

**THE EXPERIENCES OF URBAN POVERTY
AMONG RECENT IMMIGRANTS IN ANKARA:
SOCIAL EXCLUSION OR NOT?**

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

BY

SERPİL TAŞKAN

**IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY**

MAY, 2007

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata
Director

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

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıođlu
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. Helga Rittersberger-Tılıç
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

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

Assoc. Prof. Dr. H. Sibel Kalaycıođlu (METU, SOC) _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Filiz Kardam (ÇANKAYA UNİV, ECON) _____

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 conducts, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Surname: Serpil Tařkan

Signature:

ABSTRACT

THE EXPERIENCES OF URBAN POVERTY AMONG RECENT IMMIGRANTS IN ANKARA: SOCIAL EXCLUSION OR NOT?

Serpil Taşkan

Ms, Department of Sociology

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Helga Ritterberger-Tılıç

May 2007, 180 pages

The aim of this study is to find some indications about social exclusion in some neighbourhoods in Ankara. Social exclusion has increasingly gained importance as a concept in contemporary social sciences. To attain this aim, firstly, a theoretical framework, through which theories of the concept of social exclusion, main dynamics and differences of this concept from the concept of poverty were discussed. Secondly, a field work was carried out in some squatter settlements in Ankara known as “poor”, to see whether there is social exclusion perceived and lived, by analysing recent immigrants’ daily life experiences of urban poverty and social exclusion.

In this study, a qualitative approach formed the basis and in-depth interview were collected. The in-depth interviews were realized with 8 men, as heads of households, and 7 women, as spouses of heads of households, living in squatter settlements in Ankara in February and March 2007. All interviews were recorded and transcribed for the analysis Since De Haan’s (1998) theory of social exclusion

shaped the theoretical frame, his methodology and operationalization of social exclusion's multi-dimensionality were adapted in an attempt to identify experiences and "examples" of excluded and processes forming their exclusions.

In conclusion, two main indicators', gender and ethnicity, impacts on the respondents' experiences and perceptions of social exclusion appeared as follows:

Gender has not appeared as a striking indicator that makes women perceive themselves as excluded. The reason for this has to be seen in the fact that do not have had any serious experiences of social exclusion. They did not mention any conditions of exclusion in terms of economic, social, cultural and political participation in the society that would lead to the experience of exclusion or to a perception of themselves as excluded. The recent women migrants interviewed have a very limited social interaction and direct participation in the social and local life. A reason might be seen in the existing patriarchal system still controlling gender roles in general and a lack of trust of the interviewed women migrants towards their social environment.

Ethnicity, however, as an indicator has more determining effects on the respondents' experiences of exclusion and on their perception of being excluded. Forcibly migrated Kurdish respondents' experiences after migration to Ankara indicate that, their ethnic identity is a dynamic factor since: first, it results in exclusion from economic and social domains of life, though it does not make them be the "poorest"; second, it makes them perceive themselves as excluded from these domains. Thus, at the last stage, it leads them into a kind of "isolation" from society, as response to exclusive attitudes of the society. In reaction they form ethnic based "semi-isolated communities" which can be described as: strong ethnic and familial/kinship-ties determining their social, cultural, economic life and also their geographical living spaces.

Key Words: Social exclusion, urban poverty, migration, ethnicity, gender, Ankara.

ÖZ

ANKARA'DA Kİ YENİ GÖÇMENLERİN KENT

YOKSULLUĞU DENEYİMLERİ: SOSYAL DIŞLANMA

MI?

Serpil Taşkan

Yüksek Lisans, Sosyoloji Bölümü

Tez Danışmanı: Yard. Dr. Helga Ritterberger-Tılıç

Mayıs 2007, 180 sayfa

Bu çalışmanın amacı, son yıllarda çağdaş sosyal bilimlerde önem kazanmış olan sosyal dışlanma hakkında Ankara'nın belli mahallelerinde bazı ipuçları bulmaya çalışmaktır. Bu amaca ulaşmak için, ilk olarak, bazı sosyal dışlanma teorilerinin, buna neden olan temel dinamiklerin ve kavramın yoksulluktan farklılığının tartışıldığı teorik çerçeve verildi. İkinci olarak, Ankara'nın yoksul olarak bilinen gecekondu yerleşim yerlerinde, yeni göçmenlerin kent yoksulluğu deneyimleri incelenerek, sosyal dışlanma olarak adlandırılabilir bir durumun olup olmadığını anlamak için saha çalışması yapıldı.

Bu çalışmada, niteliksel yöntem ve derinlemesine mülakat kullanıldı. Derinlemesine mülakatlar Ankara'nın yoksul gecekondu bölgelerinde yaşayan 8 erkek, hane reisi olarak, ve 7 kadın, hanereisinin eşi olarak, görüşmecisi ile 2007'nin Şubat ve Mart'ın da gerçekleştirildi. Bütün görüşmeler, analiz sürecinde kullanmak için kayıt edildi ve çözümlendi. Bu çalışmanın yönteminde, De Haan'nın (1998)

sosyal dışlanma teorisi temel alındığından, dışlanmışları ve onların dışlanma süreçlerini anlamak için, onun sosyal dışlanmanın çok boyutluluğunu (operationalization of multi-dimensionality of social exclusion) gösteren tablosu uyarlanarak kullanıldı.

Sonuçta, iki ana göstergenin, toplumsal cinsiyet ve etnisitenin, görüşülenlerin sosyal dışlanma deneyimleri ve algıları üzerindeki etkileri şu şekilde belirdi: Toplumsal cinsiyet, kadınların kendilerini dışlanmış olarak algılamalarına neden olan çarpıcı bir gösterge olarak belirmemiştir. Bu durumun sebebi, onların dışlanma yada kendilerini dışlanmış olarak algılama koşullarını yaratacak olan, ekonomik, toplumsal, kültürel ve politik alanlara ciddi bir katılımlarının olmamasıdır. Bu da toplumsal cinsiyet rollerini hala kontrol eden ataerkil sistem ve sosyal çevreye olan güvensizlik nedeniyledir.

Bununla birlikte etnisite, görüşülen kişilerin dışlanma deneyimleri ve, sonuç olarak, algıları üzerinde daha fazla etkisi olan bir gösterge olarak belirdi. Zorunlu göç eden Kürt görüşmecilerin Ankara'ya göçlerinden sonraki deneyimleri, onların etnik kimliklerinin dinamik bir faktör olduğunu göstermektedir çünkü: ilk önce, onların, en yoksul yapmamasına rağmen, kent yaşamının ekonomik ve sosyal alanlarından dışlanmasına neden oluyor; ikinci olarak, onların kendilerini dışlanmış olarak algılamalarına neden oluyor. En son aşamada, bu dışlayıcı tutumlara cevap olarak ve kendi sosyal, kültürel ve psikolojik ihtiyaçlarını karşılamak için, kendilerini toplumdan, etnik temelli yarı-izole edilmiş bir oluşturarak, izole etmelerine neden oluyor.

Key Words: Sosyal Dışlanma, kent yoksulluğu, göç, etnisite, toplumsal cinsiyet, Ankara.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest indebtedness to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Helga Rittersberger Tılıç for her guidance and contributions through the whole study and for her moral support.

I would also like to express my highest indebtedness to my jury members, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıođlu and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Filiz Kardam for their precious and contributive comments.

I offer my special gratitude to my family members, especially my parents, for their endless sacrifices.

I am greatly indebted to Sema Yurduşen who never send back my requests whenever I need help.

I would also like to thank my friend, Dilek Türkođlu, who has never spare her moral support that made me feel lucky.

I am also very grateful to Süheyla Türkyılmaz for her invaluable help and support during the hardest times of my study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	viii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ix
APPENDICES.....	xii
LIST OF TABLES.....	xiii
I-INTRODUCTION.....	1
II-METHODOLOGY.....	5
II-1-Objective of the Study.....	5
II-2- Justification of the Research Area.....	7
II-3- Description of the Neighbourhoods.....	8
II-4-Selection of the Sample.....	8
II-5-Data Collection.....	9
II-6-Research Experiences during the process of interviews.....	10
III-WHAT IS SOCIAL EXCLUSION?	12
III-1-Poverty.....	13
III-2-Urban Poverty: Definition and Historical Process	15
III-3-Social Exclusion Debate.....	17
III-3-1-Operationalizing Social Exclusion.....	23
III-3-2-Social Exclusion across the Generations.....	25
III-3-3-Causes of Social exclusion	27
III-3-4-Differences of Poverty	29
III-3-5-Critiques of Social Exclusion	31
III-4- Social Exclusion in Advanced Societies.....	34

III-4-1- USA	34
III-4-2-Social Exclusion in Europe.....	39
III-4-3-Social Exclusion in Developing Countries.....	43
IV-THE TURKISH CASE.....	51
IV-1- Poverty Profile in Turkey.....	52
IV-1-2-Urban Poverty: The Pre-1980 Era.....	56
IV-1-3-Urban Poverty: The Post-1980 Era.....	62
IV-1-4- Urban Poverty in 1990s.....	65
IV-1-4-1-The Weakening Role of Traditional Regime of Turkey.....	70
IV-1-4-2- Forced Migration.....	74
IV-2-Social Exclusion in Turkey.....	75
IV-2-1-Aged and Disabled People.....	76
IV-2-2-Women.....	77
IV-2-3-Children	78
IV-2-4-Forced Immigrants.....	79
V-DESCRIPTION of the FINDINGS.....	84
V-1-Demographic and Social Characteristics.....	84
V-2-Migration Patterns of the Poor.....	86
VI- ADAPTATION of De Haan CONCEPTUALIZATION.....	90
VI-1-Physical Dimension: Locational and Infrastructural . Aspects of Squatters.....	90
VI-2-Economic Dimension.....	93
VI-2-1-Labor Market Attachments of Heads of Households.....	93
VI-2-2-Working Conditions of Heads of Households.....	97
VI-2-3-Income: The Main Source of Dissatisfaction.....	97

VI-2-4-Households' Conditions of Subsistence and Absolute Poverty.....	99
VI-2-5-Respondent's Perceptions of Relative poverty.....	103
VI-2-6-Respondents' Positions of Having Assets.....	104
VI-3-Dimension of Human capital.....	105
VI-3-1-Health Statuses of Respondents and Their Families.....	105
VI-3-2-Educational Levels of Respondents.....	107
VI-4- Dimension of Social Capital.....	109
VI-4-1-Social Background.....	109
VI-4-1-1-Gender's Impact on Exclusion.....	109
VI-4-1-2-Ethnicity's Impact on Exclusion.....	110
VI-4-2-Civic Engagement.....	112
VI-4-2-1- Level of Membership Organizations.....	112
VI-4-2-2- Social Networks and Contact with Society.....	114
VI-4-3-Psychological Dimension.....	121
VI-4-3-1-Respondents' Adaptation to City Life.....	121
VI-4-3-2-Respondents' Senses of Self-esteem.....	125
VI-4-3-3-Future Prospects of Respondents.....	126
VI-5-Political Dimension.....	129
VI-5-1-Respondents' membership of organizations.....	129
VI-5-2-Respondents' Perception of Citizenship.....	131
VII-CONCLUSION.....	133
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	145

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A-1 Respondents' migration patterns, job status and social Demographic Profiles.....	156
APPENDIX A-2 Respondents' migration patterns, job status and social Demographic Profiles.....	157
APPENDIX B Respondents' Position of Taking Institutional Helps.....	158
APPENDIX C Questionnaire form in Turkish.....	159
APPENDIX D Questionnaire form in English.....	170

LIST OF TABLES

Table I. Operationalization of Social Exclusion.....	24
Table II. Dynamism of Social Exclusion.....	25
Table III. Difference between social exclusion and poverty.....	31
Table IV. Social and Economic indicators in European Union Countries.....	40
Table V. Demographic and social charactersitics of Head of households....	84
Table VI. Educational level of Head of households and their spouses.....	85
TableVII. Economic sector and occupational status of the head of households.....	94
Table III . Multi-dimensionality of social exclusion.....	142
Table VIII. Actors, intstitutions and processes of social exclusion	143

I-INTRODUCTION

This study aims to examine the experiences of urban poverty among recent immigrants in Ankara within the framework of urban context in a developing country in order to see if these experiences meet the requirements of the social exclusion concept. Regarding this, in the first part of this study, the concept of social exclusion and its causes from an academic perspective will be reviewed. People thinking that they already had experienced or have been still experiencing the social exclusion and/or also perceiving themselves as ‘socially excluded’, will be analyzed in terms of their attachments to the labor markets, and the living environments, also their access to the public services. Regarding labor market attachment, people’s employment, their occupational status and also their working conditions are implied while the living environment corresponds to the physical and social conditions of the housing. In addition to these, access to public services, in the last stage, will imply the conditions of health and educational services using. All these concepts will also be examined in terms of migrants’ socio-demographic characteristics such as ethnic, religious, cultural, educational backgrounds, and age, sex and migrant status, which are crucial, for the main objective of the study in order to understand these characteristics’ interactions and impacts on the migrants’ experiences and also on their perceptions related to social exclusion individually or collectively. Moreover, it is also crucial to understand the effects of these characteristics on the people’s future expectations that are also included by the study as another fundamental object of the study.

It is an indisputable fact that many societies in the world either developed or not, had a section or sections of the society experience social disadvantages deeper than others. Income poverty, as a universal and a historical social fact, is one of the most known of these social disadvantages. However, structural changes after 1980s have so affected the living conditions of the people that there have been emerging some advanced forms of the subject disadvantages that have gone beyond the concept of poverty, which could not be explained just by referring to income poverty. In line with this information, new concepts have been required so new approaches have

been developed in order to make the existing forms of these disadvantages more understandable. Social exclusion is one of these concepts that have become a turning point for the urban poverty debate when the current forms of the disadvantages in the global era could not be explained just by using the income/monetary inefficiency concept anymore. This new form of the disadvantages or inequalities, which lead to a conceptual shift, is due to the reinforcement of neo-liberal economic policies and the weakening structure of the welfare state and this transformation has led to changes both quantitatively and qualitatively in the nature of the urban poverty. Not only a number of people have suffered from the increasing poverty, but also the type of poverty and other related disadvantages that reinforce each other. Thus, there have been an emerging more complicated urban context in terms of the difficulties and the disadvantages, which the poor social groups face to.

Increase in the types of disadvantages such as chronic poverty, long-term unemployment, being uneducated and limited access to the labor market, homelessness, and also these concepts' complicated interactions socially, economically and politically, more disadvantaged categories because of race, ethnicity, gender, age and disability have caused the growing risk of disintegration in the society, which has fortified the emerging social exclusion concept and this new concept has substituted the classical perspective of poverty. However, since structural differences in different societies affect the norm of these disadvantages in terms of reflecting different characteristics because of different experiences of different agents. This has created a serious debate about the advantages and the disadvantages of social exclusion concept in terms of definition, operationalization, measurement and different applications as a recently developing context.

