context of students’ satisfaction, intimacy between the cleaning workers and the students is aimed at being kept at a minimum level in all the dormitories. In the state dormitories, Demiray dormitories and guest houses, the workers are under direct control of storehouse supervisors, who often check the satisfaction of the students by directly talking to them. The necessity to avoid intimacy is also frequently reminded to the workers by the managers and supervisors. Seyhan says: “Dertleşip, sohbet ettiğimiz öğrenci çok nadir. Öğrenciyle zaten der ki müdürlerimiz çok şey olmayın baştan, samimi olmayın.

22. “The previous head of department always said ‘call the students by their names, this will please them greatly.’” Çiğdem, interviewed at METU, 2011.

23. “She told me not to aggravate the students. She said that they study hard, they have exams, etc. She told me to talk to the student, explain to her that you clean with the vacuum cleaner three times a week, and tell her to write a note on the door if she did not want you to enter her room. That was her solution! I was already reprimanded. It doesn’t matter for me to tell this.” Feride, interviewed at METU, 2011.

Sonu kötü olur der mesela. Sen kendini iyi anlattırısın, içini dökersin ama öğrenci, ne olacağı belli olmaz.”²⁴

In the EBİ dormitories however, there are structural precautions in order to prevent intimacy between workers and students. Accordingly, the floors of the workers are periodically changed so that the worker cannot develop intimate relations with the students. In addition, the students are provided with the power to control the workers through giving randomly chosen students a form for them to evaluate the cleaning workers. The cleaning workers are not told which student is given the form. This leads the students to feel superiority over the workers and puts the workers under constant control decreasing their autonomy. Hatice draws attention to the stress due to being subjected to such a continuous control:

“Çoh iyi birine de veriyo, çoh çoh agresif olana da veriyo, çok temiz birine de veriyo, çoh pasaklı olana da veriyo. Ya şimdi burdaki aslında bu bize karşı bir hahsızlık biliyo musun? Yani çünkü biz o insanların her şeyini yapıyoruz elimizden geldiğince. Ama yani bizi onlara karşı daha çok ezmiş oluyo. O zaman o daha çok hak sahibi oluyo diyo ki haa, bu bana bunu verdiği göre ben bunu denetlerim, iyiyse de kötü derim yani, diyolar yani.”²⁵

There is an apparent difference between the public and private dormitories in terms of perception of the students. While in the public dormitories, the students are still seen as students; in private dormitories they are seen and treated as customers of the dormitories, who pay the price and need to be kept satisfied at all cost. This perception damages the egalitarian elements in the cultural tradition and leaves the workers in the private dormitories limited space to challenge social hierarchies.

24. “The students we have a chat are very rare. Our managers in any case tell us not to be intimate with the students in the first place. Or it will end badly, they say. You may explain yourselves well, and pour your heart out, but they are students, you never know.” Seyhan, interviewed at METU, 2011.

25. “(The manager) may give it to someone good or someone very aggressive, someone tidy or someone very messy. This is unfair to us, do you know? Well, because we do all the things, as best as we can. But (the manager) makes us more inferior vis-à-vis the students. Then they feel superior, and they think ‘since they give me this (form), I am able to control the worker, and evaluate negatively even if the service is good’.” Hatice, interviewed at METU, 2011.

The construction of private dormitories on the campus from late 1990s onwards indicates that METU has been internalizing the changing logic which rules the way class hierarchies are experienced. Similar to the transition of the labor regime based on this logic, the way social hierarchies are experienced has also been changing at METU through structural interventions. Although structural precautions against intimacy between the students and cleaning workers are taken only in private dormitories, we would not be overstating it if we claim that these tendencies are likely to expand to the public dormitories in the future. These tendencies constitute the way METU reflects the general picture in Turkey towards the sharpening tone of social hierarchies.

Sixthly, in the dormitories the cleaning workers are forced to keep the dormitory rooms secure in addition to cleaning because, in case of theft, the managers and students primarily ask them since they have the keys to the rooms. This is also related with the image of the lower classes as criminal and dangerous, which will be discussed in the fourth chapter in terms of class encounters.

Also the hierarchical relationship between the subcontracted workers and the students forces the workers to gain the trust of the students. According to the dormitory rules, the students are seen as customers who pay for their accommodation and their satisfaction must be attained at all cost. Caner told me about a student who told his mother that the cleaning service in his dormitory was bad. A committee from the directorate of the dormitories came to the dormitory to check, and if the student did not confess that he lied because he wanted to stay in an apartment flat, Caner would be fired. This unquestionable priority of the students' satisfaction therefore increases the stress of the cleaning workers and forces them to establish good relations with the students. Caner talks about the necessity of intimacy with the students: "Muhabbet etmezsen, o seni her şekilde kötü görür. Seni hırsız olarak da görür, arsız olarak da görür. Ona bi güvence

vereceksin ki onun odasına girdiğinde o da demiycek yani ya Caner abi böyle bi şey yapmaz.”²⁶

For all the workers, therefore, it is crucially important to be trusted by the students, because they are the first ones to be called by the managers and / or the students in case of theft. As a result, the workers feel the need to introduce themselves to the newcomer students and to explain how and when they work in their rooms. In this context, possibility of theft acts as a despotic control mechanism because of the workers’ fear of being accused of theft.

Last but not least, in the dormitories, the subcontracted cleaning workers are subjected to control mechanisms such as favoritism and spying. Favoritism by the managers towards the personnel on the desk vis-à-vis the cleaning workers, by the personnel especially towards newcomer cleaning workers, and choosing those favored workers as spies are common in almost all the dormitories.

The dormitory managers first of all treat the cleaning workers differently to the other personnel in the dormitories, although both of them are subcontracted. The personnel on the desk and the storehouse supervisors are the managers’ right hand, whereas there is a necessity to avoid intimacy with the cleaning workers. Within this context, Caner told me about their dormitory manager who had intimate relations with them. He continued that his manager received a warning about his intimacy with the cleaning workers in case it might threaten his efforts to be appointed as the core of the managers group: “Bizim müdür yemek yiyodu bizimle birileri buna demiş ki sen demiş bunlarla yemek yiyosun nası demiş şey (kadro) alıcaksın demiş.”²⁷

26. “If you don’t have a chat (with students), they will see you as bad in every way. They will see you as a thief or cheeky. You need to assure them so that they won’t expect you to do anything like that.” Caner, interviewed at METU, 2011.

27. “Our manager used to have lunch with us. Someone had said to him that ‘you eat your lunch with those, how will you be appointed as the core manager’. Caner, interviewed at METU, 2011.

The necessity to avoid intimacy with the cleaning workers is apparent in the different attitudes of dormitory managers towards them and the other personnel in the dormitories. Melek takes offence at not being given value at METU:

“Yalnız zorumuza giden şeyler var. Değer görmüyoruz kesinlikle. Yaptığımız işten dolayı. Sınıf sınıf ayrılır ya. Burda o var. Mesela bi danışma görevlisi değer görüyo ama bi şirket elemanı değer görmüyo. Hâlbuki o da şirket elemanı. Ama yer farkı var.”²⁸

Dilge also says that they are seen as the lowest level not only by the managers but also by the people in general at METU:

“Müdür’anım bize ayrı davranıyo, danışmaya ayrı davranıyo. Onlar bize göre üst kademedede biz alt kademedede olduğumuz için. Yani buranın geneli öyle... Yurttaki çalışanlar erkek yurdunda olsun, bayan yurdunda olsun alt kademe. Gaydeye alınmıyoruz.”²⁹

The dormitory managers show favor to the personnel and the supervisors in return for their loyal service, including collecting information about the workers and the students. Gonca told me about her dormitory manager while she was working on the information desk in a state dormitory, who asked her to bring information about the cleaning workers. When she refused to do so, she says, she was not granted to temporary personnel status.

More commonly, the personnel show favor to some workers in return for their collecting and bringing information about the other workers. Feride talked about one old worker, who was protected by the personnel in return for her carrying information about them to the management. She said that she learnt this fact when that spy worker told something about a familial issue of hers to the personnel. She also observed that that spy worker was always at the desk, could act more comfortably with the personnel and was protected by them although worked less

28. “But there are things that hurt us. We do not see value, definitely, because of what we do. It’s subclassified here. For example, a worker on the information desk sees value but we don’t. However, they are subcontracted too. But there is status difference.” Melek, interviewed at METU, 2011.

29. “The dormitory manager treats us and the personnel in the desk differently. Because they are at a higher level, and we are at a lower level. I mean, the general campus is like this. The cleaning workers in the dormitories, either men or women, are at the lowest level. We are not taken seriously.” Dilge, interviewed at METU, 2011.

than the other workers. Gonca was also reprimanded by the dormitory manager when one of the cleaning workers informed to the manager about her using the computer room in the dormitory during her working hours. After that, she said that she lost her trust in her friends and never shared anything with them again. Similarly, Adnan, Gülsen, Feride, Hatice, Melek and Dilge told me that they could not trust some workers in their dormitories on the basis of their experiences of betrayal.

Some workers also talked about the dominance of the older, more experienced workers over the newcomers. Gülsen, for instance, has been working in her dormitory for more than one year when she was interviewed. She was really tired of the consciously exclusionary and bad attitudes of the older workers towards her. She said:

“Eskilerin sözü geçerli oluyo... Sessiz kalmak zorunda kalıyorsunuz... Bir yıldır çok şeyle mücadele ettim ben burda. Bizim bölümümüzde eski mesela bi ablamız var, onunla mesela çok büyük problemler yaşadım. Çok şey yaptı bana, deterjan vermedi, ben önce bitirdim diye kızdı; faraşımı öğrenciler almış, odada demek ki bi şey kırılmış mesela geri getirmeyi unutmuş; aşağı iniyorum istiyorum, vermiyo, çıkıyo bana 21 odanı tek tek aç, bul diyo mesela... Çok şey ya çok şey. İlk geleni mutlaka eziyorlar. Benden sonra gelen oldu ve yapıyorlar aynı şeyi.”³⁰

In private dormitories, also, Hatice and Melek, who are Sunni, said that there is a division among the subcontracted workers based on religious sects. They said that dormitory managers allowed the distribution of general work based on religious sect by the personnel on the desk. Melek said that they were given the heaviest work by the personnel on the information desk who are Alevi. She also told that once there was a complaint from one student concerning room cleaning, the personnel took the Alevi worker from that room and deliberately sent Melek to the room.

30. “The words of the more experienced workers are more are influential... You have to remain silent... I have struggled with many things here for one year. For instance there is an old worker here. I had serious troubles with her. She did a lot of things to me, didn’t give me detergent, got angry because I finished earlier. The students had taken my dustpan, apparently something was broken and they forgot to bring it back. I went downstairs, asked her; she didn’t give it to me. She said, check all 21 rooms one by one and find yours. Lots of things... They always oppress the newcomers. A new worker came after me, and they are doing the same things to her.” Gülsen, interviewed at METU, 2011.

Those workers, who are favored by the management, as my interviewees had given their names, frowned on having an interview with me. Therefore I did not have an interview with any of them. I estimate that they may have chosen to act in solidarity with the management rather than the cleaning workers in order to obtain more comfortable working conditions. In that sense, I argue that despotic control mechanisms damage solidarity and trust relations among the subcontracted workers.

In the light of all this, it can be claimed that the subcontracted labor regime at the Middle East Technical University uses despotic mechanisms to control and divide subcontracted workers. Due to the fragmentation and stratification of the labor force, the managerial strategies of favoritism and spying and the tiresome of workload, patterns of solidarity are weakened and the workers could not develop class consciousness based on shared experiences. De-unionization and the constant fear of job loss also make the subcontracted workers more defenseless vis-à-vis the despotic mechanisms.

3.3 Job Insecurity and Fear of Job Loss

Job insecurity is the primary feature of precarious forms of employment under the neo-liberal market. These forms of employment are the only choice for those people who migrated from rural to urban areas and could not supply the demands of the labor market because they were not highly educated and qualified. The subcontracted cleaning workers in this study are among those people since they have inherited poverty from their families. In that sense, a separate section about job insecurity, which has become chronic in these people's lives, needs to be written. In this part, the sources of condemnation to job insecurity for the subcontracted cleaning workers, their feelings about job insecurity, and their expectations from a more preferable job will be discussed.

The subcontracted workers fear losing their jobs mainly because of their inherited poverty and low level of education. These workers' inherited poverty and the

absence of good education facilities in their villages have condemned them to the dominance of unsecured jobs, which do not require special qualifications, when they migrated to Ankara.

To begin with, the subcontracted cleaning workers in this study were –with a few exceptions- born into poor, peasant families, in the villages of small towns such as Çankırı, Çorum, Yozgat, Sivas and Kırıkkale or villages in Central or Eastern Anatolia. Most of their parents earned their livings from agriculture and had no possessions to leave to their children. The workers’ parents also had a short-term experience at schools due to poverty and absence of good education facilities in their villages. In this context, the majority of the workers’ fathers were graduates of primary school whereas the mothers were generally uneducated.

As Bourdieu (Bourdieu & Boltanski 1977; cited in Swartz 2011, 252) discusses, educational credential markets have become a new important source of stratification in industrial society by providing vital resources for status distinctions among segments within upper- and middle-class groups. He conceptualizes these changes as a shift from a ‘family’ mode of reproduction to a ‘school’ mode of reproduction where the educational system increasingly replaces families in mediating the class reproduction process (Wacquant 1993b, 27, 32; cited in Swartz 2011, 252).

As the importance of educational credentials in terms of the class struggle increased, therefore, the workers spent longer time at school compared to their parents. Seven of the workers are graduates of primary school, three from middle school, three from high school, seven from vocational high school, and two of them are students at the Open University at the time the interviews were being done. Among them only Şükriye had never gone to school due to health problems. Slightly less than the half of their siblings are graduates of primary school. One third of the workers’ siblings are graduates of high school, vocational high school or open high school. However, their investment in formal education was still limited by financial restrictions.

Accordingly, these workers were obliged to work from their earlier ages. Male workers especially entered the labor market when they graduated from high school. The younger women workers, namely Damla, Seda, Gülenay and Ömür, talked about their obligation to work after high school for financial reasons, and the difficulty of combining work life and formal education. Two older women workers, namely Feride and Gülsen, also said that because they were married they did not continue with university education.

While the male workers worked in many different jobs for varied durations, the women workers worked in one or two different jobs before coming to METU. Cleaning work at METU is the first job experience only for Seyhan (56) who had to work after she divorced her husband, Şükriye (38) and Seda (25). Due to the obligation both to work and to work in precarious jobs, the experience of unemployment was low among the workers, since they frequently had to change their jobs. The duration of unemployment is longer for the married women since they had to suspend work life when they got pregnant until the child was of a certain age.

One of the major features of precarization is the rates of informal employment. In Turkey, according to the data provided by the Turkish Statistical Institution, between 1988 and 2002, the proportion of informal employment was higher than that of total employment in all periods except for between 1992 and 1996 (Çerkezoğlu & Göztepe 2010, 70). The informal sector is an inferior alternative to formal sector employment in terms of labor standards. Workers' wages are generally below the minimum wages and also without legally-required benefits such as social security, workers' compensation or unemployment insurance since there is no official record of employment.

The earlier work experiences of more than two thirds of the workers were within the informal economy. While male workers before coming to the dormitories, worked as casual workers, without insurance and compensation rights as builder's

laborers, electricians, elevator repairmen, furnishers, waiters, painters, and peddlers; women workers worked as cleaners, textile workers, charwomen, secretaries, saleswomen, cooks, tea makers, and product presenters in supermarkets. Within this context, the majority of the workers preferred their work in the METU dormitories compared to their earlier jobs, because they are part of the formal economy at METU. Within the same context, completing social insurance charges was the most central emphasis in the workers' narratives about why they came to METU.

More than two thirds of the workers complained about their earlier work in terms of long working hours, indefinite workload, and absence of social insurance. Dilge worked as charwoman and she counted the heavy workload and absence of social insurance in household cleaning service as the reasons for quitting it. She also talked about one employer, who asked her to wash her bloody panties and after that she never went to her house again. Gülenay also talked about her previous manager when she was a secretary. She said that he asked her to do everything including cleaning, tea making and washing the dishes in addition to her secretarial duties. Gonca was working in a cargo company with higher wages and social insurance before METU, but she said that the working hours were so long, and she found it hard as a woman to get back home safely late in the evenings.

Not all the workers came to METU willingly, on the other hand. Melek had worked as pastry cook but she came to the METU dormitories in order to complete her social insurance charges and be able to retire. Ercan came to METU against his will after the paper factory, in which he was working with higher wages, social insurance and the right to compensation, went bankrupt. Although he was not happy with his wage and deprivation of annual leave and compensation rights at METU, he was grateful for social insurance and the easiness of cleaning work compared to his previous 'male' jobs. Necati was also working in a saw mill before coming to METU and he was earning more although he was uninsured. He came to METU only to complete his social insurance

charges, but he said that he had a wealthier social environment before and he could ask to borrow money in case of need. However, at METU, he could not borrow money from anyone because all of his friends were on the minimum wage. Akif had done casual, uninsured work before, and came to METU in order to be able to complete his insurance charges and retire. He said that he is not happy at METU because cleaning is a female job and does not have the right to compensation and annual leave. However, he was showing patience and enduring these conditions only to be able to retire. Lastly, Gülsen was working in her family's own cleaning company but had to come to the METU dormitories when their company went bankrupt and she and her husband were left unemployed.

Therefore, although the workers are not happy with their heavy working conditions and deprivation of rights to annual leave, compensation and de-unionization at METU, they prefer to remain in cleaning work mainly because of the existence of social insurance. This shows the importance for the subcontracted workers of being part of formal economy. The workers also counted the facility of personnel buses, which leaves transportation expenses in their pockets, the definiteness of working hours and the healthy natural environment and good social environment at METU as the other reasons to remain in cleaning work.

Within the same context, demand for long-term security is central in these workers' narratives. This is because of the fact that inherited poverty and their low level of education have condemned these workers to a constant struggle in life. Within this context, the most important investment is housing and nearly half of the workers had bought their own houses, seven of which were squatter houses, with their savings or more often by obtaining credit from banks. Two of them were living in janitor flats, and the rest were paying rents.

The workers' perception of job security also focused mainly on social insurance premiums and retirement. That perception however did not include regulating working hours and wages. More than half of the workers wanted to see their work in the dormitories as a permanent job from which they could retire. However,

because they were subcontracted, they were not sure about the continuation of their work. Ömür (26) says, for instance: “Buraya kalıcı olarak bakamıyorum, ben bakıyorum ama onlar beni isterler mi?”³¹

Job insecurity is so big a fear for Ercan (33), who has two school-aged children and who is the only wage earner in his family that he is even ready to accept giving up the right to compensation:

“Keşke kalıcı da... Güzel bi şeyler olsa. Mesela kadrolaşma gibi bi şey olsa. En azından bizler de rahatlarız. Hani kadrolaşma olunca da biz de şey gibi ahım şahım bi düzen istemez. Bize göre bi düzen olsun yalnız çıkmama gibi bi şeyimiz olsun. Yani bi en azından tazminatı da geç yani çıkmak için yani çıkartmasınlar.”³²

Şükriye (38), who is uneducated and whose husband is also a subcontracted worker, feels the fear deeply:

“O sürekli aklımızda gelip gidiyoruz saten. Her sabah çantayı alıyorum geliyorum, acaba bi şey derler mi gelecek miyim, çıkacak mıyım mesela ben hep o düşünceyle geliyorum. Şirket sonuçta, kadrolu değilsin. Seni koruyacak bi ne bileyim bi sendikan ney hiçbi şeyin yok. Yani çık deseler çıkarsın.”³³

The fear of job insecurity seems to be proportional to the level of education, age, marital status and gender at first glance. The uneducated, older and male workers, who have school-aged children, fear of losing their jobs most. On the other hand, they are the ones who trust themselves that they could provide subsistence of their family at all cost. Adnan (33), who has two kids and does not want his wife to work, says that job insecurity has been a constant concern for him since his first

31. “I cannot see my job here as permanent. I mean, I can see it but will they want me (permanently)?” Ömür, interviewed at METU, 2011.

32. “I wish it was something permanent... Something good happens. For example, something like becoming permanent workers. At least, we’ll feel more comfortable. Then, we won’t want an excellent organization. If only it will be an organization for us, we won’t be laid off. I mean, we don’t even want compensation, as long as we won’t be laid off.” Ercan, interviewed at METU, 2011.

33. “We come and go always keeping it in mind. Every morning I take my bag and come, will they say something, will I leave, will I remain, for example I always come with that thought. It’s subcontracted in the end, you are not a regular employee. You have nothing to protect you such as a union, etc. I mean, you leave if they tell you to leave.” Şükriye, interviewed at METU, 2011.

day in the METU dormitories. Akif (54), who also has two kids, adds that because of his fear of losing his job, he always tries to do his work perfectly and does not claim his right.

The workers who think that they have some qualifications, who are graduates of vocational high school, and married women whose husbands have a job, on the other hand, fear less losing their jobs compared to the former group. Feride for instance has a certificate of embroidery and typewriting, Melek has a certificate for pastry cooking, Seda (25) was going to courses to be a security guard and was also a student in the Open University, Caner (29) trusts his youth for his ability to earn money in any job and Gonca trusts herself both about being able to find another job and adaptation to every workplace. They all said that they would be able to find other jobs in case of dismissal. Ömür (25) and Çiğdem (34) on the other hand trusted that their husbands work as well and earned more than them.

Although during the interviews these workers said that they do not fear losing their jobs very much, that possibility deeply worries them. Feride, for instance, was constantly asking me if I had heard anything about rumors of dismissal of subcontracted workers in summer time. Çiğdem, although she said that she did not fear losing her job, said later on in the interview: “Sonuçta şirket adına çalışıyoruz. İki dudak arasındayız. Gelme dediği zaman bitmiştir.”³⁴

Although the level of fear changes according to age, education level, marital status and gender, the general picture was that all of the subcontracted cleaning workers have a deep fear of losing their jobs. Their rejections of an interview with me and the interviewees’ obsession with the secrecy of the interviews need to be referred to here as well. They were terrified by the possibility that their dormitory managers might learn that they give me information about the internal structure of the dormitories, and dismiss them.

34. “In the end, we work for the subcontractor company, our future is dependent on their decision. When they tell us not to come again, it’s done.” Çiğdem, interviewed at METU, 2011.

What is worth considering is that fear of losing one's job is constant even for those workers who have been working in the METU dormitories for more than ten years –who constitute more than one third of the interviewees. This fear resulted from job insecurity prevents the workers from developing a sense of belonging to their work. In that context, they could not develop a long-term narrative regarding their work and their lives. This causes 'corrosion of character' to the extent that character reveals itself as loyalty, mutual dependence, making an effort and sacrificing for long-term purposes (Sennett 2010, 10).

The major institution that the workers have as a fulcrum in the absence of job security is a network of relatives and countrymen. Since these workers had to migrate to Ankara for financial reasons generation after generation, in time there emerged a network based on kinship or territory in Ankara. Although this network has been weakened by the rat race in the big city, it is actively used by the workers to find jobs as stated above. The workers found their previous jobs through their family members. Almost all the workers also have come to the METU dormitories via family / kinship network and some of the interviewees are even relatives. Among the interviewees, Akif is Dilge's brother-in-law and Çiğdem is Dilge's daughter-in law. Melek's brother, Ercan's cousin, Hatice's sister and Necati's sister are also workers as subcontracted on the METU campus.

The workers use that network efficiently to look for better jobs as well. Adnan for instance has been waiting for news about work from his brother-in-law who was trying to be the president of the workers' union in a medicine factory within the military. Gonca, Hatice and Feride let their relatives know that they were looking for a better-paid job with more comfortable conditions.

Since it is not possible to subsist on the minimum wage, male workers also do extra work in the evenings and at the weekends such as doormen (Ercan and Mustafa), street traders (Eren), cleaners (İsmail), and security personnel in municipalities (Adnan and Caner). Women workers, on the other hand, save money in the kitchen by using the resources at METU. They bring their lunch

from home and spend no money at METU. They also go for a walk in the campus both in order to get some fresh air of which they are deprived in the city, and to pick fruits and vegetables such as leaves to stuff and healing herbs to take home.

All in all, the situation of “being between two lips” in the workers’ own words, creates fear among the subcontracted cleaning workers due to their inherited poverty and limited level of educational capital. The necessity to earn money, however, makes the workers obliged to work and leaves them not very much choice in terms of job selection. Although the workers complained about their deprivation of rights to compensation, annual leave and unionization, most of them preferred to remain at METU because they were paying social insurance charges regularly, in other words, they were within the formal economy.

The workers also do not give in to their material deprivations nor give up struggling. They actively use their social network to find jobs, and do extra work in order to subsist, and make savings in the kitchen. Although those strategies do not change the conditions of the workers radically, they are important as they indicate that the lower classes are not passive vis-à-vis the sharpening material conditions.

3.4 Absence of Belief in Collective Action

We discussed in the previous chapter that in Turkey, the rate of unionization is low and getting lower due to both external and internal problems. While expanding job insecurity and fear of losing one’s job pose a great challenge for the workers not to unionize, the legal prohibitions and employers’ sanctions against unionization and the ineffectiveness of the unions to produce quick solutions to flexible market conditions cause distrust among the workers.

Within this context, the despotic control mechanisms, which are based on the fragmented and stratified organization of the work force on the campus and in the dormitories, prevent the workers from developing and acting based on class consciousness. Because of job insecurity, the workers’ unions are also made

ineffective for subcontracted workers, and the major tool of the workers to develop class consciousness and take collective action is taken from them.

As discussed in the previous chapters, the subcontracted labor force is fragmented on the METU campus and in the dormitories. In the dormitories in particular, the fragmentation of the subcontracted labor force among the cleaning workers, personnel and supervisors causes further fragmentation based on status. The strategies used by the management on the other hand divide the workers and cause exclusion of some workers based on their experience in a particular dormitory, religious sect, and loyalty to friendship. In that sense, more than half of the workers confess that they do not trust their co-workers.

As to cooperation and assistance among the cleaning workers, the interviewees honestly talk about the impossibility of helping in each other's work because of the tiresome nature of their own workload. However, the strategies used by the management aimed at dividing the workers also lead to the weakening of cooperation in some dormitories. Adnan answers the question of whether they help each other in special cases such as illness: “Ben yapıyom da burdakiler yapmıyo. Onlar da yapıyolar ama birbirlerininkini yapıyolar. Yani ben geç galıyım, yaparlar ama özensiz yaparlar.”³⁵

Gülşen talks about her fear of the older and favored workers which has caused her to secretly cooperate with the newcomer worker:

“Bi tane buraya benden bi yıl önce giren bi kızımız var. O ilk zamanlar bana gizliden çok destek oldu! Öbür büyükleri duymadan, tabi tabi. Çok korkuluyo onlardan... Duyulduğu zaman tepki görüyoruz çünkü “Ben de hastayım, ben nası işimi yapıyorum, niye o yapmıyo, sen gidip ona destek oluyosun?” diye.”³⁶

35. “I do but the other workers here don't. They do too but they do works of each other. I mean if I come late, they do my work but imprecisely.” Adnan, interviewed at METU, 2011.

36. There is one girl who started to work here one year after me. In the beginnings she helped me very much secretly, without the notice of the older workers, of course. They are very frightening... Because when it is heard we have a negative reaction such as ‘I am sick too, how do I do my work, why doesn't she do hers, why do you go and help her, etc.’ Gülşen, interviewed at METU, 2011.

The workers in the EBİ dormitories in parallel to that mentioned some workers who declined to do their work in case of illness or a day off as Gonca says:

“Benim gibi iyi niyetliyse yapıyo, ama öbür türlü düşünürse yaa bana ne diyo, hastaysa gelmesin diyo. Onun işini ben niye yapıyım ki diyo.”³⁷ Hatice also says: “Bazıları karşılık bekliyo, bugün ben sana yaptım yarın sen bana yapıcaksın diye açık açık söyler.”³⁸

In the EBİ dormitories, the division of the workers based on religious sect also affects the cooperation among the workers. Gonca says:

“Özellikle bizim Alevi insanlarımız diğerini gördükleri zaman ‘ya bu Sünni, Sünni boş ver ya ona çoh iyi davranma, yardımcı olma’ diyo mesela. Öbürü diyo ki mesela Sünni olan insan ‘yahu onlar Alevi Alevi diyo, boş ver sen ne yapacan diyo, bunların açığını buldukça diyo söyleyelim, şikâyet edelim’ diyo. Bunlara şahit oldum ben.”³⁹

These strategies alone, however, do not yet completely capture the ways through which trust is built among the subcontracted cleaning workers. Nearly half of them told me about a ‘close friend’ in their dormitories, in opposition to those narratives about workers who told their secrets to the manager or declined to help them in cleaning. Especially married women workers did not have friends and a social life outside of the workplace and Feride, Dilge, Gülenay, Ömür, Melek, Hatice, Seyhan, Gülsen, and Seda told me that they had one or two close friends in their dormitories, shared their problems, took advice, and helped in each other’s work. Although there may be problems and disagreements among the cleaning workers, in all the dormitories, in which I made interviews, the workers cooked and ate together at lunch. They were also sharing what they cooked, when they

37. “If they have good intention like me, they do. But if they think the other way, they say never mind, if they are sick, they shouldn’t have come; why I would do their work.” Gonca, interviewed at METU, 2011.

38. “Some expect help in return, they openly say today I help you, tomorrow you will help me.” Hatice, interviewed at METU, 2011.

39. “Especially our Alevi people say for example when they see the Sunni workers that ‘they are Sunni, never mind, don’t treat them well, don’t help them’. The other who is Sunni also says that ‘those are Alevi, never mind, why would you help them; we shall inform (the manager) when we catch their mistakes’. I have witnessed these.” Gonca, interviewed at METU, 2011.

cooked something special, with the personnel on the desk and the manager. In eight dormitories including both public and private ones, the workers said that they have cooperative relations among each other. Although the heavy workload limits the extent of assistance and cooperation, they said that they firstly finished collectively the work of the worker, who took a day off in case of sickness or emergency situations.

There is a kind of a solidarity link not only in their dormitories but also among the subcontracted workers in the campus. Since there are also bonds of family/neighborhood among the workers, solidarity reveals itself especially in cases of funerals and weddings, in which the subcontracted workers give material and spiritual support to each other. Gül told me that when her mother died, six personnel buses full of subcontracted workers came to offer condolence.

However, the dominant tendency in the METU dormitories is for weak solidarity and trust relations. In this context, only Gülenay and Adnan counted their friendship relations among the reasons for not choosing to leave their work in the METU dormitories, and others emphasized the social insurance charges paid regularly and the fact that they have to remain in this work in order to be able to retire.

Within the context of the heavy workload and despotic strategies, the workers, except for older ones, had a constant desire to change their job and find a better one. Hence, two thirds of the interviewees said that they were actively looking for another job and would leave without hesitation if they found one. The others who were not looking for different jobs explain it with their hopelessness about being able to find a better job. Since they think that the other jobs they could find would have the same or worse conditions, they did not want to start from the beginning. However, they would not refuse to leave if they found a better job.

The relations with the personnel on the desk, who are also subcontracted, were also damaged in some dormitories due to stratification, their higher status based

on their higher education level, their inclusion in the process of controlling the cleaning workers, and their protection by the dormitory managers. Fewer than one fifth of the interviewees talked about the haughtiness of the personnel on the desk who could reprimand them, command them to do something, and choose some workers as spies to collect information about them. However, none of these workers think that the personnel are superior to them, although they accept the latter's higher level of education. In addition, in one third of the dormitories, cleaning workers have good relations based on mutual respect with the personnel on the desk.

We may conclude that the legitimacy of social hierarchies is still problematic for the subcontracted cleaning workers. However, although the subcontracted cleaning workers resist the boundaries which are drawn by class differences, which is apparent in both their perception and attitudes towards the subcontracted personnel on the desk, having a "class consciousness" seems to be a questionable subject for the subcontracted workers. Fragmentation, stratification and the strategies aimed at dividing the subcontracted workers prevent them from developing class consciousness out of shared experiences based on their situation in the relations of production. None of the workers defined themselves as working class nor did they feel that they were subjected to similar exploitation mechanisms with the personnel on the desk.

As a result of de-unionization, also, the workers are deprived of the major tool with which solidarity and collectivity among them are built. The absence of workers' unions in the subcontract labor regime at METU and workers' fear of losing their jobs due to job insecurity cause worry and discourage already fragmented workers from taking collective action. Hence, the attendance in the protest march in 2009 was very low among the subcontracted cleaning workers in the dormitories. The workers' worry and distrust in collective struggle are also founded in the ignorance of the subcontracted cleaning workers about a culture of unionized struggle. Thinking that their earlier work experiences include unsecured, uninsured, non-unionized, irregular, casual works, none of them has a culture of

collective struggle and subcontract cleaning work does not give them the opportunity to develop one. As Geniş asserts (2006, 183), the results created by de-unionization (low wages, job insecurity, heavy workload) at the same time limit the capacity of the workers to unionize. In other words, de-unionization reproduces de-unionization.

We must also refer to the internal problems, namely the ineffectiveness of the trade unions in communicating with the unsecured workers. We have discussed how the source of information about trade unions in Turkey is membership of them. In line with this general picture, the subcontracted cleaning workers do not know much about trade unions. Accordingly two thirds of the workers confess that they do not know exactly what a trade union is and what it does. Within that context, the knowledge of the other workers is based on what they heard around, saw on TV, or read in the newspapers. They use the expressions such as “they say” or “as I’ve heard” when answering the questions about trade union. For example Caner says: “Dediklerine göre iyi bi şeymiş.”⁴⁰; Seyhan says: “Sendikadan bi şey anlamam fazla.”⁴¹; and Ömür says, ‘İşçilerin haklarını savunan bi şey değil mi? Ama herkes bağlı değil galiba. Bizim yok mesela. O yüzden çok bi şey oluşmadı kafamda. Olanlar için ne yapmış onu bile hiç bilmiyorum.’⁴²

The subcontracted cleaning workers, on the other hand, generally have a positive image about workers’ unions. All of the workers answered yes, when they were asked about whether they would like to be unionized. In most of their answers, they defended trade unions on the basis of their belief that they would provide them with their basic rights to security, annual leave and compensation. Fewer than half of them said that their voice would be louder and stronger, and their

40. “It is a good thing as they say.” Caner, interviewed at METU, 2011.

41. “I don’t understand much about trade union.” Seyhan, interviewed at METU, 2011.

42. “Isn’t it something that defends workers’ rights? But not everybody is a union member. We aren’t for example. Therefore I can’t envisage much about it. I don’t even know what it did for its members.” Ömür, interviewed at METU, 2011.

demands would be met with higher concern. Slightly fewer than two thirds of them also complained about insecurity due to the absence of a higher unity that would lead them and provide them with guidance in order to make their voice be heard.

However, the lack of knowledge may cause prejudice and misinformation as indicated in the context of Turkey. Çiğdem, Gonca, Seda and Mustafa talked about their distrust towards the unions saying that a union could not solve all the problems by itself and not all the unions fight for the rights of labor. Although they say that they would want to be unionized because it would protect some of their rights and stand behind them, they added that it was not strong enough to protect all their rights, all the time. Mustafa, for instance, talks about the image of a union which only collects subscription fee: “Eğer işçiyi koruyosa, işçinin hahlarını savunuyosa tabi ki iyidir. Ama hep kendini savunuyosa, gendi aidatını düşünüyosa o zaman iyi değildir.”⁴³

Even though all of the workers said that they would want to be unionized which would unite them, the fear of losing their job and prejudices due to the absence of information about collective struggle creates just the opposite results in practice. At METU, unionization is forbidden but we can trace the tendencies of the workers about collective action in the context of the protest march of 2009.

As mentioned above, in the summer of 2009, there was a protest march against the subcontractor company and METU not giving the workers their right to annual leave. It was organized primarily by the subcontracted workers in the departments, and supported also by the instructors and students. Similar to the general picture in Turkey, the workers in the dormitories were discouraged from attending the march by the company supervisors and the dormitory managers. They were also warned that their pictures were taken by the company supervisors and they were marked. The attendance as a result was only about 50 people among nearly 700 subcontracted workers. For one week, those workers continued their protest after

43. “If it protects the workers, defends the workers’ rights, it is good; but if it always thinks about itself, and its own subscription fee, then it is not good.” Mustafa, interviewed at METU, 2011.

the employment period was over and they marched to the President's Office. However, there was no change in the usage of annual leaves in favor of the workers.

More than half of the workers with whom I interviewed did not attend the march. The workers from the EBI dormitories did not attend because of their fear of losing their jobs since they could use their right to annual leave. In that context, Melek openly said that if they attended the march, they would definitely be fired. Şükriye, similarly, explained why she and most of the workers did not attend the protest march with their fear of losing their jobs:

“Mesela adam emeklisine çok az kalmış, yürüyüşe gitcek, işten çıkartılma korkusu var... Gitmeyince de sen katılmıyorsun oluyo. Sen bize destek vermiyorsun oluyo. Yani. Şu anda bana işte eyleme çağardılar... Dedim ben nası geliyim şu anda yani beni şefim, müdürüm görse, sen neye yürüyorsun dese, ben ne derim? Ondan sora o öbür bayanlar işte o bizden değil, o gelmesin falan diye demeye başladılar... (gülür) Bana o kadar üstüme gelmeseler de mesela ben öbürlerine şahit oldum. Aynı şirketteler. Biri yürüyo biri yürümüyo. Onun üstüne geliniyo, sen hakkını aramıyorsun, sen yürümüyorsun, destek vermiyorsun, işte biz böyleyiz, bundan kaybediyoruz diyorlar. Ama işte çoğu katılmıyosa ekmek korkusundan katılmıyo.”⁴⁴

Akif (54) from the public dormitories, like Şükriye, talks about the general unemployment conditions in Turkey which pacify those who are already without job security: “Hakkı düşünmüyo. Ekmek alak diyo. Çoluk çocuk. Türkiye'nin halini biliyon işsizlik yani. Ya. Bize zor. Bi de bizim yaştaki adam hiç iş bulmaz. Ya. Nereye gidiyon? Ben yaparım diyon.”⁴⁵

44. “For example, a worker whose retirement is close will go to the protest march, but he has fear of losing job... If he doesn't go, then they say you don't attend and support us. I mean. At the moment, they've called me to the march... I said how could I come, I mean what do I say if my supervisor or manager sees me and asks me why I am protesting? Then the women started to say that I'm not one of them, we don't want her to come... (she laughs) They didn't insist very much to me but I witnessed they did to the others. They are in the same company. One protests and the other doesn't. The latter is pressed and they say to him/her that you don't struggle for your rights, you don't protest, you don't support, we're like this, we lose because of this. But if the majority can not join, it is because of their fear of losing job.” Şükriye, interviewed at METU, 2011.

