

GENDERED CITIZENSHIP: EXPERIENCES AND PERCEPTIONS OF THE  
BULGARIAN TURKISH IMMIGRANT WOMEN

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

BY

ÖZGE KAYTAN

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR  
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE  
IN  
GENDER AND WOMEN'S STUDIES

SEPTEMBER 2014

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

---

Prof. Dr. Meliha ALTUNIŞIK  
Director

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

---

Prof. Dr. Yıldız Ecevit  
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. Canan Aslan-Akman  
Supervisor

**Examining Committee Members**

Prof. Dr. Ayşe Gündüz Hoşgör (METU, SOC) \_\_\_\_\_

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Canan Aslan Akman (METU, ADM) \_\_\_\_\_

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Pınar Akçalı (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 : Özge KAYTAN

Signature :

## **ABSTRACT**

### **GENDERED CITIZENSHIP: EXPERIENCES AND PERCEPTIONS OF THE BULGARIAN TURKISH IMMIGRANT WOMEN**

Kaytan, Özge

M.S., Department of Gender and Women's Studies

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Canan Aslan Akman

September 2014, 156 pages

The aim of this thesis is to analyze the citizenship experiences and perceptions of the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women with specific reference to their participation to the public sphere, their engagements in the private sphere, different socialization processes they have been through and their daily lives. It is argued that the Bulgarian Turkish women's citizenship practices were constructed through their ethnic minority identity in Bulgaria, in Turkey their citizenship has become a gendered construct due to the gender norms imposed on immigrant women. This thesis study is based on feminist perspective and research procedure, challenging the conventional definitions of citizenship by including the experiences, thoughts, sensations, and the narratives of the immigrant women, and it is contended that the notion of citizenship should include such subjectivities. The fieldwork was conducted in the form of semi-structured interview surveys with 19 immigrants who immigrated to İzmir, Turkey from Bulgaria in 1989 and in the 1990s. The experiences of the immigrant women about their socio-economic conditions, identity perceptions, and their participation to the public spheres and the changing

gendered dynamics in the private spheres constitute the core subjects for the analysis to demonstrate how they have experienced gendered citizenship in Turkey.

Keywords: Gendered Citizenship, Immigrant Women, Bulgarian Turks, Immigration

## ÖZ

### TOPLUMSAL CİNSİYET TEMELLİ VATANDAŞLIK: BULGARİSTAN GÖÇMENİ KADINLARIN DENEYİMLERİ

Kaytan, Özge

Yüksek Lisans, Kadın Çalışmaları Anabilim Dalı

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Canan Aslan Akman

Eylül 2014, 156 sayfa

Bu çalışmanın amacı Bulgaristan göçmeni kadınların Türkiye'deki kamusal alana katılımlarını, özel alandaki konumlanışlarını, günlük yaşamdaki farklı sosyalizasyon süreçlerini ele alarak onların vatandaşlık deneyimlerini ve algılarını analiz etmektir. Bulgaristan'da iken Bulgaristan göçmeni kadınların vatandaşlıkları etnik kimlikleri ve azınlık statüleriyle kurgulanırken, Türkiye'de göçmen kadınlara yüklenen toplumsal cinsiyet normlarından dolayı bu kadınların vatandaşlıkları toplumsal cinsiyet temelli olarak kurgulanmıştır. Bu çalışma feminist bir çerçeveden ve araştırma tekniğinden yola çıkarak, vatandaşlığın geleneksel tanımlarını eleştirerek, vatandaşlığın aynı zamanda kadınların deneyimlerini, düşüncelerini, duygularını ve öznelliklerini ele alan bir olgu olduğunu savunur. Bu teorik çerçeve ele alınarak, saha çalışması derinlemesine mülakat tekniği ile 1989'da ve 1990'lı yıllarda Bulgaristan'dan İzmir-Türkiye'ye göç etmiş 19 göçmen kadın ile gerçekleştirilmiştir. Bu tez çalışması, göçmen kadınların Türkiye'deki vatandaşlıklarının toplumsal cinsiyet temelli bir kurgu olduğunu, analizin temeline kadınların sosyoekonomik durumlarını, kimlik algılarını, soydaşlık durumlarını ve etkilerini, kamusal ve özel alanda konumlanışlarını koyarak ulaşmayı hedeflemiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Toplumsal Cinsiyet Temelli Vatandaşlık, Göçmen Kadınlar,  
Bulgaristan Göçmenleri, Göç.

*To My Beloved Grandmother Habibe Kahveci...*

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Firstly, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my dear advisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Canan Aslan Akman for her continuous support, guidance, patience and immense knowledge. Her encouragement, precious feedback and revisions guided me to conduct this research. I am also grateful to her for listening and advising me about personal issues. Without her precious support and continuous encouragement I would not be able to complete this work.

I would also like to thank my thesis examining committee members, Prof. Dr. Ayşe Gündüz Hoşgör and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Pınar Akçalı for their insightful comments and criticisms. Their valuable contributions helped me to broaden my perspective about my research.

I would like to sincerely thank Prof. Dr. Yıldız Ecevit for her support and encouragement throughout my study in Gender and Women's Studies. She is one of the respectful idols of my life, because of her energy, friendship and approach to the problems of life. I would not be what I am now, if I did not meet her.

I am grateful to my beloved family; Hayriye, Nazım and Evrim for their support, love and care. They have a continuous belief in me to overcome every problem and to succeed in my studies. Their precious unconditional support and love has encouraged me throughout my life. I thank my family for being such a great one.

I would like to thank all interviewees for dedicating their time and for disclosing their feelings and experiences. I feel a deep respect for all the women I interviewed; they are the strongest women I have ever met in my life. Without their contribution, I would not be able to complete and finalize this research.

I would also like to express my sincere appreciation for Dr. Nilgün Fehim Kennedy and Assist. Prof. Dr. Tore Fougner for introducing me feminism in my

undergraduate studies. I thank them for being such precious professors of my university years.

I would like to sincerely thank Can for his endless patience and love. He has always been there for me whenever I felt down and miserable. He provided me with technical and emotional support, in addition to reading and revising this thesis. He has always made me feel that I am very fortunate to have such an amazing person in my life, regardless the distance and borders between us. Without his support, this research would be incomplete.

I am also grateful to Destina for being my lovely roommate and soul mate. During the thesis study, she always supported me and calmed me down, whenever I felt disappointed. I thank her for providing me with technical support, emotional help and for her commitment to our friendship. Her friendship is something I can never find in anyone else.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  |      |
|--|------|
| PLAGIARISM.....  | iii  |
| ABSTRACT.....  | iv   |
| ÖZ .....   | vi   |
| DEDICATION .....   | viii |
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....   | ix   |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS .....  | xi   |
| CHAPTER  |      |
| 1. INTRODUCTION.....   | 1    |
| 1.1 The Subject Matter of The Thesis .....   | 1    |
| 1.2 Research Procedure.....  | 6    |
| 1.3 The Organization of the Thesis .....   | 11   |
| 2. PROBLEMATIZING WOMEN’S CITIZENSHIP: FEMINIST<br>CRITIQUES AND SITUATION OF MIGRANT WOMEN..... | 13   |
| 2.1 The Evolution of Citizenship: Beyond a Legal Status .....                                    | 14   |
| 2.2 The Feminist Critiques of Gendered Citizenship.....  | 20   |
| 2.2.1 The Public and Private Dichotomy: The Basis of Liberal<br>Citizenship.....                 | 27   |
| 2.2.2 The Relationship between Nation-States and Women’s<br>Citizenship.....                     | 31   |
| 2.2.3 The Migrant Women’s Citizenship.....   | 34   |
| 3. THE BULGARIAN TURKISH IMMIGRATION TO HOMELAND<br>TURKEY AND WOMEN .....                       | 46   |
| 3.1 The Historical Background of Turkish Minority in Bulgaria .....                              | 46   |
| 3.1.1 Bulgarian Turks as Ethnic Kins .....   | 52   |
| 3.1.2 The Post-1990 Immigrants to Turkey .....   | 53   |
| 3.2 Turkish Women’s Situation under the Bulgarian Communist<br>Regime .....                      | 54   |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 4. BEING A BULGARIAN TURKISH IMMIGRANT WOMAN IN TURKEY:<br>GENDER DYNAMICS IN THE PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SPHERES..... | 59  |
| 4.1 The Immigration Process and the First Years in Turkey:<br>What the Narratives of Immigrant Women Tell .....   | 62  |
| 4.2 Issues of Identity and Ethnicity among the Bulgarian Turkish<br>Immigrant Women .....                         | 69  |
| 4.3 The Gains from Immigrating to Homeland.....   | 75  |
| 4.3.1 Freedom and Economic Opportunities.....   | 77  |
| 4.3.2 Women’s Employment and Education Opportunities.....   | 79  |
| 4.4 The Losses that Came with Migrant Status and Impact of<br>Patriarchy.....                                     | 82  |
| 4.4.1 Boundaries, Community Pressure and Stigmatization:<br>Narratives of the Immigrant Women .....               | 83  |
| 4.4.2 Immigrant Women’s Perception of Gender and Women<br>in Turkey .....   | 86  |
| 4.4.3 Implications of Diminished Social Welfare Policies for<br>Immigrant Women .....                             | 90  |
| 4.4.4 Public Participation and the Changing Gender Norms of the<br>Family Life .....                              | 94  |
| 5. THE BULGARIAN TURKISH IMMIGRANT WOMEN AND<br>THEIR PARTIAL CITIZENSHIP .....                                   | 99  |
| 6. CONCLUSION .....   | 114 |
| REFERENCES.....   | 122 |
| APPENDICES  |     |
| A. IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE .....   | 132 |
| A.1 Questionnaire in Turkish .....  | 132 |
| A.2 Questionnaire in English .....  | 136 |
| B. TABLE-2: MIGRATIONS FROM BULGARIA TO TURKEY .....  | 140 |
| C. TURKISH SUMMARY .....  | 141 |
| D. THESIS PHOTOCOPYING PERMISSION FORM .....  | 156 |

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **1.1 The Subject Matter of the Thesis Study**

The concept of citizenship, which is a multi-layered construct by itself, consists of diverse structures when it comes to the citizenship of immigrant women. This thesis investigates whether, how and to what extent social and cultural changes experienced by the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women, along with changes in their educational lives and labor force participation made an impact on the practice of their citizenship rights. The migration process itself is gendered not simply due to the fact that men and women are differently affected; it is also likely to affect how gender identity interacts with the new identity bestowed upon the migrant women. Transnational migration generates new social inequalities and social exclusion. The tragedy of ethnic oppression and ethnic assimilation and, in extreme cases, the danger of ethnic cleansing are made unbearable through the assaults on women and the children. Hence, the victimization of ethnic minorities is almost always feminized. Women's reproductive roles are controlled to maintain and reconstruct the boundaries for inclusion and exclusion (Yuval-Davis, 2010). The gendered experiences of oppression directed towards minorities are transformed into gendered dynamics of migrating to a host country and integrating into the new society.

The case of the Bulgarian immigrants of ethnic Turks who were forced to emigrate to Turkey in the late 1980s due to the oppressive assimilation policies of the late communist regime in Bulgaria is significant in that 'Bulgarian Turks' were not, strictly speaking, deemed as the outsiders by the Turkish public. On the contrary

they were considered as ethnic kins (soydaş) and were welcomed to the Turkish society with high degree of empathy for their situation. Thereafter, many studies investigated their situation during and after the migration process. However, Bulgarian Turkish migrant women's citizenship experiences were subject to very few studies so far. The issue, however, is worth revisiting since migrant women underwent a process of adapting into the Turkish society where patriarchal structures more visibly constrain women's individual citizenship experiences than the communist regimes or for that matter many of the advanced capitalist countries. While their citizenship in Bulgaria had been largely constructed based on their ethnicity and to a lesser extent by their gender identity (as an ethnic Turkish minority women), in Turkey the process of adaptation to the Turkish society and their subsequent citizenship experiences in terms of access to the social, political and civic aspect of citizenship were also shaped by the dominant gender constructions for Turkish women in addition to being a migrant.

In light of these issues, deriving from the feminist perspectives and insights on women's citizenship and the findings of existing studies on transnational migration and women, this study inquires into the specific ways in which Bulgarian Turkish women's socioeconomic, cultural, educational situation resulting from their immigrant status have intersected with their gender identity in the host country, Turkey and thus compromised their citizenship experiences vis-à-vis other women and Turkish citizens. This study thus examines the impact of the intersectionality in the construction of citizenship for immigrant women. As Werbner and Yuval-Davis (1999) contended, the conventional approaches to the notion of citizenship excluded the complex ways gender and ethnic identity intertwined while framing for women's experiences. This thesis research demonstrates how the citizenship of the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women has been constructed on the basis of gender inequalities operating in the public and the private spheres as distinct from their experiences in Bulgaria.

This thesis study underlines that even those immigrant women who have gained certain citizenship rights by virtue of the fact that they are part of the ethnic majority in a host country and are likely to have problems regarding the practice of their citizenship rights; as a result, their citizenship may be constructed incompletely. Full and equal citizenship does not necessarily mean being part of the majority or having substantial rights within a state. The concept of citizenship considered here is not only about legal, political or social citizenship, which this thesis does not address, but it is rather concerned with the concepts of inclusion and exclusion. It is also related to the sensations, thoughts, and identity perceptions (Caldwell et al., 2009) of the subject. Citizenship consists of and intersects with different factors including women's position in the public and private sphere, women's laboring process both inside and outside home, their domestic roles most notably in their caring roles, and how women are influenced by the prevailing gender stereotypes in a host country. Therefore, although the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women are from the same ethnic kin with the majority of people in Turkey, it is important to recognize them as a different category of women whose access to full citizenship has remained constrained in the patriarchal society in Turkey whose dynamics differ from those of Bulgarian society.

The exclusion of women from citizenship was conventionally legitimized by liberal systems as women were assumed to be naturalized in the private sphere and family, where they belonged to their husbands (Yuval-Davis & Werbner, 1999:6). Women's exclusion from citizenship has been a long-standing problem. While modern citizenship does not exclude women from citizenship as status, the dominant citizenship understandings in democracies has for a long time and even today confines women to motherhood and wifhood. These domestic statuses of women have excluded them from the political sphere and from equal access in education, property-holding and civic participation (Pateman, 1988). Feminist literature has long been concerned with the construction of the identity of the female citizenship on the basis of the separation between the public and private spheres. Lister (1997:69) classified the characteristics "citizen, public, abstract,

disembodied, mind, able to apply, rational, independent, active, heroic, strong” as features attributed to men, while the characteristics “non-citizen, private, particular, embodied, rooted in nature, emotional, irrational, partial, preoccupied with domestic concerns, dependent, passive, weak” as those typically attributed to women. Hence, it was always difficult to add women into the framework of citizenship theory and practice, because of the limitations imposed by these constructed notions that perceive women as incapable of being equal to the male citizen.

Feminist political theorists criticize not only exclusion of women from both the theory and the practice of citizenship in the liberal state, but also the masculinist perception of citizen who was almost always white, heterosexual and non-disabled (Lister, 1997:66). Feminist scholars claimed that the concept of citizenship has always been ‘inimical’ to women and they criticized modern democracies for privileging the male citizens and engendering citizenship in a ‘gender-blind’ manner under the patriarchal institutions (Roy, 2005:27-28). However, far from documenting and criticizing the victimization of women as secondary citizens, it is also contended that feminist citizenship involves both theory and practice, which emphasize women’s agency without victimizing women (Lister, 1997:5-6). It is problematic to see citizenship as a relation only between individuals and the state, “without considering the way gender dynamics impact on individuals in terms of status and access to resources, political participation, the formation and implementation of state policies” (Pateman 1988; Young 1990; Phillips 1991; Jenson 1993; Jenson & Saint Martin 2003 cited in Abraham et al., 2010:4-5). Feminist scholars contributed to the theory and practice of citizenship by challenging binaries such as ‘equality of opportunity versus equality of end result’, ‘a masculinized public defined by rationality versus a feminized private defined by care’, ‘individualism versus collectivism’, ‘homogenous identity versus difference and diversity’ (Abraham et al., 2010:5). As constructed binaries subordinate women more than men, feminist thought came to oppose all kinds of binaries and dichotomies regarding citizenship as practice.

The process of economic globalization, changing migration patterns, and increased world population has influenced the construction of citizenship in terms of ‘shifting from membership in a nation-state to a post-national or transitional space’ (Chow, 2010:159). In the face of this change, conventional descriptions of citizenship have remained ‘gender-biased’, ‘racist’, ‘class-based’, ‘age-specific’, ‘western centric’ and ‘static’ (Chow, 160). As Caldwell et al. (2009:7) argued, “a gendered approach to citizenship should include a definition of the political, as constituting realms outside the public sphere, and incorporate the experiences of both women and men in their families, local and ethnic communities, tribal nations and diasporic communities, as well as in nation-states”. Hence, it is important to consider the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women’s positions in their ethnic communities, families and in the Turkish society when rethinking their citizenship.

The 1989 emigration of Bulgarian Turkish minority from Bulgaria to Turkey was a forced migration which took place as a result of the ongoing expulsion and ethnic cleansing against the Turkish minority in Bulgaria. Discriminatory campaigns that began with the Pomaks, especially after 1984, started targeting Turkish minority, and ended up with the mass deportation of the Turkish community in 1989. However, emigration to Turkey continued throughout the 1990s. Migrants who came in 1989 immediately obtained Turkish citizenship; but post-1990s migrants, who mostly came and resided illegally, had difficulties in obtaining citizenship status, and they sometimes resided with temporary resident permits. The Turkish government treated these illegal migrants as a source of cheap labor and provided them with temporary permits under the condition that they should vote in Bulgarian elections, as a result of the transnational policies of Turkey (Kasli & Parla, 2009:206). This thesis examines the situation of both 1989 and post-1990s immigrant women, without separating them categorically; the differences between 1989 immigrants and post-1990s immigrants are not however the focus of the thesis study. The concept of citizenship considered in this research is beyond immigrants’ legal residency or legal status or the right of voting in Turkey; rather, citizenship is

considered as a practice that is constructed through the public and private dichotomy, which shapes women's citizenship in a gendered manner.

The experiences of being a woman and facing discrimination are doubled for the case of immigrant women. The fact that there has not been much research on Bulgarian Turkish migrant women might be because of the submission and resignation culture they brought along from the communist system, as well as the misconception that the discrimination that they were faced with in Bulgaria as a minority had completely ended after migration to Turkey, and due to the illusion created by the existence of opportunities in Turkey that they had not enjoyed in Bulgaria. However, the lives of the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women comprised different experiences before and after the migration; the immigration process was problematic by itself. Furthermore, establishing and sustaining a new life in a host country was embedded in different socialization processes and in specific citizenship practices of women. While living in Bulgaria, the Bulgarian Turkish women's citizenship was largely constructed mainly through their ethnicity, but it was transformed into a more visible gendered construct in Turkey. As a study informed and inspired by the premises and the assumptions of feminist research methodology, this thesis study raises questions on gendered citizenship and also contributes to the explanations on women's historical exclusion from citizenship.

## **1.2 Research Procedure**

What prompted me to study the Bulgarian Turkish women in Turkey was my familiarity with the experiences of these women as a second-generation Bulgarian Turkish woman living in Izmir, Turkey. The lives of the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women have always captured my interest, as I was born into the middle of these women's lives. I have always tried to understand their experiences through my relationships with my relatives and neighbors most of whom were migrants

from Bulgaria. I did not have a chance to witness what my parents have been through -as they were the 1977 migrants- but I have closely observed the 1989 and the post-1990s migrants from Bulgaria to Turkey, as I have been surrounded with immigrant relatives and acquaintances. Existing research on the Bulgarian Turkish immigrants have not specifically looked at immigrant women's experiences. In fact, migrant women's experiences could get more difficult compared to men, as migration itself is a gendered process.

In this thesis study, the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women are the subjects rather than objects of the research; as I also empathized with these women and I gave credit to every single word of the immigrant women that reflected their experiences. In this research, I tried to infer from the Bulgarian Turkish migrant women's experiences based on my semi-structured interviews with them, enriched with reflections as a second-generation Bulgarian Turkish woman in the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant society. As will be explained in the following section, there is no claim in this thesis study to represent all immigrant women who came from Bulgaria to Turkey in this period. The thesis aims at contributing to feminist citizenship research by demonstrating the gendered experiences of a group of migrant women, which are like to share significant commonalities with migrant women in similar or different settings in Turkey or elsewhere.

In terms of methodological position, feminist research methodology is adopted in this research. Women's subjective experiences constitute the center of the research, which are major concerns of the feminist social research. Feminist social research, though born into modernism, has been very critical of positivism and its characteristics of objectivity and neutrality (Ecevit, 2011:33). Feminist research has consistently questioned the androcentric structure of science, which has excluded women in all spheres. As Ramazanoglu and Holland (2002:45) highlights, "making sense of women's experiences, absences and silences through feminist theory enabled feminist critiques to target the sexist practices and patriarchal ideas that have shaped the social and political contexts within which scientific goals have

been prioritized and set”. Hence, feminist social research promptly questions what science is and who produces it, and rejects patriarchal postulations. As Bleier (1984) clearly states, “Patriarchal consciousness is our conceptual prison” (cited in Ramazanoglu & Holland, 2002:45). Further, feminist social research holds that gender is a social construct and gender is constructed as a base of women’s life experiences (Ecevit, 2011:35). It accepts that differences of women’s life experiences are based on their subjectivities and these subjectivities are spatial, contextual, situational, and even provisional and contingent, and these subjectivities are constructed as reflexive and discursive (Ecevit, 2011:35). By using multiple research techniques, feminist research aims at providing voice to women and it challenges the predominant male point of view of science, which is assumed to be objective, task-oriented and instrumental (Neuman, 2005:102).

Neuman (2005) summarized the characteristics of the feminist social research by stating that, “...feminist social research has an advocacy of a feminist perspective that rejects sexism in assumptions and research questions; feminists researchers produce reflexive and emphatic connections with the one who is studied; there is a strong sensitivity to how gender and power relations exist in all spheres of life; feminist researchers incorporate their own feelings and thoughts into the research process” (Neuman, 2005:103). As a result, feminist researchers mostly use qualitative analysis and case studies rather than relying on using quantitative methods. In addition, feminist methodology is mostly associated with interpretive social science, although as Gorelick (1991) contended feminist research should engage with critical theory as well, in order to reach social change (cited in Neuman 2005:103).

Knowledge is political, and feminist standpoint theory intends to reveal power relations between gendered lives. Taking a feminist standpoint implies a way in which knowledge is derived from women’s experiences and political relations between women and men (Ramazanoglu & Holland, 2002:60). A feminist standpoint requires a deep investigation of the relationship between knowledge and

power as an opposition to modernity, where knowledge is associated only with reality; deconstruction of the 'knowing feminist' is significant because the knowing self is a socially constituted notion, which can suggest an authority on the subject being researched; women's experiences and emotions constitute the most important source of knowledge in feminist standpoint theory; women's differences and different experiences are taken into account in feminist standpoint because they may create power hierarchy among women; feminist standpoint theory do not claim that their knowledge is generally true, because "knowledge, from a feminist standpoint, is always partial knowledge of women" (Ramazanoglu & Holland, 2002:60-67). Feminist standpoint is also an epistemology, in which gendered power relations are always investigated, and what people think and know about gender is questioned (Ramazanoglu & Holland, 2002:67).

What makes this thesis an instance of feminist research is that it attempts to explain immigrant women's citizenship from the perspective the feminist literature on citizenship. I adopt the feminist critiques of the gendered citizenship, which are relevant for this research. Although the conventional approaches to citizenship exclude women, and deem women unable to perform citizenship rights and duties, feminist approach tries to include women without ignoring their needs apart from men. Furthermore, understanding how immigrant women experience citizenship in a host country with the triple burden of paid-work, domestic work and the migration experience is only possible with a feminist standpoint. When I interviewed the Bulgarian Turkish women, they intended to tell their migration experiences in the presence of men; but when I insisted that they tell their own experiences as a woman separately, they were surprised to see that I was interested in them on the issue of migrants as women. When immigrant women recognized that I explored their own experiences, I observed that they began to tell their own stories more sincerely. In addition, I tried to make them feel that I understand their conditions. This particular approach as well as the fact that I empathized with them as a fellow immigrant woman meant that the hierarchy between the researcher and the

researched was weakened, and I believe that this, too, is only possible with a feminist approach.

The primary research technique I used in this research was semi-structured in-depth interviews. I conducted 19 interviews with the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women. Eleven of these women immigrated to Turkey in 1989, five of them immigrated in 1990, one immigrated in 1991, one immigrated in 1992, and one immigrated in 1997. Sixteen of women were originally from Kırcaali (Kardzhali), two are from Dobriç (Dobrich) and one is from Hasköy (Haskovo). The average age of immigrant women is 53. Five of the women are university graduates, seven of them are high school graduates and seven of them are secondary school graduates. I conducted interviews with Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women living in Izmir (Bornova, Bayrakli), in April, May, June 2014. I chose Izmir to conduct the research, because of the convenience it provided to me in terms of access to the immigrant women in my own environment. Although Izmir is a Westernized town in Turkey with a relatively more liberal atmosphere in terms of gender roles compared to the towns in other regions, it was likely that restrictive gender norms and dynamics have a considerable influence on immigrant women life experiences in Turkey. It would still be very interesting and meaningful to see how women perceived their lives even in a Westernized city like İzmir after having been migrated from Bulgaria. Apart from two women, I conducted the interviews in the subjects' own places, i.e. their homes. While three of the immigrant women were my relatives, the rest were acquaintances from the neighborhood and were suggested to me by the women I interviewed previously. I tried to conduct the interview in the form of a conversation, and apart from the interview questions, I did some probing through open-ended questions in order to make my subjects feel more comfortable and to be able to understand them with a deeper insight into their problems and how they coped with them. A schematic profile of the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women interviewed for this thesis study is provided in Chapters 3 and 4.

### **1.3 The Organization of the Thesis**

Chapter 1 lays out the research topic, by introducing the research question(s) and the major arguments underlying this study. This introduction section explains why feminist methodology is adopted in this thesis, and presents the research procedures used, the research sample, and the research setting.

In Chapter 2, the evolution of citizenship beginning with the historical conceptualizations of the notion of citizenship, modern citizenship and current conceptualizations of citizenship are briefly explained. The feminist critiques of citizenship, which is central to the general framework and to argument of this thesis, are elaborated. The concept of intersectionality, which is used by feminist scholars to understand the multidimensional dynamics of oppression of women on the basis of structural inequalities, is also introduced. A discussion of the public/private dichotomy, and the nation-states' masculinist constructions of women's citizenship, and particularly of migrant women's citizenship are also covered in this chapter.

Chapter 3 looks at the case of the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women, by first providing a historical account of the existence of Turkish minority in Bulgaria, the discrimination they faced and the reasons of migrating to Turkey. Also, reflections on the concept of ethnic kin in Bulgarian Turks and the post-1990 immigrants from Bulgaria is touched upon to highlight the problems that are faced with. In the last part of the chapter, women's situation under the communist regime in Bulgaria is also overviewed in the context of the feminist criticisms of the gender relations in the communist regimes, which succumbed to the ideal of "Bulgarian socialist emancipated woman" (Panova et al., 1993).

Chapter 4 analyzes and problematizes specific aspects of the citizenship experiences of the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women in Turkey, which also

provides women's subjective assessments of their relative status and situation in Turkey, compared to that in Bulgaria. With the narratives of women told in interviews, the first years of the migration, and women's difficulties with the adaptation process are explained in this chapter. Furthermore, issues of identity and ethnicity are examined regarding their relationship with women's citizenship and immigrant women's perception of themselves. The positive aspects of migration, including the social and economic advantages it brought are also analyzed. On the other hand, the negative effects of the migration on immigrant women, and in particular the impact of stereotypical attitudes towards immigrant women are also covered. Immigrant women's perception of gender and women in Turkey is presented in order to reach their comparative understanding of gender in the two countries. This chapter also examines how migration to Turkey restricted their access to the state-provided social services, and how this affected them. Lastly, immigrant women's participation in the public sphere constrained through public patriarchy and their changing roles/status within the family (private sphere) are also analyzed.

Chapter 5 presents the discussion of the findings about the citizenship experiences and perceptions of the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women by integrating the research findings into the theoretical issues raised by the feminist scholarship on women and citizenship, and women and migration. This chapter underlines the ways immigrant women's citizenship is largely shaped by the intersection of their migrant status and gender identity in Turkey. The narratives of immigrant women are put into perspective to provide insights into their changed citizenship practices in Turkey.

Finally, Chapter 6 summarizes how and why immigrant women's citizenship is problematized in the feminist citizenship approaches. The chapter provides a brief summary of how the findings of this research fit within the framework of feminist citizenship literature. The major points of the thesis research and the analysis are also provided by underlining the contributions of the thesis.

## CHAPTER 2

### PROBLEMATIZING WOMEN'S CITIZENSHIP: FEMINIST CRITIQUES AND SITUATION OF IMMIGRANT WOMEN

Citizenship is not only about the identity certificates, nationality, and legal, political and social rights; citizenship covers multiple identities and socializations. Most of the time, the concept of citizenship is perceived only as political citizenship, which consists of political participation of citizens; or social citizenship, which covers economic dependence or independence of citizens (Prokhovnik, 1998:84). Nonetheless, citizenship is not necessarily constructed as 'neutral', 'abstract', 'universalized', 'genderless', which requires an equal membership of all in public sphere: rather it can include diversities of gender, ethnic and cultural bases in public and private spheres. Hence, the concept of citizenship is beyond the political and the social rights. As Walby (1994:391) contended, "access to citizenship is a highly gendered and ethnically structured process". This chapter briefly looks at the evolution of citizenship in the West and the theoretical approaches developed to understand it as a construct with a historical background. After a short summary of the historical and evolutionary patterns of citizenship, the feminist critiques to citizenship will be introduced with specific references to the concepts of gender-pluralist and gender-differentiated citizenship; the effects of intersectionality of multiple social structures on women's citizenship; the relationship between nation-states and women's citizenship; and public and private dichotomy. Conceptualizations on women's political, social and cultural citizenship are elaborated to highlight the theoretical insights of the feminist research on gendered citizenship. In this context, the public and private sphere dichotomy of the liberal theory, which has constituted the bastion of women's subordination to men and

unequal citizenship, will be explained. The implications of the public-private dichotomy will be followed by a separate discussion of the construction of women's citizenship vis-à-vis the nation state ideology and construction. Lastly, the predicaments of migrant women's citizenship will be taken up to provide the background for the subsequent discussion of the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women's experiences in Turkey with specific reference to their labor force participation, their positions in the public and private spheres, and their gendered migrant identity as Turkish citizens.

## **2.1 The Evolution of Citizenship: Beyond a Legal Status**

The status of citizenship was constructed specifically in various societies, and its boundaries have been subject to changes. Right-wing and left-wing ideologies have both been concerned with citizenship, which is an inclusive and exclusive principle and a tool for the political mobilization and de-politicization of people (Yuval-Davis, 1997:133). Although citizenship seems to formally comprise broader groups of people, it does not guarantee representing all of them (Parla, 2011:77). "The widespread enjoyment or practice of citizenship is not thereby guaranteed, there is often a gap between possession of citizenship status and the enjoyment or performance of citizenship in substantive terms" (Parla, 2011:77). In other words, citizenship denotes "act of closure about a group of people it calls citizens" and excludes some others (Janoski & Gran, 2002:35). Hoffman (1986:83) asserts that people excluded from citizenship can be categorized in four groups: 'stigmatized, impaired (i.e. disabled groups), potential (fetus, patient in coma), and quasi-humans (corporations)'. Stigmatized people consisted of 'class-denigrated poor', 'gender-disqualified women', 'status-degraded racial or ethnic groups', 'gender-despised homosexuals' who are perceived deficient to claim rights of citizenship and to accomplish its duties, as well as being deemed unfit for the society. All four of these groups were excluded from citizenship for similar reasons (Hoffman, 1986:83). Stigmatization remains as a current issue, because differences based on

gender, class, ethnicity and sexual orientation were perceived as deficiency, which is why groups of people were excluded from citizenship.

As the history of citizenship began in the ancient Roman and Greek societies, citizenship was intertwined with the development of city-states (Turner, 1990:201). In this period, citizenship was considered as an expression of human nature, and it was seen as ‘the primary organizing principle of human life’ (Roy, 2005:5). Citizenship in the ancient republics comprised active political participation of those legally defined as citizens, supremacy of men, and familiarity and trust between people and the republic (Roy, 2005:5). Aristotle stated that the Ancient Greek citizenship referred to “all who share in civic life of ruling and being ruled in turn” (Roy, 2005:5). However, Turner (1990) highlights the concept of citizenship was only associated with the dominant classes in the society who enjoyed many privileges including free and legal constitution of citizenship and used slave labor extensively. The dominant class of the polis had every right to free speech and to govern; on the other hand, women along with adult slaves, children and homosexuals were defined not as citizens. In the Roman Empire, the idea of active participation in civic life had turned into passive citizenship, as a legal status with citizenship rights and equal protection, because the society consisted of different ethnicities and it was important to keep them heterogeneous and together to empower the empire (Roy, 2005:6-7). Although some aspects of citizenship seems to have transformed with the Roman Empire, the status of women and the lowest classes remained as it was; they were unable to perform citizenship. It is hard to argue that this situation has changed dramatically in modern times.

In the late medieval and early modern times, the concept of citizenship evolved into a different path. Citizens were not recognized as political people, but as private agents whose privacy and happiness were of primary significance (Roy, 2005:8). For the early liberal thinkers, the notion of common liberty was significant. For instance, for Hobbes, people’s physical life should be protected, for Bodin and Montesquieu the family and home were important, and Locke thought that the

authority should protect conscience and property (Roy, 2005:8). Moreover, the protection of familial space became much more important, as liberty provided the priority of the familial and private life (Roy, 2005:8). While the passive notion of citizenship as a legal status was a core element between 16<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries, the French Revolution challenged this passive citizenship notion; the revolution introduced republican ideas, making room for the participation of citizens (Roy, 2005:10).

The early modern notion of citizenship appeared in the 19<sup>th</sup> and the 20<sup>th</sup> centuries with the development of the capitalist market, and the idea of liberalism (Roy, 2005:12). Liberal individualism and civic republicanism led to the concept of liberal citizenship with equality and universality, which paved the way for free market and class inequality in the society (Roy, 2005:16). Liberal thought accepts that all citizens have equal status, equal rights and equal obligations; therefore, different identities of ethnicity, gender and class producing inequalities between individuals are not associated with citizenship (Yuval-Davis, 1997:137). Although citizenship rights seemed to promise equality (Marshall, 1992), they did not break down the existing structures of inequality, and the promise of equality concealed differences of gender, culture and ethnicity but obscured them in order to show their irrelevancy for the rights of citizenship (Roy, 2005:16).

Subsequent social struggles have contributed to the understanding of the concept of citizenship (Turner, 1990:194). The concept of civil society for the development of citizenship had an importance in the German tradition, where citizen was defined as “any individual who had left the family context in order to enter the public arena” (Turner, 1990: 204). An important question is whether women, minorities, and immigrants are included in citizenship when this definition is considered; this issue will be examined later.

T. H. Marshall and Tom Bottomore (1950/1992) produced one of the most influential pieces of theoretical work on citizenship, with significant insights for the

eighteenth, nineteenth and the twentieth centuries. Marshall's theory put forward that citizenship had an evolutionary and progressive nature, which could be considered as the "modern drive" of the society in order to reach social equality. T. H. Marshall analyzed and distinguished citizenship rights in three categories: civil, political and social. The civil rights of citizenship comprised basic rights of individuals including individual liberty, freedom of speech, thought and faith, property rights, right to contract and right to justice; the political rights included right to participate in the parliament and councils of governments where individuals have political authority to exercise power; and the social rights were composed of "the whole range from the right to a modicum of economic welfare and security to the right to share to the full in the social heritage and to live the life of a civilized being", which were mostly associated with the educational system and the social services in the society (Marshall & Bottomore, 1992: 8). Marshall's schema followed an evolutionary path for the citizenship rights; civil rights correspond to the eighteenth century, while the political ones to the nineteenth and the social part to the twentieth centuries respectively (Marshall & Bottomore, 1992: 10). Marshall considered citizen as a member of a community, in opposition to the liberal tradition, which constructed the male citizen as the individual, free and rational member of a state (Yuval-Davis, 1997:136).