In Turkey, there has been also an emerging academic tendency, which points out the changing features of the disadvantages having been experienced in the urban context. In line with this information it is claimed that existing forms of urban social, cultural and economic problems that impede integration or evoke exclusion go beyond the stage that refers solely to poverty (Erder, 1997; Erman, 2002; Işık and Pınarcıoğlu, 2003; and Keyder, 2005). Persistent unemployment, rising levels of

crime and violence and conditions of street children refer to the changing fabrics of social problems that are accompanied by the social exclusion concept. In fact, there is no considerable number of studies related to social exclusion in Turkey and the existing studies are mostly and intensively based on the former studies related to poverty. While the risk of social exclusion is mentioned, the studies concentrate on the changes in the dynamics of the urbanization, which are very effective in order to overcome the poverty. Recent changes in migration, housing and employment patterns have shown that these patterns are some of the main sources sustaining the risk of social exclusion. Position of forcibly migrated Kurdish population, in the 1990s, in the Western cities with the scarce source of housing and job opportunities has made the ethnic issue more complicated that needs to be scrutinized by also taking the concept of social exclusion and its risks into consideration. Kurdish immigrants, subjected to enforced migration, from East and Southeastern parts of Turkey to the western and central parts of Turkey, have been evaluated as one of the more disadvantaged categories that are very vulnerable to the risk and the facts of social exclusion concept within the theoretical frame. However, this issue needs more scientific and robust empirical study for making a reliable judgment.

In this framework, in the following chapter, methodology of the research will be explained. The research was carried out in three central districts (merkez ilçe) of Ankara, in a manner each of which two squatter quarters was selected from. In Altındağ; Yıldırım Bayezit and Doğanşehir quarters, in Yenimahalle; Ergazi and Mehmet Akif Ersoy and in Mamak; Türközü and Kayaş were selected by paying attention to make equal distribution of interview for each district. Thus, fifteen interviews were made, four of which in Yenimahalle, four in Mamak and six in Altındağ. In-dept interview, which would give the best qualitative data on experiences of urban poverty and social exclusion, was conducted.

In the third chapter, theoretical framework of the study will started to be drawn. In the first and second parts, some theories urban poverty will be focused on because of their being thought as the base that gave rise to theory of social exclusion. In the third part of the same chapter, some debates on the theory of social exclusion will be explored by referring to some international works pointing both on advantages and

disadvantages of the term, in theoretical and practical means, main dynamics that thought as cause of the problem, its generational impacts and differences from poverty. The chapter will be ended with social exclusion in advanced and developing countries in order to see forms and dynamics of problem in different contexts.

The fifth chapter will be devoted to Turkish case to examine the phenomenon of social exclusion through academic works. Investigation of the problem has been a recent event in academic domain and since main tendency in the existing works is to take social exclusion through the process of urban poverty, the dynamics of urban poverty in Turkey were explored periodically. The pre-1980 era will be examined on the dynamics, such as internal migration, emergence of squatter settlements and informal economy, which had created a dynamic type of urban poverty. The first decade of post-1980 era will be elaborated to see the structural developments that started to transform the type of urban poverty while, the post-1990 era will be elaborated to see further developments made urban poverty be closer to social exclusion.

In the sixth chapter, results of the field work will be discussed to see whether there is a phenomenon fits to social exclusion or not. Using De Haan's (1998) operationalization, questions of "social exclusion from what" and "exclusion by whom" will be answered by depending on the data collected through the study. In the concluding chapter, main results of the study will be summarized and discussed by considering Turkish urban context.

II-METHODOLOGY

II-1-Objective of the Study

The main objective of this study is to analyze the experiences of urban poverty among recent immigrants in Ankara in order to see if their experiences related to urban poverty match with the requirements of the social exclusion concept. The specific goal of this thesis is to analyze the relationship between social exclusion and urban poverty by revealing that “how poor people living in squatter settlements in specific quarters of Ankara experience poverty in different domains in their lives and also how can these experiences be defined as a concept of social exclusion or not”.

In this study, the concept of social exclusion will be used by using De Haan’s definition in which ‘context-dependence’ of the term is frequently being mentioned. De Haan (2001) uses the concepts of exclusion and deprivation synonymously. According to him, social exclusion refers to exclusion (deprivation) in the economic, social and political sphere. Therefore it is focused on the multi-dimensionality of the deprivation concept. The theory also touches the relations and process that cause the deprivation. What De Haan (2001) means by the multi-dimensionality of deprivation is that people are often deprived by the different issues at the same time. In addition to this, through relation and process, the agency that activates the exclusion is implied. The multiple deprivations (economic, social and political) faced by the excluded tend to be interrelated and any of these dimensions is dependent on the context. The concept of the social exclusion provides the ground for the context of specific analyses in order to understand process through the dynamics of that society.

By taking Haan’s definition of social exclusion into consideration, this study aims to reply the question “do recent migrants living in poor quarters in a metropolitan city experience and perceive social exclusion?”. In line with this information, by using the word of ‘recent’, the period after 1990 is implied while by

using the words of ‘metropolitan city’, Ankara is implied. Thus, the study will be implemented by searching urban context of Ankara in which people migrated after 1990s face multi-dimensional deprivations and roles of relations, mechanisms and processes that all lead to poverty in terms of their labor market attachments, living environments and access to public services. The relation between social exclusion and poverty is a complicated issue, which has different dimensions such as age, sex, health, education, ethnic, religious and cultural believes, language, solidarity networks and migration patterns. Hence, at this stage of the study, after the elaboration of general and Turkish academic frameworks, the concept of social exclusion and its causes will be defined. In addition to this Haan’s (1998) earlier study on the operationalization of multi-dimensionality of social exclusion will also be used during the study. Therefore, deprivation in the physical dimension; from the locational and infrastructural aspects; economic dimension; from the aspects of income and labour market status, assets; human capital dimension; from the health and educational aspects; social capital dimension; from the social background and civic engagement aspects and political dimension; from the rights, freedom of association and citizenship aspects will be explored.

Thus, labour market attachment, living conditions and access to public services will be the main variables of the study. Immigrants’ life standards belonging to the conditions of before and after migration, will be compared to each other in order to see if there is an improvement or a pejoration in terms of the conditions related to above mentioned variables. Within this perspective, living conditions of people who perceive themselves as ‘socially excluded’ will also be analyzed in terms of their interactions with other social-demographic peculiarities such as education, health status, gender, linguistic factors, religious and cultural values, solidarity networks, relations with the place of origin. Furthermore, local, international NGOs on the people’s experience of exclusion (individually or collectively) will be another outcome of this research.

This study also insists on that the immigrants’ self-perceptions about exclusion in order to understand whether they perceive themselves as excluded or not, and on their attempts and will preventing or permitting their exclusion.

II-2-Justification of the Research Area

Regarding the implementation of this type of study, Ankara is selected because of two main reasons. The first one is that Ankara is one of the biggest cities of the country that has been receiving internal migration since the foundation of Turkish Republic. In line with this information, according to data provided by TUIK, although migration rate between the years of 1995 and 2000 (57 %) is less than the previous years of 1985 and 1990 (62 %), the biggest metropolises have saved the characteristics of being the place of taking migration from other cities and villages. Ankara appears as the 10th among the other cities that have received population from other cities and villages. Moreover, Ankara's migration rate shows a slight increase (from 24.9 % to 25.6 %) for the same periods. That is to say, Ankara has emerged as one of the appropriate urban places for the investigation of existing advanced forms of poverty and social exclusion.

The second reason for the selection of Ankara is my being familiar with the city, which provided me many technical advantages during the research. For instance, since I know nearly all districts and neighborhoods in the center of Ankara, it was not so hard to go to the spaces living in poverty and to contact to people in order to implement the research process.

After selection of the city, I tried to determine the poorest quarters belonging to eight central districts that have their own municipalities. At this stage, Güvenç's (2001) study about Ankara's status-income map was very beneficial. According to this map, İstanbul-Samsun Highway divides the Ankara in east-west directions, while the wealthiest part of the city covers the south part of the city and the poorest section is located in the north part of the city. Thus, the districts such as Mamak, Altındağ, Yenimahalle and Sincan are some of the important districts related to poverty.

In this study, I did not restrict the study as covering an only one area. Hence, I aimed to reach the main profile of people experiencing poverty in different residential areas in order to understand if residential aspects have impacts on their experiences related to poverty or not. For practical reasons, such as easy

transportation or finding key informant to contact with, Mamak, Yenimahalle and Altındağ were decided as the main area of the research to be implemented. For each of the districts, I tried to select two sub-districts, composed of squatter housing. I also made equal number of interviews in each of the subdistricts in order to clarify the differences and/or similarities of people's experiences related to poverty.

II-3- Description of the Neighborhoods

Since this is not a community study, a detailed description of neighborhood was not required. But, specific places such as squatter settlements, both in the city center and peripheral areas of Ankara, were selected. Among these places, Yıldırım Bayezit and Doğanşehir quarters in Altındağ Municipality, which are located in the city center, can be described as inner-city squatter settlements including old and neglected types of housing quite closer to each others. Ergazi and Mehmet Akif Ersoy quarters in Yenimahalle, in the west side of the city, can be described as peripheral settlements. As different from quarters in Altındağ, houses in these settlements more distant housings with garden make quarters look like a village. But, although in Mehmet Akif Ersoy quarter is still keeping this appearance, Ergazi is losing since new and luxury building blocs are being replacing in the area. Türközü and Kayaş quarters in Mamak Municipality represent a similar condition of space transformation. While in Türközü, which is closer to Çankaya the wealthiest living space in the city, old squatters are being transformed in to new, luxury and expensive buildings, in Kayaş there has not such a situation yet. In all quarters there is no difficulty in terms of access to public services. To reach hospitals and schools do not take much time since there is no transportation problem.

II-4-Selection of the Sample

Regarding field research, I made a mixed design of sampling. At the beginning of the plan, I used random sampling during the selection process of quarters so I wanted to give equal probability of being chosen from the sample as Bailey (1987;87) argues. In addition to this, a list provided by TUIK, two quarters were chosen for each district. In Altındağ; Yıldırım Bayezit and Doğanşehir quarters, in Yenimahalle; Ergazi and Mehmet Akif Ersoy and in Mamak; Türközü and Kayaş were selected by using random sampling.

After the selection process, snow-ball sampling was used for the selection of people to be interviewed. Due to the study's object, being a recent migrant is the main variable of the research so I met households migrated to Ankara after 1990. I interviewed with only one person, either household head or his/her spouse, in each household. But I tried to be careful for the construction of an equal distribution of sex and ethnic differences of the respondents since gender and ethnic dimensions are other important criteria of the study. I interviewed 15 people composed of 7 women and 8 men, as head of the household or her/his spouse. All heads of households were male except the household head whose husband have been jailed for 1 year.

II-5-Data Collection

Since this study is mainly based on the qualitative research methods, I used in-depth interviews during data collection process. I used a single questionnaire, which composed of a small part including close- ended questions for demograpgic characteristic and a long list of open-ended questions asked to provide information about the respondent's experience related to poverty. The questionnaire included nine parts to collect the information about different domains of life. In the first part, there was a table that was used to receive information about social and demographic characteristics, such as sex, age, type of the relationship among the members of the household, while the table in the second part was used for having information about the educational, employment and social security status of the members of the household. The third part was related to respondent's migration process while the fourth part was about the physical living conditions. The fifth part was about the economic structure such as employment status of the head of household and other members living in the same household and the patterns of main income, consumption and savings of the household. The sixth part was related to human capital including questions on health and educational status of the respondent. The following part was about the social capital questioning identity and culture while the next one was about the social network relationships. The ninth part, which was the final including questions related to the political dimension.

All interviews were implemented in the respondent's house by taking the factor of comfortable atmosphere for implementing an efficient interview into account. That is to say, I tried to be alone with the respondent to avoid the interference of other people. I went to respondent's home by myself and at the beginning of the interviews, I introduced myself and explained the reason why I was there. During the interviews with the Kurdish respondents, I spoke Kurdish in order to provide the trust and comfort of respondent. Then, I informed them about the voice recorder and the necessity of using the equipments for the time scarcity. I also convinced them about the security of information recorded during the interview. In addition to these, I tried to make respondent feel as if she or he was making a friendly speech and feeling comfortable for checking out the questionnaire, whenever she/he requests in order to prevent the formation of examination atmosphere.

II-6-Research Experiences During the Process of Interviews

In general sense, I did not have a great difficulty that caused a cease in the process of field research. After finding an appropriate respondent to interview, it was so easy to reach other respondents. Nevertheless, some unexpected events (such as refusal of my interview request) happened. One of the male household head rejected to interview because of his recent experience in terms of being cheated. I did not insist on and passed to the next house. But, at this time, since the male household influenced the other neighbors, I faced the second rejection and I left the area.

Another difficulty that I experienced was the interruption of two interviews. One of the interviews was interrupted by the respondent because of the voice recorder. Although I started to interview without the voice recorder, she decided to interrupt because of the fear of her husband. In another case, I stopped the interview because I figured out that the respondent had psychological problems. However, I did not make respondent feel uncomfortable by explaining that I had already completed the interview.

Except these above mentioned cases, I completed all the interviews without experiencing any problem even within the two quarters of Altındağ, mentioned as being insecure places because of the high criminal rate. All respondents residing in these two quarters expressed their feelings of distrust because of burglary events, drug selling and alcohol usings. In line with this claim, it was interesting that one of the respondents talked about his experience related to burglary in his house a few weeks ago.

In the light of all these paragraphs, it might be concluded that the general attitudes among the respondents towards such type of research and researchers could be summarized as: at the first glance, the feeling of distrust and uncomfortable and then expecting help from the researcher. The former came easier for me while for the latter there is no opportunity and this was the worst side of this study that I experienced.

III-WHAT IS SOCIAL EXCLUSION?

Regarding social exclusion, there is not a clear consensus among social scientists related to this term. On the other hand, social exclusion signifies a social context, in which some people can not make any progress in terms of participation in society because of their more disadvantaged positions related to economic, political, social and/or cultural conditions. Most of the social scientists (de Haan,2001; Sen., 2000; Silver,1995 and 2003; Kabeer, 2000; Burchardt, 2004) however, compromise that the term is functional in explaining today's advanced forms of civil problems caused by recent structural changes while there are some challenges relate to this concept because of their believes in its conveying definitional vagueness (Du Toit, 2004; Farrington¹), being analytically uncertain (Arthurson, 2003) and its misleading character, which obscures the simple truths about the problems as well as their cause (Saunders and Tsumori, 2002).

Nevertheless, this general academic shifting about defining and understanding social problems towards social exclusion perspective has also been a situation in some governmental units that want to take efficient steps to cope with social exclusion. In Europe and United Kingdom (UK), for instance, social exclusion has been put on the administrative agenda in early 1990s: In 1992 Maastricht Treaty, combat exclusion was accepted as one of the problem that European Union (EU) has to overcome. In 1997, UK's Prime Minister set up Social Exclusion Unit (SEU) to solve the relevant problems about the concept. EU determines the 'risk of financial poverty' as the first benchmark that causes the social exclusion and, similarly, SEU puts the 'poverty and low income' at the top of the list refers to the socio-economic causes of social exclusion. Similarly, some international institutions, such as United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and International Labor Organization (ILO), also use the concept of 'social exclusion' in their policies about social disadvantages. In line with this information, like EU and SEU, these international bodies put the economic dimension, as unemployment and income

¹ Fletcher, Ferrington, "Towards a Useful Definition: Advantages and Criticisms of Social Exclusion", *The Journal of Geography, Environment and Oekumene Society*. (Available) <http://www.ssn.flinders.edu.au/geog/geos/farrington.html#footnote>

poverty, at the heart of the issue, which makes social exclusion an argumentative concept because of relativity with poverty. There are some people who argue that there is nothing new about the concept of social exclusion apart from relabelling the old problem. However, it is clear that the concept of social exclusion developed through the poverty debate gave rise to the fact of social exclusion. Thus, it is needed, at the beginning, to review poverty debate in a historical context before the elaboration of the concept with the social exclusion.