45. “We don't think about our rights. We go after our livelihood. All the family. You know the situation in Turkey, I mean unemployment. It's difficult for us. Also someone at our age can never find job. Where do you go! You say, I'll do.” Akif, interviewed at METU, 2011.

Therefore, even if all of the workers found their colleagues under the BİGA Company right and some of them stated that they wanted to attend and support the other workers, their fear of losing the job to which they are bound due to financial restrictions, overwhelmed their feeling of collectivity.

Among the other workers (under the BİGA Company) who did not attend, some said that they wanted to but they could not – Adnan and Seda because they were working at the time of the protest march, and Gülsen because she was new to METU and afraid to attend. The others explained their not attending it by their disbelief in the collective action of the subcontracted workers. They said that they knew from the beginning that the attendance would be very low because of the subcontracted workers' fear of job loss, and therefore the action would not succeed. Ercan, Eren and Caner openly expressed their disbelief in changing something in favor of the workers by the collective action of the workers.

The notion of the stability of the established order is so strong a belief among the workers (even those who have a fighting character) that some workers who attended the march confessed that they lost their hope when they saw that nobody cared about their protest, and Gonca and Nurcihan did not attend the whole process for one week because they lost their belief in changing their conditions through that protest march to which the attendance was really low. Both fear of losing one's job because of attending a justified march (in their words) and disbelief in the possibility of changing their conditions through a protest march indicate the subcontracted workers' disbelief in their collective power.

This disbelief in the power of collective action is also related with the workers' 'feelings of marginality', similar to the wage earners in OSTİM (Geniş 2006, 183-4).⁴⁶ Due to their deprivation of the symbolic power to produce discourse and

46. Geniş analyzes both the specific characteristics of waged labor in the small industry in OSTİM and the fragmentations among the small industry workers. He observes that these workers develop a feeling of marginality based on the unstable work rhythm and a latent opinion towards the peripheral nature of their workplaces in OSTİM vis-à-vis the major employers like Sabancı who determine their working conditions. This feeling drives the workers to hopelessness about their future, and prevents them from unionizing to change their conditions.

policy, they do not see the power in themselves to decide either about the general conditions in the country or about their own working conditions and therefore their lives. In other words, the power to ameliorate their working conditions lies not in the protest marches of a small group of workers but in the hands of the authority and politicians, as they believe. However, as all of the workers agreed, those who are paid minimum wage as well as the poor are never included in the discourses of the politicians. This increases their feeling of marginality.

The feeling of marginality is also reflected in the political mobilization patterns of the cleaning workers. None of the workers said that they supported left-wing parties which make claims about the workers' economic and social rights. Most of the workers interviewed were Alevi and they supported the Republican People's Party because of their sensitivity about secularism. The Sunni workers on the other hand mostly supported the Justice and Development Party and secondly the Nationalist Movement Party.

What is more, some of the subcontracted workers (Necati, Damla, Mustafa, Eren, Ömür, one co-worker of Ömür, and 5 co-workers of Gül) thought that under the rule of the Justice and Development Party, Turkey has developed economically, and it has become a high-industrialized country. Mustafa, for instance, believed that the JDP had developed Turkey in terms of industry and trade. Interestingly, although Turkey is an agricultural country, he explained the underdevelopment in agriculture with the will of the farmers to make money without working. He says: "Tarım ülkesi Türkiye ama pek tarım yapan da yok. Köylere gidiyoz, araziler boş duruyo. E niye ekilmiyo diye soruyoz, adam diyo tarla parası alıyom diyo, gerek yok diyo."⁴⁷ However, none of these workers could deny that this development of the country had not changed their own economic conditions for the better.

As can be seen, the fact that political mobilization in Turkey hardly ever carries a character of class is valid for the subcontracted cleaning workers. This is the result

47. "Turkey is an agricultural country but there is not many who do agriculture. We go to villages, the land is empty. We ask why they don't sow; they say they take direct income support, so there is no need (to sow)." Mustafa, interviewed at METU, 2011.

of the absence of a strong history of unionized struggle and of working class movement. Like the general picture of the working classes in Turkey, there is no strong belief among these subcontracted workers in collective struggle and they do not think they are capable of changing their conditions through their own struggle. This disbelief is the consequence of the managerial efforts to limit shared experiences among the subcontracted workers through despotic mechanisms. Fragmentation and stratification of labor force, strategies aiming at dividing the subcontracted workers in the dormitories, de-unionization, and fear of losing their jobs prevent the workers from developing class consciousness.

3.5 “Realistic” Future Dreams

The disconnection between the workers’ own socio-economic conditions and those of Turkey in general indicates the workers’ general mood: hopelessness. In this chapter, the future dreams and expectations of the subcontracted workers will be discussed by focusing on the reasons for their hopelessness about future.

Due to the financial inadequacies inherited from the family, the subcontracted workers do not expect that their socio-economic situation will be changed radically in the future. In other words, their future expectations are shaped by their material conditions similar to those of the charwomen in the study of Kalaycıoğlu and Tılıç (2000, 161). Şükriye, who has a son and whose husband also does subcontracted work, summarizes the general feelings of the subcontracted cleaning workers:

“Ya bi asgari ücretli gelicekten ne bekleyebilir ki? Aldığımı kenara atmayınca, ilerde bi ev alamayınca, çocuğuna iyi bi gelecek sağlayamayınca, yani emeklilik böyle uzayınca, nerde umut olacak? 58 yaşında emekli olucam. 58 yaşına kadar yaşayabilcem mi? Hele bu ağar işte çalışabilcem mi? O yüzden yok umudum.”⁴⁸

48. “What can someone who works for the minimum wage expect from the future? Where will hope be as long as you cannot save your earnings, you cannot buy a house in the future, you cannot provide your child with a good future, I mean retirement takes longer? I will retire at 58. Will I live until 58? Will I especially be able to do this heavy work? Therefore, I don’t have hope.” Şükriye, interviewed at METU, 2011.

Gülenay (25) also talks about her incapacity to make plans about the future based on her material conditions: “Geleceğe dair plan pek yapamıyorum, imkânlar el vermiyo.”⁴⁹

This hopelessness is also fed by the unfulfilled dreams from the past since the interviewees were all deprived of necessary opportunities to do so. Ömür, who is now a student in the Open University, said that she had always wanted to go to university in Eskişehir but due to financial restrictions and the conservatism of her family about sending their daughter to another city, she could not. Damla similarly wanted to go to university but she had to start working for financial reasons. Şükriye, who could not go to school due to health problems but learned to read and write with her own efforts, said that she always wanted to be a lawyer or a detective because she loved to struggle with difficulties. What is common in their narratives is their sorrow about not being able to obtain high educational credentials.

None of the workers had come to METU chasing their dreams but they preferred to work at METU because of social insurance. The women workers were also thinking their work as temporary when they first started cleaning work. Dilge, who has been working in the METU dormitories for 11 years, said that she thought about leaving work every day but she found herself on the way to METU every morning. Seda and Ömür said that they started working at METU in order to save money for private teaching but then they could not leave work. They primarily wanted to go on with their education but they could not leave work. Damla said she started at the Open University but had to leave in the first year due to financial reasons. Gülenay said that she could have gone to the universities in the provinces with her score in the university exam, but she gave up due to financial and gender-related reasons. Male workers on the other hand frequently complained about the unqualified nature of this work, as İsmail says: “En son iş

49. “I cannot make plans about the future within the bounds of possibility.” Gülenay, interviewed at METU, 2011.

yapamayan kişinin yeri burası işte. En basit iş. Ne var cam sil o kadar. Bi kişinin yapacağı en son iş işte.”⁵⁰

As Bourdieu (Swartz 1997, 226) discusses the tendencies of a class to move upwards or downwards shape its members’ perceptions about future. In that sense, within the context of unfulfilled dreams due to financial restrictions, the dreams about the future of the subcontracted workers are realistic. Nurcihan (32) says that they are in no position to make dreams under their socio-economic conditions:

“Gelecek için, hiç bi hedefim yok. Ben burda çalışarak heralde siyasete girmeyi, şirketlerde üst yönetim hayalini kuramam... Şimdi insanın şu yerde çalışan bi insanın tek şeyi ne olabilir ideali? ... Daha iyi bi iş bulursam tabi ki giderim yani. Hedefim bu daha nolabilir ki?”⁵¹

Due to dominance of job insecurity in their lives and the low status of cleaning work, therefore, the workers’ expectations from their work at METU are low. None of them believed that their working conditions would ameliorate in the near future. In that context, while older workers expected to continue working in the METU dormitories until retirement, the younger workers emphasized that they did not see any future in this work and they expected to find a more comfortable job. Şükriye was among the former group and says that her dreams are always small:

“Benim hayallerim hep küçüktür canım. Yani ben hep bi oğlum bi kızım olsun dedim mesela. O olmadı. (Kalbinde delik olduğu için) Ben ne istiyorum? Sağlıklı emekli olmak. Bi evim olsun. Eşim çocuğum yanımda mutlu bi hayat istiyorum. Başka da hiç bi şey istemiyorum.”⁵²

50. “Here is the last resort for someone who is incapable. The simplest work. Clean the window, that’s it. It’s just the last work for anyone.” İsmail, interviewed at METU, 2011.

51. “I don’t have any aims for the future. I surely cannot dream of going into politics or high management in companies while working here... Now, what can be the dream of a person who works in this place?... If I found a better job, I would leave of course. My aim is this, what else can it be?” Nurcihan, interviewed at METU, 2011.

52. “My dreams are always small, my dear. I mean I always wanted to have one son and one daughter. It didn’t happen, for instance. (Because of her health problems). What do I want? A healthy retirement. I want to have a house. I want a happy life with my husband and child. I want nothing else.” Şükriye, interviewed at METU, 2011.

The older workers with children also emphasized that they could continue working after retirement as well, if necessary until their children's graduation and marriage. İsmail (48) said that he had to work until his 2 elementary school-aged children graduated from university. Melek (46) said that she would continue as a pastry cook after her retirement in three years. Akif, in his last months in the METU dormitories before retirement, was thinking about what jobs he could do and he started to work in the canteen of his dormitory. The older workers also gave importance to leaving something behind for their children. In that sense, five of them had taken out loans in order to buy their own houses. They also wished for their children to have good jobs, which would be secure and bring them dignity in people's eyes. In relation to the increasing importance of educational credentials, as we discussed, they were ready to give anything for the education of their children.

The younger workers on the other hand expect to find better jobs. They were however pessimistic about that as reflected in their definition of better jobs, which are shaped again by material conditions. Women interviewees dream about some other jobs which are less tiring, less boring jobs that they would love more, with higher-status but again subcontracted. While Melek and Feride believed that they would be more useful if they worked in the nursery school at METU, again as subcontracted workers, Dilge wanted to work somewhere else at METU such as the medical center. Seda, who is a student in the Open University, was preparing for the exams to become security personnel at METU (whose status is higher than the cleaning workers' although it is subcontracted as well). Gonca and Ömür wanted to be on the information desk in the dormitories. The male workers on the other hand said that they would prefer jobs with masculine associations such as electrician or installer. They thought that they would be happier there, even though they knew that they would still be working without job security.

The workers all suffer from their limited level of education because it is the thing that restricts their dreams. Nurcihan says that it is meaningless for them to make dreams since they are deprived of the material tools to make them come true:

“Okumamışsın etmemişsin lisede bitirmişsin her şeyi. Zaten senin hedefin orda bitmiş yani... Hayallemele de olmuyo işte.”⁵³

About their own socio-economic conditions, some see the only salvation in God which is a sign of pessimism about the possibility of changing their conditions. Dilge (46) says that her dream is to move back to her village when her husband retires in four years and see her children’s marriage. As to whether she had hopes, she says: “Genellikle yani ne umutluyum ne... Bilmiyom onu Allah’a birahtım yani. Geleceğe birahtım.”⁵⁴ Eren similarly was hopeless about any change in their working conditions: “Sen Odtü'ye yıllardır hizmet et, emeklin gelsin, emekli ol, ama burdan 5 kuruş para almadan çık. Bu, insanın zoruna gider. Her kim olursa olsun. Yani bunun değişmesi lazım. Bilmiyom kim yapıcak, her şeyi akışına göre bırakıyorum.”⁵⁵

However, the workers are not captured by fatalism in their perception of the future. Even though most of the workers are not hopeful about their own conditions; within the context of the shift from a family mode of reproduction to a school mode of reproduction as we discussed, they believe that if their children receive a good education, they will be able to have high status jobs and even to be rich. They expressed their wish for their daughters and sons to go to university since formal education is thought as something that could help their children to move up the social ladder. The dreams about their children’s education and work life reflect their admiration for jobs with high-status.

53. “You haven’t received higher education. You finished everything at high school. Your target has already ended there... Dreaming is not enough.” Nurcihan, interviewed at METU, 2011.

54. “In general I am neither hopeful nor... I don’t know, I mean I leave it to God, to the future.” Dilge, interviewed at METU, 2011.

55. “You serve METU for years, time of your retirement comes, you retire, but you leave without taking one penny from here. You take offense at this. Regardless of whom you are. I mean, this has to be changed. I don’t know who will do that, I let everything slide.” Eren, interviewed at METU, 2011.

As a result, when I asked the cleaning workers where hope lies, they answered, ‘in their children’, similar to the urban poor in Turkey (Erdoğan 2007c, 71). However, in contrast to the uncertain and dark future of the children of the poor, the subcontracted workers believe that their children would be living under better conditions and will acquire dignity in people’s eyes as long as they acquire educational credentials. The provision of good educational opportunities to their children for them to be able to find high-status jobs and move up the social ladder is the most important dream for the subcontracted workers.

The workers give great importance to be able to provide their children with a secured future. Parallel to the argument of Erdoğan (2011, 99), which discusses that the working classes in Turkey experience time in two different forms and while the time experience of those, who are completely excluded from and have no hope to be included in the production process, is based on saving the day; that of those, who are slightly stably included in the production process, as the workers in this study, is a pursuit of security in the long-run, which is expressed in the aspirations of those laborers about ‘possessing a house’, ‘having a government job’, and which may sacrifice present needs for the sake of those aspirations.

The desire to provide their children with a secured future is also articulated with a strong sense of family planning in the narratives of the subcontracted workers, in contrast to their class habitus. Four workers had four siblings, three workers had five siblings, seven workers had six siblings, and four workers had more than six siblings. Most of them come from big families, and especially the workers below the age 40 thought that fact as the reason for their poverty.

As to the number of children, Necati (50) had five, Seyhan (55) four, and Akif (54), Dilge (45), and Mustafa (46) three. Nearly two thirds of the workers had two children, while one sixth of them had one child. Six workers did not have any children. Those workers who are not married or do not have children yet say either that they do not want to have children or they postpone having children due to their financial conditions. Damla (31) who has been married for eleven years

says that she does not want to have children because she would not be able to provide them with good opportunities. She adds that it is not a skill to have children unless they are offered good opportunities. Nurcihan (34), who is single, talks about her worries about her own capability to provide a good education to her children:

“İki çocuğum olana kadar gücüm yetmiyorsa tek olsun, okusun, son noktasına kadar yanında olurum... Hani bak ben okumadım benim çocuğum nereye kadar okuyabilecek? Veya nereye kadar ona ne mantıklı şeyler gösterebilcem?... Hani ben sağlıklı bi çocuk nası yetiştirsem? Yetiştirsem bile kimin altında ezilecek, kimin lafına şey olacak? Yani çok zor ya, Türkiye’de yaşamak çok zor.”⁵⁶

Ömür (27) who has been married for two years and is a student at the Open University, talks about her worry about the future as the reason to delay having children:

“(ileride) Sadece şunu isterim okulum bitmiş olsun, bi tane çocuğum olsun, ona garantili bi gelecek hazırlayım. Bu konumdayken çok da bi şey verebileceğime inanmıyorum. Daha üst düzey bi iş bulmak istiyorum... Şu anda doğurmadan bile onun kaygısı sardı beni, eşimde de var büyük ihtimal. O yüzden erteliyoruz sürekli.”⁵⁷

As a result, it can be said that children symbolize hope for the workers although they are pessimistic about the possibility of any radical change in their own conditions. However, as the social hierarchies sharpen, children have started to be the concrete symbol of the workers’ hopelessness. While the workers who already have children direct all their resources and efforts to the aim of saving their children from having to share their destiny; the other younger workers delay having a child to save their children from their destiny.

56. “I want to have one child instead of two and provide him/her with good educational opportunities. I would be at her/his side to the end. I mean I didn’t receive a good education, but until when will my child be able to study? Or to what extent will I be able to show him/her logical things? ... I mean will I be able to raise a good child? Even if I could, who will suppress him/her, to whose words will his/her life be subject? I mean it’s too hard, too hard to live in Turkey.” Nurcihan, interviewed at METU, 2011.

57. “I only want in the future that I would graduate from the Open University, have one child, and prepare for him/her a good future. I don’t believe that I could give him/her much. I want to find a higher level job... At the moment, this worry has surrounded me, and my husband also has such a worry I guess. That’s why we constantly delay having children.” Ömür, interviewed at METU, 2011.

3.6 Concluding Remarks

In this chapter, the transformation of the labor regime at METU has been analyzed with its effects on the class consciousness of the subcontracted cleaning workers. With the institutionalization of subcontracting practice on the METU campus, the workers have not only lost their rights to job security, compensation, annual leave and unionization, at the same time they have become subjected to despotic control mechanisms based on fragmentation and stratification, which make their working conditions heavier.

Accordingly, the fragmentation and stratification of labor force, isolated workplaces and the tiresome nature of workload, and the managerial strategies such as favoritism aimed at dividing the workers have weakened trust and solidarity relations among the workers and prevented them from developing class consciousness based on common experiences. As a result of de-unionization and managerial pressure over collective action, subcontracted workers are left in isolation against despotic mechanisms. Therefore, we may conclude that subcontracting practice prevents the development of class consciousness since it makes the workers' tool for collective struggle ineffective.

In addition, there is a constant fear of job loss felt by all the workers, although more than one third of the workers had been working at METU for more than ten years, and the rate of job change is very low among the workers. This fear is sourced majorly in the low level of education and qualification of the workers, who do not believe that they could find a better job in the market. While increasing precarization leads the workers to keep silent and endure their conditions for their children's sustenance, it also prevents them from developing a long-term narrative towards their work, and this results in 'corrosion of character' for them.

While subcontracting practice prevents the workers from developing class consciousness, the despotic control mechanisms make them feel worthless. The

unquestionable priority of the students and the aim of their satisfaction at all cost in the dormitories limit the autonomy of the workers and make them feel inferior to the students who are in the dormitories only for temporary periods. They are also forced to take responsibility for the security of the dormitories, since they are primarily called in cases of theft or missing property. The intimacy between the subcontracted workers and the students is also subject to control from above in order for the workers not to disturb the students. In the EBI dormitories, structural precautions are even taken in order to prevent intimacy and these tendencies are likely to expand to the public dormitories, thinking of the general transition in Turkey. The change in the logic that rules social hierarchies, as a result of which students have become customers, therefore, makes the working conditions heavier for the subcontracted workers who are already deprived of the tools of resistance.

Within this context of their material conditions, the subcontracted workers are forced to be cautious and realistic in terms of their future expectations. Due to the low status of their jobs, they do not have any expectations from their work and most of them are not hopeful about their future work life. However, they believe that their children would be in better conditions compared to them because they will be better educated. In that sense increase in their investment in educational capital is articulated with internalization of insights of family planning and good parentage. While children symbolize hope especially for the older workers, the sharpening norms of the labor market and increasing precarization lead younger workers to deeper worries about the future and force them to delay having children.

CHAPTER IV

CLASS ENCOUNTERS IN THE METU DORMITORIES

In this chapter, the encounter of the subcontracted cleaning workers with the civil servants, the managers and the students staying in the dormitories on the METU campus will be analyzed. The extent of the relevancy of the dominant lower class image, which is dirty, smelly and dangerous, on the METU campus will be the context of the discussion. Keeping in mind that social hierarchies have been sharpened after the 1980s, the traces of this transition will be followed in the METU dormitories. In that context, the relevancy of the negative lower class images on the METU campus, the search of the cleaning workers for self-respect in their encounter with the students and the civil servants, their application to moral-humanistic values, and their ways of resistance will be the main points in the discussion. In addition, the relation between gender and class for the subcontracted workers will also be briefly examined.

4.1 Sharpened Social Hierarchies in the METU Dormitories

The relevant literature on class encounters in Turkey has shown that the experience of social hierarchies has sharpened in Turkey, following the neo-liberal transition. The lower classes are more and more excluded from well-paid, secured, unionized, and high-status jobs. This makes it harder for them to gain respect on the basis of their work, which is the major source of respect under modern capitalism. The cultural reflection of this transition, therefore, is the association of lower classes with dirt, bad smell and danger.

The mentality which regulates subcontract labor regime as well as relationship of the subcontracted cleaning workers with the regular employees, the managers, the other subcontracted personnel in the dormitories, and the students at METU is considerably parallel to this transition although there are also counter tendencies.

In this chapter, the extent of the relevancy of these general tendencies will be discussed in terms of the subcontracted cleaning workers' encounter with the civil servants, the subcontracted personnel in the dormitories, the dormitory managers and the students.

I must put forward that with the sharpening tone of class hierarchies in Turkey, I mean a transition in the mentality which rules the way class hierarchies are experienced and expressed. Within this context, I am interested not in the class situations of these groups, but with their perception of social hierarchies, and with the underlying features of the attitudes towards the subcontracted cleaning workers.

The value that is attributed to the workers can first and foremost be seen in the place provided for them in the dormitories. Similar to the spatial stigmatizing of janitors by giving them small, dark and airless flats on the basement floor in the apartments (Özyeğin 2005, 23-24); the subcontracted cleaning workers either have no private rooms in the dormitories, or the rooms are dark, airless and small. In the EBİ dormitories and guest houses, the rooms, which are on the basement floor and are small, dark, and airless, are clearly separated from the management rooms and the floors of the students. In the state dormitories for women, on the other hand, there is no room specifically separated for the women workers. There are only very small rooms like cells without windows, each one on each worker's own floor, for the workers to store their stuff and change their clothes. In male state dormitories, on the other hand, there is one small room without windows for each worker on their own floor, consisting of one bed, one small table, and one mini refrigerator. The cleaning workers eat their breakfast and lunch in the kitchen on the basement floor which is again dark, airless and has small windows. İsmail from the EBİ dormitories who has been working at METU for more than fourteen years complained about the obviousness of their lack of worth:

“Bak şu yurt, bir öğrencinin aylığı 966 milyon kardeşim. Oturduğumuz yeri görüyorsun diil mi? Bunları söyleyin yani konuşun... Bak bu öğrencilerin aldığı paraya bah ya 966 milyon, benim oturduğum yere bah. Ya bunlar, yani işçiyi gorusunlar gardeşim. İşçiyi niye mahcup düşürüyorsunuz? Devlet

yurtlarına vermiyo, orda oturacak yer yok doğru düzgün. Biz mutfakta oturuyoduk mutfakta, dokuzuncu yurtta, alt katta. Ufacık bi yer, pencereleri yok.”⁵⁸

We have mentioned the fragmentation of the labor force on the campus and said that the subcontracted workers are inferior to the regular employees not only in terms of workers’ rights and working conditions but also in terms of their status on the campus. The workers all agreed that they are not seen as major parts of METU. This is reflected to Melek’s words when I asked whether she thinks herself as part of METU: “I think myself as part of METU but they (people in METU) do not see me.”

We also said that due to the prevention of subcontracted workers from using the social facilities on the METU campus, they do not feel valuable parts of METU, and do not develop a sense of belonging to their workplace. Caner complains about the double standard in METU towards the subcontracted workers:

“Yani ben bu ODTÜ’deyim, ODTÜ’nün hiçbir şeyinden faydalanamıyorum. En basitinden yani yemekhanesinden... Yemekhanede mesela memurlara 1,5 milyonsa, bize 4 milyon. Havuz mesela burdaki memura 2,5 milyonsa, bize misafir olarak görüyolar, 12 milyon mu 13 milyon mu öyle bi şey. Önceden mesela sticker veriyolar, memura sticker almak 750 lira, 7,5 milyon mu ne? Bize 450 milyon. Ben bu ODTÜ’ye şimdi ne diyim?”⁵⁹

The fragmentation of labor force and priority of the civil servants caused a superiority feeling in them, which is reflected in their words, gazes and attitudes towards the subcontracted cleaning workers. When I asked the interviewees their

58. “Look, in this dormitory students pay 966 TL a month. You see the place we are sitting in, right? Say this I mean let these be spoken... Look at the price the students pay, and look at where I stay! These must protect the workers. Why do you embarrass the workers? They don’t give room (for the cleaning workers) in the public dormitories. There is no proper place to sit there. We were sitting in the kitchen in dormitory 9, on the basement floor. A tiny place, with no windows.” İsmail, interviewed at METU, 2011.

59. “I mean I’m at METU, but I cannot use any facility. The simplest I mean the cafeteria. In the cafeteria, for example, the price of fixed menu is 1,5 million for the regular employees, but 4 million for us. Swimming pool for example is 2,5 million for the regular employees here while they see us as guests and it is 12 million or so for us. They gave us car stiker before for example. The price is 7,5 million or so for the regular employees, but 450 million for us. What do I say to METU under these conditions?” Caner, interviewed at METU, 2011.

thoughts about how they think the people in METU see them, firstly civil servants came to their mind, and the answers were very similar, summarized in Seyhan's answer: "Onlar bizi farklı görüyo, biz onları değil de."⁶⁰

We have said that class relations are more and more occularcentric, expressing itself in the humiliating gaze of the upper classes. Skeggs (2009, 37) observes the same things from the narratives of white working class women in Britain. She writes about those women's awareness that they are being read and judged by the others, when they enter for instance posh shops:

"'Being looked down on' was their description of a process to which they were continually subject, a visual assessment by others that repeatedly positioned them as lacking value... The gaze that embodies the symbolic reading of the women makes them feel 'out of place', thereby generating a sense of where their 'place' should be."

Within the same context, the subcontracted workers were not allowed to enter the spring festival area in 2009 because they were 'spoiling the festival area' in the words of the company supervisors.⁶¹ In 2010, before the spring festival, the company supervisors gathered with the subcontracted workers and told them that they could attend the festival but they were not allowed to collect bottles. The previous year, it was claimed that some subcontracted workers were seen collecting empty bottles of beer in order to sell them.

Ercan verifies the occularcentric feature of social hierarchies in METU. He said that he felt that some civil servants saw themselves superior to the subcontracted workers. When I asked how he understood that, he answers; "from their look." Gonca also refers to the way the haughty civil servants look at her: "Böyle çok kendini beğenmiş, ukala insanlar da değişik bakıyo yani. Ya bunlar bizim bi alt

60. "They see us differently; we don't see them as such." Seyhan, interviewed at METU, 2011.

61. <http://haber.sol.org.tr/sonuncu-kavga/odtu-iscilerinden-rektorluk-onunde-eylem-haberi-15219>

sınıfımız, işte kadroluyuz biz memuruz böyle işte hani havalara girenler bilmem ne oluyo tabi ki.”⁶²

On the METU campus, however, the disturbance of the encounter with the subcontracted cleaning workers is not only expressed through gazes. All the subcontracted workers told me that they are subject to loud complaints of the civil servants about their usage of the personnel buses and even humiliations towards themselves, as discussed in the previous chapter. Gülsen complains about the unequal position of the other personnel and the indifference of the authorities to the rights of subcontracted workers: “Bazı mesela memurlar var, biz sıradayken, geliyo, en başa duruyo, biniyo. Ve öncelik bize diyo mesela. Şirket elemanları hiç sesini çıkaramıyo. O konuda hiç hakkımız yok yani.”⁶³

Dilge told me about a regular employee who forced her to give her seat to him in the personnel bus which was watched in silence by everybody in the service, most of whom are regular employees as well:

“Bana böyle, ben (...) servisini kullanırkene bindim, memur ayakta kaldı. Ya dedi şirketler dedi haddini aştı dedi girer girmez, baktı ayakta kaldı. Şirketten bi ben varım, iki üç kişi de arkadaydı. Tam benim yanımdaydı. İsmi de Hasan mıydı neydi geri zekâlı işte. Şirketler geldi böyle işte hakkımızı aldılar dedi. Ayakta kalıyoruz dedi. Ben de dedim ki o sırada valla akşama kadar iş yapıyoruz biz dedim, siz akşama kadar oturuyosunuz bilgisayar başında, bütün temizliklerinizi biz yapıyoruz dedim. Bırakın da biz oturalım dedim. Hayır dedi önce dedi memurların hakkı dedi, yer kalırsa sizin hakkınız dedi. Ben ondan sona hiç uzatmadım kalktım, yer verdim. Gayet güzel de oturdu. Ben ayakta geldim.”⁶⁴

62. “Those people who are very haughty look differently I mean. There are of course those who get pumped up thinking that these are our inferior class, we are regular employees.” Gonca, interviewed at METU, 2011.

63. “There are some regular employees for example. They come and jump the queue while we are waiting. And they say that the priority is theirs. The subcontracted workers can not say anything. We don’t have any rights about that I mean.” Gülsen, interviewed at METU, 2011.

64. “I got on my personnel bus and a regular employee was left standing. He said that the subcontract companies overstepped the mark as he got on and saw that there was no empty seat for him. There were two or three subcontracted workers except for me sitting in the back seats. He was right beside me. His name was Hasan or so, idiot! He said that subcontractor companies have come and taken our rights, we leave standing. I said we do work all day long, you sit in front of the computer and we do all your cleaning. Let us sit, I said. He said no, it’s primarily the regular

Ömür says they have no right to speak although they are the ones who pay for the transportation service;

“Mesela bi gün n’oldu, adamın biri çok konuşuyo, kadrolu. Yol boyunca konuştu. Arkadaş da dedi ki şakasına ya biraz sessiz olur musun, o da şirket... Ondan sonra dedi ki rahatsız oluyosan özel arabaya binersin dedi arkadaşıma. O da dedi ki niye öyle diyosun, sen bin özel arabaya dedi. Yok dedi ben binmem dedi, burası bize ait, bu servis bize ait dedi. Anladın mı yani en basitinden? Yani zamanında şirkete oturma yasağı bile varmış. Yani önce memurlar oturuyomuş daha sonra arkasından şirket. Düşün yani. Ama şu servisin ücretleri kimden kesiliyo? Benden kesiliyo. Yani en çok benim hakkım var. Ama ben konuşamıyorum orda. Adam kendini konuşmaya daha çok yetki sahibi gösteriyo. Ama bende yok yani o yetki, hâlbuki onun parası benden çıkıyo, senden değil.”⁶⁵

Gülenay, Çiğdem, Gülsen and Gonca also talked about some civil servants who sit with their children while subcontracted workers are standing in the personnel buses. They said that the civil servants use the fact that they are with children in order to get ahead of the subcontracted workers in the queue for the buses.

The METU management also takes sides with the civil servants. Adnan talked about an old subcontracted cleaning worker who had an argument and fight with a civil servant when the latter took his place in the queue for the bus. After that fight, the civil servant made a complaint about that worker and he was taken from the dormitories to the departments. However, when the civil servants in that department learnt about the fight, they did not want him, and he was fired.

Class relations are at the same time relations of smell. Skeggs (2010) talks about the association of the working class with degeneracy in terms of the claims to

employees’ right, and if there are empty seats left, then it is your right. I didn’t insist and gave my seat to him. He sat quite well, and I stood all the way.” Dilge, interviewed at METU, 2011.

65. “For example one day a regular employee was talking too much. He spoke all the way. A friend who was subcontracted told him jokingly to be a little quiet. He offered my friend to get on a private car if he was disturbed. My friend said ‘why you said so, you get on private car’. He rejected and then said this personnel bus was theirs. Do you see? There used to be even prohibition for the subcontracted workers to sit in the personnel buses! I mean first the regular employees sat and then if there remained empty seats, subcontracted workers sat. Think about it. But who pays for these buses? I do. I mean it’s majorly my right. But I cannot talk there. They (regular employees) show themselves as more authorized to talk. But I don’t have that authority, although I pay for it, not you.” Ömür, interviewed at METU, 2011.

moral legitimacy of the middle classes in Britain. She writes that in the bourgeois claim for moral legitimacy, domestic servants, in particular, became the projected object for dirt, and more explicitly were associated with the care of back passages and the generalized poor came to be represented as excrement (Skeggs 2010, 343).

Hygiene was also used by the middle class employers of the charwomen in Turkey (Bora 2005, 148-9) out of the need to underline class differences caused by the closeness of the urban, lower class women. Within this context, Bora gives examples such as giving plastic plates to charwomen, asking them to change their clothes in the bathroom, and directing them to different bathrooms than those used by the family.

Civil servants at METU use hygiene to underline the inferiority of the subcontracted workers and to differentiate themselves from them. Although, the cleaning workers take shower every day after work, they are associated with bad smell and dirt. Şükriye told me about the humiliating words of a civil servant which hurt her deeply:

“O bayan dedi ki memur muydu bilemiyorum ama kesinlikle memur olması lazım. Şey dedi yaa dedi yarın dedi servisler birleşiyomuş dedi artık dedi şirket elemanları pis pis kokarak binerler bu servise tıklım tıklım dedi... O çok ağarıma gitmişti benim.”⁶⁶

Gül and Dilan also told me some civil servants and instructors who carefully avoid physical contact with the subcontracted workers and do not touch anywhere in the personnel buses. The obsession of the civil servants with associating themselves with hygiene and cleaning workers with dirt is a result of the need to underline social hierarchies (Bora 2005, 147).

The workers however do not accept as legitimate their association with these images of dirt and bad smell, and they use the same discourse of dirt and bad smell against the civil servants. Hatice says: “Memursun ama çok affedersin

66. “That woman, who must be a regular employee, said that tomorrow the personnel buses were to be merged; now the buses will be overcrowded and full of bad smell of the subcontracted workers. I took offence at that.” Şükriye, interviewed at METU, 2011.

sucuğu yiyip sarımsaklıyı yiyip gelip kokan da sensin. Şirket elemanı senden daha temiz görünüyo.”⁶⁷ Gülenay, who worked in the Rectorate building one summer time, talks about the differences in their working conditions with those of the civil servants: “Ben rektörlükte çalıştım, orda banyo yapma hakkım yoktu. Akşama kadar terliyodum yani kokuyodum. (Memurların) Kendi oturdukları yerde klimalar üflüyodu ama bize üfleliyodu.”⁶⁸

The discussion above may seem to include particular examples of the relevancy of inferior and dirty lower class images. However, the subcontracted workers were more hurt by the silence of the people in the personnel buses towards the humiliation of the civil servants. They read this as a sign of the acceptance of the legitimacy of the attitudes of the civil servants on the campus. Dilge (45) tells me how the silence, both while and after the civil servant forced her to give her seat to him, hurt her: “Nalet olsun gaderime dedim içimden. Ayakta geldim o gün. Ve hiç bir Allah'ın gulu da galkıp yer vermedi. Çünkü şirketsin. Çünkü alt gademedesin. Seni gaydeye almıyolar.”⁶⁹

Gülşen also draws attention to the general undervaluation of the work done by the cleaning workers: “Servisteki diğer kimse bi şey demiyo... İçinden aynı şeyi düşünüyö demek ki cevap vermiyo... Tamam, biz memuruz ama onlar da burada çalışan işçilerimiz diye söyleyen hiç kimseyi duymadım.”⁷⁰

67. “You are regular employee but you smell since you eat sausage, garlicky food and come to the workplace. Subcontracted workers seem cleaner than you.” Hatice, interviewed at METU, 2011.

68. “I worked in the President’s Office building. There I didn’t have the right to take shower. I was sweating until the evening, I mean I smelled bad. Air conditioners were turned on where the civil servants worked, but where we worked, there wasn’t any air conditioning.” Gülenay, interviewed at METU, 2011.

69. “I said to myself god damn my fate. I came standing that day. And nobody stood and gave their seat to me. Because you’re subcontracted and at a lower level. They don’t care about you.” Dilge, interviewed at METU, 2011.

70. “Noone else in the bus says something... They must think the same way so that they did not reject... I never heard of anyone who said that OK, we are regular employees, but these are also our workers.” Gülşen, interviewed at METU, 2011.

This silence may force the subcontracted cleaning workers to keep silent and not to resist. Gülenay for instance said that if she was asked to give her seat to a civil servant, she would not do that. However, when I asked what if nobody in the bus defended her, she said that she would have to stand up for herself then, in order not to be offended.