According to Marshall, social rights of citizenship seemed more compatible with the 20<sup>th</sup> century because there are prerequisites for social rights including economic well-being, social security and education. Marshall stated that 20<sup>th</sup> century established a bond between citizenship and the capitalist system (Marshall & Bottomore, 2000:69). As Turner (1990) asserts, unemployment and economic difficulties in society constituted a ground for demanding welfare and social rights (Turner, 1990:192). Although social rights started to emerge in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the classical notion of citizenship did not involve social rights as a central and necessary component of citizenship (Marshall & Bottomore, 1992:16).

Marshall's theory on citizenship has undoubtedly been very significant; however, there have been challenges and criticisms raised against his conceptualization of citizenship. Social and political ideas brought about changes, which led to a revisiting of his ideas on citizenship. Turner (1990) asserted that citizenship notion has changed in relation to phenomena such as social integration and social solidarity. The concept of citizenship, which was only related to social equality, education, and social work, has lost its effectiveness over years. Marshall was also criticized for offering a unitary model of citizenship. As it was the case in the liberal traditions of James Mill and John Stuart Mill, Marshall approached English liberalism from the perspective of integrating individualism and social equality (Turner, 1990:189). It was pointed out that Marshall could not distinguish the problem of social inequality from the issue of individual freedom, because the problem of social inequality is a social phenomenon (Laski, 1962). Marshall has a misplaced perception that the historical emergence of citizenship has a definite character; however, social change meant that welfare state rights were not definite but changeable. As Giddens (1982) reminds us, citizenship rights are not unified and constant but subjected to change. In addition to his status-quo oriented approach, Marshall did not consider culture in terms of its relation with social rights; however, culture provides a national feature to the notion of citizenship (Turner, 1990:192).

According to Turner, Marshall misses the point that social struggles should have importance, as they are one of the bases for the development of citizenship, which comprises a set of relations between the state and the society. Hence, in terms of the historical evolution of citizenship, social struggles could not be denied; their accounts and importance for democratic participation is understood in wartimes (Turner, 1990:194). In addition, while new social movements, such as feminism, peace movements, and the green movement, have challenged the dominant perception of citizenship, these social movements take action from below for citizenship (Turner, 1990:199-200). Mann (1987) criticized Marshall for his evolutionism and Anglocentrism, and his underestimation of the importance of the

military and geographical formations; but Mann, on the other hand, underestimated the significance of ethnicity, race and gender for citizenship. Walby claimed that Marshall, Mann and Turner reduced citizenship to a narrow conceptualization based on a class analysis, despite the fact that citizenship was more than class, as it comprises different determinants and they ignored the gender dimension (Walby, 1994:381, 384).

In the modern times, the meaning of citizenship has shifted in accordance with the subsequent changes in the world. Citizenship was previously perceived as a status, which was provided by the state as an absolute authority and an institution over people. However, social struggles have broadened the definition of citizenship to include ‘political and social recognition’ and ‘economic redistribution’ (Isin & Turner, 2002: 2). Roy (2005) asserted that citizenship, as a concept of equal rights, instead of privileges given by birth, has been contested since the French Revolution. While the ideas that stemmed from capitalism and liberalism encouraged individuals to demand citizenship rights, they kept neglecting differences of race, gender, class, and ethnicity (Roy, 2005:5). Nonetheless, the ideas provided by globalization and multiculturalism kept questioning this aspect of citizenship (Roy, 2005:5).

The consideration of different sexual, racial, and ethnic identities has contested citizenship viewed as a status, rather than as a claim. However, citizenship as a claim is intertwined with “the formation of new claims for inclusion and belonging” such as “women’s rights, animal rights, lesbian and gay rights, civil rights, language rights, disability rights” etc. (Isin & Turner, 2002:1). Citizenship was closely related to the nation-state in the classical period because of its authority over people, but at the present time citizenship is associated more with social movements to raise awareness of social rights (Isin & Turner, 2002). Moreover, the process of globalization and postmodernist critiques of modernity also took up the issue of the nature of citizenship as a practice, by challenging the nation-state and its authority (Isin & Turner, 2002:3,4,7). It was claimed that citizenship was not only a legal

notion but also embodied a social process of rights (Isin & Turner, 2002:3,4,7). Multiculturalism in particular has made an impact on the debates over citizenship, because ethnic, religious and racial communities have claimed their rights according to specific needs. Hence, multiculturalism attempted to redefine citizenship by making room for cultural differences among social groups (Roy, 2005:20).

The relationship between citizenship and migration suggests new social facts to investigate, such as ‘marriage’, ‘family structures’, ‘pluralism’ and ‘multiplicity’ (Isin & Turner, 2002:9). Therefore, citizenship is not only seen as a legal concept including state-society relations, but it is also defined as entire relationships and interactions between social groups and their claims, needs, differences and identities. Citizenship studies engage with injustices in order to make them visible, so that they can create changes for people who try to overcome these injustices (Isin & Turner, 2002:2-3). Roy (2005:21-22) elucidates that these two definitions of citizenship are acceptable; “global/world citizenship with its basis in human rights that delink the relationship between citizenship and the nation-state and the differential rights and differentiated citizenship for members of cultural groups which gives them rights not only as individuals but also as members of groups”. Citizenship theories need to discuss women’s needs, thoughts and identities specifically. Although women are not a homogenous group and every single woman’s experience is subjective, they constitute a specific community in the society, as they are subordinated and discriminated due to their gender. Migrant women, who also constitute a specific category, are the subjects of the problem of citizenship, and their citizenship experiences are different from those of men and local people.

## **2.2 The Feminist Critiques of Gendered Citizenship**

The Feminist critiques to citizenship suggest that the conceptualization of citizenship must be revisited so that they pursue gender equality and protect

women's needs, since the historically patriarchal notions of citizenship largely excludes women. Stasiulis and Bakan (1997) offer "negotiated citizenship", which includes gendered, racial and class structures to reveal the negotiated citizenship strategies of those at the margins, such as migrant women, and puts back the legal concept of citizenship which comprises only the relationship between an individual and a single nation-state. As Werbner and Yuval-Davis (1999:28) contended, there was a need for reshaping citizenship; despite the fact that citizenship has had a gendered history, it could be reconsidered through the lenses of feminist and pluralist ideas, and approaching citizenship as a political issue.

Feminist scholars asserted that Marshall's classification of civil, political and social rights should be taken as 'interdependent' (Abraham et al. 2010). Expectation from women to exercise their political rights is a contentious issue, because women lack the necessary economic sources, and mostly the providers of care work in private sphere; where men largely have basic social rights, women do not (Abraham et al., 2010:7). The definition of politics is problematic because it only includes formal politics, which has a masculine character, so that women's participation remain invisible or nonexistent (Lister, 1997:147). Feminist scholars also questioned the gendered forms of political mobilization, which exist in and across national and cultural borders, in order to challenge gendered definitions of 'democracy', 'citizen', and 'immigrant' (Caldwell et al., 2009:8-9).

Gender is relevant to citizenship, because historically women, who comprised half the population, were denied from the full and active citizenship (Walby, 1994:391). Both in the ancient and the modern history, women were excluded from citizenship rights of the formal status of citizenship (Lister, 1997). Even in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century "a married woman did not exist as an independent individual under the common law doctrine of coverture, which meant that she lived under the tutelage of her husband who, as head of household, enjoyed the status of civil citizenship" (Lister 1997).

The focus of the contemporary feminist critiques of modern citizenship is mainly concerned with women's situation after they became legally equal citizens as men. Traditional gender roles attributed to women and women's place in the eye of the society have prevented them from practicing the equal citizenship rights. Double-shift (working both outside and at home), care-work and financial dependencies of women remained the major obstacles hindering women's full citizenship (Lister, 1990). In addition to domestic roles, women's existence as political citizens was denied in revolutionary and nationalist movements (Fraser & Gordon, 1994). Further, in the republican thought, men's participation as citizens relied on women's exclusion and women's contribution in the private sphere; whereas in the liberal tradition, women's exclusion meant more than an exclusion because there was a legal subordination of married women, and the white male, who was the family head and the real citizen, owned all property and the wife (Fraser & Gordon 1994). Men's citizenship was constructed on the basis of a "fraternal social contract" which excluded women and gave men the patriarchal power (Daskalova, 2006:122).

Feminists from different ideologies have a variety of arguments on citizenship rights. Liberal feminists underlined the importance of reform programs for citizenship; on the other hand, radical feminists criticize citizenship rights because they represented only male values, and argue that the category of women cannot be universalized (Lister, 1997:195). Socialist feminists opposed to individual-based rights; they believe that citizenship rights should be communal (Lister, 1997). Although feminists claimed that citizenship rights should not be overvalued, they do not reject the whole concept (Lister, 1997:18). Feminist critiques to citizenship seem to overlap with the left-wing ideologies because they criticize liberal democratic institutions for not meeting citizenship needs of those at the margins such as women, racialized groups and the lower classes (Lister, 1997:18).

There have been three specific approaches to citizenship with regard to gender: the first is gender-neutral citizenship, where both women and men have equal rights;

the second is gender-differentiated citizenship, where women are set apart from men in terms of different experiences; and the last is gender-pluralist citizenship where it is recognized that women and men belong to multiple communities and they have multiple identities (Okin 1989; Jones 1990; Phillips 1991; Mouffe 1992; Hobson & Lister 2002; Denis 2006 cited in Abraham et al., 2010:10) Gender-neutral citizenship takes women into account as the equals of men in citizenship rights, yet gender-differentiated citizenship distinguishes women's concerns and gives importance to their role in private sphere (Lister 1997:92). However, it should be recognized that gender-neutral spaces do not exist in current social structures. It is not meaningful to discuss gender-neutral citizenship for women, because we have not reached it yet; on the other hand, gender-differentiated citizenship may cause essentialism and put emphasis on women's 'natural' abilities, limiting women into private sphere (Lister, 1997:93). Furthermore, in order for women to be active citizens, they need to participate in the public space as women, rather than as gender-neutral citizens (Abraham et al., 2010:8). Nonetheless, minority women should have 'group differentiated rights' that reveal the structures in which women's historical oppression and exclusion from citizenship were constituted (Abraham et al., 2010:8). Gender-pluralist citizenship approach suggests separate rights for women and men who belong to different cultural communities. Hence, for example, a minority woman who has experienced specific instances of discrimination and oppression should have specific rights that address her needs, compared to women who were already the member of the host country.

It is argued that, in the context of multiculturalism, differentiated citizenship rights provides empowerment only for specific cultures, and does not pursue the well-being of all members of the society, consequently failing to promote women's specific needs (Roy, 2005:25). Hence, it is a double-edged question which type of citizenship is more appropriate. When it is culture-specific to determine whether gender-neutral or gender-differentiated citizenship is appropriate, women's position becomes invisible and remains subordinated. Concrete achievements of women's movement can provide pathways to the issue of women's citizenship as well.

According to Roy (2005), globalization and multiculturalism prevent women's full citizenship and impede the accomplishments of women's movements against inequality. Feminists have strongly criticized multiculturalism, which essentializes women and glorifies cultural rights, which did not imply any efforts for women's citizenship (Roy, 2005:254).

Feminist theoreticians have been using the concept of intersectionality to understand the multidimensional dynamics of oppression of women on the basis of structural inequalities. In this context, transnational processes and globalization pressures shaped intersectional structural inequalities and led to women's subordination. The theory of intersectionality refers to paying attention to the "vexed dynamics of difference and the solidarities of sameness" regarding antidiscrimination and political movements (Cho et al., 2013:787). Further, intersectionality puts emphasis on the fact that 'single-axis thinking' results in despise for struggles for social justice (Cho et al., 2013:787). Nevertheless, intersectionality provides a major understanding of 'gender, race and other axes of power' to the politics, by investigating 'dynamics of difference and sameness' (Cho et al., 2013:787). While posing open-ended questions to the axes of power, intersectionality theory also reveals embedded relationships between gender, race, class, nation and other inequalities (Cho et al., 2013:788).

The recognition of intersectionality of gender, class and ethnicity has significantly influenced the reconsideration women's citizenship as well. Feminist scholars referred to intersectionality theory in relation to the construction of women's citizenship. According to Yuval-Davis and Werbner (1999), the concept of citizenship excluded 'the reality of differentiation' and 'intersections of class, gender, ethnicity, race, religion, sexuality and ability in framing citizenship'. Hence, minorities, indigenous groups, lower-class people, persons with disabilities, and migrant women have long been excluded from citizenship, and all of these features intersect in the construction of citizenship as well. Citizenship and national identity do not only lead to inequalities between women and men, but also among

different groups who have been affected by ‘colonization’, ‘conquest’ and ‘im/migration’ (Stasiulis & Bakan 1997). Intersections of gender, race, and class have been visible political, social and economic impacts of citizenship (Abraham et al., 2010:8).

The concept of ‘multilayered citizenship’ of Yuval-Davis (1999) emphasizes the importance of women’s citizenship identities, which are shaped by their allegiances, rights and obligations both in a nation-state and within “ethnic, local, religious, diasporic and other communities”. Hence, multilayered citizenship can provide deeper insights of “politics of belonging” (Yuval-Davis, 2004) and “unbelonging” of women who have different experiences and narratives in nation-state borders and in different spaces of family, ethnicity, gender, and class (Caldwell et al., 2009:7). The concept of citizenship should be understood as a multilayered construct because women’s citizenship has different layers such as local, ethnic, national, and in order to investigate gendered citizenship in a non-westocentric way, one needs to look at how each layer influences women’s citizenship (Yuval-Davis, 1999).

According to Walby, citizenship cannot be sufficiently theorized unless a dynamic theory of gender relations is offered; she argued that citizenship in the twentieth century involved “a transition from private to public patriarchy” (Walby, 1994:379). Citizenship, in its classical conceptualizations, requires political and social participation to public life. However, women’s participation in those areas is contentious<sup>1</sup>. Feminist scholars have argued that women’s active citizenship can be provided with women’s participation in the public and political sphere (Pettman, 1999: 212).

An important argument suggests that “engendering citizenship” should consist of subjective experiences of women, which are mostly ignored in issues of politics and

---

<sup>1</sup> The Human Development Report of 1995 summarizes women’s political participation as follows: “political space belongs to all citizens, but men monopolizes it”. According to the report in the mid-1990s women have only a tenth of parliamentary seats in the worldwide, whereas the Nordic countries have bigger amount, which is a third (UNDP, 1995: 41 in Lister, 1997:146).

perceived outside the domain of citizenship (Caldwell et al., 2009:7). Spirituality, emotions, family, kinship and sexuality are part of what constitutes citizenship (Caldwell et al. 2009:7). The feminist perspective suggests that everything can be a subject of interest for politics. Hence, Lister (1997) articulates that women can get actively involved in informal politics when conventional definitions of politics are abandoned. Participation is also hierarchical; for instance participation of women from working class and minority women remained relatively nonexistent, while privileged women could actively participate in politics and the public sphere (Lister, 1997:147-148). While men dominate women in most spheres of life, women exclude some groups within themselves, as well. Nevertheless, women are expected to be depoliticized and silent, as in the case of indigenous women of Americas who are forced to stay in solidarity with men in their fights for rights, without challenging patriarchy (Ramirez, 2009:157).

Women's social citizenship has also been increasingly 'tenuous' and 'incomplete' (Abraham et al. 2010). If citizenship is perceived as a concept of membership, it involves inclusion and exclusion; women, immigrants, and refugees have been excluded from full citizenship, and they have been left with 'incomplete citizenship', 'partial citizenship', or 'fragmented citizenship' (Abraham et al., 2010:4). Moreover, "women's claims to social citizenship cannot be couched in the language of equality with men, around the male model of citizen-the worker, or in the language of difference around the female model of citizen-the carer" (Lister, 1997:168). Women's social citizenship requires women's increasing participation in the labor market, and an inclusive "worker-carer" model both for women and men (Lister, 1997:168).

Women not only experience exclusion from citizenship, but also experience "partial citizenship". Parrenas (2009) contended that partial citizenship was related to the 'stunted integration of migrants in the receiving nation-states'; as a result of which women encounter discrimination regarding their reproductive rights. For instance,

bilateral contracts made by states in the Middle East and Asia ban pregnancy for migrant Filipina domestic workers (Parrenas, 2009:89).

### **2.2.1 The Public and Private Dichotomy: The Basis of Liberal Citizenship**

It is clear that there is a need for transformation of the public and private spheres in order to understand women's exclusion from citizenship. According to Lister (1997) there were three main elements for the re-articulation of the public and private spheres. First, it is important to deconstruct sexualized values that have gendered attributions for public and private spheres; second, the rigid separation between public and private spheres has to be eliminated because it creates unequal gender relations; and lastly, the changing boundaries of the public and private spheres have to be identified (Lister, 1997:121). The distinction between the public and private spheres justifying women's exclusion from citizenship was criticized by Wollstonecraft and Mill in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. The separation of public from the private sphere explains the sexual division of labor, as contemporary feminist scholars also theorized, as a result women's exclusion from citizenship reflects women's exclusion from the public sphere of labor and political participation (Lister, 1997:125).

The distinction of public-male and private-female in the liberal thought has historically justified women's exclusion from citizenship and prevented women's political involvement (Pateman, 1988). As Lister contended, "We cannot understand gendered patterns of entry to citizenship in the public sphere without taking into account the sexual division of labor within the private" (Lister, 1997:42). According to Yuval-Davis & Werbner (1999), public and private dichotomy is 'fluid', 'historically determined', 'contested', and 'culture and gender specific' (Yuval-Davis & Werbner 29). As such, public/private dichotomy has significantly shaped women's citizenship experiences and the power discrepancies among men and women.

Therefore, feminist citizenship firstly criticized the ‘liberal suppression of women’s gendered subjectivity’ in public sphere (Prokhovnik, 1998:96). In addition to citizenship being a male-dominated notion, it is associated with the public space, and this increases the gap between public and private domain, so that women becomes invisible and subordinated in terms of being identified as figures of private sphere (Roy, 2005:28). Pateman (1988) reviewed the theories of the classical social contract, which divided the civil society into public and private domains. She concluded that ‘the sexual contract’ in the modern times was based on the power enforced by men over women, and is justified with this patriarchal idea (Pateman, 1988:1). The concept of fraternity does not simply denote the brotherhood between men or male citizens but it refers to the hegemonic power of patriarchy that rules men and women, which turns into power men exercise over women in private sphere (Pateman 1988). Furthermore, because the discourses of nations and nationalism belong to the political public space, women’s exclusion from this space brings exclusion from these discourses as well (Yuval-Davis, 2010:38). As Yuval-Davis and Werbner (1999:12) underlined, women’s exclusion from public spaces as equal citizens has not only been due to their roles in private sphere, but also due to women’s designation as the ‘reproducers of the nation’. Women, as the mothers of the nations, were subjects of ‘bio-political discourses’ and ‘eugenics policies’; as a result, women remained the major reproducers for the care work for handicapped and elderly people, which welfare states mostly benefit from (Yuval-Davis & Werbner, 1999:17). The social philosophy of state citizenship is not universal due to its construction with ‘male values’ and its agreement between the regime and its members, who tend to exclude women (Yuval-Davis, 2010:151-152). Women are limited to the private sphere, which is mostly understood as domestic sphere related to housework, care work and the endless reproduction process, which are the implications of modern citizenship for women.

The public and private dichotomy results in women’s subjection to structural inequalities in the public sphere. In the private sphere, women are exposed to

double burden while working outside home; they are also largely engaged in the domestic chores and care work for elderly and children. State policies of states may fall short of providing sufficient support for working women, such as childcare and elderly-care; rather, most liberal states pile tend to these works on women's shoulders. Further, states try to control women's sexuality, which also restrains women's participation to the public sphere. Although currently women increasingly participate in the labor market, there are many obstacles preventing women from being fully represented in the public sphere. In fact, public patriarchy (Walby, 1990) in the public sphere puts many restraints on women especially in the labor market. Gender-segregated labor market causes women to be exploited in public sphere and also in the private sphere. Female workers are assumed to be less stable and less skillful compared to male workers, who are assumed to have strength, rationality, and technical knowledge, whereas women are associated with more feminine skills such as 'quasi-domestic work, charms, and manual dexterity' (Gordon, 1995:141). Women earn lower wages, are employed without social insurance and security, and work largely in informal sectors. Migrant women are largely exposed to negative conditions in the labor market, since they tend to be more vulnerable to discrimination.

Feminists continue advocating the active political participation of citizens in the public sphere, which is a civic republican ideal, in order to include women and minority groups and their interests into the citizenship notion. Feminists also criticize the narrow definitions of the 'political' and 'citizen', and challenge rigid separation of public and private spheres, universalism and impartiality of universalism (Young 1989, 1990; Phillips 1991, 1993 cited in Lister, 1997:24). Secularization and the acquisition of political rights do not aim for confounding public/private gender role dichotomy (Kadioğlu 1997:543). Hence, although women participate in politics and they vote, this does not imply emancipation from the public/private dichotomy. Feminist studies indicate that especially migrant women, poor women, and women of color suffered from working both at home and outside, so that they have shouldered double-burden (Abraham et al., 2010:9).

However, although these women frequently engage in public activities by working outside, their spatial existence still remains invisible. Lister (1997, 2003) argues that women's and men's access to the public realm and its social, political and economic implications have been determined by the gendered division of labor in both private and public spheres (cited in Abraham et al., 2010:9). Moreover, while liberal feminists adopted 'add the women approach' to include women into the public sphere, radical feminists problematized the policies of the patriarchal state, which perpetuated the masculinity of public space (Roy, 2005:29).

Due to their exclusion from citizenship, women were perceived as late-obtainers of citizenship rights, as Marshall (1992) argued so; however, because the status of citizenship was not delivered to all individuals but only to men as the representatives of the family, women remained at the margins of citizenship (Yuval-Davis, 2010:152). The emphasis on family refers the idea that women, by themselves, cannot be free individuals but they belong within the family, in private sphere. Hence, women's citizenship -if obtained- is only meaningful within the family, as a member of the family, and limited to the family. Although the institution of family seems to lose its effectiveness, it is still one of the milestones for nation-states. The issue of family is of interest here because it is important to examine to what extent immigrant women's citizenship is dependent upon the institution of family, and if migration could bring emancipation to women within the context of family relations.

Gendered division of labor in the private sphere has also led to the denial of the value of domestic work (Bosniak, 2009:131). Care work has also been problematic for the female citizen because it confined women to the private sphere. Care work has not been existed in the definition of citizenship, because care work is seen as 'flexible' and 'free commodity', and because attached to women, it is undervalued and underestimated (Gouws, 2010:147). As Abraham et al. (2010:10) puts, "deconstructing the associated gendered and hierarchical notions of care, and incorporating care into citizenship involves developing a broader ethos of caring

and a global responsibility, which would mean the expansion of citizenship to cultural, women's and transnational rights and the agency of individuals, groups and movements".

### **2.2.2 The Relationship between Nation-States and Women's Citizenship**

In modern societies, citizenship is not only associated with universal rights and obligations but also with a nation-state (Janoski 1998, Bottomore 1993 cited in Janoski & Gran: 2002, 13). Janoski and Gran (2002:13-14) describes this concept of citizenship with four basic points; the first is that citizenship is defined through the concept of membership in a nation-state, with specific rights which exclude denizens and native people; the second is that citizenship includes active participation in the legal system; third is that citizenship rights are universalistic, which are applied to all citizens, and the last is that citizenship consists of equality with some limits.

The relationship between nation-states and citizenship, which stood for racial exclusion and "national manhood" in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, served for the construction of the global labor market that created "guest and aliens" (Sassen, 1999 in Isin & Turner, 2002:6). For instance, the doctrine of 'terra nullius' (land belonging to no one) in Australia excludes Aborigines from citizenship and accepts them as migrants (Isin & Turner 6). Hence, the interconnection between citizenship and nation-state ignores the rights of indigenous people and produces ethnic discrimination as well. Walby (1994:384) contended that nation-state formation followed specific trajectories in different countries, hence, "countries vary as to whether white men, white women, men and women of minority ethnic groups, gained citizenship at the same time or not".

According to Moghadam (1999:138) "national identity formation and citizenship intersect are gendered and contested" because nationalism, national identity and

citizenship overlapped with gender, confining women into private sphere and privileging men (Moghadam, 1999:138). While every nation defines its women and men in a different way from other nations, it produces its own national essence and gender relations (Sirman, 2002:227). Further, the relationship of the authority with the male subject is constructed differently from its relationship with the female subject (Sirman, 2002:231). Moreover, the nationalist ideology represents the state as if it is the ‘woman who should be protected’; hence a gendered identity is dictated to the state (Sirman, 2002:233).

In particular, the notion of ‘motherland’ (anavatan) is a gendered construct and it reflects the connections between gender relations and establishments of nations (Cohen, 1995 cited in Yuval-Davis, 1997:130). The control of women’s bodies and reproduction has constituted an important part of the nation-state ideology, because women have always been seen as the producers and reproducers of the nation-states. Reproduction technologies, birth control, in vitro fertilization, artificial insemination, sperm banks, abortion and sex identification, which cause femicide, are the control mechanisms of women’s bodies by the states. T. H. Marshall’s concept of citizenship that consists of civil, political and social rights and responsibilities, means a full membership of a community; however, women’s citizenship in these communities have a two-fold structure; women are interior to the general concept of citizenship in one hand, and on the other hand there are always different rules, policies and regulations peculiar to women (Yuval-Davis, 1997:58). Such regulations include reproduction and abortion policies, as well as policies on women’s employment. Furthermore, eugenic<sup>2</sup> practices targeted women as the producers and reproducers of the nations. For instance, the Bulgarian government enforced policies encouraging ethnic Bulgarian women to give more birth in order to start a ‘demographic race’ with the Turkish and Roma women, who had undesirably higher birth rates (Petrova, 1993). Similarly, Israeli pro-life

---

<sup>2</sup> Encouraging people with desired traits to reproduce more, and discouraging or preventing people with less-desired or undesired traits from reproducing (Frederick Osborn, *Development of a Eugenic Philosophy*, 1937).

campaigns declared that women who did not have children, and women who married and had children outside the Jewish community, contributed to the 'demographic genocide' (Yuval-Davis, 1997:69). Nevertheless, the peak point of enforcement of women to give more birth was the practices in Nazi Germany, where the 'aryan' women were forced to have children from the 'aryan' men with the Lebensborn Project, even without legal marriage, and the state undertook the care of the children (Yuval-Davis, 1997:69). Another eugenic campaign took place in Singapore, where high-educated women were forced to give birth to children who have high consciousness of nation, while low-educated women were offered 10.000 dollars of cash if they accepted to be castrated (Heng & Devan, 1992 cited in Yuval-Davis, 1997:72). In most Western countries including Australia, England and the United States, lower- class and minority women were offered long-term unsafe contraceptive and castration pills (Yuval-Davis, 1997:72). All these examples indicate that women often are perceived as tools of reproduction by nation-states in two senses; first reproduction as bearing children and second as reproducing the class they belong to.

As Yuval-Davis (2010:35) reminds us, one of the most important differences among women is their affiliation to ethnic and national communities. Bureaucracies and intelligentsia reproduce nations biologically, culturally and symbolically, and a central role has been attributed to women in reproducing the nations. Yuval-Davis (2010:38) elucidates that women are the "conveyors of the communities", but the basic structure embedded in the rules of social order is not 'women's struggle', it is rather their subordination and control (Levi-Strauss, 1969). Women, as the reproducers of the communities, establish bigger communities (Levi-Strauss, 1969). Women also have a 'natural' mechanism that produces social solidarity between men from different kinship communities (Levi-Strauss, 1969), which implies that women are not only the reproducers of communities, but also the equalizers of them.

Hence, in order to study an Israeli citizen Palestinian woman, it is important to understand her position in the Palestinian community in Israel, Palestinian community's relationship with Israel and other Arab countries, and international positions of both Israel and the Arabs (Yuval-Davis, 2010:172). Therefore, citizenship is not examined in a truly individual or truly collective manner, because the borders of the states, societies and communities are constructed continuously (Yuval-Davis, 2010:173).

In the developing world, feminist activists participated in anti-colonial nationalist struggles, because they looked upon nationalism as a redemptive movement necessary for 'autonomy', 'popular sovereignty' and 'universal citizenship'; however, women remained excluded from citizenship rights even after nations gained independence (Yuval-Davis & Werbner, 1999:1). While they were trying to establish democratic citizenship rights, many eastern European countries and developing countries failed to emphasize the relationship between rationality and individuals; rather they gave importance to the relationship between nationalism and citizenship, which increased the importance of communalism, blood and soil (Yuval-Davis & Werbner, 1999:1).

### **2.2.3 The Migrant Women's Citizenship**

Immigration is a contentious concept when considered in relation to citizenship, as the statuses and the life conditions of immigrants have often been problematic. Phizacklea (1987) argued that the relevance of migration to women's citizenship was about 'boundaries', 'rights' and 'unequal opportunities'. Immigration creates new social inequalities and social exclusion. A critical analysis of gender in relation to migration is very important in order to understand global movements deeply (Boehm 2004 cited in Duran, 2011:76). It reshapes and reconstitutes how women and men should be; gender is compromised with migration (Duran, 2011:77). Further, immigration generally comprises 'geographic movement' and 'linguistic

and cultural displacement', which are not experienced in the same way for women and men; this displacement is very much related to 'belonging', 'citizenship' and 'inclusion/exclusion' (Duran, 2011:78). Hence, the concept of citizenship -who to be a citizen- and migration should be examined from the gender lenses, because they can influence gender relations by transforming or consolidating inequalities (Duran, 2011:78). According to Pettman (2010:259), academic studies of migration do not reflect the stories of many migrant women, which include losses and gains, because many of them do not focus on women as a primary subject, but as victims and dependents. However, feminist studies have produced a better understanding of women's citizenship experiences by viewing them as the primary subjects in the immigration process (Pettman, 2010:259).

As noted before, while intersectionality is associated with the analysis of power, it also interacts with multiple social dynamics (Cho et al., 2013:797-807). Despite the fact that (im)migrant women constitute an 'extraordinarily heterogeneous group' having educational, social, cultural and ethnic differences, they experience the process of 'gaining entry to the countries of destination', which is one of the important commonalities among them (Lutz, 1997:102). Immigrant women are not a homogenous group to investigate; they can have different socializations, experience different situations and practice citizenship in multiple ways; however, they face discrimination in multiple ways in most of the spheres. Yuval-Davis (2010:29) argues that women's subordination is a result of the unequal distribution of authority and material resources in society; hence, patriarchy cannot be separately considered from capitalism and racism. Although 'women', as a category, have "fluctuating identities", and women are historically and discursively constructed in relation with the other categories (Riley, 1987:35), differences among women influence and produce similarities about women's oppression (Spelman, 1988:159). The main problem is not the consideration of differences or similarities among women; rather it is significant to constitute a political feminist mobilization for women (Yuval-Davis, 2010:35). The term "(im)migrant women"

may not represent any women as a specific category, due to different determinations such as age, class, religiosity, sexual orientation and ethnicity. For instance, Carbado's (2013) research on Black women's legal cases about discrimination indicates that Black women are discriminated in workforce both 'as women who are Black, and as Blacks who are women', and the term 'Black women' remain insufficient to report these cases. Carbado (2013) argues "Black women are too different to represent either Blacks or women as a whole". Discrimination narratives that Black men and white women faced with seem to be universal and standard; Black women's narratives on discrimination remain silent, partial, unrecognizable; it is neither fully race discrimination and nor gender discrimination, but both of them (Carbado, 2013). Therefore, it is articulated that, while categories of race, ethnicity, gender, culture, sexuality and nation are intersecting; they also mutually constitute and transform each other (Patil, 2013:848). Gender causes a structural inequality along with other structural inequalities such as ethnic discrimination in the case of immigrant women; as Patil (2013:850) asserts, "Even gender was never just about gender". Intersections of these structural inequalities prevent immigrant women from benefiting from full citizenship, leading to immigrant women's subordination and exploitation.

Immigrant women construct everything from the beginning in the host country, so their citizenship is reconstructed unlike other women's citizenship. Hence, it is important to question immigrant women's citizenship distinctively. Women's and men's citizenship experiences are determined by their memberships to racial, ethnic, religious and sexual communities (Yuval-Davis 1991 cited in Pettman, 1999:207). In addition to the host community, the immigrant women's own communities and women's spatial existence in the community also influence women's access to citizenship. Six structures of patriarchy; "patriarchal mode of production, patriarchal relations in paid work, patriarchal relations in the state, male violence, patriarchal relations in sexuality, patriarchal relations in cultural institutions including religion, media and education", as claimed by Walby (1990:177), entail immigrant women's subordination, since migrant women are the

most vulnerable group in a host country. Further, immigrant women have been discriminated concomitantly by the patriarchy in family and labor market, and by being a member of a marginalized ethnic or racial group (Kadıoğlu, 1997:539). Migrant women are mostly re-subordinated by men within gender-segregated labor market; they are often employed without social insurance or are employed in ‘family businesses’, where men benefit from the labor of women without insurance and payment (Abraham et al., 2010:6). As Walby (1990:176) contended, women are increasingly subordinated and oppressed in public patriarchy, which is observed mostly in the labor market. Although private patriarchy means they are subordinating to men in households, today women are subordinated by the structures outside of the household too, due to public patriarchy (Walby, 1990:177-178). Hence, in the globalized world, subordination and exploitation of immigrant women are because of the public patriarchy in addition to the private one.

Immigrants have been viewed as the ‘other’, and treated as either criminal or as victims by the western thought, which is dominantly represented by the male, white, heterosexual and Christian (Duran, 2011:75). Alund’s (1999) research on immigrant women in Sweden showed that there is a ‘stigmatized otherness’ of migrant women, since they are discursively stereotyped, and considered to be “belonging to an undeveloped culture, in contrast to modern, superior and supposedly homogenous Swedish culture” (Alund, 1999:150).

According to Janoski and Gran (2002), “Identity enables excluded persons to knock at the door of citizenship to organize into social movements and interest groups so that they can participate as citizens with legal, political and social rights”. While Marshallian approach to citizenship theorizes nation-state-based citizenship, cultural approaches on identity provide a different perspective including social movements, globalization and international civil society; hence, the two approaches complement each other (Janoski & Gran, 2002:35-42). Identity issue is also very much related to migration, as most people tend to reconsider their identities after immigration. Pettman (1999:216) states that “post-migratory identities are more

multiple, fluid and multinational and are negotiated within complex transnational webs of association and communication”, as people’s relationship with people, places and identities are reshaped by constructing a new home and a new citizenship. Implications of identity for migrant women are important because migrant women also adopt reconstituted gendered identities with the migration process.

Although people in a cultural community have similar difficult conditions in the migration process, migrant women’s conditions become differentiated, as migration has its own gendered agencies. Women are mostly harmed by the decisions of states regarding what communities culturally need about education, marriage, divorce, and women’s shelter (Yuval-Davis, 1997:150), because migrant women’s needs are beyond the needs of the community they belong to. As David Harvey (2008) explains, ‘the right to the city’ is an issue beyond the free access to urban resources, because both right to the city and citizenship rights could not be thought individually; they are common rights, which should include all citizens. Citizenship rights are constructed as it belongs to a hegemonic class, particularly men, likewise the right to the city. As a result, patriarchal society does not give migrant women credit for citizenship rights, and also leaves out women from the conventional characteristic of “inclusiveness” of citizenship.