III-1- Poverty

Although it has been target of much criticism, definition and statistical informations provided by some international institutions, such as World Bank (WB) and United Nations (UN), have still been taken as the basic source for many works related to poverty, which has provided researchers a chance to make international comparisons. In addition to this, WB defines ‘the poor’ according to income measurement from an absolute perspective: people who make their livings through less than \$ 1 and \$ 2 a day. According to WB², World Development Indicators poverty is the most cruel in developing countries, especially in Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia, where ‘more than one person in five people’ subsists on less than \$ 1 a day. Share of people who make their livings through less than \$1 a day, in 2001, for these regions is 46.4 % (431million) and 31.3 % (313 million). In other regions, these rates are lower than the others such as 14.9 % (271 million) for East-Asia & Pacific, 9.5 % (50 million) for Latin American and Caribbean, 3.6% (17 million) for Europe and Central Asia and 2.4% (7 million) for Middle East and North Africa. Although it is expressed that the number of people who make their livings through less than \$ 1 a day decreased, the number who make their livings through less than \$ 2 a day increased from 2.4 billion, in 1981 to 2.7 billion in 2001.

Moreover, UNDP, in this sense, tries to provide a large perspective about the world poverty, which uses ‘ Human Development Index’ (HDI) to measure progress in human development based indicators such as life expectancy at birth, adult

² <http://devdata.worldbank.org/wdi2005/section1>

literacy rate, combined gross enrollment ratio for primary, secondary and tertiary schools and GDP per capita etc.

According to UNDP³, human development index scale, gains in human development have been less impressive in global era. Human development gap between rich and poor countries are getting larger. For instance, level in life expectancy in high level income of Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries is increasing (about ages of 80) whereas there is a decrease in Central and Eastern Europe (about 68) and the least development is in Sub-Saharan Africa (under the ages of 50). Similarly, while average years spent in education in North America and Western Europe is around 15 years in 2005, this value changes to about 7 years for Sub-Saharan Africa which is also under the world average of last 9 years. Finally, decline ratios in income poverty in the world shows the uneven economic progress among regions: level of income poverty in East Asia and Pacific, which is 29,4 % in 1990 and declines to 14.3 % in 2001, in Latin American countries to 9.9 % from 11.6 %, in South Asia to 31.9 % from 41.3 % while in Europe and Central Asia increases to 3.5 % from 0.5 %, in Middle East and North Africa to 2.4 % from 2.3 %, in Sub-Saharan Africa to 46.4 % from 44.5 %.

The data in the same report⁴ also imply that gap between the number of average citizen in the richest and in the poorest countries is very large and also getting larger: in 1990, an average American citizen was 38 times richer than an average Tanzanian citizen and today, the average American citizen is 61 times richer. There is also inequality within the countries. Latin American and Sub-Saharan Africa countries, relevant data point out very high levels of inequality, whereas OECD countries and South Asian countries much lower levels. Sub-Saharan Africa, with 72.2 Gini Coefficient⁵, exemplifies the highest level of inequality in terms of income distribution. In line with this information, Latin American Countries have

³ UNDP, Human Development Report, 2005, chapter 1.

⁴ *ibid*, chapter 2

⁵ According to World Bank, this is the most commonly used measure of inequality. The coefficient varies between 0, which reflects complete equality and 1, which indicates complete inequality : www.web.worldbank.org

also high level of inequality, which is 57.2 % despite the fact that it is under the world average of 67.0 %. East Asia and Pacific region countries' level of Gini Coefficient is 52 while in Central and Eastern Europe countries 42.8, in OECD countries 36.8 and South Asian countries 33.4.

III-2-Urban Poverty: Definition and Historical Process

Regarding urban poverty, the spatial distinction between rural and urban (even the continent, region and country based distinctions) is very important for the research of poverty. According to WB⁶'s report, all regions in the world is becoming less rural and more urban. Thus, urban population face more risk of limited access to employment opportunities and income, inadequate and insecure housing and services, violent and unhealthy environments, little or no social protection mechanisms, and limited access to adequate health and education opportunities.

Although poverty is still prevalent in rural areas of the developing countries, for the time being, cities are carrying the characteristics of being shelters for the growing proportion of the world's poorest people. Furthermore, 30 % of the world's poor lives in urban areas and it seems that this value will increase because of the increasing nature of migration fact. Moreover, most of the migrants are looking for an opportunity for the employment in urban area but such type of migration only corresponds to the movement of poverty from rural to urban area (Rahman, 2004).

According to WB, urban population living below the national poverty line is 35 % in Sub-Saharan Africa, 15.4 % in North Africa, 20.6 %, in Asia and 26.2 % in Latin American and Caribbean (2002;157).

Additionally, within the academic perspective, Rowntree's (1901) work is shown as one of the earliest and significant studies related to poverty, which contributed the academic researches in this era. Rowntree's study that was implemented in the city of York in 1899 as remembered as the starting point for many discussions related to the concept of poverty since that time. It is claimed that attempts to define and measure poverty were Rowntree's major achievements and he did it by drawing a

⁶ http://povlibrary.worldbank.org/files/4418_chap16.pdf

poverty framework depending on the lack of income required to maintain a basic standard of living (Huby, Bradshaw and Corden, 1999).

Rowntree's definition, which implies a certain type of poverty caused by low income, is closer to definition of 'absolute poverty'. The absolutist perspective describes a manner in which poverty arises from individual's inefficient physical/material conditions that a person needs to meet some basic necessities such as food, shelter and clothing, to sustain his/her life (Sen, 1983; 159). Such a point of view establishes strong relationship between poverty and being deprived of income or adequate income to have minimum living standards. This approach tries to set a 'poverty line' to divide population into the poor and non-poor and according to its counter-approach, 'relative' one, which is inaccurate in understanding poverty since it simplifies and standardizes the complicated and varying structure of the problem and excludes different elements of poverty, in the urban context (Townsend, 1985).

The 'relative definition' of poverty focuses on the social dimension of the problem and comprehends it in accordance with the living standards in the society. The term 'relative deprivation' expresses a negative psychological process, emerged from social problems, through which individuals feel lack of satisfaction in terms of meeting their expectations. A relatively deprived person is the person who does not have something but wants to own it in order to compare himself/herself to the reference group that owns it, then the agent is 'relatively deprived' with reference to the subject group. It is pointed out that the term of relative deprivation just takes the feasible wishes that are legitimized within the frame of social justice and equality but excludes the fantasy ones (Runciman, 1969: 9-10). Within the relative perspective, poverty is explained by referring people's social existence and their spiritual conditions, in addition to material ones that allow them to participate in the society. In line with this argument, it is cited that:

...Poverty can be defined objectively and applied consistently, only in terms of the concept of relative deprivation...Individuals, families and groups in the population can be said to be in poverty when they lack the resources to obtain the type of diet, participate in the activities and have the living conditions and amenities which are customary...in the societies to which they belong (Townsend, 1979:31).

Furthermore, according to Chamber (1995) poverty, like physical weakness, isolation, vulnerability and powerlessness, is one of the dimensions of 'deprivation'. Deprivation has physical, social, economic, political and psychological/spiritual dimensions and poverty, despite the fact that it is more than being income poor, refers to economic dimension of the concept. These are related but not synonymous concepts (1995;175) and vulnerability, which has become a crucial term in poverty studies, means not lack or wants, but mostly means exposure and being defenseless. In addition to this, vulnerability has two sides: the external side of exposure to shocks, stress and risks and the internal side of being defenseless, which means a lack of means to cope without damaging loss (Chamber, 1995; 188-189).

Recent academic works have tendency to perceive urban poverty in its relative terms since there has emerged a belief, which claims that only such kind of a perspective can explain the real structure/nature of today's urban poverty. The absolutist perspective is insufficient to understand the problem because it leads to a decrease in the number of the poor. The relative perspective shows the "real" degree, which has reached to a threatening level (Townsend, 1985). In fact, poverty has not only changed as a population but also diversified so analyzing poverty in terms of different population categories such as women, children, elderlies and ethnic groups, became a requirement both in academic and political domain. These qualitative and quantitative changes, in the nature of urban poverty have required a new concept as 'new urban poverty' in order to describe this new state of being experienced of this type of poverty. In line with this information, relativist perspective insists on some social conditions such as isolation, vulnerability and powerlessness, which are more important than income poverty and, which refer to not only being deprived of goods and services ordinarily available in the society, but also refer to social and political deprivation.

III-3-Social Exclusion Debate

One of the main characteristics of today's disadvantages is the concept's being mentioned in relation with the exclusion though certain definition and meaning of the concept is still in a questionable position. De Haan (2001), by using exclusion and deprivation as closer concepts, argues that social exclusion is a "multi-

dimensional concept, which implies a focus on the relations and processes that cause deprivation” (2001; 26). In addition to this, increasing significance of the concept from the theoretical perspective, social exclusion, in social science, corresponds to a lens that is used for looking at reality by people. Furthermore, the concept is not a reality of itself but it is a way of looking at society and it stresses civil relations and processes through which people are being deprived and also helps providing a ground in understanding deprivation during the analyses. It focuses on the multi-dimensionality of deprivation, regarding the fact that people are often deprived by different factors (social, economic and political spheres) at the same time. Furthermore, it also points out the relations and processes caused by deprivation, through taking social researchers’ opinions into account, beyond mere description of deprivation. It is also focused on social relations, processes and institutions that might be a part of deprivation, that underlie the concept of deprivation (De Haan, 2001).

Regarding this, Silver (1994) claims that definition of exclusion is difficult since it is a vague term related to numerous economic, social, political, and cultural connotations and dimensions. It is also stated that the term of exclusion is contextually and ideologically embedded and this characteristics, in turn, can also be seen as an opportunity to understand political cultures, ideologies and national discourses in a society that attributes exclusion to a different cause. In addition to this, according to Republican Political Philosophy, social exclusion is the rupture of solidarity between the individual and society whereas in Liberalism, it is considered as a consequence of specialization, economic division of labour, and separation of spheres and in Social Democracy, it is a consequence of the formation of group monopoly.

Silver’s opinions are very useful to understand the effect of political and ideological discourse in Turkey’s Republican culture on exclusive patterns in the society. In line with this argument, it could be stated that structural and ideological differences may affect the perception of social exclusion in a different manner. However, this does not make a general definition useless. Regarding this, for depicting a clear

picture, Silver and Miller (2003) make a definition of the concept of social exclusion by stating:

...(1) multidimensional or socio-economic, and encompasses collective as well individual resources, (2) dynamic or processual, along a trajectory between full integration and multiple exclusions, (3) relational, in that exclusion entails social distance or isolation, rejection, humiliation, lack of social support network, and denial of participation, (4) active in that there is a clear agency doing the excluding, and (5) relative to context (p.8).

When the social exclusion concept was firstly originated in France, it was used to express the incompetence in economic, political and social domains (Silver, 1994; 536) and also used to show specific population identified as ‘the excluded’, which made up one-tenth of the French population. They were suicidal people, aged invalids, single parents, abused children, drug addicts, delinquents, multi-problem households, marginal, asocial people, and other “social misfits”. All these people all were completely included by social categories, which are unprotected through social insurance (ibid, 532). The peculiarities of population that social exclusion emphasis have become very popular on a global scale despite the fact that the term was first used three decades ago for France. It increased in kind and in number and it was necessary to look at the characteristics of people considered as excluded socially. Silver (1995), gives a long list of the excluded on a global level categorized such as: long-term or recurrently unemployed, employed in precarious and unskilled jobs or unprotected by labour regulations, the low-paid and the poor, the landless; the unskilled, illiterate, and school dropouts, the mentally and physically handicapped and disabled, drug abusers, prison inmates and criminals, youth, especially with no work experience or educational background, child labourers, women; foreigners, refugees and immigrants, racial, religious, linguistic and ethnic minorities, the politically disenfranchised, recipients of social assistance, people need but ineligible for social assistance, residents of disreputable neighborhoods, people with consumption levels below substance, people whose consumption, leisure, or other practices stigmatized or labeled as deviant, the downwardly mobile, socially isolated without friends or family (1995;74-75).

In line with this information, it is stated that collecting all these groups under the bold titles, they are the social sections excluded from (Rodgers, 1995) goods and

services, labour market, land, security and most importantly human rights. Moreover, human rights, is crucial since attainment of basic human rights (to equality before law, to freedom of organization and expression, to security, dignity and identity) might be the prerequisites for overcoming other forms of exclusion. This takes us to the point, where (Townsend, 2000) their weak positions in the economic, politic and socio-cultural structures of the society is the result of both government's insufficient social policies and negative attitudes of mainstream society towards their life patterns (2000;442).

In addition to these, many academicians take the conditions of these disadvantaged categories into consideration by referring to social exclusion perspective. However, these categories might change according to societies. For instance, In Europe, landless or not participating in the activities relates to land is not a factor that causes exclusion. For each society, (Burchardt, Le Grand and Piachaud, 1999) "normal activities," (p.231) through which people are excluded from the society, are questioned and commented differently. Thus, while taking the definition of social exclusion into consideration in terms of participation in key aspects-consumption, saving, production, political engagement and social interaction-, it should be recognized that these activities represent the most important activities of that society. Accordingly, factors which affect individual ability of participating in the society are very important and these factors might show difference in terms of interaction patterns. In line with this information, these factors include (1) individual's own characteristics (health or education qualifications), (2) events in the individual's life (partnership breakdown or job loss), (3) characteristics of the living area (physical conditions of the area and concentration of unemployment), (4) social, civil and political institutions (racial discrimination and legal aid) (1999; 231-32).

Regarding the fourth factor in this study, social exclusion can be perceived as the result of disadvantage, which is explained, by Kabeer (2000) as: "when the various institutional mechanisms are operated in this way as systematically denying particular groups of people, the resources and the recognition, which would allow the disadvantaged groups to participate fully in the life of that society" (2000; 9). Furthermore, the analysis

of social exclusion could be understood through a particular aspect of institutional analysis. Institutions have dual aspects working on the principles of membership, which at the same time excluding the non-members (ibid.p.10).

Such an analysis of exclusion, in which institutions fulfill exclusion, direct the researchers to look at Atkinson's (1998) formulation of social exclusion based on agency, together with relativity and the dynamics. According to him, the agency implies an act of agent or agents, which can be employers, governments, unions and other workers. Agency takes the activities of other agents into account. It makes social exclusion a process through which people interact and organize themselves to gain economic, social and political benefits and, for this purpose, exclude others who are vulnerable and having few resources or who are facing to risks.

An important point in exclusion discourse, which Atkinson (1998) points out is to take the problem into account from the side of excluded people. Exclusion occurs when they are unable to participate in customary consumption activities, including expenditure related to recreational cultural, and leisure activities and social services, of the society where they belong to. The important point here, however, is the extent to which he or she is responsible for this situation. Individual choice related to this situation of being excluded is a delicate point to understand the problem. The appearance of self-exclusion, however, should not be deceptive to individuals or groups and these agents may withdraw themselves from participation in larger societies in response to the experience of hostility and discrimination (Barry, 1998). Hereby, the real withdrawal seems like voluntarily but the context is the case of social exclusion, which refers to a chronic problem.