In addition to the civil servants, the relationship between the cleaning workers and dormitory managers in particular is shaped by the lowest status of the cleaning work as well. As discussed in the first chapter, the managers favored the subcontracted personnel whereas they avoided intimacy with the cleaning workers. Hatice talks about the differing attitudes of the managers to them and to the personnel on the desk, although both of them are subcontracted:

“Tabi ki danışma çok farklı, danışmadaki elemanlar sanki müdür’anımın koruması altındaki şeyleri. Her anlamda onlar ayrıcalıklı. Özel günleri vardır, mesela bi doğum günü vardır onların kutlanır... Senin özel gününü bilmez, senin yaşının kaç olduğunu, hangi gün olduğunu bilmez ama onun doğum günü olur, ona parti yapılır, ona pasta alınır, böyle bi kutlama yapılır ve senden hizmetini bekler.”⁷¹

Gülenay, from a guest house, observes a similar difference in a different context;

“Şeyde hissediyodum ben mesela ya söylenecek bi şey değil ama müdür bi şey alıyordu mesela, ordaki insanlarla yiyodu, diyelim bi çikolatası var, bi şeysi var, onlarla paylaşıyodu ama işte seninle paylaşmıyodu. Tamam, bazı gelir seninle de paylaşıyodu ama yani onlarla daha çok paylaşıyodu, onlara daha çok veriyodu.”⁷²

71. “Of course the personnel in the desk are very distinct. The personnel are like the things under protection of the manager. They are distinguished in every term. Their birthdays for example are known by the manager, and celebrated... The manager doesn’t know your special days, your age, your birthday, but birthday parties are made for them, cake is bought, a celebration like that is made, and you are expected to serve.” Hatice, interviewed at METU, 2011.

72. “I felt that in cases for example, it is not something proper to say but the manager was buying something for example. She didn’t share it with you, but ate it with the personnel. When she had chocolate or something, she shared it with them but not you. OK, she sometimes shared with us too, but I mean she shared more with them, she gave more to them.” Gülenay, interviewed at METU, 2011.

The personnel's awareness of this superiority sometimes gives them the right even to insult the workers openly. Feride and Dilge from the same dormitory told me that when they, out of intimacy, made a joke about the personnel, they were met with the reply: "Who are you to say something like this to me / to intervene with me". Gonca also talked about the previous personnel on the desk, who reminded her of the status difference between personnel and cleaning workers and warned her not to be intimate with the cleaning workers. Şükriye also heard a similar talk of the personnel among themselves about the cleaning workers: "Danışmaya diyo ki siz bunlara yüz veriyosunuz, ama bunu da diyen kim? Danışma, danışmaya diyo. Ama ya biz insanız orda, neyiz?"⁷³

Some workers talked about the commanding attitudes of the personnel in the dormitories. Gülenay observes the feeling of superiority of the personnel when they give commands to them;

"Bize bi iş buyuruyolar... Malzeme geliyo falan, taşıyoruz ağır ağır mesela... E danışma görevlisi n'apıyo, yanımızda geliyo, gidiyo... Sana yardım edip de şunu şuradan şuraya almıyo. Canı isterse alıyo yani. Burada şimdi danışma görevlisi hamile, ben de hamileyim. Sana diyebiliyo işte Gülenay şunu at diyebiliyo mesela... O da hamile ben de hamileyim ama o sana iş buyurabiliyo yani."⁷⁴

The managers' protection towards the personnel gives them a feeling of superiority and out of the confidence they take from the managers put pressure upon the cleaning workers.

In the public dormitories and guest houses, the cleaning workers might have intimate relations with the personnel on the desk. In these dormitories, there are not very well defined boundaries among the workers. The rooms of the cleaning workers and the personnel are not very strictly separated and the cleaning workers

73. "The personnel in the desk said that you spoil them too much. Who says that? The personnel in the desk say to the other personnel. But we are humans too, what are we?" Şükriye, interviewed at METU, 2011.

74. "They order us to do things... Heavy equipments come for example, we carry them. What do the personnel do? They come and go with us. They don't help you carry it. I mean they do if they want to... One of the personnel in the desk is pregnant now, and I am pregnant too. But she can tell me to carry something. She is pregnant and I am too, but she can order me to do work." Gülenay, interviewed at METU, 2011.

can sit and rest on the information desk. In the EBI dormitories, in contrast, the boundaries are more strictly defined. The room, kitchen and baths of the cleaning workers are bigger compared to those in the public dormitories and they even have a television but they are strictly separated from those of the other personnel. Communication between the cleaning workers and the other personnel is more formal and limited compared to that in the public dormitories.

In the public dormitories, therefore, social hierarchies can be challenged more easily by the subcontracted workers. In five dormitories to which I went for interviews, the personnel on the desk and storehouse supervisors were eating lunch and spending their breaks together with the cleaning workers, even in the latter's rooms or kitchen on the basement floor. In two public dormitories there were some personnel on the desk who actively supported the protest march of the subcontracted workers in 2009. Although private dormitories limit the autonomy of subcontracted cleaning workers to resist social hierarchies, they have not yet completely accepted them as legitimate.

As to the relations of the cleaning workers with the students, a contradictory picture exists as well. Cleaning work in the METU dormitories is a public service and the relationship between the students and the workers is more and more expected to be a rationalized labor relation in contrast to the 'pseudo-kinship relation' (Kalaycıoğlu & Tılıç 2000) between the charwomen and their middle class employers. Due to the specific cultural tradition in Turkish society and its egalitarian elements, the relationship between the workers and students has also not been entirely rationalized, yet. However, with the neo-liberal transition and the resulting sharpening tone of social hierarchies, these elements in the cultural tradition have weakened.

The neo-liberal transition has brought privatization and commodification of the educational apparatus. Within this context, METU has been internalizing the logic of the private sector, and the students in the dormitories are more and more treated as customers, who pay the cost of staying in the dormitories and therefore must

always be kept satisfied. As Feride says: “Müdür’anıma göre bence hep öğrenciler haklı. Çünkü onlar velinimetimiz.”⁷⁵

In order to keep the customer-students satisfied, the relations between the subcontracted cleaning workers and the students are controlled and regulated from above. This may be thought of in parallel to the transformation of the urban space so as to prevent any kind of encounter of middle / upper classes with the dirty, smelly and dangerous lower classes. Within this context, the subcontracted cleaning workers are told to be always kind and smiling towards the students, to call them by their names, to pay attention to the students, to climb down, to apologize in cases of students’ problems with them although they are right, and to keep silence when the students reprimand them.

When I asked the workers about their most disappointing memory of the students, some of them talked about students who shouted at and reprimanded them. Feride from the state dormitory told me about a student who reprimanded her because she unintentionally woke her up when she entered the room at 11.30 am to clean. She said that her pride was so broken when someone much younger than her loudly reprimanded her that she went to the dormitory manager and told her what happened. However she was more disappointed when the manager told her to climb down in her affairs with students who were stressed due to their lessons and exams.

Çiğdem, from a guest house, also told me her worst memory of the dormitories. One day, she had to leave one student’s room while cleaning upon a call for her from the information desk. Before she came back to continue cleaning, the student went to the manager and complained that Çiğdem has left her work unfinished. She was more hurt when the manager asked her to apologize to the student although she was right:

“Bana hiç sormadan, danışmadan gidip şikâyet etmesi daha sonradan da o bana git, özür dile... O zaman benim fikrime hiç önem vermemiş oluyo.

75. “For the dormitory manager, the students are always right. Because they are benefactors.” Feride, interviewed at METU, 2011.

Beni hiç duymamış oluyo, o haklı, o buraya para veriyo, sen gidip özür dileyeceksin... Bu bazen beni üzüyo çünkü nasıl, ha tamam belirli yerlerde haklı olabilir ama ya ben, benim hakkım? Tamam, o haklı, ben özür dileyebilirim amma benim haklı olduğum zaman kim benden özür dileyecek?”⁷⁶

We have mentioned in the previous chapter that attempts were made to keep intimacy between the students and the cleaning workers at a minimum level, and it is controlled from above in the dormitories. As a reflection of the mentality which transforms the students to customers and the university to a private company, any encounter with the subcontracted workers, who are associated with dirt and bad smell, is associated with unhealthiness and infectiousness. In the public dormitories, there are no strict precautions against intimacy and the workers can resist the existing tendencies, but in the EBI dormitories structural precautions, namely periodic floor change and distribution of an evaluation form to the students, aimed at preventing intimacy between cleaning workers and the students make the workers hesitant in their relations with the students.

Through these precautions, the cleaning workers are forced to do their work and leave in the EBI dormitories. The continuous control of intimacy and the unquestionable priority of the students puts extra pressure on them as Gonca says:

“Öğrenciyle ilişkide, samimiyette, bi şey paylaşırken tedirgin oluyoruz yönetim duyarsa diye... Olur ya ne bileyim konuşmaların olsun, esprilerin olsun müdüriyete gider. Yani o korkun oluyo.”⁷⁷

The attitudes of the students towards the cleaning workers are also very much shaped by these precautions. One example of the effect of giving the authority to

76. “The fact that she directly went to complain without even asking me and then the manager told me to apologize... That means that she doesn’t take notice of my thoughts. She doesn’t even hear me. (The student) is right, she pays money to the dormitory, and you will go and apologize! This sometimes makes me sorry. How? OK, she may be right at some points, but what about me? She’s right, and I can apologize, but who will apologize to me when I’m right?” Çiğdem, interviewed at METU, 2011.

77. “In our relationship with the students, we feel uncomfortable while building intimacy and sharing something with the students in case that the management might hear about it; in case that your jokes might be heard by the manager. I mean you have that fear.” Gonca, interviewed at METU, 2011.

evaluate the workers to the students can very well be seen in what Şükriye experienced with one student before and after the form was given to her:

“Kızımın biri mesela çok dağanıktı, toz alamıyodum ben. O zaman günaydın, meraba diyodu... O dosyayı da o kıza vermişler. Bilmiyorum ama. Kağat eline geçmeden önce merabalaşan, günaydınlaşan kız, dağanık olan kız; ay bi gün odasına girdim, günaydın diyorum, ses vermiyo, arkasını döndü. Ondan sora masasını toplamış, tozunu aldım, çıkıyorum, iyi günler dedim, ses vermedi. Allah Allah kızın bana böyle hayırdır niye merabayı kesdik? Bi hafta sonra duydum ki kağat ondaymış! Ben onu anlıyamadım. Ben ona çok üzölmüşüm.”⁷⁸

As in this example, the reflections of the transformed mentality are not only seen in the managerial regulations but more importantly in the attitudes of the students towards the cleaning workers. The subcontracted cleaning workers talked about the students’ indifferent, disrespectful, and haughty attitudes towards them.

To begin with, all the cleaning workers without exception talk about the dirtiness of the students which indicates the fact that they do not give worth to the workers’ labor and day-long efforts to make the dormitories livable for the students. They say that the students, including those who are close and kind to the workers, are very dirty and they use the dormitories carelessly. They complain about the students who do not flush the toilet, defecate on the outside of the alla turca toilet, and leave their sanitary napkins and used epilating materials open in the rooms. Due to the low status of cleaning work, workers and their labor are not shown respect by the students as well as the other employees on the campus. Nurcihan says that the students negate their labor by their careless and disrespectful attitudes:

“Yani çevrede vardır ya okumuş insan başka olur. Neyi başka olur? ... Sifonu çekmeyi bilmiyo. Yani dönüp de demiyo ki ya bu da bi insan. Sen benim emeğimi de inkâr ediyosun oraya gelip pisleyerek... Düşünebiliyo

78. “One of my girls were very untidy, I couldn’t even do the dust. She was greeting me at the time... They had given the form to that girl. I didn’t know. The girl, who had greeted me, said hello and good morning to me, and was untidy before... God I walked into her room one day, I said hello, but there was no reply. She turned her back. Then she had tidied her desk, I dusted and said good afternoon while leaving, there was again no reply. God, why does my girl treat me like this, I thought? One week later I heard that the form was in her! I couldn’t understand that. That hurt me a lot.” Şükriye, interviewed at METU, 2011.

musun yani regli kanını duvara kalp çizenler varmış yani. Yani sen onu kendine yakıştırıyosan artık benim diycek bi şeyim yok ki.”⁷⁹

Feride agrees with Nurcihan that their labor is invisible: “Çok pisler. Öyle böyle değil yani. Çıkıyo ya nasılsa ordan, işi bitip çıkıyo. Kim gelirse gelsin, hiç umrunda değil.”⁸⁰ Adnan also takes those attitudes of the students as signs of bad intention: “Kötü niyet olup da yapanlar da var. Çocuk İzmirli, anası babası okumuş, güzel bi kişi. Yani o çocuk onu yapıyosa bil ki ben bilerek diyom.”⁸¹

A second point which makes the workers surprised is that the attitudes of the students are unpredictable towards the workers. They may behave warmly one day and not even greet the workers the other day. The workers especially talked about the students who treat them warmly when they need the workers. Gül talks about one such student: “Çok suratsız biri. Ondan ben o kızla konuşmak istemiyorum. Beni gördüğü zaman, anahtar istemeye gelceği zaman (taklit ederek) “Anahtar alabilir miyim?” şöyle tatlı dille şey yapıyo böyle. İş düşünce!”⁸²

Gülenay is surprised by the randomness of the students’ intimacy with her:

“Bi kız vardı, ben o kıza ne zaman günaydın desem kız bana cevap vermiyodu ve ben bunu bi sene devam ettirdim ve kız bana hiçbir zaman günaydın demedi. Bi gün hıdırellez miydi neydi, bana içi çerez dolu bi şey verdi... Bi de böyle boyalı bi yumurta verdi. Ben sana bunu vermek istiyorum dedi birden bana. Şaşırdım, dedim herhalde bundan sonra iyi

79. “It’s believed that the educated people are different. How different?... They don’t know how to flush the toilet. I mean they don’t think that these are humans too. You also negate my labor by doing that... Can you imagine there are those who draw heart shape on the wall with their blood while they have period? I mean I don’t have anything to say if you regard that as suitable for you.” Nurcihan, interviewed at METU, 2011.

80. “They are very dirty, I mean extremely. They somehow or other leave there (the restrooms). They don’t care who comes after them.” Feride, interviewed at METU, 2011.

81. “There are also those who have bad intention. The boy is from İzmir, for instance, his parents are educated, he is a good person. I mean if that boy does that, I say it is intentional.” Adnan, interviewed at METU, 2011.

82. “She is grumpy. That’s why I don’t want to talk to that girl. When she sees me, whenever she comes to asks for the keys (mimickingly) ‘can I have the keys?’. I mean with a sweet talk, she speaks. When she needs me!” Gül, interviewed at METU, 2011.

olacak, en azından bi merhaba desin günaydın desin. İnsan günaydın demeyene bozuluyo yani... Aradan baya bi zaman geçti, yine günaydın diyorum, kızda tık yok. O araki şeyi neydi acaba, bilmiyorum.”⁸³

This uneven temper indicates the underlining fact of the relationship of the students with the cleaning workers which is hierarchy. The students do not see the workers as someone that does their heavy work and to whom they should be grateful but instead they see the workers as someone who cleans their dormitories and is paid for that. Therefore they do not feel the need to establish long term relations with the cleaning workers.

More importantly, the cleaning workers are most surprised and humiliated by the haughtiness of the students. As asked by the dormitory management, the workers behave kindly to the students; ask permission to enter and clean their rooms, and try to use the names of the students or expressions such as “dear” or “honey”. Despite all their efforts, the workers without exception talked about some students who see them only as cleaning workers who have to clean because this is what they are paid for. Hatice from the EBİ dormitories says: “Bazıları mecbursun, yapacaksın gibi davranıyo... Ben zenginim, okuyorum bak, ODTÜ gibi bi yerde ohuyorum ama sen altı üstü bi temizlikçisin, ya bunu hissettirenler de var.”⁸⁴

Çiğdem had to apologize to a student when the student thought she left her work unfinished. She was more hurt by the student’s reply: “Ben buraya 500 milyon para veriyorum dedi, bi anda dedi, sen dedi yapmak zorundasın dedi.”⁸⁵

83. “There was one girl, whenever I said good morning, she didn’t say anything and I continued doing that for one year and she never said good morning to me. One day, it was spring festival or something and she gave me something full of snack... She also gave me a painted egg. Suddenly she said I wanted to give you this. I was surprised, and thought that she would be better now. I wished her to say good morning at least. Those who don’t gret you make you demoralized I mean... Some time passed, I said good morning, not a sound. What was that in between past and present, I don’t know.” Gülenay, interviewed at METU, 2011.

84. “Some treat you that you’re obliged to do... there are those who make you feel that I’m rich and student in a place like METU, but you are only a cleaning worker.” Hatice, interviewed at METU, 2011.

85. “She said ‘I pay 500 million here, you have to do what I say.’ Çiğdem, interviewed at METU, 2011.

Some workers also observed that students treated them differently than the other personnel, as the managers did. Dilge was hurt by their inferiority in the eyes of the students:

“Ben onun ađar işini yapıyorum. Benim başıma geldi... Dilge ablaa bana yardım eder misin, bavulları indirmem lazım, otobüsüm kaçacak, böyle. Yemin ederim Öznur, yukardan aşşađa indirdik beraber. Sađolasın dedi ve gitti danıřmadakilernen görüřtü öpüřtü alasmaldık dedi gitti. Bana hiç demedi ki Dilge abla Allah razı olsun, teřekkür ederim, gel bi öpüyüm. Bu da benim zoruma gitti yani. Ben onun eşyasını taşıyom. Tařımaya mecbur deđilim ama. Bi de yeni çıkmıřtım yukarı. O da direk onlara gitti. Benim çok sinirime gitti... Mesela biz onların şey temizliklerini yapıyoruz ediyoruz, onlar yanımızdan geđerken bi selam vermezler iyi akřamlar demezler, ama danıřmaya direk konuřurlar ederler. İřte onlar bile ayırıyo yani. Direk adımız temizlikçi.”⁸⁶

Gül observes a very similar difference shaped by the low status of cleaning work and the images of dirt associated with the cleaning workers:

“Eli cebinde, masada oturan kiřiler çok iyiler, onlarla konuřmayı, sohbet yapmayı bilirler. Ama bize gelince suratını asıp, burnunu asar giderler... Gündüz iş elbisesi üstümüzdeyken mesela ayrı konuřma oluyo, ahřam elbisemizi giydikten sonra ayrı bi konuřma oluyo. Hani biz ahřamları düzgün giyiniyoruz ya. Çok ayrı bi konuřma oluyo... Gündüz çok konuřmak bile istemiyo yani uzak duruyo, ama ahřam olunca yakınlařıyo. Öyle insanlar var.”⁸⁷

We have said that class relations are relations of smell. Within this context, Gülenay told me about a student who always treated her coldly and never greeted her despite her efforts. She was surprised when one day the student gave her a

86. “We do their heavy work, I experienced once, let me tell you. She came to me, ‘aunt Dilge, could you please help me carry my luggage, I am going to miss my bus’. I swear Öznur, we carried the bags from fourth floor to bottom floor together. She said thanks and went to the personnel on the desk, kissed them, hugged them and left. She never thanked me from the heart, and said let me kiss you. This hurt me I mean. I carry her things although I don’t have to. And I had just gone upstairs. She directly went to them. And that got on my nerves. For example, we do their cleaning but they don’t greet us when they pass by, and say good evening. But they talk to the personnel on the desk. I mean the students even make discrimination. We are just cleaning workers.” Dilge, interviewed at METU, 2011.

87. “Those whose hands are in their pockets and who sit all day are very good; they know how to chat with them. But when it comes to us, they pull a long face and leave. For example they speak differently when we have work clothes on and after we change our clothes in the evenings. I mean, since we wear more properly in the evenings. During the day, they don’t want to talk to us very much and keep distant, but in the evenings they get closer. There are people like that.” Gül, interviewed at METU, 2011.

bottle of perfume as a gift for her efforts. After that, their relations continued only with greetings. The fact that perfume is the first thing which came to the mind of the student – who has no close relations with Gülenay-, is related with the association of the cleaning workers with bad smell, similar to the intellectual (Erdoğan 2010b) and the capitalist (Erdoğan 2012c) who thought first about smell when they were to talk about lower class people.

In addition, as a reflection of the association of the lower classes with danger and crime as discussed above, subcontracted cleaning workers are the primary suspects of theft in the eyes of the students and managers. Accordingly, they are firstly called by the students and / or the managers about whether they know / saw anything. When the answer is that they did not, questions about the time of their entrance to the room follow. Until the thief is found, they remain under suspicion.

İsmail talked about the times when he first came to METU in 1999. At the time, successive thefts happened in the second dormitory as a result of which the cleaning workers were fired. However, when one student put a camera on his room, it became clear that the carpenter was the thief. Dilge also told me that when there was a theft in her dormitory, she heard the director of the dormitories ask the student whether the cleaning worker could be the thief. Gülenay also told me that once a student left his walkman in her dormitory before summer, and his parents called the manager to find and send the walkman to them. However, the room number they told to the manager was wrong. When the cleaning workers found the walkman in another room, the manager (whom, Gülenay said, is a very good and understanding person) accused them of having taken the walkman first and then, out of fear, to having put it in another room.

Although Dilge and Gül told me that students defended them to the managers in cases of theft, the general picture was the opposite. The cleaning workers are the first suspects in the eyes of the students as well, and their association with crime leaves them defenseless, as Gonca says:

“Ya şimdi kızcağız odasına bi şeyini koydu, gitti. Ben de ondan sonra girdim, temizliğimi yaptım. Orda onun altın kolyesi de varsa ben onu fark

etmemişimdir. Ya da almıştır çantasına koymuştur, cüzdanına koymuştur, parayı çıkartırken ederken düşürmüştür, fark etmemiştir. O zanneder ki ben onu oraya koydum, masanın üzerinde zanneder, gelir direk der ki benim kat görevlim Gonca ablaya soralım, benim kolye ordaydı der, ki ben görmemişimdir mesela. Beni suçladığı zaman ben ne diyebilirim? Sen orda yapmış görürsün, karalanırsın yani.”⁸⁸

Adnan, Akif and İsmail talked about their disappointment when students, who had good relations with them, came to ask them whether they saw their stolen things after a theft occurred. Adnan also said that some students protected their roommates but not the workers. He talked about a student on his floor, whose 400 TL was stolen and asked the cleaning workers first with an assumption that they must have taken it. When the dormitory manager offered to call the police to take fingerprints, the student declined because his roommates might have touched his wallet.

Şükriye was humiliated when she was the first person coming to her student’s mind in case of missing things:

“Kapıdan gelir gelmez çantayı terliğin üzerine bırakmış... Terlik giyecek, terlik yok... ‘Şükriye abla’ dedi, ‘efendim’ dedim, ‘terliğim yok’ dedi. ‘Nasıl’ dedim, ‘olur mu canım, ben yeni çektim süpürkeyi, bi de ben bakıyım’ dedim. Girdim içeri, baktım, çantayı kaldırdım, terlik altında... ‘Ay teşekkür ederim, ben panikle bulamadım’ dedi. Tam kapıyı çekip çıkıcaktım, kapıya doğru yöneldim, öbür kız dedi, ‘hii, demedim mi sana, günahını aldın, yapmaz abla!’ dedi. Ben ona çok üzülmüştüm.”⁸⁹

88. “Now, say the student put something in her room and left. I entered after her, did my cleaning. Even if there was a neckless there, I didn’t even realize it. Or she might have put it in her bag or wallet and pulled it when she tried to take her money but she might not have realized. She thinks that I took it from the ground and put it on the desk. She directly says that let’s ask Gonca, because my neckless was there –but I didn’t even see it for example. What can I say when she blames me? You seem to have done it, you become slandered.” Gonca, interviewed at METU, 2011.

89. “As she entered the room, she left her bag over her slippers... She was going to wear slippers, but they were absent. ‘Şükriye’ she said, and I said ‘yes’, she said ‘my slippers are absent’. I said ‘how come, I’ve just swept there, let me look once again’. I entered the room, looked around, pulled her bag, the slippers were there... She said ‘thank you, I couldn’t find with panic’. I was just going to leave the room and directed to the door, the other girl said ‘God, I told you, she can’t have done it. You accused her for nothing’. That made me very sad.” Şükriye, interviewed at METU, 2011.

In addition to the administrative precautions, some workers talked about the students' methods to check on the workers concerning theft. Necati stated that most of the students put hidden cameras somewhere in the rooms to check the workers. Ömür also observed in her dormitory that some students were putting money on the floor or on a visible part of the rubbish bin and tested whether she took it. In the answers, there was a gentle ridicule of the students who think the workers are that stupid not to realize that they are being tested. Nevertheless, Ömür said that being tested felt really bad: "Kötü, çok kötü. Dışardan diyosun ki hani böyle bi kişiliğim mi var, öyle mi görüyolar falan diye düşünüyosun yani. Hani yapar, eder, tipi onu gösteriyo falan. Yani kendinden bile şüpheleniyosun açıkçası."⁹⁰

In addition to this picture, workers also talked about the students they love and feel close to. Gül said that she loved one of her students as her own child and carried her photograph with her in addition to her son's photo. Çiğdem, Gül and Feride talked about some students who helped their children with their exams and homework without expecting anything in return. Dilge and Gülsen talked about some students who comprehend when they are too tired to clean their rooms. Male workers, similarly, talked about students, who invited them to their rooms for tea/coffee and shared the food sent by their mothers from their hometowns. Dilge also told me a student who defended her in front of the directorate of the dormitories who suspected her in case of a theft.

There has been a 'hocam' culture on the METU campus since the late 1960s, which has also expanded to Ankara. This culture is rumored to have been started in the late 1960s by Sinan Cemgil, who was looking for a form of address which excluded all the hierarchies.⁹¹ Accordingly, everyone calls each other 'hocam' which means my master and which establishes an equal basis for social interaction

90. "It's bad, very bad. You think whether I look someone like that from the outside. I mean you know, she can do it, she looks like someone who can do it. I mean you even feel suspicious about yourself." Ömür, interviewed at METU, 2011.

91. <http://t24.com.tr/haber/sinan-cemgil-hocam-hikayasini-baslatan-isimdi/203977>

and erases the socio-economic and status differences among people. This tradition still continues at METU as well as in Ankara, even though in a weakening tone. While the students have more and more been calling the cleaning workers as (elder) sister, brother, aunt or uncle, the majority of the subcontracted cleaning workers still call the students ‘hocam’. Female workers tend more to call them honey or dear, in order to emphasize their good intention from the beginning. This can be said to have resulted from the changing managerial tendencies in the dormitories as a result of the neo-liberal transition. Although the egalitarian elements in the cultural tradition have been weakening, as the students have started to be treated as customers of the dormitories, they still exist in the METU dormitories.

In the light of the workers’ narratives about the haughty, careless, unpredictable attitudes of the students, we should acknowledge that the transition in the labor regime and in the way class hierarchies are experienced has been reflecting more and more in the attitudes of the students towards the workers. It is important to underline that we do not have substantial information about the social class base of the students since the monthly prices of the dormitory rooms at METU vary from 120 TL to 1,268 TL. The social class base of the students differs, therefore. The students whose family earns the minimum wage for instance cannot stay in the private dormitories, whereas those who have better socio-economic conditions may not prefer to stay in the public dormitories. What is important instead is the mentality that rules the students’ perception about class differences and attitudes towards subcontracted cleaning workers.

As we have said, there is a difference between the public and private dormitories in terms of existing possibilities to resist social hierarchies. The stricter tendencies in private dormitories to treat the students as customers also cause another difference in terms of the attitudes of the students towards the workers. Some workers talked about a difference between the students in the public and private dormitories. Adnan, who has worked in both types of dormitories, says that there is a huge difference between the students in public dormitories and private ones.

He feels close to those in the state dormitories who are generally from rural, lower classes, whereas those in the private dormitories could spend his monthly wage in one night. Therefore, he says that he could not develop common feelings with the students in the private dormitories. İsmail also said that he was much closer with his students in the state dormitory in the sense that they shared their lunch and lent money to each other; however, this kind of intimacy is impossible with the students in the private dormitories. Hatice, from the private dormitories, also said that she felt closer to the students with scholarships for the same reasons put forward by Adnan and İsmail.

Although there is a difference between public and private dormitories, there is one fact that cuts the attitudes of the students in both dormitories vertically, namely the difference between the students in the past and the newcomers. Seven workers, who have been working in the dormitories for more than five years, agreed that the students when they first came to the METU dormitories were more careful, respectful, and considerate towards them compared to the newcomers. They all agree that the student profile has been worsening in terms of the attitudes towards them every year. Şükriye says: “Yani ilk geldiğimde öğrencilerimin bütün ismini biliyodum. Ne biliyim onlarla daha şeydim sanki, böyle iç içeydim.”⁹²

Gülenay complains about the change in their relations with the students as a result of the difference between the students in the past and now:

“İnsanlar artık merhaba demekten çekiniyo, daha bi agresif olmuş... Eski öğrenciler yok yani. Eskiden daha güzeldi, odaya girip konuşan da oluyodu, senle sohbet edip çay içen de oluyodu... Eskiden senden biriymiş gibiydi yani. Şimdiki öğrenci yok, merhaba bile demiyo... Umrunda değil sen odasını temizlemişsin, temizlememişsin.”⁹³

92. “I mean, when I first came (to METU), I knew all my students’ names. I was more like, more intimate, then, I guess.” Şükriye, interviewed at METU, 2011.

93. “People now hesitate even to say hello, they’ve become more aggressive... The students in the past were no longer here. It was better before, there were those who came to your room and had a cup of tea and a chat with you. It was like they were one of you before. Those students are gone, now they don’t even greet you... They don’t care whether you clean their room or not.” Gülenay, interviewed at METU, 2011.

Mustafa from the EBİ dormitories talks about the change in the students as well as in the dormitory rules regarding intimacy between the workers and the students:

“Eski öğrenciler daha canayahındı. Daha iyilerdi, daha derli toplu, daha çalışkan. İnsanlıkları daha iyiydi diyebilirim. Şimdi bi de sık sık kat değişikliği olduğu için biz öğrenciyle tam tanışmadan belki başka kata geçebiliyon. Onun için pek aşırı samimiyetlik de olmuyo. Eskiden olurdu bazı öğrencilerle çay kahve içerdik, bazıları yanımıza gelirdi, bizimle laflardı, gonuşurdu, görüşlerimizi alırdı. Şimdi pek olmuyo yani çoh nadir... Eski öğrenciler mesela ramazan ayında bi arkadaşımıza ramazan pakedi şey falan hediye etmişlerdi. Öyle gendi aralarında yardım toplamışlar. Fitre adı altında... Şaşırmıştım yani, hiç, genelde bu tür şeyler öğrencilerden beklenmez, 2003 senesiydi galiba. Şimdiki öğrencilerden beklemiyoz, böyle bi şey görmedik de.”⁹⁴

Gül also says that the students in the past treated the workers respectfully:

“Vallahi eskiler sanki daha iyiydi, gerçekten. Şimdiki öğrenciler hiç lafa gelmiyo, burnu büyüme... Ama öncekiler çoh başkaydı, çoh iyilerdi... Mesela bi şey söylediğim zaman işte Gül Abla şuraya çok kötü yoruluyo ya, şuraya şöyle yapıyo ya biz yapmayalım ya diye aralarında konuştuklarını hep duyuyodum yani. Ve yıl başlarda felan Gül Abla bizim katı tertemiz yapıyo diye kat olarak kızlar aralarında para toplamışlar, bana robot almışlardı. Yani en azından benim nasıl çalıştığımı biliyolardı.”⁹⁵

Adnan, who has been at METU for ten years and works in a state dormitory, compares the old and new students and says that the former were more respectful while the latter are so wayward that they never listen to his warnings about the dormitory rules.

94. “The students in the past were warmer, better, tidier and more hardworking. I can say that they treated more humanely. Now that there is often floor change, you may change your floor before getting to know the students. Therefore, there isn’t much intimacy. We used to have that but, we drunk tea/coffee with them, some came to our rooms, we had a chat with them, they asked our opinions. Now there isn’t much, I mean very rare... The students for instance once prepared a gift pack for one of our friends and gave it to him in Ramadan. They collected money among themselves. I was surprised, I mean, these kinds of things aren’t generally expected from the students. It was 2003, I guess. We don’t expect from the current students, and we haven’t seen anything like that either.” Mustafa, interviewed at METU, 2011.

95. “I swear the students in the past were better, really. The newcomers are very spoiled, they don’t even listen to you. But in the past, they were very different. For example, they were aware how my work exhausted me. I always heard that they spoke among themselves that Gül got very tired cleaning there, so we should’ve kept there clean. And they collected money among themselves and bought me a food processor in one Christmas as remuneration for my efforts. At least they knew how hard I worked.” Gül, interviewed at METU, 2011.

Gonca who has been working in the dormitories for fourteen years observes the sharpening hierarchy in the attitudes of the newcomer students:

“İlk geldiğim dönemki öğrenciler daha bi sıcakkanlı daha bi böyle bi hani şöyle söyleyim sen bi çalışansın, sen bi temizlik elemanısın gözüyle asla bakmıyolardı. Kendileri gibi görüyolardı, kendileri gibi bağına basıyolardı. Şimdi mümkün değil... Aman işte ben şunla muhatap olmayım, ben bu elemanı sevmedim, ben bunla niye muhatap oluyorum ki boş ver diyenler oluyo.”⁹⁶

This difference indicates the sharpening tone of social hierarchies and weakening of the ‘hocam’ culture at METU. This sharpening tone of social hierarchies increases the symbolic violence of inequalities. Within this context, the feeling structure of younger workers was imposed by a split between conscious belief and inner conviction (Sennett and Cobb 1993, 96-7). Despite they never had a chance to be anything else, therefore, in secret they feel ashamed of who they are. As Sennett and Cobb (1993, 78-79) argues in the context of American laborers: “All these people feel society has limited their freedom more than it has limited that of middle-class people [...] but they are not rebellious in the ordinary sense of the word; they are both angry and ambivalent about their right to be angry.”

In this context, the younger workers were forced to defend themselves vis-à-vis the students at METU. They talked about the financial restrictions that prevented them from investing in educational credentials, emphasizing that they would do much better if they were given the chance. In this way, they have accepted their lower position which confuses their anger since they also feel the students have a right to feel superior.

As a result, the younger cleaning workers are more powerless vis-à-vis the sharpening tone of hierarchies. They seem to normalize the necessity of distance in their relations with the students, in contrast to the older workers, who prefer to develop relations with the students beyond a rationalized labor relation. The

96. “When I first came here, the students were friendlier. They never treated you as a cleaner or worker. They saw you as one of them and treated you as such. Now it isn’t possible. There are those who think ‘I didn’t like that worker, I’d better take no notice of him, never mind’. Gonca, interviewed at METU, 2011.

younger workers say that they do not need and therefore do not try to build intimacy with the students; instead, they would rather do their work and leave in the sense that this would give little space for interaction with the students.

Seda (25) for instance, says that since she is a ‘worker’, intimacy with the students is unnecessary:

“Sonuçta sen çalışan oluyosun. Oturup öyle bi sohbetin olmuyo. Kolay gelsin diyince sağol, günaydınla, sınavların nası geçti filan böyle. Öyle bi diyalogumuz olmuyo... Öğrenciyle samimiyete gerek duymuyorum... Öğrenciyle konuşmamın bi anlamı yok gibi geliyo çünkü mesafeyi korumam gerekir. Yani öyle olması gerekir. Sonuçta yani çalışanım, hani niye ki, oturup da aa senin ne derdin var gibisine konuşmam. Ama kendi anlatmak istiyosa dinlerim tabi.”⁹⁷

Damla (31) similarly says that she prefers to take the rubbish of the students from in front of the doors of the rooms without entering. Eren (32) also says that he does not prefer to build intimacy with the students who can neither be trusted nor are mature enough to understand him. Ömür (25) and Çiğdem (34) tell me that they do not prefer very much intimacy and their relation with most of the students is at the greeting level. Çiğdem was hesitant to build intimacy with the students because they might think that she overstepped the mark. Within this context, she told me that she overheard an argument of a student with her mother on the phone, but could not find the courage to ask her about it because she was afraid to receive a bad reply;

“Acaba niye üzüldü, niye canı sıkkın, sışılmasın diye soruyorum bunu ama o belki beni yanlış anlayabilir yani. Üzülürüm tabi ki o an... Sormadım da yalan yok. Yani o an cesaret etmedim o an o sinirle sormaya cesaret etmedim. Şimdi ben sorduğum an bana derse ki seni ne ilgilendirir, sana ne derse işte o beni üzer.”⁹⁸

97. “I mean you are a worker in the end. You don’t normally sit and have a chat with them. Your relation remains at the level of greeting, saying good morning, and asking how their exams passed, etc. We don’t have more dialogue... I don’t need intimacy with the students... I feel that there is no meaning to talk to them. I need to put a distance. I mean it’s a necessity. I mean I’m a worker in the end. I cannot have a chat with them about their problems. But if they want to talk, I’ll listen, of course.” Seda, interviewed at METU, 2011.

98. “Why is she sad and depressed, I wonder, but she may misunderstand me if I ask, I mean. And that makes me sorry, of course. ... I didn’t ask at that moment, I cannot lie about it. I mean I couldn’t feel courageous to ask since she was nervous. If I ask and she says it’s none of my business; that makes me sorry.” Çiğdem, interviewed at METU, 2011.

In contrast, the older workers all say that they become happy when the students ask their thoughts and advice, when the students invite them to their room to drink tea or coffee together or give them some provisions that their parents sent from their hometown. Gül (37), for instance, talked about a student whom she loved like her daughter and carried her picture near her son's. Gülsen (41) talked about a student in the Psychology department to whom she spoke and relaxed with every day. Dilge (45) and Feride (38) took their favorite students to their homes for dinner. Akif (54) expressed his happiness when the students shared their problems with him and asked what he thought. Necati (50) told me how happy he became when he encountered in the bank one of the students who had once stayed in his dormitory, and he quickly handled Necati's work. The older workers also are more courageous in taking the initiative to start talking with the new students, even if they do not greet them.