Overall, as migration is a gendered process, gender relations are deeply affected by migration (Hondagneu-Sotelo, 2000:116). Migrants are gendered subjects and “the feminization of migration raises new issues both for policy makers and for those who study the migratory process” (Castles and Miller 1993 cited in Lister, 1997:44). Migration is gendered both for women or men, because of different roles and relationships in the household, the gendered division of labor, the conditions women and men experience while crossing the border (Pettman, 2010:255). Women and men experience different kinds of exploitation, violence or discrimination when they immigrate to a host country, which are all gendered effects (Pettman, 2010:255). Women migrants are seen as passive citizens who do not participate in

politics or propose political discourses, and the women migrants are the most oppressed group in terms of employment; women are paid less, hired less or with difficulties, and they are dependent on both the employer and husband or father; therefore, migrant women have been exposed to double exclusion as migrants and women (Zavos, 2010:21, 25).

Moreover, women and men may experience spousal separations and conflicts due to new living and working arrangements. Women's spatial mobility may increase and a more egalitarian division of labor can be achieved in the household. Decision making processes may also change for the benefit of women in family relations (Hondagneu-Sotelo, 2000:116). On the other hand, it might result in a conflict if women earn more than their husbands (Hondagneu-Sotelo, 2000:116), because women are not seen as the main breadwinners of the households. Therefore, certain aspects of the condition of women may not change through migration due to the socially constructed gender roles. However, working outside for wages can provide women with the self-confidence necessary for negotiating for cooperative roles with their husbands (Pedraza, 1991:20). Whether women are going to be successful at negotiating is a controversial issue, demanding on the strength of traditional gender roles. Women may not challenge patriarchy; but they work very hard, take responsibilities, struggle for better conditions and search for opportunities, they are still not seen as the primary providers of the household (Erman, 1998:160). Due to the patriarchal division of labor, women do not acquire what they deserve through hard work. Especially in private sphere, the role of women and contributions of women to the household remain invisible and worthless.

As immigrant women's labor force participation influences their citizenship experiences and may also bolster traditional gender roles in the private sphere. One of the basic demands of the feminist movement is equal payment and equal opportunities for women at work. Pateman (1989) highlights that while men were designated as the architects of the welfare states and the breadwinners, women were designated to be their dependent wives. Marshall (1992) mentioned that access to

employment is a citizenship right. As explained, despite the advent of women's employment rights, gendered division of labor and a segregated labor market kept subordinating women workers, who were considered primarily as wives and mothers (Yuval-Davis, 1997:170). When the issue of migration comes on to the surface, gendered division of labor becomes much more visible, as migrant women mostly work in sectors such as domestic service, care work and sex industry. According to some feminists, in order to achieve equal citizenship, women should have 'decent-quality and socially valued works' (Bosniak, 2009:134); however, how migrant women can reach socially valued and quality work is another problem, since migrant women are mostly at the lower ranks of the society.

Migration has a definite effect on women's and men's labor force participation, which is a central element of migration research (Pedraza, 1991:313). Compared to migrant men, migrant women tend to enjoy a smaller scale of job opportunities. Migrant women mostly work in domestic service, garment industry, care work and more recently work in high-skilled occupations such as nursing; sometimes women can find jobs from hard labor, such as construction work, but they are few and mostly temporary (Pedraza, 1991:314). Women are responsible for domestic tasks (Tastsoglou & Preston, 2005:48), often in addition to working in routine jobs, under risky conditions and with low wages. Further, migrant women may have to accept jobs they never engaged with previously in their home countries. However, 'women always work', whether in paid employment or domestic work; as Morokvasic put it, "Whether migrant women in the Philippines produce Barbie dolls for the Western markets, or whether they produce watches in Singapore; whether they are domestics in Dakar or Mexico City, whether they sew high quality garments for high income and middle class women in the sweat shops of London, Paris or New York, or jeans in Manila; work in the fisheries in Senegal, or clean German, Swedish and British hospitals and public toilets, their role in wage employment is usually not considered as primary role, neither by them nor by their employers." (Morokvasic, 1983:888).

It follows that although there are many women from many different origins migrated to different countries; they unite in the fact that their labor is considered less significant than that of men, their wages are less than men's, and they might not have social security. Furthermore, immigrant women gain the lowest wages because they are seen as 'dependants' so that they deserve only 'complementary' wages to support family (Kadioğlu, 1997:539). Thus, patriarchal ideology shapes women's position in the labor market by prioritizing their domestic roles as mothers and wives. Migrant women justify this situation easily (Kadioğlu, 1997:540), as women also see themselves primarily as mothers and wives, who are invisible in public sphere. Migrant women's role in private sphere also seems to be invisible because women's labor in the household is unrecognized and not seen as a 'real work'. Hence, in the beginning of migration process, migrant women perceive paid-work as an opportunity to contribute to the family, rather than as an opportunity for self-actualization (Pedraza, 1991:313). However, the situation may change if migrant women see labor participation as a way of gaining independence, and increasing their self-confidence. If migrant women consider their employment more than a mere contribution to the family budget, women can realize their potential, not only in the private sphere but also in the public sphere. Mostly migrants are constructed as 'traditional' without taking their culture, ethnicity or root into account; they are deemed less educated, less experienced at work, and more conservative (Kadioğlu 1994). However, as Abadan-Unat (1977) explained certain factors facilitate or indicate the level of emancipation among migrant women: "decline of extended family relations, adoption of nuclear family role patterns, fragmentation of family structure, entrance into a wage earning production process, increasing media exposure, decline of religious practices, increasing belief in egalitarian opportunities of girls and boys in terms of education and adoption of consumption oriented behavior and norms". The significance of these factors will be elaborated for the case of the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women in the following chapters.

Immigrant women have generally the lowest rank of jobs (Kadioğlu 1997:539); yet, they encountered gendered discrimination and gender specific violence everywhere

in the migration process (UN 1995 cited in Lister, 1997:47). Working conditions of migrant women can be tough and dangerous, since these women generally do not have social security insurances. There are negative effects of working in risky conditions; for instance, working women suffer from deteriorated eyesight, dizziness, and headaches. While women work in difficult conditions, protective clothing is only provided to men in some factories (Morokvasic, 1983:887). Because women are seen as ‘ready-made labor supply which is, at once, the most vulnerable, the most flexible and at least in the beginning, the least demanding work force’ (Morokvasic, 1983:886); hence, their work safety has a lower priority than men’s. “Risk living and working illegally in the host country forcing women to remain on the margins of society” (Raijman et al., 2003: 727). Women accept jobs in host countries even though there are uncertainties about its outcomes, but in the end this further contributes to their marginalization.

As the literature on transnational migration demonstrated there is a visible ‘rampant feminization of transnational migration’ (Raijman et al., 2003:728), due to the increasing need for domestic work and care work in the developed countries. In this case transnational migration can lead to women’s relatively autonomous status in decision making, taking actions and reconstructing family and labor roles in a new world, due to women’s demands for better life (Raijman et al., 2003:728). In some cases, for example, transnational care work provides women with more public participation and independence, especially in the developed countries and in richer families (Pettman, 2010:258). However, Pettman (2010:258) poses the question “Why is it everywhere women who are overwhelmingly responsible for ‘domestic’ work?” The answer is embedded in gendered power relations and the socially constructed gender norms. Gender constitutes performative roles, and hence, gender identities are reproduced and reconstructed in the migration process (Pettman, 2010: 259).

Feminization of migration in the global world also contributes to the globalization of the gendered division of labor. In fact, there are neglected aspects of

globalization of child-care and globalization of domestic work (Raijman et al., 2003:728). Working in domestic service and care work is not only a consequence of migration, but ‘domesticity is one of the few occupations that are open to migrant women due to gender segregation in the labor market of developed countries’ (Raijman et al., 2003:730). Hence, migrant women do not have much opportunity to change jobs. In addition to occupational costs of migration, there are also its emotional costs. According to Raijman et al. (2003:731), there are three dilemmas women encounter during migration process. The first one is the low status jobs that they have in host country, the second is the search for economic betterment, and the last is their role as mothers who search for better conditions for their children. Immigrant women are not provided with child benefits that are enjoyed by women in the host country, and this situation contradicts with the evolutionary model of Marshall’s citizenship, which prescribes that social rights follow the civil and political rights (Yuval-Davis, 2010:145).

The notion of ‘transnational motherhood’ means enduring motherhood from a distance (Raijman et al., 2003:731). This refers to ‘overseas mothers’ who assume the position of the primary breadwinner for their children from a distance. For instance, there are many women coming from the former communist countries, who work as domestic workers in Turkey and experience transnational motherhood. In this context, kinship assumes a critical importance for immigrant women engaging in transnational childcare; many migrant women entrust other women -mostly mother, or a relative- in their home country to take care of their own children. In some cases, whether illegal or legal, immigrant women do not claim any social rights from the governments, and this leads to immigrant women doing unpaid care work for the elderly and the children (Yuval-Davis, 2010:145). Pettman (2010:258) argues that migrant women who are occupied with domestic work are caught between the public and the private, and between productive and reproductive work, and this situation creates “a triple burden of vulnerability as women, as migrants, and in forms and places of work that are largely unregulated or hard to monitor, or organize”.

Apart from the difficulties of motherhood, exploitation of immigrant women in the labor market means that they serve as cheap labor for the employers. Migrant women largely work as unregistered (informal) workers, who are the most vulnerable group to discrimination and exploitation, because their work conditions remain precarious (Raijman et al. 2003:730). Sole and Parella (2003) demonstrated in their research on immigrant women in Spain, that these women have inferior social status because of their gender and because they are not perceived as citizens, so that high levels of state exploitation and insecurity through legislation is observed among immigrant women. Immigrant women in Spain constitute the most vulnerable part of working class because they mostly have 'marginal activities' such as 'dirty', 'insecure', and 'routine' jobs, which local women reject doing. Moreover, immigrant women are invisible in media, and they are not brought up in parliamentary discussions (Sole & Parella, 2003:65).

One of the most important consequences of the globalization of migration and sexual division of labor is trafficking in women. Sexual division of labor has been a subject of interest to gender and migration studies (Parrado and Flippen, 2005:610) According to Andrijasevic, the concept of 'trafficking in women' is more appropriate for demonstrating migrant women's experiences, instead of using 'human trafficking' (Andrijasevic, 2003:251). Furthermore, it is noted that in the visual depictions of border-crossing women are mostly absent, unless they are depicted as war refugees or as victims of trafficking, whereas male migrants are depicted as central figures of migration, which creates the impression that women are not the important subjects of migration (Andrijasevic, 2003:256).

After the fall of the communist system in the former Soviet Union, poverty and unemployment influenced women more than men; women are affected negatively by social and economic depression and dissolution of families. Women were used to the gender equality in the labor market in the socialist system; following the rise of the capitalism, women were subordinated and were forced to migrate to Western

countries, in hope of a solution (Kalfa, 2010:349). However, not all migrant women end up working in domestic service and care work, or having jobs as a waitress or a translator in the destination countries as promised to them; some are dragged into sex industry (Kalfa, 2010:349). Human trafficking and activities that focus on exploitation of people who are in search of a job has increased in 1990s throughout the world (Kalfa, 2010:349). Prostitution has become a major route for migrant women to survive in destination countries. Therefore, some migrant women started working in sectors they never worked in before. Although trafficking in women is not a separate category to investigate in this thesis, it is important to highlight that immigrant women can be exposed to such discrimination as well.

## CHAPTER 3

### THE BULGARIAN TURKISH IMMIGRATION TO HOMELAND TURKEY AND WOMEN

#### 3.1 The Historical Background of Turkish Minority in Bulgaria

Ethnic Turks have been living in Bulgaria since the early years of the Ottoman Empire<sup>3</sup>. Bulgarian Turkish minority in Bulgaria has had several migration processes towards Turkey. Over a period of more than 100 years, Turkish people have migrated to Turkey from Bulgaria, due to the interventions of foreign organizations and states to the ethnic problems in Bulgaria and the intensive nationalist propaganda against Turkish minority in Bulgaria (Vasileva, 1992:343). Since the foundation of the Bulgarian nation-state in 1878, ethnic Turks have been living in Bulgaria. Bulgaria was founded in 1878 in accordance with the Berlin Treaty, in the Tuna Province of Ottoman Empire (Şimşir, 1986:199-200). However, the Turkish minority was periodically exposed to ethnic discrimination, which resulted in emigration to Turkey (Parla, 2009:757). The first group of migrants appeared after the Russo-Turkish war in 1877-1878, when the Ottoman rule was over in the Balkans (Vasileva, 1992:344). Zhelyazkova (1998) suggests that not only Turks but also other Muslim populations, such as Pomaks, Circassians, and Tatars migrated from Bulgaria between 1878 and 1912. In addition to migration from Bulgaria, migration flows from former Yugoslavia and Romania occurred as a result of the Russo-Turkish war and independence of Balkan states from the Ottoman and Austro-Hungarian empires. (Vasileva, 1992:345). The second migration wave from Bulgaria to Turkey was between 1913-1934 with 10.000-

---

<sup>3</sup> Bulgaria won its independence from the Ottoman Empire in 1878.

12.000 people each year, due to international law agreement, and the third migration period was in the wartime period between 1940-1944 with 15.000 migrants (Zhelyazkova, 1998). After the Second World War, the Bulgarian state imposed land collectivization, which resulted in migration of about 155.000 people to Turkey as a beginning point of the mass exodus in 1950-1951 and, between 1968-1978, 130.000 migrants came to Turkey under the family reunification agreement signed between the Turkish and Bulgarian governments (Zhelyazkova, 1998).

After 1980, Bulgaria was affected considerably by the socio-political and economic changes in the region; as a result of the dismantling of the communist one-party regimes in eastern Europe, economic and political instability in neighboring countries, and the increasingly restrictive immigration policies of the EU, Turkey became an attractive target for migration (Apap et al. 2005, Corliss 2003 cited in Parla, 2007:158). In May 1989, Bulgarian president Zhivkov declared that the Turkish border was open for whoever “does not feel Bulgarian” (Anagnostou, 2005:91). Hence, the largest emigration flow of ethnic Turks took place during the mass exodus in 1989 with approximately 360.000 people fleeing to Turkey. This was the largest collective civilian migration after the Second World War, taking place due to the “revival process” of the Bulgarian state. However, some Turkish migrants returned to Bulgaria immediately after the fall of Zhivkov’s regime (Zhelyazkova, 1998) –president Zhivkov was forced to resign in November 1989 after an international condemnation for the assimilation campaign and due to Gorbachev’s demands on changing leadership in Bulgaria (Anagnostou, 2005:91). Nevertheless, while 240.000 of these immigrants stayed in Turkey as permanent residents, migration flows continued after 1990, with temporary tourist visas taken with the intent of finding jobs in Turkey due to the negative economic conditions in Bulgaria (Zhelyazkova, 1998). According to Dunkov (1994, cited in Eminov, 1999:32) the numbers of Turks who migrated to Turkey between 1989-1992 was 321.800. Although there are different accounts<sup>4</sup> of the exact number of immigrants

---

<sup>4</sup> See Table-2 for the numbers of migrants from Bulgaria to Turkey.

who fled to Turkey in 1989, historically Bulgarian Turkish immigrants constituted the largest portion of the immigrant population in Turkey, which further increased with the 1989 immigration (Çetin, 2008:56). During this period, while the whole world focused their attention on East Germans escaping to the West in 1989, a larger number of ethnic Turks were being deported and expelled from Bulgaria (Bates, 1994:201).

In the period between 1950-1960, 35.496 families who had residence permits were settled in different provinces of Turkey (Geray, 1962:54). Most of the peasant families out of 25.593 were settled in Adana (1442), Ankara (1136), Balıkesir (1474), Bursa (2185), Konya (1523), Manisa (1383), Tekirdağ (1619), and most of the artisan families were settled in Bursa (1356), Eskişehir (1116), İstanbul (3100), and İzmir (1160) (Geray, 1962:55). Migrants who came in between 1968-1979 due to the agreements of unifying separated families settled in different provinces in Turkey with their own financial resources (DPT, 1990:7). Some migrants of 1989 settled with their own financial resources in provinces where their relatives resided, whereas the Turkish state provided some of them houses in 14 provinces and 23 districts, under the condition that they pay back within five years (Köy Hizm, 1996). Geray (1989:13) contended that the government did not do any preliminary preparation for the immigrants from Bulgaria; rather the government was a mere spectator for the problems of immigrants. Rather than making a migration treaty with Bulgaria for protecting immigrants' properties in Bulgaria and defending their rights, the Turkish government of the time used this migration as a means of propaganda (Geray, 1989:12). Nevertheless, one year's worth of rent payment was provided by the Turkish state to 40.000 families; however, the process of finding a job and proper settlement of immigrants lasted more than a year; this situation lead employers to make use of immigrants' labor as a cheap labor force (Geray, 1989:13).

The Turkish minority in Bulgaria faced discrimination in Bulgaria since Bulgaria won its independence from the Ottoman Empire. Although there were occasional

recruitments, a continuous assimilation campaign was carried out against Turks in Bulgaria. Zhelyazkova (1998) highlights that Turkish people had Turkish schools, sports societies and cultural-educational activities, as well as being able to use their own language freely from Bulgaria's liberation in 1878 up to 1944. However, Bates (1994) asserts that after the liberation of Bulgaria in 1878, the presence of Muslim minority inherited from the Ottomans caused discomfort. During that time, non-Slavic people were discriminated against, minority schools were not included in the national school system and remained Islam-oriented, which meant that girls were not allowed (Parla, 2009:757). The population of the Turkish community in Bulgaria was 1.801.000 out of 3.414.000 in 1876, and after the liberation of Bulgaria, the Russian politicians who had Pan-Slavist ideals were uneasy with the increasing Turkish population in Bulgaria, perceiving them as a threat (Çetin, 2008:57). Nonetheless, from 1878 up to present day, Bulgaria never reported the exact population of the Turkish community; it was never reported the Turkish population to be more than 1.000.000 in the official population census, in order to avoid recognizing the right to cultural autonomy, which is required for minorities with more than 1.000.000 people according to the Bulgarian constitution (Çetin, 2008:57).

The Turkish minority in Bulgaria was largely an agrarian community. In 1876, before the liberation of Bulgaria, 2/3rds of agrarian lands that was being tamed belonged to the Turkish community (Çetin, 2008:57). Furthermore, Turkish community in Bulgaria lived as an inward-oriented ethnic and religious group, who were mostly agrarian, and a small percentage of them lived in city centers till the Second World War (Parla, 2009:757). However, this picture changed dramatically under the fascist regime that came into power in 1934, as Turkish schools and newspapers were banned, Turkish parliamentarians and mayors were excluded from the politics. When the communist government came into power in 1944, the discriminatory practices against Turks stopped and the situation of Turks were ameliorated; Turkish institutes, Turkish theatre and folklore groups were

established, daily newspaper and radio broadcasts in Turkish were allowed and for the first time the minority groups became visible in Bulgaria (Parla, 2009:757).

However, in the 1960s the Bulgarian Communist Party enacted a forceful and repressive policy to ‘integrate’ ethnic Turks and Pomaks, aiming at a unified socialist citizenry and declaring a single-nation state in order to create a homogenous society (Zhelyazkova, 1998). Eminov (1999:32) noted that that the communist government in Bulgaria had increased the level of oppression considerably by assimilating minorities, beginning in 1970s and especially in 1980s with the ideal of a single-nation state. When Bulgaria realized that the country had the lowest birth rate in socialist world, it turned into a “nationalist revival process” (vazroditelen protses), which included converting and assimilating ethnic Turks (Vasileva, 1992:346). As a result of this “revival process”, renaming campaign began with the Pomaks between 1972-1974. When the ideal of a homogenous community peaked in 1984 with the “rebirth campaign”, it continued with a systematic oppressive renaming campaign against Turks, strictly prohibiting the speaking of Turkish language, and even denying the existence of ethnic Turks in Bulgaria (Parla, 2006:545) between 1984-1985 under the leadership of Zhivkov. His administration seemed determined to assimilate Turkish cultural and religious identity into the Bulgarian society (Zhelyazkova, 1998).

Although the expulsion and obligatory immigration of the Turkish community in Bulgaria were motivated by different political and ideological dispositions under specific Bulgarian governments, it has been a constant state policy of Bulgaria (Çetin, 2008:58). For instance, Bulgarian government enacted a law in 1880, which anticipated compulsory military service for Muslims, and another law in 1882, which imposed tax on land for Muslims, both of which resulted in the migration of the Turkish community (Çetin, 2008:57). Moreover, oppressive policies of the Bulgarian state against Turkish minority varied from economic blackmailing to overt violence, and from changing people’s names to physical violence to women and children (Zhelyazkova, 1998). In addition to these incidents, even names of

gravestones written with Turkish and Arabic letters and patient files were changed to the Bulgarian characters (Zhelyazkova, 1998). The communist government in Bulgaria systematically assimilated Turkish people, and any social and cultural institutions that carried Turkish-Muslim identity, such as mosques, madrasahs, fountains, and bridges were destroyed (Çetin, 2008:56). Furthermore, instruction in Turkish at schools and Turkish publications were all banned, as well as usage of Turkish language in public spaces (Eminov, 1999:41). Islamic rituals were also prohibited, including Islamic holidays and circumcision (Eminov, 1999:41), and fasting in Ramadan (Parla, 2009:758). Outfits associated with the Turkish-Islamic culture such as ‘şalvar’ were banned, and the names of Turks were forcibly changed with petitions signed by Turkish people under coercion, ensuring that they convert from Turkish to Bulgarian names (Parla, 2009:758). There were racist theories that denied the presence of Turkish people in Bulgaria, claiming that Turks were Bulgarians who were forcibly converted to Islam by the Ottoman Empire (Parla, 2009:758). In 1985, The Minister of International Affairs Dimitur Stojanov announced that there were no Turks in Bulgaria (Eminov, 1990:209). Nevertheless, scholars argued that the incidents of 1984-1989 were an “ethnicized turn in the history of the Bulgarian nationalism” (Parla, 2009:758).

Forced changes of the names of ethnic Turks became a turning point in the lives of the Turkish minority, because the names of Turks were an indispensable part of their ethnic identities in Bulgaria. Bates (1994) argued that names of Turks in Bulgaria were deeply associated with their cultural and historical existence, which contradicts with the nation-state ideology and Bulgaria’s Slavic character. The government first enacted the name-change policy in 1912, and later in 1930, ethnic minorities were forced to adopt Bulgarian names. However, the communist government in 1944 encouraged Turks to reclaim their original Turkish names and punished authorities that carried out assimilation campaigns (Bates, 1994:206).

### 3.1.1 Bulgarian Turks as Ethnic Kins

Being “soydaş<sup>5</sup>” has meant a lot in the Bulgarian Turkish migration to Turkey, because Turkish local authorities in Turkey settled and positioned these migrants through their ethnic kinship. Parla (2006:544) asserted that there was an ‘ambiguity about the original location of the homeland’ of Bulgarian Turkish migrants, because when Turkish minority escaped from the oppression of the falling communist government in Bulgaria in 1989, they migrated to Turkey, which is “what Turkish nationalism designated as their true, ancestral homeland”. When Turgut Özal (1927-1993), the Prime Minister of Turkey, declared the borders open to “soydaş”s coming from Bulgaria, 300.000 migrants fled to Turkey, but the border was closed immediately after the mass migration (Parla, 2006:546), due to the high number of immigrants, which exceeded the expectations. Ethnic kin is the very key component of the immigrant incorporation among Bulgarian Turkish immigrants. Apart from the immigrants who fled from Bulgaria to Turkey in 1989, many people kept migrating to Turkey in the 1990s.

The 1989 migration from Bulgaria to Turkey was classified as “return migration”, since at the time, return migration meant going back to a homeland that was never visited before. However, at present, the definition was extended so that it makes “the notion of a return to homeland never visited not only possible but also the very reason for existence of diaspora” (Parla, 2006:546). However, while the 1989-immigrants were all automatically granted citizenship in Turkey, the post-1990s immigrants needed tourist visas to enter the country. As Parla (2007:157) suggests, the post-1990s migrants are seen as ‘ethnic return migrants’, because there is a tendency to accept Turkish migration from Bulgaria as ethnic return migration, rather than irregular migrant flows. For example, a post-1990s Bulgarian Turkish immigrant woman who had made several attempts to obtain Turkish citizenship without success quoted the citizenship officials as stating that; “...Of course, I too prefer citizens like you, instead of those from Azerbaijan or Turkmenistan”. The

---

<sup>5</sup> ‘Soydaş’ means ethnic kin. In order not to cause a semantic shift, I use the word ‘soydaş’.

fact that she had “Turkish origin” indicates “a relative privilege of ethnicity” (Parla, 2011:67). Hence, migrants of Turkic origin enjoyed privileged treatment compared to other migrants of non-Turkic ethnicity. However, as Parla (2011:67-68) clearly puts, “the peculiar status of being of Turkish origin does not automatically exempt them from precarious legal status; Turkish migrants from Bulgaria are still exposed to vulnerabilities: no job security or social security, no legal access to medical care and utter dependence on personal networks for treatment, overpriced rent for ill-maintained housing with the perpetual risk of eviction, and a threat of deportation”. However, if post-1990s migrants have earlier migrant acquaintances or relatives, their Turkish ethnicity could provide them with better housing and health opportunities. Hence, as Parla (2011) put it, “ethnicity is a double-edged sword”.

Until 2009, migrants who bring documentation of ethnic origin –*soy belgesi*– could acquire Turkish citizenship, provided that they resided in Turkey for two years (Parla, 2011:68). Other migrants were required to reside for five years, even though the new law abolished this rule; the current Settlement Law classified migrants vis-à-vis their Turkic origin (Parla, 2011:68). Furthermore, migrants who had Turkic origin including the Turks of Iraq, Western Thrace, Eastern Turkmenistan, Afghanistan and Bulgaria were in a more favorable position to obtain work permits (Parla, 2011:69). This situation was indicating of the fact that ethnic Turkish descent remained a central feature of the republican citizenship policies in Turkey during/since the Turkish nation-building process (Parla, 2011:69); their Turkish origins continued to provide them with an advantage later on, as well.

### **3.1.2 The Post-1990 Immigrants to Turkey**

Nearly half of the 300.000 migrants who fled in 1989 to Turkey returned to Bulgaria after the fall of the communist Zhivkov regime in Bulgaria in 1989, but this event remained unreported; migration to Turkey continued through the 1990s along with the seasonal labor migration of women who are mostly working in the

domestic work in Turkey (Parla, 2006:544). Turkish women were largely engaged with tobacco cultivation in Bulgaria. The “dramatic drop in the price of state-purchased crops” in the beginning of 1990s had affected women negatively, which was also a reason of post-1990 migration to Turkey (Daskalova, 2000:340).

Many of the post-1990s migrants stayed illegally in Turkey after their visas expired. There were also immigrants who illegally entered Turkey. Kasli and Parla (2009:206) indicated that the Turkish government made use of the illegal status of the immigrants, considering them as a source of cheap labor and granting them temporary residence permits in return for voting in Bulgarian national elections. The post-1990s migrants have been coming to Turkey largely due to the unstable economic conditions in Bulgaria and to make their living in the homeland Turkey. These irregular migrants held hopes of finding salaried jobs in Turkey, and wanted to work temporarily and then return home. However, until 2001, these migrants needed to get visas to enter Turkey, but it was difficult for people to obtain tourist visas in 1990s because visas were only granted to one person in each family. This led to illegal entries to Turkey (Kasli & Parla, 2009:208). After 2001, the Turkish government removed the visa requirement for Bulgarian citizens, and in 2007 a new visa agreement has been enacted due to the Schengen visa regime. According to this new policy, migrants could only stay in Turkey for 90 days within any six months. On the other hand, for the Turkish nationals, the visa process became more flexible –they could enter the Schengen area with a proper visa and they did not need a separate Bulgarian visa; however, understandably, this sanction created difficulties for labor migrants who came to Turkey for employment (Kasli & Parla, 2009:207-209).

### **3.2 Turkish Women’s Situation under the Bulgarian Communist Regime**

Bulgarian Turkish women have had considerably different patterns of social life and different experiences of citizenship before and after the mass migration of 1989.

Migration was an obligatory exodus for ethnic Turks, as the “soydaş”; however, their emigration to Turkey, as with all migration processes, has brought about many problems. In particular, women went through many different gendered experiences with different socializations, and had different perceptions of citizenship. The citizenship of Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women has been constructed through gender identity and migrant status in Turkey, while their citizenship was largely shaped by their ethnic minority status in Bulgaria.

Panova et al. (1993:15) asserts that Bulgarian women adopted three role models throughout the years: “the oriental, the patriarchal eastern orthodox and the totalitarian socialist”. Variety of influences from different cultures and traditions gained the women in Bulgaria a hybrid role (Panova et al., 1993:15). Panova et al. highlights that when Ottoman conquest brought Islam to Bulgaria in 1396, gender relations and roles were highly affected. Even Christian women were influenced; they could not go to public realm alone, and hesitated to be seen in bazaars. Churches remained as the only public place women could go to, but that became gender-separated too. Nevertheless, totalitarian socialist system brought new regulations and restrictions to women, even though it claimed so-called “liberation of women from the chains of capitalism” to create “Bulgarian socialist emancipated women” (Panova et al., 1993:16,17). However, it imposed double-burden on women, who worked both at home, and ‘as a new member of the paid labor force’. Hence the ‘myth of the emancipated working socialist women’ became refuted, as the political, financial, institutional, social and scientific world have been in control of men (Panova, 1993: 17,18).

Socialism was a political system where women and men could have relative equality, due to its egalitarian project underlying its ideology. Hence, socialist systems provided more work and career opportunities to women compared to capitalist, corporatist and conservative systems (Hellsten, 2006:57). On the other hand, scholars demonstrated that women in the former Soviet bloc countries had only a ‘virtual’ equal employment situation with men (Voronina, 1994:733). Due to

the dominance of conventional gender roles, women predominantly worked in domestic labor, child-care and public canteens, and remained responsible for all domestic tasks. The issue of whether there were equal gender relations under communist regimes was always debated (Daskalova, 2000:343). Although women were in the labor force because it was necessary for the construction of a socialist system in Bulgaria, the unequal gender-based division of labor in the private sphere was not questioned. Women could not get rid of their domestic responsibilities, although they used to work shoulder to shoulder with men in the communist period (Daskalova, 2000:343). A research on the ‘use of time’, conducted in 1980s, indicated that the time women in Bulgaria engaged in domestic work was significantly more than it was 20 years ago, and in 1990s “women spent three times more time in domestic work than men did” (Daskalova, 2000:339). Even though women were as educated and as qualified as men in the labor market, they were not equal in employment opportunity, payment and promotion (Petrova, 1993:22).

Women’s situation in the former Soviet bloc countries gave important insights regarding gendered patterns. Yuval-Davis (1997:156) claimed that almost all women in former socialist countries were employed; yet they had the lowest positions compared to men. Women had political and legal equality –they were never incorporated in Politburo (Todorova, 1993:31). Women had childcare and public kitchen opportunities that collectivized domestic labor – but women continued to do domestic work in addition to their paid work outside (Todorova, 1993:31). Women in Bulgaria mostly worked in agriculture, especially in the interwar period, and this provided a relative independence of action; however, the relative independence and freedom of action did not bring emancipation to women in village communities (Todorova, 1993). Women’s double-burden issue was deeply embedded in the rural life, where women’s domesticity becomes prominent and the double-burden issue becomes invisible and ‘natural’; hence, “women in Bulgaria did not, as a group, experience entire periods based on ‘the cult of domesticity’, the ‘feminine mystique’ or the ‘beauty myth’” (Todorova, 1993:33). As a cultural pattern, women in Bulgaria, including the Turkish minority, did not

see themselves as subjects of beauty due to the communist tradition they belonged to. One can deduce this from the narratives of the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women; they neither felt that they totally belonged to the domestic sphere, nor do they felt as feminine as the other women.

It seems that socialist promises failed at the issue of women's emancipation in the communist system. Although on paper, women seem to be politically, economically, socially and culturally equal, emancipation of women remained unsuccessful due to the impositions of the emancipatory regulations through 'male supremacist institutions' (Petrova, 1993:22). Women in Bulgaria received monthly payments and paid leave for childcare, which helps to secure the reproductive rights of women. However, due to the decreasing birth rates in Bulgaria, the communist government enacted pro-natalist policies restricting abortion and encouraging giving birth in the 1980s (Daskalova, 2000:345). The state encouraged Bulgarian women to give birth to more children, and banned abortion if a woman had only one child, because the other communities (Turks and Roma) had higher birth rates (Petrova, 1993:23). The abortion law in Bulgaria required the consent of the husband in the communist regime; however, the lack of contraceptive pills increased abortion rates with the result that 90 percent of the deaths from abortion between 1964 and 1990 were cases of illegal abortion (Daskalova, 2000:345).

Although women seemed to enjoy formal equality with men, they were basically attributed three social functions: being a mother and wife, being a good worker, and being a social activist in the socialist system (Petrova, 1993:24). However, in the late 1970s and the early 1980s, women were expected to be more conservative with the rise of the 'antifeminist ideology of essentialist inspiration', which expected women to stay at home (Petrova, 1993:24).

As Parla (2009) states, the communist system in Bulgaria provided many opportunities for the Turkish community in the field of health-care, education and the welfare system. Women especially took advantage of the education and

employment policy, which was not formerly available for ethnic Turkish women (Parla, 2009:758). There was, however, a generational difference among women: women between ages of 30-50 and their mothers. While the first group of women had access to education for at least eight years -even if they come from the countryside-, their mothers only had a few years of religious education. Further, the first group of women had a chance to get higher degrees and get jobs in health care and education, while their mothers were obliged to do unpaid work in agriculture and took care of children at home (Parla, 2009:758). Although both group of women suffered from the double-burden , those with paid work were satisfied with the situation, even if they worked in lower-paid day care centers and kindergartens (Parla, 2009:758). Women claimed that they had relative autonomy with the paid work, although such kindergartens and day care centers were seen as “the hotbeds for the pernicious communist propaganda” by some Turkish nationalists (Parla, 2009:758). However, according to Parla (2009), it was necessary to accept the ‘persecuted’ ethnic kin issue –soydaş- in order to get social acceptance from the Turkish community, but it would not be appropriate for immigrant or working women to talk about the positive aspects of communism in Turkey. Because the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women challenged women’s confinement to home by “insisting on working outside of home at all costs”, their sense of national belonging and identity in Turkey seem to remain unclear (Parla, 2009:759).

## CHAPTER 4

### **BEING A BULGARIAN TURKISH IMMIGRANT WOMAN IN TURKEY: GENDER DYNAMICS IN THE PUBLIC AND PRIVATE**

Immigrant women's citizenship has been constructed in a different way compared to the local women in a host country. Immigrant women experience living in a new country with the features they carry from the past, while also learning from the host country, and transforming themselves accordingly. The communities the immigrant women and men belong to influence their access to citizenship, and how they experience it (Yuval-Davis, 1991 in Pettman, 1999:207). Although they lived in a secular, partly communist country in Bulgaria, Bulgarian Turkish women belong to the Turkish and Muslim community, which shaped their gendered practices differently than the Bulgarian women. On the other hand, immigrant women belong to the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant community in Turkey, which determines their place and their gendered practices in the Turkish society. Migration determines and reconstitutes how women and men should behave in accordance with the gender norms of the host country (Duran, 2011). Furthermore, immigrant women are likely to be oppressed by the patriarchal norms and the labor market structure in the host country both for their gender and for being a member of a marginalized ethnic group (Kadıoğlu, 1997). Hence, citizenship of immigrant women cannot be truly collective and truly individual (Yuval-Davis, 1997), due to their identities leading to intertwine multiple structural inequalities.

Gender relations are affected by migration, and one can raise the question of whether gender inequality is transformed or consolidated by migration (Duran,

2011). Another important question is whether immigrant women challenge the gender norms in the host country. Migration affects boundaries, opportunities and rights of women, and can cause new inequalities and a reconstituted exclusion for women (Abraham et al., 2010). Immigrant women are likely to adapt new identities and new habitats. As Pettman (1999) articulates, ‘post-migratory identities are multiple’.