Additionally, after reviewing some academic works in order to understand the meaning of the term of 'social exclusion', it is necessary to analyze some national and international institutions' perspectives related to the term. Furthermore, it might be useful to understand if they are corresponding by using their perspectives so this might give some clues in order to clarify if these institutions recognize the academic-scientific perspectives in their policies and works.

Additionally, UNDP (2006)⁷'s recent report provides a definition by which social exclusion “should be understood as the relatively permanent, multiplier conditioned and multidimensional state of deprivation of an individual” (p; 26) and as the product of intersection of three key areas of deprivation-unemployment, poverty and isolation (p; 27), which is an individualistic and more economic approach for the clarification of the subject issue.

Moreover, definition of one the experts of ILO, seems more comprehensive in terms of explaining the concept of social exclusion. This definition claims that:

...accumulation of confluent processes with successive ruptures arising from the heart of the economy, politics and society, which gradually distances and places persons, groups, communities and territories in a position of inferiority in relation to centers of power, resources and prevailing values (Estivill, 2003: 19).

Regarding another approach to the concept of social exclusion, EU's perception of social exclusion can be understood from the indicators, which were accepted by The Social Protection Committee (2001)⁸ in order to provide a baseline for the policies aiming at inclusion. The subject committee determined eighteen indicators of which the first ten of indicators are called as 'primary' while the others 'secondary'. Low income, distribution of income, persistence of low income, median low income gap, regional cohesion, long term unemployment rate, people living in jobless households, early school leavers, life expectancy at birth and self perceived health status form the first category and the most important point in the first category is that six of the subject indicators refer to income and unemployment related problems. In the second category, there are eight indicators, seven of which are related to same issues (EU, 2001:3-4).

Additionally, the UK based Social Exclusion Unit (SEU) has a more sensitive frame than EU since they do not just touch on income/monetary and distributional aspects of deprivations but also on other aspects such as discrimination, high crime, poor skills and poor housing. It is claimed that SEU has more sensitive perspective and they do not only engage in extreme forms of multiple disadvantages that marginal

⁷<http://www.undp.hr/upload/file/104/52080/FILENAME/Poverty,%20Unemployment%20and%20Social%20Exclusion.pdf>

⁸ http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/news/2002/jan/report_ind_en.pdf

groups face to but also engage in understanding how more complicated social inequality and intergenerational disadvantages could impact the subject issue. It is also stated that social exclusion include problems that are linked and mutually reinforcing, combining and creating a vicious cycle (SEU, 2004: 14).

In conclusion, according to Department for International Development (DFID)'s recent study focuses on the subject issue more different than the other international bodies. They focus on the public institutions such as the legal system or educational and health services and social institutions like households in which discrimination occurs and leads to social exclusion (Beall and Piron, 2005: 8-10).

III-3-1-Operationalizing Social Exclusion

After reviewing the conceptual side of the term of social exclusion, another important step is necessary in order to review the comprehensive perspective of the social exclusion. At this stage, De Haan's contribution to the making the concept of social exclusion operational, will be very enlightening. According to De Haan, there are two central elements embodied by the concept: one of them is its multi-dimensionality side, which tries to answer the question of "exclusion from what" and the other is its focus on processes, which tries to answer the question "exclusion by whom". It is also claimed that both elements are relevant for the policies that combat social exclusion, and aim to promote social integration (De Haan, 1998; 11).

While focusing on the operationalization of multi-dimensionality, De Haan (1998) counts five different but related dimensions regarding the multi-dimensionality of the concept. Each of them has one or more aspects and indicators of exclusion. A brief summary of his work provides an idea how multi-dimensionality of social exclusion can be operationalized and measured. Operationalization the multi-dimensionality of social exclusion can be summarized by using a hypothetical example related to India in Table I, which is given below:

Table I. Operationalization of Social Exclusion

Dimension	Aspect	Indicators	Example of being Excluded
Physical	Location	Local poverty indicator	Inhabitant of Bihar
Economic	Income	Per capita income/consumption	Absolutely Poor
	Labor Market	Economic Sector	Rural Laborer
Human Capital	Health	Health Indicators	Unhealthy
	Education	Years of schooling	School drop-out
Social Capital	Social Background	Gender	Woman
		Caste	Scheduled Caste
Political	Rights	Access to Courts	Powerless, illiterate

***: Source; De Haan, 1998: 15.

The key points of measurement in social exclusion might change according to societies as De Haan cites “cause and manifestations are context specific” (p1998; 22). This might be the cause of structural transformation in Western societies or from weak economic structure or political system or strong family, kinship, tribal community and related symbolic patterns in Southern countries. What truly characterizes exclusion, even in traditional societies, is lack of access to a huge amount of various material goods, to social, educational, and health services, to social protection and to participation in the decision making mechanisms or ‘which their people’s lives depending’(De Haan, 1998).

This multi-dimensionality reminds us a person might be more excluded from one societal domain than another and one exclusionary dimension might be worse than another but important point is that they are excluded on the base of their identities and who they are is important for their experience of being excluded. This is directly related to their economic, social, political, cultural and also personal possessions.

Regarding the operationalization of dynamic process, it should be reemphasized that another basic element of social exclusion is the dynamism. The question of “who does the excluding” implies that exclusion is a dynamic process through which actors involved (De Haan, 1998; 20). In line with this argument, it could be stated that dynamism implies activities of an agent or agents and accordingly it is important to identify actors who include and exclude, and to understand how and why they do so. Actors might be social groups, the state, business enterprises, the military, local authorities, religious bodies and local elites and they are, certainly, context-specific but each of them refers to a layer and what makes exclusion dynamic is its multilayered structure that results from the interaction of these already mentioned concepts as Burchardt⁹ argues.

Regarding dynamism, if de Haan (1998)’s approach is scrutinized, the relevant institutions and processes could be summarized in Table II, which is given below.

Table II. Dynamism of Social Exclusion

Aspect	Example of Exclusion	Institutions/Agents	Processes
Location	Inhabitant of Bihar	Central Government Planners	Allocation, disbursement of relevant funds
Labor Market	Rural Laborer	Landlords, employers	Hiring Practices
Healthy	Unhealthy	Health Authorities	Allocation of Medical Funds

***. *Source; De Haan, 1998; 21.*

In conclusion, it will be beneficial to make Kabeer (2000)’s emphasis related to the subject: “No matter whether formal or informal, they are the actors who make up these institutions, form collectivities and interactions between them by providing agency behind the patterns” (2000; 5).

III-3-2-Social Exclusion across Generations

The dynamic character of exclusion may have two important effects on the disadvantages that excluded people face. One of them is ‘cumulative’ nature of the disadvantages which refers to beginning of exclusion just from one domain but, in

⁹ http://policyresearch.gc.ca/doclib/DecConf/Tania_Burchardt.pdf

the case of continuity, leads to emergence of exclusion from one or more domain. An example given by Silver may best define the cumulative character of exclusion:

“For the worker, long-term unemployment can be demoralizing. As constant rejection diminishes the motivation to keep looking for work, job searches may tail off. Loss of a socially recognized status may also lead to substance abuse, poor health, mental illness and family instability-not to mention loss of friends and job contacts. Insufficient income may restrict other forms of sociability as well. Even if alternative economic activities-from crime to gardening-are found formal work habits and social skills may atrophy¹⁰”

This example may carry extremity but it is not unreal. Excluded people may isolate themselves, voluntarily or involuntarily, in a context in which both they and their families suffer from various disadvantages. Another crucial point, which is also the second effect of dynamic character of exclusion, is transition of these disadvantaged situations to the next generations. It is an indisputable fact that individuals existing living conditions both are affected from their family backgrounds, in terms of social, economic and cultural capitals, and also affect their children futures in the same way. There are some studies which may demonstrate such a transition across the generations.

In his empirical work carried in Britain, Hobcraft tried to explore the effect of childhood experience of poverty, family disruption, and contact with the police on their adult disadvantages. Some of his findings showed that poorly socialized girls appear more likely to become young mother and young fathers are quite likely to have had a contact with police, to come from lower social class, and to have performed poorly at school. (Hobcraft, 1998).

According to SEU (2004), children growing up in low-income households are more likely to earn lower wages as adults. It also found that the likelihood of becoming teenage mother was almost ten times higher for girls whose family was in the lowest social class compared to the highest one (2004;5). Machin 's (1998) work on the childhood disadvantage and intergenerational transmission of economic status shows that early age cognitive achievement of children is significantly related to the

¹⁰Hilary Silver, “Fighting Social Exclusion” <http://www.democraticdialogue.org/report2/report2a.htm>

labor market earnings of their parents and to their parent's math's and reading abilities. The work also indicates that having parents with low income during the years of growing up is a strong disadvantage in terms of labor market success and it can contribute importantly to factors like adult joblessness and participation (1998; 17-21).

III-3-3-Causes of Social Exclusion

The common attitude or tendency in explaining reasons of social exclusion, as an advanced form of disadvantages, is to analyze the globalization process in terms of its economic, political and social aspects. Economic transformation includes transition from fordism to post-fordism based on flexible production and reconstruction of labor market leading to unemployment. Political transformation refers to weakening role of welfare state in providing welfare of its citizens and demographic changes refer to dissolution of societal relationship.

International Labor Organization (2006)¹¹ reports that, the world unemployment rate stood at 6.3 per cent in 2005 (191.8 million people), unchanged from the previous year and 0.3 percentage points higher than a decade earlier.

Globalization and development of new telecommunication and computer networks technologies transformed the financial structure of both advanced capitalist and developing societies and realized the transition from mining and manufacturing sectors to finance and consumer services. Organization of this new economy contributed by growing service intensity sectors, (hotels and restaurants), works and employment types. While the service-led economy employed professional, highly educated workers, old types of economic activities and workers became irrelevant. This new trend affected socio-economic structure of the society in a negative way that is inequality and employment-centered exclusion increased. Uneducated and unskilled people became low-paid workers at the bottom of service sector offering insecure, unstable and badly paid jobs. In the meantime, since middle class was no more dominant form in the economic structure, position of new working class was weaker in terms of trade unionism. While working people polarized between high

¹¹ <http://ilo.law.cornell.edu/public/english/employment/strat/stratprod.htm>, accessed: 6 March 2007.

and low income jobs referring to distinct types of consumption patterns (Sassen, 1996) current estimates for 2005¹² show that there is no significant change in the conditions of 'working poor'. There are 1.37 billion people in the world work but are still unable to lift themselves and their families above the US \$ 2 a day poverty line. Among them 520 million can not even lift themselves and their families above the extreme US \$ 1 a day poverty threshold. In addition, children and women became cheap labor force, elders and disables are being pushed out of the economic system and, consequently, more people confronted with the risk of poverty and many of them can not escape from it.

Changes in the political structures of the states are also important factors in expansion of exclusive patterns in the societies. Flexible production has been mobilizing and settling wherever and whenever it finds a cheap labor force to maximize the profit and nation-states, have not only facilitated the free movement and development of these cross-national companies but also withdraw themselves from the economy in the global era. Nation state's leaving up their welfare regime accompanied by their weakening role in economy and, privatization of national economy and services made many poor. These impede many people to benefit from social services. Social integration became something more difficult for the disadvantages part of the society.

As a project of nation-building ideology, construction of a strong 'welfare state regime' and its affirmative effect on the balance between full employment, equality and prosperity had created a 'golden age' in capitalism's postwar era (Esping-Andersen, 1996:1). Social order was something unquestionable in this era and it was due to the perfect harmony between social citizenship and well functioning industrial relations system. Welfare state, labor market and family structure were working on an interdependent system producing welfare and changes in the economic pillar of this system have also changed political one that is to say the welfare state's success, as a social policy maker, in public management of social risks lessened. Post industrial employment trends excluded unskilled, uneducated, old and disabled workers and faced them to make a choice between low income and

¹² <http://www-ilo-mirror.cornell.edu/public/english/employment> accessed: 6 March 2007.

unemployment. Decline in the social support, especially in the family structure as a third pillar of the welfare production, made more people, mainly elders and children, vulnerable to poverty especially in US. Both unemployment insurance and cost of social welfare have become burden for the welfare state (Esping-Andersen, 1999). Privatization appeared a one of the most reasonable ways that welfare state used to diminish public spending loads and respond to the more differentiated and individualistic demands of ‘post industrial’ society (Esping-Andersen, 1996:26).

The changes in the socio-demographic structure of the advanced countries brought a more differentiated profile of disadvantaged urban population that governments have to deal with. As Mingione (1996) argues, population ageing, decrease in the sense of family, kinship and communal solidarity systems and other types of social networks, as a result of encouragement of individualism, increase in the fragile type of marriages and number of single parent families and growing waves of international migration appeared as important dynamics that both enlarged and deepened the social distance. Individuals fit into the one of these categories, in addition to their position of unemployment, have more risk in terms of falling to state of exclusion since they have less protection provided by social networks. Infact, conditions that produce these extreme form of inequalities are strongly relate to the modern system of citizenship and they should imply a condition of exclusion from “opportunities and support which should ensure every citizen is able to satisfy survival needs and achieve life standards that lead too acceptance in the community of belonging and permit....minimum of self-confidence..”(1996; 1)

Urban poor, in that case, constitute a section that can not respond poverty, and, therefore, can not integrate to the society easily. The level of social integration or social exclusion has risen as the main criteria of the new urban poverty (Mingione, 1996).

All these structural changes have created a new type of urban context strongly related to social exclusion which takes its’ roots mainly from political domain. States are no stronger to respond the welfare of their membership, and, in fact, “governments, politicians, and others in the policy process construct it through their

discourse and rhetoric, through ideas, themes, images and symbols” (Becker, 1997:5-6) to legitimize their inefficiency and reluctance in the solution of the problem of inequality.

III-3-4-Differences of Poverty

After the elaboration of the some academic works to understand the concepts of social exclusion and poverty, now it is needed to make clear the distinction between them.

It is claimed that (Estivill, 2003) exclusion and poverty are certainly not equivalents. It is possible to be poor but not excluded and, similarly, not all the excluded are poor, even though all the surveys and research show the existence of a broad area in which the poor and the excluded coincide. They both share the dimension of a process that causes of them are to be found in central structures. They are not synonymous, but complementary terms (p: 2).

According to DFID (2005) social exclusion and poverty are related that is the former is the cause of the latter since exclusion both reduces productive capacity of particular people and rate of poverty reduction of society as a whole. In general terms (Becker, 1997) social exclusion is something more than poverty and inequality in the distribution of resources. It is related to the prevented interaction between poor and state and the rest of the society result from social reactions, social and individual prejudices and attitudes, policies and practices that build walls between the two sides. Being out of most common social activities, living patterns and customs refers to ‘exclusion’ from the society.

The difference between poverty and social exclusion, according to Abrahamson (2005), comes from their insertions to different time in historical time. Poverty is a classic phenomenon in modernity related to early industrialization and refers to opposite of ‘wealth’ because of exploitation of the working class by the rich, the bourgeoisie. Social exclusion, on the other hand, is a postmodern phenomenon that should be understood as oppose to the ‘integration’. It is a post-industrial condition for the minority of people who are marginalized from mainstream middle mass society (2005:15-16) ruled by competition, fashion, the mass media and information

technology. They are not equivalent that is it is possible to be poor but not excluded or to be excluded without being in poverty.

When look at them as framework, it is stated that understanding of causality is weak in most donor analyses of poverty that is there is a missing middle between description and prescription. Social exclusion framework encourages poverty analysts to look at the path ways or trajectories of disadvantages (Maxwell and Kenway, 2000). It may broadens the conventional framework that identifies poverty as a lack of resources relative to need and, in this way, it can just help to promote, not replace the need for additional work on poverty (Saunders, 2003).