With this discussion about the difference between younger and older workers, I do not claim that the younger workers have accepted the social hierarchies without a problem. Rather it is claimed that, for younger workers, self-respect is more dependent on how they are seen by the 'superior' others, parallel to the findings of Kalaycıoğlu and Tılıç in their study about charwomen (2000, 111). Their doubt about respect is more dependent also on the problematic of ability-inability in Sennett and Cobb's terms (1993). In that context, because the younger workers are more hurt when they are treated as inferior, and because the moral weapons of the lower classes have weakened due to the penetration of negative lower class image into the lower segments of society, they use distance as a defense strategy.

Damla (31), for instance, seems not to care about the disrespectful and cold attitudes of the students by saying that she behaves toward the students as they behave toward her. However, as the interview goes, she says that when one student behaves coldly to her or does not greet her, she keeps her mind on those attitudes and feels very sorry about that.

Ömür (25) similarly talks about how sorry she was forced to feel by the students who do not greet her, which is a high number in her dormitory:

“Kötü oluyorum ya, çok kötü oluyorum. Kendimi yani ne biliyim böyle sanki beni hiç tiye almyo, ben sadece orada olmak zorunda olduğum için... Yani tamam ben olmak zorundayım ama sen bana bi günaydını esirgiyosan, ben orada sadece gerçekten senin yani sana ait bi hizmetçiymişim gibi hissediyorum kendimi.”⁹⁹

In conclusion, out of the workers’ narratives about the civil servants who treat them as if they are inferior, the discriminatory attitudes of the managers, and the haughty, unpredictable and careless attitudes of the students, it can be claimed that the egalitarian elements at METU and in Turkish culture in general have been weakened by the transition in the labor regime on the campus and increasing tendencies to rationalize the relation between the workers and the students in the dormitories. The workers in private dormitories and also younger workers are more subjected to the symbolic violence of inequalities and pushed to hesitation in their relations with the students. However, a contradictory picture reveals itself in the form of students who help the workers’ children with their lessons, friendship relations among the workers, the workers’ perception about the personnel on the desk, and the workers’ reaction to the students’ attitudes with surprise, disappointment and indignation. These examples indicate that the egalitarian culture has not been completely erased from the METU campus, yet.

4.2 The Search for Respect

Although the image regarding the subcontracted workers has become more and more negative, they reject the legitimacy of those images and social hierarchies. This indicates a commonality in their feeling structures with those of the urban poor (Erdoğan et al. 2007).

Their feelings of indignation and sorrow about the haughty attitudes towards them already show that class hierarchies are still not legitimate for these workers and they expect equal treatment. In particular in their relations with the students, they

99. “I feel sorry, very sorry. It’s like she doesn’t care about me and I’m there just because I have to be there... I mean OK, I have to be there, but if you deny even saying good morning to me, I really feel that I’m only a private servant that belongs to you.” Ömür, interviewed at METU, 2011.

think of themselves as mothers / fathers or brothers / sisters of the students. They also expect to be seen as family rather than solely as cleaning workers, who have to clean because it is their job.

The workers, secondly, resist accepting the neo-liberal hegemony since they do not explain their poverty with their inability, similar to the urban poor (Erdoğan 2007c, 76). They rather explain it with either the poverty of their families, which is the result of the failure of political actors, or with their honesty. Çiğdem says that wealth and poverty are transferred from the family: “Fahir zaten arhası yok ki, kendi yağında sürekli kavruluyo. Zengin zaten elinde var, onun çocuğu da zengin olur, torunu da zengin olur.”¹⁰⁰ Melek, in parallel to Çiğdem, says that some people are born rich: “Mesela bizde hiç bi şey yok. Babam normal bi devlet memuru. Ne verebilir? Hiç bi şey... Belki onların anadan babadan dededen kalma bi şeyleri var, o da olabilir. Kimi insan dünyaya zengin geliyo.”¹⁰¹

In the workers’ thoughts about the sources of wealth, unjust earnings are more emphasized than familial heritage. All of the workers say that wealth cannot be possessed with lawful and just earnings unless one was born into a rich family. Within that context, the subcontracted workers relate their poverty with their honesty, as Adnan says: “Biz doğruluktan (zengin) olamıyoz. Yoksa çalıp çırpmakta ne var ya çok kolay ama bizim şeyimiz olmaz.”¹⁰² Mustafa also says that wealth attained by dishonesty is not permanent:

“Zengin eğer vergisini verip de işçisinin bütün haklarını verip, sigortasını yapıp buna rağmen bu adam zengin oluyosa, dutup o adamı öpmek lazım.

100. “The poor already has nothing, they have to live on their names. The rich already have everything; therefore their children and grandchildren become rich as well.” Çiğdem, interviewed at METU, 2011.

101. “For example, we have nothing. My father is a public servant. What can he give us? Nothing... Maybe they have something inherited from their family, it can be. Some people are born rich.” Melek, interviewed at METU, 2011.

102. “We cannot be rich because of our honesty. Otherwise, what is difficult about stealing? But we have no business with that.” Adnan, interviewed at METU, 2011.

Ama ordan çalıp çırpıp burdan çalıp çırpıp da işinin hakkını gendi üzerine geçiriyosa zaten o zenginlik değildir, bi gün yok olur o.”¹⁰³

The subcontracted cleaning workers divide the rich into two groups as ‘the good rich’ and ‘the bad rich’. While the former refers to the rich people who do not see themselves as superior and treat the poor justly, the latter is those who look down on the poor. The ‘good rich’ and ‘bad rich’ distinction is a contradiction in the discourses of the workers since they all agreed that wealth is only possible with unjust earnings and they could not be rich due to their honesty. This indicates the fact that the source of wealth is still not legitimate for the subcontracted workers. Although they talked about the existence of ‘the good rich’, on the other hand, they could not give concrete examples of them in the interviews. However, they talked about the other group at length with concrete examples.

Dilge worked as a charwoman before coming to the METU dormitories. She talked about a house she went to only once as a result of the humiliating attitude of the employer;

“Bi tane bi eve gittim... Bana dedi ki ha kendi oğluyla kahvaltı yaptılar orda tamam mı mutfakta... Oğlunyan kalktılar kahvaltı hazırladılar hiç bana sormadılar bi. O çok zoruma gitti ve ben acıktım kahvaltı yapmadan geldim. Evimiz uzak, dört araba yapıyorum. İki araba akşam iki araba sabah. Saat altıda evden çıkıyorum ki taa Oran sitesine yetişebilim diye. Kahvaltı yapamıyosun haliyle. Sona onlar ikisi kahvaltıyı yaptı benim çok zoruma gitti. Bi de ney ne dedi ki, oğlu kalktı gitti, sen kahvaltı yapcak mısın? Ben de utandım yapcam demedim. Yok dedim işte utandım. Neyse öyle bana bi çay getirdi. O çayı içtim aç karnına.”¹⁰⁴

103. “If someone pays all his taxes and provides his workers with all their rights and he can remain rich, then congratulations to him. But if he steals from here and there, and doesn’t give the workers’ rights, then it isn’t richness, it disappears one day.” Mustafa, interviewed at METU, 2011.

104. “I went to a house... She had breakfast with her son, and they didn’t even ask me. I was hungry; I was using two vehicles, and leaving home at 6 a.m. so that I could arrive on time. Therefore I couldn’t make breakfast. Then they two had their breakfasts, I was offended very much. And also only after her son finished his breakfast and left the table, she asked me whether I was hungry. I was ashamed to say yes, and she put me a glass of tea. I drank it on an empty stomach.” Dilge, interviewed at METU, 2011.

Melek, (46) who is divorced and has two daughters living with her, also talked about a member of the parent-teacher association in a high school who humiliated her when she declined to donate to the school;

“Büyük kızımı liseye yazdırıcam... Çalışıyorum. Baba yok. Nerde olduğu bile bilinmiyo. Gittik işte sınıfın birisine, böyle okul aile birliğinden, sıralara oturmuşlar, kayıt yapıyorlar. Hanfendi ne kadar bağış yapacaksınız dedi bana. Öyle diyince zaten ses tonundan öyle bi anlıyosun ki, ne kadar yapmam gerekiyo dedim. Yani iki yüzden başlıyo. Bu iki yüz dediği de o zamanlar asgari ücret yüz yirmi beş milyon falan. Dedim ben veremem. Nası veremezsin? Ya dedim ben tek başına çalışıyorum. İki kızımı okutmaya çalışıyorum dedim. Halen böyle şeyimi sinirimi koruyorum yani. Tepkimi göstermiyorum. Tek başıma çalışıyorum hani anlayış bekliyorum. Hanfendi dedi, götür kızını, evde dedi çeyizini hazırlasın, koca beklesin dedi.”¹⁰⁵

Ömür also worked in the supermarkets and advertised some goods such as yoghurt and cheese before coming to METU. She talked about one ‘rich’ customer whose daughter is ‘spoiled’ and who threatened her with dismissal;

“Tanıtım yaparken mesela Real’de yapmıştım... Bi tane adam, ama zengin böyle, belli, kızı da şımarık, benden orman meyveli istedi. Elimde kalmamış. Ben de çıkmak üzereydim o saatte ajansı arasam getiremezler. Ben de elimde kalanı verdim azıcık bi şey. Bana dedi ki ben seni şikayet edeceğim, bi daha seni buraya aldırılmayacağım dedi. Niçin efendim, n’aptım dedim. Bana verdiği bakar mısın ya dedi bu ne böyle dedi dilenciye verilmez bu şekilde dedi. Ben de dedim ki niye öyle diyosunuz dedim, ben sonuçta tattırıcıyım dedim, doyurucu değilim dedim. E sonuçta reyonda da var, beğendiysen satın alabilirsin, yani bi kaşıқта anlamaz mısın sen neyin ne olduğunu? Ay dedi seni buradan attıracağım, seni şikayet ettireceğim. Buyurun dedim. Benim alt tarafı o ajansla işim biter. O olmaz başka ajans olur. Sınır oluyosun tabi ki ama bi şey diyemiyosun. Neler demek istiyosun halbuki.”¹⁰⁶

105. “I was going to register my older daughter to high school. I was working myself, her father was absent, and we didn’t even know where he was. Anyway, we went there, they were sitting in the tables, registering the students. He asked me how much donation I would make. His tone of voice was disturbing, and I asked how much I needed to make. He said it started from 200 million. At the time minimum wage was 125 million! I said I couldn’t give that amount. He said how? I said I was trying to sustain my two daughters with one wage. I didn’t overreact and expected understanding. He said ‘lady, take your daughter to home, let her prepare her dowry and wait for a husband!’” Melek, interviewed at METU, 2011.

106. “I promoted fruited yoghurt in Real... One man, it was obvious that he was rich and his daughter was spoiled, wanted to taste one, but I was about to leave and there was very little yoghurt left. I gave him that, and he said ‘I will complain about you, and not allow you to work here again’. I asked ‘why, what did I do?’ He said ‘look at what you gave me, this cannot be given even to a beggar’. I said ‘I’m only there to have people taste the products, but not to feed them’. If you like the taste, you can buy it; you can understand how it tastes when you have one teapot of it. He said ‘I will have you get fired, I will complain about you.’ I said ‘you can, I can go to other

As to the question of who is rich, most of the workers answered that it is the academic and administrative personnel. While the workers in the state dormitories do not think that the students are rich, those workers in private dormitories opposed that. Melek for instance said that the first thing she realized when she came to the EBI dormitories was the wealth of the students. Eren also thought that the students in the private dormitories are rich. The women workers in the guest houses on the other hand think that most of the students are well off and children of educated people and some students are rich. Those in the state dormitories also talked about poor students, who for instance ate pasta at breakfast.

When I asked how the rich treat the poor, therefore, the workers answered with reference to the personnel and the students at METU. Thinking about the manifestations of the dirty, smelly and dangerous lower class image in the attitudes of these people, it can be claimed that they are included in the ‘bad rich’ group, although not all of the workers openly said so.

The most important weapons of the subcontracted workers against social hierarchies are their moral-humanistic values. To the extent that class differences are set in relational terms (Bourdieu 1984, 372; cited in Bora 2005, 139-40), the workers negotiate with the boundaries of class differences and emphasize their honesty, assiduity, self-sacrificing, morality, appreciation, and good manners, although they are deprived of economic and educational capital. In that sense, it can be said that the difference between soul and appearance regarding the subalterns (Erdoğan 2007b, 34) is still valid in the minds of these workers. Against the negative image of the lower classes, they defend their inner beauty. Within this context, they relate richness with being dishonest, lazy, selfish, immoral, moneygrubbing, haughty, and unappreciative and disloyal to the family. So, in the underlying dominant / subordinate contradiction, the moral-humanistic values constitute the symbolic capital of the subcontracted workers.

agencies if they don't want me any longer?. You feel angry of course, but you can not say anything at that moment. However there are a lot of things you want to say actually.” Ömür, interviewed at METU, 2011.

As Sennett argues in the context of American laborers (1993, 25), the workers may feel that people of a higher class have a power to judge them because they seem internally more developed human beings, and, because they are better armed, they feel compelled to justify their position in order to earn respect. This indicates revulsion in the feeling structures of the workers, and they try to justify their work as opposed to the desk work of educated people.

The workers in that sense emphasized that they work much harder than anyone else on the campus because of the fact that the burden of METU is actually above the subcontracted workers, and without the cleaning work, no other work would be possible. In that sense, the subcontracted workers rejected the perception of respect which defines their labor as less valuable. Hatice rejects the symbolic value given to desk work vis-à-vis cleaning work: “Ben senden (memurdan) daha çok çalışıyorum. Tamam, sen orda iki kalem yazı yazıyorsun ama ben burada affedersin bilmem ne gibi çalışıyorum. Senin temizliğini dahi yapıyorum.”¹⁰⁷

Dilge in the same context opposes their labor’s inferiority to that of the personnel on the desk: “Konumu farklı yani. Mesela o danışmada oturuyo akşama kadar. Biz cebelleşiyoz akşama gadar, kıyafetlerimizle.”¹⁰⁸

Although they believe that their labor is not as valued as it deserves, what is more important than gaining what they actually deserve is to work for the good of their children. The subcontracted workers legitimize their performance in their unqualified, low-status work with their sacrifice in that sense. Dilge, who worked as a charwoman before coming to METU, was satisfied with her income on this basis, although she knew that it was less than what she actually deserved:

“(Kazandığı para emeğine) Aslında değmiyodu da ama yani işi yaptıktan sona hani o parayı eline veriyo ya o anda o yorgunluk bitiyodu. Ha değsin değmesin sade sen bi para kazanıyorsun. Sonuçta evine ekmek götürceksin,

107. “I work harder than you (regular employees). OK, you wield the pen there but I deal with your dirt all day long.” Hatice, interviewed at METU, 2011.

108. “Their status is different I mean. For example they sit on the desk all day, but we labor all day, with our cleaning clothes on.” Dilge, interviewed at METU, 2011.

çocuklarına giderken çikolata alcaksın. Yani o... o anda aldığım deęiyo gibi geliyo.”¹⁰⁹

The workers, by emphasizing their children’s subsistence, establish their poverty as something that could be voluntarily endured for the sake of walking with their heads high. This sacrifice and patience for the sake of the sustenance of their family represents the proof of qualification for the subcontracted workers (Erdoğan 2007c, 70-71).

We have said that sharpening tone of social hierarchies causes self-accusation in the younger workers. They are both angry and ambivalent about their right to be angry, as a result. However, the workers were not captured by that confusion. They compared themselves with the rich and talked about the things of which the rich are deprived while they had such as happiness, peace, and satisfaction which could not be derived from economic wealth. For the rich, on the other hand, everything is achievable therefore they are deprived of real satisfaction and happiness felt at the end of the struggle to achieve one’s desires. Seda (25) talks about the happiness of saving one’s own money:

“Özenmiyorum... Mutlu olmayan da var. Huzurlu olmayan da var. Hani hasta olup da zengin olmak var bi de. Sağlıklısun, elin ayağın tutuyo. Çalışıyosun, kendi paranı kazanıyosun... Gerçekten kendi paranı kazanmak çok ayrı bi şey. Ben çok fazla bi şeyim olsun istemezdim ya... Çok çok zengin oluyum gibisine bi şey düşünmedim. Ya da karşılaştınca özenmedim.”¹¹⁰

Damla (31) also compared herself with the students in her dormitories. She said that she had the material things that they also have, but have real satisfaction in

109. “What I earned actually wasn’t what I actually deserved but after your work was done, they gave you that money and your exhaustion ended at that moment. It doesn’t matter it was worth or not. You earn some money and you bring home the bacon. You will take chocolate for your children. I mean, it seems worthy at the moment you take the money.” Dilge, interviewed at METU, 2011.

110. “I don’t aspire... There are those ‘rich’ who are not happy and peaceful as well. I mean there is also wealth without health. You’re physically sound and strong. You work, earn your own money... Really it is very special to earn your money. I don’t want to have a lot of things... I haven’t dreamt of being very rich or so. Or I didn’t aspire when I encountered them.” Seda, interviewed at METU, 2011.

contrast to them: “Mesela ben teknoloji manyağım. Yani benim iki tane telefonum var. Notebook’um var evde. Üniversiteyi de yoğunluktan, işten güçten okuyamadım... Yani hiç imrenmiyorum bunlara... Zenginin var ama bende olan da onda yok.”¹¹¹

With these words, Damla also accepts her lower position and the legitimacy of using technology and having cell phones and Notebooks. Although she emphasizes what the ‘rich’ could not possess while she does, her acceptance also indicates the increasing tone of symbolic violence over the younger workers pushing them more to defensive discourses. This decreases the autonomy of the younger workers in their relations with the students. They preferred to keep a distance from the students, whose reactions they could not estimate, in contrast to the older workers who are more courageous in communicating with the students. The younger workers are more sensitive about the humiliating and degrading attitudes and words of the students; their indignation and anger about these are much stronger compared to those of the older workers.

As can be seen in their words, economic capital is not a legitimate source of social hierarchy in the eyes of the subcontracted workers. However, they compare themselves with the students and the personnel on the campus and accept them as successful on the basis of their educational capital and high-status jobs. “The certification of mind through formal education,” as Sennett and Cobb argue (1993, 180) “is a necessity to keep class inequality alive. By making people feel a disparity between what they ought to be as persons as a result of being educated and what they experience directly in their work, such certification persuades them that the onus rests on themselves.” Cultural capital in that sense is more legitimate than the economic one to establish social hierarchies for the subcontracted workers because they are led to self-accusation about their inadequacy. In that sense, due to working on a university campus within which they constitute the

111. “For example, I’m crazy about technology. I mean I have two cell phones. I have a notebook at home. I couldn’t continue my university education because of life struggle... I mean I don’t envy those at all... The rich have many things, but they don’t have the things I do.” Damla, interviewed at METU, 2011.

lowest level in terms of level of education, the symbolic violence of the hidden injuries of class concentrate on their position in the cultural hierarchy.

Even before their encounter with the people outside, some workers feel the hidden injury of class at home, concretized in their fear that their children, to whom they try to provide educational opportunities, would be ashamed of them. That is why the women workers expressed their indignation about their inability to help their children with their lessons. Çiğdem, who did not want to have children because she did not believe that she could provide them better lives than hers, says, for instance: “Çocuğuma yardımcı olamadığımda çok üzülüyorum, sinirleniyorum. Bana geliyo anne bunu anlamadım diyo. E anne anlamıyo ki? O yüzden hep diyorum keşke okusaydım.”¹¹² Within the same context, three women workers said that they bring their children to their dormitories and some students help their children with their exams and homework. They try to compensate for their deprivation of educational capital with their social capital.

Mustafa, from the EBİ dormitories, also feels thankful that his children are not students in METU when he sees the students in his dormitories:

“Aradaki bu farkı görünce iyi ki diyom, benim çocuklarım böyle bi üniversite kazanmamış, okutturamazdım diyom. Yani okuttursam bile burs falan almam lazım, borçlanmam lazım falan diyom yani veya gazansa öyle lüks, özel bi yurttta galamaz.”¹¹³

Attempts are made to heal the hidden injuries symbolized in differences in terms of educational capital with emphasis on good manners. The workers in that context emphasize the importance of the good manners of the Turkish familial structure against the formal education given at school which the students and the personnel had. Accordingly, education could be given at school but good manners

112. “I feel very sad and angry when I couldn’t help my children (with his lessons). He comes to me and says that he doesn’t understand something. But the mother also doesn’t understand! Therefore, I always say I wish I could continue with my formal education.” Çiğdem, interviewed at METU, 2011.

113. “When I see this difference, I think to myself that thank God my children didn’t win such a university, because I couldn’t sponsor their education. I mean even if I could, they would have to take scholarship or I would have to take on debt. Or I mean they couldn’t stay in such a luxurious dormitory.” Mustafa, interviewed at METU, 2011.

could only be provided to someone by their family, and they are more valuable than a university diploma.

Within the same context, the workers classify the students and civil servants on the campus not as rich and poor, but as those who have grown up spoiled and mannerless, and those who are modest and cultured. In that context, they rejected generalizations about the ‘rich’ and ‘poor’. They rather used a map of meaning based on dualities such as mannerless/cultured, spoiled-haughty/modest, and decent/moral. Within this context, they evaluate the cold, haughty, unpredictable and disrespectful attitudes of the students in terms of their character or psychology, and those of the personnel with their bad manners. This denial of social class differences, which also shapes the minds of the charwomen in Turkey (Bora 2005, 139), is sourced in the relative importance of other, cultural dualities in Turkey.

Within the same context, they did not have a high class consciousness but rather defined themselves such as ‘Anadolu çocuğu’ and ‘gariban’. These expressions referred not solely to class position, but more to the feeling structure of the poor, articulated with pain in Turkey. As Erdoğan (2007b, 36) put forward, poverty in the cultural history of Turkey has always referred to a feeling structure rather than being a solely economic signifier.

In that context, they receive those students and civil servants who speak and act like they are superior with surprise. Mustafa says about those students who do not greet him: “Yani Türh aile yapısına uygun olmadığını düşünüyom. Yani bi güler yüz, bi merhaba demesi tabi ki iyi olur diye düşünüyom.”¹¹⁴ Hatice also criticizes the childrearing style of the ‘rich’ in terms of overly spoiling the children. She describes the students she loves:

“Yani yetişme tarzının verdiği böyle aile yapısının farkı çok büyük. Yani hani ben zengin çocuğuyum, zenginim, buraya kadar geldim okuyorum şeyi

114. “I mean I think that these are not suitable to the traditional Turkish family structure. I mean I think that it would of course be better if they say hello and good morning at least.” Mustafa, interviewed at METU, 2011.

yok yani. Böyle daha doğal, daha kırsal kesimden geldiği belli oluyo yani. Böyle bakıyosun daha böyle şımarık yetişmişler var. Daha bi kendilerini farklı görüyolar. Fark var yani. Sen onu daha yakın hissediyosun kendine.”¹¹⁵

Although the workers are pushed to feel inadequate due to their limited educational capital, they reject the legitimacy of the lifestyles of the rich, on the basis of their cultural and moral differences, just as the charwomen, who see great differences in cultural and moral terms, and lifestyle and clothing style between them and their employers (Kalaycıoğlu & Tılıç 2000, 122). They have a similarity also with the urban poor (Erdoğan 2007b, 50) in the sense that wealth is not considered solely bad in itself, but in terms of the behavior patterns it produces, the way it is experienced, and the form of usage.

On the basis of the way ‘wealth’ is experienced by the students, morality itself constitutes the last moral weapon of the subcontracted workers. In that context, the students are associated with decadence in the eyes of the cleaning workers. This perception is most apparent in the workers’ observations and thoughts about the campus life and male-female relations on the campus.

The workers mainly referred to the degeneration of moral and ethical values on the campus when compared to their traditional rural community. They all confessed that they were very surprised and nine of them were also highly disturbed when they first came to the METU campus and saw the students around who were kissing and making out. They all think that it is wrong to do ‘these things’ openly in public since these are incompatible with the moral values of Turkish culture. Ercan, for instance, has a magazinish picture in his mind towards the METU campus:

115. “I mean, there is difference due to manners taught in the family. I mean they don’t make you feel that they come from rich families, and they are students in such a good university. They are more natural, I mean it is obvious that they’ve come from rural areas. When you look, there are those who grew up in a spoiled manner. They see themselves differently. There is a difference I mean. You feel closer to the other.” Hatice, interviewed at METU, 2011.

“Çok değişik. Derler ya İstanbul’da hayat 12’den sonra başlar, aynı öyle bir yer... Biraz serbestlik gibi şeyler var yani, görüyorsunuz sağda solda. İyi bi şey mi? Kesinlikle değil. Şey de demiyom yani serbestlik değil de katı bi şekilde olsun. Ama böyle de doğru değil... En azından kendine çeki düzen, biraz bazı şeylere dikkat edilse daha iyi olur.”¹¹⁶

Adnan expresses his astonishment referring to the spring festivals during which the consumption of alcohol, the visibility of marginal clothing and sexual affairs increase:

“Burda herkes çok rahat. Hele de şu bahar şenlikleri gibi olaylarda, içkisi olsun, adam yatmış, ne bileyim adam her şeyi yapıyo. Ben öyle şeyleri hiç burda daha gördüm... Buraya geldim ilk sene, bahar şenliğinde, kız bir giymiş, mine. Allahım diyom bu ney, n’oldu, ben nereye geldim. Hiç utanma yok... Dedim bura bize göre değil. Çıttım direk servisime.”¹¹⁷

Feride and Dilan even said that the university administration had responsibility and must do something to prevent the intimacy between different sexes from being this openly experienced within the public sphere. Caner also feels free to state that he wanted to fight those who kissed openly in the public. Some other found the students “extremely comfortable under the guise of freedom”.

The deprivation of the tools to produce discourse is apparent in terms of morality as well. Çiğdem explains how she feels about this ‘unacceptable’ social atmosphere which exists without their consent:

“Yani tabi ki herkes kendine göre özgürdür, düşüncesine saygı duyarız. Ama ben özgürüm, her şeyi yaparım anlamı da bazen karşındaki adamı yorar, yormaz mı sence? ... Şimdi en basidi kendi hocasıyla da olabilir bu, bu mesela erkek arkadaşıyla da olabilir. Yani ben burda ohuyorum, sen bana

116. “It’s very different. They say life begins after midnight, it’s just like that. There is a little bit freedom, we see it around. Is it a good thing? Definitely not. I mean I don’t think that there needs to be a strict order on the other hand. But this is not true either...It would be better if they are more careful about these things at least.” Ercan, interviewed at METU, 2011.

117. “Everybody here is extremely free. Especially during spring festivals. Drinking alcohol, making out on the grass in public... I first saw those things here. I came here, it was the time of spring festival, I saw a girl who wore a mini skirt. I said my God, what it was, where I came. They never feel ashamed of anything. I said this place wasn’t for us. I directly went to my personnel bus.” Adnan, interviewed at METU, 2011.

karışamazsın, edemezsin düşüncesi... Ama karşıdaki adamı da biraz düşünmen gerek, ben öyle düşünüyorum.”¹¹⁸

Similarly, Ercan shares the same feelings: “Yani arkadaşlık başka bi şey, o işler başka bi şey... Güzel güzel oturmak sohbet etmek var. Ama bi yerde, herkesin göreceği şekilde her türlü... Ee o zaman sen hiç kimseyi baza almıyorsun.”¹¹⁹

Although the disapproval of the subcontracted workers of the ‘degenerate’ lifestyles of the students could never gain as much legitimacy as the disrespect of the students and personnel towards them; that does not mean that the destiny of the workers is completely in the hands of the dominant discourse. Although they are deprived of the tools to produce a dominant discourse, they want to be included in that production process. This can be seen from the contradictory expressions.

While speaking from the outside of the power relations which have established them as subalterns, for instance, when expressing their thoughts about the decadence or unhappiness of the middle classes compared to themselves, expressions such as “we are ignorant people”, “you know better than us”, “this is my thought, it may be wrong”, “I may sound narrow minded to you” etc. were often repeated. The same workers however, also expressed their wish to be heard by everybody. They used expressions such as “write down my words / I am saying this, let everybody hear”, “these issues shall be discussed”. They also talked about how different they would act if they were rich, in some cases without being asked. In that sense, the wish to be included in the production of dominant discourse and the deprivation from the educational and intellectual capital to produce one are intertwined (Erdoğan et al. 2007, 58).

118. “I mean everybody is free in his own way, we respect his thoughts. But the attitudes underlined by the meaning of ‘I’m free, I’ll do anything’ sometimes make the others tired, don’t they? ... It could be with her boyfriend or instructor. I mean the thought that I am student here, you cannot tell me what to do... But you also have to think about the other people, that’s what I think.” Çiğdem, interviewed at METU, 2011.

119. “I mean friendship is different than those things... You may sit and have a chat together but other things in public in a way that everyone can see... Then you don’t care about anybody.” Ercan, interviewed at METU, 2011.

The workers also hold on to the division in the self and endure until their work is done. As conceptualized by Sennett and Cobb (1993, 209-10) in the context of American laborers, the workers divide the self as the real person and as a performing individual as a defense against the pain they would feel otherwise, if they had to submit the whole of the self to a society that makes their position a vulnerable and anxiety-laden one. They said that they showed patience and endured the heaviness of work and humiliations for the sake of their children's sustenance. All the workers said that they left work in the workplace and they protected their home from the discomfort caused by working conditions and social hierarchies. Most of the workers told me that they did not talk about the problems in workplace with their families. Eren said that he is a person who has targets in life and he reads books, watches documentaries and goes to museums with his family in his free time. Mustafa similarly says that he feels like passing to another world when he leaves the workplace: "Aile içi ilişkilerim süper. Zaten buradan çıkınca iş falan unduyom. Başka bir dünyaya geçmiş gibi hissediyom kendimi. Ta ki sabah işe gelene kadar."¹²⁰

The workers also use some tactics through which they escape without actually leaving in their relations with the 'superior' others. Similar to the tactics of the poor (Erdoğan 2007c, 78), during the interviews, they were initially cautious and hesitant about my intention. Only after they became sure that they could trust me based on my references to other workers' narratives, did they start to talk more comfortably. However, they declined to answer questions especially about their managers and gave superficial information to those questions.

Towards the students and personnel, they also use some tactics such as gossiping and cold treatment in order to protect their self-respect and honor. They talked

120. "My relations at home are super! I forget about the work once I'm out of the workplace. I feel like passing to another world. Until I come back to work in the morning." Mustafa, interviewed at METU, 2011.

about the difference in their attitudes towards the students and personnel on the basis of the respect shown to them. Gül says:

“Kimin içtenlikle (selam) verdiğini kimin vermediğini biliyoruz yani. Ben de ona göre konuşurum ama odaya girince. Mesela konuşan kişiyle konuşurum ama öyle (havalı) insanlarla hiç konuşmam, işimi yapar çıkar giderim. Yüzüne bile bahmam.”¹²¹

While they always protect their favorite students who respect them, try to help them whenever they can, lend money when they need, ignore their violations of dormitory rules and defend them in front of the management; they say that they only want to ignore those students or personnel who make them feel inferior. So, they treat coldly or show fake intimacy to those who see them as inferior, but embrace the others with real intimacy. Gül says that she does not greet or speak with the students she does not love, while she first sees her favorite students before starting work in the morning. Akif says that he does not even care about those who see themselves as superior. Dilge similarly says that she does not want to greet those who do not greet her. Damla says that she cannot think all day about why some students do not greet her, and treats the students as they treat her.

Although the workers want to ignore and seem indifferent towards the disrespectful students and personnel, they are both surprised and hurt by those attitudes, as discussed above, and they may even lose sleep about them. The workers at that point talk to their colleagues and get support from each other. When I went to their rooms for interviews, most of the time they were talking about the students they find weird or the personnel they do not love. They may gossip about them criticizing and swearing behind the backs of the dirty ones or the ones, who do not greet them, and they may ridicule the students or the personnel in their absence.

In conclusion, the subcontracted workers do not necessarily internalize and legitimize the social hierarchies. Their feeling of indignation and sorrow about the

121. “We know who greets us intimately and who doesn’t. I speak to them accordingly when I enter their rooms. For example I speak warmly to those who speak to me friendly, but I don’t say anything to the (haughty) people, I do my work and leave. I don’t even look at their faces.” Gül, interviewed at METU, 2011.

humiliating attitudes of the students, and the personnel proves that equality before God is still legitimate for these workers. Their explanation of their poverty as the state's fault on the other hand indicates that neo-liberal ideology is not yet a dominant ideology for them. They also denied social class while explaining the source of the haughtiness of the students, managers and regular employees, and emphasized the personal characteristics instead. Social class therefore is still not a major reference point in understanding the society in these workers' minds. They do not define themselves on the basis of class, either.

The workers' emphasis on their moral-humanistic values is a strategy to cope with the social hierarchies they cannot accept, as Erdoğan (2007c, 49-50) suggested. As social hierarchies in METU get sharpened as a result of adopting a rationalized labor relation by management, however, the moral weapons of the lower classes are weakened and especially the younger workers and the workers in the private dormitories are pushed to take a defensive position. Yet, they use tactics through which they "escape without leaving" in order to heal the hidden injuries of class.

4.3 Gender and Class in the Dormitories

The cleaning workers in the METU dormitories are chosen for this study for three reasons. Among those was to pursue the traces of the construction and reproduction of gender roles in everyday practices in terms of both men and women workers. How they perceive their work, how much they feel responsible for the subsistence of their families, how they experience job insecurity, how the division of labor at home is organized, their social lives and contact with the public sphere are of special interest to this study in order to pursue the role of gender in everyday life.

To begin with, patriarchal roles shape the meaning of the cleaning work for the workers and it changes for men and women. According to shop floor terminology, jobs have certain characteristics such as 'easy and light', 'difficult and heavy', 'requiring patience and dexterity', 'requiring skill or experience' or 'requiring mechanical knowledge and technical ability'. Certain characteristics are also

attributed to workers. It is believed that passivity, patience, dexterity, and accuracy are typical female attributes, so women are better suited to sedentary, monotonous, ‘fiddly’, and repetitive jobs. On the other hand, typical male attributes include a high level of activity, physical strength, and technical ability, which are said to make men suitable for jobs requiring mobility, strength, and technical knowledge (Ecevit 1991, 62). Within this context while the work of cleaning is seen as a female job by some male workers, none of the women workers talked about such disturbance. Akif said:

“İnşaatta çalıştım evet, kazma kürekte çalıştım... Onların hepsi iyiydi yani benim yapacağım, erkek işiydi. Bu iş benim hoşuma getmiyo. Ama ister istemez çaresiz kalınca şey yapıyosun... Kadın işi tabi. Erkek de yapar da benim sevmediğim bi iş.”¹²²

The patriarchal roles are also decisive in the duration in the labor market and the previous work experiences of the workers. The cleaning work in the dormitories is the first or second work experience for more than half of the women interviewees. In contrast to their limited work experience in the market, the male workers, as men belonging to the working class and with their responsibility to take care of their family, had much more work experience than women workers and as a result had already had to face much many difficulties and learnt to overcome them more easily. In addition, to overcome them is an issue of pride for the male workers since they are the bread-winners of the family.

The fear arising from job insecurity, within that context, is not as strongly felt by married women workers as it is felt by the bread-winner male workers. The labor of women workers is less valuable for the women themselves and they tend to see their wage as additional income to that of their husbands (Kalaycıoğlu & Tılıç 2000, 69). Ömür, for instance, says: “Buranın parasından şikâyetçi diilim, eşim de çalıştığı için. Ben ona sadece yardımcı oluyorum.”¹²³

122. “I worked in constructions, in works with digging tools. They were all good, male jobs that I could do. I don’t like this work. But you cannot say anything since you have to... This is a female job, of course. I mean men can also do it, but I don’t like it.” Akif, interviewed at METU, 2011.

123. “I’m not untroubled by my wage here because my husband also works. I only support him (with my wage).” Ömür, interviewed at METU, 2011.

Gülenay also sees her wage as supportive, and does not fear very much losing her job because her husband's wage is higher: "Benim řu an eřim 1 milyar alıyo ama ben de hani destek oluyorum. Ben ıkarsam evim var en azından, eřimin parasıyla geinebilirim."¹²⁴

In parallel to this, iğdem says that she is not very much afraid of losing her job since her husband works: "řimdi ben kendi aımdan söyleyim, benim eřim alıřtıęı srece ben o kadar problem yapmam. Bura olmazsa bařka yer olur."¹²⁵

What is interesting in these examples is that all these women's husbands work as subcontracted and unsecured labor just like them. Yet, these women see their own wages as supportive to those of their husbands. What is more, the women workers make future plans depending on their husbands' future time schedule regarding working and retirement. Only the two older workers who were divorced from their husbands underline that they stand on their own two feet and earn and spend money independently. This is valid even when the husbands' work is subcontracted and without security as well.

The male bread-winner image is relevant and very important for male workers, as well as women. They are afraid of losing their jobs because of non-secured organization of work; however, in that case, they said that they would try their best to find other work, and even if they could not, they would do any work for the sustenance of their family. Eren and Adnan openly stated that they would never want their wives to work even if they could not find a job. For those workers, the responsibility of their wives is to act within the traditional cultural roles which are the loyal housewife and good mother. Among the other male workers, only Akif's wife used to work as a cleaning worker before she was laid off. Other than that, in the interviews, only İsmail and Ercan said that they would

124. "My husband earns one billion a month at the moment but I also support him. If I leave work, at least I have my own home; we can subsist with my husband's income." Glenay, interviewed at METU, 2011.

125. "Let me speak for myself, I don't think it would be a big problem because my husband works. If my work here ends, I'll start working somewhere else." iğdem, interviewed at METU, 2011.

want their wives to work. They said that the contribution of the wage of their wives would not disturb them. In their statements as well they were the bread-winner figures.

These examples show that, the fact that women work in the labor market does not bring a great change in their status within the family and in the domestic division of labor (Kalaycıoğlu & Tılıç 2000, 147-52; Özyeğin 2005, 82). This shows also that the material interests of individuals are not the only determinant of the workers' actions. Their interests are determined culturally as well as materially and they do have a strong symbolic reference. As a result, the willingness of Eren and Adnan to keep their families' economic standards at a lower level by not allowing their wives to work outside home would not just be irrational. The image of bread-winner masculinity appeals to these men more than materially better conditions.