In this chapter of the thesis, I will try to bring to light the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women’s citizenship experiences in Turkey, including their social and economic conditions and everyday life experiences in the public and private spheres. I will be reflecting on immigrant women’s narratives on the basis of the interviews conducted with them. Further, I will try to demonstrate how immigrant women’s citizenship became a gendered construct in Turkey, and how immigrant women’s lives are affected by the gender norms in Turkey. As noted before, citizenship does not only mean a legal status, but also as a practice it is a by-product of the subjective experiences of women; gender relations within the family and kin relations and attitudes to women’s sexuality are likely to have an impact on their citizenship experiences (Caldwell et al., 2009). The objective of this analysis is also to explain the efforts of immigrant women to adopt a new country after the ethnic migration from Bulgaria, including the post-1990s immigrant women, without separating them categorically. Interviews with the immigrant women would provide insights into what these two groups of women have been going through both in Bulgaria and in Turkey, as these would be comparable due to their common migration experiences. As explained in the Introduction, for this thesis study semi-structured in-depth interviews with nineteen immigrant women living in Izmir were conducted. The table below summarizes the profiles and the background about these women.

**Table: Profiles of the Interviewees,**

| Name    | Age | Marital Status | Number of Children | Number of People in Household | Education        | Occupation in Bulgaria | Occupation in Turkey  |
|---------|-----|----------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|------------------------|---|
| Ganimet | 64  | Married        | 2                  | 3                             | University       | Nurse                  | Worker, Nurse, Retired  |
| Nimet   | 44  | Single         | -                  | 5                             | High School      | State Officer          | Worker  |
| Fatma   | 55  | Married        | -                  | 2                             | University       | State Officer          | Worker, Domestic Work, State Officer, Retired                     |
| Esma    | 47  | Married        | 2                  | 2                             | University       | State Officer          | Unemployed (Before secretary)                                     |
| Şükriye | 40  | Married        | 2                  | 4                             | High School      | Advisor in a School    | Domestic Work, Cook   |
| Gül     | 51  | Married        | 2                  | 5                             | High School      | Worker                 | Secretary in Hospital   |
| Hafize  | 50  | Single (Widow) | 2                  | 3                             | High School      | Accountant             | Secretary in Hospital   |
| Alev    | 49  | Married        | 1                  | 3                             | University       | Worker                 | Nurse   |
| Sevda   | 48  | Married        | 2                  | 4                             | High School      | Cook                   | Cook, Export Specialist   |
| Cemile  | 42  | Married        | 2                  | 4                             | High School      | Student                | Unemployed (Before Worker)  |
| Figen   | 63  | Single (Widow) | 2                  | 6                             | Secondary School | Worker in Hospital     | Worker in Hospital  |
| Kamile  | 49  | Married        | 2                  | 3                             | University       | Nurse                  | Nurse   |
| Meral   | 61  | Married        | 3                  | 3                             | Secondary School | Worker in Factory      | Worker in Textile Factory, Retired                                |
| Züleyha | 57  | Married        | 2                  | 4                             | Secondary School | Worker                 | Domestic Worker, Secretary, Cook, Retired                         |
| Hale    | 68  | Married        | 2                  | 3                             | Secondary School | Worker                 | Worker in Textile Factory, Retired                                |
| Zerrin  | 58  | Married        | 3                  | 3                             | Secondary School | Worker in Shoe Factory | Domestic Work, Secretary, Retired                                 |
| Nefise  | 58  | Married        | 2                  | 2                             | Secondary School | Worker in Shoe Factory | Worker in Textile Factory, Tobacco, Laboratory Assistant, Retired |
| Adile   | 58  | Married        | 2                  | 3                             | Secondary School | Worker, Tailor         | Worker, Tailor, Retired   |
| Bahar   | 57  | Married        | 2                  | 2                             | Secondary School | Dentistry Assistant    | Seasonal Worker, Cook at Kindergarden, Retired                    |

As seen in the table above, the average age of the immigrant women I interviewed is 53. Among these women, two lived in Dobriç, one lived in Hasköy and sixteen lived in Kırcaali. Five of these women are university graduates, seven are high school graduates and seven are secondary school graduates. Eleven of the women immigrated in 1989, five of them immigrated in 1990, one immigrated in 1991, one immigrated in 1992, and one immigrated in 1997 to Turkey. Except two of immigrant women, I conducted interviews in their own houses. Two of immigrant women's husbands were present during the interviews, and the rest were alone with me. Three of the immigrant women were concerned if their names and personal information will be made public<sup>6</sup>. Except one, all of the immigrant women have children; they are all married and two of them lost their husbands. Except two, all women were married at the time of immigration to Turkey. When asked where they felt like they were from, ten of the women replied that they were from Turkey, six state that they were from Bulgaria, two stated that they were from both countries and one said that she was from nowhere.

#### **4.1 The Immigration Process and The First Years In Turkey: What the Narratives of Immigrant Women Tell**

The migration stories of women reveal that they had very difficult conditions both in the first stages of the immigration and also in the following years of adaptation to a new country. The reasons for migration and how migration took place underlie the stories of the immigrant women. Immigrant women remember the migration process with all details. As one of the interviewees stated the Bulgarian Turkish minority had only couple of days to pack and leave the country due to the forceful regulations implemented by the Bulgarian state. As Ganimet told; "One morning the police came and wanted us to leave the country in three days. It was a shocking experience, because somebody forced you to leave your home country, and gave you only a couple of days for packing and leaving". While the president Zhivkov

---

<sup>6</sup> The names of the interviewees are nicknamed due to the need for anonymity. Most of the interviewees wanted to remain unidentified.

declared that the Bulgarian border was open to the Turkish minority, most of the Turks went to the border gate with a rush<sup>7</sup>. The social and political environment in Bulgaria in 1989 was very problematic for Turks; as the interviewee Nimet stated that there were raids into houses to change the names of Turks, while people were hiding and running outside without coming home for several days. Turkish women<sup>8</sup> in Bulgaria were afraid to speak Turkish in their workplaces due to the restrictions of the Bulgarian state. The Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women stated that there were always a fear in their hearts in Bulgaria because of the forceful name changes and restrictions on speaking their mother tongue. For example, Fatma stated that; “It was very hard not to remember what we have been through. We were deported from the country in only two hours, they gave us a small lorry to pack and go”. She also asserted that if somebody had leadership features among Turks, they would be the first to be deported from Bulgaria, because the state was afraid of a rebellion among Turks. Most of the women underlined that among the Turks, village leaders, engineers, teachers, high school and university graduates were deported at first from Bulgaria in 1989. Many Turkish people who were in leader positions were asked to spy against other Turkish people and the Turkish government. Nevertheless, Turkish minority protested and arranged meetings against the name changes and the assimilation campaign of the Bulgarian state. Immigrant women asserted that the assimilation campaign against the Turkish minority was a ten-year process, but it came out in 1984, starting from the shore cities, expanding to the others. The Bulgarian state was sending Turkish people to the Belene prison where the Turkish political prisoners were mostly sent, because they resisted the assimilation campaign. One of the interviewees, Kamile also stated that her cousin was murdered 45 days after being sent to the Belene prison, and nobody from his family could learn about this for a while.

Immigrant women stated that migration had many important consequences in their education and family lives. Turkish women’s education remained unfinished in

---

<sup>7</sup> From the interview with Bahar, June 2014 ; “We were watching TV one night and saw Zhivkov saying that the Bulgarian-Turkish border is open. Everybody was deported in June and then we decided to migrate in August”.

<sup>8</sup> In the same interviewee Bahar told that “I became dumb in workplace. I spoke Turkish if there was no Bulgarian around, but I often spoke Bulgarian because I was in pursuit of bread, there was no chance”.

Bulgaria due to the assimilation campaign. For instance, an interviewee, Esma told that, her university classes were not graded at school in Bulgaria, due to the nationalist ideologies in universities against the Turks. Her university degree remained unfinished in Bulgaria because of the migration, which left her frustrated. The immigration also broke up families; some women's families (mother and father) remained in Bulgaria, and never immigrated to Turkey, which was another traumatic result of the migration for women. Women mostly came with nuclear family including children and husband, leaving other family members behind, which caused feelings of loneliness among immigrant women.

The border crossing process was also problematic for Turkish people, as was narrated by the immigrant women. For instance, people's passports were not given; hence people had to get one through bribery. Bulgarian officers took some Turkish people to Bulgaria-Turkey border themselves, which was a problem too. Esma stated that, "When we were about to come to the Turkish border with 100.000 people, they took us in a camp. One night, we stayed at a place 150 km behind the border. They thought of poisoning us, but they did nothing". The 40-year-old Şükriye immigrated to Turkey in 1997 with her husband by bribing the human traffickers and passing the border with an illegal trailer truck. 51-year-old Gül told me during the interview that they slept in a car for a week, with 11 family members at the border. As most immigrant women emphasized, immigrating with little children was very difficult for them. Gül stated, "In the time border crossing, we could not nurse my baby and it got sick". Another woman Zerrin said it was very difficult migrating with her three little children.

Narratives of the immigrant women indicated that what women lived and experienced separations through their families and relatives, which also influenced women profoundly. For instance, another interviewee Alev stated that her father first migrated to Turkey, leaving other family members in Bulgaria<sup>9</sup>, because the Bulgarian state sent people randomly. Nobody could migrate to Turkey in a time

---

<sup>9</sup> Alev, also stated that "We came to Turkey with 3-4 suitcases and nothing else". She migrated with 20 families from the same village in Dobriç, which shows mass exodus nature of the migration.

that they chose, because they could not get permissions or passports. Alev's father was in prison for 11 years in Bulgaria for political reasons related to identity issues, she expressed that; "Bulgarian state used to put in prison, torture and murder Turkish people without informing their families. For years, people looked for their family members who were made to disappear by the state". Another interviewee, 68-year-old Hale mentioned that her husband was a geography teacher in Bulgaria and has been tortured in the police investigation. Hale put their situation as follows, "He was working for Turkey a lot, he always listened to Turkish radio and he was following what was going on in Turkey". Now, Hale's husband suffers from a psychiatric disease since they immigrated to Turkey, and he could not work anymore. Hale has shouldered her husband's care in addition to elderly care in her family. For all these reasons, including the reasons for migration to Turkey and the migration process itself, which women experienced with difficulties, migration had dramatic impact in the memory of women.

The immigrant women's first years in Turkey were difficult. All of the women I interviewed stressed that they began everything from scratch in a new country. Nefise (58) put it as follows: "We could not bring our money from Bulgaria except for a small amount, but the exchange rate for the Bulgarian currency, lev, was low in Turkey. We poured our money down in the customs, and nothing was left when we settled". The first years of the immigration passed with difficulties, but all migrant women found a way to struggle. Another woman, Ganimet, who is a nurse, told me during the interview that she used to work in a dried fruit factory as a worker when she first came to Turkey. After a couple of months, a university hospital offered an exam which she passed, and started working as a nurse. Other women also expressed similar things, for example, Fatma explained that she had a very negative experience in the first years of migration: "It was like an earthquake; I had a job, a house and furniture in Bulgaria, but when I came here, I had nothing. I told people that I would buy an apartment in Bornova (a central district in Izmir); everybody laughed at me but I succeeded, bought the house after three years". When she migrated to Turkey, Fatma worked in a company as a computer operator

at daytime, had a second job at another place until 11 p.m., and had a third job at a disco as a cleaner in weekends, and she continued this life for two years. Fatma also explained during the interview that her husband is a wrestling trainer but he was working at a gas station during nights, as well as working as a referee, and by working in this way they could buy a house after two years. Another woman, Sevda similarly stated that the first years of migration were very painful for them as she told me that; “We came as a nine-member family; it was really hard migrating and living with a small rented house with nine people in Turkey. I had a house and car in Bulgaria, but I was nothing when I came to Turkey”.

All women I interviewed with asserted that they came to Izmir because they had relatives or acquaintances there. Moving in to places where relatives and acquaintances live provides relief for immigrants, and kin relationships provide some degree of self-reliance for them. Although some of them were sent to other cities, they did not want to go, and eventually migrated to Izmir. For instance, Esma told me during the interview that her passport allowed her to migrate to Austria, but she exited from the Kapıkule Border of Turkey; hence, border officers of the Bulgarian state had arbitrary behaviors; the border was open and Turkish people could enter Turkey. She contended that they had a lot of losses due to migration, both moral and material, and has put it in the following way: “We lost a lot; when we passed the border from Bulgaria, it was very difficult to communicate with anyone in Turkey; people moved like a herd at the border”. Before coming to İzmir, Esma and her family were first sent to a small town in Bursa, where they stayed for 20 days. Esma remembered that the people of town were very religious and conservative; she could not even go to the market alone as a woman;

The people in the town we stayed in were very closed-minded.  
That was the very opposite of the life that I used to live; I could not even take my child to walk around.

The first impressions of immigrant women about Turkey seem negative due to the prejudices against them and conservative gender norms and practices, which are especially imposed on women. Another woman, Fatma expressed her frustration in the following way; “10 years of my life were stolen because of migration”, and she

continued to talk about Turkish people's behavior to them in the first years of migration, as she stated, "People could hear our accent in the first years and understand that we are migrants, so they called us Bulgarians; but we are the grandchildren of Ottomans without any mixed race".

The 1989 immigrants are mostly deported Turkish immigrants who were criminalized in Bulgaria for resisting the assimilation campaign and for doing Turkish propaganda. However, migrants who came in 1990 and 1991 had immigrant visas while entering Turkey. Many Turkish people who wanted to migrate to Turkey in 1989 were not accepted since the border had closed. Some people wanted to be deported to other countries such as Austria and Sweden, but most of them came to Turkey in the following years. Some women stated that they had fears about going to other countries, as they are Turkish and they speak Turkish. The people who had sufficient time before migrating withdrew their money from banks and sold their houses before coming to Turkey.

Turkish migrants from Bulgaria who came to Turkey in 1989 obtained citizenship in the same year without any effort, as Turkish government granted them citizenship in a couple of months. However, migrants who came after 1989 encountered difficulties to obtain citizenship. For example, another woman (Nimet) told me that she and her family migrated in 1992 and struggled for 10 years to have Turkish citizenship. They resided in Turkey with resident permits, which required annual payments. She further explained that they used residence permits to find a job. Although they were able to work with residence permits, their social insurance rights are not granted by the employers. Nimet stated, "The Turkish state did not impose sanctions; our condition depended only on employers, so they did not give our social rights". Similarly, Şükriye explained her situation in the following way: "We came to Turkey in 1997, we have stayed with residence and work permits for six years, and finally got citizenship in 2003". She also worked illegally as a domestic worker while she was also working as a cook in a gas station. Most of the women who immigrated in 1990s and worked in Turkey had the same problem: working without social insurance for several years. In addition, women without

Turkish citizenship used to work illegally, without asking for any rights. Hence, the patriarchal and capitalist system in Turkey, including employers and the state used immigrant women as a source of cheap labor without any social insurance and guarantee.

All of the migrant women I interviewed with, except one, held both Bulgarian and Turkish citizenship. The women suggested that dual citizenship is useful especially for their children in entering Europe without a visa. Women have different reasons for holding dual citizenship. To some extent, women feel that they belong to both countries; hence, it can be convenient to hold dual citizenship. For instance, Esma explained during the interview that she held dual citizenship since she reclaimed her rights to her ancestors': "I have dual citizenship because I have rights in my ancestors' land". Although feeling of belonging to both countries may at the same time cause feeling of belonging nowhere, immigrant women have substantial benefits to hold dual citizenship as well. As interviewee Nimet also explained, they held dual citizenship in order for their parents to be retired from Bulgaria and get old age pensions, since her parents did not count their working years in Bulgaria and could not retire in Turkey. Another women, Fatma, holds dual citizenship in order to sell their property that remained in Bulgaria, since Bulgarian government did not allow them to sell their property unless they were Bulgarian citizens. Further, some immigrant women have families in Bulgaria, and dual citizenship is useful for them to be able to frequently visit them.

Most of the post-1990 migrants from Bulgaria to Turkey are women, because there is an increasing demand for domestic work sector in Turkey, especially from the educated upper-middle class women (Parla, 2003:563). Hence, women are increasingly immigrating to Turkey because they can easily get visas and it is easier for them to find jobs in textile or leather work industry (Gheorghieva, 1998:22). Although most migrant women are perceived as 'dependents', Bulgarian Turkish migrant women are not in a dependent status in any part of the migration process. On the other hand, as mentioned above, if immigrant women cannot get citizenship,

they mostly engage in less paid (\$500-1000 a month) domestic work without social security and retirement plan (Parla, 2009:760). After the resolution of the communist system in Bulgaria, the country has gone into extreme poverty “with about four-fifths of the population living below the minimum standard of living and two-thirds below basic subsistence level” (Daskalova 2000) and this situation lead to feminization of the migration. While Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women who immigrated in 1989, earned as much as men and contributed equally to the household as well, an important point about the post-1990 immigrant women is that they became the primary breadwinner in the household because of the feminization of migration in the 1990s (Parla, 2009:763). Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women have especially been working in child care sector for the middle and upper-middle class families in Turkey, but there is no such sector for unskilled immigrant men, which caused women to become the first migrants after 1990s from Bulgaria to Turkey (Parla, 2007:165).

#### **4.2 Issues of Identity and Ethnicity among the Bulgarian Turkish Immigrant Women**

Identity is an important construct in relation to citizenship. Being a citizen of a state does not necessarily mean that the persons belong there; rather one’s citizenship is determined by how they perceive and define themselves. Immigrant women’s citizenship is constructed based on how they ethnically identify themselves, where they feel they belong to, and what they feel they are. Name changes in Bulgaria constituted an important case for the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women considering their identity perception. As explained earlier, the Rebirth campaign held by the Bulgarian state aimed to transform Turkish minority into Bulgarians; hence, the Turkish minority was forbidden to speak Turkish, their mother tongue in Bulgaria, after 1984. Some Turkish officers were forced to punish Turkish-speaking people in public spaces by writing out bills<sup>10</sup>. Immigrant women stated that

---

<sup>10</sup> Fatma, who immigrated in 1989 with her husband, told that “The officers forced me to inform them on Turkish people who speak Turkish in public space, but I refused to do it”.

prohibition of the use of Turkish language was one of the most important instances of oppression that came from the Bulgarian state. An interviewee, Nimet put it as follows: “Pomaks gave up their religion, but never gave up their language, why would we change our language?” Women also explained that the use of Turkish language in public spaces became impossible because of the great oppression<sup>11</sup>.

When I asked immigrant women to tell their migration stories, they always started by saying that “They changed our names”. This seems to be the strongest memory and sensation for immigrant women from those times. For example, Züleyha expressed during the interview that they resisted changing their names but it was very difficult to resist the Bulgarian police because of being part of the Turkish minority in Bulgaria. Another woman, Nimet explained in a similar way that officers came to arrest men, as the head of the family, to get acceptance for name-changes; she stated that officers did not take women, they only took men. Likewise, interviewee Esmâ expressed that Turkish children were questioned even at kindergartens, regarding what the names of their grandparents were. Pressures on children about Turkish names in Bulgaria influenced women very much, as they seemed very miserable while telling such stories. Names reflected people’s identity, culture, religion and their lives; hence, the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women felt a significant oppression and exclusion because of the forced name changes in Bulgaria.

The Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women whom I interviewed with mostly cited the ethnic discrimination they experienced in Bulgaria as an important reason for migration, and the women explained that the consciousness of being a Turk and speaking their mother tongue were shaped under their subjective experiences of oppression as a minority in Bulgaria. “Nothing worse than being a Turk in Bulgaria, nothing worse than being an immigrant in Turkey”, say Bulgarian Turkish immigrants (Dimitrova, 1998:1). Bulgarian Turkish immigrants had difficulties in

---

<sup>11</sup> An interviewee Alev (49, immigrated with her mother and brother) said that: “If you spoke Turkish in the market, even the salesclerk discriminated against you and did not give to you what you wanted. When you had a bureaucratic issue in the state office, you had to speak Bulgarian even if you could not speak it properly”.

both countries, because they were minority in Bulgaria, and they became immigrants in Turkey. As Parla (2006:546) indicated, one the most common sentiments expressed by the Bulgarian Turkish immigrants was that they are persecuted in Bulgaria because they were Turkish, and in Turkey because they were Bulgarian.

Ethnic based identity problems Bulgarian Turkish minority experienced in Bulgaria have also continued in Turkey. During the interview Zerrin put it as, “People in Turkey call us ‘gavur’ (foreigner, infidel); we are not gavur, we are real Turks”. Most of the immigrant women emphasized the importance of being Turkish. As noted above, immigrant women complained about being Turk in Bulgaria and being ‘gavur’ in Turkey. For example, Fatma expressed; “They told us ‘you are Bulgarian, pick a name’. Although we had always considered migration, we immediately decided to migrate after name-changes, as it has risen our Turkish identity”. Similarly Fatma stated, “It was a real genocide, how do we go through such a genocide in 20<sup>th</sup> century?” Most of the immigrant women asserted that even some Bulgarians opposed to such discrimination and expulsion. Many of the interviewed women for this study expressed that there were some good Bulgarian friends who foretold them the home invasions of officers for name-changes. Another woman, Ganimet expressed during the interview that her best friends were Turkish in Bulgaria even though there were really nice people among Bulgarians; she could not trust them after 1984 when discrimination policies were enacted: “Discrimination was very visible, they have called us ‘nasty Turks’ and it always created problems. I always felt humiliated and excluded in Bulgaria”.

In the interviews, migrant women were asked to identify themselves based on how they felt and describe themselves both in Bulgaria and Turkey, and were asked to choose among one or many of the following identities: minority, Bulgarian Turk, foreigner, second class citizen, European, migrant, Muslim and Turk. All women stated that they were Turks and Muslims, six of them stated they were second class citizens, five of them stated they were minority in Bulgaria. The favorite answers

for Turkey were Bulgarian Turk, migrant and Muslim. Although majority of the immigrant women I interviewed with declared themselves to be Turkish in the first place. For example, one of them, Nimet contended that they had never felt that they were Turkish before 1984, as she had not been discriminated because of her ethnicity: “It was a political change; our Bulgarian friends and neighbors had never changed against us. We were discriminated only by the Bulgarian state, and we felt exclusion only when they changed our names”.

Most of the immigrant women I interviewed with expressed that they did not feel discriminated in Turkey. Although women did not want to become migrants, they did not have any regrets in migrating to Turkey; and women expressed their gratitude for having migrated to Turkey.

The cultural and religious habits of the Turkish minority were also suppressed after 1984. As my interviewees explained, it was forbidden to bury parents with shroud (kefen), to circumcise children, and also to cook bagel (pişi) in holidays, because they were associated with Islam. Animal sacrificing was forbidden too, as it was a religious ritual. Also, Arabic named gravestones that belonged to Turkish minority were removed. Moreover, the Bulgarian government wanted Turkish children to be baptized and when they were born, they immediately got Bulgarian names<sup>12</sup>. Another interviewee, Hafize, told me during the interview that; “There were rumors of infertility vaccines being injected to Turkish boys at kindergartens, which led the Turkish women to take their children immediately from the kindergartens in late 1980s”.

Most of the interviewees explained that they never felt they were from Bulgaria<sup>13</sup>, because going to Turkey has always been their ultimate goal. Immigrant women mostly asserted that all Turks had an ideal of going to Turkey, their homeland.

---

<sup>12</sup> An interviewee Esmâ put it as, “We got out from hospital with my son with his Bulgarian name”.

<sup>13</sup> Nimet stated that: “Turkey belongs to the Turks, Bulgaria belongs to the Bulgarians; we are now living in our own land”.

Turkish people had been saving money for the possibility of migrating to Turkey. Attempts at obtaining a passport sometimes resulted in failure, because Bulgarian state could reject such requests. During the interview with her, Esma expressed her feelings in the following way:

We did not belong to Bulgaria, because the Bulgarians made us feel that way. We were humiliated in history classes at school; we were like a thorn inherited from Ottoman Empire. They drowned our identity. The immigration we experienced does not have an explanation even in United Nations. It was not a political refuge; we were neither refugees nor asylum-seekers, hence we did not have rights. We fled from genocide.

Some of the immigrant women I interviewed with contended that they wished to born, to study and to work in Turkey from the beginning, so that they could have a better life. Nevertheless, they are very pleased to live in Turkey eventually<sup>14</sup>. Immigrant women consider Turkey as a more tolerant country to different ethnic groups compared to Bulgaria, although it has a great ethnic diversity<sup>15</sup>; however, women also stated that in terms of lifestyles people do not respect each other in Turkey.

All of the migrant women interviewed for this study pointed out to me that relations of neighbors were very good in Bulgaria, as people were sincere and intimate. Women explained that neighbors visited each other even in apartments in cities, and the relations of colleagues were very warm regardless of whether they are ethnic Bulgarian or Turkish. For example Fatma stated; “Our neighbors were very good no matter if they are Turk, Bulgarian, or Pomak. Our relationship has not been affected, we are still in touch”. When I asked them whether they received help from friends and relatives when they were in trouble, some migrant women stated that they tended to reject help from others, as they considered getting help from someone to be a weakness.

---

<sup>14</sup> Fatma stated, “I have gained my freedom, my Turkishness, my religion in Turkey. We only came with four or five pieces of luggage, started a new life from scratch, but it was worth it to live in your own land”.

<sup>15</sup> Esma put it as, “There is more freedom in Turkey, but there is no respect among people; in Bulgaria we respected each other”.

Although immigrant women claimed that they did not hold discriminatory attitudes towards people in Bulgaria, when it came to marriage, they were against mixed marriages between the Turks and other ethnic groups. All immigrant women I interviewed with, without exception, confirmed that Turks married Turks in Bulgaria; they very rarely married Bulgarians or Pomaks. Immigrant women also stated that marriage with Roma and Alevi community in Bulgaria was very rare and met with disapproval among their community. In Turkey the situation has not changed yet; immigrant women preferred their children to marry other second-generation immigrants, especially those coming from Bulgaria or former Yugoslavia, because they believe that their traditions and cultural habits could fit easily with such a partner. As Zhelyazkova (1998:11) puts forward, patterns of endogamy<sup>16</sup> are frequent in Bulgarian Turkish families, as they want their children to marry children of other immigrants, especially from Bulgaria. For example, Şükriye said that; “My son can marry whoever he wants, but I do not want anyone Kurdish, Gypsy, or Christian”. Other women expressed similar sentiments. Another interviewee, Alev, told me in the interview that; “I do not expect my son to ask me who to marry with, but I do not want her to be Christian, because I suffered a lot from Christians. But she can be Alevi or Kurdish, these are mostly my husband’s obsessions”. Most of the immigrant women oppose to marriages with Kurdish, Alevi and Roma people in Turkey, believing in conflict of cultures and traditions<sup>17</sup>, and they said they preferred marriage with especially Bulgarian immigrants. Interviewee Sevda expressed that; “Except Kurdish, Alevi and Gypsy community, my children can marry who they want”.

Bulgarian Turkish migrants are filled with feelings of nostalgia for Bulgaria because of the relatives, friends and the hometown they left behind, but when they remember the ‘revival process’, the pain they experienced, and relative well-off in

---

<sup>16</sup> Endogamy, in this context, means as marriage within a specific ethnic group, instead of marriage with relatives. Marriage with relatives is not observed in Bulgarian Turks.

<sup>17</sup> Interviewee Nimet put: “We can handle any difficulty but local people cannot, hence, we cannot compromise with local people in Turkey when the issue comes to marriage, they are different than us, their culture, traditions and behaviors are different, we cannot understand each other”.

Turkey, the nostalgia rapidly disappears (Zhelyazkova, 1998:8). During the interview Esma put this in the following way; “The biggest wealth is memories”. Immigrant women miss their relatives and friends who remained in Bulgaria. Also, sometimes they indicate that they miss the social and economic conditions such as child-care and health care provided by the former communist system in Bulgaria, due their absence in Turkey. However, in general most of the immigrant women I interviewed with seemed satisfied with their situation in Turkey.

#### **4.3 The Gains from Immigrating to Homeland**

As the immigrant women believe that they benefited from migrating from Bulgaria to Turkey, it is important to inquire what the advantages of this migration are. Although immigrant women do not consider the gendered advantages separately, there are some positive sides and gendered results of the migration that influence the citizenship experience of the immigrant women in Turkey.

Immigrant women obtained freedom to live their own culture in Turkey, and this is very important to them. The women passionately explain the religious rituals they freely perform in Turkey. For instance, Turkish families used to circumcise their boys secretly in Bulgaria, since it was forbidden. One of the interviewees, Figen, stated that she learnt to read Quran in Turkey. Another woman, Ganimet expressed that before 1984, Turkish people could arrange marriage ceremonies with Turkish music, but later that became forbidden too. She also remarked, “Cemeteries became mixed of Bulgarian and Turkish people; they did not even allow us to bury our funerals separately, in accordance with Islamic rules”. She is pleased to celebrate marriages and circumcision freely, and to arrange *mevlids* (Islamic ritual for celebrations or deaths) in Turkey. Although some immigrant women think that celebration and even funerals in Turkey were pompous, women felt free and happy to practice whatever they wish in terms of religion. However, some immigrant

women I interviewed with argued that women in Bulgaria did not go to funerals, but in Turkey, women went to funerals together with men. Also, women asserted that religious marriages were arranged secretly in Bulgaria, but they are openly practiced in Turkey. Most of the immigrant women I interviewed with are aware that the religious practices have their own gender norms that differ in two countries. Although immigrant women contended that women in Turkey seem to participate religious rituals freely, immigrant women have also realized that religion in Turkey is one of the important reasons of the gender inequality in Turkey<sup>18</sup>.

Another issue that could be gain for immigrant women is children's education in Turkey. As most of the immigrant women asserted that their children have opportunities to study at universities in Turkey, which might not be the case if they remained in Bulgaria due to ethnic discrimination, and lower economic status. Hence, it could be said that, providing education opportunities for their children in Turkey may increase their social status in society, although it is open to question whether this could also bring about empowerment for immigrant women.

Although Bulgaria became a member of the European Union, and the communist regime ended, most of the immigrant women asserted that they never thought of going back to Bulgaria. Immigrant women have had variety of economic opportunities in Turkey, and they have provided better education for children, however, Bulgaria remained a relatively poor country with high poverty rates with the result that the youth chose to live and work in the Western European countries, due to unemployment in Bulgaria. Therefore, Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women stated that they preferred living in Turkey in all conditions.

---

<sup>18</sup> In the interview Esma put this in the following way: "We are Muslims, but when it comes to lifestyle we live like *gavurs* (infidels), because most people in Turkey are conservative and they think that women are subordinate to men".

### 4.3.1 Freedom and Economic Opportunities

When asked which country they would prefer to live in, most of immigrant women stated that they preferred to be in Turkey. The forced migration has some positive consequences for immigrant women, for which they all want to stay in Turkey, with no exception. Some women I interviewed with declared that they never wanted to return to Bulgaria<sup>19</sup>, despite the fact that there are negative aspects of Turkey as well. Living in big cities in Turkey, and earning higher wages compared to Bulgaria are other important reasons for immigrant women to prefer living in Turkey<sup>20</sup>. Immigrant women asserted that they could live freely in Turkey without any restrictions about speaking their mother tongue<sup>21</sup> and practicing their religion. For instance, Nimet's words clearly summarize how they felt about being in Turkey, as she stated, "If we have not ever seen Turkey, we would be content with what we had in Bulgaria". Moreover, immigrant women stated that it was very difficult for people to demand their democratic rights by rallying in the streets in Bulgaria due to the former communist system, where everything belonged to the state under the rule of the one party<sup>22</sup>. One of my interviewees, Esma asserted that there was a residence law in Bulgaria that prevented people from moving to other cities; there was no freedom of movement. The law was enforced to everyone irrespective of whether they are Turks or Bulgarians, and Esma mentioned that it used to create a psychological pressure that she does not experience in Turkey. In addition, economic opportunities in Turkey attracted most immigrant women; because they

---

<sup>19</sup> Author's interview with Ganimet: "I would never want to go to Bulgaria again if I did not have relatives. My children did not have a chance to study there, but in Turkey they have professions and jobs. Although politics is not stable in Turkey, it is a big and wealthy country, we are never ashamed of anything here, I am very happy to be in Turkey".

<sup>20</sup> Author's interview with Cemile (42, immigrated with 9 people including her mother, father, brothers, brothers' wives and their children, in 1989): "I miss nothing about Bulgaria; what can I miss, just fresh air and a couple of high school friends. It was very difficult to live in a village in Bulgaria, now I am living in a big city in Turkey".

<sup>21</sup> From the interview with Fatma: "I am Turkish and I speak Turkish freely in Turkey, this is what I missed a lot. Zhivkov denied the existence of Turks in Bulgaria, it was good to be in the country in which we can live freely".

<sup>22</sup> Author's interview with Gül: "Communist regime seems good, but there were too many limitations inside, it was closed to the external world".

could not possess anything they like in Bulgaria<sup>23</sup>, whereas women and their families have many properties in Turkey.

When immigrant women were further asked about the positive aspects of living in Turkey, they compare the oppressive conditions in Bulgaria with the freedoms they gained in Turkey. Nimet (44) explained that she got rid of doing tobacco cultivation and stockbreeding in Bulgaria; her lifestyle has changed in Turkey. During the interview Nimet similarly stated, “I do not have tobacco or blackness in my hands, my feet are not cracked here in Turkey. Women used to carry water to their homes in Bulgaria; we have seen plenitude and luxury in Turkey”. Interviewees Bahar and Nefise also said that Turkey was a wealthy country where anybody can buy anything, but in Bulgaria they used to earn a standard wage, which was not too little or too much, it was just enough<sup>24 25</sup>. Almost all women highlighted that they were very happy to work and able to get retirement, as there is currently a high level of unemployment in Bulgaria. Although facilities such as health care and childcare are not for free in Turkey, women do not complain about it; they are all happy with their situation in Turkey<sup>26</sup>. However, these positive sides of the migration came with the increased cost of domestic gender roles, which will be examined in the following sections.

Migrant women indicated that everything changed in their lives in Turkey and they all believed that if they had remained in Bulgaria, everything would have been ‘terrible’. Hence, women are very happy to live in Turkey, such a wealthy country. During the interview, Hale asserted that her life has completely changed, as she put it in the following way: “We were living with fear in Bulgaria, we could not speak

---

<sup>23</sup> Esma told me that: “We can have private ownership in Turkey, which provides great freedom. We could not even buy a banana with our money in Bulgaria. Opportunities are limitless in Turkey”.

<sup>24</sup> Bahar who immigrated with two little children and husband in 1989 said that: “You die neither hungry, nor full in Bulgaria”.

<sup>25</sup> Another interviewee, Şükriye, said that, “I was living in the outskirts of Bulgaria, which was undeveloped and rural, but here in Turkey we have lots of opportunities, life is easy here”.

<sup>26</sup> Adile who immigrated with two children, husband and his grandmother, in 1990, put this in the following way: “Transition to a capitalist state from a socialist state was not so bad, we work in both countries, so there is no change. If people work, they do whatever they want”.

our own language”. On the other hand, after migration, she has been employed, and built a house, which she believes to be very important developments in her life. Another woman, Ganimet also stated that if they stayed in Bulgaria, their condition would be worse because the Bulgarian economy has collapsed. Most of the immigrant women stated that their children have a chance to study in Turkey, which would not be the case had they stayed in Bulgaria. For instance, Bahar put it in the following way: “I am very happy that my children graduated from university in Turkey; if we have stayed in Bulgaria they probably would be rambles”. Immigrant women seem to not worry about their children in Turkey, except the issue of marrying with someone the women do not prefer.

All migrant women I interviewed have their own houses in Turkey. A few years after the migration they all have built or bought their houses, but most of them bought land and built their own houses. For instance, Ganimet did not have any savings in Bulgaria, but in Turkey she has a three-story apartment building, which they built in the fourth year of migration to Turkey. Nimet and her family lived in a rented house for ten years beginning in 1992, after which they built a two-story house. People in immigrant families have been working hard together to save money and build their own houses. Immigrant women, men and children mostly acted reasonably to save money to be able to own houses.