These differences between social exclusion and poverty which are more or less accepted by many academics and research units can be summarized in a table:

Table III: Difference between social exclusion and poverty

	Poverty	Social Exclusion
Basic Assumption	*Low income as an illegitimate form of inequality	*Limited chances to realize formal social participation as a threat to social stability
Point of reference	*Equality/ inequality *Distribution of resources *Minimum income	*Being part of society or not *Social participation/ integration *Social rights
Characteristics	*One-dimensional *State *Concerned with structural factors	*Multi-dimensional *Cumulative character/ process *Concerned with structural factors + individual perception
Dimension of social inequality	*Vertical *Distributive	*Polarized (inside/ outside) *Distributive + participatory
Indicators	*Income	*Various –related to economic, social, political and cultural dimensions

(Source: Petra Böhnke, 2001: 11)

III-3-5-Critiques of Social Exclusion

Although ‘social exclusion’ is welcomed, by many academics and policy makers, as a new and a functional perspective that has brought new insights in terms of redefinition of problem and its causes and also in developing effectual social

policies, there are also some who express their discomforts with it. Main critics are concentrated on the definition and it is stated that, by Farrington¹³, the key to problem of social exclusion lies in the construction of an appropriate definition. It is hard to make a single and a clear definition and the broad and vague definitions can render concept of social exclusion useless and lead to a context without any widely accepted methods to fight the problem. Adapting the terminology without adapting an adequate approach to tackle problems of social exclusion is going to ultimately result in failure. Thus, any definition must merely be one of 'best-fit', which reflects the social, economic and political reality of the state. In addition, any definition must also identify the inherent inequalities between all groups in the society and not just between the excluded and the rest (Farrington, *ibid*).

Du Toit (2004) questions the export of 'social exclusion' to the developing countries by claiming that a value of any new discursive theoretical or methodological product is determined not by where it comes but how it can be adopted to local purposes. He explains that the situation of excluded of Europe is very different from that of the South, who usually comprises the majority of population. Social exclusion makes general sense of the complex, divergent and locally specific dynamics of deprivation and inequality (2004; 987-988).

Haan's argument on the context dependence side of social exclusion may confront the both critiques counted above. He argues that what exclusion means is context dependent that is in different countries social exclusion is defined differently. He states that, by referring Silver's (1994) work, within one society the rupture of social bonds may be the central concern, as in the France, whereas the access to markets and individual incentives may be more central in others as in UK and US. The approach, by the same way, can generate policies, in less developed regions, by taking account of local priorities (De Haan, 1998; 12-13). Likewise, Beall and Piran (2005) claims that a "one-size -fits-all" approach is not appropriate and sensitivity to country context are essential to understand the real nature of the problem. Social exclusion, in this sense, is a flexible approach that is it provides an appropriate way

¹³ Fletcher, Farrington, "Towards a Useful Definition: Advantages and Criticisms of Social Exclusion", *The Journal of Geography, Environment and Oekumene Society*: <http://www.ssn.flinders.edu.au/geog/geos/farrington.html#footnote>, accessed: 9 March 2007.

in related studies. In Nicaragua, for instance, social exclusion approach helped researchers to understand that crime and violence are phenomena, with historical, social and cultural origins, as both cause and consequence of social exclusion while in Nepal; key dimensions of social exclusion are caste, ethnicity and gender (Beall and Piron, 2005; 45-47).

Saunders (2002) argues that there is no something new with the multidimensionality and dynamism of the social deprivation. Recognition that deprivation is something more than money is not new: the culture of poverty theories of the 1960s have already emphasized that poverty has cultural and behavioral as well financial dimensions. What is new about the concept and the reason why it has become so popular is its assumption that people' deprivation is somebody else's fault than their own. To be excluded is to be victim of somebody else's exercise power and the word 'exclusion' entails agency on the part of one party and victim hood on the part of another. Thinking about deprivation as social exclusion misleads us about the nature of the problems we face as well as their causes. The main cause of poverty today is lack of employment and principal solution to poverty lies in getting more welfare claimants in to work.

Sen. (2000) has more moderate approach to the social exclusion. Although he accepts the underlying idea behind the concept is not radically new, it provided new insights for the poverty analysis. He claims that how much additional ground 'social exclusion' breaks depend on what our pre-existing concept of poverty was. If poverty is seen in terms of income deprivation only, the introducing the notion of social exclusion would broaden the domain of poverty analysis. However, if poverty is seen as deprivation of basic capabilities, then there is no real expansion of the domain of coverage. Thus, the conceptual linkage between social exclusion and poverty as capability deprivation both provides more theoretical underpinning for the approach social exclusion and helps us to extend the practical use of the approach.

Levitas (1999) insists on the effect of the inadequacies of current work on social exclusion, due to the definitional ambiguity of the concept, lack of clarity as to

causal processes and restriction to the existing data which is not necessarily appropriate for the purpose, on the political attitudes of the governments. The concept provides the opportunity for politicians to pick and mix among indicators and among groups identified as socially excluded and enables them to justify preferred policies and avoid confronting the growth of poverty and income inequality which afflict large parts of population. In other words, (Arthurson,2003) the approach became a tool for politicians that is they use concept strategically without dealing precisely what is meant and they legitimizes their policies which are far more complex useless than in the past. Levitas¹⁴ argues that this may result of social exclusion discourse's evoking a dichotomous image of society which accommodates 'insiders' and 'outsiders' and in which only marginal part is problem. If the idea of social inclusion is understood simply as the opposite of exclusion caused by unemployment and moral behaviors, it becomes legitimating of the statusquo. While the lifting of small groups of marginalized outsiders becomes the main aim of policies, other inequalities, notably between the super-rich and others, are regarded as irrelevant.

However it should be noted that existing forms of today's inequalities have already arisen from weak economic policies and choices which society makes about how resources are used and who access to them. The notion of social exclusion, in contrast, may bring strong policy implication.

III-4-Social Exclusion in Advanced Societies

Social exclusion, more or less, has become a problematic phenomenon for almost every country, advanced, developing or backward. Individuals and groups may face risk of exclusion from politic, economic and social activities of the society they live in because of dominant ideologies and working mechanisms penetrated in to these domains.

III-4-1- USA

Although it is one of the most advanced countries in the world, America is also experiencing this problem and a large scale of societal divisions/inequalities is

¹⁴ <http://www.ccsd.ca/events/inclusion/papers/rlevitas.htm>, accessed: 10 March 2007.

commemorative for racial and ethnic diversities. The argument of racially or ideologically based exclusion is quite prevalent for US and UK. Both conservative and liberal parties in these two countries conducted such tendencies as state policies and paved the way for the spatial and social segregation of urban context on the base of white and colored people. This reminds us strong relation between urban poverty and the 'urban ideology'. We are excited that:

..the power and influence of the urban ideology, its power of evoking everyday life, its ability to name the phenomena in terms of the experience of each individual....., the discourses of moralists and politicians are inspired by them...the theoreticians of the 'cultural revolution' of the western petty bourgeoisie patch up the myth in order to give a 'material base' to their theses on the mutation of our *societies* (Castells, 1977; 111).

Conservatives and Liberals try to construct a causal connection between disadvantages that people experience and their cultural behaviors or life styles while they are explaining the weak situation of these categories. In his work, Wilson (1991) rejects the existence of such a relation and he claims that ghetto-specific behaviors were not a different system of values but sole way of adaptation to the restricted opportunities to the disadvantaged in American society. Joblessness, reinforced by increasing social isolation and declining access to the job information, is the main problem of the underclass and infact, what makes a difference between underclass and those of other economically disadvantaged group is the former's marginal economic position to the labour force reinforced by social milieu. He uses the term 'concentration effects' to explain the impacts of social milieu on the individuals. To clarify the term:

Poor people who reside in neighborhoods that ...support strong labour force attachment are in a much different social context than thoseliving in neighborhoods that promote weak labor force attachment. Thus neighborhood that have few legitimate employment opportunities inadequate job information networks, and poor schools not only give rise to weak labor force attachment but also raise the likelihood that people will turn to illegal or deviant activities for income, thereby further weakening their attachment to the legitimate labor market. A jobless family in such a neighborhood is influenced by the behavior, beliefs, orientations, and social perceptions of other disadvantaged families disproportionately in the neighborhood. To capture the process I used the term "concentration effects"... (Wilson, 1991:651).

Relation between space and race, in terms of exclusion, appears as the identification of ghetto with the black population. Fiss (2003) states that, the exclusionary practices in America created the ghettos and they continue to isolate and concentrate the most disadvantaged and, through this, perpetuate and magnify that disadvantage for blacks. People living in ghettos are black, poor, many of them are on welfare or living under poverty line even for those work. Housing stock in ghettos aged, school institutions deteriorated and crime escalated.¹⁵

In fact, ghettos of the Fordist Era had more communal aspects and represented, in some sense, Weber's definition of community. Social interactions were carried by internal mechanism based on ethnic, traditional or family ties that is they are based on subjective feelings and closed to outsiders. (Holton & Turner, 1990). Ghettos' fulfillment of its role in favor of its members has lessened when working mechanisms of it were prevented by out migration of working and middle class families, and rising level of joblessness and when they turned to places of concentrated poverty. Underclass members or residents of ghettos isolated socially and this not only made them deprive of economic and social resources, but also of the kind of cultural learning from mainstream social networks that favors social and economic advancements in modern industrial society (Wilson, 1991).

They have become ghetto of the 'excluded' and 'cast out'. The more its residents are cast out, marginalized, unemployed and unwanted by their masters, and the more they are seen as exploiter of public and private resource, a threat to social peace, fulfilling no useful social role (Marcuse, 1996).

The negative attitudes towards poor are common among conservative and liberal ideologies and governmental units. Mutual encouragement between them creates a discourse making members of underclass undeserving poor to legitimate the leaving of them without any support. Single mothers' parenthood, children, elders, disables, blacks and long term unemployed, as members of underclass, become the most 'vulnerable' part of the society because of the kind of institutional and ideological attitudes mentioned above. They are not only left without any help but also

¹⁵ <http://press.princeton.edu/chapters/s7492.html>, accessed: 12 April 2007.

excluded from equal job opportunities in the market, the political process and social services. To say it other words they are excluded from basic citizenship rights and, thus, they become more vulnerable that is more defenseless, insecure and exposed to risks, shocks and stress. They are vulnerable to illness and injury since they have poor living conditions and basic services (UN, 1996).

Infact, inequality is the matter through the country but existing researches evidence that it is more felt by racial and ethnic groups. U.N. expert Sengupta, for instance, reports¹⁶ that over 12 per cent of the U.S. population (37 million) lived in poverty in 2004 but ethnic minorities are suffering more from extreme poverty than white American. Compared to one in ten whites, nearly one in four Blacks and more than one out of every five Latinos are extremely poor in the U.S. Another work (Staveteig and Wington, 2000) brings out that Blacks, Hispanics and Native American have poverty rates almost twice as high as Asians and almost three times as high as whites. Children born in to Black, Hispanics and Native American families are almost three times as likely to be poor as children born in to White and Asian families.

It is not hard to estimate that this picture is strongly relates to the labour market structured on racial inequalities. According to work carried out by American Sociological Association (ASA, 2005) while white men have the highest labour force participation and employment rates (68.0) and the lowest unemployment rates (3.0), African-American men have smaller share in employment rates (52.5) and the highest unemployment rates (6.9). This ratio between Blacks and Whites has been constant through economic expansions and recessions despite shrinking gap in educational differences between them. Moreover, one-to- three of White men and nearly one-to-two of Asian men are employed in managerial, professional and related occupations, compared with one-to-five of African-American and one-to-seven of Hispanic men. Conversely, more than one-quarter of both African-American and Hispanic men hold jobs in production, transportation and service occupation characterized with low-paid, few benefits and little career mobility,

¹⁶ Sengupta, "Racial poverty Gaps in US Amount to human rifhts Violation" cited in, One World.net, published on Wednesday, November 30, 2005.

compared with less than one-fifth of White men and less than one-seventh of Asian men (ASA, 2005).

In U.S., the market based inequalities between Whites and Blacks are explained by skills gap between these two groups but this gap is itself is a result of social exclusion process. This discrimination is the reflection of social and cultural factors, geographical segregation, deleterious social norms and peer influences, poor education that have racial dimension. Black population's family resources and community backgrounds explicitly influence the acquisition of human-capital that needed for individual in favor of themselves (Loury, 1999). According to Farcas (2003), children belong to African-American or Latino families who with-low income show lower school achievement than children from White and middle-income families because of racially and economically isolated elementary schools lead former children to lesser skill. For instance, whereas African-American children begin elementary school approximately one year behind Whites in vocabulary knowledge, they finish high school approximately four years behind Whites (;5-7). Similarly, between 1983 and 1989, high school completion rates were 5.4 per cent points lower for Blacks than Whites and, in1979, college attendances rates were 4.2 percentage point lower for blacks than whites.

Health conditions are also worse for Black population. The middle-aged adults in high poverty urban African-American population have a high probability of dying or becoming disabled long before they are old. Harlem or Chicago's south side, one-third of boys who reach their 15th birthdays do not live until their 65th. In contrast, only 10 % of girls and about 25 % of boys fail to live to age 65 in nationwide (Geronimus and Thompson, 2004, pp; 3-4). These examples can be multiplied but the important point is that black population can not reach health services on the equal base even if state's capacity is improved. An impressive data (De Navas-Walt, Proctor and Lee, 2005) evidences that although "the percentage of people covered by government health insurance programs rose in 2004, from 26.6 percent to 27.2 percent" , "the uninsured rate in 2004 was 11.3 percent for non-Hispanic whites and 19.7 percent for blacks, both unchanged from 2003" (2005;17-19).

The damages come from social and physical environments are important as well as weak health service that made black population suffer from repeated disadvantages.

III-4-2-Social Exclusion in Europe

Europe, like North America, is called as an advanced region and according to UNDP's 2005 report all European Union countries fall in to the high human development category. Most of the countries has the low gini value, however, Europe, as a result of structural transformations mentioned above, and has also faced the risk of social exclusion. Many individuals within the border of the Europe have lost their welfare and still experiencing new forms of inequalities called as 'new marginality'. In Scandinavian countries, since social-democratic welfare state and its traditional economic policies are more powerful, there are less segregated cities. However, this does not change the truth of existence of 'new marginality'. It may be named as 'new poverty' in the Netherlands, Germany and Northern Italy, 'exclusion' in France, Belgium and Nordic countries, but signs of them are nearly the same; homeless, beggars, drifters, unemployed and underemployed, drug users, street criminals, informal economy workers and the rising sense of despair, insecurity, helplessness and loneliness. Although discrimination, hostility and violence against immigrants are indisputable facts of European cities, there is no question of 'ghettoisation' and exclusion of immigrants and poor people are mainly due to the natives' reaction to their loose in labour market rather than racist attitudes (Wacquant, 1999).