Patriarchal gender roles are also important for the workers who are looking for a different job. Most of the interviewees do not actively look for another job because they do not believe that they could find a better one. Those who are looking for other jobs are however moving within the patriarchal boundary that defines the jobs appropriate for both genders. In the case of women these would be cleaning and secretarial work while male workers looking for other jobs also move with patriarchal references in the sense that they look for jobs in spheres of industry, construction, renovation, and the like.

Male workers often referred to their previous jobs and said that they wish they could still do those jobs. While male workers had worked generally without insurance and compensation rights as builder's laborers, electricians, elevator repairmen, furnishes, waiters, and peddlers; female workers either did not work before or worked as cleaning workers, textile workers, charwomen, secretaries, saleswomen, tea makers, and product presenters in the markets. As can be seen, the previous work experiences appear also as extensions of the division of labor at home defined by patriarchal gender roles.

The criteria of more preferable jobs for male workers is masculine reference as their previous jobs as well as higher wages, compensation right, better working conditions, regular payment of insurance. Female workers on the other hand look for more comfortable and less tiresome jobs such as cleaning in the nursery school of METU or security personnel in the dormitory area at which they would be subcontracted anyway.

It follows from here that all these mindsets are reflected into domestic relations and division of labor, as well. Although as a result of the mechanization of agriculture, of urbanization and migration, the material foundation of traditional patriarchy has yielded, the gender relations have not been redefined (Özyeğin 2005, 101-102). As a result, the division of labor at home based on patriarchal gender roles has remained untouched, to a certain degree.

Those workers are from families who emigrated from adjacent small towns such as Tokat, Yozgat, Çorum, Sivas and Kırıkkale to Ankara as a result of the mechanization and industrialization of agriculture in the 1950s. When they first came to Ankara, they carried their cultural values with them and accordingly, female members of the family constituted the honor of the family which must be protected at all costs. In time, however, those values were broken by the ruinous material conditions in the developing capitalism, the women also had to work. However, their entrance into the labor market did not challenge their roles and duties at home. They remained primarily responsible for housework, childcare and care of the elderly, while the responsibilities of men remained mostly outside the home. Regardless of how helpful their husbands, fathers, and sons are within the house, men remain as “assistants” within the house, which is associated with women, as women do in the market, which is associated with men.

In parallel to this process, while male workers do extra work in the evenings and at the weekends, women workers do the housework. The male workers, except for Akif and İsmail, on the other hand, do some extra work after they leave the

METU campus. Ercan and Mustafa are janitors in their apartments; Necati cleans the cafeteria of his dormitory, Eren works as a seller in bazaar on Sundays; Caner and Adnan work as security guards in the municipality. Adnan also paints walls when there is work. All of the married female interviewees, on the other hand, say that they do housework and spend time with their children after work and at the weekends. They say that they clean the house, do the laundry for the whole family and then ironing, help with their children's homework or spend time with them.

This creates a double-burden on the shoulder of women to work both inside and outside the home. In cases where their husbands do not do extra work, the women remain as the main one responsible for housework and childcare. Women workers, as a result, admit that they have serious troubles about work, overtaking the housework, which is culturally their mission. Although the husbands of all of the married workers support the women in housework such as cooking, and carrying heavy things this support is selective in the sense that for instance cleaning is, in most cases, done by women and they cannot decline to do that even though they hate cleaning as much as the male workers. Mustafa, for instance, says that he started to hate cleaning work since he worked in the dormitories and therefore he never did cleaning at home. The women workers on the other hand do not have the choice to quit their responsibility of reproduction of the family and the house. Çiğdem for instance did not want to hear a question about cleaning work but she admitted that she had to do it.

As to the pastime activities of the workers, the male workers say that they could go out with friends, have a rest, and take spare time for themselves, though, in contrast to women workers. Eren, for instance, said that he loved to read books and watch documentaries in his spare time. Adnan said that he played football or watched football matches with his friends regularly. Caner said that he went out with his best friends after work and drank beer in their cars. The social lives of the female workers are, on the other hand, dependent on those of the male members of their families.

The contact of female workers, who are married, with the public sphere is established through their husbands or sons-in-law since their primary mission is in the private sphere. While the male workers could spend their spare times outside independently of their family, women cannot go out with their friends without the consent or knowledge of their husbands / fathers after work or at weekends. Some of the women do not know Ankara except for the road between METU and their neighborhoods, so so they cannot go out alone, whereas male workers may easily go out by themselves, be with their friends, and come to the house late. The contact of the women with the public sphere is established through the male members of their family. Melek for instance said that she first saw Atakule and Ulus only through her son-in-law when she was 45. The women workers have to organize their time according to their children, husbands, parents, or the guests to come.

Patriarchal culture also shapes the viewpoints of the cleaning workers about METU students based on chastity discourse whose border is defined by patriarchal gender roles. Values such as the necessity for the protection of virginity until marriage or preference for suitable clothing so as not to sexually stimulate men underlie their discourses. Accordingly, in the mindset of the workers, the comfortable social atmosphere within the METU campus, in terms of the lack of any strict border between private and public lives of the (female) students, which is most apparent in the relations between the different sexes and also the clothing styles of women, is unacceptable to them. The questions regarding the workers' observations and thoughts about the students' life styles are among those which had the longest answers from workers so as to prove the inadmissibility of the common morality understanding in METU for the workers.

The verbal condemnation of this comfort by the workers is, openly or not, directed to the female students, especially their clothing styles and comfort in their love affairs with their boyfriends, as the virginity norm of patriarchy requires. Feride symbolizes the general opinion of workers at METU whose mindsets are shaped by the patriarchal codes. She tells me her disappointment and disgust

when she saw “those things of students” referring to their having sexual relation on the grass;

“Yani o yönden çok kötü. Mesela buraya kapının önüne geliyolar, sevişiyolar gözümüzün önünde, doğru mu? Yanlış, bence çok yanlış! ... Ha elinden tutmuştur, sarılmıştır, onlar gayet normal ama kaldı ki çimlerde yuvarlancaz, bilmem ne öpüşcez, o onun üstünde, o onun altında... Parklarda gidiyoruz ya biz işte dolaşıyoruz ediyoruz affedersin hep prezervatif... Sağlık merkezinde tanıdığım var akrabam, çalışan. 10 tane kız girmiş günde 10 tane şey yaptırmaya, gebelik testi. Doğru mu yani bunlar? Okuyosa adam gibi okusun.”¹²⁶

In the light of this, it can be said that patriarchal gender roles are consciously used by the lower class women to distinguish themselves from the degenerate middle classes, as a strategy to compensate for social hierarchies. The same norms also dominate the everyday lives and socializing patterns of the workers, although the women workers criticize and complain about them. These show that the workers are active in handling the dominant norms and they do not accept their legitimacy.

4.4 Concluding Remarks

In this chapter, the transformation of social hierarchies to a sharper tone on the METU campus and in particular in the student dormitories has been analyzed with its consequences for the emotional world of the cleaning workers. With the transition in the labor regime and in the way class hierarchies are experienced, which became apparent with the construction in the campus of private dormitories in which students are treated as customers, the subcontracted cleaning workers have lost their autonomy to challenge social hierarchies. While attempts have been made to rationalize the relation between the students and cleaning workers, the negative images of the lower classes have also gained relevancy on the METU campus in the attitudes of the regular employees, managers, the personnel in the dormitories and the students towards the cleaning workers.

126. “I mean it’s very bad in terms of that. For example, they come in front of this dormitory, and they kiss and make love in front of us; is it right? Wrong, very wrong in my opinion... Holding hands and hugging are normal, but rolling over on the grass one under the other... In the parks, everywhere there are condoms. I have a relative working in medical center; she says that everyday ten girls come to take pregnancy test. Are these true? If they are students, they must act accordingly.” Feride, interviewed at METU, 2011.

However the subcontracted cleaning workers refuse to accept the social hierarchies and they expect to be seen as family and trusted by the students and managers. They rejected any connection between social class bases and humiliating attitudes, and they did not define themselves on a class basis either. Although they emphasized their honesty, assiduity, self-sacrifice, morality and good manners, the symbolic violence of hidden injuries are concretized in the cultural hierarchies as the importance of educational credentials increases. Within this context, the feeling structures of especially the younger workers – who are subjected to a stronger symbolic violence of sharpened social hierarchies - have a character underlined with revulsion. Although they defended themselves on moral-humanistic values, they were pushed to adopt defensive discourses about their lower position. They were also more sensitive about humiliation and they hesitated to build up intimacy with the students in contrast to the older workers, who were more courageous to challenge the legitimacy of class hierarchies in their relations with the students. The workers in the private dormitories also have less autonomy to challenge social hierarchies due to the managerial tendencies to treat the students as customers.

Although the symbolic violence of social hierarchies has decreased the legitimacy of the moral-humanistic values of lower classes, the workers are not completely passive in their relations with the people on the campus, and use some tactics within the system such as ignoring and treating coldly those who do not show them respect, ridiculing and gossiping among themselves about the students and the personnel. They also keep the real person deep inside and endure everything for the sake of their children's sustenance, which becomes the proof of adequacy for them.

In terms of gender and family relations, in addition, the centrality of patriarchal codes in shaping the workers' work experiences, thoughts about their work and definition of better jobs, the division of labor at home, and the social lives of the workers are acknowledged. The workers are on the other hand not passive victims

of patriarchal discourse in the sense that they use it as a defense mechanism vis-à-vis the 'degenerated' students in terms of morality and patriarchal gender roles.

CONCLUSION

This study has been an attempt to examine the class experiences of subcontracted cleaning workers who work in the student dormitories on the Middle East Technical University campus in Ankara. Within the context of transition in the class relations in Turkey, the METU campus allowed me to analyze the changing tone of social hierarchies in terms of the relations of the subcontracted cleaning workers with the regular employees, the other subcontracted workers, the managers, and the students. In that sense, I would be glad if I could contribute with my thesis in class literature in Turkey by examining the working conditions of subcontracted cleaning workers, and challenges they face in their interactions with the students, the managers and the regular employees.

My main purpose in this study was to reveal the extent of the relevancy on the METU campus of the sharpening tone of social hierarchies in general society. I have found that there are increasing tendencies dominant in the METU dormitories and on the campus, which verify the general transition in Turkey in terms of the way social hierarchies are experienced. Deprivation of only the subcontracted workers from using the facilities in the campus, spatial organization which stigmatizes them as inferior, the unquestionable priority of the students in the dormitories and the major purpose of their satisfaction, the construction of private dormitories which treat the students as customers and aim at transforming the relations between the students and the workers into a rationalized labor relation, strict control of intimacy between the students and the cleaning workers through structural precautions in private dormitories –which is likely to expand to public dormitories within the context of the sharpening tone of social hierarchies-, the workers' association with theft by the students and the managers, avoidance of intimacy with the cleaning workers by the dormitory managers, the humiliating and degrading attitudes of civil servants about the subcontracted cleaning workers, and the careless, haughty and unpredictable attitudes of students; I have concluded

that the general picture at METU in terms of sharpening social hierarchies is similar to that across Turkey.

The first focal point of this study has been the despotic labor regime in the dormitories with reference to their impacts on the class consciousness as well as workers' belief in upward movements in the future. Then, it has examined how workers experience class as a matter of self-respect in their workplaces, their representations about the social hierarchies, how they react and cope with haughtiness of the students, the personnel on the desk, the managers and the regular employees. Gender and family relations of workers are also mentioned.

I have discussed first about the transition of the labor regime on the METU campus towards a despotic one. I have defined the subcontracting practice as a despotic labor regime based on the fragmentation, stratification, managerial strategies aiming at dividing the workers, de-unionization, workers' constant fear of job loss due to job insecurity, and precautions against intimacy between the workers and the students. Accordingly, the labor force was fragmented on the campus mainly as the civil servants and subcontracted workers. While the loyalty of the former is guaranteed through making them feel that they are major parts of METU, the latter is controlled through despotic mechanisms. The subcontracted workers are deprived of using the health center, cafeteria and sports center; of having a sticker to their cars for free entry to the campus; and of entering the spring festival area in 2009. In previous years, it was also declared that the civil servants had priority in terms of using the personnel buses although certain amounts of the wage of only subcontracted workers are cut back for them to use those buses.

The fragmentation is not only between the civil servants and subcontracted workers. The subcontracted workers are also fragmented within each other in the dormitories as the personnel on the information desk, storehouse supervisors, and cleaning workers. The low status of cleaning work, lower education level of the cleaning workers compared to that of the other subcontracted personnel in the

dormitories, the favoritism of the managers towards the other personnel damage the unity among the subcontracted workers in the dormitories.

The tiresome nature of workload and the managerial strategies such as choosing some cleaning workers as spies also damage trust and solidarity relations. As a result, it can be said that the managerial tendency in the METU dormitories is towards leaving 'every worker for himself' in order to prevent class consciousness to grow out of common experiences. As a result, the workers, except for the older ones whose retirement is close, were looking for better jobs and in case that they found, they would leave without hesitation.

These managerial efforts of dividing the work force do not yet completely capture the ways through which trust is built among the workers. The workers have friendship and cooperation relations among each other, and also with the personnel on the desk. However, these friendship ties are not strong enough to develop a sense of belonging to the METU dormitories. The workers rather emphasized the existence of social insurance as the major reason for them to remain in the cleaning work.

Job insecurity and fear of job loss have the function of a despotic control mechanism as important as the fragmentation of the work force. Although the level of fear may change according to age, gender and level of qualification, I have observed that fear was constant for all the workers since they were very uncomfortable about both having an interview with me as well as time and place of the interviews. The absence of special qualification and low level of education of subcontracted workers have condemned them to precarious forms of employment, as is obvious in their past work experiences, which were unsecured, de-unionized and low-paid jobs. Although work has been seen as among the major sources of self-respect and social respect, the workers could not feel as such due to the low status of cleaning work. The workers, including those who have been working in the METU dormitories for more than ten years, on the other hand could not see their works as permanent due to job insecurity, and they could not

develop a long-term narrative regarding their works. Together with the weakening of solidarity bonds among workers, this causes ‘corrosion of character’ for them, because temporary work experiences corrode trust and loyalty among the workers.

The major reason for the expansion of subcontracting practice in Turkey, as well as in other parts of the world, is to de-unionize workers. Within that context, on the METU campus, the subcontracted cleaning workers are prohibited to unionize. Workers, whom have already been deprived of developing class consciousness through fragmentation and despotic strategies aimed at dividing them, in this way lose their major tool, in the historical context of working class in Turkey, to develop class consciousness as well. Hence the attendance to the protest march in 2009 about the workers’ deprivation of the right to annual leave was low among the subcontracted cleaning workers in the dormitories, because of their distrust in collective action as well as their fear of job loss.

Although similar to the general picture in Turkey, the workers have a positive image regarding unions; fear of job loss as well as weak trust and solidarity relations among workers, absence of communication with and information about the unions, and the discouraging strategies and threats of the managers and the supervisors of the subcontractor company prevented the workers from taking collective action. As a result, it can be said that subcontract work is an impediment to the workers to develop class consciousness through collective struggle. The conditions caused by de-unionization of the workers (low wages, absence of annual leave and compensation rights, heavy working conditions, the absence of precautions about workers’ health and workplace safety, and fragmented labor regime), cause de-unionization itself by discouraging the workers about collective action.

Disbelief in collective action is also articulated to a ‘feeling of marginality’ in the workers in the sense that they do not see the power in themselves to decide about their own working conditions and therefore their lives. They emphasized that the official authorities must come together in order to solve their problems. This

feeling of marginality is also reflected onto their political mobilization patterns, which are not determined on the basis of social class. While they feel that they do not have the power to change their conditions, they also do not believe that those who are authorized namely the politicians would ever take them as reference point neither in their discourses nor in policy-making process.

This hopelessness is also reflected in the workers' future expectations and dreams which are shaped by material conditions. While the older workers expect to complete their insurance premium charges and retire from their work in METU; the younger ones, who have relatively higher education level and also some qualification, expect to find better jobs. Definitions of better jobs such as working in the nursery school on the campus as cleaner or cook, which are subcontracted again, are also defined within the framework of tendencies to move upwards or downwards, internalized in their class habitus.

Within this context, the only path of hope for the workers is their children. They all mentioned their desire to provide their children with good educational facilities and a good, secured job with high status. As the importance attributed to educational capital has increased, the workers' investment in educational capital increased as well. There was a strong sense of family planning and necessity of good parentage in their answers, in contrast to their class habitus since almost all of them are from big, peasant families. This contradiction indicates the workers' acceptance of being urban and educated as legitimate. In other words, some middle class values have penetrated into the lower parts of the society. This penetration; however, has increased the symbolic violence over the younger workers. While older workers are more hopeful about the future of their children, younger workers delay having children since they do not believe that they could provide them a good future.

Parallel to the women in the household cleaning service in the studies of Kalaycıoğlu & Tılıç (2000, 109), discrimination is more traumatic for the subcontracted cleaning workers than heavy and bad working conditions. In

relation to the workers' demand for respect, a wider section of this thesis is separated for the discussion about the encounter of the subcontracted workers with the students, the managers and the civil servants on the campus.

The findings of this study have similarities as well as differences with the findings put forward by the relevant literature in Turkey. In contrast to household cleaning service, which takes place in private area, the cleaning work in the METU dormitories is a public service, whose working conditions are set by a public institution. In that sense, the relationship between the workers, who carry out that service and are paid in return, and the students, who benefit from that service, are expected to be a rationalized labor relation. Whereas in household cleaning service, and within the unique cultural formation of Turkey, the charwomen and the employer women do not permit the establishment of rationalized labor relations by sharing the assumption that domestic labor is carried out for love not for money (Gregson and Lowe 1994, 227; cited in Özyeğin 2005, 153-4).

Similarly, due to the unique cultural tradition of Turkey which contains in itself egalitarian discourses, the relationship between the students and the cleaning workers has not completely been rationalized. Although this has been changing with the tendencies to treat the students as customers, and the strict control of intimacy between the workers and the students from above in the private dormitories; the workers still resist establishing a rationalized labor relation with the students. Similar to the charwomen in the studies of Kalaycıoğlu & Tılıç (2000) and Bora (2005), the cleaning workers expect to be trusted and to be seen as family; they also deny class differences in their perception about the students, managers and civil servants; and urban middle class lifestyle is not entirely a legitimate model for them in the sense that they respect them on the basis of their educational capital, while disapproving the lifestyles of the students and civil servants in terms of morality and culture.

The attitudes of the civil servants, managers and students are shaped by the sharpening tone of social hierarchies. Within this context, the workers told stories

about the civil servants who forced them to give their seats to them in the personnel buses and also humiliated the subcontracted workers associating them with bad smell and dirt. Şükriye heard one civil servant complaining about being in the same bus with the subcontracted workers, who smell badly. The managers were also treating the subcontracted cleaning workers as if they were inferior to the other subcontracted personnel, and they always took side with the students and ask the cleaning workers to apologize even when they are right.

The students were also treating the cleaning workers without respect. The workers were tired of the students' careless usage of the dormitories, through which the workers think that their labor is negated. The workers complained mostly about the students' feeling of superiority, the blame of which they think is on the dormitory management, which treats the students as customers. The students also associate the workers with bad smell and dirt and avoid physical contact with them. Dilge talked about a student to whom she helped to carry her luggage in the last day of the semester but who did not hug and kiss her, while she went to the personnel and kissed them goodbye. Gül also said that the students were avoiding them when their work clothes on and treating more warmly in the evenings after the workers took shower and put their daily clothes on.

The workers were associated with crime since they were suspected by the students in cases of theft or missing property. Although some workers mentioned some students who defended them to the managers, the majority of the workers talked about students who asked them first whether they saw their missing thing. None of the workers told me about any subcontracted worker, who committed a theft. This indicates the fact that the minds of the students are shaped by the negative images in the society concerning the lower classes.

However, both the egalitarian cultural tradition in Turkey, which is still relevant for the subcontracted workers, and the 'hocam' culture at METU still resist the legitimation of the sharpening tone of hierarchies on the campus. The METU campus in that sense contains a contradictory picture which indicates that class

hierarchies are not yet entirely legitimized. While the subcontracted workers have more and more been associated with dirt, bad smell and crime in general; some cleaning workers talked about students, who helped their children with their lessons and exams, and who collected money among them and gave it to the cleaning worker in Ramadan, and some instructors who collected funds for the cleaning workers in their departments. As opposed to the haughty and humiliating attitudes of the managers, and personnel on the desk; some workers also talked about modest dormitory managers who treat equally to all the workers in the dormitories, and some personnel with whom they had a relation based on mutual respect.

The tradition of the ‘hocam’ –even though it has been weakened- still continues at METU, and the students, instructors, workers in the canteens, bus drivers, night-watchmen, cleaning workers, security personnel, and the like call each other ‘hocam’. As to the interviewees in this study, especially male workers were calling the students ‘hocam’, while women workers tended more to call the students dear or honey instead of ‘hocam’ in order to emphasize their good intention. This preference also indicates the sharpening tone of despotic mechanisms which force the workers to treat the students as customers. The students on the other hand were said to be calling the cleaning workers (elder) sister, brother, aunt or uncle. Although in the minds of the students, the ‘hocam’ culture is not very strong, their relations with the workers still carry certain characteristics of a ‘pseudo-kinship relation’.

Within the context of egalitarian element in Turkish culture, also, the subcontracted cleaning workers have not yet internalized the legitimacy of social hierarchies. This was first of all apparent in their feelings of indignation and disappointment about the humiliating attitudes towards them. They were surprised and hurt by the humiliating, cold and degrading attitudes and gazes of the students, civil servants, and managers. They see the students as their children or younger siblings, and they want to be seen as their fathers, mothers, elder sisters and

brothers. In other words, they desire to be treated as family, similar to wish of the charwomen to act in a pseudo-kinship relation (Kalaycıoğlu & Tılıç 2000).

In addition, the workers expect from the students and the managers to trust them as the charwomen in the study of Kalaycıoğlu & Tılıç (2000). During the interviews, the most sensitive topic was about theft. Most of the workers, especially male workers, feel disturbed and they did not want to talk about it, probably because they feel humiliated by even being asked questions about theft. They said that they are hurt when they are checked on by some students about theft by putting money in visible places in their rooms and checking whether the worker takes it. They also feel uncomfortable when the students watch them clean, because this shows the students' discomfort from their existence in the room.

Social class situations are not important reference points in the discourses of the cleaning workers about social hierarchies. They denied social class while they explain the reasons of humiliating attitudes towards them. Most of the workers defined the civil servants, the dormitory managers, the students in the private dormitories, and the university instructors as rich. The other students in the public dormitories were generally well situated and children of educated people such as teachers and lawyers, while some of them might be poor. What is important, however, is that they did not establish a direct link between the bad manner of the students and civil servants, and their social class base, similar to the charwomen in the study of Bora (2005, 137). The subcontracted workers refused to associate richness with the haughtiness of civil servants, but rather they emphasized the importance of personal characteristics and good manners taught within family. They also explained the cold, haughty, unpredictable and disrespectful attitudes of the students with their own character or psychology.

However the students they love and feel close to were in no case among the students whom they defined as 'rich'. They emphasized that they feel closer to the poor students whom were grown up in a modest way. None of them have

established closeness with those ‘poor’ students on the basis of class position on the other hand. They rather said that they have a pity for those students.

The denial of class differences, in the sense of the differences in position in the relations of production, is probably because of the importance of other dualities such as modern / traditional in Turkish cultural tradition rather than rich / poor as Bora (2005, 140-1) asserted. This specificity of Turkey separated the experience of class hierarchies from the countries where class boundaries are strictly set. Skeggs (1998) in her study about white working class women in Britain for instance observes a high consciousness about being a member of working class among those women; however they resist to be classified as working class because of its negative judgments. The subcontracted workers on the other hand did not use expressions directly related with class for themselves. Their definitions for themselves such as ‘Anadolu çocuğu’ and ‘gariban’ referred not solely to class position, but more to the feeling structure of the poor, articulated with pain in Turkey. As Erdoğan (2007b, 36) put forward, poverty in the cultural history of Turkey has always referred to a feeling structure rather than being a solely economic signifier.

Within the same context, the subcontracted cleaning workers hold on to their moral-humanistic values vis-à-vis the humiliating and degrading attitudes which they think are sourced by weakness of those values. Although they accept the legitimacy of formal education, the urban middle class lifestyle is not entirely a model for the workers in the sense that they disapprove and criticize them on the basis of cultural and moral terms. To the extent that class distinction is not a stable position but rather a practice of demarcation through a struggle for the dominance of monopolizing the legitimate visions of the social world (Bourdieu 2003, 23-4; cited in Bora 2005, 157), the workers also attend in this struggle.

This struggle has respect as its target. Sennett and Cobb (1993, 147-148) argue that ‘the terrible thing about class in our society is that it sets up a contest for dignity’. The workers experience social hierarchies as a matter of self-respect

since class relations cause symbolic violence in workers' self-perception. They feel worthless as a worker when dormitory managers always defend the students and ask them to apologize to the students even when they are right. They also bristle with indignation vis-à-vis the general acceptance of the negative images of them concretized for instance in the silence of the people in the personnel buses in response to the humiliating words about their 'bad smell' of the civil servants. The sharpening tone of social hierarchies in that sense makes protection and reconstruction of self-respect an urgent necessity for the workers.

Within this context, the workers build up their symbolic capital with their moral-humanistic values, namely good manners, assiduity, honesty, self-sacrifice, and morality as opposed to the 'degenerate', selfish and spoiled students and haughty civil servants. The separation of self and appearance, which exists in the forms of representation regarding the lower classes in Turkey (Erdoğan 2007b, 37-38), is still legitimate for the subcontracted workers. However, the younger workers have more difficulty in establishing their dignity on the basis of their inner beauty.

The subcontracted workers do not explain their lower position with their own inability but either with the failure of the state or with the will of God, which indicates that the neo-liberal ideology is not yet legitimate for them. They also emphasized their honesty as the reason for their poverty, since wealth can only be possible with unjust earnings. We have said that the only path of hope for the workers is their children, and they wanted their children to have better lives compared to them. Therefore, working for their children's future and endurance for the sake of that is the basic sign of adequacy for the workers, as well as the urban poor in Turkey (Erdoğan 2007c, 71).

The workers also resist the dominant images associated with them by using the same discourse towards the civil servants and the students. They criticize the civil servants because they smell badly; and the women students who are surprisingly dirty and incapable as a girl and immoral in terms of the traditional values in Turkish society. All the workers talked about their surprise at the extremely

comfortable relations of the female students in their love affairs and clothing. Workers in that context actively used patriarchal gender roles to legitimize themselves against the incapability and ‘immoral’ female students.

Their contradictory discourses as a result of the simultaneous existence of their desire to be included in the production of discourse and the deprivation of the necessary tools for it, as in the case of the urban poor (Erdoğan 2007c, 58-9), also need to be mentioned, within the context of their refusal of legitimacy of social hierarchies. They used expressions such as ‘we are ignorant people’, ‘you know better than us’, and ‘this is my thought, it may be wrong’, ‘I may sound narrow-minded to you’, and the like. However, they all had self-confident thoughts about justice. They talked about how different they would treat the lower class people if they were rich, without being asked. They also used expressions such as ‘let my words be heard by everyone’ or ‘these issues (referring to the unjust practices in METU) shall be discussed in public’.

Although the cleaning workers resist accepting class hierarchies as legitimate and defended themselves on the basis of egalitarian elements in the cultural tradition, the neo-liberal transition and the resulting sharpening tone of social hierarchies have weakened these elements. Within this context, it can be claimed that the way class hierarchies are experienced has gained a sharper tone on the METU campus, as a result of the change in the labor regime which makes the subcontracted workers more powerless vis-à-vis the despotic mechanisms, and the change in the mentality that rules class encounters which showed itself in the construction of private dormitories on the campus, in which students are treated as customers and intimacy between the workers and the students are kept at a minimum level, whose expansion to the public dormitories in the near future is not difficult to estimate.

Within this context, the workers who have been working in METU campus for more than five years agreed that the students in the past were more careful, respectful, intimate and egalitarian towards the workers; however, the newcomer

students were more and more treating them only as cleaners. Through despotic mechanisms, which are developed out of the negative images of the lower classes, the relationship between the students and workers has been more and more rationalized.

As the importance of cultural capital has increased, on the other hand self-confidence sourced by the experience of the ‘ubiquity of power and privilege’ (Sennett 2005, 44-5) by middle classes based on their relatively more cultural capital increases. This paved the way for the concentration of the symbolic violence of class hierarchies in cultural hierarchies. The workers in that sense compared themselves with the students, the managers and the other personnel and seemed to accept the legitimacy of their superior position in terms of their educational capital. In parallel to Sennett and Cobb’s findings (1972, 25) about American working class, the cleaning workers felt that the students and the personnel had right to judge them due to their possession of cultural and educational capital. However, when the workers thought of themselves, without comparison to the other personnel, they came to think that they worked harder than the other personnel and they carried the heaviest burden among all the personnel at METU.

The younger workers are more subjected to the symbolic violence of sharpening of cultural hierarchies and they are pushed to use defensive discourses. The effort to heal the doubt about self which is articulated with self-accusation is more relevant in the feeling structure of younger workers. They emphasized that if they were given the chance they would do much better and be in a higher status. By this, they have accepted the legitimacy of educational credentials, which they lacked, and thus their lower position.

The younger workers are also more hesitant about acting regardless of the boundaries of social hierarchies. They preferred to keep a distance with the students, whose reactions they could not estimate, in contrast to the older workers who are more courageous to communicate with the students. The younger workers

are more sensitive about the humiliating and degrading attitudes and words of the students and civil servants; their indignation and anger about these are much stronger compared to the older workers.

The workers are not completely passive, though, and use some tactics against the sharpening tone of social hierarchies. As Sennett and Cobb (1993, 209-10) argue in the context of American laborers, the cleaning workers also divide the self as the real person and as a performing individual as a defense against the pain they would feel otherwise, if they had to submit the whole of self to a society that makes their position a vulnerable and anxiety-laden one. All the workers said that they left work in the workplace and they protect their home from the discomfort caused by working conditions and symbolic violence of social hierarchies.

Mustafa says that he feels like passing to another world when he leaves the workplace: “Burdan çıkınca iş falan unuduyom. Başka bir dünyaya geçmiş gibi hissediyom gendimi. Ta ki sabah işe gelene kadar.”¹²⁷

The workers also resist the humiliating attitudes of the students and the personnel by their tactics namely gossiping, cold treatment toward the haughty students, not greeting the students who do not greet them, ridiculing, showing patience until their work is done, and endurance. Also in the interviews they were initially cautious and hesitant, and only after they became sure that they could trust me, they started to talk comfortably. They also refused to answer questions especially about their managers and gave superficial information to those questions.

Lastly, the construction of gender relations in everyday practice has been discussed in this study. Gender is considered not as a fixed identity as Bora (2005, 50) suggests, but as a practice/process in this sense. I asked about the relations and division of labor at home to the workers and have found that female workers have a double-burden on their shoulder, since they are primarily responsible from the duties at home, even though they work in the labor market. Male workers on the

127. “I forget about work once I’m out of here. I feel like passing to another world. Until I come back to work in the morning.” Mustafa, interviewed at METU, 2011.

other hand do extra work in order to provide the sustenance of their family. Some even do not allow their wives to work in the market.

In that sense, the male bread-winner image and the domestic labor of women constitute the basic roles at home. This is a result of migration to the urban place since rural life does not exclude working women. Male workers had entered the labor market earlier than the women workers and they had more job experiences. The previous job experiences were also shaped around the patriarchal gender roles. While women worked as secretaries, saleswomen, cleaning workers; men worked as constructors, painters and electricians. Some male workers expressed their disturbance from doing a female work in the METU dormitories, and some other also talked about their previous ‘male’ jobs with aspiration. Within the context of male bread-winner image, the fear of job loss is also less in married women workers, whose husbands worked, although subcontracted. For the women workers themselves therefore their income is additional income, similar to the charwomen in the studies of Tılıç & Kalaycıoğlu (2000, 71). Bora (2005, 101) conceptualizes these tendencies of women as ‘alignment strategies’ according to which women retreat in order to compensate male bread winner image.

As to the social lives of the workers, the female workers complained about their dependency of their husbands or fathers about sociality. Melek (46), who was divorced from her husband, said that she first saw Atakule only through her son-in-law. While male workers could organize their times independently, and they could go out with friends whenever they wanted; women workers could not do so due to priority of their domestic responsibilities.

The patriarchal gender roles are also effective in shaping the workers’ thoughts about the students. Accordingly, workers complained about the ‘immoral and degenerate’ lifestyles and love affairs of the female students. The two workers who said that the METU management must do something to prevent these things to be openly lived on the campus were also women. In that sense, the workers

used patriarchy as a moral weapon against the students. In other words, they are not passive victims of patriarchal ideology, rather they negotiate with it.

Finally, the study has argued that the METU campus and in particular the student dormitories with their subcontracted workers, managers, civil servants and students are significant places to observe how class differences are continuously reconstructed in everyday interaction. The interaction of the subcontracted workers with the students, the managers and the civil servants verifies the sharpening tone of social hierarchies in Turkey in terms of the wider attribution of the lower classes with images of dirt, bad smell, and crime. It is more important to emphasize, on the other hand, that the resistance to the sharpened social hierarchies still exist –although in a weakening tone- on the METU campus within the context of historical ‘hocam’ culture at METU and egalitarian cultural tradition in Turkey in general.

The topics discussed in this study certainly require more comprehensive analysis. In this regard, it is necessary to include the students, the civil servants, the other subcontracted personnel in the dormitories, and the managers in this research to analyze their representations about the cleaning workers and how they experience their encounter with them. I should acknowledge that this relationship is too complicated to be covered within a single research.

REFERENCES

- Bakır, O. & Akdoğan, D. (2009) “Türkiye’de Sendikalaşma ve Özel Sektörde Sendikal Örgütlenme”, *Türk-İş Dergisi*, No: 383, pp. 88-97.
- Berber, Ö. (2003). *Toplumsal İlişkiler Bağlamında Sınıf Bilinci ve Sınıf Kültürü: Seydişehir Eti Alüminyum Fabrikası Örneği*. Unpublished master’s thesis. Ankara: Ankara University.
- Bora, A. (2005). *Kadınların Sınıfı*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Bora, T. & Bora, N. & Erdoğan, N. & Üstün, İ. (2011). *Boşuna mı Okuduk?: Türkiye’de Beyaz Yakalı İşsizliği*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Boratav, K. (2004). *İstanbul ve Anadolu’da Sınıf Profilleri*. İstanbul: İmge Kitabevi Yayınları.
- Bulut, G. (ed.). (2010). *Tekel Direnişinin Işığında Gelenekselden Yeniye İşçi Sınıfı Hareketi*. Ankara: Notabene Yayınları.
- Burawoy, M. (1982). *Manufacturing consent: Changes in the Labor Process under Monopoly Capitalism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Burawoy, M. (1985). *The politics of production : factory regimes under capitalism and socialism*. London: Verso.
- Bürkeç, Y. (2010). “Tekel Direnişi: Ne Eskinin Basit Devamı Ne Yeninin Kendisi”. Bulut G. (ed.) in *Tekel Direnişinin Işığında Gelenekselden Yeniye İşçi Sınıfı Hareketi*. Ankara: Nota Bene Yayınları.
- Çakır, Ö. (2007). “İşini Kaybetme Kaygısı: İş Güvencesizliği”, *Çalışma ve Toplum* (1).
- Çerkezoğlu, A. A. & Göztepe, Ö. (2010) “Sınıfını Arayan Syasetten Siyasetini Arayan Sınıfa: Güvencesizler”, Ankara: Notabene Yayınları.
- Ecevit, Y. (1991). “Shop Floor Control: The Ideological Construction of Turkish Women Factory Workers”, N. Redclift and T. Sinclair (eds.) *Working Women: International Perspectives on Labour and Gender Ideology*, London: Routledge.
- Ecevit, Y. (1998). “Küreselleşme, Yapısal Uyum ve Kadın Emeğinin Kullanımında Değişmeler”, F. Özbay (ed.) *Küresel Pazar Açısından Kadın Emeği ve İstihdamındaki Değişmeler: Türkiye Örneği*. İnsan Kaynakları Geliştirme Vakfı, İstanbul.

Erdem, Mehmet Ü. (2010), “Yeni Başlayanlar için 4/C”. 17 February.
(http://www.sendika.org/yazi.php?yazi_no=29308, 10.09.12).

Erdoğan, N. (2000), “Gündelikçi Kadınlar, Emir Eleri ve Benzerlerine Dair "Aşağı" Sınıflar, "Yüksek" Tahayyüller”, Birikim (132).
(<http://www.birikimdergisi.com/birikim/dergiyazi.aspx?did=1&dsid=122&dyid=2777&yazi=G%FCndelik%E7i%20Kad%FDnlar,%20Emir%20Eleri%20ve%20Benzerlerine%20Dair%20%22A%FEa%F0%FD%22%20S%FDn%FDflar,%20%22Y%FCksek%22%20Tahayy%FCller>, 11.09.12).

Erdoğan, N. (2007a). “Yoksulları Dinlemek”, Necmi Erdoğan (ed.) in *Yoksulluk Halleri: Türkiye’de Kent Yoksulluğunun Toplumsal Görünümleri*. İstanbul: Demokrasi Kitaplığı.

Erdoğan, N. (2007b). “Garibanların Dünyası: Türkiye’de Yoksulların Kültürel Temsilleri Üzerine İlk Notlar”, Necmi Erdoğan (ed.) in *Yoksulluk Halleri Türkiye’de Kent Yoksulluğunun Toplumsal Görünümleri*. İstanbul: Demokrasi Kitaplığı.