#### **4.3.2 Women’s Employment and Education Opportunities**

There have been changes in the paid employment patterns of Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women. They have continued to work in Turkey, but they do not mind the difficulties of being a working-woman in Turkey.

Immigrant women explained that they used to do domestic reproduction at home continuously in Bulgaria. The domestic tasks never ended at home, women used to make bread, cheese, butter and they were given this responsibility when they were

children in Bulgaria. While women reproduced the domestic tasks, men generally did not engage in any of them<sup>27</sup>. However, food production activities of women diminished after migrating to Turkey, since everything was readily available at the market. On the other hand, while most migrant women were satisfied with working conditions in Bulgaria, some immigrant women prefer working in private sector in Turkey because they think that people can get what their labor's cost is in private sector. The immigrant women used to work for the state when in Bulgaria, but this has changed in Turkey due to different political and economic regimes, and immigrant women started viewing private sector as an advantage since they did not experience it in Bulgaria.

Most of the immigrant women asserted that it was difficult for the Turkish minority to study at university due to discrimination. In addition, as a woman in the Bulgarian Turkish minority in Bulgaria, it might be even harder to study because of Islamic traditions and culture that mostly prevent education for women. For example, during the interview, one of them, Alev expressed that she would not have had a good job in Bulgaria, whereas in Turkey she attended the university and became a nurse:

I was working in a factory as a worker in Bulgaria; there was night shift and it was not easy, the wage they gave was not enough. After work, I used to help my mother in tobacco cultivation at home, and care for animals. It was difficult to go to university for us there”.

Another interviewee, Şükriye, similarly stated that Turkish women needed to study a lot if they wanted to get better jobs, because ethnic Bulgarians enjoyed priority in all segments of life. She wanted to study at university in Bulgaria but she could not; her mother said to her, “How would you consider studying while we think and worry about migrating?”. Thus Şükriye had to work after high school, as her mother prevented her from studying in university: “I used to give my wage to my mother. After work I was helping my mother in tobacco cultivation, normally.”

---

<sup>27</sup> Interviewee Alev said that “My older brother did not do anything at home, but I always used to work both at home and outside work”.

Coming with a couple of suitcases, suffering a lot at the border, and encountering difficulties in the settlement process in Turkey did not discourage women. Despite all the difficulties and the sufferings, all the women are happy in Turkey<sup>28</sup>. Immigrant women I interviewed with are satisfied with the conditions in Turkey. They are happy especially for children's education<sup>29</sup>. Although women stated that when they lived in communist regime, things were easy but now the system in Bulgaria has collapsed. On the other hand, some immigrant women considered that there was nothing to aspire about the communist system, because there was no democracy in Bulgaria.

Migrant women generally feel content with their current economic conditions. Most of them are now retired, and the rest of them –the younger generation- are still working. 13 of the immigrant women I interviewed with are retired. One of the most important advantages of migration for women was to be able to gain their retirement rights in Turkey, whereas in Bulgaria there is currently scarcity of employment opportunities.

Before the mass migration to Turkey, Bulgarian Turkish women were living especially in the rural parts of Bulgaria had multiple domestic chores such as child care, elderly care, tobacco cultivation and production at home; but after migration to Turkey, women's situation has changed since they had to take up paid work (Gheorghieva, 1998:22). As a result, they turned into more active as breadwinners. All immigrant women I interviewed with, without exception, are/were employed in Turkey. They stated that they “opened Turkey, set a good example for women in Turkey”, while Gheorghieva (1998:46) highlights that “even if it was not them who did this, the cultural nuance introduced by them in the existing variety seems encouraging, as well as stimulating the overall positive tendencies”. Immigrant women think they set a good example for women in Turkey in terms of paid-employment outside home. Thus Immigrant women's employment might have

---

<sup>28</sup>Within the same interview Alev said that; “Although the way the migration happened was too ugly –coming with 2 suitcases- I am very happy to have migrated to Turkey”.

<sup>29</sup> Gül, immigrated with two children, husband, and his family in 1989 said that; “If we could not come to Turkey, I would go to another country for my children's education”

encouraged women in their neighborhood in Turkey to be economically active and take up paid employment.

However, although the labor participation of the Bulgarian Turkish women in Bulgaria was not exclusively and not always based on a strict gender division of labor, in Turkey, their labor participation largely aligned with the prevailing gendered division of labor. Immigrant women have been mostly employed in children and elderly care work, domestic work, and nursery, which reproduce gender roles and gender norms in Turkey. However, as will be explained in the preceding sections being employed outside home in Turkey does not necessarily bring participation to public sphere along with for immigrant women.

#### **4.4 The Losses That Came with Migrant Status and Impact of Patriarchy**

In addition to the positive effects of the immigration from Bulgaria to Turkey, there were negative and damaging outcomes of the immigration, which influenced immigrant women's adaptation process to a new country and women's perception of citizenship. For women coming from the rural parts of Bulgaria, adaptation to big cities was naturally an important challenge. During this process, reactions coming from the local women were discouraging for immigrant women. Immigrant women's criticism of the social system in Turkey and of the local women indicate that the migration had mixed effects on the women's lives, which underlies immigrant women's perception of the new society.

In order to exemplify the negative aspects, immigrant women tried to illustrate their experiences in Turkey. Adaptation to a new country and culture, and leaving the past behind were very significant problems for immigrant women. For instance, during the interview, Esma told me that it was very difficult to adapt to big cities in Turkey, as she said, "Migrants mostly have repressed lives; the only thing they can be proud of is what they possess, but if you lack education and social life, it is not

worth anything”. She also claimed that they did not know any of their rights when they came to Turkey because nobody informed them. Esma had to quit her university in Bulgaria because of migration. When she came to Turkey in 1989, the government allowed her to enter the university entrance exam, but she was not aware of this. She stated that she did not know what ÖSYM (the official body responsible for organizing national university entrance examinations in Turkey) is. Furthermore, another woman, Fatma commented on the current situation in Bulgaria, claiming that there were similarities between Turkey and current Bulgaria: “There is no human rights or freedom left in Bulgaria, which is very similar to Turkey”. She stated that she would not choose to live in either country, as they currently share many negative features. She also claimed that lifestyle is different in Turkey, people are selfish, and they always compete with each other. Immigrant women seem to have experienced a culture shock when they came to Turkey, although they have the same ethnic kin and language. Another interviewee, Nimet also expressed her frustration; she did not consider herself economically self-sufficient in Turkey, because in Bulgaria they used to grow vegetables and fruits in their garden and they had animals which supplied them meat, milk, cheese, butter and yoghurt. Therefore, it is understandable that the market economy in Turkey, which relies on private ownership, was considered favorably by immigrant women, and their lives were changed significantly coming from a socialist system.

#### **4.4.1 Boundaries, Community Pressure and Stigmatization: Narratives of the Immigrant Women**

Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women have been exposed to marginalization and alienation in Turkey, initially because of their culture of work. Immigrant women argued that they encountered many criticisms about their work outside home, one of the interviewees, Fatma explained her experience in the following way:

Local people looked down upon us because immigrant women have been working outside; even women told us ‘how do you dare to work?’ They were very narrow-minded, but now local women

have begun working, after seeing it from us. There are very ignorant people in Turkey who cannot stand women's employment. Who can say anything if you want to work?

The neighbors criticized the husbands of immigrant women, regarding how they allow their wives to work. Dimitrova (1998:43) wrote that one of the big differences between the Bulgarian Turkish immigrants and the local people was "men's hegemonic role in the family". Patriarchal relations within the families in Turkish society affect all women, oppress them, and confine them into the private sphere. In the Turkish society, if women are employed in paid-work -which seems unnatural due to gender roles- they are seen as the contributors to the family as opposed to an equal or primary breadwinner. Women are mostly associated with domestic responsibilities, mothering and nursing. In Turkey the honor of immigrant women working out of home was also questioned and judged by the majority of society. Immigrant women felt that they were stigmatized as "women of loose morals" and were even criticized by neighbors with their style of hanging clothes outside (Zhelyazkova, 1998:11). The fact that the immigrant women came from a former communist country could lead people to think that these women have "loose morals", and are low skilled for domestic tasks. This creates oppression on immigrant women even if the critiques are not so open. Zhelyazkova (1998:11) asserts that although immigrant women first ignored this judgment from other women in Turkey, after a while, feelings of isolation and loneliness emerged because of the gender division in Turkey. Immigrant women are literally forced to adapt to the conventional definition of 'women' and gender roles in Turkey. Most of the interviewees claimed that women in Turkey were not 'sincere', never talk negatively about their husbands, and do not talk about their problems in a friendly way, which made the immigrant women communicate more with other immigrant women from Kosovo, Macedonia and Bosnia, and less with the local women (Zhelyazkova, 1998:11). Immigrant women considered themselves "European" and more socially developed<sup>30</sup> compared to people in Turkey because of the prevalent

---

<sup>30</sup> Author's interview with Esma: "We came from a more developed system, which was socialism."

gender inequality and conservatism in Turkey, which constrained women's relationships with men (Dimitrova, 1998:45).

The local people perceived the post-1990 immigrant women in a different way compared to the immigrant women who had come to Turkey before 1989. There were negative perceptions of the sexual conduct of these women (Dimitrova, 1998:38), targeted the immigrant women who came in 1990s, working as prostitutes in Turkey due to the negative economic conditions in Bulgaria. Although it is not the focus of this research, there are many Bulgarian Turkish women, both in Turkey and Bulgaria, who has worked or still working as prostitutes, at least for some time before they find another job and settle in Turkey. The issue of sex work also fed into the prevailing prejudices on all immigrant women in Turkey, regardless of the time that they migrated.

Apart from the discrimination and isolation women experienced in Bulgaria, they also felt alienated in Turkey due to prejudices coming from the Turkish society. For instance, Nimet complained during the interview, "Local people in Turkey envied us, they said, 'You Bulgarian gavurs! You eat only bread and onion and build houses! You steal our jobs, we get less wages because of you, you do all kinds of work!' but we are just deaf to these rumors". Also as Dimitrova (1998:44) contended, the immigrant women were stereotyped as "only know working, not know living" type of women who build houses even for their children. This led to feelings of alienation and isolation for women; when they expected to be welcomed by the Turkish society, they encountered many criticisms and negative comments. Another women, Şükriye told me in the interview that, "We have been isolated in Turkey too, because local people blamed us for working for smaller wages, is it a shame working for minimum wage?" Hafize<sup>31</sup> similarly expressed that people were staring at them while going to work in the bus because their heads were not covered. However, after a couple of years in Turkey, immigrant women got used to

---

<sup>31</sup> (From the interview with Hafize, who immigrated with two children, husband and husband's mother in 1990). After three years of immigrating to Turkey her husband died, Hafize has shouldered all responsibilities of her two children and her mother-in-law. She has been living with her mother-in-law in the same house.

hearing such rumors about themselves; they also thought that the local people were also accustomed to living with immigrants.

#### **4.4.2 Immigrant Women's Perception of Gender and Women in Turkey**

Immigrant women's views about women in Turkey provide significant insights regarding their perception of the gender relations and the nature of women's gendered experiences in both countries comparatively. I first asked the immigrant women how they considered the conditions of women in Turkey in general. In the first years of migration -1990s-, immigrant women noted that only a small fraction of local women worked outside in Turkey. Housewifery is widespread and one of the basic structures of the conservative family in Turkey. Although the woman is employed in a paid-work, she is the constant housewife of her house. This was one of the most surprising features of social life in Turkey for the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women<sup>32</sup>. As Ganimet explained during the interview, in her neighborhood women did not work, and she was very surprised when she saw them; but in her workplace, in the hospital she saw a lot of women working. Another woman, Şükriye suggested that women in Turkey started working outside more after seeing the immigrant women working. Most of the immigrant women stated in the interviews that there was no such thing as a 'housewife' in Bulgaria; every woman worked out of home. In her study, Dimitrova (1998:43) also quoted a Bulgarian Turkish immigrant woman: "In Turkey women do not go to work, they only peddle gossip around". In my study, immigrant women I interviewed also expressed their surprise of how local women were preoccupied with their appearances. However, immigrant women's life practices and their judgments of what is important are different. When they were in Bulgaria, women struggled with the ethnic discrimination; while in Turkey they tried to hold on to life after a traumatic migration experience, and get used to a new social structure. Moreover, women among my interviewees also claimed that they had good relationships with

---

<sup>32</sup> Author's interview with Alev: "When I first came to Turkey I was very surprised that women were not working but cracking seeds all day outside."

other women in Bulgaria<sup>33</sup>, but in Turkey immigrant women have trust issues with other women<sup>34</sup>. For example, Ganimet stated that there was solidarity between women in Bulgaria, a neighbor woman or a friend could look after their children when needed, but she expressed her belief that this is difficult in Turkey. Other interviewee, Şükriye also indicated that there is solidarity among immigrant women in Turkey, “I can consign my house to a trusted immigrant woman, but I would hesitate doing so with a local woman”.

On the issue of women’s employment, immigrant women I interviewed had a lot to say, because it is an essential issue for them. For instance, Nimet expressed during the interview, “We have heard it here that ‘women do not work’, women in Bulgaria have always worked in all conditions”. She also stated that she has seen more women working in Turkey recently, whereas in their first years in Turkey it was very rare. Immigrant women expressed that it was a shame for a woman to not work in Bulgaria, but in Turkey, women’s employment is perceived shameful on the contrary. Esmâ said that; “People in Turkey rumored about my studying secretary services, however, it is not something to be ashamed of.” Women’s working in Bulgaria was an ordinary and common case, as Gül put it:

The gavr do not think that women cannot work in Bulgaria, and 80% of women had economic independence in Bulgaria. Local women say that they become retired because we encouraged them to work, people in Turkey have learnt that women can work with honor (namus) too. It was obvious that we did not belong to Turkey in the first years of migration, because, for example, I wore a blue uniform that I brought from Bulgaria in a fig factory in Turkey, where I used to work and it revealed where we came from. I was working in fig factory as a seasonal worker; however, apart from the seasonal job, local women did not work elsewhere, but after seeing from us, now they are working. We broke the taboo of women’s working.

---

<sup>33</sup> From the interview with Gül: “When we were leaving for Turkey, one my Bulgarian neighbors prepared a package which included diapers, milk powder and clothes for my baby. She told me ‘Do not go, it will be difficult with children’, but we had no chance.”

<sup>34</sup> Esmâ put it as follows: “Women in Turkey undermine each other; there is no solidarity among women but only jealousy. I am afraid of women in Turkey because they do not like women with a character”.

Struggle of women against patriarchy, and violence against women in Turkey attract the attention of Bulgarian Turkish women. Some of the immigrant women expressed their thoughts about violence against women during the interviews, but most of them remained silent about the issue<sup>35 36</sup>. For instance, Fatma stated that:

There was solidarity among women in Bulgaria; young women used to live with older women –mother or mother-in-law- in the same house without problems. However, women and their work are worthless in Turkey; everyday a woman is murdered, and men see women as servants.

Immigrant women I interviewed argued that there was not such violence against women and children in Bulgaria, as it exists in Turkey. In addition, immigrant women asserted that there was no limitation to women in Bulgaria, whereas they cannot even go outside alone at nights in Turkey; they expressed that they do not feel safe in Turkey. Women expressed that it is very difficult to live in Turkey as a woman, because women are still oppressed, as Kamile put it,<sup>37</sup> “Women cannot express themselves, they are not seen equal to men; it is due to the system in Turkey.” Although there was no direct question about domestic violence in the interviews, one woman, Nefise asserted that her husband in Bulgaria was abusing her with violence. She stated that her husband was addicted to alcohol in Bulgaria, but in Turkey he quitted drinking; hence, she stated that the violence ended in Turkey.

Immigrant women commented on the dominant gender roles and relations in Turkey in relation to different realms in Turkey. Women expressed their thoughts about marriage and its relation to women’s emancipation, and women and men’s participation to public sphere, comparing the two countries, Turkey and Bulgaria. For instance, Esma argued that women’s freedom in Bulgaria depended on the fact that the state did not allow consanguineous marriages until fourth generation, but

---

<sup>35</sup> Nimet expressed; “Women protest violence against women in streets, but women do not have a value in Turkey. If a couple could not get along, they divorce, nobody murders women in Bulgaria.”

<sup>36</sup> Alev told me during the interview; “Only feminists protest against violence against women in Turkey, I do not see any other women saying a word”.

<sup>37</sup> Kamile immigrated to Turkey in 1990 with her two children and husband. She mentioned that they fled from the assimilation.

she stated that Turks do not marry until seventh generation in Bulgaria. Esma stated:

It is intrinsic to Balkans that people do not marry relatives, and people do not look at each other in a hostile manner. The level of social justice was very high in Bulgaria; the only marriage type was monogamy, and there was no rape or kidnapping. Women from Balkans usually do not marry second or third times because they have learnt not to be in need of men. There were no arranged marriages in Bulgaria; a woman can marry whomever she wants. There were no child marriages in Bulgaria, and although bride price existed before, it was decreasing over time. The biggest mistake in Turkey is preventing women from studying and trivializing them. Men can do anything to women in the name of religion in Turkey. Women are imprisoned at homes in Turkey. In Bulgaria people attached importance to women's education, but in Turkey people only look at what a girl has in her dowry. School diplomas are more important than dowry.

Men's limited engagement with private sphere and domestic works such as childcare attracted immigrant women's attention. For instance, Esma asserted that people rumor about a man if he takes his child to park, so she and her husband go to park together with their children in Turkey. In addition, women's limited visibility in public sphere in Turkey has also become an issue for some immigrant women. Immigrant women argued that there is more intervention to women in Turkey, and one of its reasons is Islam, as Alev put it:

There was no issue of 'turban' in Bulgaria, headscarf is a political issue in Turkey, I do not understand why people intervene if a woman wear headscarf or not. It was easier to be a woman in Bulgaria, because nobody would judge you with what you wear, and women were free to go outside at nights. It is closely related to the influence of Islam in the society, because women are freer wherever Muslims are a minority.

However, Gül expressed the same issue differently: "Although women were generally free in Bulgaria, we were not that free because we are Turkish and Muslims; I had boyfriends but I never forgot that I am a Turk, and I behaved accordingly". Although women's position seemed more independent in Bulgaria, Turkish minority women had to behave in accordance with the religious rules their ethnic affiliation prescribed.

Immigrant women were very interested in providing a better education for their children regardless of their gender, holding a belief in egalitarian opportunities for girls and boys. However, more recently discriminatory tendencies emerged due to the gender roles in Turkey. For instance, girls are preserved and not allowed to be independent like boys, which is an accepted attitude towards girls in Turkey.

Bulgarian Turkish migrant women do not only criticize women's level of employment in Turkey but also how local women behave. For instance, interviewee Esma stated that women in Turkey do not prepare food for winter, while migrant women have always prepared tomato paste, pickle, soup with dried yogurt, fried meat in summers. Esma asserted that "Migrant women always do preparation for winter, even they reside in apartments". Another woman, Fatma also made a similar point by stating that immigrant women were very determined and hardworking; they attach importance to the education of their children, and they can overcome any difficulty. It should be noted, however, that although immigrant women complained about the prevailing restrictive gender norms in Turkey, they could still criticize women in the Turkish society on the basis of gendered expectations. Hence, immigrant women seemed to associate women with the domestic sphere unconsciously, upholding the same gender role expectations.

#### **4.4.3 Implications of Diminished Social Welfare Policies for Immigrant Women**

When immigrant women were asked about the general differences and similarities of Bulgaria and Turkey, they all claimed that rather than similarities, there were substantial differences regarding social services of the states. In Bulgaria under the socialist regime, social services were provided for all citizens. In the interviews, the first issue raised by immigrant women was the importance of the childcare facilities

which were provided by the state in Bulgaria, as both the former communist state and the current state provided childcare for all women. Although with the transition to capitalism, there were restraints in the amount, the state has been continuing to provide childcare through kindergartens, and payments for children in Bulgaria. It was mentioned that the government used to pay money to the parents of children until they turn 18, and women who had five children were entitled to be retired. In addition, immigrant women expressed that opportunity of kindergartens for every child without discriminating ethnicity<sup>38</sup> was really helpful for women. Further, women underlined that health care, schools, social activities were free and all people could benefit from them in the former communist system. Some of the immigrant women interviewed also underlined that the level of education was higher in Bulgaria among people, compared to Turkey.

The communist legacy in Bulgaria had a discipline of work, organization and order that was infused in all spheres of life. Immigrant women pointed out the importance of the principle of social justice in Bulgaria, which, they said, was not the case in Turkey. For instance, most of the immigrant women interviewed pointed out that there was not a big gap between the minimum wage and salaries of the parliament members in Bulgaria<sup>39</sup>. In the socialist system in Bulgaria, there was no gap between rich and poor, as Fatma explained:

There were no beggars in Bulgaria in those times, everybody was working and everybody was middle-class. Children did not work as they do in Turkey, they used to only study in Bulgaria. I was happy with my job in Bulgaria, but nobody could anticipate what would happen in the socialist regime. On the other hand, everybody possessed a house and a car and people knew how to manage on; everyone enjoyed equal conditions in Bulgaria.

The importance of social justice appeared in the workplaces as well, as there were no quarrels in workplaces, people only did their jobs<sup>40</sup>. Immigrant women who cultivated tobacco in rural parts of Bulgaria could get half the price of the tobacco

---

<sup>38</sup> In my interview with Ganimet she put this in the following way: “There was no showing favor for someone in education in Bulgaria, as it is in Turkey”.

<sup>39</sup> Author’s interview with Nimet: “There was a balance in the communist system.”

<sup>40</sup> From the Author’s interview with Bahar.

after selling them to the state, which was an important social right as well. Another woman, Nimet also claimed that people were honest; there was no deception or robbery in Bulgaria. She told me that until 1984, they lived freely in Bulgaria, where everybody was independent. Another important issue raised by Esma is that they could get food from the workplace's kitchen for dinner in Bulgaria, so that women did not have to cook dinner at home at nights. This issue resembles the idea of communal kitchens, which seemed very important especially for women to get rid of cooking at home.

Thus, immigrant women suffered a lot from the absence of such social services in Turkey. Some women had to quit their jobs in order to look after their children, as there was nobody else to do it. Some of them sent their children to Bulgaria, so that their relatives can look after the children for some time. The interviewees also expressed their frustrations regarding this situation: Cemile told me that after working in a factory for five years in Turkey, she had to quit the job because there was nobody to look after her children and she never worked after that. She paid her retirement pensions, but she stated that, "We have economic difficulties; only my husband is working and we have a child who studies at university in another city". Another interviewee, Şükriye, who has been working in different sectors, is currently a cook in a gas station. She used to work as a domestic worker in the first year of migration, as well as a worker in a factory. She was a 'transnational mother' for some time; while she and her husband were working hard in the first years of migration, she sent back her son away to her mother and mother-in-law in Bulgaria for them to look after him for three years. This situation is commonly observed in young married women who came to Turkey in 1990s, leaving her parents in Bulgaria. As these women worked in a couple of jobs in Turkey, mostly without social insurance due to not obtaining citizenship yet, they had to send their children away to Bulgaria. Lack of social services, especially childcare, forced women to do follow such a path. Immigrant women work in Turkey at the risk of leaving their children or sending them away, which is a very difficult condition.

Immigrant women fled from an assimilation campaign while immigrating to Turkey; although they knew that the social and economic system is different in Turkey, women were not aware of the extent of this difference, and did not expect as much difference as they observed. The new social and economic system, combined with patriarchy in Turkey, resulted in negative conditions for immigrant women. Esma put it as follows:

We have come from a higher social system, namely socialism. I had many cultural and social opportunities in Bulgaria, where I also had two years of paid maternity leave. When I gave birth in Turkey, it was a total mess. My family and I suffered from poverty in the first years in Turkey; for the first time in my life I saw bedbugs in Turkey.

Although migrant women seem happy to live in Turkey, they had negative experiences due to inadequacy of social and economical conditions. For instance, Nimet told me that , “That is very good to have TV, dishwasher, washing machine, computer in our houses, but people have financial difficulties in Turkey, health care services are very problematic. We wait in queues for hours, bank interests are high, even bread is very expensive in Turkey”.

Migrant women were content with the working conditions in Bulgaria. Different narratives of immigrant women may give the big picture more clearly. For instance, one of my interviewees, Züleyha, explained that her workplace provided holiday cards, which covered half of the holiday expenses, and everybody could use day-offs by going to beach or thermal baths. However, Ganimet, who worked as a nurse in Bulgaria, mentioned that the medical tools were old in Bulgaria; for instance the needles used for injection were not disposable. Nevertheless, Ganimet told that she would still be satisfied with the working conditions in Bulgaria, if she had not been forced to migrate to a different country in the prime of her life. Women used to work mostly in tobacco cultivation, stockbreeding and agriculture in villages, and in textile and shoe factories in small towns and nearly in all sectors in cities in Bulgaria. As Nimet told, “We were cultivating tobacco and selling it to the state; we all worked for the state”. She used to work in a market that belonged to the state, and she asserts that she was happy with her working conditions. However, she also

stated that working conditions in Turkey were stressful, while she was working as floor waitress in a hospital. Esmâ also pointed out that 80% of women were working in agriculture, specifically in tobacco cultivation, in rural parts of Bulgaria, while women in cities were seen in every sector such as textile, health, and service; the only sector where women were not seen was coal mining. Moreover, another interviewee explained that they had a work discipline that they brought from the communist regime; she said, “People in Turkey do not respect working hours, we have that discipline”. Migrant women paid some money to count their working years in Bulgaria towards their retirement in Turkey. Interviewee Sevda said that she paid 12.000 Turkish liras to count her four and a half years of working in Bulgaria towards her retirement. However, not all of the women were lucky enough to have their working years in Bulgaria counted; most of them could not get their rights from Bulgaria.

#### **4.4.4 Public Participation and the Changing Gender Norms of the Family Life**

There is a strong connection between participation in the public sphere and gendered citizenship, because positioning of immigrant women in public sphere in Turkey directly influences their citizenship. Although public participation of the immigrant women is examined throughout the thesis, it is necessary to provide further specific examples. Participation in the public sphere manifests itself largely as participation in the paid employment for the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women. However, this has proved to be a difficult task for immigrant women in Turkey due to the way they were viewed by the locals. In particular, Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women were subject to prejudices about working women. This reflected the prevailing dominance of the male breadwinner idea in the Turkish society. One of the interviewees, Esmâ explained, “Local people asked our men if they cannot feed the women, and asked why they send the women to work”. She went on to explain, “People treated us as if we were prostitutes because we have been working. When we gave birth, they told us to look after children at home”. In

addition, Esma claimed that people in Turkey perceived every migrant woman who comes from Bulgaria, Russia or other Balkan countries as prostitutes:

Men in Turkey think that we are -migrant women- available for everything; because we come from a socialist country, they think we are common goods. Men in workplaces first test the waters to see if we are available for everything. A man came to me and said: 'I wish my wife were like you!' I would understand if men appreciated immigrant women for their determination at work, but they approach differently.

When immigrant women were asked whether living in Turkey was easy for them regarding their public participation in the city, they provided different answers. For example, Ganimet told that it was good for a woman to live especially in Izmir, as she could use public buses while going to night shifts. Nimet also made a similar point: "Being a woman in Bulgaria was easier compared to Turkey, because women could walk in the streets at nights without any fear, but in Turkey there are always rumors and gossips about women". Fatma stated that it was always difficult to be a woman wherever you were, and she added, "It was easier to be a woman in Bulgaria, I was coming from night shift late at night and nobody used to say anything".

Migrant women all explained that they had economic independence in Bulgaria. For instance, interviewee Fatma stated that it was very important to have economic freedom both for women and men. However, Gül stated, "My mother told me 'when you are married, freedom is over, you should give your wage to your husband', but my husband did not take my money in Bulgaria, we were living with old family members, neither of them took my money". Immigrant women mostly knew that they had economic independence in Bulgaria, although when they married, it seemed to have decreased. However, in Turkey, women do not seem to declare their economic independence; they only see themselves as contributors of the family budget. It is contentious whether women become the real breadwinners without getting rid of the domestic responsibilities in Turkey, or women's labor is reshaped as visible and valuable. Immigrant women seem to be one of the contributors of the family in order to build houses, but women's domestic labor

remained invisible; hence, there is no clear emancipation regarding immigrant women's labor. Although immigrant women work both at home and outside work to provide for their families, they are not property-owning women.

Immigrant women used to live with elderly family members, most of the time with the parents of the husbands, in-laws, which impeded the women to have a voice in the family in Bulgaria. Most of the women assumed the "bride" role inside the family, to which Islamic gender traditions attached a lot of responsibilities. Although women worked outside home, they had tobacco work at home, and most of the domestic tasks were waiting for the 'brides' of the extended families. Immigrant women largely abandoned living with elder family members in Turkey. However, after migration, most immigrant families adopted the pattern where the family owns a multiple-story house, and a nuclear family -each belonging to the same extended family- lived in each floor. Despite in different units, immigrant families continued to live together in the same building, hence, the family structure has preserved its importance for them.

In terms of social life, which can be an indicator of political involvement to public space for women, Bulgarian Turkish women remember that they used to sometimes go to cinema and theatre, and frequently read the newspaper *Novjivod*, -although it was the state's newspaper- in Bulgaria. Ganimet asserted that she read newspaper very frequently and was very interested in politics in Turkey, as she stressed that there was one party in Bulgaria, and hence people were not interested in politics. Most of the immigrant women declared that they were more social when they were living in Bulgaria, due to the state-provided cultural activities. Fatma explained that she used to go to cinema, theatre, opera, ballet and Russian circus in Bulgaria every weekend. Another woman, Gül asserted that she was a very social person in Bulgaria; she used to go out with friends everyday after work: "When I came home immediately after work, my mom used to ask if I was ill." However, in Turkey women expressed that they do not have enough time to do such activities. For instance, interviewee Nimet said that she reads newspaper, but does not go to

cinema or theatre; mostly she was watching TV at home, if she had time after work. Immigrant women's involvement in public sphere through social activities seems to have reduced in Turkey, because they had double-shift at home and outside work. Also, these activities cost for immigrant women who try to save money for building house, and for education of children.

Immigrant women also developed new patterns of domestic tasks in the private sphere. Many of their habits in the private sphere changed in Turkey. For instance, Nimet explained that after coming to Turkey, they were made to cook many different dishes for meals although they used to cook a limited number of meals in Bulgaria. She reflected that they did not have any time to cook at home, because in addition to the waged work outside, women did tobacco cultivation at home to support and help other women in the family. Nimet similarly explained, "We had every fruit and vegetable in our garden, there was no need for shopping outside; after 1989, we bought sugar, flour and oil with coupon in Bulgaria. However, in Turkey we have seen a large variety of products", which caused them to learn different domestic tasks, such as cooking different meals, and using different tools for cleaning. Immigrant women also expressed that in Bulgaria, they were not accustomed to doing certain domestic tasks. For instance, Nimet asserted that they did not iron clothes or clean windows in Bulgaria, these are tasks they had learnt in Turkey. Although immigrant women felt uncomfortable with those tasks at first, they have adapted to do them. Immigrant women have consequently changed their domestic habits in accordance with the gender norms in Turkey, because of criticisms coming from the local people. In order to be accepted in a society, one of the most important tasks to do is adapting to gender norms of a country, which these immigrant women have accepted without any challenge.

Immigrant women also claimed that men (husbands) usually help with the domestic tasks, as from the communist system, they adopted the principle that life should be shared with a partner, although it was always women who took all responsibilities of the private sphere. Ganimet pointed out that there were no banking issues in

Bulgaria, but tasks that belong to the outside were mostly taken care of by her husband, while in Turkey she took on all tasks inside and outside home. She adds, “Whoever came home first did the domestic tasks, but mostly women used to clean animals, put wood to the stove, cook, and wash clothes at home”. If there was a need for going to other towns or cities for shopping in Bulgaria, men handled it mostly. Some immigrant couples seemed to be more egalitarian due to specific reasons. For instance, Şükriye migrated only with her husband without any other family members; this resulted in her husband to be more egalitarian in the domestic tasks. She stated that her husband does domestic work in Turkey and adds, “He told me that we do not have anyone but each other in this country”. While Fatma mentioned that she and her husband shared domestic tasks both in Bulgaria and in Turkey, another interviewee Esma indicated that in Bulgaria she and her husband were sharing domestic tasks, but in Turkey she has been handling all things. Esma stated, “Our men have become like Arabs in Turkey, they are condemned by local people if they are seen doing domestic tasks. Men in Turkey call our husbands ‘henpecked husbands’, it is ridiculous”. Immigrant men also seem to have adapted to the gender roles in Turkey, which prescribed that they did not do domestic work. Hence, it is difficult to generalize that immigrant men adopted more participatory roles in the household to bring about equality in terms of sharing the household tasks.

## **CHAPTER 5**

### **THE BULGARIAN TURKISH IMMIGRANT WOMEN AND THEIR PARTIAL CITIZENSHIP**

As noted in the preceding chapters, the subject matter of this thesis study stemmed from my own familiarity with the lives of the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women in Turkey, especially with those living in İzmir. I was born into a family with the same immigration experience from Bulgaria in 1977, and as a second-generation Bulgarian Turkish woman, my relationship with the immigrant women in İzmir (Bornova, Bayrakli) has always prompted me to reflect on their experiences as they left the lands where they were treated as second-class citizens as an ethnic minority and as ethnic kin immigrants in homeland Turkey, where they went through a distinct experience of citizenship in a highly patriarchal society. In İzmir I was thoroughly immersed into the community of the Bulgarian Turkish immigrants since all my relatives were also immigrants. For the purposes of this study, which is informed by the insights from the feminist critiques into male-stream citizenship approaches in the literature, my close personal relationship with them provided a background to design and carry out a small-scale interview survey to tap into those factors which turned the migration experience into a gendered process with significant implications for the practice of their citizenship rights in Turkey. Through this personal familiarity, I could then interpret and complete the subjective responses of the women whom I interviewed with, by tying their personal narratives to the broader picture of the migration process and by integrating the subjective knowledge I gained by my own experiences among them.

By virtue of the fact that the Bulgarian Turkish immigrants who fled to Turkey in 1989 were granted full Turkish citizenship, they enjoyed equal legal rights with Turkish citizens. Moreover, in the eyes of the Turkish society, these immigrants had many advantages. They were not outsiders; on the contrary they were welcomed by the Turkish government, and their settlement and employment were facilitated. They are “soydaş” ethnic kins, who were provided refuge from the oppressive regime in Bulgaria at the time. However, the general assumption was that they did not suffer from any difficulties, and they were adapted to the Turkish society smoothly. The Turkish government provided housing and jobs for some immigrants; however, immigrant women’s conditions were never made into an issue; their needs were ignored. As the feminist analysis has demonstrated, citizenship rights, which are bestowed upon a community, do not comprise all members of the community in terms of the practice of citizenship, and do not necessarily pursue gender equality on the basis of women’s difference. Especially, women’s special needs in a community are highly prone to be neglected. As such, women’s citizenship remains a multilayered construct that is determined by the “ethnic, local, religious, diasporic and other communities” women belong to (Yuval-Davis & Werbner, 1999). After migration, immigrant women’s adaptation problems remained invisible, and their citizenship has been constructed based on the intersection of structural inequalities that resulted from their statuses as ‘migrant’ and ‘minority’, as well as the gendered inequality that resulted from their status as ‘woman’.

Gender-pluralist citizenship accounts hold that women and men have multiple identities in multiple communities (Abraham et al., 2010). Gender-pluralist interpretation of citizenship fully acknowledges the diverse and evolving identities women hold, and makes the social divisions among them, such as race, gender, and class, more apparent and visible compared to other approaches (Lister, 1997). Without falling into the trap of multiculturalism, which gives specific differentiated rights only to one community, the concept of gender-pluralist citizenship seems relevant for explaining the condition of the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women.