In fact, problem of inequality has been on the EU agenda since early 1970s and social action programme of 1974 was starting point of the union's the anti-poverty policies. In 1992 Maastricht treaty was accepted to promote employment, to improve living and working conditions, to realize social protection, to built dialogue between management and labour, to develop human resources and combat 'exclusion'. The Lisbon Strategy, had been accepted in March 2000, determined the combating with 'social exclusion' as one of the three main objectives of the reform agenda. In March 2001 at Stockholm, European Commission Social Protection Committee determined some primary and secondary indicators for understanding of social exclusion and poverty in the European context and to take step against the

related problems¹⁷. Finally, in March 2006 EC has adopted a new framework for the social protection and social inclusion process and new objectives emerged as social inclusion pensions and health and long-term care¹⁸.

All these insistent interferences that EC realized to annihilate or/and at least to lessen the problem of social exclusion and poverty make necessary to look at some related data. The following table, basing on Social Protection Committee's primary indicators and Euro stat's 2004 data, tries to give a general picture about the region. The first line refers to EU 15 and the second one to EU 25 countries.

Table IV: Social and Economic indicators in European Union Countries¹⁹

Low income rate after social transfers		Distribution of income		People living in jobless households		Long-term unemployment rate		Early school leavers		Life expectancy at birth	
2001	2004	2001	2004	2001	2004	2001	2004	2001	2004	2001	2004
15%	17%	4.5	4.8	9.7%	9.8%	3.1%	3.4%	19.0%	17.7%	16.3 %	16.4%
16%	16%	4.5	4.8	10.1%	10.3%	3.8%	4.1%	17.0%	15.6%	15.9 %	16.1%

According to table, there is a negative view about people's access to a permanent job, adequate and equal income both in former and newly joined European Union countries. Depending on these negative conducts rate of people living in jobless households is increasing. To speak more clearly, Eurostats verifies the reality that 16 % of the population in the 25 countries in EU was at risk of poverty in 2004 and living in households with an income below 60% of the median equaivalized income of the country they live in. When the effects of social transfers such as old-age and survivors pensions, unemployment benefits, invalidity payments and family allowances in alleviating the risk of poverty is considered another reality comes to the fore: in the absence of all social transfers the poverty risk for the EU 15 population, in 2001, would be 39 % instead of 15 %. The impact of social transfers is the greatest in Scandinavian and Central European countries, notably in Denmark where this rate would reach to 65%. All Scandinavian countries', by the effect of

¹⁷ European Commission 2000, "fight against Poverty and Social Exclusion", Brussels, 30 Nov. 2000: http://ec.europa.eu/comm/employment_social/soc-prot/soc-incl, accessed: 12 April 2007.

¹⁸ European Commission, http://ec.europa.eu/comm/employment_social/soc-prot/soc-inc/obj, accessed: 12 April 2007.

¹⁹ Eurostat Yearbook. (2004). The Statistical Guide to Europe Data: 1999-2002, chp. 2 http://www.ue-empresas.org/document/eurostat/capitulo_II.pdf, accessed: 25 May 2007.

social transfers, Netherland's and Austria's share of the population at risk of poverty is under the EU average but UK's, Ireland's and Southern countries' are above. The EU average masks the wide differences between member states and although risk of poverty and social exclusion has increased in all countries in Europe, southern countries like Spain, Italy and Portugal are more deprived regions comparing to the northern ones. This may relate to the financial difficulties that affect a higher proportion of people in these countries. In Portugal and Greece, for instance, a financial difficulty is the highest whereas it is the lowest in Denmark and Luxembourg (Eurostat, 2004).

However, risk of social exclusion is lower for the southern countries that are there is less stigma and better integration for the unemployed in Southern countries since social contact of people, especially poor, with the family, friends, neighborhoods, clubs, parties and churches is greater. (Paugam, 2001; 19). This may be the result of the countries' welfare regime and their dealing with inequalities. The level of monetary deprivation is largest in Southern European Union Regimes, next largest in the Liberal regimes and the lowest in social-democratic regime. Whereas in social-democratic regimes governments support collective solidarity, in the Southern regimes it is likely family that support solidarity and keeps deprivation low (Muffels and Didier, 1999).

According to empirical study²⁰ carried out in 28 European Countries (15 EU members, 13 acceding and 3 candidate countries) in 2002, individual's perception of the social exclusion, carry influence of their country's welfare regime. In general, material resources and employment are seen as most important factors that prevent social exclusion in all countries but, there is much emphasis on family support in acceding and candidate countries while in EU member state there is less emphasis on family as source of social support and participation. In the acceding and candidate countries, main reason for social exclusion was mentioned as injustice in society and the number is even higher when the poor themselves are asked for their

²⁰European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, 2004 "Perception of Social Integration and Exclusion in an Enlarged Europe"; <http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/pubdocs/2004/35/en/1/ef0435en.pdf>, accessed: 20 May 2007.

opinions. Respondent from member states mention individual responsibility as well whereas among poor long-term unemployment and social welfare cuts are more important reasons of social exclusion. Most of the European citizens perceive themselves to be socially integrated. In the acceding and the candidate countries, sense of social exclusion measured as a lack of recognition, feeling of uselessness, inferiority and being left out of society is more prevalent. In the three candidate countries (Bulgaria, Slovakia and Turkey) level of perceived social exclusion (23%) is quite above the acceding countries (14%) and EU average (12%). Thus, the results show that countries with the lowest GDP per capita, the highest unemployment rate and the highest levels of severe poverty also have the highest rates of perceived social exclusion.

The life standard based inequalities do not exist just between the countries that are the regions within the countries also show some striking differences. According to a research carried in 1993, although there is nobody, in both parts of Germany, who felt completely left out of or excluded from society, percentage of people who claimed that they were left out to a certain extent and had the limited chance to participate the society is 28% for East Germany and 9% for West Germany. This difference between the regions is strongly related to the unemployment and high degree of dissatisfaction with political and social systems in the East. When the same survey was conducted in 1998, in both parts of the country 1% of the population associated themselves with extreme form of exclusion, being completely unsatisfied. Although there are some improvements in terms of material living conditions, East Germany is still more deprived than West Germany (Böhnke, Petra, 2001:15-16)

Similarly, Italy displays a clear north-south divide that is southern part of the country is poorer than the northern one. Flemish speaking area of Belgium is significantly richer than the French speaking one. Northern region of France and Northern Ireland have the highest rate of poverty including unemployment, inadequate access to health and education services and well housing conditions. These are important factors that exclude people from participating in everyday life (Stewart, 2002).

in Europe, according to Silver, unemployment is the most obvious statistically valid factor of exclusion and the category of people who is the most excluded are constituted by young people, immigrants, refugees, disables, homeless, elders, unemployed, people on a low income benefits, prisoners, people living in rural areas, single parents, minorities, carers and women. Gender factor is also an important to understanding social inequalities and as Silver claims in that, in Europe, women and racial and ethnic groups are the most disadvantaged than the other categories of population. Although European-wide anti-discrimination laws and commitment to provide equality between men and women have been taken, social and cultural sources of exclusion are still rooted in informal social relations and cultural practices as well as official institutions. In Europe, women are much more likely to be underemployed and working fewer hours than they would like. Social exclusion of racial and ethnic minorities produces economic as well as social deprivation. Blacks in Europe are more likely than white people to live in poverty. They have higher unemployment rates and are concentrated in low-paid jobs. Minority women, in this case, are doubly disadvantaged that they bear a heavier burden of domestic responsibilities, materially dependent and morally indebted to the men²¹.

III-4-3-Social Exclusion in Developing Countries

Since the concept of ‘social exclusion’ has been developed in its relation to the welfare state and formal employment structures in industrialized economies, application of the term to the developing countries, where such systems are absent, is questionable. This is due to the claim that concept makes general sense of the complex, divergent and locally specific dynamics of deprivation and inequality (Du Toit, 2004). Looking from social exclusion perspective makes (Ruhi, 2001) majority of people in developing countries “socially excluded” since there are very few social security schemes and rural and informal/unorganized economic sectors are dominant. Percentage of people engaged in the formal/organized sectors and

²¹ Silver Hillary, “European National Policies to Promote the Social Inclusion of disadvantaged Groups” <http://www.brown.edu/Departments/Sociology/faculty/hsilver/documents/Ch.9-HSilver-REV10-24.pdf>

covered by social security systems is very low thus, it is not clear according to Western standard that others are excluded or not. Application of social exclusion does not seem practically feasible, nevertheless, poverty studies in developing countries have moved in the same direction as poverty studies in the West: from rather economic conceptualizations towards more complex 'human' concept, including social and political rights and people's capabilities. But most studies, although labeled as 'social exclusion' are quite similar to earlier multidimensional poverty studies performed in the respective countries. For instance, poverty research that earlier looked at landlessness now looks at exclusion from land, those that looked at gender, caste or race based discrimination now look at exclusion on the basis of these criteria (Ruhi, 2001).

Starting from Latin America, it is stated that replacement of 'social exclusion' with the term 'marginality' reflects a shift in intellectual fashions and change in reality in this region. The debates about marginality in 1960s focused on the urban situation and were closely linked to the political movements of the time which aimed to support the poor population and make the city. The urban poor of the 1960s and 1970s had real chances for their rising expectations to be met, albeit through their own efforts in constructing their homes and creating work opportunities. In contrast, urban environments of today are much more consolidated physically and provide limited opportunities both for living and demand-making. The competition for space is more severe and the economic environment is a more hostile one. The informal economy grows but incomes drop within it. In this situation there are severe constraints upon the upward mobility of the poor. Social exclusion in Latin America refers to the second-class citizenship in which disadvantage derives the differentiation produced by the institutions of the state (Roberts, 2004: 195-196).

Another important point in the Latin American poverty researches is about the survival strategies of the population experience disadvantages. In fact, survival strategies derives from traditional relationships between people in the case of material hardships, are fact in most of the developing countries but, Lewis' (1969) work on the relation between 'slums' , as poor areas in the cities of Latin America,

and the sub-culture developed by their inhabitants had become a touchstone for academic works on the issue.

Although, in his work, Lewis (1969) defines presence of a ‘culture of poverty’ he also counts some conditions that lead to construction of it, and by this way, culture of poverty emerges as a production of set of negative conditions that poor have to experience: a cash economy, wage labor and production for the profit, persistently high rate of unemployment and underemployment for unskilled labor, low wages, the failure to provide social, political and economic organization for the low-income population, the existence of a bilateral kinship system, existing of the dominant class and their perception of poverty as the result of personal inadequacy or inferiority. In more certain words “The way of life that develops among some of the poor under these conditions is the culture of poverty” (Lewis, 1969:188). It is something useful since it provides some rewards without which the poor could hardly carry on. The culture of poverty is both an adaptation and a reaction of the poor to their marginal position in a class-stratified, highly individuated capitalistic society (Lewis, 1969).

Some academicians, by depending shift from marginality to social exclusion, focus on the change in the system of survival strategies that depends, in some sense, culture of poverty. De La Rocha (2003) focusing on Latin America, claims that there has emerged a context in which survival strategies or any other supporting mechanisms among the poor have weakened. She points that today’s urban poor households experience significantly different conditions. She claims that:

“The current situation is characterized by new forms of exclusion and increasing precariousness, is unfavorable to the operation of traditional household mechanisms of work intensification. Instead of talking about the resources of poverty....., the present situation is better described by the opposite: poverty of resources, the lack of employment opportunities in a context shaped by an economic model that produces labor exclusion” (de la Rocha, 2003: 14).

She implies the erosion of social systems of support and self-help “ due not to any inherent incapacity of the poor to survive or to escape from poverty but to the increasing deterioration of labour market.....persistent economic crisis.....has made

the urban poor's strategies and resourcefulness insufficient to offset the erosion of their asset base" (ibid,14).

The general lack of employment, low, irregular wages and labour exclusion diminished the regular wages that household need to maintain such mutual help relationships and support systems (De La Rocha, 2003.15).

Keeping these appropriate comments in the mind, it now becomes inevitable first to look at the poverty estimations about developing regions given by international institutions. According to WB's development index of 2005, in Latin America and Caribbean, percentage of population living on less than \$ 1 a day has become 9.5 % which was 11.3 % in 1990. According to a research (Bouillan and Buvinic, 2003) during 1990s Latina America and Caribbean (LAC) reduced the poverty but absolute number of poor increased because of population growth. Moreover, the economic slowdown and crises in the past two years reversed the gains in some countries in the region. One third of its population, roughly 180 million people, is earning less than \$ 2 a day and living in poverty. Most of the poor (69, 5 million) exist in Brazil, Mexico (20, 6 million) comes next and it is followed by Colombia (16, 4 million). 49.6 % of rural population and 50.4 % of urban population living in poverty and poverty is concentrated in households whose heads are employed in agriculture and in the urban non-financial service sectors (pp: 1-2).

Percentage of people who suffer from extreme poverty and who are not integrated in to the society and lack the patterns of socialization rose, from 13 %, to 15% and the main cause of this negativeness is the shift from industrial policy and any other state sponsored enterprises to free market model in the early 1980s. Neo-liberal open-market adjustment not only resulted with increase in unemployment, decrease in the formal working class and blurring of the formal-informal divide but also rises in inequality and relative deprivation led to urban crime, violence and public insecurity. According to a comparative study based on the field works in six Latin American nations, labour market has evolved in against to the majority of people with the partial exception of Chile. In Chile, where the economic signs are the best, unemployment rate increased to 10.6 % in 2002-2003 from 10.4 % in 1980 and

informal workers increased to 35.6 % from 27.1 % for the same period. Argentina's unemployment rate, which is the worst, has reached to 15.1 % from 2.6 % and informal workers to 41.8 from 23.0 % and these rates are 17.0 % Uruguay's (Portes, 2005).

All these negative conducts and economic crises in the 1980s resulted with decline in real income in almost all countries in the region and led middle-income groups be encircled by poverty which, in general, became a way of being that does not allow individuals exercise their rights. The cultural deprivation imposed by the absolute absence of rights suppresses human dignity and leads to material deprivation and political exclusion. Social exclusion is a problem goes hand in hand with income inequality and the gini values in Latin American countries, which make the region has the highest level of income inequality, range between 60.7 in Brazil and 40.4 in Cambodia (Altimir, 1998). Social exclusion is both causes and consequences of inequality. It extends the problem to the groups and creates a problem as visible and wide disparities in life standards not only between rich and poor or urban and rural but also between men and women, between indigenous and other groups, between people of African descendents and the others. In addition to these categories, disables, elders, people with HIV/aids and immigrants share poverty, suffer multiple and cumulative disadvantages, stigma and discrimination (Bouillon and Buvinic, 2003; 4).

According to a research, households with African descendants, mixed race or indigenous heads having significantly lower earnings than those households with white or Asian-Brazilian heads. The earnings of the latter are almost two-and-a-half times higher than that of the former. The non-poor in Brazil are predominantly white, whereas the poor are African descendants or mixed race. Over 50% of black and mixed-race households are poor; in contrast this rate is 25 % for households headed by a white person. Social inequalities in Brazil that effectively constitutes a mechanism of social exclusion of the poor are extremely high. Life expectancy, for instance, is shorter among blacks than whites by around seven years and infant mortality rates are almost double among blacks. African descendants have just two-thirds the level of education of the white population and one quarter of them has no

schooling at all. In Peru, ethnicity is one of the most important dimensions of inequality. While the national average illiteracy rate is 13%, it reaches 33 % among the indigenous population. Since they can not use their own languages in urban areas, indigenous people are excluded from employment and access to social services (Justina and Acharya, 2003:3-10).