Erdoğan, N. (2007c). “Yok- sanma: Yoksulluk – Mâduniyet ve Fark Yaraları”, Necmi Erdoğan (ed.) in *Yoksulluk Halleri: Türkiye’de Kent Yoksulluğunun Toplumsal Görünümleri*. İstanbul: Demokrasi Kitaplığı.

Erdoğan, N. (2010a). “Sınıf Karşılaşmaları (2): Kapıcının Kızı”, BirGün, 17 September.
(http://www.birgun.net/actuels_index.php?news_code=1284734543&year=2010&month=09&day=17, 11.09.2012).

Erdoğan, N. (2010b). “Entelektüel ve (Gündelikçi) Kadın”, Bianet, 17 November.
(<http://bianet.org/bianet/toplum/126115-entelektuel-ve-gundelikci-kadin>, 11.09.2012).

Erdoğan, N. (2012a). “Sınıf Karşılaşmaları (3): Devlet Okullarında Sınıflar ve ‘Sınıflar’”. Birgün, 31 July.
(http://www.birgun.net/actuels_index.php?news_code=1343723956&year=2012&month=07&day=31, 11.09.12).

Erdoğan, N. (2012b). “Sınıf Karşılaşmaları (4): ‘Beyaz Adamlar’ ve ‘Apaçiler’”. BirGün, 7 August.
(http://www.birgun.net/actuels_index.php?news_code=1344329897&year=2012&month=08&day=07, 11.09.12).

Erdoğan, N. (2012c). “Sınıf Karşılaşmaları (5): Bezmen ve (Devrimci) İşçiler”. BirGün, 14 August.
(http://www.birgun.net/actuels_index.php?news_code=1344934124&year=2012&month=08&day=14, 11.09.12).

Erdut, Z. (2007). “Enformel İstihdamın Ekonomik, Siyasal ve Sosyal Etkileri”, Çalışma ve Toplum (1).

Geniş, A. (2006). *İşçi Sınıfının Kıyısında: Küçük Sanayi İşçileri Üzerine Bir İnceleme*. Ankara: Dipnot Yayınları.

Gökbayrak, Ş. (2008). “Kentsel Hizmetlerin Özelleştirilmesinden Kesitler” in Tes-İş Dergisi, May, pp. 115-120.

Göztepe, Ö. (ed.) (2012). *Güvencesizleştirme Süreç, Yanılgı, Olanak*. Ankara: Notabene Yayınları.

Güler, Birgül, A. (2003). “Kamu Personel Sisteminde Reform Zorlamaları”. Amme İdaresi Dergisi, 36/4. pp: 17-34.

Gürbilek, N. (2011). *Vitrinde Yaşamak*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Güzel, A. (2010). “Alt işveren Uygulamasında Güvencesiz Bir Sisteme Doğru...”, Çalışma ve Toplum (4).

Kalaycıoğlu, S. & Tılıç, H. R. (2000). *Evlerimizdeki Gündelikçi Kadınlar / Cömert Ablaların Sadık Hanımları*. İstanbul: Su Yayınları.

Kapar, R. (2007). “Enformel Ekonomide Çalışanların Örgütlenmesi ve Sendikalar”, Çalışma ve Toplum (1).

Koç, Y. (1999). *Türkiye’de İşçi Sınıfının Yapısı*. Ankara: Eğitim Yayınları No: 32 (<http://www.yildirimkoc.com.tr/usrfile/1322244964b.pdf>, 11.09.2012).

Koç, Y. (2000). *Türkiye’de İşçiler ve Sendikalar (Tarihten Sayfalar)*, Türkiye YOL-İŞ Sendikası Yayınları.

Koç, Y. (2001). *Taşeronluk ve Fason Üretim: Sorunlar, Çözümler*. Ankara: Türk-İş Eğitim Yayınları No: 61 (<http://www.yildirimkoc.com.tr/usrfile/1322171572b.pdf>, 11.09.2012).

Koç, Y. (2003). *Türkiye İşçi Sınıfı ve Sendikacılık Hareketi Tarihi*. Ankara: Yol-İş Sendikası.

Koçak, H. (2001). *Türkiye’de Çalışan Sınıf Kültüründe Dayanışma Örüntüleri*. Unpublished master's thesis. İstanbul: Mimar Sinan University.

“Küresel sendikal hak ihlalleri raporu” (2007) (<http://www.disk.org.tr/default.asp?Page=Content&ContentId=407>, 11.09.12).

Marx, K. & Engels, F. (2008). *Komunist Parti Manifestosu*. İstanbul: Siyah Beyaz Yayınları.

- Marx, K. & Engels, F. (2010). *Alman İdeolojisi [Feuerbach]*. Ankara: Sol Yayınları.
- Mütevellioğlu N. & Işık S. (2009). “Türkiye’de Neoliberal Dönüşümün Emek Piyasası Üzerindeki Etkileri”, Mütevellioğlu N., Sönmez S. (ed.) in *Küreselleşme, Kriz ve Türkiye’de Neoliberal Dönüşüm*. İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, pp. 159-204.
- Nichols, T., Suğur, N. (2005). *Global İşletme, Yerel Emek: Türkiye’de İşçiler ve Modern Fabrika*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Okcan, N. & Bakır O. (2010). ” “İşletmenin ve İşin Gereği Taşeronlaştırma”: Taşeron Cumhuriyetine Doğru...”, *Çalışma ve Toplum* (4).
- Onyejekwe C. J. (2004). Economic Globalization and the Free Market Ethos: A Gender Perspective. *Nebula*, Vol. 1. No.1, June, 26-31.
- Özügürlü, M. (2008). *Anadolu’da Küresel Fabrikanın Doğuşu: Yeni İşçilik Örüntülerinin Sosyolojisi*. İstanbul: Halkevleri Emek Çalışmaları Merkezi Bilimsel Yayınlar 1.
- Özveri, M. (2012). “Güvencesiz Çalışmanın Hukuki Dayanakları”, *Çalışma ve Toplum* (2).
- Özyeğin, G. (2005). *Başkalarının Kiri: Kapıcılar, Gündelikçiler ve Kadınlık Halleri*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Quataert, D. & Zürcher, E.J. (1998). *Osmanlı’dan Cumhuriyet Türkiye’sine İşçiler: 1863-1950*. İstanbul: İletişim.
- Selamoğlu, A. (2003/2) “İşçi Sendikacılığında Yeniden Yapılanma ve Örgütlenme Modeli” *Kocaeli Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* (6) : 63-98.
- “Sendikaların Doğuşu ve Gelişimi - Hava İş Sendikası” (2004). http://www.sendika.org/yazi.php?yazi_no=115, 11.09.12).
- Sennett R., Cobb, J. (1993) *The Hidden Injuries Of Class*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Sennett, R. (2005). *Saygı: Eşit Olmayan Bir Dünyada*. USA: Penguin Books. (trans. Ümmühan Bardak).
- Sennett, R. (2010). *Karakter Aşınması: Yeni Kapitalizmde İşin Kişilik Üzerine Etkileri*. New York: Norton (trans. Barış Yıldırım).

Skeggs, B. (2009). "Haunted by the Spectre of Judgement: Respectability, Value and Affect in Class Relations", Kjartan Pall Sveinsson (ed.) in *Who Cares About White Working Class?*. UK: Runnymede Trust.

Skeggs, Bev. (2010). "Class Culture and Morality: Legacies and Logics in the Space for Identification", M Wetherell and C.T. Mohanty, (ed) in *The Sage Handbook of Identities*. London: Sage, pp. 339-360.
(<http://eprints.gold.ac.uk/4456/>, 11.09.2012).

Swartz, D. (2011). *Kültür ve İktidar: Pierre Bourdieu'nun Sosyolojisi*. U.S.A.: The University of Chicago Press. (trans. Elçin Gen).

Şafak, C. (2004). "4857 Sayılı İş Kanunu Çerçevesinde Taşeron (Alt İşveren) Meselesi", *Türkiye Barolar Birliği Dergisi* (51), Mart/Nisan, pp. 119.

Şafak, C. (2005). "Sendikalar da Değişecek", 12 November.
(http://www.sendika.org/yazi.php?yazi_no=3784, 11.09.12).

Şafak, C. (2007). "Eğitim Notları: Türkiye'de İş Güvencesi". 21 March.
(http://www.sendika.org/yazi.php?yazi_no=10382, 11.09.12).

Şen, S. (2006). "Alt İşverenlik ve Asıl İşin Bir Bölümünün Alt İşverene Verilmesi", *Çalışma ve Toplum* (3).

Taşkıran, G. (2011a). "Taşeron İşçilerde Örgütlenme Sorunları: Sağlık İşçileri Üzerine Bir Araştırma", III. Sosyal Haklar Uluslararası Sempozyumu, Kocaeli.

Taşkıran, G. (2011b). "Sınıf Örgütlenmesinde Yeni Deneyimler", *Çalışma ve Toplum* (4).

Temiz, H.E. (2004). "Eğreti İstihdam: İşgücü Piyasasında Güvencesizliğin ve İstikrarsızlığın Yeni Yapılanması", *Çalışma ve Toplum* (2).

Thompson, E. P. (2006). *İngiliz İşçi Sınıfının Oluşumu*. İstanbul: Birikim Yayınları.

Uçkan, B. & Kağnıcıoğlu, D. (2009/3) "İşçilerin Sendikalara İlişkin Algı ve Tutumları: Eskişehir Örneği" *Çalışma ve Toplum* (22).

Urhan, B. (2005). "Türkiye'de Sendikal Örgütlenmede Yaşanan Güven ve Dayanışma Sorunları" *Çalışma ve Toplum* (1).

Urhan, B. & Selamoğlu, A. (2008) "İşçilerin Sendikalara Yönelik Tutum ve Davranışları; Kocaeli Örneği", *Çalışma ve Toplum* (3).

Uyanık, Y. (2008). "Neoliberal Küreselleşme Sürecinde İşgücü Piyasaları", *Gazi Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi* (10/2), pp: 209-224.

Wood, E. M. (1982). “The Politics of Theory and the Concept of Class: E.P. Thompson and his Critics”, Studies in Political Economy, Vol. 9. (<http://spe.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/spe/article/view/13340/10223>, 11.09.12).

Yıldırım, E., Uçkan, B. (2010) “İşverenlerin Sendikasıylaştırma Modelleri Ve Türkiye Örneği”, Çalışma ve Toplum (2).

Yorgun, S. (2005). “Küreselleşme Sürecinde Türk Sendikacılığında Yeni Yönelişler”, Çalışma ve Toplum (3).

Yücesan-Özdemir, G. (2010). “Despotik Emek Rejimi Olarak Taşeron Çalışma”, in Çalışma ve Toplum, (4).

APPENDIX A

INFORMATION ABOUT THE INTERVIEWEES

Name	Sex	Birth Place	Age	Marital Status	Education *	Experience in dorm.s	No. of child	Earlier work experiences
Damla	F	Çorum	31	Married	H. S.	3 years	0	saleswoman
Nurcihan	F	Sivas	34	Single	V.H.S.	1.5 years	0	secretary
Feride	F	Çorum	39	Married	V.H.S.	2 years	1	Cleaning, worker in medical factory
Dilge	F	Kırşehir	45	Married	P.S.	11 years	3	Charwoman
Akif	M	Tokat	54	Married	P.S.	9 years (retired)	3	Casual works in constructions
Ercan	M	Kırşehir	33	Married	V.H.S.	1 year	2	Casual works in constructions, Paper factory
Şükriye	F	Yozgat	38	Married	-	10 years	1	-
Melek	F	Çorum	46	Divorced	S.S.	2.5 years	2	Pastrycook
Gonca	F	Yozgat	40	Single	H.S.	10 years	0	Cargo company, saleswoman
Hatice	F	Kars	37	Married	S.S.	2.5 years	0	Textile factory, health company
Necati	F	Çankırı	50	Married	P.S.	10 years	5	Furnisher (uninsured)
Adnan	M	Çorum	33	Married	H.S.	10 years	2	Waiter, gas, painter
Gülenay	F	Çorum	27	Married	V.H.S.	7 years	1	Secretary
Ömür	F	Ankara	26	Married	O.U.	3.5 years	0	Saleswoman, secretary, product presentation
Çiğdem	F	Tokat	34	Married	P.S.	8 years	2	Cleaning, tea maker
İsmail	M	Çankırı	48	Married	S.S.	14.5 years	2	Elevator

								operator, shopkeeper
Mustafa	M	Ordu	46	Married	P.S.	14 years	3	Butcher in a small market
Gölsen	F	Ankara	41	Married	V.H.S.	1.5 years	2	Secretary, cook
Caner	M	Kırkkale	29	Single	V.H.S.	6.5 years	0	Waiter, peddler, shoeshiner
Eren	M	Kars	32	Married	V.H.S.	2.5 years	2	cook
Seyhan	F	Kırkkale	55	Divorced	P.S.	10 years	4	-
Seda	F	Çorum	25	Single	O.U.	3 years	0	-
Göl	F	Tokat	37	Married	P.S.	10.5 years	1	Farm laborer, Textile factory

- * P.S.: Primary School
S.S.: Secondary School
H.S.: High School
V.H.S.: Vocational High School
O.U.: Open University

APPENDIX B

DRAFT OF THE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Life Story

Age, homeland, family size, educational and work stories of family members...
Educational level, marital status, number of children, ownership of house...

2. Work History

Earlier work experiences, working conditions, unionization experiences, relations with the managers...
Comparison with the work in METU dormitories...
The story of coming to METU, how long they work in METU, if they look for another job, definition of better jobs...

3. Thoughts about Unionization and Collective Action

Whether they had a unionization experience, thoughts about de-unionization in METU, thoughts about collective action and protest march in 2009 in METU...

4. Relations with the Other Workers and the Managers

Relations with other subcontracted cleaning workers, with the personnel in the desk, with the storehouse supervisors, and with the company supervisors...
Relations with the regular employees in METU namely the civil servants, the university instructors...
The humiliations in the personnel buses...

5. Relations with the Students

Thoughts about METU, about the students they love, about the students who do not greet them, the most tiring part of their work in the dormitories, their worst memories in the dormitories, how they react to the negative and positive attitudes of the students, how they classify the students, whether there is difference between the students in the past and the newcomers...

6. Relations with the Managers

Control mechanisms, whether there is difference in managers' attitudes towards them and other personnel in the dormitories, priority of the students, their suspicion of theft...
Thoughts about the METU management, about subcontractor companies, about violation of rights to annual leave and compensation, about deprivation of METU facilities...

7. Justice in General Society

How they explain the gap between the rich and the poor, who is rich / poor, how the rich treat the poor; how the state treats the poor, their political mobilization, which political party should come to power, whether they have a strong belief in religion and will of God...

8. Future Expectations

Their hopes and dreams for themselves, for their children, where they see themselves in 5-10 years, where they see hope, whether they want their children to be rich...

9. Everyday Lives

Domestic division of labor, social lives, relations with neighbors, relatives and friends, connections with Ankara...

APPENDIX C

AN EXAMPLE OF INTERVIEWS

- Seni birazcık tanıyabilir miyim? Nerelisin, kaç yaşındasın?

Ben Çorumluyum. Evlendim. 25 yaşındayım. 85'liyim. Ben küçükken annemi kaybettim aslında. Sonra babaannem baktı, amcalarım baktı. Ankara'ya geldik Çorum'dan. Sonra bir başka amcam baktı bana tekrar 15-16 sene. Ondan sonra evlendim, 8 aylık 9 aylık evliyim ve 7 aylık da hamileyim. Öyle işte.

- Ankara'ya kaç yaşında geldin?

8. İlkokulu yarım dönem köyde okudum. Sonra buraya devam ettim. Yarı dönemimde de burada devam ettim yani yeni başladığım sene geldim.

- Ortaokul lise okudun mu?

Hı hı okudum, liseyi bitirdim ben. Üniversiteyi de bıraktım, şey parası çok olduğu için. ÖSS'ye girdim ben, Ankara'yı tercih ettim. Zaten meslek lisesi mezunuyum, Ankara Ticaret lisesi. Üniversite sınavına girdim ben barajları hiç geçemedim çünkü hiç çalışmıyordum dershaneye de gidemedim amcamların maddi durumu için, yüzünden. Direk geçiş hakkı çıktı meslek liselerine. Şehir dışına yazsaydım iki yıllığa direk geçiş hakkım vardı üniversiteye, ama şehir dışında okuyamazdım Ankara'yı yaptım. Ankara Üniversitesiyle Gazi Üniversitesiydi herhalde, gelmedi onlar da. Ama şehir dışı mutlaka geliyordu.

- Şehir dışında hani kız çocuğu olduğu için seni göndermeyecekleri için mi yoksa paradan dolayı mı?

Hem para hem de kız çocuğu bir de amcamların yanında kaldığım için. Güvensizlik vardı bir de böyle, bir şey olur başına bir şey gelir falan.

- Annen sen çok küçükken mi...

Annem doğumda öldü. Annem hamileymiş yine 6 aylık. Çocuk zehirlemiş. Benden sonra hemen hamile kalmış. Doktorlar demiş ki artık bir sorunu mu vardı, hamile kalma demiş. Ama kalmış hamile, o zaman da o zamanlar köy yerinde doktora götürmek yok bir şey yok, babam da zaten şehir dışına çalışmaya gitmiş. O da zehirlemiş bebek, bebekle birlikte ölmüş zaten. Evlendikten bir buçuk iki sene sonra...

- Baban?

Babam ondan sonra evlendi, evlenince birkaç tane çocuğu oldu işte. Bir oğlu bir kızı var.

- Sen görüşüyor musun?

Babam vefat etti, babam da iki sene oldu vefat edeli... Ondan önce işte zaten amcamların yanındayım, babamla hiçbir alakam yoktu evlendiği için, bir kızı bir oğlu vardı, karısı vardı. Şimdi işte kızı evli, oğlu da annesiyle yaşıyor. Askerlik çağına geldi. Öyle.

- Onlar peki okumuş muydu? Yani baban annen okumuşlar mıydı?

Yok, annem de ilkokul mezunu, babam da ilkokul mezunu. Zaten babam köyde çobancılıkla geçinirdi. Maddi durumu hiç yoktu yani.

- Sana bakan amcaların ne işle meşguldü?

Amcam kalorifer dairesinde çalışıyordu, yani asgari ücretle çalışıyordu. Eşi de ev temizliğine gidiyordu. Diğer amcam da öyleydi zaten bana bakarken. O da yurtdışına gidiyordu çalışmaya. Yani asgari ücretle çalışan insanlar.

- Kardeşlerin var mı peki senin?

Kendi annemden babamdan hiç yok benim, tekim ben. Ama üvey kardeşlerim var, kızla oğlan.

- Onlarla iletişiminiz var mı, görüşüyor musun?

Onlarla görüşüyorum. Askere gitcek bir tanesi, bir tanesi evlendi başka bir yerde. Babam aslında maddi durumu iyi olmadığı için bunları yuvaya verdi, yuvada kalsınlar dedi, okusunlar, devlet okutsun dedi. Ortaokula geçince bunları, ilkokulu bitittirdi. Onlar da maddi durum da olsa dayanamadılar anne babaya. Çorum'da durmadılar daha çok, belki de okumak istemediler bilmiyorum da. Köye geri geldiler ikisi de.

- Peki, kocan ne iş yapıyor?

Aşçı. On yıldır aşçı. Böyle devletin düzenlediği aşçılık kursları var, oraya gitmiş, oradan bir belge almış, kalfalık belgesi ama ustalığını da alabilir çünkü on yıldır bu işi yapıyor. Herhalde beş yıla kadar şeymiş, kalfalık diye geçiyormuş. On yıldır yapıyor, o kurslara gitti işte devletin verdiği.

- Nerede çalışıyor şimdi?

Şimdi Mevki Hastanesi'nde Dışkapı'daki askeri hastanede. Bir hafta oldu oraya gireli. Ondan önce polis akademisindeydi, ondan önce Konya'da çalıştı. Baya bir çalıştı yani, askeriyelerde çalıştı hep.

- Oralarda yine asgari ücretle mi çalışıyor?

Asgari ücret değil de asgari ücretin biraz üstü diyelim, bir milyar falan, bir milyar yüz.

- Sigortası var mı?

Sigortası var, başka bir şeyi yok. Ama gittiği yerler ya servisle ulaşılıyordu ya da servis olmuyordu.

- Şimdi var mı?

Şimdi yok, şimdi de yol parası verip gidiyor. Yani.

- Sen peki buradan önce başka işlerde çalıştın mı?

Çalıştım. Burada 7 yıldır çalışıyorum zaten. 19 yaşında buraya girdim. Zaten buraya lise mezunu alıyorlar, üniversite mezunu da almıyorlar. Mülakata girdim, beni seçtiler, baya bir soru sordular o zaman.

- Ne diyorlar mesela mülakatta?

Mesela ne dediler. O zamanlar Hayri Bey vardı mülakatta, şimdi emekli oldu. Şey diyordu mesela bana işte seni kim gönderdi, referansla çünkü benim gittiğim sene, buraya girdiğim sene 100 tane lise mezunu varsa 50 tane üniversite mezunu vardı. Bir kuyruk vardı anlatamam. Eylül 2004'te. O zaman da artık gasteye ilan mı verdiler nedir? Geldim, bir sürü kuyruk var ama sıraya giriyoruz. Benim de burada bir abla var, o önder oldu bana, hani ismini yazdı referans olarak yurtlarda çalışıyorum diye. Tanıdık komşum, yan komşumdu. O da referans olunca, mülakata girince, şimdi onu tanıyor ya Hayri Bey, hemen beni şey yaptı mesela ön sıralara çekmeye çalıştı. Artık o gün ne kadar kişi aldılar bilmiyorum işe. Bana dedi ki işte soru sordu, gerçi alacak mıydı onu da bilmiyorum da upuzun bir koridor var dedi, sen nasıl yapacaksın dedi, sen bak zayıfsın boyun kısa, 19 yaşındasın dedi, oraya nasıl paspas atacaksın dedi. Ben dedim atarım, yaparım

dedim yani, ne iş olsa yaparım dedim. Bir de bize söylediler ki her şeye evet diyeceksin, her şeye yaparım diyeceksin. (güler) Öyle oldu işte, öyle mülakatla girdik. Baya bir soru sordular ama yani tam hatırlamıyorum da.

- Peki, buraya gelmeden önce...

Buraya gelmeden önce de... Aslında ben liseyi bitirdim ya, liseyi bitirdikten sonra staj gördüm ben Halkbankasında, 9 ay staj gördüm.

- N'aptın orada stajda?

Stajda, yani bankada ne yaptırıyorlar ayak işleri işte fotokopi çektim, daktiloda şey, ben kambiyo katındaydım, dolar şey üzerine çalışıyorlardı. Orada şeyde daktiloda yazıyordum, benim daktilom da vardı liseden. Bilgisayar da vardı da okulda az gösteriyorlardı. Lisede iki insana bir bilgisayar düşüyordu. Artık ya o kullanacaktı ya ben, işte mouse'u bir o alıyordu, bir ben alıyordum. O da kısıtlıydı mesela. Daktiloyu çok güzel görüyorduk, işte daktiloyu öğrendim orada, bankada.

- Ücretli miydi staj?

Staj şeydi, maaşın üçte birini veriyorlardı, o zaman yetmiş beş milyonu sonra doksan milyon oldu. İşte 2002-2003 senesi. 2002'de bir gördüm, 2003'te bir gördüm. Sonra stajım bitti, benim orada kalamadım tabi. Orada çalışanlar beni çok sevdiler, başka bir yere yönlendirdiler, şey işte referans olup. Gittim, şey bıraktım CV falan bıraktım. E daha yeni çıkmışsın liseden kimse kabul etmiyor, 2003 mezunuydum bir de. Sonra şey yaptım ben, bir yerde bir arkadaşım iş önerdi Fıratpen PVC (pivisi diye okuyor) işinde, girdim orada sekreterlik yaptım. O zaman iki yüz milyon verdi bana, asgari ücret miydi bilmiyorum 2003'te. İki yüz milyonla çalıştım.

- Ne kadar çalıştın?

İki yüz milyonla altı ay mı yedi ay çalıştım. 2003-2004 senesi arası.

- Sonra da buraya geldin?

Yok, buraya gelmedim. Ondan sonra 2004'te tekrar nisanında veya temmuzunda OSTİM'de bir şirkete girdim. Orada da üç yüz milyon maaş, asgari ücretti o zaman. Yine sekreterlikti ama ben çok iş yapıyordum, patronun yemeğine kadar da hazırlıyordum yani. Evden yemek getiriyordu git ısıt diyordu bana mesela. Bir de ukalaydı yani böyle çok saygısızdı. Üç yüz milyon veriyordu ama bana oranın tüm temizliğini, telefon trafiğini... Bir de çok büyük bir şirketti yani valiler felan arıyordu, ben onu n sekreterliğine ilk defa geçmişim. Daha önce sekreterlik yaptım ama 'pivisi'de, 'pivisi' n'olcak, insanlar gelip 'pivisi'lere bakıyorlar falan, tanıtıyorsun. Ama girdiğim şirket büyük bir park tasarım şirketi idi, valiler arıyordu, şuraya park yaptırmak istiyorum, şuraya şöyle şunu yaptırmak istiyorum, çevre düzenlemesi yaptırmak istiyorum. Tabi valilerin de özel kalemleri oluyor, özel kalem de farklı bir insan oluyormuş, hani benim gibi sekreter şeyinden olmuyor. E onlarla nasıl konuşacağımı bilemiyordum. Özel kalem valinin şeyi kadar oluyormuş herhalde, çok samimi şeyi mi oluyor. Yani onla bile konuşurken daha dikkatli konuşman gerekiyormuş. Ben bilemiyordum tabi, fazla yürütemiyordum hem telefon trafiği hem temizlik, hem öğlen yemeğiyle bilmem neyiyle bulaşığı yıkıyorsun, çayını veriyorsun. Misafirleri çok geliyordu, böyle büyük insanlar. Orada da dört ay çalıştım ama artık baktım oradaki insanlar... Bir de bir muhasebeci vardı, biraz bana şeydi, sapık sapık hareketleri vardı o yüzden de ondan da rahatsızlık duydum.

- Sapık dediğin bakış, söz falan mı?

El hareketleri vardı. Ben hiç görmemiştim öyle bir şey. Bir de zaten tedirginsin, amcamın yanında kalıyorum. Onun şeyliği vardı. Öyle işte. Oradan kendim çıktım işte, hiçbir şey demedim, çıktım. Temmuzda çıktım 2004 Temmuzunda, Ağustos'ta işsiz kaldım, gasteye gittim, gastelerde ilan baktım. Şey ya avukatlık bürosu vardı, Sıhhiye'de. Gittim oraya, yedi tane avukat var. Dediler bana işte şey yapar mısın, işte çayımızı demler misin, temizlik yapar mısın. Her şeyi yaparım dedim, çünkü işe ihtiyacım var. Asgari ücret verecekti. Ne mezunusun? Ticaret lisesi. Zaten onlar da ticaret lisesi arıyorlardı, avukatlık bürosu. Yedi kişiye yemek yapacaktım, telefonlara bakacaktım. Yaparım dedim yani. Ama şey oldu, adam dedi ki bana, ya dedi Ankara özel ticaretten de bir kız geldi dedi. Artık beni sevmediler mi memnun mu kalmadılar bilmiyorum, siz CV'nizi bırakın dedi ya sizi alacağız ya onu dedi. Asgari ücretle, konuştu. Tamam dedim hiç fark etmez. Ben oradan çıktım. Artık o... bir daha da beni aramadılar zaten. Sonra başka ilanlara baktım, yine bulamadım. Sonra Eylül'de işte buraya girdim, yedi senedir de buradayım.

- Geldiğinden beri bu yurttay mısın?

Bu yurttayım, hiçbir yere gitmedim. Aynı katımdayım, aynı yerimdeyim. Bu sene belki çıkacağım kısmet olursa, doğum izni dersin. (güler)

- O nasıl oluyor? Ne zamandan itibaren izin alabiliyorsun?

Otuz ikiyle otuz yedi diyorlar. Ben herhalde otuz ikide çıkarım, yurtların işi çok ağır çünkü. Yani kaldıramıyorum bazen yapamıyorum.

- Peki, o ücretsiz izin mi oluyor?

İki ay doğum öncesi, iki ay doğum sonrası. Ücretsiz derken sana belli bir para veriyorlar, mesela nasıl deyim bana mesela iki milyar falan verebilirler, toplam. Toplu para yani o dört ayda toplu para verecekler. İki ay doğum öncesi alacağım, iki ay doğum sonrası. Çocuğu iki aylık bırakıp çalışmaya gelcem, öyle bir şey yani.

- Onu nasıl yapacaksın? Evde çocuğa bakabilecek biri var mı?

Kayınvalidem var da ben asıl, ben annesiz büyüdüm. Dayanabilir miyim, onu da bırakmak istemiyorum hani çocuğum da o eksikliği çeksın istemiyorum. Bilmiyom yani dönerim de ücretsiz izin veriyorlarmış şirkete sordum, bir seneye altı ay arası. Bir de ben eski elemanım hani yedi senedir çalışıyorum. En azından biliyorlar nasıl bir olduğumu. Tekrar dönüşümü sağlayabilirler. Bir de bu şirket değişiyor ya sürekli, aralık ayında ocak ayında ihaleler. İşte belki o arada gelirim birkaç gün çalışırım diyorum, şirkete girişimi yaparım, tekrar ücretsiz izin isterim diyorum altı ay.

- Peki, şimdi şeyi sorayım, siz burada taşeron elemansınız. Güvenceniz yok, diyebilir ki üç ay sonra gelmeyin, sizi çıkaracağız. Bu sende şey yaratıyor mu sürekli bir kaygı, hani atılırsam n'aparım...

Tabi ki, yani üzülürüm çünkü yıllarca buraya emek vermişim.

- Yani öyle bir ihtimalin olduğunu düşünüyor musun?

Öyle bir ihtimal zannetmiyorum yani büyük bir üniversite, sürekli şey şirketler girip çıkıyor, zannetmiyorum yani.

- Yani memur gibi çalışmıyorsunuz sonuçta, hani memur bir işe girdiğinde ben buradan emekli olacağım diye düşünebiliyor ama siz...

Yani memur gibi değiliz tabi ki. Eskiden burada çıkış da varmış, son üç senedir zannedersen çıkış yok. Ben de aldım yazın, bana da verdiler, ben o zaman işsizlik sigortasından da 500 milyon falan almıştım 250-250 2 aylığına. Sonra baktılar bu

sefer de yenileri çıkarmaya başladılar, eskileri bıraktılar. Bir tek eski elemanlar kalıyordu burada. Burada yedi kişiye ikisi çıkıyordu beşi kalıyordu veya altısı kalıyordu. Genelde altıncı kişi ben oluyordum ve hep başka bir yurda gönderiliyordum, beş kişi burada kalıyordu. Başka bir yurda derken, misafirhaneye falan da hani. Orada çalıştım. Ücretsiz aman sigortasız çalıştırıldım yani şeyde İsa yurduna gönderdiler. Belirli bir kişiyi, üç seneye kadar olanları mesela İsa yurduna gönderdiler. Bir-bir buçuk ay falan orada çalıştık. Yazın. Mesela bir senelikleri tamamen çıkardılar. İşte dediler ki üç yıllıkla beş yıllık arası da çıkış alacak ama onlara yine iş vereceğiz ama sigortası yatmayacak dediler.

- Yani iki senedir yazın çıkışlar olmuyor diyorsun?

İki ya da bu seneye üç olur olursa.

- Bir ara da ücretsiz izin veriyorlarmış yazın, hani üç ay yok. Ondan sonra da geri çağrılmama durumu oluyormuş.

Evet, eskilere olmuyordu da yenilere oluyordu.

- Peki, sen mesela burada yedi yıldır çalışıyorsun, hiç başka bir iş bakıyor musun?

Ya ben ticaret lisesi mezunuyum ya ben muhasebe bitirdim liseyi yani üniversiteyi de devam ettim birinci sınıfta bıraktım zaten. Hani devam edeyim dedim bir, üniversiteyi bitireyim hani burada belki gece bekçiliğine geçerim falan diye düşündüm. Burada iki yıllık üniversite mezununu geceye alıyorlar. Gece olayı da bana tersti ben gece çalışmam, gündüz çalışmam gerekir. Zaten okusam da okuyamıyordum. Hem para çok istiyorlar, beş yüz milyon falan istiyorlar. Liselerinki falan yirmi beş milyon, bugünkü beş yüz milyon, çok pahalı. Benim eşim lise okuyor yani dışarıdan, yirmi beş milyon yatırdı. Ben şahsen yatıramadım yani o yüzden gidemedim. Başka bir işe de... Muhasebeciliği sevmiyorum yani bana göre değil küçücük bir odanın içinde bir muhasebeciyle tıkr tıkr bilgisayar başında bana göre değil, çok sıkıcı iki üç kişiyle çalışmak. Ben kalabalık ortamı seviyorum. Yani, öyle.

- Buradan şimdilik memnunsun yani?

Buradan şimdilik memnunum ama olur da eşimin bir yerden para çıkar bir şey olur, belki biraz daha durumunu düzeltir, çok güzel bir iş alır. Yani belki o zaman bir iş yeri açarsak, ona yardımcı olurum aşçılıkta, hani yemek yapmakta. Öyle bir düşüncem var yoksa başka türlü bir işe gireceğimi zannetmiyorum. İş bulabilirim aslında da sigorta yapmıyorlar, sizi çok eziyorlar, çaydı bilmem neydi sana o mesleği öğretmiyorlar ki.

- O sekreterlikte hep mi öyle yani sen hep mi en alt kademe gibi görülüydün?

Evet, sekreterlikte hiç sekreterlik olarak geçmiyordum, işte çayı yapıyordum, etrafın temizliğini yapıyordum. Sekreter olarak, sekreter dediğin bilgisayar başında orada sana yardım eder. Mesela ben 'pivisi'de çalıştım ama insanlar geliyordu, evin çizimine... Mesela benim patron kendi çizimlerini yapıyordu, ben onu güzelce çiziyordum tekrardan ve onu faksliyordum o pivisi'yi yapan şeye. Yani bu da bir meslektir, bu da bir... Bilgisayar olsaydı orada bilgisayardan çizirdim gönderirdim faksıldım. (Sessizlik) Yani, ne sormuştun? (gülür)

- En alt kademede mi görülüydün?

Yani oturup orada müşteriler arıyor, onlarla ilgilenmen gerekirken o ara temizlik de oluyor, o ara müşteri geliyor ona çay veriyorsun. Her şeyi yaptırıyorlar yani. Ama özellikle o adamın yemeğine varana kadar her şeyi yapmak hiç hoşuma

gitmedi yani. Bir de çok saygısızdı bir gün bana dedi ki ben işte kahve yapıyordum da yanına su konduğunu bilmiyordum ben. Bir gün şey geldi işte misafiri geldi, işte dedi üç tane kahve yap. Tamam, hani kahveyi yaptım götürdüm. Bunun suyu da özeldi, hani biz çeşmeden içiyorduk, o kendine hazır su aldırıyordu. Odasındaydı, dolabı vardı, bardaklarını da ben yıkayıp koyuyordum. Suyu da odasındaydı, hani kendi de verebilir o insanlara odasındaki suyu. Götürdüm, kahvelerini verdim, bardaklarını koymamışım. Adamlar gitti sonra neyse. Bana telefon açtı odasından yanına da çağırıyor. Ben şok oldum, dedi ki bana, insan dedi kahveyi yapar da dedi, yanına su koymaz mı dedi. Şak benim suratıma kapattı telefonu. Şaşırdım kaldım böyle ben. Hani kahve, su bilmiyordum yani hiç düşünmemiştim kahvenin yanına su konacağını. Yani öyle şeylerine çok rastladım yani saygısızdı yani insanlara bir şey... Ya öğretilir, kızım yanına su koy falan diyebilirdi yani veya su odasında insan isteyince çıkarır verir, ben şişeden dolduracak halim yok ya içeri girip. Ya öyleydi işte.

- Diğer yöneticilerle aran nasıldı?

Bankadaki insanlar çok saygılı, çok iyi insanlardı, yani bana iş bulmaya çalıştılar hatta benim bana kıyafet falan almak istediler, yardım etmek istediler. Aldılar da yani ben kabul etmediğim halde bana gidip ayakkabı, mont... Çünkü orada sade ben değildim, orada yedi kat vardı, yedi tane stajyer çalışıyordu. Hepsine yardım yapıyordu yani banka güzeldi. Pivisi'ci de iyiydi, yani mesela biz ikimiz vardık yaşlıydı kendisi zaten. Çocukları falan Siyasal Bilgiler'de okuyor, kızı Odtü okuyor. Yani adam kendi de bankadan emekli lise mezunu ama banka emeklisiydi. Adam çok iyiydi, çocukları da hani okumuş, bana seviyeliydi yani saygılıydı. Sigortamı yapamadı ama o adam. Sigortamı yapmadığı için çıktım zaten oradan da. yüz elli-iki yüz milyonla da çalışılmıyordu. Zaten onu da götürüp aileme veriyordum, bana hiçbir şey kalmıyordu. Kızılay'dan Küçükesat'a kadar da yürüyordum ben bir araba yapayım diye, aradaki arayı da yürüyordum. Bana hiç para kalmıyordu zaten.

- Sendika mevzusuna nasıl bakarsın? Sizin sendikanız yok, niye yok ve olmasını ister miydin sen?