While women and men immigrated together to Turkey, they have been under the influence of inequalities stemming from distinct identities crystallized in the host country during the process of adapting to the Turkish society. In particular, most of the immigrant men assumed a more dominant role in Turkey in accordance with the hegemonic model of masculine identity in the public and private sphere. The reflection of this process can be seen in the daily practices and the gender division of women among the Bulgarian immigrant families. Men were engaged with the tasks that belong to the public sphere by going to shopping and paying the bills; while immigrant women shoulder all the domestic responsibilities and household chores including child-care, elderly-care, cooking, and cleaning. One can then contend that immigrant women seem to have lost their relative autonomy, which they previously enjoyed in Bulgaria after migration, because they became more confined to the private sphere in Turkey. Immigrant women have lost their visibility in the public sphere in Turkey, while men continued to be active in the public domain. Consequently, immigrant women are subordinated both in home by the husbands, and in public sphere by the political institutions of the patriarchy that exist in Turkey. However, while immigrant women have different needs compared to the immigrant men, such as childcare services, at least in the first stages of migration, they also have different needs from those of the local women. Immigrant women have experienced different forms of discrimination and oppression compared to a woman who is the member of the local community. Child-care, elderly-care, education of children, finding employment, having a voice in the public sphere are rights all women should have access to; however, they become much more significant for the immigrant women trying to adapt to a new country.

The community in which women live in determines certain gender roles for both women and men. In addition to the ethnic discrimination against the Turkish community in Bulgaria, Turkish women had specific problems in the Bulgarian society. Although the communist rule prescribed equal gender relations, Turkish women were not as free as the Bulgarian women due to the Islamic traditions their community lived by. Nevertheless, the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women felt

relatively freer in Bulgaria than in Turkey. Although, to a certain extent they feel nostalgia for their communist past in Bulgaria, women have learnt how to adapt to the new society. As I observed from the immigrant women's narratives, the feeling of in-between for the immigrant women still exists.

Positioning and dispositioning of immigrant women in public and private spheres in Turkey directly affect their citizenship rights. Turner (1990:204) defines citizen as "any individual who had left the family context in order to enter the public arena". However, this definition may not include immigrant women as their citizenship is engendered in relation to many structural determinants. For instance, although women stepped out of home to participate in the public sphere by taking up paid-employment, they are not fully represented in public sphere due to the conventional gender roles upheld by the patriarchy embedded in the Turkish society. Obviously, the notion of citizenship as practice implies that those who cannot participate in the public arena cannot effectively claim full citizenship.

Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women's participation in public sphere remained limited in Turkey compared to Bulgaria. In fact, as the research done for this thesis study demonstrated, immigrant women have been stuck visibly in private sphere in Turkey. Many immigrant women had to quit their jobs later to take care of their children, since there is not sufficient and financially accessible state-provided child-care service in Turkey, unlike the case in Bulgaria. This resulted in several years uncounted towards women's retirement insurance; in addition, some immigrant women could not go back to work. Most of the immigrant women I interviewed with emphasized that they could not go out freely at nights in Turkey, which implies a limited presence in the urban space, *i.e.*, their mobility in their towns were severely constrained. Hence, immigrant women largely lost their visibility in public sphere in Turkey. Moreover, immigrant women had to change some of their domestic habits in Turkey because of the social oppression coming from the local women. As a result, most immigrant women have also retreated to the private sphere. For instance, in the interviews, immigrant women complained that it did not

matter how clean their house was in Bulgaria, because neither anybody paid any attention, nor there was time for it. There were other responsibilities at paid-work outside and at tobacco cultivation. However, in Turkey the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women were constantly criticized regarding their house-cleaning habits (cleaning the windows, for example). Immigrant women resentfully stated that the domestic chores were considered of utmost importance in Turkey by both men and women. Therefore, more traditional and religious gender norms are reconstructed for the immigrant women in Turkey, and they have learnt how to behave accordingly. Immigrant women have been changing their habits and adapting to the new gender roles both in public and private spheres in Turkey, assuming that they can fit into society by doing so.

Most of the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women are employed in paid-works in Turkey. Labor participation of the Bulgarian Turkish women in Bulgaria was not exclusively and not always based on a strict gender division of labor; however, in Turkey, their labor participation largely aligned with the prevailing gendered division of labor. In Turkey, immigrant women are mostly employed in children and elderly care work, domestic work, and nursery, which reproduce gender roles. Although most of the immigrant women were employed outside home in Turkey, it should not be overlooked that working outside may not bring participation to public sphere along with. All immigrant women I interviewed with explain that they work hard, and build their own houses in Turkey, and they are proud of it. Nevertheless, to what extent working hard, making money and building houses contribute to the immigrant women's construction of active citizenship in terms of enjoying equal legal rights with men remains an important question. Immigrant women considered themselves as contributors to the family budget to build their own house, however, although immigrant women emphasized their hardworking character, they are not property-owning women. This is a reflection of the fact that women's invisible unpaid work and care work in the domestic sphere remains unrecognized and unnoticed. Lister (1990) argues that double-shift and care work of women were the main problems interfering with women's full citizenship. Moreover, "failure to

formally recognize the value of domestic work is itself a denial of citizenship” (Bosniak, 2009:131). When it comes to immigrant women, this issue gains a critical significance since adapting to a new country itself has proved to be a triple-burden on women’s shoulders from their gender identity, migrant status and exploited laborer at home and in the employment market. Simon and Brettell (1986 cited in Kadioğlu, 1997:539) asserted that immigrant women have been discriminated concomitantly by the patriarchy in family and labor market, and by being a member of a marginalized ethnic or racial group. This was also largely the case for the immigrant women whom I interviewed with in İzmir.

Most of the immigrant women I interviewed with used to live in the rural parts of Bulgaria, where the Turkish community mostly lived. In Turkey, immigrant women were settled in the urban areas, towns and cities, mostly located in the economically relatively more developed parts of the country. Hence, women’s immigration also had another dimension; that of rural-to-urban migration. Although rural-to-urban migration is not a different category and not the focus of this work, it seems to be an important factor of change in women’s social lives. Immigrant women may think they moved up a social ladder, both as an ethnic community, and economically. Immigrant women are satisfied because they live in a country where their ethnicity is majority, and because they live in big cities that provide many social and economic opportunities for them. In fact, back in Bulgaria, these women were fed up with the tobacco cultivation in villages; hence immigration to urban cities relieved them from the burden of tobacco cultivation work. Although rural-to-urban migration is supposed to bring opportunities regarding the ‘right to the city’ (Harvey, 2008) of women, immigrant women felt rather imprisoned in the private sphere due to endless cycle of domestic work and care work, which are not provided by the state, and consequently they also have lost their autonomous voice in the public domain.

Immigrant women’s citizenship in Turkey also required women’s adaptation to flexible-overtime working hours, precarious conditions at work, and the lack of

social security and retirement loans. This and all other circumstances regarding gendered work patterns in the private and public sphere effectively excluded immigrant women from equal and full citizenship. It seems like an illusion that the immigrant women consider Turkey as a country with full of opportunities, where private sector dominates the economy; the opportunities immigrant women highlight do not provide full and equal citizenship for women. For instance, making money, talking one's mother tongue, or affording any goods does not mean that women could fully practice gender-neutral citizenship. Although most of them claimed that it was worth migrating to Turkey because they could now speak their language in Turkey and have achieved significant economic opportunities they never had in Bulgaria, these benefits came with the cost of increased gender inequality. Immigrant women sometimes seemed to underrate gender discrimination they faced with in Turkey, because the issue of gender discrimination falls behind the issue of ethnic discrimination they experienced in Bulgaria. This can explain why immigrant women express satisfaction about having been settled in Turkey, without challenging or even realizing the exclusion they have been encountered as women and immigrants. They tend to assume that they are not discriminated against in Turkey because they are "soydaş"; however, they have been still subjected to discrimination as women.

On the other hand, most of the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women are aware that the patriarchal gender relations and the gender order in different realms of social life compromises their citizenship. The interviews made it clear that immigrant women are very critical of the honor killings and the violence against women in Turkey. In their first years in Turkey, immigrant women were subject to control over sexual conduct and faced prejudices, which made them realize that "men in Turkey believe they have a right to snipe at every woman", and "men assume that women coming from the communist system are open to immoral things". Immigrant women state that there was no such violence against women in Bulgaria, although some Turkish women experienced harassment based on ethnic

discrimination<sup>41</sup>. The Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women sometimes “do tend to idealize the communist commitment to gender equality in Bulgaria and to stereotype gender equality in Turkey” (Parla, 2009:763). Despite their recognition of the fact that the prevailing social conservatism in Turkey was a major obstacle in achieving gender equality, immigrant women did not fully question it; they rather acknowledged it in order to gain acceptance in the Turkish society as fellow citizens, without considering that they, too, can be victims of male violence in Turkey.

Immigrant women do not harbor political expectations; they seem to be content with what they possess in Turkey. Women assert that being retired and education of their children are the only expectations they have from life<sup>42</sup>. Immigrant women were aware that they were overwhelmed with tobacco cultivation, endless reproduction of domestic works at home and stockbreeding in Bulgaria since they were children, on top of the discrimination and migration they experienced, and women’s work has not ended in Turkey. After settling in Turkey, they kept working both in the household and outside, and tried to be a part of the society. Most of them claimed that they feel much older than they are. Immigrant women were of the opinion that women in Turkey lived comfortably, as they did not experience the difficult experiences immigrant women went through. When I asked them whether they could obtain assistance from friends and relatives when they had any problems, most of them stated that they refused to get help from others, as women felt themselves strong enough, and the idea of getting help from someone else made them feel weak. Some migrant women I interviewed with proudly stated, “We have made everything by ourselves through working; we work and succeed”.

It is important to note at this point that Bulgarian Turkish women have a specific culture of work that they inherited from their communist past. As the interviews

---

<sup>41</sup> Interviewee Ganimet witnessed that the Bulgarian state officers harassed Turkish women when they came to Turkish villages for name-changes.

<sup>42</sup> Author’s interview with Ganimet, a retired nurse: “I only expect a healthy and beautiful retirement, and happiness of my grandchildren, nothing more”.

also suggested, working is life for them; they identify themselves through their working. Hence, they believe that if a person works, s/he can succeed everything and deserve citizenship. According to immigrant women, being a good worker is a prerequisite of being a good citizen. Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women stated during the interviews that they “set a good example for women in Turkey”; as Gheorghieva (1998:46) asserted, “even if it was not them who did this, the cultural nuance introduced by them in the existing variety seems encouraging, as well as stimulating the overall positive tendencies”. Although immigrant women set an inspiring example for local women in Turkey in terms of working, being employed is not sufficient by itself to be a citizen, because working does not necessarily provide women full participation to the public sphere, and does not guarantee their emancipation in the private sphere.

Paid employment is an ordinary task for both women and men among Bulgarian Turks because of the socialist system they were accustomed to live in. Hence, immigrant women continued to be employed after immigration to Turkey as well. As Gheorghieva (1998) demonstrated in her previous research on the Bulgarian Turks, Bulgarian Turkish women declared themselves to be ‘better’ and ‘more coveted’ workers, which made them believe that local people did not like the immigrant women. Bulgarian Turkish women interviewed for this study believed that it is very important for women to work in order to provide economic stabilization of the immigrant family, but they also claimed that especially Turkish women opposed to their employment as they are rarely accustomed to working (Gheorghieva, 1998:20). Zhelyazkova (1998:11) pointed out that the Bulgarian Turkish women had an equal role in the family, as they are “emancipated and educated” with certain qualifications as good as their partners. However, most women in Turkey were adhered to their husbands’ guardianship, unlike the women from Bulgaria. Zhelyazkova (1998:11) indicated, regarding the women from Bulgaria, that the woman “manfully stands side-by-side with her husband to take part in the struggle for family well-being and for securing good prospects for the

offspring”. Although the word “manfully” sounds biased, the scholar tries to indicate how powerful the role of women in Bulgaria was.

Identities become multiple, fluid, and multinational after migration, as people’s relationship with people and places are reshaped by the construction a new home and a carving a route for a new citizenship (Pettman, 1999). However, people who experienced discrimination try to consolidate their identity perception, to attach themselves somewhere. Immigrant women’s emphasis on Turkishness, and speaking Turkish are therefore powerful in terms of identifying themselves. In Bulgaria, they were forbidden to speak Turkish, and their narratives reveal that it was very difficult not to speak their own language. In a country where people largely speak Turkish, Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women feel that they are not excluded, or no longer discriminated. Speaking one’s mother tongue is important, but its significance becomes more emphasized for people who faced discrimination because of their ethnicity and language. Immigrant women feel that they are citizens of Turkey because they speak Turkish and they can practice their religion freely in Turkey, which indicates a sense of belonging to the Turkish majority in the country.

Another important and perhaps contradictory point to be underlined in this analysis relates, however, to the fact that feeling to be part of the majority in a society was sometimes accompanied with discriminatory attitudes or attitudes against other minority people. Because Bulgarian Turkish women were not exposed to ethnic or religious discrimination in Turkey, immigrant women considered Turkey as a tolerant country. However, although they faced with ethnic discrimination in Bulgaria, immigrant women sometimes held discriminatory attitudes to the different ethnic groups in Turkey. For instance, the widespread discrimination against Kurds, Alevi, and Roma people in Turkey was reflected in the immigrant women’s attitude in the issue of marriage with these ethnic groups. To prove that the Bulgarian Turkish immigrants were from the majority group -Turks- and to adapt to the cultural codes of Turkey seem to be the reasons why the immigrant women

make this kind of discrimination against Kurdish, Alevi and Roma people. Immigrant women might have learned to discriminate against some groups based on their ethnicity, without considering the gendered discrimination they are faced with in Turkey. If immigrant women had been more aware of the gendered exclusion they were exposed to, they may have been more empathetic with people facing other types of discrimination, as well. Further, the immigrant women may have felt that discriminating against minorities was a prerequisite to being a 'proper' Turkish citizen, as it was an attitude adopted by the majority in Turkey.

Within the dominant patriarchal construction of citizenship in Turkey, women in Turkey have been obliged to be citizens without having been recognized as autonomous individuals vis-à-vis the collectivity, and have contributed to the construction of a national identity (Kadioğlu, 2008b:80). In a similar vein, the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women have also become full legal citizens of Turkey, without being emancipated individuals. Because these immigrant women have Turkish ethnic kin, they have been treated as if they are the same with the local women in Turkey. However, Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women have experienced a forceful migration process, expulsion, and discrimination, and these women have tried to constitute a new identity in Turkey. Furthermore, the Turkish women in Bulgaria did not have equal citizenship with the Bulgarian women; for instance, while abortion was illegal for Bulgarian women, it was allowed for Turkish women due to eugenic politics of the nation-state in Bulgaria. Nonetheless, there are expectations in Turkey from society and the state about the appropriate behaviors from the male and female citizens, as Turkish citizens are educated by the state regarding how to behave and how to dress, and which language to speak (Kadioğlu, 2008a:28). Immigrant women accepted the legal identity and internalized the gender identity imposed by the state in Turkey, rather than challenging it. The statement by Sirman (2002:234) clearly summarizes the case of the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women: "National femininity and masculinity are not identities imposed externally; rather, they are subjectivities assumed by the

people themselves, driven by the desire to possess the authority offered by the identity”.

Whether the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women attained emancipation or empowerment in Turkey is an important investigation, but this is a too broad and separate question to deal with. Although Abadan-Unat's (1977) work on Turkish immigrant women workers employed abroad was one of the early pieces of research, her criteria on emancipation of immigrant women are still relevant. Abadan-Unat (1977) claimed that factors such as the “decline of extended family relations, adoption of nuclear family role patterns, fragmentation of family structure, entrance into a wage earning production process, decline of religious practices, increasing belief in egalitarian opportunities of girls and boys in terms of education and adoption of consumption oriented behavior and norms”, might have been indicators of the extent of emancipation among immigrant women from patriarchal constraints. Hence, it is worth exploring the status of the immigrant women in terms of these criteria. The relationship between immigrant women's emancipation and citizenship is strong because the more women get emancipated, the more they become full citizens. This thesis tried to come up with at least a partial answer to this question, or to put more correctly, looked at the relative significance of both the constraints and the opportunities a group of selected Bulgarian Turkish women have been facing over the past three decades due to the migration process. Immigrant women abandoned the extended family relations by living as a nuclear family in Turkey, unlike the case in Bulgaria. Living with the elderly impeded the women to have a voice in the family in Bulgaria, as most of the women used to live with the parents of the husbands. Most women assumed the “bride” role inside the family, to which Islamic gender complementarity and traditions attach a lot of responsibilities vis-à-vis the elderly in the family, namely the in-laws. Although women worked outside home, they had tobacco work at home, and most of the domestic chores were waiting for the ‘brides’ of the extended families, especially in the rural parts of Bulgaria. Although most of the Turks lived in rural parts of Bulgaria, some women who lived in bigger cities had nuclear

families, and did not have tobacco work after paid-employment outside. In Turkey, immigrant women largely abandoned living with elder family members in the same house. However, after migration, most immigrant families adopted the pattern where the family owns a multiple-story house, and a nuclear family -each belonging to the same extended family- lives in each floor. Hence, despite in different units, immigrant families continued to live together in the same building. However, any clues for emancipation of immigrant women from patriarchal traditions due to the decline of extended family was not fully inferred in this research; on the contrary, the family structure has preserved its importance for them.

Having paid employment and earning a wage in Turkey cannot be determinants of the emancipation for the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women, either; they used to work in Bulgaria, as well. However, while immigrant women were employed in a variety of sectors in Bulgaria, women's work has been reshaped in a more gendered way in Turkey. Immigrant women worked in some sectors in Turkey that they never did in Bulgaria. They were engaged more with child-care, elderly-care and domestic service sector in private houses of local women in Turkey. Hence, these women's employment status has not changed substantially; instead the sectors that they are employed in changed in Turkey, but this did not necessarily emancipate women,. Rather changing employment patterns seems to have placed new gender constraints on women's shoulders. This attests to the significance of the public patriarchy for the lives of the immigrant women. As Walby (1990:176) puts it, women are increasingly subordinated and oppressed in public patriarchy, which exists mostly in the labor market, since there has been a transition to private patriarchy to public patriarchy. Although private patriarchy still exists in households, women are subordinated by the structures outside of the household too, due to public patriarchy embedded in labor market (Walby, 1990:177-178). Hence, in the globalized world, subordination and exploitation of immigrant women are because of the public patriarchy in addition to the private one.

Rather than a decline, a rise of religious practices is clearly observed in Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women. Due to the prohibition of religious activities in Bulgaria, immigrant women could not practice their religion freely in Bulgaria. Although they were clearly aware that they have Islamic identity, most Bulgarian Turks did not actively practice their religion in Bulgaria. However, immigrant women's awareness for Islam was raised in Turkey due to the general interest for religion in Turkey. Immigrant women became interested in learning to read Quran with Arabic letters. Immigrant women are more interested in performing prayer compared to immigrant men. Therefore, Abadan-Unat's (1977) criterion of decline of religious practices does not hold true in the case of the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women, as on the contrary, a rise in the religious practices is observed among them. To be able to practice one's own religion in a country, namely Turkey, is perceived as a requirement of, and equalized with being a full citizen. Immigrant women strive to be part of the majority in Turkey in an effort to "obtain" full citizenship, and practicing religion an important component of this effort. The immigrant women may feel that if they do not practice their religion enough, they would be excluded by the society. Raising awareness for religious practices among immigrant women requires surrendering to the patriarchy in a country like Turkey, where women's place is largely determined by the religious norms. As immigrant women expressed during the interviews, more religiosity brings more subordination to women.

As explained in the preceding chapter, immigrant women, on the whole, were quite content with the material opportunities they obtained in Turkey, as they can buy anything they like so long as they can afford in Turkey. In Bulgaria, because of the communist system, women experienced a blockade and scarcity of goods; hence, they see Turkey as a 'country of opportunities'. The capitalist system and the consumption society allowed them to buy many goods and services, and women benefit from them. However, Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women tend to save rather than spend, due to the culture they brought from Bulgaria; hence, it is difficult to argue that they have adopted consumption-oriented behavior. It is also difficult to argue whether women would be emancipated had they adopted

consumption-oriented behavior; however, if immigrant women consider themselves capable of buying anything they like freely, as they have paid-work like the other members of the family, they might feel that they are economically independent, without being adhered to somebody. Nevertheless, immigrant women prioritize their families' needs, which consist of, for example, building a house and saving money for children's education.

Most of the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women studied in this research hold a strong belief in egalitarian opportunities for boys and girls. Women are very interested in providing a better education for their children, regardless of their gender. Displaying a preference for boys in this respect is very rarely observed among Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women. However, so long as immigrant women adapt to the conventional gender roles in the Turkish society, their overall behavior to girls and boys tend to be different. Girls are largely protected and warned against 'inappropriate' behavior, unlike boys. Nevertheless, it is difficult to argue that there has been emancipation of immigrant women in Turkey solely due to their belief in egalitarian opportunities for boys and girls, due to women's understanding of the gender roles in Turkey.

## **CHAPTER 6**

### **CONCLUSION**

This thesis aimed at analyzing gendered citizenship of the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women by taking into account their experiences, thoughts, feelings, and subjectivities, as opposed to the classical notion of citizenship. Citizenship, as a concept denoting equal legal rights for the members of the polity, has always excluded women since its historical practices in Greek and Roman communities. The development of the capitalist market and the idea of liberalism brought a new approach to citizenship, by highlighting equal citizenship for all. However, citizenship as practice has remained unachieved and differences based on gender, ethnicity and class were ignored (Yuval-Davis, 1997). “The question of ‘who are the citizens?’ has been transformed to the question ‘who is the citizen?’ by the production of subjectivity”-which corresponds to the importance of the needs of an individual citizen, and “the answer is that the citizen is who enjoys her/his all ‘natural’ rights, who realizes individual oneself, and who is free because s/he is equal to other persons; the citizen is subject, the citizen is always a hypothetical subject” (Balibar, 1991 cited in Donald, 2008:152). Throughout the evolution of citizenship, women, lower classes, homosexuals and ethnic minorities have been denied from full citizenship. Hence, “access to citizenship is a highly gendered and ethnically structured process” (Walby, 1994:391).

As Walby (1994) indicates, “gender matters to citizenship” because women are excluded from citizenship. Women need different citizenship rights that directly address their specific needs. While citizenship given to a specific community does

not comprise all members of the community, it does not necessarily pursue gender equality either. The concept of citizenship, which is a multi-layered construct by itself, consists of diverse structures when it comes to the citizenship of immigrant women. The citizenship of Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women has been constructed on the basis of the intersection of structural inequalities entailed by being 'migrant' and 'minority', in addition to the structural inequality that gender entails. The citizenship conceptualized in this thesis is not about legal citizenship that provides an identity card and many rights to those who belongs to a state; rather the thesis questions and scrutinizes how immigrant women, as subjects, are excluded from equal citizenship as practice, and examines the problems of immigrant women in performing full citizenship rights. Most of the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women did not face any difficulty in obtaining Turkish citizenship. However, obtaining citizenship does not immediately mean that immigrant women acquired all citizenship rights along with. This thesis investigated how the social and cultural changes experienced by immigrant women, along with changes in their educational lives and labor participation, shaped the citizenship of these women on a gendered basis. Social and economic conditions of the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women indicate that immigrant women's citizenship in Turkey has remained a gendered experience. The ethnic discrimination Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women faced in Bulgaria was more dominant compared to the gendered one, due to the gender equality myth in the communist system, which provided certain social rights to women, thereby making patriarchy less visible.

Under the communist regime of Zhivkov, Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women, along with men, suffered from forceful name changes, assimilation campaigns, and prohibition of the Turkish language among other ethnically discriminatory policies in Bulgaria, which constituted the reasons for migration to Turkey. Immigrant women have unforgettable memories about the hardships of the migration process, which became even more difficult with little children, and the process even resulted in psychological damages in some. Migration stories of the immigrant women

indicate that they suffered poverty and were exposed to discrimination in Turkey in the sense that they encountered many problems in Turkey such as childcare, elderly care, and negative working conditions. Some women who immigrated in 1990s as labor migrants due to the difficult economic conditions in Bulgaria had to be employed as sex workers in Turkey. Women who had specific professions in Bulgaria had to work in many different sectors and in two jobs at the same time in Turkey. Eventually some immigrant women had to quit their jobs to look after their children, after which they could not get back to work. Some of them sent away their children to Bulgaria in order for their relatives to look after them, consequently experiencing the difficult process of transnational motherhood.

Beside the trauma induced by the forced migration, immigrant women were discriminated in Turkey and their labor force participation was frequently criticized. While Turkish community was excluded as 'Turks' in Bulgaria, they came to be excluded as 'Bulgarians' and 'gavurs' in Turkey. Furthermore, different gendered practices of these women in Bulgaria as Turks and Muslims, and in Turkey as 'Bulgarian Turkish' have had a significant impact on these immigrant women's citizenship. Although communist rule in Bulgaria provided some degree of gender equality, Turkish women were not as free as the Bulgarian women due to the Islamic culture of their community; however, the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women were relatively freer in Bulgaria than in Turkey.

This immigration process from Bulgaria to Turkey has produced gendered results, as in every migration. As Duran (2011) points out, migration determines and reconstitutes how women and men should be; hence, it is important to examine the migration process and the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women's citizenship experiences from a feminist perspective. For instance, the Bulgarian Turkish women's labor participation in Bulgaria was based relatively less on gendered division of labor, while in Turkey these immigrant women are largely employed in the types of work that reproduce gender roles, such as domestic work, children and elderly care work. The Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women were often harassed

based on their labor force participation and ethnic identity. Men in Turkey labeled them as being immoral due to their communist past, and they were exposed to gendered discrimination in Turkey. Local people accused immigrant women of being “women of loose morals” (Zhelyazkova, 1998), and “women who do not know how to live well, care for themselves, and travel but only work”. On the other hand, nobody questioned the special needs the immigrant women might have in the earlier stages of the immigration to Turkey. As Yuval-Davis and Werbner (1999) asserts, women in a specific ethnic community who experience migration may have special needs such as child-care, education, and participation to the public sphere, and meeting those needs are requirements for citizenship. Considering the difficulty of unifying the familial and public responsibilities, equal citizenship for women is impossible unless work places and career expectations are reorganized so that they allocate more spaces for the familial responsibilities, and unless men accept and undertake their responsibilities in the domestic sphere (Okin 1989:54), because “equal access to citizenship is not enough” (Dietz, 1997:2).

Although participation to the public sphere is tied to the definition of citizenship (Turner, 1990), the extent to which immigrant women can participate to the public sphere remains problematic. Further, even if immigrant women participate in the public sphere, they remain underrepresented and invisible, as if they do not belong to public space, since the patriarchal culture in Turkey confines women largely to the private sphere; however, immigrant women feel even more isolated and alienated in public spaces. The immigrant women argued that they did not feel safe at nights outside because they felt like strangers in Turkey, which is also related to the fact that they are denied free usage of the public space in Turkey. This demonstrated that, as Yuval-Davis once asserted, the “exclusion of women from citizenship is because of their naturalization as embodiments of the private, the familial and the emotional” (Yuval-Davis & Werbner, 1999:6). Although immigrant women all held the view that economic independence was very important for them, after settling in Turkey they became immersed in domestic tasks and are thus increasingly confined to the private sphere in Turkey than they were in Bulgaria,

due to the prevailing gender role attitudes in Turkey. In fact, even traditional and religious gender roles were expected more from the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women in Turkey. Consequently, immigrant women are less likely to participate actively to the public sphere in Turkey compared to their participation in Bulgaria. The more gender-segregated labor they perform such as domestic work and childcare, the more they are imprisoned and attached to the private sphere. Immigrant women's social activities are limited in Turkey; they do not go to cinema or theatre, whereas they used to frequently go to such activities in Bulgaria. Hence, limited or no participation in the public sphere prevents immigrant women's full and equal citizenship, and restricts them to a gendered one.

Immigrant women cannot help but tell their stories with a comparative evaluation of Bulgaria and Turkey in terms of similarities and differences about freedom, working conditions, conditions of women and class society in both countries. Immigrant women asserted that people who worked in Turkey receive sufficient remuneration for their labor; however, they explained that in Bulgaria people only received scarcely enough payment from the state. Immigrant women could afford anything they desire in Turkey. However, they are also aware of the fact that the loss of state-provided social services such as childcare, elderly care and health care was very important, as well as the loss of social justice, which causes bribery and special treatments in Turkey. The material opportunities women gain access to in Turkey could compensate for the loss of these social services, resulting in women feeling nostalgia for the social system in Bulgaria. Moreover, unpaid domestic labor of immigrant women became more visible in Turkey, and child-care became an issue due to lack of child-care services provided by the state, hindering their paid employment, which have all obstacles for the full citizenship of immigrant women.

It can be contended that Immigrant women have been one of the most silenced groups in the society; as they have adapted to the life in a new country, new rules, new gender norms, and a new citizenship. Even though the immigrant women were from the same ethnic kin as the Turks of Turkey and spoke the same language as

the local people, migration has changed too much in the women's daily lives, and they needed to adapt to the gender norms of Turkey. Apart from the legal citizenship immigrant women obtained, women have had an illusion that they would gain full citizenship from the society to the extent that they adapt to the new gender norms; however it is precisely these gender norms themselves that have denied full citizenship to women.

The adaptation process of the immigrant women in Turkey also involved their integration with the majority ethnic group, the Turkish people. The concept of citizenship is deeply related to inclusion and exclusion, and gaining inclusion from the majority involved immigrant women's exclusion of the other minority groups such as Kurds and Roma community in Turkey. As victims of ethnic discrimination in Bulgaria, Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women do not hold tolerance toward ethnic groups in Turkey especially regarding inter-ethnic marriage. Most of them would not want their children to marry somebody from the Kurdish, Alevi or Roma communities in Turkey. Immigrant women justify this attitude by referring to the cultural differences and they claim that they could not get along with people from these subcultures, but they seem to hold this view as part of their efforts to be accepted by the Turkish society, and to indicate that Bulgarian Turkish immigrants are, too, from the majority in Turkey.

The Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women seem to underrate the gender discrimination in Turkey, since they too seem to be integrated to the dominant gender norms and patriarchal culture, and because the gendered discrimination the immigrant women experience in Turkey seems insignificant and invisible compared to the ethnic discrimination they experienced in Bulgaria. The Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women do not consider themselves separate from men, as they all experienced the same ethnic discrimination in Bulgaria; but migration still had gendered conclusions for women's lives in Turkey. Although immigrant women, too, are the subjects of the gendered violence in Turkey, they do not seem to challenge gendered discrimination and gender inequality in Turkey. Most

immigrant women willingly accept the gendered identities given by the authority; as Sirman (2002:234) contended, ‘national femininity is not imposed externally’, rather it is a subjectivity demanded by women, in order to possess authority.

The new and ample economic opportunities the Bulgarian Turkish women found in Turkey, partly due to the capitalist system, may also have blinded them to the more traditional and religious gender roles they are subject to in their new country. As Caldwell et al. (2009) explained, emotions and thoughts also constitute citizenship, but the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women seem to define citizenship through having a national identity card, being employed, having access to wider economic opportunities, and the sense of belonging to the majority who speaks the same language and shares the same religion. Hence, the immigrant women seem to prioritize the issues related to their past in Bulgaria in their understanding of what constitutes citizenship, and leave out the gender inequality that they must deal with in their definition of citizenship. Although immigrant women are aware that patriarchal gender relations in Turkey produces gender inequality, they do not question it. Succumbing to the general patriarchal order seems necessary to be integrated in the society. Therefore, it is important to note that there is no sign that immigrant women try to transform and challenge gender inequality in Turkey.

Despite this thinly veiled criticism and even acceptance of gender inequality, immigrant women do criticize men’s hegemonic role in Turkey and their family relations do not replicate male dominance, which is more common in the local families. For example, while local women question immigrant women regarding “how their husbands let them work”, asking for husband’s permission to work outside home is not observed in the case of the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women. This is largely due to their culture of work and culture of gender relations coming from their communist past. Immigrant women believe that women in Turkey are considered worthless by men and by the society, and also sometimes criticize violence against women and murders in the name of honor.

This research is conducted in order to indicate that even immigrant women who are the ethnic majority in a state and have certain citizenship rights may still have problems regarding citizenship, and their citizenship may be constructed in an incomplete manner. Full and equal citizenship does not necessarily mean being majority or having substantial rights. Immigrant women's life experiences and their evaluation of migration show how incomplete their citizenship is in Turkey. As I examine in the previous chapters, citizenship is not only about legal, political or social citizenship, which I do not address in this thesis, but rather it consists of inclusion and exclusion, and is related to sensations, thoughts, and identity perception. Citizenship consists of and intersects different factors including women's position in the public and private sphere, women's labor both inside and outside home, child-care, elderly-care, how immigrant women citizens are subjectively constructed by the patriarchal prejudices, stereotypes and the critiques about them in a host country, and how they position themselves in a new country. Although the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women are from the same ethnic kin with the majority of people in Turkey, it is important to recognize them as a different category of women who are excluded from citizenship, as their experiences during and after the immigration to the host country interacts with their gender identity and the other structural inequalities they have been exposed to in Turkey.

This research aimed of contributing to further research on feminist citizenship and the Bulgarian Turkish immigrant women. Due to the limitations hitherto mentioned, the thesis could not focus on several issues. The rural-to-urban aspect of the migration of the Bulgarian Turkish women could be examined as part of further research, as a different determinant regarding their citizenship. Moreover, taking the Bulgarian Turkish men's citizenship practices into consideration could be another line of research in order to compare and determine the degree of gendered citizenship immigrant women and men experience.

## REFERENCES

- Abadan-Unat N. (1977). "Implications of Migration on Emancipation and Pseudo-Emancipation of Turkish Women". *International Migration Review*, 11(1).
- Abraham, M., Chow Ngan-ling, E., Maratou-Alipranti, L., Tastsoglou, E. (2010). "Rethinking Citizenship with Women in Focus". In M. Abraham, E. Tastsoglou, E. Chow (Eds.), *Contours of Citizenship: Women, Diversity and Practices of Citizenship*. Surrey: Ashgate Publishing.
- Al-Ali, N. (2002). "Loss of Status or New Opportunities? Gender Relations and Transnational Ties among Bosnian Refugees". In D. Bryceson & U. Vuorela (Eds.), *The Transnational Family: New European Frontiers and Global Networks*. Berg Publishing.
- Alund, A. (1999). "Feminism, Multiculturalism, and Essentialism". In N. Yuval-Davis & P. Werbner (Eds.), *Women, Citizenship and Difference*, (pp. 147-161). London: Zed Books.
- Anagnostou, D. (2005). "Nationalist Legacies and European Trajectories: Post-communist Liberalization and Turkish Minority Politics in Bulgaria". *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, (pp. 89-111), Vol. 5(1). London: Routledge.
- Andrijasevic, R. (2003). "The Difference Borders Make: (Il)legality, Migration and Trafficking in Italy among Eastern European Women in Prostitution". In S. Ahmed, C. Castaneda, A. Fortier, M. Sheller (Eds.) *Uprootings/ Regroundings: Questions of Home and Migration*, (pp. 251-272). Berg.
- Bates, D. G. (1994). "What's in a Name? Minorities, Identity and Politics in Bulgaria". *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power*. 1:2-3 (pp. 201-225). OPA.
- Bosniak, L. (2009). "Citizenship, Noncitizenship and the Transnationalization of Domestic Work". In S. Benhabib & J. Resnik (Eds.), *Migrations and Mobilities: Citizenship, Borders and Gender*, (pp. 127-156). New York, London: New York University Press.

Caldwell, K.L., Coll, K., Fisher, T., Ramirez, R.K., Siu, L. (2009). *Gendered Citizenships, Transnational Perspectives on Knowledge Production, Political Activism and Culture*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Carbado, D.W. (2013). "Colorblind Intersectionality". *Signs*, Vol. 38 No. 4. (pp. 811-845). The University of Chicago Press.

Cho, S., Crenshaw, K.W., McCall, L. (2013). "Toward a Field of Intersectionality Studies: Theory, Applications and Praxis". *Signs*, Vol. 38 No. 4. (pp. 785-810). The University of Chicago Press.