Not only in social or economic terms, is exclusion of some categories also common in spatial term. The concept of ‘urban marginality’ refers to the version of the spatial segregation of the poor, in Latin America. It emerged as a result of state employing different policies for different social economic groups in the society. Urban marginality can be defined as the inability of the market economy or state policies to provide adequate shelter and urban services to an increasing proportion of city dwellers. Although there is no overlap between urban marginality and occupational marginality, majority of people living in these areas making their earnings in informal sector of the economy and some of them have low level of income or lack of stable job (Castells, 1983). In El Salvador more than 60 % of the houses in the five most important cities have been unconventionally or illegally built. About 50 % of Mexico City’s inhabitants live in some kind of settlement without control or authorization (Galafassi, 2002; 124). Mega cities are increasingly divided in to favelas for the poor and gated communities for the rich. Residential location severely limits the possibilities of upward mobility that is prejudices of the elite and middle classes against favela dwellers exclude the latter from better life opportunities. Favelas are affected by rising rates of crime, violence, murder and the associated stigma and immobility and precarious environmental conditions (Perlman, 2007).

South Asia, as another developing region, has the problem of social exclusion. Before sketching the form of exclusion, however, it is necessary to look at the some statistical estimation about development given by international institutions. According to WB (2003)²², South Asia has become successful in reducing percentage of people living \$ 1 a day that is it was 41.3 % in 1990 but decreased to 31.3 % in 2001. The region’s value of HDI is under 600 that refer to the medium

²² http://www.worldbank.org/html/extpb/2003/south_asia.html, accessed: 22 march 2006.

human development category. But all of the countries in the region, except Maldives and Sri Lanka, stand at the bottom of this category near to the low human development one.

ILO (2006)²³ reports that in South Asia, where unemployment rate increased to 4.7 % in 2004 from 4.0 % in 1995, number of working poor (202.3 million) is the largest in the world and constitutes the nearly 40 % of the total number in the world. South Asia has also the largest number of chronically poor²⁴ people in the world- an estimated 135-to 190 million people and chronic poverty is concentrated in Eastern and Southern Pakistan, Central India, Western Nepal and Northern and Southern Bangladesh. Most poor in the region still live in rural areas since towns and cities are given greater opportunities.

Since region's main economic activity is based on agriculture, governments' failure in generating agricultural development and employment programmes became the main cause of the extreme poverty. One of the most striking characteristics of the poor in the country is their limited access to land or their being completely landless. According to a research centre, Bangladesh, 26 per cent of agricultural land is owned by only 5 per cent of landowner while the majority, 70 per cent, altogether just own 29 per cent of the country's agricultural land. In Nepal 67 per cent poor own 18 percent and 4.8 per cent rich own 37 per cent of lands. Only in Sri Lanka, over 80 % of the land remains state property²⁵.

While in Bangladesh, according to WB (2002), poverty rate does not appear to be strongly correlated with religion or gender of household head, those female-headed that are widowed, divorced or separated have considerably higher incidence of poverty relative to the others²⁶. In Nepal, women and people belonging to a certain

²³ ILO, 2006, global Employment Trends: Brief, January: <http://www-ilo-mirror.cornell.edu/public/english/employment/strat/download/getb06en.pdf>, accessed: 2

²⁴ <http://www.chronicpoverty.org/pdfs/CPR1%20FINAL/CPRfinCH7.pdf>, accessed:

²⁵ http://www.saape.org.np/resources/publications/poverty_report03/overv.pdf

²⁶ WB, Poverty Reduction Unit (2002), "Poverty in Bangladesh. Building on Progress http://www.mdgbangla.org/report_publication/povertyin_bangladesh.pdf

social groups, such as occupational castes, suffer from poverty more than the other categories²⁷

In Pakistan, women are more excluded. Because of the existing strong Islamic rules and patriarchal traditions women can not experience their political and ownership rights. A women of 50 years or older, for instance, can stand for election just with permission of her husband. Although this position has changed after protests, gender based discriminatory laws and practices, inequitable family laws, unhealthy customs and traditions and religious beliefs still tend to exclusion of women from many spheres of social life (De Haan, 1995, chapter 1).

Despite the Indian Government's emphasis on a socialist society, inequalities and exclusion based on status and caste structure still exist and this makes 150 million people untouchables, oppressed, excluded and can not integrated to the mainstream of national life. Although Indian constitutional system prohibited the caste based discrimination the continued use of terminology and practices show that 'caste' has been transformed but has not disappeared. For Sheduled Castes, for example, economic, educational, political exclusions and for Scheduled Tribes cultural exclusion is subject of matter. (De Haan, *ibid*).

In addition to the caste system India has the great number (more than 40 million) of people who are socially excluded because of joblessness. This situation results from existence of dominant classes that hold the reins of power and those constitute the tiny minority that pushes the rest of the population in to the poor category. (Pulin Nayak, 1995).

In general, in South Asia, caste, tribe, religion and gender are the factors that lead to processes of social exclusion.

²⁷ WB, Poverty Reduction Unit (1998), Nepal:Poverty in Nepal: At the turn of the Twenty-first century

IV-THE TURKISH CASE

As stated earlier, one of the main critiques that directed towards the concept of social exclusion is its unfitness to the developing countries. Since it was originated to define social exclusion resulted from structural transformations peculiar to Western societies, its application to the developing countries, having different social, economic, cultural and political structures, has become a controversial state. That is to say, the concept creates vagueness since, according to Western social and economic standards, it is not clear whether the majority of the population in developing countries is excluded or not.

Nevertheless, in developing countries as well, a side of such studies, especially urban poverty, has started to turn address at a perspective of social exclusion. In Turkey there has also emerged an academic tendency that calls our attentions to the existence or risk/danger of social exclusion in some metropolitan areas. While some points the social exclusion as a new type of poverty (Keyder & Buğra, 2003), some define social exclusion as the converted form of poverty by violence and crime issues (Erman, 2002). Increase in the density and extent of poverty made some to focus on the ethnic and religious (Erder, 1997; Erman, 2003, 2004), gender (Kardam & Alyanak, 2002), children (Altuntaş, 2003; alada, Sayita & Temelli, 2002) aspects of this exclusive and rigid attitudes that emerged as result of state liberal policies after 1980 era (Işık & Pınarcıoğlu, 2001). These and other studies on social exclusion are heavily dependent on a poverty perspective but the point, which they take into consideration mostly, is a deepening and an expanding form of urban poverty having the potential of turning to social exclusion.

The assumption in these studies, which implies the shift towards advanced forms of urban poverty mentioned with social exclusion, base on the truth of dynamic process in the nature of urban poverty in Turkey. It was the early 1950s when urban poverty started to emerge, transformed as result of demographic movements and changes in the economic and political spheres, and has taken a new form. Internal migration from the rural to the urban areas and its interaction with economic

changes aimed to place liberalism and a political culture lacks of effective social policies had become basic components of the urban poverty. In order to understand the problem of social exclusion in Turkey, questions of how poverty, in a general sense, and urban poverty in specific is defined and how economic, social and political processes led to such an evaluation are interpreted should be answered. This framework can shed light on the roots of the problem, mechanisms that led the transformation and resulted in the existing form of the problem.

IV-1- Poverty Profile in Turkey

In Turkey, like in many countries in the world, level and kind of poverty have changed in opposition to the economically and socially weaker categories in the society for the last three decades. Governmental units, however, have not realized the problem and taken systematic measures early. It was not until the late 1990s that poverty arouses the state's interest. Erdoğan (1997)'s (an expert of State Institute of Statistic (SIS)) study seems as the beginning of such studies conducted to make a poverty definition and estimate number of poor in Turkey. In her work (1997), she defines 'extremely poor' (food poverty) as people who are under the minimum amount of calories per day needed by an individual. The 'poor' on the other hand are defined as people who can not meet the cost of basic needs such as housing, clothing, transportation and furniture in addition to food. Accordingly, by depending on SIS's Household Consumption and Income Survey data collected in 1994, the rate of 'extremely poor' emerges as 11% for Turkey, 7 % for urban and 14 % for rural areas. The rate of 'poor' is higher since it also includes the non-food costs: it is 31% for Turkey, 28% for urban and 32% for rural areas. In both categories Aegean emerges as the region where these rates are the lowest while East and Southeast emerge as regions where these rates are highest (Erdoğan, 1997).

In Dumanlı's (1996) study poverty is analyzed on the base of monetary (0.91 \$) equivalent of 2450 calories needed in a day. Regional and rural-urban differences are explored by using SIS's 1987 household Income and Consumption Expense data. Accordingly, the rate of persons who do not have 0.91\$ in a day is estimated as 3.01 % for Aegean, 18.55 % for Mediterranean, 8.34 % for Black sea, 26.30 % for Central Anatolia and 43.80 % for Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia Regions. In

all regions except Central, East and Southeast regions rural poverty is higher than urban poverty (cited in 8th Five Year Development Plan, SPO, 2001; 114-115).

Dansuk's (1997) study aims to evolve a new approach to measure poverty and bring light to the relationship between poverty and social indicators. He claims that the element which does not exist in relative and absolute poverty approaches is the determination of poverty line (by basing on the whole) not only food and non-food, expenses of a person. These are food, clothing, furniture, services and cares for house and household members, health, individual care, transportation, communication, culture, education, housing and other expenses. He supposes that in Turkey, for the year of 1987, an average 50.283 TL/month was the line for 'absolute poverty in accordance with consumption expenditure' (tüketim harcamasına göre mutlak yoksulluk) and percentage of absolutely poor is 55.64 %. But the interesting point in his work is that he selects the lowest regional average, which sharply differs from the country average, to determine the poverty level of the country. In this case, when East and Southeastern regions' average of 29.950 TL/month is taken, the rate of absolutely poor appears as 25.54 % for Turkey. Nevertheless, Dansuk's interpretation relationship between poverty and social indicators gives crucial results which bring out that people living in rural areas and engaging in agricultural and informal economic activities uneducated and unemployed people and people out of social security system face more risk of poverty. This state is strongly related to the low level and unequal distribution of national income.

In Dağdemir's (1999) work, beside the level and distribution of national income, economic instability, high inflation and rural to urban migration become visible as causes of general poverty in Turkey. By comparing SIS's Household Income and Consumption Expense Survey 1987 and Household Income Distribution Survey 1994, he tries to analyze the susceptibility of poverty from the causes counted above. Although there is no change in the general poverty rate of Turkey (11.5 %), there is a change in the rates of rural and urban poverty to this general one. While the level of urban poor rose to 35.5 % in 1994 from 26.5 % in 1987, the rural decreased to 64.4 from 73.5.

Dağdemir interprets such a change as move of poverty from rural to urban areas and also a deepening type of rural poverty. As a matter of fact rural poverty in Turkey is not a new phenomena and it has been a subject of many studies. Here, to look at the issue in a limited framework both to complete the poverty profile and understand its relation to the urban poverty is crucial for the aim of this study.

It is stated that (Akder, 2000) low human development²⁸, in terms of income, education and health, is a widespread phenomena in rural areas of Turkey. There are close to nine million people living in low-hdi ranking district, 35.7 % of which are living in significantly rural and 59.7 % in predominantly rural districts. The majority of low-ranking districts are located in the East, Southeast, and Black sea and also in Central Anatolia Regions.

To update these statistics helps us to understand the change through time. According to SIS's 2004 Poverty Work's Result, percentage of 'food poverty' (extreme poverty) is 1.29 and 1.35 in 2002. Most of them (2.01 % in 2002 and 2.36 % in 2004) live in rural while urban areas consist of the least (0.92 % in 2002 and 0.62 % in 2004). When the percentage of 'food and non-food poverty in 2004 is considered, it emerges as 25.6 %, which was 26.96 % in 2002, for Turkey. In the same period urban percentage decreases to 16.57 in 2004 from 21.95 in 2002 and rural percentage increases to 39.97 from 34.48. SIS also gives percentage of population below \$ 1 a day which is % 0.02 in 2004. According to WB (2005) this rate is smaller than 2 % and quite low compared to international standards despite the fact that it has not changed since 1994.

Although WB' interpretation is affirmative, Turkey's poverty conditions should be dealt with in comparison to the European Union Countries, since they may give an answer for the question why its joining has been taken as such a doubtful issue by the Union. In fact, the level of poverty and social exclusion exists as major

²⁸ World Bank defines the concept of 'human development' on the base of achievement in three basic dimensions- a long and healthy life, knowledge and a decent standart of living (WB, 2006;407). Similar to this definiton, Akder (2000) uses human development index based on life expectancy, level of access to education and GDP per capita (p. 16).

challenge that EU has to fight with. But Turkey's accession to the union carries risk of deepening these problems. According to a recent report of the European Commission (2005), the significant number of people, more than 68 million (15 %) of the EU population, living at 60 % of the equivalized national median income or at risk of poverty in 2002 (Commission of the European Communities, 2005) and this number increased to 72 million (16 %) in 2003 (Guio, 2005; 1). This level even increases in many of the new member States and is the highest in Turkey with 23 %. Similarly, since Turkey's Gini coefficient value (49) is quite above the EU 15 countries' (29) (Dennis and Guio, 2003). Furthermore, GDP per head is only 27 % of the EU average, high regional economic inequality, and youth unemployment rate and low employment rate of women lead perception of Turkey as a large poor country. Thus, Turkey's joining in means transfer of a significant budget from the Union (Hughes, 2004, summary part) and lowering of average economic standard which would make poverty emerge as an important issue that Turkey has to overcome to join the European Union.

All these studies show that poverty in Turkey, in its general sense, is not a widespread phenomenon but should not be underestimated, especially for uneducated and unemployed people, for those without social insurance and working in informal economy and living in rural areas. In addition to them, regional difference in terms of human development level is another impressive fact that should be considered. The East and Southeastern Regions having dominantly rural characteristics are poorer than the other regions. These categories constitute the poverty profile of Turkey but, for the aim of this study, they will be investigated in their relation to urban poverty. In order to understand urban poverty in Turkey its nature, causes, changing features and effects on the urban social spheres, a detailed periodical analyze is needed. In this study, the pre-1980s, the years between 1980 and 1990 and the post 1990s will be the main periods in which urban poverty will be analyzed. This help us to see what kind of a structure does urban poverty have and what are the mechanisms that led to its change in each period and also to estimate the future prospect of the problem: whether there is a course of events that can lead to social exclusion.

IV-1-2-Urban Poverty: The Pre-1980 Era

Urban poverty in Turkey takes its roots from 1950s when state's insistence on the industrial development and negligence on the agricultural economy began. In 1950 nearly 85 % of the total population (21 million) gained their livings on agricultural economic activities but in 2000 it decreased to 36 % of the total population (68 million). The change in these statistics gives a sign of some other important changes that cause the internal migration, and in turn, increased the urbanization rate from 18.5 % to 61.5 % and the emergence of urban poverty (Alpaytekin, 2006; 3).

Structural transformation in rural areas such as mechanization in agriculture, changes in land tenure, surplus labor force and increase in population had become push factors for rural inhabitants' migration to the big cities. Existing of industrial job opportunities, developing service sector and relatively better life standards in urban context had become pull factors that accelerated internal migration (Friedrich Ebert Foundation, 1996; 4). Looking from a periodical perspective, 1950s and 1960s became the years through which these pushing factors had been most effective and, in the end, rapid receding both from village and peasantry realized. 1970s and 1980s however, became the process in which pull factors, as result of recognition of better life conditions in urban and development in transportation and communication technology, became effective (İçduygu and Ünalın, 1998;43-44).