Olmasını isterdim. Herhalde sendikalılar daha çok sesini çıkartıyor zannedersen. İşte sendikalıyız falan. Daha çok sesimizi çıkartırdık herhalde şimdi korkuyoruz, asgari ücretle çalışıyoruz. Her an çıkartılma korkusu var. Kemal Sunal diyor ya hani ona elli kuruş mu yüz kuruş mu veriyorlar ben niye bu kadar alıyorum diyor ya. O da diyor onlar sendikalı, e ben de Harranlıyım diyor (güler). Adam da bilmiyor sendika ne demek, köyden gelmiş. Ya o arada bir de şunu ima etmeye çalışıyorum yani adama verdikleri parayla sendikalıya verdikleri para bile farklı yani.

- Peki, 2009'da galiba bir yürüyüş yapıldı bu izinlerle ilgili? Senede beş gün gibi komik bir izin veriliyormuş size. Sen orada mıydın?

Olmuşumdu. Yani arkadaşlarla gittik ama şöyle söyleyeyim çok kalabalık değildi yani. ya memurlar hiç destek olmadı. İşçiler vardı ama belli bir işçiler vardı, genelde bölümün işçileri vardı, yurtlar yine yoktu, çünkü yurtlar hep ezilen bölge olduğu için. Yurtlar pek yoktu yani nadirdi, tek tüktü yani.

- Sen peki oraya katılırken, yürürken ya iznimizi alacağız galiba gibi bir hisle...

E tabi ki öyle yürüdük, öyle düşünmesen zaten oraya kadar gidemezsin.

Umutlanıyorsun tabi, en azından versin iznimi ben mesela yedi yıldır çalışıyorum

yirmi bir günlük iznim olması gerekiyor beş yıldan sonra. E bana verecek dokuz gün, verirse o da. Yani ben buraya geldim geleli bir kere mi ne on beş gün kullandım girdiğim sene. Bir daha hiç kullanmadım. Bir hafta falan. Bölümler pazartesiden cumaya kadar olduğu için beş gün sayıyorlar, bizde yedi gün sayıyorlar ya da dokuz gün mü oluyor öyle bir şey.

- Bölümler daha rahat herhalde, onlara idari izin veriliyormuş sanırım...

Hı hı. Bölümler daha rahat, yurtlar gibi değil. Hafta sonu geliyoruz, onlar hafta sonu gelmiyorlar. Ben yol parası verip geliyorum. Ve geldiğim saat de sekizle on iki arası. Geldiğim dört saatlik yolu şey gelip burada dört saat çalışıyorum ama yol parası veriyorum, Kurtuluş'tan biniyorum ama evimden Kurtuluş'a kadar yol parası vererek geliyorum.

- Nerede oturuyordun?

Şey, Mamak tarafı.

- Ev size mi ait, kira mı?

Eşim nişanlıyken aldı, topraktan girdi. İşte geçen sene teslim aldı, bu sene de oturduk içine. Daha biraz borcu da var. Birazını kendi çalışarak ödedi, birazını benim takılarımla ödedi. İçine biraz masraf yaptı, duşa kabindi, vestiyerdi. Allaha şükür 90 milyona aldığı ev şimdi yüz yirmi-yüz otuz milyona geldi. Oraya şimdi büyük fabrika gibi bir yer, IKEA yapılıyor. Büyük bir yer yapılıyor, büyük bir fabrika gibi bir yer. Büyük metro açıldı. Orası çok gelişti, o yüzden birden evler fırladı.

- Peki, bu yurttaki çalışanlarla aran nasıl, birbirinize güvenir misiniz?

Birbirimize güveniyoruz, tabi ki güvenmek zorundayız, aynı yerde çalışıyoruz. Ama şimdi bazen, ben yedi yıldır buradayım, yedi yıldır hep aynı arkadaşlarım var ama ekstradan hani yeni yeni arkadaşlarımız geldi, bazı şeyler de gördük, geneler de oldu, çok iyiler geldi, çok kötüler geldi, değişik insanlar geldi. Ama öyle insanları da biz hiçbir zaman burada bulundurtmadık yani. Hırsızlık yapana da denk gelmiştik. Onu durdurmadık burada. Kadının bir tanesi geldi ve o da şeydi, evliydi ve buradan biriyle görüşüyordu evli bir adamla. İşte o adamla kaçtı falan bilmem ne. Adı çıktı burada. Öyle insanları da yine durdurmadık burada. Durdurmadık yani.

- Nasıl yaptınız? Müdüre mi gittiniz?

Müdüre gittik biz kendi adımızı vermedik zaten. Zaten bunu el altından söylüyorduk. Yani bu insan bunu yapıyor, biz fark ettik ama bizden duymasın. Çünkü aynı ortamda çalışıyorsun, birlikte o kadar yemek yedik. Biz fark ettik ama siz bilirsiniz dedik. Ama emin olmadan da böyle bir şey yapmadık. Yani duyuyorsun, sonra işte o insanını o adamla konuşmalarını duyuyorsun. Yurda geliş şeklini görüyorsun, kıyafetini görüyorsun, evli insan o da evli o da evli mesela. Daha şık gelirdi, makyajlı, erken saatte çıkmalar. İşte öbür hırsızlık olayında da bakıyordum birkaç arkadaşımınla ben, paramız eksiliyordu. Üç milyon koyuyorsun cüzdana bir bakıyorsun iki milyon. Ben evimden yemek getiriyorum, o insan kantinden yiyor. Her gün bakıyordum param eksiliyor, bir milyon eksiliyor. Öbür arkadaşımın saati gitti yok hani kolyesi falan kayboldu. Öyle insanlara denk geldik yani.

- Ama şu anki arkadaşlarından memnunsun?

Şu andaki arkadaşlarımdan tabi ki memnunum.

- Peki, burada danışmayla aran nasıl? Kendi aranızda olduğu kadar herhalde onlarla samimiyet yok?

Yok, tabi ki yok. Nasıl diyeyim sabahtan akşama kadar biz kendimizle meşgulüz. Onlar, bazen usta geliyor, gönderiyorlar veya bize bir iş buyuruyorlar. Onların görevi aslında orada... Sonra bazen bizim çıkmamamız gerekiyor, biz çıkıyoruz, işimizi bırakıyoruz. Elektrikçi geliyor mesela, sabah elektrikçi geldi ama orada iki kişi değildi, tek kişiydi mecburen ben ilgilendim. Öyle. Bazen malzeme geliyor falan, taşıyoruz ağır ağır mesela, ağır ağır malzemeleri. Mesela ben hamileyim ya tek tek taşıyorum. Arkadaşlarım iki taşıyorsa ben tek taşıyorum. Ben ufaklarını taşıyorum, daha hafiflerini. E danışma görevlisi n'apıyor, yanımızda geliyor, gidiyor, zaten memur.

- O biraz daha üstteymiş gibi mi?

E tabi ki yani sana yardım edip de şunu şuradan şuraya almıyor. Canı isterse alıyor canı isterse yani. Burada şimdi danışma görevlisi hamile, ben de hamileyim. Sana diyebiliyor işte Gülenay şunu at diyebiliyor mesela. Ama sen de yapamıyorsun, sen de onun gibi ağır kaldıramıyorsun. Tamam, o da hamile ben de hamileyim ama o sana iş buyurabiliyor yani.

- Onlar sözleşmeli mi kadrolu mu?

Yok, bir tanesi memur (depocuyu kast ediyor), bir tanesi de şirket galiba. Bir tanesi yine bizim gibi. Gece bekçilerimiz de öyle, iki tanesi sözleşmeli, iki tanesi de şirket. Onlarla da zaten fazla samimiyetimiz yok. Bir hafta sonu bir de akşamüstü işte kantinde karşılaşırsak yani.

- Peki, mesela burada hani hastalık gibi ya da hani sen hamilesin, yorgun olursun, hani senin de paspasını ben yapayım ya da orayı da ben moplayım gibi aranızda öyle bir dayanışmanız var mı?

Şöyle söyleyeyim yani ben hastaneye gidersem onlar benim işimi yapmak zorunda kalıyor. Ama normalde de içinden gelirse senin çöpünü atmak isteyebilir ama katına inip de senin işini yapamaz çünkü onun da işi var. Şu işini de ben yapayım olayı olmuyor. Ama toplu işlerde oluyor tabi ki yardım ediyorlar.

- Anladım. Öyle hani içinizden geliyor mu peki yani senin şimdi özel bir durumun var. Sen onlardan daha çok yoruluyorsun...

Mesela bizim bir abla vardı, ben girdiğim sene hamileydi. Şimdi ben düşünüyorum ben o zaman ona niye hiç yardım etmedim diye düşünüyorum. Ben yeni girmiştik buraya o eskiydi. O da baya bir iş yapıyordu yani makine tutuyordu ne bileyim çöp atıyordu ve ben hiç yardım etmedim. Etmedim derken belki etmişimdir de ufak tefek, hiç hatırlamıyorum o insana çıkıp da şunun işini yapıyım. Şimdi gün döndü ben de hamileyim şu an, aradan yıllar geçmiş. O şu an burada çalışmıyor. Yani düşünüyorum niye etmedim acaba ben başkalarından şu an beklerken bekleyemiyorum çünkü ben etmedim. O zaman küçüktüm ama yeniydim, belki çekindim, belki işi bilmiyordum. Beklerken önce kendime soruyom yani. İnsan tabi ki bekliyor. Ama genelde gücüm yetiyorsa şey yapmak istemiyorum yani kızıyorum sen yapma diyorum mesela ben kendim yaparım ama bazen yapıyorlar, dayanamıyorlar.

- Peki, diğer yurtlarda çalışan taşeron işçilerle herhangi bir iletişimin, samimiyetin var mı ya da ODTÜ'deki başka taşeron işçilerle, bölümde olur...

Bölümde var. Rektörlükte de çalıştım ben. Geçen sene yazın, burada yine belli bir eleman kalması gerekiyordu. Bir de benim yurt müdürümüz beni oraya çekti, beni çok seviyordu. İki ay burada çalış dedi. Sekreterlik yaptım orada rektörlük katında. Herkesle iyiydim yani. Bir de orada, ora çok farklı bir sistem, bura gibi değil.

Orada kıyafetlerin hani siyah pantolon, beyaz gömlek, makyajsız çıkmaman gerekiyor. Sürekli ruj sürüyordum, işte saçların düzgün durmak zorunda, ne bileyim. Bura gibi değil, burada tozla kirle uğraşıyorsun ama orada insanlarla muhatap oluyorsun, çay veriyorsun. Ya tam rektörün yanına giremiyordum ben, rektörün çaycısı başkaydı.

- Orada da yine çay, temizlik falan mı yapıyordun?

Temizlik o kadar detaylı değildi, sabah onlar gelmeden yapıyordum ama. Çay olayı orada çok yoğun çay, kahve, kimin ne istediği belli olmuyordu. Yurtlarda da zaten bayanların çoğunu tanıyorum artık. Mesela benim düğünüm olduğunda çoğu kişi belki evime gelemedi ama hediye almak isteyenler oldu, hediye verenler oldu böyle. Yani öyle hediye verenler de oldu yani.

- Peki, bu ODTÜ'deki kadrolu elemanlar yani hocalar olsun, memurlar olsun onları nasıl görüyorsun ya da onlar sence taşeron işçiyi nasıl görüyor?

(Kısa sessizlik) Yani zannetmiyorum ama onlar da eminim ki bize tepeden bakıyorlardır, yani.

- Ben şey duymuştum mesela semt servislerinin kullanımında bazı memurlar hepsi değil de hani bu taşeron şirketler de haddini aştı, siz kalkın biz oturacağız...

Ha evet.

- ...gibi şeyler söylüyormuş...

Olmuş ama benim servisimde o kadar memur yoktu. Yani öyle bir şeye pek rastlamadım ama duydum. Ya işçiler oturuyor falan gibisine duydum. Ya da memurlar çocuklarını oturtturuyorlar. Bak bizim servisimizde vardı, evet. Çocuklarını oturtturuyorlar. Ben mesela ayakta gidiyorsun, hamile olarak diye konuşmuyorum ama hamile olmadan önceki şeyimde çocuğunu oturtturuyordu, kadına diyemiyorsun çocuğunu kaldır diye. Çocuğunu da getiriyor, çünkü memur sonuçta.

- Ama sen çocuğunu oturtursan o sana diyebilir kaldır diye?

Evet, der, mutlaka derdi yani.

- Senin servisinde olsaydı mesela kalk deseydi bir memur sana nasıl tepki verirdin?

Kalkmazdım, niye kalkayım? Ben de bu üniversiteye hizmet veriyorum. O veriyorsa, ben de veriyorum. Belki asgari ücretliyim belki o bir milyar alıyor, ben yedi yüz elli alıyorum ama hiçbir farkımız yok. O da buraya hizmet veriyor, ben de. Sonuçta hepimiz öğrenciye hizmet veriyoruz.

- Yani onun öyle kendini üstte görmesi...

Beni rahatsızlık verirdi, ben tepki verirdim. Kalkmazdım yani...

- Öyle bir de bunu yaşayan ablalar mesela anlattı, hani tartışıyoruz memurla memur bize kalk bilmem ne diyor ve ringden hani hiç ses çıkmıyor kimseden bir şey çıkmıyor hani destekleyici hani sen n'apıyorsun falan...

Ha öyle bir durum olsaydı, ben onu diyecektim aslında. Diyelim o anda aşağılayıcı bir durum oldu, adam sana kalk diyor mesela. İnsanlardan ses çıkmıyorsa, kimse oradan sesini çıkarmıyorsa işte niye kalkıyormuş bilmem ne onun da hakkıdır falan, kimseden eğer ses çıkmıyorsa herhalde kuzu kuzu kalkardım mutlaka, yani o anda insanlar arasında rencide olmaktansa kalkardım yani.

- Bir de şey duydum ben bir tane memur kadın şey demiş, servis bekliyorlarmış durakta, bu servislerin tam birleşeceği zamanmış, işte ayy

şimdi yarın da şirket elemanları da gelir de pis pis kokarak tıklım tıklım binerler bilmem ne demiş...

Aslında şirket elemanları daha temiz. Mesela biz yurttan günlük banyo yapma gibi bir hakkımız var. Yani ve bunu bize artık kâğıdımızda öyle yazıyor yani üç buçukla dört buçuk arası personelin banyo saati. Şimdi temizlikle uğraşıyoruz mecburen evimize buradaki pisliği götürecektir halimiz yok. Yani. Hâlbuki yani pis kokan bizler değiliz. Akşama kadar. Yani ben rektörlükte çalıştım, tamam orada da şirkettim ama orada banyo yapma imkânım yoktu mesela hani. Yurtlarda böyle bir imkân var, orada terliyordum yani ister istemez. Servise binene kadar ister istemez kokuyordum yani. Sonuçta öyle oluyor yani, sürekli hizmet ediyorsun o insanlara çünkü. Kendileri oturduğu yerden klimalar üflüyor falan ama bize üfleliyordu.

- Peki, ODTÜ hakkında ne düşünüyorsun? Yani ODTÜ senin mahallenden, memleketinden farklı mı?

Çok farklı.

- Ne gibi farklar var mesela?

Ben mesela şimdi hamileyim ya. Servisten iniyorum altı buçuk servisinde. Yedide iniyoruz zaten rektörlükte. Rektörlükten buraya kadar özellikle yürüyorum Mart ayından beri. Niye? Çünkü yeşillik, orman, nasıl güzel! Bizim orada hiç öyle bir şey yok. Ne ağaç var ne bir şey her yer apartman, her yer ev. Böyle hiçbir yeşil alan yok. Ama buraya gelince, gerçekten ben şimdi izne çıkacağım ya en çok ona üzülüyorum. Sabah oradan buraya yürüyene kadar kuş cıvıltısı, yemyeşil alan... En çok, ya buna seviniyorum yani.

- Peki, buradaki öğrenciler sana nasıl görünüyor?

Öğrenciler iyi. Benim kendi öğrencilerim iyi. (Kendiliğinden) Mesela selam vermeyeni de var, selam vereni de var. Mesela anneler günüydü geçen gün. Bana bir tanesi, normalde kız mesela tuvaletini falan temiz kullanmıyor normalde diyelim. Hani ben görüyorum ama onun yaptığını da biliyorum ama yüzüne tabi ki vuramıyorsun. Benim görevim onu temizlemek. Bir gün odasını süpürüyordum bana anneler günüydü, dedi ki ya hizmetlerinizden dolayı dedi yani, ben size bir parfüm aldım, kabul eder misiniz dedi. Ben kaldım böyle yani onun hakkında kötü düşünmüyordum ama onu da beklemiyordum. Hiçbir öğrenciden görmedim, ben 7 yıldır buradayım. Size dedi bu parfümü vermek istiyorum, hem annesiniz, hamile hamile çalışıyorsunuz, hem de hizmet ediyorsunuz bize dedi. Parfüm verdi bana. Hiç kabul etmedim. Çok kendimi bir tuhaf hissettim. İlk defa bir de anne oluyorum, onun da şeyi var. O hediyeyi verdi ama sağ olsun, teşekkür ediyorum ben hala. Samimiyetim de yok hâlbuki hiç konuşmuşluğum da yok.

- Sonra peki değişti mi diyalogunuz?

Yo, her zamanki gibi merhaba merhaba yine merhaba merhaba yani hediyeyi verdi diye ben ona daha çok ilgi göstermedim veya o bana daha çok ilgi göstermedi. Sadece o anlık bir şeydi. Kimileri mesela kiraz veriyordu, erik veriyordu yani sana, annesi göndermiş öyle yani. Kimileri hasta sana senin onla ilgilenmeni bekliyordu, onun senle ilgilenmesini bekliyor yani ilgi bekleyenler oluyordu. Kimisi hiç selam vermiyordu. Mesela bir kızım var. Hiç selam vermiyor. Bir ben günaydın derim o da günaydın der. Mesela sabah girdim, ondan bekliyorum ben de ister istemez. Hiç demedi günaydın, ben de demedim. Bir gün ben banyoyu yıkıyorum, kapı kitliydi, ben açtım o kapıyı, banyoyu yıkıyorum. Kapıdan bir şey geçti odaya, şimdi kızın olduğunu ben hissettim ama çaktırmadım.

Arkam dönüktü ama aynadan yansımayı görüyordum. Selam vermedi, hiç selam vermedi. Öyle mi, öyle dedim. Tam çıktım banyoyu yıkadım güzelce, hiç odanın içine de bakmadım. Güzelce kapıyı kitledim, çıktım. Ya sen o saygısızlığı yapıyorsan, ya biraz da kendinde bir şey ara de mi? kapıyı kitledim, çıktım. Sonra üzüldüm ama e o ara bir merhaba demeden içeri geçiyorsun, hırsız mısın, şey misin? Ben o odanın kapıyı ben açmışım. Senin odan olabilir. Başkası da girmiş olabilir o an. Ama onun olduğunu biliyordum. (gülür) Kitledim kapıyı.

- Yani öyle bir samimiyet bekliyorsun öğrenciden?

Hıh, bekliyorsun yani. Anladı mı dersin, anlamadı, yine günaydın demiyo, yine demiyo. (Güler) Yani.

- Peki, odalarına girince temizlik için, kendini rahat hissediyor musun?

E tabi ki yani. Önceden hissetmiyordum mesela. Ya böyle daha bir ayrıntıya giriyordum. Mesela ben iş yetiştiremiyordum. Ablalar hep benimle dalga geçerdi, ben hiç saatinde yetişemezdim. Hâlbuki onların mesela on yedi odası varken, benim dokuz odam vardı mesela. Ben hala hep o kattayım. Ben işi yetiştiremiyordum. Anlamıyordum, çok özeniyordum çok, aman bana laf gelecek, aman işten çıkartacaklar. Mesela banyoya suyu çekerdim ama bir de peşinden bezle kurulardım, hiç öyle bir sistem yok yani kurulayım diye. Suyu çekince zaten kendi kuruyor. İşte öyleydi, çok özenirdim.

- İlk başta öyle bir izleniyor gibi bir his...

Hah. Şimdi mesela ben banyonun kapısını kapatarak yıkıyorum. Çünkü daha rahat yıkıyorum. Banyo kapısı açık olunca öğrenci de ilgisini çekiyor, nasıl yıkadığına dikkat ediyor. Tamam, kapıyı kapatınca ben çok kötü yıkıyorum diye bir şey yok. Daha rahat yıkıyorum, daha güzel... Mesela odaya süpürge tutuyorum, mesela öğrenci sana bakıyor böyle. Ya bakmasa ben hâlbuki orayı daha güzel süpüreceğim. Baktığı zaman eli ayağıma dolanıyor ya kapıya çarpıyorum ya bir şey düşürüyorum orada öğrencinin bir şeyi, kâğıtları dökülüyor. Ya baktığı için huzursuz oluyorum ister istemez.

- Peki, böyle samimi olduğun, dertleştiğin sohbet ettiğin öğrencin var mı hiç?

Dertleştiğim yok da hani böyle nasılsın, iyi misin, işte hasta mısın, işte annen nasıl baban nasıl. Öyle bir samimiyet, öyle yani kendi özel hayatımı anlatayım, o da bana özel hayatımı anlatsın değil de.

- Burada peki öğrenciyle samimi olmanız hoş karşılanıyor mu?

(Sessizlik) Tabi ki. Tabi ki. Öğrenciyle zaten merhaba demediğin zaman bile bazen öğrenci alınıyor yani. Mesela biz çöp alıyoruz, odalara giriyoruz, mesela ben diğer kat öğrencileriyle alakam yok ama hafta sonu mutlaka giriyorum, çöp falan alıyorum. Öğrenciyle muhatap oluyorsun, konuşuyorsun. Odaya giriyorsun ama o anda o insanlara merhaba, günaydın demen gerekiyor yani. Diyorsun yani.

- Hım, anladım. Onları şımartman lazım yani biraz?

Yani. (gülür) Biraz öyle oluyor. Günaydın demen gerekiyor yani.

- Yani öğrenciyle çok fazla bir samimiyetlik olmuyor diyorsun özel hayat üzerinden, sen biraz daha çekingen misin öğrenciyle kaynaşmakta?

Çekingen, başta çekingen değildim ben, okulda da öyleydim, anlatırdım mesela soru sorarlardı annen ne iş yapıyor, baban ne iş yapıyor. Anne babam hayatta değil derdim veya babam o zaman hayattaysa işte babamla alakam yok derdim.

Kardeşlerim var, amcamın yanında kalıyorum derdim. Öğrenci de ister istemez seni merak ediyor, tanımaya çalışıyor. Yeni girdiysem ben eğer, o katta yeni çalışıyorsam ilk girdiğim senelerde. Soruyorlardı ister istemez.

- O zamanlar rahattın, sonra sonra mı...

Sonra sonra kendi özel hayatımı kimse bana sormadı. Çünkü ben o katta artık ben üst kademe olmaya başladım. Öğrenci yeni geliyor ve yaşları küçük oluyor. Sana abla diyorlar. Önceki girdiğim senelerde ben on dokuz yaşındayım. Okuyan öğrenci de on dokuz yaşında, yirmi yaşında. Aynı kademedesin, e soruyor sana, merak ediyor. Yaşın kaç diyor, belki o ikinci sınıf üçüncü sınıf öğrencisi, senden bile büyük. Ama şimdi hiçbir şey sormuyorlar, çünkü ben onlardan büyüğüm, abla diyorlar, sorma gereği duymuyorlar herhalde. (güler)

- Peki, hiç seni böyle üzen, kıran unutamadığın bir şeyin oldu mu öğrenciyle?
Hiç hatırlamıyorum da, olduysa da bilmiyorum yani.

- Peki, öğrenci keşke şunu yapmasa, şu şöyle olmasa dediğin bir şey...

Ya işte mesela seninle çok samimi oluyordu, e bir bakıyordum hiç selam vermiyordu. Öyle öğrenciler oluyordu. Nasıl diyeyim sana. Ha mesela bir gün şey oldu. Ben de üzülmuştüm. 7 numarada bir kızım vardı, Cansu, mezun oldu şimdi. Bana şey dedi ya kız şey yapıyordu. Temiz bir kız değildi. Banyoya sepetini koymuş, çamaşır sepetini. Ben de her gün çıkar, her gün çıkar, kapıya çıkar, içeri koy, banyoyu yıkıyorum ister istemez, o da bunun farkında. Ben de artık sıkıldığımdı. Çıkarmayacağım dedim ya. Ya çamaşırını yıkayacak, ben bu ağırlığı ikide bir içeri koymak zorunda değilim. Yıkamıyordu yani çamaşırını. Pis bir kızdı. Çıkarmadım, ıslandığını biliyordum ben o çamaşırın ama ders alsın diyordum ya yıkasın diyordum, belki kokar, belki bir şey olur. O koku gitmez. Ondan sonra yıkamadı, şey yaptım. Baya bir yaz dönemi geldi böyle, kız evine gitcek artık, mezun olmuş. Odaya geldi, beni çağırdı, ya bir dedi, gelebilir misin dedi. Ben de böyle yaz dönemi ya umutlandım, ya bir şey mi diyecek acaba dedim, allahısmarladık falan mı diyecek falan. İster istemez bekliyor insan, teşekkür mü edecek, hani emeklerinizden falan dolayı. Gittim, yaptığını beğendin mi dedi bana. Şaşırdım, çünkü buradan şey gittiymdim mutlu gittiymdim. O da hani tepki vermediydi, n'apmışım dedim. Elbiselerini hep ortaya dökmüş, odanın ortasına, küflenmişler artık böyle. Ben yıkadığım için değil, ben yıkadıysam altına su gitmiştir, tutup da üstüne buradan su tutmadım. Çünkü çamaşır biliyorum, o çamaşır hiç yıkanmıyor. Küflenmiş dedi, ben bak dedi elbise dedi n'apıcam ben şimdi dedi. Ben de şaşırdım. Ondan sonra ya dedim ben yapmadım dedim. Sen bunları yıkamadığın için, benim bir suçum yok dedim. Banyodan sürekli çamaşır... Yıkandığını biliyorsun banyonun dedim. Ama bana kız bir kızdı, ya çık odamdan dedi ya yaptığını beğendin mi dedi. Ya bu olayı yaşamıştım, hâlbuki benim suçum yoktu. Yani bilmiyorum belki uyarılmışımdır da birkaç sefer hani ben burayı yıkıyorum falan diye de, aldırış etmedi eminim ki. İşte öyle bir olay yaşanmıştı.

- Sonrasında peki seninle tekrar bir...

Yok, zaten okul kapandı gitti. Bir daha hiç şey olmadık.

- Sen anladığım kadarıyla bir sorun yaşadığında direk öğrenciye gidip söyleme değil de ona mesaj verme, dersini alsın, anlansın falan diye...

Hıh, hıh. Şeydeki kız gibi o selam vermeden geçip de. Vermiyorsan verme. Ben bir sürekli selam veririm, iki veririm, üç veririm. Ben sürekli vermek zorundayım yani. Odaya giriyorsun merhaba demek. Ama yani insan ondan da bekliyorsun. Belki rahatsız oluyor. Belki benimle muhatap olmak istemiyor. Mesela yine aynı odada bir kız vardı, o Cansu'yla birlikte kalıyordu. O kıza ben ne zaman günaydın desem kız cevap vermiyordu ve ben bunu bir sene boyunca devam ettirdim ve kız

bana hiç, hiçbir zaman günaydın demedi. Bir gün Hıdrellez miydi neydi, kız baya bir okudu o sene o katta. Bana şey verdi böyle, içinde çerez dolu bir şey verdi. Normalde hiç samimiyetimiz yok ama. Günaydın derim karşılığını vermez ama ben insaniyetlik namına hep günaydın derdim. Bana çerez verdi, bir tane de böyle boyalı yumurta verdi. O yani, kötü olsun diye ben biliyorum. Ben sana bunu vermek istiyorum dedi birden bana. Şaşırdım böyle dedim bundan sonra herhalde dedim iyi olacak, herhalde daha bir samimi olacak. En azından merhaba desin yeter, günaydın desin. İnsan günaydın demeyene bozuluyor yani. O çerezleri falan verdi, ben sevindim, yedim falan. Aradan baya bir zaman geçti, yine günaydın diyorum, kızda tık yok. Yani o aradaki, o araki şeyi neydi acaba, bilmiyorum. (Gülerek) Hala da aynı yani. Hıdrellez için mi verdi, o samimiyeti neydi, hiç bilmiyorum.

Mesela bir gün tuvalet kapağı kırılmıştı, 11 numarada Aylin vardı. Tuvalet kapağı kırıldı ama ben kırmadım biliyorum. O zaman da herhalde parasını alıyorlar mıydı neydi bilmiyorum. Dedim ki tuvalet kapağını kırmışsınız dedim. Hayır dedi biz kırmadık dedi. Ya ben kırsam bizden zaten parasını almazlar yani. Belki öğrenciden de almıyorlardır da, artık nasıl bir tepki verdi, ben kırmadım diyor, oda arkadaşım da kırmadı diyor. İyi de siz kırmadınız ben de kırmadım, kim kırdı bunu? Bizden başka hiç kimse girmiyor bu odaya. Böyle kendimi suçlu duruma düşmüştüm yani. Biz kırmadık dedi ama sonra ben dedim ki işte bir şekilde kırılmış demek ki dedim, ben yıkarken mi yaptım. Değiştirdik biz o kapağı ama seni yalancı durumuna düşürüyor, ikisi de aynı anda biz yapmadık diyor. E tuvalet kapağı bariz kırılmış yani. Kendini şey yapamıyorsun yani ben yapmadım diyemiyorsun. Ha öğrenciye diyorsun ama na kadar ispatlayabilirsin ki yani? Hadi o anda parası alınmış olsa ne diyeceksin?

- Benzer şekilde bu hırsızlık meselesinde direk hani kat görevlisinin adı gidiyor hani öğrencinin bir şeyi kayboluyor. Belki oda arkadaşı alıyor ya da başka bir yerden çıkıyor o.

Bizim mesela arkadaşımız şey öğrenci ayakkabısını ayakkabılığın üstüne değil de ayakkabılığın yanındaki dönüşümün (geri dönüşüm kutusu) üstüne koymuş. E kız da bir gün bakıyor, iki gün bakıyor, bir hafta boyunca o dönüşümün üstündeki ayakkabılar alınmıyor. İki çift ayakkabı. E bu da hiç bakmıyor yeni mi eski mi, alıyor çöpe atıyor mesela. E çöpe atınca kızdan parasını aldılar tabi. Kız dedi ki iki yüz milyon vereceksin dedi parasını dedi işte o arkadaşımıza. Allaktan bunun (kat görevlisi) ailesi anlayışlı, benim ailem olsa belki şey yapcağı, tepki vercekti, belki o parayı veremeyecekti, o paraya ihtiyacı var, başka bir yerine ayırmış. İki yüz milyon isteyince kız. Fakat suç yarı yarıya aslında, o oraya koymayacaktı dönüşümün üstüne, o da atmayacaktı sormadan. Bir de yeni elemandı. Ondan sonra attı, iki yüz milyon deyince müdür de tamam, onayladı. Yani ödeyeceksin dedi müdür de mesela. Kıza yazı yazdırdılar falan. Şey kız, öğrenci artık laf mı oldu neyse yüz milyonunu aldı, yüz milyon da almayacağım dedi işte laf olmuş falan dedi. Böyle bir olayla da karşılaşmıştık daha geçenlerde evet. İzin aldı almadı. Artık yarı yarıya suç bölüşülmüş oldu.

- Hım, yani sekiz yüz milyondan az maaş alan biri için iki yüz milyon neredeyse dörtte birinden bile fazla.

Öğrenci sana o anda iki yüzü vereceksin dediği zaman, mecbur vereceksin yani başka çaresi yoktu. Arkadaşımız dedi ki taksite bölelim dedi, yüz yüz vereyim

dedi, ben de veremem dedi. Kız da Allaktan yüzünü aldı, yüzünü almadı. O da sevindi yani.

- Peki, sen uzun yıllardır buradasın. İlk geldiğin zamanki öğrencilerle yeni gelen öğrenciler arasında bir fark görüyor musun?

Görüyorum. Eski öğrenciler yok burada yani. Eski samimiyet yok, eski konuşma yok, eski sohbet yok. İnsanlar artık merhaba demekten çekiniyor, daha bir agresif olmuş, daha bir... Mesela gelen öğrenciler artık yaşı bizden küçük oluyor? Artık 92 mi, 93 mezunları mı var? Benim geldiğim sene belki benden büyükler vardı. Üçüncü sınıf dördüncü sınıf öğrencileri vardı. Benden iki üç yaş büyük insanlardı. Mezun şeyine gelmişlerdi. Eski öğrenciler yok yani eski samimiyet yok.

- Eskiden nasıldı?

Eskiden daha güzeldi, odaya girip konuşan da oluyordu, senle sohbet edip çay içen de oluyordu. Mesela bir Başak diye öğrencimiz vardı, yıllar oldu mezun olalı, Başak yurtdışına gitti, hatta bir gün parkta karşılaştık falan, yolda karşılaştık. Geleceğim, geleceğim hep böyle samimi bir havada konuşuyordu, ama gelemiyordu. Belki imkânları el vermiyordu, ama hep geleceğim diyordu mesela. Çayımızda mesela hiç boş bırakmazdı. Samimiyet... Hep gelirdi bizimle çay içerdi. Ama şimdi o eski öğrenci yok, bir şeyi paylaşmak yok. Eski öğrencilerde vardı yani.

- Bunu bir başka abla da söylemişti. Şimdi öğrenciyle bir şey konuşuyorsun ya da bir şey yiyorsun ama hep tedirginsin, diyorsun ya dengesizlik, bir sonraki adım ne olacak bilemiyorsun. Ama eskiden hani rahtık, beraber yemek yerdik sohbet ederdik...

Senden biriymiş gibiydi yani. Şimdiki öğrenci yok, merhaba demiyor yani.

- Şimdiki öğrenci temizlikçi olarak mı görüyor yani?

Evet, öyle görüyor.

- Öncekiler arkadaşları gibiydi...

Hıhı. Bir de şey önceden sanki... Bir de şöyle bir durum var, önceden sanki daha çok şikâyet alıyorduk öğrenciden. Artık samimiyetten dolayı mıydı sizi tanıdığı için miydi? Bu zamanlarda hiç şikâyet olmuyor öyle yani öğrenci seni şikâyet etmiyor. Umurunda değil sen odasını temizlemiştin, temizlememiştin. Ne bileyim? Ben öyle düşünüyorum, şikâyet yok, öyle bir rahatsızlıkları yok. Sen bunu böyle yaptın, böyle yaptın demiyorlar.

- Önceden nasıldı mesela?

Bir gün ben hafta sonu çöp almıştım. 107'de bir Damla vardı o da mezun oldu. Şey dedi, çöp almıştım ama çöp poşeti temizdi, ben değiştirmek istemedim ya da değiştirme gereği duymadım. Ya sonuçta bu poşetleri değiştiriyoruz ama o anda belki küçücük bir peçete vardı. Ona dikkat etmiş, değiştirmedime. Ertesi gün şikâyet geldi mesela. Şaşırdık işte. O katın o hafta sonu çöpünü kim aldı işte? Ben aldım diyorum. Kız seni şikâyet etmiş işte sen çöp poşetini değiştirmemiştin. Doğrudur, yani belki temizdir de değiştirmemişimdir yani belki isteyerek yapmamışımdır. Hani öyle insanlarla da karşılaşıyorduk.

- Eskiler sanki daha bir temiz, yani yeniler sanki daha bir dağınık, pis, eskiler daha bir temiz, düzenli, çalışkan yani kişilik olarak gibi bir şey de söylendi mesela. Şimdikiler daha bir...

Umursamaz diyorum ya sen temizliği yapmışsın yapmamışsın, kendisi temiz, pis, aldırış etmiyor. Nedendir bilmiyorum.

- Eskileri özölüyorsun yani.

Tabi ki.

- Buradaki peki müdürle aranız nasıl?

Müdürle iyi aramız. Zaten müdürümüz bir buçuk iki senedir burada. Herkesin huyu farklı farklı yani ben çeşitli olaylar da gördüm burada.

- Ne gibi?

Yani mesela bir yaz dönemiydi eski müdür zamanında. Yine ufak ufak çocuklar geliyordu, basketbolcu mu artık neydi sporcular mıydı. Biz burada dört kişiydik. Bir de bir başka yurttan abla geldi. Ama o ablanın eminim ki öyle bir şey yapmayacağına kesinlikle eminim. Yıllardır burada çalışmış ama başka bir yerden buraya verdiler. Şey için verdiler zannedersen bir izin problemi vardı, burada daha mı rahat olacaktı bilmiyorum yaz dönemi. Öğrencinin, artık yurttan ayrılıyorlar, burada kaldı diyelim, 119'da mı ne kaldı diyelim çocuk. Yastığının altında şeyini unutmuş, voltmenini. Biz de çarşafı, nevesimleri söküyoruz, yenisin geçiriyoruz çünkü yeni öğrenci gelecek, ona temizleyeceksin odayı otel gibi. İşte ne oldu ne bitti, o 119'da kalmış dedi müdür hanım. Şey oldu şöyle söyleyeyim. Çocuk voltmenini unutmuş, gitmiş artık. Çocuk arıyor, ben voltmenimi orada unuttum 119 no.lu odada. Biz bakıyoruz 119 numaralı odada voltmen yok. Hafta sonu benle Gonca abla gelmiştik. Telefon geldi müdüre hanım, dedi ki, pazartesi dedi, ay hiç haberimiz yok ama bak voltmenden daha zannedersen o zaman, pazartesi dedi, o şeyi masamda istiyorum dedi. Neyi dedik, işte voltmeni dedi. Pazartesi masamda istiyorum. Şaşırdım kaldım ben. Cumartesi işe gelmiştik biz, öbür iki arkadaş da ertesi gün gelecekti çünkü yaz dönemi herkes izne gitmişti, dördümüz vardık. Sonra pazartesi oldu, voltmeni istiyor, ya hiç birimiz bilmiyoruz, ya haberimiz yok! Ondan sona gidin dedi, bakın dedi, bulacaksınız o voltmeni dedi. Ama böyle yani karşıdaki insanın seni hırsızlıkla suçlaması çok kötü bir duygu! Müdürümüz çok çok iyi bir insan, ondan böyle bir şey beklemiyoz. Öbür abla yeni girmiş, biz üçümüz de eski elemanız, kim kimden şüphelensin. Niye şüphelensin hem? Alt tarafı bir voltmen. Aldıysam getiririm, aldım derim yani. Ben aldım, e gördüm, aldım, belki de size verecektim, pazartesi olmasını bekledim falan diyebilirim. Sona çıktık kata, biz geriliyoruz böyle, araştırıyoruz, bakıyoruz. En son 121 no.lu, 119'da yatmış çocuk, öyle duyduk tabi, bilmiyoruz kesin mi. 121'in şeyinin üstünden sallanıyordu böyle, dolabın üzerinden. Sanki böyle atılmış gibi ya da konulmuş da aşağı düşüyormuş gibi bir şey olmuş, bir anlık görülmemiş mi? Yani arkadaşı da almış olabilir, bir sürü öğrenci gelip kalmıştı. Sonra işte biz sevine sevine, ben koşu koşu indim özellikle, müdüre hanım bulduk dedim, ya 121'de çıktı dedim, 119'da değilmiş dedim. Evet dedi, aldınız oraya attınız değil mi dedi, mesela! Ay böyle nasıl kendimi aşağılanmış hissettim, nasıl kötü hissettim. Ben hâlbuki sevinerek inmiştim yani. (Sesi titreyerek) Bunu böyle diyeceğini beklemiyordum. İşte öyle bir olay geçmişti. Ben onu hiç unutmuyorum çünkü hırsızlıkla suçlanmak çok kötü bir duygu.