Chow Ngan-ling, E. (2010). "Citizenship Divided, Education Deprived: Gender and Migrant Children's Rights to Schooling in Urban China". In M. Abraham, E. Tastsoglou, E. Chow (Eds.), *Contours of Citizenship: Women, Diversity and Practices of Citizenship*. Surrey: Ashgate Publishing.

Çetin, T. (2008a). "Bulgaristan'daki Soydaşlarımızın Türkiye'ye Göç Etme Süreçlerini Etkileyen Bazı Değişkenlerin İncelenmesi". *Ege Üniversitesi Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Türk Dünyası İncelemeleri Dergisi*, (pp. 55-75), Vol. 8(1).

Çetin, T. (2008b). "The Socio-Economic Outcomes of the Last Turkish Migration (1989) from Bulgaria to Turkey". *Turkish Studies*, (pp. 241-270), Vol. 3(7).

Daskalova, K. (2000). "Women's Problems, Women's Discourses in Bulgaria". In S. Gal, G. Kligman (Eds.), *Reproducing Gender: Politics, Publics and Everyday Life after Socialism*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Daskalova, K. (2006). "Education and European Women's Citizenship: Images of Women in Bulgarian History Textbooks". In S. Hellsten, A. M. Holi, K. Daskalova (Eds.), *Women's Citizenship and Political Rights*. Macmillan.

Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı, Sosyal Planlama Başkanlığı (1990). *Bulgaristan'dan Türk Göçleri*. Ankara.

Dietz, M. G. (1997). "Context is All: Feminism and Theories of Citizenship". *Daedalus*, (pp. 1-24), Vol.116 (4), Learning about Women: Gender, Politics and Power (Fall). The MIT Press.

Dimitrova, D. (1998). "Bulgarian Turkish Immigrants of 1989 in the Republic of Turkey". In A. Zhelyazkova (Eds.) *Between Adaptation and Nostalgia: The Bulgarian Turks in Turkey*. Sofia: International Center for Minority Research.

Donald, J. (2008). "Vatandaş ve Kent Aylağı". In A. Kadıoğlu (Eds.), *Vatandaşlığın Dönüşümü: Üyelikten Haklara*, İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Duran, M.G. (2011). "Gender, Migration and Identity". In S.P.C. Borrego & M.I.R. Ruiz (Eds.), *Cultural Migrations and Gendered Subjects: Colonial and Postcolonial Representations of the Female Body*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Ecevit, M. (2011). "Feminist Bilim Sorunsalı: Feminist Metodoloji ve Feminist Epistemoloji Tartışmaları". In Y. Ecevit and N. Karkıner (Eds.) *Toplumsal Cinsiyet Sosyolojisi*. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Açıköğretim Fakültesi Yayını No: 1304.

Eminov, A. (1990). "There are no Turks in Bulgaria: Rewriting History by Administrative Fiat". In K. Karpat (Eds.) *The Turks of Bulgaria: The History, Culture and Political Fate of a Minority*, (pp. 203-222). İstanbul: ISIS Press.

Eminov, A. (1999). "The Turks in Bulgaria: Post-1989 Developments". *Nationalities Papers: The Journal of Nationalism and Ethnicity*, (pp. 31-55), Vol. 27(1).

Erman, T. (1998). "The Impact of Migration on Turkish Rural Women: Four Emergent Patterns". *Gender and Society* (pp. 146-167), Vol. 12, No. 2. Sage Publications.

Fraser, N., Gordon, L. (1994). "A Genealogy of Dependency: Tracing a Keyword of the U.S. Welfare State". *Signs*, Vol.19 (2), (pp. 309-336).

Geray, C. (1962). "Türkiye'den ve Türkiye'ye Göçler". Türkiye İktisadi Gelişmesi Araştırma Projesi, No:4. Ankara.

Geray, C. (1989). "Göçler Ülkesi Türkiye ve Son Göç Olayı". *Mülkiyeliler Birliği Dergisi*, sayı 110, (pp. 3-13).

Gheorghieva, T. (1998). "The Motivation of Bulgarian Turks to Migration". In A. Zhelyazkova (Eds.) *Between Adaptation and Nostalgia: The Bulgarian Turks in Turkey*. Sofia: International Center for Minority Research.

Gordon, I. (1995). "Migration in a Segmented Labour Market". *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, New Series*, Vol. 20 No.2 (pp. 139-155). Blackwell Publishing.

Gouws, A. (2010). "Citizenship, Gender Equality and the Limits of Law Reform in South Africa". In M. Abraham, E. Tastsoglou, E. Chow (Eds.), *Contours of Citizenship: Women, Diversity and Practices of Citizenship*. Surrey: Ashgate Publishing.

Harvey, D. (2008) "The Right to The City". *New Left Review*, 53. London.

Hellsten, S. (2006). "Can Feminism Survive Capitalism? Challenges Feminist Discourses Face in Promoting Women's Rights in Post-Soviet Europe". In S. Hellsten, A. M. Holi, K. Daskalova (Eds.), *Women's Citizenship and Political Rights*. Macmillan.

Hoffman, D. (1986). "Personhood and Rights". *Polity*, Vol. 19, No.1 (pp. 74-96). Palgrave Macmillan Journals.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, P. (2000). "Feminism and Migration". *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* (pp. 107-120), Vol. 571, Feminist Views of the Social Sciences. London: Sage Publications.

Janoski, T., Gran, B. (2002). "Political Citizenship: Foundation of Rights". In E. F. Isin & B. Turner (Eds.), *Handbook of Citizenship Studies* (pp. 13-52). London: Sage Publications.

Kadioğlu, A. (1994). "The Impact of Migration on Gender Roles: Findings of Field Research in Turkey". *International Migration*, (pp. 533-560), Vol. 32(4).

Kadiođlu, A. (1997). "Migration Experiences of Turkish Women". *International Migration*, (pp. 538-556), Vol. 35(4). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Kadiođlu, A. (2008a). *Vatandaşlıđın Dönüřümü: Üyelikten Haklara*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Kadiođlu, A. (2008b). "Aydınlanma, Vatandaşlık ve Kadın: Türkiye Örneđi". In F. Keyman (Eds.), *Aydınlanma, Türkiye ve Vatandaşlık*. İstanbul: Osmanlı Bankası Arşiv ve Araştırma Merkezi.

Kalfa, A. (2010). "Türkiye'de Fuhuş Sektöründe Çalışan Kadınların Çalışma Koşulları Üzerine Bir Alan Araştırması". In H. Durudođan, F. Gökşen, B. E. Oder, D. Yüksek (Eds.) *Türkiye'de Toplumsal Cinsiyet Çalışmaları: Eşitsizlikler, Mücadeleler, Kazanımlar*. Koç Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Kasli, Z., Parla, A. (2009). "Broken Lines of Il/Legality and the Reproduction of State Sovereignty: The Impact of Visa Policies on Immigrants to Turkey from Bulgaria". *Alternatives*, Vol. 34 (2), (pp. 203-227). Sage Publications.

Köy Hizmetleri Genel Müdürlüğü (1996). *Hizmet Uygulamaları Genel Envanteri, Uygulama Raporları ve Notları*, Ankara.

Kymlicka, W., Norman, W. (2008). "Vatandaşın Dönüřümü: Vatandaşlık Kuramındaki Yeni Çalışmalar Üzerine bir Deđerlendirme". In A. Kadiođlu (Eds.), *Vatandaşlıđın Dönüřümü: Üyelikten Haklara*, İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Laski, H. J. (1962). *The Rise of European Liberalism*. London: Allen and Unwin

Levi-Strauss, C. (1969). *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Lister, R. (1990). "Women, Economic Dependency and Citizenship". *Journal of Social Policy*, Vol. 19 (4), (pp. 445-468).

Lister, R. (1991). "Citizenship Engendered". Paper presented at the Critical Social Policy Conference, 'Citizenship and Welfare' (pp. 65-71). London.

Lister, R. (1997). *Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives*, New York University Press.

Lister, R. (1997). "Citizenship: Towards a feminist synthesis". *Feminist Review*, (pp. 28-48), No. 57.

Lutz, H. (1997). "The Limits of European-ness: Immigrant Women in Fortress Europe". *Feminist Review*, No.57, (pp. 93-111).

Mann, M. (1987). "Ruling Class Strategies and Citizenship". *Sociology*, 21:3, (pp. 339-354).

Marshall, T.H., Bottomore, T. (1950/1992). *Citizenship and Social Class*, London: Pluto. (Yurttaşlık ve Toplumsal Sınıflar, Çev: Ayhan Kaya, Gündoğan Yayınları, Mayıs 2000)

McCarthy, J. (1999). *Death and Exile: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ottoman Muslims, 1821-1922*. Princeton, New Jersey: The Darwin Press, Inc.

Moghadam, V. (1999). "Gender, National Identity and Citizenship: Reflections on the Middle East and North Africa". *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East*, Vol. 19 (1).

Morokvasic, M. (1983). "Birds of Passage are also Women...". *International Migration Review* (pp. 886-907), Vol. 18 No. 2. The Center for Migration Studies of New York.

Neuman, W.L. (2005). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Sixth Edition. Pearson.

Okin, S. M. (1989). *Justice, Gender and The Family*. New York: Basic Book Inc.

Panova, R., Gavrilova, R., Merdzanska, C. (1993). "Thinking Gender: Bulgarian Women's Im/possibilities". In N. Funk & M. Mueller (Eds.), *Gender Politics and Post-Communism: Reflections from Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union*, (pp. 15-21). Routledge.

Parla, A. (2003). "Marking Time Along the Bulgarian-Turkish Border". *Ethnography*, Vol.4, No.4 (pp. 561-575). Sage Publications.

Parla, A. (2006). "Longing, Belonging and Locations of Homeland among Turkish Immigrants from Bulgaria". *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, Vol.6, No.4, (pp. 543-557). Routledge.

Parla, A. (2007). "Irregular Workers or Ethnic Kin? Post-1990s Labour Migration from Bulgaria to Turkey". *International Migration*, Vol.45, No.3, (pp. 157-181). Blackwell Publishing.

Parla, A. (2009). "Remembering Across Border: Postsocialist Nostalgia among Turkish Immigrants from Bulgaria". *American Ethnologist*, Vol. 36, No.4 (pp. 750-767). American Anthropological Association.

Parla, A. (2011). "Undocumented Migrants and the Double Binds of Rights Claims". *differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies*, Vol.22 No.1 (pp. 64-89). Duke University Press.

Parrado, E. A., Flippen, C.A. (2005). "Migration and Gender among Mexican Women". *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 70, No. 4. (pp. 606-632). American Sociological Association.

Parrenas, R.S. (2009). "Transgressing the Nation-State: The Partial Citizenship and "Imagined (Global) Community" of Migrant Filipina Domestic Workers". In K.L Caldwell, K. Coll, T. Fisher, R.K. Ramirez, L. Siu (Eds.) *Gendered Citizenships, Transnational Perspectives on Knowledge Production, Political Activism and Culture*, (pp. 89-107). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pateman, C. (1988). *The Sexual Contract*. Cambridge: Polity.

Patil, V. (2013). "From Patriarchy to Intersectionality: A Transnational Feminist Assessment of How Far We've Really Come". *Signs*, Vol. 38 No. 4. (pp. 847-867). The University of Chicago Press.

Pedraza, S. (1991). "Women and Migration: The Social Consequences of Gender". *Annual Review of Sociology* (pp. 303-325), Vol. 17. Annual Reviews Inc.

Petrova, D. (1993). "The Winding Road to Emancipation in Bulgaria". In N. Funk & M. Mueller (Eds.), *Gender Politics and Post-Communism: Reflections from Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union*, (pp. 22-29). Routledge.

Pettman, J. (1999). "Globalization and the Gendered Politics of Citizenship". In N. Yuval-Davis & P. Werbner (Eds.), *Women, Citizenship and Difference*, (pp. 207-220). London: Zed Books.

Pettman, J. (2010). "Migration". In L.J. Shepherd (Eds.), *Gender Matters in Global Politics* (pp. 251-264). Routledge.

Prokhovnik, R. (1998). "Public and Private Citizenship: From Gender Invisibility to Feminist Inclusiveness". *Feminist Review*, (pp. 84-104) No.6.

Raijman, R., Schammah-Gesser S., Kemp A. (2003). "International Migration, Domestic Work, and Care Work: Undocumented Latina Migrants in Israel". *Gender and Society*, (pp. 727-749), Vol. 17, No. 5. Sage Publications.

Ramazanoglu, C., Holland J. (2002). *Feminist Methodology: Challenges and Choices*. Sage Publications.

Ramirez, R.K. (2009). "Gender, Belonging and Native American Women: The Activism of Cecelia Fire Thunder and Sarah Der". In K.L Caldwell, K. Coll, T. Fisher, R.K. Ramirez, L. Siu (Eds.) *Gendered Citizenships, Transnational Perspectives on Knowledge Production, Political Activism and Culture*, (pp. 157-172). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Riley, D. (1987). "Does sex have a history? Women and Feminism". *New Formations*, no.1.

Roy, A. (2005). *Gendered Citizenship: Historical and Conceptual Explorations*, Orient Blackswan.

Sanli, S. (2011). "Public Sphere and Symbolic Power: 'Woman's Voice' as a Case of Cultural Citizenship". *Cultural Sociology*, (pp. 281-299), Vol. 5(2). Sage Publications.

Simon, R. J., Brettell C. B. (1986). *International Migration: The Female Experience*. Rowman & Allanheld Publishers.

Sirman, N. (2002). "Kadınların Milliyeti". In T. Bora & M. Gültekingil (Eds.), *Milliyetçilik: Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce*, cilt 4. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Sole, C., Parella, S. (2003). "Migrant Women in Spain: Class, Gender and Ethnicity". In J. Andall (Eds.), *Gender and Ethnicity in Contemporary Europe*. Oxford, New York: Berg.

Spelman, E. (1988). *Inessential Women: Problems of Exclusion in Feminist Thought*. London: The Women’s Press.

Stasiulis, D., Bakan, E. (1997). "Negotiating Citizenship: The Case of Foreign Domestic Workers in Canada". *Feminist Review*, No:57, (sf. 112-139). Palgrave Macmillan.

Şimşir, B. (1985). *Türk Basınında Bulgaristan Türkleri: Zorla Ad Değişirme Sorunu*. Ankara: Başbakanlık Basın, Yayın ve Enformasyon Genel Müdürlüğü.

Şimşir, B. (1986). *Bulgaristan Türkleri*. İstanbul: Bilgi Yayınevi.

Tastsoglou, E., Preston, V. (2005). "Gender, Immigration and Labour Market Integration: Where We Are and What We Still Need to Know". *Atlantis: Critical Studies in Gender, Culture and Social Justice*, 30:1. (pp 46-59).

Todorova, M. (1993). "The Bulgarian Case: Women’s Issues or Feminist Issues?" In N. Funk & M. Mueller (Eds.), *Gender Politics and Post-Communism: Reflections from Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union*, (pp. 30-38). Routledge.

Turner, B. (1990). "Outline of a Theory of Citizenship". *Sociology* Vol. 24 No. 2, 189-217.

Turner, B., Isin E. (2002). "Citizenship Studies: An Introduction". In E. F. Isin & B. Turner (Eds.), *Handbook of Citizenship Studies* (pp. 1-10). London: Sage Publications.

Vasileva, D. (1992). "Bulgarian Turkish Emigration and Return". *International Migration Review*, Vol. 26, No. 2. (pp.342-352). The Center for Migration Studies of New York.

Voronina, O. A. (1994). 'Soviet women and politics: on the brink of change'. In B.J. Nelson and N. Chowdhury (Eds.), *Women and Politics Worldwide* New Haven, (pp. 722-736). Conn.: Yale University Press.

Walby, S. (1990). *Theorizing Patriarchy*. Oxford, Cambridge: Basil Blackwell.

Walby, S. (1994). "Is Citizenship Gendered?" *Sociology*, Vol.28, No.2. (pp. 379-395). Sage Social Science Collections.

Yuval-Davis, N. (1997). "Women, Citizenship and Difference". *Feminist Review*, (pp. 4-27), No. 57.

Yuval-Davis, N. (2010). *Cinsiyet ve Millet*. İstanbul: İletişim. (*Gender and Nation*, London: Sage, 1997)

Yuval-Davis, N., Werbner, P. (1999). "Women and the New Discourse of Citizenship". In N. Yuval-Davis & P. Werbner (Eds.), *Women, Citizenship and Difference*. London: Zed Books

Yuval-Davis, N., Anthias, F. (2005). "Connecting Race and Gender". In N. Yuval-Davis & F. Anthias (Eds.), *Racialized Boundaries*. London, New York: Routledge.

Zavos, A. (2010). "Gender, Migration and Anti-racist Politics in the Continued Project of Nation". In I. Palmary et al. (Eds.), *Gender and Migration: Feminist Interventions*. Zed Books.

Zhelyazkova, A. (1998). "The Social and Cultural Adaptation of Bulgarian Immigrants in Turkey". In A. Zhelyazkova (Eds.) *Between Adaptation and Nostalgia: The Bulgarian Turks in Turkey*. Sofia: International Center for Minority Research.

## APPENDIX-A

### IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

#### A.1 Questionnaire in Turkish

##### Demografik Bilgiler:

1. Doğum yeriniz, doğum tarihiniz?
2. Hanede kaç kişi yaşıyorsunuz?
3. Kaç çocuğunuz var?
4. Kendinizi aslen nereli hissediyorsunuz?

##### Bulgaristan'dan Türkiye'ye Göç:

5. Göç hikayenizi hatırladığınız kadarıyla anlatır mısınız? Nereden geldiniz? Ne zaman? Neden?
6. Bulgaristan'da yaşayan akrabalarınız var mı? Bulgaristan ile halen bağlantınız devam ediyor mu?
7. İzmir'e göç etmenizdeki sebepler nelerdir?
8. Buraya göç etmenin sizin yaşamınıza etkileri neler oldu?
9. Türkiye'ye hiç göç etmeyip Bulgaristan'da kalsaydınız hayatınız nasıl olurdu?
10. Sizce Bulgaristan ve Türkiye arasındaki benzerlikler ve farklılıklar neler?
11. Bulgaristan'daki ve Türkiye'deki yaşam koşullarınızı karşılaştırırsanız hangisini tercih edersiniz? Neden?

##### Meslek-Çalışma Hayatı:

12. Bulgaristan'da çalışıyor muydunuz? Mesleğiniz ne idi? Ne kadar çalıştınız?
13. Çalıştığınız yerdeki çalışma koşulları nasıldı?
14. Bulgaristan'da gözlemlediğiniz kadarıyla kadınlar ne tür işlerde çalışırdı?
15. İşinizden memnun muydunuz? Gelecekte beklentileriniz nelerdi?
16. Kendinizi ekonomik olarak yeterli görüyor muydunuz? Aile ekonomisine

katkınız ne idi?

17. İzmir’de şu an ne iş yapıyorsunuz?
18. Türkiye’deki çalışma koşullarını nasıl buluyorsunuz? Bulgaristan ile karşılaştırma yapsaydınız hangisini ülkeyi seçerdiniz?
19. Türkiye’de kadınları iş yaşamında sık görüyor musunuz?
20. Şu anki ekonomik durumunuzu yeterli görüyor musunuz? Gelecekte beklentileriniz nelerdir?

### **Sosyal Yaşam**

21. Bulgaristan’da yaşarken günlük hayatınızda en çok kimlerle görüşürdünüz? Arkadaşlık ve komşuluk ilişkileriniz nasıldı?
22. Başınız sıkıştığında kimlerden yardım isterdiniz?
23. Bulgaristan’daki düğünler, sünnet törenleri, cenazeler nasıl olurdu? Geleneklerinizden bahsedebilir misiniz?
24. Bulgaristan’da kimlerle evlilik yapılırdı, kimlerle yapılmazdı?
25. Bulgaristan’da kadınlar arasında dayanışma var mıydı? Çocuk ve yaşlı bakımı, ev işleri gibi konularda başka kadınlardan (aile, arkadaş) yardım alır mıydınız?
26. Bulgaristan’da gazete okur muydunuz? Sinema ve tiyatroya gider miydiniz?
27. Türkiye’de günlük hayatınızda en çok kimlerle görüşüyorsunuz? Arkadaşlık ve komşuluk ilişkileriniz nasıl? Biraz anlatabilir misiniz?
28. Kimlerden yardım istersiniz?
29. Türkiye’deki düğün, cenaze, sünnetler nasıl oluyor? Farklılıklar var mı sizce?
30. Türkiye’de çocuklarınızın kimlerle evlilik yapmasını ve kimlerle yapmamasını istersiniz?
31. Türkiye’de kadınlar arası dayanışma var mı sizce?
32. Türkiye’de mi yoksa Bulgaristan’da mı kadın olarak yaşamak kolaydı? Yaşadıklarınızı biraz anlatabilir misiniz?
33. Evle ilgili olmayan işlerde (alışveriş, banka işleri, fatura ödeme vs.) kim daha çok ilgileniyor? Bulgaristan’da nasıldı?
34. Ev işleri ile daha çok kim ilgileniyor? Bulgaristan’da nasıldı?

35. Türkiye’de gazete okuyor musunuz? Sinema ve tiyatroya gitme fırsatınız oluyor mu?

**Kimlik Algısı:**

36. Vatandaşlık durumunuz nasıl? Ne zaman ve nasıl Türkiye vatandaşı oldunuz?

37. Çift vatandaşlığınız var mı? Varsa neden?

38. Bulgaristan’dayken kendinizi aşağıdaki seçeneklerden en çok hangisi olarak tanımladınız?

Azınlık

Bulgaristan Türkü

Yabancı

İkinci sınıf vatandaş

Avrupalı

Göçmen

Müslüman

Türk

39. Bulgaristan’dayken en çok kimlerle yaşıyordunuz? Ve hangi topluluktan insanlarla anlaşıyordunuz/anlaşamıyordunuz? Kimleri uzak veya yakın hissediyordunuz? Neden?

40. Farklı kültürden insanlarla birarada yaşamak sorunlara neden oluyor muydu?

41. Bulgaristan’dayken dışlanmış olarak hissettiniz mi? Neden?

42. Bulgaristan’da yaşamamanın olumlu ve olumsuz yanları nelerdi?

43. Türkiye’de kendinizi en çok ne olarak tanımlıyorsunuz?

Azınlık

Bulgaristan Türkü

Yabancı

İkinci sınıf vatandaş

Avrupalı

Göçmen

Müslüman

Türk

44. Türkiye’de en çok kimlerle yaşıyordunuz? Ve hangi topluluktan insanlarla anlaşıyordunuz/anlaşamıyordunuz? Kimleri uzak veya yakın hissediyordunuz? Neden?
45. Türkiye’de kendinizi dışlanmış olarak hissettiniz mi? Neden?
46. Türkiye’de yaşamının olumlu ve olumsuz yanları neler?

**Mülkiyet Soruları:**

47. Bulgaristan’da oturduğunuz ev kendi eviniz miydi kira mıydı? Nasıl bir evdi ve kimlerle oturuyordunuz?
48. Bulgaristan’da size ait tarla veya bahçe var mıydı? Varsa nasıl sahip oldunuz? (miras, satın alma, devlet verdi)
49. Bulgaristan’da birikim yapabiliyor muydunuz? Yapabildiyseniz ne şekilde değerlendirdiniz? (döviz, faiz, altın)
50. Türkiye’de oturduğunuz ev size mi ait? (Kira ise ne kadar kira ödüyorsunuz?) Nasıl bir ev ve kimlerle oturuyorsunuz?
51. Size ait arsa, tarla, ev var mı? (Varsa nasıl sahip oldunuz?)

**Değerlendirme:**

- Yaşamış olduğunuz göç tecrübesi size neler kazandırdı, neler kaybettirdi? Pişmanlıklarınız veya özlemleriniz var mı? “İyi ki gelmişim” diyor musunuz?
- Türkiye’de yaşamaktan memnun musunuz? Evet ise hangi sebeplerden dolayı? Hayır ise neden? Hiç göç etmemiş olmayı diler miydiniz?

## **A.2 Questionnaire in English**

### **Demographic Information**

1. Place of birth, date of birth?
2. How many people live in your household?
3. How many children do you have?
4. In which country do you feel you belong?

### **Immigration from Bulgaria to Turkey:**

5. Could you please tell your immigration story as far as you can remember?  
Where did you come from? When? Why?
6. Do you have any relatives living in Bulgaria? Do you still have contact with Bulgaria?
7. What were the reasons for your immigration to Izmir?
8. How did the immigration affect your life?
9. How would your life look like if you stayed in Bulgaria and did not immigrate to Turkey?
10. In your opinion, what are the similarities and differences between Bulgaria and Turkey?
11. If you compare Bulgaria and Turkey in terms of living conditions, which one do you prefer? Why?

### **Working Life:**

12. Did you work in Bulgaria? What was your occupation? How long did you work?
13. How were the working conditions of the place that you worked?
14. As far as you observed, what kind of jobs have women done in Bulgaria?
15. Did you use to be pleased with your job? What were your expectations for the future?
16. Did you use to find your financial standing fair? How did you contribute to your family budget?

17. What is your current job in İzmir?
18. How do you find working conditions in Turkey? If you compare Bulgaria and Turkey in this regard, which one do you prefer?
19. Do you think that women actively participate in working life of Turkey?
20. Do you find your financial standing fair? What are your expectations for the future?

### **Social Life**

21. Who did you use to meet the most in your daily life, when you were in Bulgaria? How was your relationship with your friends and neighbors?
22. Who did you use to ask for help, when you were in trouble?
23. How were wedding ceremonies, circumcision feasts, and funerals held? Could you please tell about your traditions?
24. Who did people use to marry in Bulgaria, who could not?
25. Was there solidarity among women in Bulgaria? Could you get help from other women (friends, family) for housework, child and elderly care etc.?
26. Did you use to read newspaper in Bulgaria? Did you use to go to cinema and theatre?
27. Who do you meet the most in your daily life in Turkey? How is your relationship with your friends and neighbors? Could you please tell about it?
28. Who do you ask for help?
29. How are wedding ceremonies, circumcision feasts, funerals held in Turkey? Do you see any difference?
30. Who do you prefer as a daughter-in-law and son-in-law in Turkey, who do not?
31. Do you think there is solidarity among women in Turkey?
32. Which one is easier, to live as a woman in Turkey or in Bulgaria? Could you please tell about your experiences?
33. Who is the person in charge of stuffs unrelated to the housework (shopping, bank stuffs, bill-paying etc.) among family members? How was it in Bulgaria?

34. Who is the person in charge of housework among family members? How was it in Bulgaria?
35. Do you read newspaper in Turkey? Do you go to cinema and theatre?

### **The Sense of Identity**

36. What is your citizenship status? When and how were you recognized as a Turkish citizen under law?
37. Do you have dual citizenship? If yes, why?
38. Which of the options below would you define yourself the most, when you were in Bulgaria?
- Minority
  - Bulgarian Turk
  - Foreigner
  - Second-class citizen
  - European
  - Immigrant
  - Muslim
  - Turk
39. With whom did you use to be in contact in Bulgaria the most? With which people from which community could/could not you get along well? To whom did/did not you feel close? Why?
40. Did living with people from different cultures cause any problems?
41. Have you ever feel discriminated in Bulgaria? Why?
42. What were the pros and cons of living in Bulgaria?
43. Which of the options below do you define yourself in Turkey the most?
- Minority
  - Bulgarian Turk
  - Foreigner
  - Second-class citizen
  - European
  - Immigrant

Muslim

Turk

44. With whom do you use to be in contact in Turkey the most? With which people from which community can/cannot you get along well? To whom do/do not you feel close? Why?
45. Have you ever feel discriminated in Turkey? Why?
46. What are the pros and cons of living in Turkey?

### **Questions about Properties**

47. Were you living in a rented house or your own house in Bulgaria? How did it look like? With whom were you living there?
48. Did you own any field and/or garden in Bulgaria? If yes, how did you own it? (Inheritance, buying, state gave us etc.)
49. Could you make savings in Bulgaria? If yes, how did you utilize your savings? (foreign currency, interest, golden, etc.)
50. Do you live in your own house in Turkey? (If it is rented, how much rent do you pay?) How does your house you live in look like and with whom do you live?
51. Do you own any field, garden and/or house? (If yes, how did you own it?)

Evaluation:

- What did your immigration experience bring to and lose you? Do you have any regrets or longing? Can you say that “I am so glad I came here”
- Are you pleased to live in Turkey? If yes, for what reasons? If no, why? Have you ever wished not to immigrate?

## APPENDIX-B

**Table 2: Migrations from Bulgaria to Turkey**

| Years       | Number of Migrants |
|-------------|--------------------|
| 1878 - 1892 | 279.397            |
| 1893 - 1902 | 70.603             |
| 1912 - 1920 | 413.922            |
| 1921 - 1922 | 21.172             |
| 1923 - 1939 | 198.688            |
| 1940 - 1949 | 21.353             |
| 1950 - 1951 | 154.393            |
| 1952 - 1968 | 24                 |
| 1969 - 1978 | 113.393            |
| 1979 - 1988 | 20                 |
| 1989        | 313.894            |
| 1990 - 1997 | 209.500            |
| Total       | 1.796.359          |

Source: Çetin (2008b:246), Şimşir (1985:51-55), Vasileva (1992:346), McCarthy (1999:175-177)

## APPENDIX-C

### TURKISH SUMMARY

Osmanlı İmparatorluğu zamanında Bulgaristan'a yerleştirilen Türkler, Bulgaristan'ın 1878'de bağımsızlığını kazanmasından bu yana çeşitli ayrımcılıklara maruz bırakılmışlardır. Kendi dillerini kamusal alanda kullanmaları yasaklanmış, Türk okulları ulusal eğitim sisteminin dışında bırakılmış, Türk asıllı siyasetçilere kara propaganda yapılmış, zorla isimleri değiştirilmiş ve zorunlu göç politikalarına maruz bırakılmışlardır. Bu asimilasyon kampanyası, ulus-devlet kavramının amacı olan homojen bir topluma ulaşmak niyetiyle başlamıştır. Tüm azınlıklara (Pomaklar, Tatarlar, Çingeneler) uygulanan ancak, temelde Türk kökenli vatandaşları hedef alan asimilasyon kampanyası, Türklerin Bulgaristan'daki varlığını yok sayarak, ulus-devlet prensiplerini yerine getirmeye çalışmıştır. Bağlam olarak sosyalist olan ancak pratikte milliyetçilik ilkesini benimseyen Bulgaristan'ın Türklere karşı harekete geçirdiği asimilasyon kampanyasının etkili olmasının nedenlerinden biri de bu kampanyanın Avrupa'da ve dünyada görünmez oluşudur. 1989 yılında tüm dünyanın gözü Doğu Almanya'dakilerin batıya kaçışı üstüneyken, Bulgaristan'da bunun iki katı sayıda etnik Türk sınır dışı edilmiş, ve bu insanlar zorla vatanlarından sürülmüşlerdir (Bates, 1994:201). Bulgaristan Türklerinin Bulgaristan'dan Türkiye'ye göçleri çeşitli yıllara yayılmakla birlikte, en büyük göç dalgası 1989'da yaşanmıştır. Yaklaşık 360.000 Türk, Türkiye'deki sınır kapılarının da açılmasıyla birlikte zorunlu göçe tabi olmuş ve yerlerinden edilmiştir.

Her göç olgusunda yaşandığı üzere Bulgaristan göçünün de toplumsal cinsiyet temelli sonuçları olmuştur. Dolayısıyla, göç sürecini ve göçmen kadınların Türkiye'deki vatandaşlık deneyimlerini, kadın bakış açısıyla ele almak önemlidir. Örneğin, kadınların Bulgaristan'daki iş gücüne katılımları, sosyalist sistemin de

etkisiyle, toplumsal cinsiyete dayalı iş bölümüne görece uymazken, Türkiye'deki iş gücüne katılımları neredeyse tamamıyla toplumsal cinsiyete dayalı iş bölümünden oluşmuştur. Çocuk ve yaşlı bakımı, ev içi işçiliği gibi toplumsal cinsiyet rollerini yeniden üreten işlerde daha çok çalışmışlardır. Zorunlu göçün yarattığı travmanın yanı sıra, Türkiye'de de ayrımcılığa uğramış, iş gücüne katılımları sıklıkla eleştirilmiş, eşlerinin 'erkeklikleri' bu sebeple sorgulanmıştır. Ayrıca, Bulgaristan'da Türk olmakla suçlanırken, Türkiye'de de 'Bulgar' olmakla itham edilmiş, ve 'gavur' olmakla suçlanmışlardır. Bulgaristan göçmeni kadınların, iş gücüne katılımları ve etnik kökenleri üzerinden cinsellikleri sorgulanmış ve yine bu kadınlar toplumsal cinsiyet temelli ayrımcılığa maruz kalmışlardır. Hali hazırda çok katmanlı bir kurgu olan vatandaşlık, göçmen kadınların vatandaşlığı söz konusu olduğunda çok farklı yapılardan oluşmuştur. Bu araştırmada göçmen kadınların deneyimlediği kültür ve sosyal yaşamdaki değişimlerin, eğitim hayatlarının, iş gücüne ve kamusal alana katılımlarının göçmen kadınların vatandaşlığını toplumsal cinsiyet temelli olarak nasıl şekillendirdiği sorgulanacaktır. Türk kökenli kadınların vatandaşlığı Bulgaristan'da onların etnik kimlikleri ve azınlık statüleri yoluyla kurgulanırken, Türkiye'de toplumsal cinsiyet temelli olarak kurgulanmıştır.

Gerek Bulgaristan'daki asimilasyon politikaları ve zorunlu göçe, gerekse Türkiye'deki çeşitli ayrımcılıklara maruz bırakılan göçmen kadınların öznel anlatıları bu çalışmanın belkemiğini oluşturmaktadır. 1989'da İzmir'e göç etmiş ve yerleşmiş olan Bulgaristan göçmeni kadınların anlatılarında zorunlu göç sürecindeki deneyimlerinin –konvansiyonel vatandaşlık kavramından farklı olarak- kadınların vatandaşlıklarını toplumsal cinsiyet temelli olarak nasıl kurguladığını açıklayabilmek bu araştırmanın temel amacıdır.

Vatandaşlık kavramından söz ederken, bu kavramın hangi aşamalardan geçtiğine ve nasıl modern tanımına ulaştığına bakmak faydalı olacaktır. Vatandaşlık tarihi, eski Roma ve Yunan uygarlıklarında ortaya çıkmış ve vatandaş olmak şehir devletleri ile özdeşleştirilmiştir (Turner, 1990:201). Bu toplumlarda vatandaşlık insanların yaşamını düzenleyen birincil gereklilik ve insanın kendini ifade biçimi olarak

algılanmıştır. Vatandaşlık, vatandaşların aktif katılımı, erkeğin egemenliği, karşılıklı güven esaslarına dayalı olup, Aristoteles'in de dediği üzere, sivil yaşamı yönetme ve karşılığında yönetilme olarak tanımlanmıştır (Roy, 2005:6). Ancak, Turner'ın (1990) belirttiği üzere, vatandaşlık egemen sınıfların yararlandığı, köle ticareti ve emeğinin serbestçe sömürüldüğü bir sisteme dayandırılmıştır. Şehir devletlerindeki vatandaşlık kavramını, sadece egemen sınıfın yararlandığı, kadınların, kölelerin, çocukların ve eşcinsellerin tamamıyla dışlandığı, temsil edilmediği ve vatandaş olarak görülmedikleri problemleri bir olgu olarak anlatmıştır. Roma İmparatorluğu'nda vatandaşların aktif katılımı ilkesi, pasif vatandaşlığa dönüşüp, farklı etnik kimlikten insanlara eşit yaklaşım ilkesi uygulanmasına rağmen, kadınlar ve alt sınıflar yine vatandaşlık kavramının dışında sayılmışlardır. Ortaçağ sonları ve modern çağın başlangıcı, vatandaşlık kavramında ortak özgürlüklerin önem kazandığı ve vatandaşların politik olarak görülmesinden ziyade özel yaşamları ve mutluluklarının öne çıkarılmak istendiği bir çağ olmuştur (Roy 2005). Pasif vatandaşlık kavramı 16. ve 18. yüzyıllar arasında gündemdeyken, Fransız Devrimi'yle birlikte vatandaşlık kavramı cumhuriyetçi bir nitelik kazanmış, vatandaşların aktif katılımları önem kazanmıştır (Roy, 2005:10). Modern vatandaşlık kavramı serbest piyasa ekonomisi ve kapitalizmin gelişimiyle 19. ve 20. yüzyıllarda ortaya çıkmış, liberal bireycilik ve cumhuriyetçilik akımları, eşit ve küresel liberal vatandaşlık kavramını doğurmuştur. T.H. Marshall'ın "Yurttaşlık ve Toplumsal Sınıflar" (1992) adlı ünlü çalışmasında belirttiği gibi, modern zamanlarda ortaya çıkan herkese eşit haklar ve fırsatlar sunmayı vadeden vatandaşlık kavramı, hem bu ideali gerçekleştirememiş hem de toplumsal cinsiyet temelli, kültür ve ırk temelli ayrımcılıklara son verememiştir (Roy, 2005:16).

T. H. Marshall modern vatandaşlık kavramını teorileştiren ve 18., 19. ve 20. yüzyıllardaki vatandaşlık kavramının boyutlarını inceleyen önemli bir yazardır. Marshall'ın temel teorisi, vatandaşlığın toplumlara sosyal eşitlik getirmeye yönelik bir modern dürtü olduğunu vurgular. Marshall vatandaşlığını üç kategoride incelemiştir; sivil, siyasi ve sosyal. Sivil haklar, düşünce, konuşma, inanç, mal mülk edinme özgürlüğü ve adalet gibi genel olarak bireyin haklarını içerir. Siyasi

haklar, politikaya katılım sürecini kapsarken, sosyal haklar ekonomik bağımsızlıktan, güvenlik hakkına, miras hakkından, uygar yaşama özgürlüğüne kadar birçok hakkı içermektedir (Marshall & Bottomore, 1992:8).

Marshall'ın vatandaşlık teorisi büyük önem taşımasına rağmen, birtakım eleştiriler de almıştır. Turner (1990), sosyoloji disiplinin sosyal entegrasyon ve sosyal dayanışma kavramlarının da etkisiyle değişerek, vatandaşlık teorisini de zamanla değiştirdiğini iddia etmiştir. Marshall'ın İngiliz liberalizminin de etkisiyle kavramsallaştırdığı vatandaşlık teorisi zamanla etkisi yitirmiştir. Vatandaşlık haklarının birleşik ve homojen olduğu iddia edilemeyeceği gibi, Marshall'ın gözden kaçırdığı kültür olgusunun vatandaşlık kavramına milliyetçi bir özellik kazandırdığı da inkar edilemez (Turner, 1990:192). Ayrıca Marshall'ın gözden kaçırdığı bir başka nokta ise vatandaşlık kavramının gelişiminin toplumsal hareketlerden nasıl etkilendiğidir. Toplumsal hareketlerin vatandaşlık kavramına sağladığı demokratik katılımlar önemlidir. Kadın hareketi, barış hareketleri ve çevreci hareketler gibi tabandan gelen toplumsal hareketlerin vatandaşlık kavramını nasıl değiştirdiği ve dönüştürdüğü de gözden kaçırılmamalıdır (Turner, 1990: 194-200).

Vatandaşlık kavramının milliyetçilik ve ulus devlet ile olan güçlü bağı problemlidir. Vatandaşlık ile ulus devlet arasındaki ilişki 19. yüzyılda tek uluslu devlet ideali olan ırkçı ve ayrımcı hareketlerin ortaya çıkmasına sebep olurken, 20. yüzyılda ise küresel pazarda emekleri kullanılan insanlara “misafirler ve yabancılar” (Sassen, 1999) gözüyle bakılmasına neden olmuştur. Örneğin, Avustralya'da Aborijinler vatandaşlıktan dışlanmışlar, ve göçmen olarak kabul edilmişlerdir. Dolayısıyla ulus devlet ideolojisinin vatandaşlık ile bağı, yerli insanları da dışlamış ve etnik kökenli ayrımcılığa yol açmıştır (Turner ve Isin, 2002: 5-6).

Vatandaşlık kavramı zaman içinde değişimlere uğramıştır. Önceleri sadece bir ‘statü’ anlamına gelen vatandaş olma durumu, çeşitli toplumsal ve politik hareketlerin de etkisiyle ‘politik, sosyal ve ekonomik olarak tanınma’ anlamı da

kazanmıştır (Turner ve Isin, 2002: 2). Kapitalizmin ve liberalizmin etkisiyle insanlar vatandaşlık haklarını talep eder duruma gelmişlerdir, fakat toplumsal cinsiyet, etnisite, sınıf gibi farklılıklar göz ardı edilmeye devam etmiştir. Küreselleşme ile birlikte gelen çokkültürlülük söylemi vatandaşlığın bu yönünü sorgulamaya başlamıştır (Roy, 2005: 5). Vatandaşlığın bir statüden çok hak arama, iddia etme, tanınma gibi anlamlara gelmesi, kadın hakları, hayvan hakları, LGBT hakları, engelleri hakları gibi hareketleri de içine alan, ‘aidiyet’ ve ‘dahil etme’ anlamlarını da beraberinde getirmiştir (Turner ve Isin, 2002:1). Ayrıca, uluslararası göç gerçeği de vatandaşlık algısının değişiminde rol oynamış, yeni aile yapıları, evlilikler, çoğulculuk gibi kavramların ortaya çıkmasına neden olmuştur (Turner ve Isin, 2002:9). Roy’un (2005) belirttiği üzere, her ne kadar pratikte uygulanması ulus devletlerin varlığından dolayı zor görünse de, ulus devlet olgusundan tamamıyla kopmuş küresel/dünya vatandaşlığı ve farklılıkları barındıran, farklı kültürden insanların –sadece bireysel değil, bir grubun üyesi olarak da- ihtiyaçlarına cevap veren bir vatandaşlık tanımı kabul edilebilir.

Modernitenin en büyük sorunlarından biri, kadınların “evrensel kurtuluşu” ve ikincilleştirilmesi arasındaki dengeyi kuramamış olmasıdır. Dolayısıyla kadınların vatandaşlıktan dışlanması, onların ev içine hapsedilmesi ve bunun doğallaştırılması yoluyla olmuştur (Werbner ve Yuval-Davis, 1999:6). Konvansiyonel vatandaşlık söylemi cinsiyetçi, ırkçı, sınıf temelli ve batı merkezlidir (Chow, 2010:160). Vatandaşlık kavramının cinsiyet bazlı tarafsızlık iddiasına rağmen, vatandaşlık sadece erkeklerin ihtiyaçlarına cevap vermeye devam etmiştir (Lister, 1997:3). Caldwell’in (2009) değindiği üzere, toplumsal cinsiyet bakış açılı bir vatandaşlık kavramı, kamusal alanın dışındaki politik olanı, yani kadın ve erkeğin ev ve kendi etnik toplulukları içindeki konumlanışlarını ve ulus devlet ile ilişkilerini ve deneyimlerini tanımlamalıdır.

Kadınların, tarihi çağlardan bu yana vatandaşlık oluşumundan dışlanması vatandaşlık kavramına feminist bir bakış açısı getirmiştir. Lister’in (1997) değindiği gibi Antik Yunan’da köleler gibi vatandaşlıktan dışlanan kadınlar, 19.

Yüzyıla gelindiğinde de benzer bir durumla karşılaşmıştır; evli kadın kocasının himayesindedir ve hiçbir vatandaşlık hakkı yoktur. Kadınların politik vatandaşlar olarak varlığı devrimci ve milliyetçi hareketlerde de yok sayılmıştır (Lister, 1997:66). Cumhuriyetçi düşünce erkeğin vatandaşlığa katılımını kadının özel alana hapsedilmesiyle sağlamlaştırmış, liberal düşünce ise kadının vatandaşlıktan dışlanmasından öte evli kadının yasal olarak ikincilleştirilmesini öngörmüş ve vatandaş ve aile reisi olarak beyaz erkeği birincilleştirmiştir (Lister, 1997:66-69). Pateman'a (1988, 1992, Roy 2005 içinde) göre modern vatandaşlık kadını tamamıyla dışlamıyor, fakat kadına biçtiği rolü annelik ve eş olmak ile sınırlıyor, bu da kadınları politik katılımdan dışlarken, onları eğitim, mülk edinme gibi sosyal haklardan da mahrum ediyor. Feminist vatandaşlık söylemi hem teoriyi hem de pratiği harekete geçirerek, kadınların ekonomik, politik ve sosyal olarak dışlanmışlıklarının ötesinde kadını bir özne olarak ele almayı hedefler (Lister, 1997:6). Çünkü vatandaşlık olgusunu sadece bireyler ve devlet arasındaki bir ilişki olarak görmek, bireylerin politik katılımını ve kaynaklara erişimini ve bunları etkileyen toplumsal cinsiyet dinamiklerini gözardı eden problemleri bir yaklaşımdır (Pateman 1988; Young 1990; Phillips 1991; Jenson 1993; Jenson & Saint Martin 2003, Abraham et al., 2010:4-5 içinde).

Kadınlar için nasıl bir vatandaşlık tanımlanabilir ve uygulanabilir sorusu önemli tartışmaları beraberinde getirmiştir. Bu konuda farklı görüşler olmakla birlikte üzerinde en çok durulan iki vatandaşlık biçimi; cinsiyet ayrımı gözetmeyen (gender-neutral) ve cinsiyet ayırt eden (gender-differentiated) vatandaşlıklardır (Abraham et al., 2010:10). Vogel'e (1991) göre, cinsiyet ayrımı gözetmeyen vatandaşlık kavramını tartışmak gereksizdir, çünkü toplumlar bu aşamaya gelmemiştir, cinsiyet ayrımı gözetmeyen bir kurumun varlığından söz etmek imkansız gibidir. Ancak yine Vogel, cinsiyet ayırt eden vatandaşlık kavramının da özgülüğe varabileceğini ve kadınları toplumsal cinsiyet rollerine ve özel alana hapsedebileceğini söyler (Lister, 1997:93 içinde). Lister (1997), cinsiyet ayrımı gözetmeyen vatandaşlık kavramının kadının vatandaşlık haklarının, erkeğin hali hazırda var olan haklarına eşitlemek olduğunu söyler, ama diğer yandan cinsiyet

ayırt eden vatandaşlığın kadınların ihtiyaçlarını daha iyi ortaya çıkararak, kadınların özel alandaki rollerini görünür kıldığını söyler. Aktif vatandaşlık gösterebilmeleri için kadınların –cinsiyetsiz değil kadın olarak- kamusal alanda daha görünür olması ve katılımının artması gerekir, ayrıca azınlık statüsünde olan kadınların, onların tarihsel baskılanışlarını ve dışlanmalarını tanıyan birtakım özel haklara sahip olması gerekir (Castles ve Davidson 2000; Tastsoglou ve Dobrowolsky 2006, Abraham et al., 2010 içinde).

Toplumsal cinsiyet, sınıf ve etnisitenin kesişimi de vatandaşlığın kurgusu üzerinde oldukça etkili olmuştur. Werbner ve Yuval-Davis'e (1999) göre vatandaşlık kavramı, farklılıkları dışlayarak, sınıfın, toplumsal cinsiyetin, etnisitenin, dinin, cinselliğin, ve engellilik durumunun kesişimlerini vatandaşlık çerçevesinin dışında bırakmıştır. Vatandaşlık ve ulusal kimlik sadece kadın ve erkek arasındaki eşitsizliğe neden olmakla kalmaz, aynı zamanda sömürgeleşme ve göçlerden etkilenen farklı gruplar arasında da eşitsizlik yaratır (Stasiulis ve Bakan, 1997:19). Kadınlar kendi aralarında homojen bir kategori oluşturmazlar çünkü “etnisite, ırk, yaş, yetenek ve başka şeylere dayalı diğer toplumsal ayrımlar cinsiyet ayrımlarıyla çakışır” (Yuval-Davis, 2010:214). Feministler “her kimlik, farklılığa göre kurulur” ifadesine dayanarak, ‘çeşitlilik içinde evrensellik’ ve ‘çaprazlama siyaset’ gibi söylemler geliştirmişlerdir (Lister 1997, Yuval-Davis 2010). Yuval-Davis'in (2010:231) değindiği üzere “somut olarak tüm feminist siyasetin, kadınlar arasındaki farklılıkların tanındığı ve bu farklılıkların seslerini duyurabildikleri bir koalisyon siyaseti biçimi olarak görülmesi gerektiği ve bu siyasi birimlerin içerisi ve dışarısının ve bu koalisyonun sınırlarının, ‘kim’ olduğumuz değil, neyi başarmak istediğimiz dikkate alınarak kurulması gerektiği anlamına gelir”. Yine Yuval-Davis'in (1999) değindiği gibi, kadınların vatandaşlığı çok katmanlıdır ve hem ulus devlet içinde hem de buldukları etnik, dinsel, diasporik topluluklar içinde aidiyet ve ait olamama olgularıyla şekillenir. Dolayısıyla göçmen kadınların vatandaşlığı birden çok yapısal eşitsizliğin meydana getirdiği toplumsal cinsiyet temelli bir kurgudur.

Özel ve kamusal alan dikotomisi kadınların vatandaşlığını doğrudan etkileyen faktörlerden birisidir. Vatandaşlık, erkek egemen bir özellikte olmasının yanı sıra, kamusal alanla özdeşleştirilen bir olgudur. Kadınların özel alana hapsedilmiş toplumsal cinsiyet rollerinden dolayı, vatandaşlık hakları da görmezden gelinir ve dışlanır (Roy, 2005:28). Kadınların kamusal alandan dışlanıp özel alana hapsedilmelerinin sebebi sadece onlara atfedilen roller değil, aynı zamanda kadınların ‘milletleri üreten’ ve ‘milletlerin anneleri’ olma vasıflarıyla, biyopolitik ve öjenik söylemlere dahil edilmesidir (Werbner ve Yuval-Davis, 1999:17). Ayrıca kadınların ev içindeki temizlik, yemek, yaşlı ve çocuk bakımı gibi sonu gelmez yeniden üretim süreçleri onları özel alana sıkıştırarak, kamusal alanda vatandaş olma haklarını ellerinden alır. Sosyal devletin sağlayamadığı kamusal alana aktif katılımı, feminist politika kadınları, azınlıkları ve onların ihtiyaçlarını gözeterek, “vatandaş” ve “politika” kavramlarının sınırlandırılmasını sorgulayarak, özel/kamusal alan dikotomisini ve evrensellik kavramını eleştirerek gerçekleştirmeye çalışır (Young 1989, 1990; Phillips 1991, 1993, Lister, 1997:24 içinde). Kadınların özel alanda sınırlandırılması, vatandaşlıklarının da sadece aile içinde, aile üyesi olarak bir anlam ifade etmesine yol açar. Abraham’ın (2010:7) da değindiği üzere, kadınlar erkeklerden daha yoksul ve özel alana indirgenmiş olarak, ve çeşitli sosyal haklardan mahrum bırakılarak, en asgari düzeyde bile nasıl siyasi vatandaşlık haklarından söz edebilirler? Politika kavramının erkek egemen tanımlarını bir kenara bırakırsak, maneviyat, duygular, cinsellik ve kadınların öznel deneyimleri gibi olguların da vatandaşlık kavramını oluşturduğu unutulmamalıdır (Caldwell et al., 2009:7). Kadınların sosyal vatandaşlığı konusu da belirsiz ve tamamlanmamış bir meseledir. Vatandaşlık tanımı ‘içerme’ kavramı üzerinden yapıldığında kadınlar, göçmenler, mülteciler dışarıda bırakılıp vatandaşlıkları “tamamlanmamış”, “eksik” ve “parçalanmış” olarak tanımlanır (Abraham et al., 2010:4). Kadınların sosyal vatandaşlık hakları, onların işgücü piyasasına katılımlarının artmasıyla gelişecektir.

Göç konusunun vatandaşlık ile ilişkisi her zaman problemlidir. Kadınların ve erkeklerin, etnik, dini, cinsel farklı topluluklara üyeliği, onların vatandaşlık

haklarını ve deneyimlerini doğrudan etkileyen bir olgudur (Yuval-Davis 1991, Pettman, 1999:207 içinde). Simon ve Brettell (1986) değindiği üzere, göçmen kadın hem üyesi olduğu aile ve işgücü piyasası içindeki ataerkil ilişkiler tarafından sömürülür hem de göçmenlik durumunun neden olduğu azınlık statüsünden etkilenir (Kadıoğlu, 1997:539 içinde). Kadınlar, göçmenlik durumunun yarattığı yeni sosyal eşitsizlikler ve sosyal dışlanmadan iki kat etkilenirken, cinsiyetçi iş bölümü, güvencesiz çalışma veya ev-aile işinde ücretsiz çalışma gibi koşullardan dolayı yeniden sömürülürler (Abraham et al., 2010:6). Göçmen kadınlar, pasif, politik katılımı olmayan ve politik söylem üretmeyen vatandaşlar olarak görülürler ve işgücü piyasasında en çok ezilen grubu oluştururlar (Zavos, 2010:21, 25).

Göç, kadınların işgücüne katılımını dolayısıyla da onların vatandaşlık durumunu çeşitli yollardan etkiler. Göçmen kadınlar, daha çok ev içi işçiliği, tekstil sektörü, bakım hizmetleri ve hemşirelik gibi alanlarda çalışmaktadırlar. Göçmen kadınlar kendi ülkelerinde yapmadıkları işleri göç ettikleri ülkelerde yapmak zorunda bırakılmışlardır. Morokvasic'in (1983:888) dediği gibi, kadınlar ücretli veya ücretsiz her yerde ve her zaman çalışırlar. İlegal ve düzensiz göçlerle gelen kadınlar hiyerarşinin en alt tabakasını oluştururken, sömürüyü, vatandaşlık haklarından mahrumiyeti ve toplumun "kenarına" itilmeyi derinlemesine yaşarlar (Lister, 1997). Bu kadınlar göç sürecinin içindeki cinsiyetçi şiddetten de daha fazla etkilenirler. İşgücüne katılımları da tamamıyla sömürü düzenine dayalı, cinsiyetçi, güvencesiz ve düşük ücretlidir.

1989 Bulgaristan göçü sınır dışı edilme, etnik temizlik gibi kampanyaların sonucunda meydana gelen zorunlu bir göçtür. Pomaklarla başlayan ve 1984 yılından itibaren özellikle Türkleri hedef alan ayrımcı kampanyalar, 1989 yılında etnik Türklerin Bulgaristan'dan sınır dışı edilmesiyle son bulmamış, 1990'lı yıllar boyunca da göçün devam etmesine sebep olmuştur. 1989 yılında Türkiye'ye gelen göçmenler hemen vatandaşlık hakkına sahip olmuşlar, ancak 1990'lı yıllarda gelenler yasadışı yollarla Türkiye'de ikamet etmiş, vatandaşlık hakkına uzun uğraşlar sonucu sahip olmuşlardır. 1990'lı yıllarda göçmenlerden kimisi kaçak olarak

Türkiye’de yaşamış, kimisi de geçici oturma izinleriyle ikametini sürdürmüştür. Kaşlı ve Parla’nın (2009:206) değindiği üzere, Türkiye bu illegal göçmenleri ucuz işgücü olarak kullanmış ve ulusötesi politikaları nedeniyle Bulgaristan’da oy vermeleri koşuluyla geçici oturma izinleri sağlamıştır. Ancak, bu çalışmadaki vatandaşlıktan kasıt, göçmenlerin yasal olarak bir ülkede ikamet hakkı, oy verme gibi haklarından öte, toplumsal cinsiyet bağlamında kadınların yaşam koşullarını derinden etkileyen, özel ve kamusal alan üzerinden kurulan ve tanımlanan bir vatandaşlıktır. Bulgaristanlı göçmen kadınların yaşamı Türkiye’ye göç etmeden önce ve sonra olmak üzere farklı deneyimlerden oluşmuştur. Göç süreci başlı başına bir problem olduğu gibi, başka bir ülkede yaşam kurma ve onu idame ettirme deneyimleri göçmen kadınlar için farklı bir sosyalizasyon süreci ve vatandaşlık algısı yaratmıştır. Bulgaristan’da yaşarken vatandaşlıkları etnik kökenleri üzerinden kurulan Bulgaristan göçmeni kadınların Türkiye’de vatandaşlıkları toplumsal cinsiyet temelli olarak kurulmuştur.

Bulgaristan’da sosyalizm, kadınları “kapitalizmin zincirlerinden kurtaracak özgürlük” ve “özgür ve sosyalist Bulgar kadını” vaatleriyle gelmiş olsa da, kadınlara yeni yaptırımlar ve kısıtlamalar getirmiştir (Panova et al. 1993:17). Kadın artık ücretli işgücünün yeni bir üyesi olmuş, ancak ev işlerinden azat edemediği için üzerine iki kat yük binmiştir. Dolayısıyla “özgür, sosyalist, çalışan kadın” miti hiç gerçekleşmemiştir (Panova et al., 1993:18). Sosyalist sistemin kadınlara sağladığı çocuk bakım parası ve ücretli izinler kadınlara fayda getiren haklar gibi görünse de, Bulgar kadınların çocuk doğurması yönündeki teşvikler, devletin kadın bedenini kontrol altına almak istediğinin en açık örneklerindedir. Türk ve Roman topluluklarının çok çocuk sahibi olması sosyalist devleti korkutmuştur, bu yüzden Bulgar kadınların kürtaj yaptırması yasaklanmıştır (Petrova, 1993:23). Bulgaristan’da kadınlar erkekler gibi iyi eğitim almış olsa bile, iş fırsatlardan eşit olarak, ücretlerden ve promosyonlardan eşit şekilde yararlanamamıştır (22). Erkeklerle eşit konumda gözükken kadınların aslında üç temel görevi vardır; birincisi iyi anne ve eş olmak, ikincisi iyi işçi olmak ve sonuncusu ise sosyalist sistemde iyi bir sosyal aktivist olmaktır.

Bulgaristan Türkleri sosyalist sistemin getirdiği eğitim, sağlık hizmetleri ve refah gibi fırsatlardan yararlanmışlardır. Özellikle Türk kadınlar için daha önce mümkün olmayan eğitim ve çalışma imkanları önemli kazanımlar getirmiştir (Parla, 2009:758). Parla (2009:758), Bulgaristan'daki Türk kökenli 30-50 yaş aralığındaki kadınlarla onların anneleri arasında iki önemli ayrımın olduğuna dikkat çekiyor; ilk grup kadınlar –kırsal bölgede yaşasalar bile- en az 8 yıllık eğitime erişebilmişler, yüksek eğitim alabilmişler ve sağlık ve eğitim sektörlerinde çalışma imkanı bulabilmişlerdir, ancak onların anneleri sadece birkaç yıllık dini eğitim almışlar ve ücretsiz olarak tarımda çalışıp evde çocuk bakmışlardır. Ayrıca, her ne kadar Türk milliyetçileri tarafından kreşler ve günlük bakım merkezleri komünist propagandanın yatağı olarak görülse de, kadınlar ücretli bir işte çalışmanın getirdiği görece özgürlükten memnun olmuşlardır (Parla, 2009:758).

1989 yılında Türkiye'ye gelen Bulgaristanlı kadınlar, bu göçün zorunlu göç olduğunu ve birkaç gün içinde sınır dışı edildiklerini belirtmişlerdir. Kamu kurumlarında çalışanlar Türk oldukları için baskı görmüşler ve önderlik yapma ihtimali olanların hemen sınır dışı edildiğini dile getirmişlerdir. Gece evleri basan polisler ve memurlar zorla isim değişikliği uygulamışlar ve Türk kökenli kadınlara taciz etmiş, şiddet uygulamışlardır. Sırf etnik kökenleri yüzünden insanlar Türkiye'nin Diyarbakır cezaevine benzetilen Belene Hapishanesi'ne götürülmüşler, çeşitli işkencelere ve kısımlara maruz kalmışlardır. Anadil yasağı, ibadet yasağı, zorla isim değiştirme ve zorla yerinden etme gibi etnik temizlik kampanyalarına maruz kalan Türkler için zorunlu göçten başka seçenek bırakılmamıştır.

Kadınlar, göç konusunun hep gündemlerinde olduğu ve çocukluklarından beri Türkiye'ye göç etmeye hazır beklediklerini belirtmişlerdir. Göçmen kadınlar, bu zorunlu göç deneyiminin travmatik bir olgu olduğunu vurgulamışlardır. Ancak genel olarak Türkiye'ye gelmiş olmaktan memnun olduklarını vurgulamışlardır. Bulgaristan'da kalmış olduklarını düşünemediklerini söylemişler ve “Türk bayrağının” altında olmanın onlar için çok şey ifade ettiğini dile getirmişlerdir.

“Bulgaristan’da Osmanlı’ya ait bir dikendik” diyerek Türklük, bayrak ve özellikle Türkçe konuşmanın onlar için ne kadar önemli olduğunu vurgulamışlardır.

İçinde yaşadıkları sosyalist sistemden dolayı Bulgaristanlı kadınlar ve erkekler ücretli işlerde çalışmaya alışık insanlardır. Dolayısıyla, göçmen kadınlar Türkiye’de geldiklerinde de ücretli işlerde çalışmaya devam etmişlerdir. Bulgaristan göçmeni kadınlar, Türkiye’ye göç ettikleri ilk yıllarda iş seçmediklerini, hangi işte olursa olsun çalıştıklarını söylemişlerdir. Özellikle göç ettikleri ilk yıllarda Türkiye’deki kadınların ve erkeklerin onların ev dışında ücretli bir işte çalışıyor olmalarına çok şaşırdıklarını ve eleştirdiklerini aktarmışlardır. 1990’lı yılların başında Türkiye’de çalışan kadınların çok az olduğunu ancak şimdi bu durumun değiştiğini vurgulamışlardır. “Türkiyeli kadınlar bizden gördükleri için çalışmaya başladılar”, “erkekler kadınların da namusuyla çalışabileceğini bizimle öğrendiler, kocalar karılarını işe göndermeye bizi gördükten sonra başladılar” gibi söylemlerde bulunmuşlardır.

Çalışma kültürlerinden dolayı Bulgaristan göçmeni kadınlar ve eşleri ayrımcılığa maruz kalmıştır. Kocalarının eşlerine çalışmak için nasıl izin verdikleri hep sorgulanmıştır. Göçmen kadınlar ahlaksızlıkla suçlanmış, yıkanmış çamaşırları asma biçimleri bile eleştirilmiştir (Zhelyazkova, 1998:11). Göçmen kadınlar Bulgaristan’dayken geceleri sokağa rahatça çıktıklarını, kimsenin onlara yan gözle bakmadığını ve laf atmadığını belirtirken, Türkiye’de geç vakitte dışarı çıkmadıklarını söylemişlerdir. Değil akraba erkeklerin, komşu erkeklerin bile onlara kardeş gözüyle baktığını ve aralarında asla bir ilişki olamayacağını söylemiş ve Türkiye’deki akraba evliliklerini ve erkeklerin kadınlara bakışını eleştirmişlerdir. Göçmen kadınlar ilk göç ettikleri yıllarda yerel halktan gelen “her işi yapıyorlar”, “bizim işlerimizi çaldılar” gibi söylemlere üzüldüklerini ama kulak asmamayı öğrendiklerini belirtmişlerdir.

Göçmen kadınlar, eşleri gibi tam zamanlı işlerde çalıştıkları için çocuk bakımı bir problem meydana getirmiştir. Bulgaristan’da çocuk bakım ücreti ve kreş desteği

alan kadınlar, ordayken bu konuda hiç sıkıntı çekmediklerini dile getirmişlerdir. Akrabaları Türkiye’de olan kadınlar, çocuk bakımı için aile içindeki yaşlı kadınlardan destek almışlardır. Çocuk bakımı için aile veya akraba desteği alamayan kadınlar çocuklarını Bulgaristan’da kalan akrabalarının yanlarına geçici olarak göndermişlerdir. ‘Ulusötesi annelik’ ve ‘denizaşırı annelik’ (Yuval-Davis 1997) kavramları kadınların bu içinden çıkılmaz durumlarını vurgulamak için üretilmiştir.

Bulgaristan’da komünist sistem devrildikten sonra yoksulluk aşırı derece artmış, halkın neredeyse beşte dördü yoksulluk sınırının altında yaşamaya başlamıştır ve bu da göçün kadınlaşması durumunu ortaya çıkarmıştır. (Parla, 2007:164). 1990’lı yıllardaki göçler, daha çok kadınların Türkiye’ye iş aramaya gelmesiyle başlamıştır. Genelde erkeklerin öncülük ettiği göç hareketleri, burada tersine bir durumda kadınların başı çektiği bir durum meydana getirmiştir. 1990’lı yıllarda kaçak yollardan gelen kadınlar, özellikle konfeksiyon fabrikalarında ve bakım hizmetlerinde çalışmışlardır. Vatandaşlık alamadıkları takdirde sigortasız ve düşük ücretle ev içi işçisi olarak da çalışmışlardır. İlk geldikleri yıllarda çocuk bakıcısı olarak üst sınıf ailelerinde yanında çalışan kadınlar kendilerini şanslı hissetmişlerdir çünkü vasıfız erkek göçmenler için böyle bir sektör oluşmamıştır (Parla, 2007:165).

Türkiye’ye göç etmenin kadınlara kazanımlar getirip getirmediği, vatandaşlık bağlamında da önemli bir sorunsaldır. Genellikle kadın göçmenler, eşlerine veya ailelerine tabi olarak göç sürecini yaşarlar. Bu zorunlu göç sürecinde de kadınlar aileleriyle Türkiye’ye göç etmişlerdir. Tek başına gelen kadınlar 1990’lı yıllarda işgücü göçüyle geçici süreler için Türkiye’ye gelenlerdir. Göç deneyiminin kadınlara ekonomik ve sosyal değişimlerden dolayı aile içinde bir statü getirdiği ileri sürülür. Ancak, göç etmeden önce kendi ülkelerinde çalışan ve bir birey olabilen ama göç ettikten sonra çalışmayan kadınlarda geçmişe özlem ve pişmanlık duygularının arttığı gözlemlenmiştir (Al-Ali, 2002:97). Görüşülen tüm kadınlar Türkiye’ye geldikleri için çok memnun olduklarını, hiç pişmanlık yaşamadıklarını vurgulamışlardır. Çocuklarını Türk bayrağı altında büyütmekten ve onlara iyi

eđitim verebilmiř olmaktan dolayı mutluluk duyduklarını belirtmiřlerdir. Grřlen gmen kadınların hepsi ya halen alıřıyor yada emekli olmuřlardır.

Kırsal kesimden gelen kadınlar, “Bulgaristan’da kalsaydık ttn iřinde lr giderdik” diye vurguluyorlar. Gmen kadınlar yařam standartlarının ykseldiđini sylyorlar. Trkiye’de istedikleri iřlerde alıřtıklarını, Bulgaristan’daki gibi tek elden her řeyi denetleyen bir ynetim olmadığı iin memnunlar. Bulgaristan’da btn arazilerin devlete ait olduđunu, ister tarlada ister fabrikada insanların hep devlete hizmet ettiđini vurgularken, Trkiye’de zel iřini kurabiliyor olmanın “zgrlđnden” bahsediyorlar. Ayrıca, kırsal kesimde ev dıřında alıřan kadınlar eve gelince tarlada annelerine yardım ettiklerini, hayvan baktıklarını, ev iřlerini yaptıklarını ve srekli alıřtıklarını dile getiriyorlar. Bu da sonu gelmez bir yeniden retim srecini vurguluyor. Trkiye’de řehirde yařamaktan dolayı belirli bir zgrlkleri olduđunu dile getiriyorlar. Kırsal kesimden Trkiye’ye gelen kadınlar, lke deđiřtirmenin yanı sıra kırdan kente gc de deneyimlemiř oluyorlar.

Kadın olmanın ve kadınlık deneyimi yařamanın getirdiđi zorluklar, gmen kadın olma deneyiminde ikiye katlanır. Bulgaristan gmeni kadınların řimdiye kadar neden fazla arařtırma konusu olmadıkları, onların komnist sistemden getirmiř oldukları ođu řeye boyun eđme, katlanma gibi zelliklerinin yanında, azınlık olarak yařamıř oldukları dıřlanma ve ayrımcılıđa maruz bırakılmanın Trkiye’ye g ttiklerinde tamamen bitmiř olduđu yanılıđında olmaları, ve daha nce grmedikleri birtakım imkanları Trkiye’de elde etmenin getirdiđi bir yanılıđının iine dřmeleri olabilir. Grřmelerden yaptığım ıkarımlarda, gmen kadınların Bulgaristan vatandařı olarak yařadıkları ayrımcılıđın etnik kken zerinden olduđu, ancak Trkiye’de dıřlanmalarının sebebinin toplumsal cinsiyet temelli rollerden ve bu kadınların kamusal alanda var olma abalarından kaynaklandıđı sylenebilir. Toplumsal cinsiyet temelli ayrımcılıđın Bulgaristan’da olmadığını sylemek yanılıcıdır; devlet eliyle ynetilen szde (pseudo) bir feminizmin kadınların omuzlarına  kat yk bindirdiđi malumdur. Parla’nın da (2009:763) belirttiđi gibi Bulgaristan gmeni kadınlar komnist sistemi toplumsal cinsiyet eřitliđinin

sağlayıcısı olarak görüyorlar ve Türkiye’de cinsiyet eşitsizliğini ve namus kavramının yüceltilmesini de bu sistemin yokluğuna bağlıyorlar. Bulgaristan göçmeni kadınlar toplumsal cinsiyet temelli ayrımcılığı Türkiye’ye gelince algılamaya başlıyorlar, çünkü Bulgaristan’dayken -kendi topluluklarında- Türk ve Müslüman olmaktan kaynaklanan bir kısıtlamaya maruz kalırken, Türkiye’de kamusal hayata katıldıkları için ve ücretli işlerde çalıştıkları için dışlanıyor ve toplumsal cinsiyet temelli vatandaşlığı deneyimliyorlar. Göçmen kadınlar Türkiye’deki patriyarkal toplum yapısının toplumsal cinsiyet eşitliğinin önündeki engel olduğunu görseler bile, toplumsal cinsiyet eşitsizliğini sorgulamıyor veya değiştirmeye çalışmıyorlar. Bu durum kadınların etnik olarak çoğunluğa dahil oldukları bir toplumsa uyum göstermeleri ve adapte olmaya çalışmaları ile açıklanabilir. Son olarak, kamusal hayatı istedikleri gibi kullanamayan, geceleri dışarı istedikleri saatte çıkamayan, çocuk bakım hizmetlerinden faydalanmayan, düşük ücretli ve güvencesiz çalıştırılan ve çalışmalarından dolayı eleştiriye maruz kalan göçmen kadınlar, Türkiye vatandaşlığına geçmiş olsalar bile, vatandaşlık kavramının içine dahil edilmeyenler olarak kalmışlardır.

**APPENDIX-D**

**THESIS PHOTOCOPYING PERMISSION FORM**

**TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU**

**ENSTİTÜ**

|                                |                                     |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü        | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Enformatik Enstitüsü           | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü      | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

**YAZARIN**

Soyadı : KAYTAN  
Adı : ÖZGE  
Bölümü : KADIN ÇALIŞMALARI

**TEZİN ADI** (İngilizce) : GENDERED CITIZENSHIP: EXPERIENCES AND PERCEPTIONS OF THE BULGARIAN TURKISH IMMIGRANT WOMEN

**TEZİN TÜRÜ** : Yüksek Lisans  Doktora

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.
2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.
3. Tezimden bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınamaz.

**TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ:**