- O olaydan sonra müdürle aranız nasıl oldu? Sen hani daha mı resmiyet koydun?

Yo, hayır hiçbir şey olmadı. Ama onu da içimden hiç çıkarmadım, hırsızlıkla suçlanmak çok kötü bir duygu. Yani beni en son hırsızlıkla suçlayan kişi bana beddua etmişti. Dedi ki bana arabaların altında kalasın, kanser olasın dedi bana kadın. Aradan bir sene geçmedi, kadın kanserden öldü. Yani babayığit, iri yarı bir insandı. Yani ben bir şey demiyorum, hani eden bulur derler ya. Allah'ından

kendisi buldu, lafi kendine döndü, kendi kanser oldu, öldü. Ben sevinmedim ama yani bunu dememesi gerekirdi. Allah'ın zoruna gitmiştir. O da bizi hırsızlıkla suçlayınca müdür, yani hiç unutmadım. Hayır, sevmiyor değilim, beni hala çok sever, dedim ya rektörlüğe çekti beni. Hatta kalmam için beni ne kadar ikna etti, rektörlükte kal dedi. Rektörlüğün sistemi daha farklı mesela orada hafta sonları gelmiyorsun, oranın sistemi farklı.

- Yani öğrenciyle ilgili bir şey olduğunda siz şeysiniz, her zaman haksız durumda, şüphelenilmesi gereken...

Yani evet öyle bir şey oluyor. Normal öğrenci zamanında böyle bir şey rastlamıyorsun ama yaz döneminde rastladık işte yani. Olacak oluyor. Belki o da o anlık siniriyle kim alabilir diye düşünecek, personel diye düşünmüştür. Yani ben onu da hani suçlamıyorum bizi niye suçladı diye. Ya bilmiyorum hani.

- Peki, depocunuz nasıl biridir?

Depocumuz zaten memur, o da yeni geldi bu dönem. Önceki depocularımız, ben... Benim bir huyum vardır danışma görevlileriyle fazla samimi olmuyorum. Bir de şeyimdir, bundan önceki depocumuzla şeydim ben, nasıl söyleyeyim, bana itici geliyordu, rahatsızlık veriyordu. Bana bir şey emrettiği zaman zoruma gidiyordu, söylediği zaman zoruma gidiyordu. Şimdiki depocumuz da öyle, yani bana bir şey söylediği zaman, yani emreder şeyiyle söylediği zaman zoruma gidiyor, yapasım gelmiyor yani. Onla inatlaşıyorum. Hiç yapasım gelmiyor. Ama normal söylediği zaman çok hoşuma gidiyor. Ama işte daha önceki depocuyla çok ben zıttım birbirimize. Benle öyle muhatap olduğunda... Benim de öyle huyum vardır benle nasıl konuşursa ben de onunla öyle konuşurum. Benimle zıtlarınsa inatlaşırsa ben de onunla öyle olurum. (gülür)

- Sorun oldu mu hiç aranızda?

Tabi ki. Ufak tefek mesela benim ona yapış sistemimi müdüre falan da yansıttı mesela şey dedi işte Gülenay bana böyle davranıyor diye veya arkadaşlarıma şikâyetlendi işte Gülenay'ı uyarın dedi, yoksa ben uyarırım falan dedi. Beni yüzüme etmedi ama kulağıma geldi. Ha ben n'aptım, düzeltmeye çalıştım kendimi. Belki olabilir dedim. Bir de bende agresiflik çoktu, agresiflik derken tepki verebiliyordum. Böyle hemen alınabiliyordum çünkü amcamgilin yanında kaldığım için. Ya böyle kaldıramıyordum bazen, orada streseydim, sürekli baskı altında oluyorsun. E buraya da gelince sana birileri bir şeyleri emrivaki ters yapınca tepkini veriyorsun, eve veremiyorsun ama buraya veriyorsun. Bazen kendimde arıyordum acaba öyle mi diye.

- Sen toparlamaya çalışıyordun yani?

Ha ben toparlamaya çalışıyordum. Mesela biraz samimi oluyorduk. E bakıyorsun gene aynı. (gülür) Yani öyle şey geçti ama hala da görürüm konuşurum, o da benimle konuşur.

- Anladım, peki bazı yurtlarda şey dendi mesela müdür bize başka davranıyor danışmaya başka davranıyor. Onlar böyle biraz daha üstteymiş gibi. Sen hiç hissediyor musun öyle bir şey?

Şeyde hissediyordum ya ben ya söylenecek bir şey değil ama müdür bir şey alıyordu mesela, oradaki insanlarla yiyordu mesela, diyelim bir çikolatası var, bir şeyi var, onlarla paylaşıyordu ama işte seninle paylaşmıyordu. Tamam, bazı gelir senle de paylaşıyordu ama yani onlarla daha çok paylaşıyordu, onlara daha çok veriyordu, paylaşıyordu. Yani onlara daha çok veriyordu deyim yani. Sana da vermiyor değil, merhaba dediğinde, odasına gittiğinde tabi ki sana da sunuyordu

ama belki öncelik onlara mı tanıyordu artık. Daha samimi oluyor onlar birbirine yakın oldukları için. Bizim gibi olmuyor, biz akşama kadar çalışıyoruz.

- Peki, şirket çok fazla muhatap oluyor mu sizinle, çok geliyor mu şefler?

Şey temizlik kontrolüne geliyorlar canım. Önceki şirket şeydi yani çok titizdi yani, yükseklere parmak atmalar, işte burada toz var bilmem ne. İnsanın hoşuna gitmiyor yani tabi ki yüksek yerde toz olur, tabi ki her yerde toz olur. Mesela benim katımda çamaşır odası var, çamaşırhane var. Üç yüz tane öğrenci orayı kullanıyor. Kurutmalardan dolayı koridora hep toz gidiyor mesela. İster istemez elini her attığında toz geliyor. Kurutmaların üstünü ne kadar silsen o kadar toz çıkar. Yani çıkıyordu, oluyordu da. E sürekli de geliyorlar burayı niye silmedin, burayı niye yapmadın, önceki şefler çok şey yapıyorlardı yani çok sıkıyorlardı ama şimdi öyle fazla yok. Var da az belki bir ayda bir geliyorlar. Mesela geçen geldiler etrafa baktı gitti, şunu şöyle yap diyor tamam yaparım diyorsun.

- Böyle kendini üstte görme var mı şeflerde?

Yok, şimdikilerde yok. Ama önceki şirketlerde vardı. Mesela arkadaşımızın biri yeni girmişti işe, Gökhan dedi, bana Gökhan deme, Gökhan bey dedi. Şimdi aynı servisteydik, herhalde aşağı yukarı yaşlarımız aynıydı. Arkadaşımız Gökhan deyince o tepkisini verdi, Gökhan demeyeceksin, Gökhan bey diyeceksin dedi. Yani mecburen diyorsun. (güler)

- Şimdi sizin burada hasta olma durumunda falan izin alma durumu çok sıkıntı yaratıyor mu?

Yok, normal hasta olduğunda falan ona veriyorlar. Ben hamileyim benim listem kabarmıştır mesela. Müdüre hanım kendi odasında liste tutuyor mesela. Kime ne kadar izin verdiyse, o da liste tutuyor. Ben hamileysem, bana özellikle söyledi, sen dedi ayrısın dedi. Senelik izinler belki normal arkadaşlarım laf şey yapıyordur sürekli almamaları açısından makine günleri en azından, bana şey yapmıyor yani.

- Ama yıllık izinler konusu sıkıntılı...

Yıllık izinler tabi ki sıkıntılı, ben şu an yirmi bir gün hakkım varsa, ben alamıyorum. Bu seneki durumumuz da belli değil işte, ben bir de doğum iznine gideceğim. İznim yanacak mı yanmayacak mı, sonradan mı verilecek hiç bilmiyorum. Yirmi bir gün izin ne demek, üç hafta demek, ne kadar güzel! Keşke verse ben en azından belki birkaç hafta daha erken ayrılacağım, belki senelik iznimi doğum iznime katacağım. Yok işte.

- Peki, Mediko'yu kullanabiliyor musunuz?

(Güler) Mediko'yu ben kullandım. Birkaç sefer kullandım, şey acilini kullandım. Bir de bize doktor şey yapmışlardı orada, ondan faydalandım.

- Anladım, ama acil durumu olmadığında sanırım taşeron işçilere kimse bakmıyormuş.

Tabi, tabi. Mesela ben şu an gidip kadın doğumdan her gün tahlile gidiyorum, buradan asıl muayenelerimi yaptıramam. Yaptıramıyorsun işte. Ama hamilelik testimi burada yaptım ben burada öğrendim ben. Buradaki ablalar hep tanıdıktı çünkü. Geldiler yaptım. Ben bir rahatsızlığım vardı, bir tane ablaya rica ettim doktorun şeyiydi, o da ona rica etti. Rahatsızlığımdan dolayı ben orada tedavi oldum.

- Tanıdık olursa yani oluyor biraz.

Hı, tanıdık olursa. Tanıdık olmasa olmaz. Doktora gidip rica edemem. Ama acilde oldum. Elimi yakmıştım, elimi bir hafta pansumana gittim. Ayağımı şey yapmıştım, sakatlamıştım, beni alçıya aldılar burada. Ben işe geldim gittim alçılı

ayağımla. Alçımı yine burada aldırđım. Acil konusunda hiç sıkıntı yaşamadım yani.

- Peki, siz mesela ekstra mesai yaptığınızda mesela bayramda geldiğinizde ya da hafta sonu ne kadar para veriyorlar size?

On yedi mi on sekiz mi sanırsam. O da zaten yola gidiyor, yemeğe gidiyor. Geriye on milyon falan kalıyor mu kalmıyor mu bilmiyorum.

- Peki, bu bir bahar şenliğinde saat dörtten önce kampüsü terk edin...
Geçen sene.

- Şenlik alanına yaklaşmayın gibi bir şey dendi mi?

Geçen sene denmişti. Bu sene de Allahtan sırf onların şansına mıydı bizim şansımıza mıydı hep yağmur yağdı (güler). Bizi topladılar, bira şişesi toplanıyormuş falan, işte toplamayacaksınız, şenliğe katılmak istiyorsanız falan katılın ama bira şişeleri falan toplamayın dediler. Geçen sene dörtten sonra şenliğe katılmayacaksınız dediler. Gizli saklı katılıyorduk yani (Güler).

- Açıklama da yapmadılar ama bu seneki gibi şişe toplanıyormuş falan diye...

Ha, bu seneki gibi değildi o direk, direk katılmayacaksınız. Biz de korkudan gidemiyorduk zaten şenliğe. Çünkü dolanıyordu şefler bir de hepimizi tanıyorlardı çünkü eski elemanlarız. Eskiler daha çok dikkat çekiyor.

- Birileri zengin birileri fakir ya sence neden öyle bir fark var insanlar arası? Yani bu mesela sence takdiri ilahi midir, doğanın kanunu mudur yoksa insanların yaptığı bir şey midir?

İnsanlar isteyerek zengin olamaz, çalışarak da olamaz. Ancak çalıp çırparak olur. Çok belki ya çok parası vardır, ya bir yerden miras kalmıştır, piyango vurmuştur. Benim babam çobancılıkla geldi, çobancılıkla öldü mesela. Niye hiçbir şeyi olamadı, bir evi olamadı, köyden köye gidiyordu? Babadan aileden bir şey kalmamış, dokuz kardeşler, kalsa bile hangi birine kalacak küçücük ev? Şehirde yaşayan insanlar eskiden toprak sahibidir, atalarından, dedelerinden kalmıştır. Öyle olmuştur yani. Mesela benim şu an evim var, arkadaşımın birinin evi yok. Eşi burada çalışıyor, kendi de burada çalışıyor, e çocuğuna kim bakacak? Ya bakıcı bakacak ya... Evi de kira. Asgari ücretle çalışıyorlar. E benim şu an eşim bir milyar alıyor ama ben de hani destek oluyorum. Ben çıkarsam evim var en azından, eşimin parasıyla geçinebilirim, evim var. Bu da bir şanstır, yani insan doğuştan zengin değil ama o da çalışarak almıştır, tamam çalmış çırpmış değil de bir evi insan belki babası yardım etmiştir, üç beş kuruş vermiştir. Dıyorum ya altınlarımı bozdurduk. Belki benim düğünümde altınım yüz tane olmuştur, onun elli tane olmuştur. Öyle bir şey olmuştur, öyle bir zenginliktir yani. (güler)

- Peki, sen kime zengin dersin? ODTÜ’de zengin var mı mesela?

Zengin... Bana göre öğrenci hani annesi babası okumuştur, bir yerden de belli bir geliri vardır. Zaten çocuğunu okutamayan insan ODTÜ’ye gönderemez. Yani belli bir geliri olmasa, benim şahsen ailem gönderemezdi beni, normal okula gönderemedi ki tutup bir ODTÜ’yü kazansam hiç gönderemezdi. İmkânlar el vermiyor çünkü. Buranın kirası benim asgari ücretle çalışmam parası kadar yani. Ben çocuğumu okutabilecek miyim bazen ben onu düşünüyorum (güler). Ona gelecek hazırlayabilecek miyim?

- Peki, zengin fakire nasıl davranır sence?

(Sessizlik) Zengin fakire... Ne bileyim hani. Ya bilm... Şöyle söyleyeyim. Ben amcamların yanında kalırken yengem temizlik işine gidiyordu, yengem işte bana

baktığını söylemiş evin kadınına, o kadın da yıllardır bana hep destek oldu mesela. Zengin hani zengindir hiç kimeye yardım etmez diye bir şey yok. Kadın beni ilkokuldan tut ki liseye kadar hep kitaplarımı, kıyafetlerimi hep yardım etmiştir. Allah razı olsun. İnşallah yani, cennetlik bir insan. Görüşmüyorum. Kadın zaten samimiyeti sevmiyor. Ama yardım etmeyi seven bir insandı. Çok da zengindi. Eşi de mali müşavirdi. Bana iş bulma şeyine hiç girmedi, en azından bilmiyom bulmaya girmedi, bilmiyom neden hiç öyle bir şey yapmadı. Ama destek oldu kitaplarım, kıyafetlerime hep destek oldu. Mesela liseye yazılacaktım ben, kadın özellikle çıktı geldi beni ticaret lisesine yazdırmak için hani müdüre para bile şey atmıştı yani. Hani müdür bey işte bu kızı okula alın, gerekirse para bile veririm demişti yani. O zaman da kitaplarımı karşıladıydı. Ya o insan da zengin, ben zengin çok şeydir diyemiyorum hani fakire karşı. Yengeme hep kömür parası verirdi, yardım ederdi. Samimi olmazdı ama yapardı yardımını kadın el altından. Öyleydi yani öyle örnek vereyim sana.

- Peki, buradaki yurtlarda kalan öğrenciler sence zengin tanımına giriyor mu?

Ya girmiyor tabi ki. Çok buradaki öğrenci zengin diye bir şey yok. En azından durumu iyi insanlar. Ama genelde buradaki çocukları hep okumuş aile çocukları. Yani benim gibi babam çobandır işte amcam şeydir falan diyen çocuklardan görmedim. Hep öğretmen, vali çocuğu var işte babası avukat olan doktor olan insanlar var. O insanlar neylen okudu? Anne babası neylen okudu? Onu da anne babası okuttu. Geliriyle okuttu. Belki tarlasını sattı, bir evini sattı bir şey yaptı, okuttu. O da çocuğuna aynı desteği verdi. Belki tek çocuk yaptı. Benim ailem üç çocuk yapıyor, iki çocuk yapıyor. E n'apcak fakirlikten! (güler) Yani.

- Peki, mesela dedin ya buranın kirası benim neredeyse aylık ücretim kadar. Sen mesela o parayla bir ay geçinmeye çalışıyorsun ama o parayı tek göz odaya verebilen insanlar var. Bu farkı görmek sende ne hissettiriyor?

Mesela o, ya beni üzüyor en azından. Mesela kimi öğrenciler var küçük odada hem ders çalışmaya çalışıyor, hem okumaya çalışıyor. Zengin olsa belki tek kişilik odada da kalır, iki kişilik odada niye kalsın, daracık odada. Dört kişilik odada kalan çocuklar var, orada üç yüz milyon mu iki yüz milyon mu öyle bir şey. Durumu iyi olsa zaten oralarda kalmaz diye düşünüyorum... Ne sormuştun soruyu bir daha?

- Yani insanların durumu arasında böyle bir fark olması seni üzüyor mu?

Üzülüyorum, onlara da üzülüyorum onu demek istiyorum. Odada ders çalışmıyor, odayı hiçbir şekilde kullanamıyor, yatak desen iki katlı orada kalabalık, milletin kimin eşyası nerede hiç belli değil. Onlar zengin deyip onları aşağılamıyoruz da yani. Belki de öğretmen maaşıyla okuyan çocuklar var. Yani öğretmenler de az alıyor mesela. Bir milyar bir milyar alsa, iki milyar. E bir tanesinin maaşı bir çocuğuna gitse bir tanesi geçinimine gidiyordur. E çok zengin değil buradaki çocuklar da. Kimileri ortadır, hani lüks odada kalan biraz daha iyidir durumu demek o.

- Ama gariban öğrenci yok bu yurttan...

Gariban yoktur, hani asgari ücretle çalışsan da yoktur yani.

- Peki, asgari ücretlinin halinden anlayan beğendiğin bir parti, bir yönetici var mı ya da hiç oldu mu öyle birileri?

Hiç olmadı, hatırlamıyorum. Bi işte Erbakan'ın zannedersen, ben normalde Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi hani CHP'ye oy veririm ailemden gördüğüm için hani

hiçbir yere beynimi, kafamı yönlendirmedim. Ama şey hep duyuyorum yani Erbakan'ın asgari ücrete yüzde yüz zam verdiğini duyuyorum. Bu beni sevindiriyor yani. Ya o insanın Refah Partili olması benim için hiçbir şey ifade etmiyor. Bana iş versin, benim emeğime saygı gösterebilirsin. Şimdi bile asgari ücret altı yüz milyon mu ne, ya bu asgari ücretin bir milyar olması demek o insanı sevindirir yani. Bana çok iyi imkânlarda şurada iş verse, mesela, lise mezunuyum, lise mezununa değer verilmiyor şimdi yani, şu dönemde. Şimdi bilmiyorum tekrar CHP'ye oy vereceğim ama bu sefer şey değişti, başkan değişti, Kemal Kılıçdaroğlu işte. Bir de onu denemek isterim. Ama sürekli şu an Ak Parti'ye veriliyor, MHP'ye de verilmesini isterim. Bir de o insanın denenmesini de isterim.

- Yani senin devletten öncelikli beklentin iş?

İş tabii ki. İş, ben istemiyorum ki bana iki milyar üç milyar versin. Tabii ki isterim ama en azından hak ettiğimi versin. Şurada ben on yedi on sekiz milyona şey bayramda geliyorsam yani. 1 Mayıs'ta mesela çalıştım. Normalde işçi bayramı ilan ettiler ama ben çalıştım, mesela geldim. Gelmek zorundasın, çünkü burası yurt çalışmak zorundasın. On yedi-on sekiz milyonu bu başbakan biliyor mu acaba, insanların bu fiyata çalıştığını? Tamam, sekizden on ikiye kadar çalışıyoruz ama yani yine sonuçta yol parası veriyorum, yine yemek yiyorum burada. Duysa belki de güler yani. Belki onun bir yemek parası, bir günlük. (güler)

- Peki, dini inancın kuvvetli midir? Hani bağlı mısındır dine?

Yo, hiç bağlı da değilim yani. Tamam, Aleviyim ama nasıl diyeyim. Ya ben ailemde eskiden varmış ama Ankara'ya göç ettikten sonra insanlara artık geçim derdinden bunları unutmuş. İşte Cem evlerine ben birkaç sefer gittim, o da köylerde yapıldığı zaman gittim. Şehirde yapanlar var ama benim ailem hiç gitmedi, gidemedik. Televizyonda izliyordum çok meraklıydım, Perşembe günleri yayınlanıyordu Cem TV'de. Evlendim, eşim tarafından giderim diye düşündüm, eşimin de bazı ailevi sorunları oldu. Düşkün, eşim değil de abisi düşkün olduğu için annesi babası Cem'e alınmıyorlar. Cem'e alınmadıkları için de ben oradan da şey oldum. Bertaraf oldum yani. Ama eşim gitseydi ben çok meraklıyım, gitmek öğrenmek istiyordum. Acaba diyorum benim çocuklarım da mı giremeyecek? Onların girmelerini isterim.

- Peki, sen burada tüm gün yurdu temizliyorsun, bir de eve gidiyorsun ev işleri var. Nasıl yapıyorsun? Evde sana yardım eden birileri var mı?

Şöyle söyleyeyim, ben bekârken, zaten sekiz aylık evliyim, bekârken mesela, şimdi rahatım, direk kayınvalideme gidiyorum, orada yemeğimi yiyip evime gidip yatıyorum. Şu an çok rahatım. Orada da bugünkü öğlen yemeğimi hazırlıyorum mesela. Orada yaptığım sadece bulaşıkları makineye dizmek. Ama ben bekârken öyle değildim. Çünkü başkalarına sorumlu yaşıyorsun, amcamlara filan. E geldiğim zaman bazen yemek yaptığım oluyordu. Hafta sonları iş yapıyordum. Yapmadığım zaman yengem kızardı mesela işte niye yapmıyorsun falan. Yani yap diyordu, yapmamı bekliyordu. Ya ben zaten hafta içi yoruluyorum, Bir anne gibi kızım sen yorulmuşsundur, dinlen olayı yoktu. Mesela eve gidince ayaklarımı uzatıp dinlenemiyordum, e çekiniyorsun, böyle toplu toplu oturuyordum yani. Böyle ezik durumundasın. On altı sene kaldım ama bir türlü alışamadım yani, alışamadım. Çekingenlik vardı, dolapta bir şey almak istiyorsun mesela, belki bir tatlı var dolapta baklava, canın çekiyor ama sayılıdır diye düşünüyorsun. Bir meyve var, sayılı mı acaba diyorsun. Veya yengem görüp kızarmı acaba diyorsun. Mesela ben rahat oturamıyordum. Mesela bir iş yapılması gerektiğinde hemen

kalkıp yapardım. Hiç oturamazdım böyle. Sürekli yapmak isterdim, çünkü orada yaşıyorsun, bir şeyleri yapmak zorundasın. Mesela onlar beni sekiz sene okuttu ya ilkokullan ortaokul, lise, sekiz sene de ben onlara çalıştım, paramı götürdüm, hiçbir yere vermeden. Üzerime bile bir şey almadım. Aldığım zaman zaten yengem kızardı yine mi harcadın, yine mi kendine bir şey aldın. Hiçbir şey almıyordum. Affedersin orkid parasını bazen zor buluyordum. Çünkü kuruşu kuruşuna veriyordum, hesap veriyordum. Götürdü mesela oğluna düğün yaptı mesela, on tane burmalı bilezik taktı mesela. E neyle taktı, benim de desteğim oldu. Sekiz sene onlar bana emek verdi, çalıştı. Ben de karşılığımı sekiz sene onlara çalışarak verdim. Öyle bir denge oldu yani ben on altı sene sonra evlendim.

- Şu an peki daha mutlu musun, huzurlu musun?

Şimdi tabi ki daha huzurluyum. Bir de ben, amcamın şeyi çoktu mesela baskısı. İşte evlilik konusunda çoktu. Hatta şey diyorlardı kızı parası için tutuyor diyorlardı mesela. Artık ben de gidecek yer yok, amcalarına mı sürekli sığınacaksın? Babama sığınamazdım zaten köyde, ne desteği olabilecek? Ben de o yüzden hep paramı götürüp veriyordum. İnsanların laflarını artık kulak ardı ediyordum. En sonunda bu insana da amcam yok dedi. N'aptım, ne ettim iki sene boyunca çabaladım, ettim, amcama artık evet dedirdim. O da zar zor dedi.

- Daha önceden tanışıyor muydun eşinle?

Yo, bu da görücü usulüydü. Görücü usulüyle tanıştık eşimle. Öyle oldu. Ama çok çabaladım. Şimdi çok rahatım. Şimdi çok rahatım yani Allah'ıma çok şükrediyorum hep dua etmişimdir evim olsun, eşim olsun huzurlu bir yuvam olsun demişimdir yani. Evi de demişimdir yani. bir de çocuğum olsun derdim hep. Allah nasip etti inşallah.

- Peki, konu komşuyla ilişkiniz nasıldır mahallede?

Önceden gecekonduda oturuyorduk amcamların orada, oradaki amcamların bahçesi çok güzeldi. Bazen şöyle aklıma geliyor şöyle erikler falan dalda, şimdi marketten alamıyorsun iki üç milyona, bazen para yetiştirip de alamıyorsun. Dalından koparıyorsun kayısıyı eriği, gecekondu bir de. Bir de amcamın bahçesi hep güldür, amcam gülleri çok severdi, yengeme hep gül alırdı. Sevgililer günü, anneler günü zamanında hep bahçeye gül dikerdi.

- Orada daha bir samimi bir ortam vardı yani?

Hıh, orada daha samimi bir ortamdı. Komşuna gidiyorsun, kapısında oturuyorsun. En azından orada kilit kalabiliyorsun, güvenebiliyorsun. Apartman şimdi öyle değil, ben yeni geçtim apartman olayına. Bizim evde kombi yoktu mesela, şey sofben vardı. Kombi olayı bile bana değişik geldi. Bizim ev sobalıydı mesela. Kombili eve alışana kadar değişik geldi. Ya dedim bu evi nasıl ısıtacak şu kombi falan. Çalıştığın yerlerde görüyorsun ama bir evin içinde yaşamak başka oluyor yani. Eşim hep dalga geçer şimdi benimle (güler), ya bak derdin diyor nasıl ısıtacak.

- Komşularla da peki daha merhaba merhaba gibi mi?

Hıh. Şimdiki komşularım bir de nasıl diyeyim Alevi-Sünni ayırdımı oluyor. Din ayrımı oluyor, ne bileyim. Bir de benim dedim ya gecekonduda yaşadığım için üstteki insanın sesini duyabiliyorum alttakininkini duyabiliyorum, onlar benim sesimi duyuyor. Yan taraf duyuyor. Şimdi ister istemez huzursuz oluyorum yani. Üstteki n'apsa tık diye sesini duyuyorsun.

- Alevi-Sünni ayrımı nasıl oluyor?

Yani Alevi-Sünni ayrımı oluyor derken, dikkatini çekiyor, ilgini, kıyafetler olsun. Mesela benim karşı komşum kapalı bir insan, sana bakış tarzı farklı oluyor. Bizim yöneticimiz de yine öyle kapalı bir insan. Benim ona bakış tarzım farklı oluyor. Rahat giyinemiyorum. Giyindiğim zaman sanki ben çıplakmışım da o çok güzel giyiniyormuş gibi yani kapalı giyiniyormuş gibi hissediyorum.

- Akrabalarınızla aran nasıl? Sık görüşüyor musun?

Benim akrabalarım, anne tarafım hala hayatta benim teyzelerim, dayılarım ama bir gün olsun beni merak edip gelmediler, hiç görmediler, yani sahip çıkmadılar diyeyim. Anneannem de hayatta, ben de işte onlara sitem edip... Ara sıra arıyorlar ama ara sıra, yılda bir sefer, üç yılda bir sefer. Anneannemi ben iki sefer görmüşümdür yirmi beş yaşındayım. Onlarla samimiyetim yok, düğünümde de çağırmadım açıkçası. Yani o tarafı saymıyorum annem tarafını hiç aile olarak. Baba tarafımda da bir tek halalarım amcalarım var. Anne yok, baba yok, olmayınca n'olucak? Sade onlar halam, amcam. E amcalarımı da tek tek kaybettim. Sade şu an iki amcam var hayatta. Halalarım da iki üç tane halam var... Yani anlayacağın benim tarafta kimse kalmadı diyeyim. (gülür) Amca çocukları var, işte yeni yetişmeler, yeni doğanlar. Onlar var. Eşim tarafı da yeni yeni tanımaya çalışıyorum. Anne babasıyla bile daha mesela hayatımda hiç anne dememişim, onun bile şeyini yaşıyorum hani yeni yeni anne diyorsun, yeni yeni baba diyorsun. Ben kendi babama bile baba diyememişim yani yıllarca görüşmemişim. Onun zorluğu da oluyor yani.

- Bir sıkıntın, sorunun olduğunda kimi ararsın?

Önce hiç kimseyi aramazdım ben, bekârken diyeyim. Sıkıntımı kimseye anlatamazdım. Sonra sonra ben çalışma hayatına başlayınca... Okul hayatı boyunca hep sessizdim böyle. Öğretmen bir soru sorardı, parmağı kaldırmaya çekinirdim, korkardım. Çünkü insanlar hep sana baskı yaptığı için her şeyden korkar hale gelmiştim. Sanki öğretmen de seni dövecek, sanki öğretmen de sana kızacak. Öyleydi okul hayatım, sonra çalışmaya başladım. Çalışmaya başlayınca daha bir açıldım. Hatta amcamlar da fark ettiler Gülenay sen çok şey oldun dediler, sesin çıkmıyordu çıkmaya başladı falan diye beni yargılamaya başladılar. E çünkü artık irademi, özgürlüğümü kazanmışım, elim ekmek tutuyor. Çok kafam kızarsa diyordum ya bir eve çıkarım ama yapamazdım öyle bir şey, yemezdi yani. Ama en azından elim ekmek tutuyordu, en azından onlara bağımlılığımı biraz, ben onlara, onlar bana muhtaçmış gibi düşünüyordum. Götürüp paramı veriyordum en azından. Bazen o para bile susturuyordu insanları, sana şey davranışları değişiyordu. Şimdi bir sıkıntım olduğunda da arkadaşlarımla paylaşırım genelde, buradakilerle.

- Peki, hafta sonu ya da akşamları dışarı çıkabiliyor musunuz?

Hiç çıkmadım. Niye? Çünkü nasıl söyleyeyim, eşim hep çalışıyor. Yaza dönüyoruz, şimdi ben hamileyim biraz beni çıkar falan diyorum, yorgunum bilmem ne başlıyor.

- Çok öyle Ankara'yı bir gezmiş tozmuşluğun yok yani?

Ankara'nın her yerini biliyorum ama. Çalışma hayatından biliyorum. Anıtkabir'e bir sefer gitmişizdir, Gençlik Parkı'na bir iki sefer gitmişizdir. Öyle bir gezme şeyi var yoksa Ankara Kalesi'ni hiç görmemişimdir. Bunları hiç yaşamadık ama. Yani öyle.

- Peki, diyelim ki aynı paraya daha az yorulacağın bir iş buldun, gider misin?

Kabul etmem. Yok. (gülür)

- Ya da mesela daha fazla paralı bir şey olsa?

Yine kabul etmezdim. Ancak hafta sonu olacak, işi farklı olacak. Temizlik ne bileyim. Ya ben şeyden, arkadaşlarımdan kopamıyorum. Bu sisteme alışmışım, bu işi yapmaya alışmışım. Temizlik olsa ben her yerde yaparım, yine yaparım. ODTÜ gibi bir yerde çalışmışım, referansım güzel. Yedi yıldır çalışmışım. İş bulurum o konuda sıkıntı yok ama ortamdaki kopamıyorum. Sanki rektörlükte müdüre hanım beni yerleştirmek istedi, başka bir yerde iş buldu, misafirhanede kalmamı istedi. Ben hiçbir yerde kalamadım.

- Peki, bir hayalin var mı?

Eskiden vardı. Ama işte hep söndürdüler. İstiyordum yani, okumak istiyordum. Yani bir şeyler olsun, ben de bir şeye sahip olayım. Olamadım.

- ODTÜ'de okumak ister miydin mesela?

İsterdim tabii ki. Ne güzel. Ama işte biraz da kapasitem yetmedi. (güler) Yani işte belki bilgi olsaydı hani biraz bilgi dağarcığım geniş olsaydı okurdum, açık öğretim okurdum en azından. Okumak isterdim, en azından, bir mesleğim olsun isterdim.

- Peki, şu an...

Şu an sadece tek hedefim anne olmak, çocuğuma bakabilmek.

- Kaç çocuk düşünüyorsun?

İki.

- Çocukların için peki ne istersin gelecekte? Zengin olsunlar ister misin?

Çocuklarım okusun olsun isterim tabii. Kendi başlarına bir ev alsınlar veya ben destek olayım, isterim yani.

- Zengin olsun ister misin peki?

(güler) Zengin olsun isterim de ya orta zengin olsun isterim ama çok zengin de istemem, ne bileyim hani belki bozulurlar. Dengeleri bozulur. Ya evi barkı olsun, evi olsun, okumuş olsun, yeter yani. Mutlu, huzurlu olsun yani.

- Peki, çocukların büyüyünce daha iyi şartlarda yaşayacaklar mı sence?

Bilmiyorum ki işte çalışıp göreceğiz. Biz ne kadar verebileceğiz onlara ne vereceğiz bilmiyorum. İşte geleceği göremiyom şu an.

- Çok uzun vadeli planlar da yapmıyoruz yani...

Yapamıyoruz. İmkânların yok. Zaten bir, eşimle ikimizin tek kazancı şu an bir ev. Biz de bu evi kazandık ama hani zor şartlarda kazandık. Bundan sonra çocuğumuza verebileceğimiz en azından bir ev daha olsa ya da bir miktar paramız olsa onu okutabilecek. Bizim ona verebilecek bir şeylerimiz olsun istiyorum. Geleceğe dair plan pek yapamıyorum. Hani tarlam tapanım olsa, birkaç tane evim olmuş olsa derim ki en azından iki evim daha var, çocuğum satar veya birini satar okur, birini satar şey yapar kendine ev yapar derim. Bunu yapabilirim yani. Şu an hiçbir şey yapamam. Ama çalışıp destek olabilirim eşime yani.

- Beş sene sonra mesela kendini nerede görüyorsun?

Beş sene sonra ben kendimi... Çocuklarımı büyütmiş mü diyeyim artık. Ben zaten üç yaşına gelince tekrar ikinciye düşünüyorum. İnşallah, Allah izin verirse. Artık babaannesi bakarsa ona bırakacağım ya da yuvaya vereceğim. Çalışmak istiyorum ben. Ben çünkü hep çalışmaya alışmışım, evde oturmayı pek sevmiyorum ama sadece şu çocuk olayını bir görmek istiyorum, bakmak istiyorum nasıl oluyor. Onu merak ediyorum. Yoksa çalışmayı seviyorum ben.

- Peki, buradaki işine kalıcı bir iş olarak bakıyor musun?

Buradan emekli olmak istemem. İstemem açıkçası, çok zor, şartları ağır. İstemem yani. Buranın geleceği yok yani hiçbir insana. Belki çok eskilere vardı ama bize yok çünkü emeklilik yaşı gelmiş altmış... Ben burada hiç yürütemem. Bilmiyorum çok zor durumda kalırsam olur da yani. E temizlik yaptıktan sonra başka yerde de yaparım. Buranın sadece servis olayına zaten insanlar geliyor, servisi var diye. Servis olmasın ben iki araba yol parası verip de sabah gelip de, iki araba da yol parası verip evime gidemem yani, dört araç. İkişer milyondan sekiz milyon yapar. Günlük sekiz milyon yol parasıyla ben buraya gelmem. (güler) Sekiz kere üç yirmi dört. İki yüz kırk milyon para yapar ayda.

- Peki, bu kadar. Çok teşekkür ederim.

Rica ederim.

APPENDIX D

TEZ FOTOKOPİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü

Enformatik Enstitüsü

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü

YAZARIN

Soyadı :

Adı :

Bölümü :

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce) :

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans

Doktora

1. Tezimin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılsın ve kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla tezimin bir kısmı veya tamamının fotokopisi alınsın.

2. Tezimin tamamı yalnızca Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi kullanıcılarının erişimine açılsın. (Bu seçenekle tezinizin fotokopisi ya da elektronik kopyası Kütüphane aracılığı ile ODTÜ dışına dağıtılmayacaktır.)

3. Tezim bir (1) yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olsun. (Bu seçenekle tezinizin fotokopisi ya da elektronik kopyası Kütüphane aracılığı ile ODTÜ dışına dağıtılmayacaktır.)

Yazarın imzası

Tarih