It was due to the state's lack of efficiency in developing an agricultural programme that led to decrease in life standards of rural population, and made them migrate to big cities like Ankara, İzmir and, especially, İstanbul. However, since there was similar inefficiency in the industrial sector, most of the newcomers could not be absorbed into formal urban economic activities and, in the end, had to engage in the informal economic sector²⁹. It is stated that low level of or no economic growth, jobless economic growth, high-tech growth of formal jobs excluding those without

²⁹ In this study informal economy is defined as employment including both self and wage employment and connected relationships are not legally regulated or protected. Today, informal economy is no longer considered as a temporary but a permanent phenomenon. It is a feature of modern capitalism and should be viewed not as a marginal or peripheral sector but a basic component of the total economy (Chen, 2006 "Rethinking the Informal Economy: Linkages with the Formal economy and the Formal Regulatory Environment" : <http://www.un.org/docs/ecosoc/meetings/2006/forum/Statements/Chen's%20Paper.pdf>. Accessed: 5 may 2007.

the skills, and economic crises and restructurings in the countries tend people find jobs in and extend the informal economy (Carr & Chen, 2001). It has been observed that informal economy is growing and has a more strong character in developing countries where incomes and assets are not equitably distributed. (Flodman, 2004). The size of informal economy in 1999-2000 periods, for instance, is the lowest in OECD and West European Countries with the average of 18 % while this level is 38 % for transition countries and 41 %, the highest, in developing countries. Turkey, as a developing country, is the 8th. with average of 32, 1 % among 27 Asian countries (Schneider, 2002). Although some argue that informal economic sector in Turkey is a functional and a dynamic system that becomes a passing place between feudal and industrial economy and created a marginal section filling the labor deficiency in the service and industrial sectors (Şenyapılı, 2000) some argues that employment in informal economy has gained a permanent character since modern urban sector did not create effective employment opportunities for the rural immigrants (Çolak & Bekmez, 2005). Population growth, internal and external migration and unemployment, as some of the social factors, and high inflation, inequality in taxation system and high cost of minimum wages to the employer as some of economic factors are shown as causes of informal economy in Turkey. In other words, in Turkey, where social security system is not adequate, informal employment functions as unemployment insurance for jobless people and those with low wages (Güloğlu, 2005). Thus, it may not be a wrong statement to say that rural population just changed its residences but not so much their conditions of poverty (İçduygu and Ünalın; ibid) since majority of them could find temporary low income jobs in the service sector due to the their low level of education and lack of job skills proper to an urban type job (Kıray, 1988).

It can be said that to engage in marginal economy had become one of the basic characteristics of the urban poor in Turkey and it can not be thought without insisting on another important characteristic the place of residence. To write specifically, the second one directly refers to another problem that of squatter housing. There is a similar dynamic, the lack of an official liability and undertaking that created the squatters, the settlements of the newly coming rural immigrants, but as the unauthorized constructions made on the public and private lands without

depending on the general rules and laws of the country that regulates building and reconstruction issues (TMMOB, 2004³⁰).

As Karpat claims “*squatter settlements are the product of the malfunctioning of the economic and social system in some third world countries, a malfunctioning that creates a relation of economic marginality between the city and low income groups*” (Karpat, 1976:3).

As oppose this quotation, Şenyapılı (1978) claims that, squatterization is not a problem related to marginal sector but a definite model of capitalization. Squatters emerged as the places which completes industrial, organizational and conciliatory gaps in the market by making house, and providing cheap and dynamic labor force. While high speed of migration has started to augment urban population in the big cities, the low speed of formal/public and cheap housing had created shelter problem for rural immigrants. Squatter housing (gecekondu), in some sense, resulted from lack of discrepancy between the speeds of migration and meeting housing needs of rural immigrants. They are the practical solution that poor rural immigrants found for their shelter. Squatters refer to cheap, rapid, informal and self-constructed buildings made by immigrants themselves for their use value (Friedrich Ebert Foundation, *ibid*). At the time of moving in, it is claimed, the squatters may lack windows, plumbing and plastered walls. The construction mainly uses the labor of family members and neighbors whose services could be reproduced. The entire process, land occupation squatter construction, is carried outside scope of the formally regulated economy. Individuals do not start the process of having squatter with a stranger, but networks based on ethnicity, co-locality or kinship. Thus, since they provide scope for social reproduction, squatters can be conceptualized as a “socially constructed project” (Tok, 2005).

Their starting to dominate the urban areas, especially after 1950, was not only due to the existing institutional and legal weakness but also governments’ populist policies. Reconstruction amnesties that provide squatter owners title deeds are the

³⁰ <http://www.tmmob.org.tr/modules.php?op=modload&name=News&file=article&sid=427>
accessed on 5 June 2007.

important factors that led increase in the level of squatterization. It is claimed that (Özler, 2000) squatters have always been, and still are, significant source of votes in the national elections and material interests including title deeds seemed to predominate their inhabitants' choice of party. Success of Justice Party in 1960s, Republican People Party in 1973, Motherland Party in 1980 and Welfare Party in 1995 depend on the votes came from periphery including squatters. The first party's emphasis on people, second's promise for the land title, third's (Özal) promises for the becoming middle class and lastly fourth's emphasis on 'just order' seemed superior to both capitalism and socialism indicate that urban squatters have allied with different political parties based not on their ideological but material interests. According to TMMOB (ibid) report, ten amnesties have been put into effect since 1948. While, at the beginning, objective of them was to give squatter just title deeds, in the latter period's amnesties organized to bring squatter areas reconstruction arrangement (imar düzeni). With the latest one in 1983 not only all unauthorized buildings and establishments were taken into amnesty but also squatters were given right to construct up to four stores. Thus, while these laws both protected and encouraged the construction of these unauthorized settlements, they paved way, as will be discussed in the next section, transformation of squatter areas on the base of land-speculation.

These legal dispositions can be interpreted as an informal redistribution process where the state fails to provide social assistance to the poorer section of society (Başlevent & Dayıoğlu, 2005). Keleş claims that this was a direct consequence of unbalanced income distribution in the society. Not only shortage of house and state inability to respond this need but also cost of existing formal residences were effective in the emergence of squatters. State's existing housing finance mechanism emphasizing ownership in housing excluded an increasing number of lower income groups from benefiting from the opportunities and led immigrants to accommodate in 'unauthorized' housing. He calls the inhabitants of squatter dwellings as a whole, regardless of the variations from one area to another, as the poorer urban classes in the society (Keleş and Hirimasa, 1987, part 1) and squatter settlements as common marginal urban areas inhabiting low income population like slums in the advanced and industrialized societies. However, squatter and slums differ in terms of former's

being space of transition to escape from poverty whereas latter of the chronic poverty. In economic terms, squatters' inhabitants are working people whereas in slums people generally unemployed. Physically, squatters consist of one storey houses with garden built, by rural origin immigrants, on the peripheral areas of the city for a permanent settlement whereas slums refer to the area constituted by old houses have more than one storey in the city center inhabited, by urban origin people, for a temporary settlement (Keleş, 2000, 375).

Squatter settlements, with their characteristics mentioned above, refer to one of the parts of a bilateral structure in the city that accommodates old and new poor. Urban poverty in Turkey, by this bilateral structure, fits to the poverty profile in advanced societies but the biggest difference between them is the dynamic and non-chronic characteristics of the former. There is neither a chronic-passive type of poverty nor rigid borders between the poor and non-poor in Turkey, since there have always been transitions, intersections and articulations between those different socio-economic categories. This is due to the poor's perception of their poverty as a changeable and temporary problem, and, their interferences for upward mobility (ODTU, 1999). This state made squatter settlements place of transition for the poor want to reach better life conditions. Infact, the first step of such dynamism in urban poverty in Turkey originates from the type of migration which can be called as 'chain migration'. It is realized by migration of a pioneer that forms a nucleus structure to determine urban resources and the way to get them to help new comers. This structure was the most functional when it was fortified on the base of traditional-communal organizations such as kinship and fellowship of countrymen. They became a ready help network that can hinder the urban problems (job, housing, money etc.) would be faced by new comers. The majority of squatter dwellers, different from other sections of society, have experienced this type of solidarity in the processes of realizing, perceiving and reaching urban resources and integration to the urban society (Friedrich Ebert Foundation, *ibid*; Karpat, *ibid*).

For the rural immigrants of pre the 1980, there was a more integrationist or soft urbanization (Tusiad, 1999³¹) and it is stated that primary aim of population in squatters, especially of the second and third generations, was to integrate to urban life socially, economically and spatially in 1970s. They recognized economic, social and cultural resources and then, claimed and acted politically for equal opportunities (Şenyapılı, 2004) since as the process of staying urban increases they compare themselves to other groups in the city, think that they experience inequality and reach the idea of ‘relative deprivation’ (Kartal, 1978). Therefore, immigrants’ initiatives were crucial in their peculiar urban adaptation and integration in the pre 1980 era, but state’s role in providing suitable conditions can not be underestimated. State’s lack of responsibility and taking no action in the urbanization process led immigrants construct the ‘working mechanisms of urban lands’ depending on the relation between squatters’ settlements (new immigrants) and making-selling (small capital owners). (Işık and Pınarcıoğlu, 2001).

However, both increase in the number of squatters and formal recognition of them were reacted by native urban population. Their demands related to urban integration were challenged and they were kept away from social and cultural spaces since there was a belief in their “culture of poverty” (Lewis, 1969) developed by native urban people (Şenyapılı, 2004).

The most bothered thing about squatters was dominant rural characteristics in the life styles of immigrants. They were seen as homogenous rural masses and imagined as ‘peasant other’, ‘lacking other’ and ‘underdeveloped other’ (Erman and Tok, 2004). This observation is verified by many studies on the issue and it is stated that immigrants’, especially the first generation, insistence on their keeping rural identity comes from their sense of exclusion by urbanite population and feelings of economic and social insecurity and also desire to take advantage of the opportunities in the city (Erman, 1998).

³¹ Türk Sanayicileri ve İşadamları Derneği (Tusiad). (1999). “Turkey’s Window of Opportunity Demographic Transition Process and Its consequences”, Tusiad Pub. No: T/99-3-254: http://www.tusiad.us/second_page.cfm?TYPE_ID=14 accessed: 5 June 2007.

IV-1-3-Urban Poverty: The Post-1980 Era

In this era, both economic transformations and the state, as the main actor of economic and social relationship, disappearance led to the emergence of this exclusive context in which many actors struggling over decreasing level of urban resources (Işık and Pınarcıoğlu, 2001). Although it was not rapid, migration to metropolitan cities continued and the population rate of squatters increased and squatters continued to be called as the places of poor. However, since structural changes contributed to economic inequalities accompanied with ethnic, religious and cultural diversities among urban poor, Turkey's profile of urban poverty started to gain a hierarchical structure in terms of economic and social peculiarities.

One of the important reasons that created this hierarchical structure was the state's legal disposition of squatters which led the post 1980 era witness transformation based on land speculation and rent relationship. Since state's lack of capacity to bring housing policies for the poorer sections of the society continued, political authorities created new ways in establishing social cohesion and stability without employing formal mechanism. The land tenures, home titles and allowance for the construction of building up to four storeys on squatter lands are the laws that realized in the Özal era. They can be called as non-material rewards given to squatter owners in return for their supports for the implementation of the liberal policies and also the factors that made squatters emerge as new state space or paradoxical solution of the state, (Tok, 2005). It is claimed that state's allowing the irregular patterns of access to urban land was a manifestation of generalized reciprocity and institutionalized redistributive practice that clearly served the purpose of avoiding social unrest and legitimizing the existing social order. However, both informalized and personalized characters of this reciprocity, called as negative reciprocity, between squatters and the state, and the extension of it destroyed impersonality and formal equality of the exchange relationships and, by this way, led emergence of "immoral economy" (Buğra, 1998).

It is claimed that, state's lack of formal policies created squatters but, even in the case of formal housing project, state may work as reproduction mechanism of

squatters. The ‘Dikmen Valley’ project in Ankara carried by semi-public company and Çankaya Municipality, for instance, led some of the squatter dwellers, who are granted one new flat, sold their flats at high prices and buy two new squatters in other parts of the city (Malusardi, 2003). Similarly, while in Çukurambar, another squatter district in Ankara, squatters have been replaced with high-rise luxury housing blocks, people in squatters have left their houses and moved to other squatter areas at the periphery of Ankara. These projects, by this way, provided the continuity of squatter settlements since they could not achieve coexistence of the two different income level and socio-cultural groups in the same space. Both exclusionary attitudes of high income groups towards squatter dwellers and difficulty of the latter to adapt the way of life in the flat requires high income have led voluntary exclusion of low income groups from the new prestige residential area. (Armatlı & Ercoşkun, 2006).

Nevertheless, squatter owners gain economic from the squatters’ process of commercialization started due to the populism resulted from Turkey’s experience of liberalism. It is observed that, in Turkey, rental incomes reduce the income gap between non-squatters and the particular groups of people living in squatters (Başlevent & Dayıoğlu, 2005), thus, squatters transformation into ‘apartment’ buildings brought welfare to their owners. But they also became center of the urban capital accumulation and residences seen as investments, not shelter anymore, by its inhabitants and it is claimed that, due to the high economic rent offered to users, squatters can be said to have become the reason for migration to the city rather than a result of it in this era. Moreover, there emerged an informal economic sector based on squatter sale in which formerly squatter owners both as producers and users of squatters and as the main actors on the urban land were replaced with “shanty “landlords”” who owned several squatters, big capital owners and mafia organizations aspired to these lands (Tusiad, 1999). This led to change in the perception of people living in shantytowns: they were not seen as victims or poor anymore but plunderers (Friedrich Ebert Foundation, 1996) and people becoming rich unjustly (köşeyi donen) (Erman, 2004) and people who are destroying the city and rights of the real urban population.

It should be noted that the change in the profile of actors is one of the important factor that created differentiation among the urban poor in terms of welfare conditions. The recent immigrants have been more poor and disadvantaged in terms of housing due to the limited urban land resources controlled by these new and powerful actors. The former immigrants had a squatter have been in a more advantageous position. These kinds of ownership provided them to reach better living conditions and, in many cases, wealth.

Infact, the main point which Turkish academicians agree upon is the existence of an informal housing market that depends on poor immigrants' ethnic, kinship and family relationships provided them certain advantages. However, in the post 1980 era, there emerged stratification in their getting advantageous due to the hierarchy and exploitation embedded in these relations. Thus, while some of them, the most advantageous, are defined as 'raising families' (yükselen haneler), some were defined as 'isolated families' (izole olmuş haneler) who could escape from poverty to a certain degree and tried to keep their position and as 'losers' who have lost since they were unskilled and stayed out of such relationships (Erder , 1996).

Such an inequality among poor, in terms of welfare conditions, does not only relate to the informal housing sector but also to informal job sector. That is to say, neo-liberal economic policies on the world scale transformed Turkey's formal and informal economic structures to be useless for the poor. While state's encouragement of privatization and export based economy, on the one hand, made formal employment sector start to shrink and the reel wages decrease, it made informal sector started to structure on the increasing unstable and temporal works embedded with hierarchical and exploitative relations, on the other hand. As migration continued, diversity of jobs and number of people working in this sector increased and it became more difficult to gather, to share, to control and to keep positions occupied in it. This was based on the internal hierarchical organization based on ethnic, kinship and cultural relationships. Such formations have the working mechanism depending on exploitation of new comers want to resist the economic, social and also cultural difficulties of urban life (Şenyapılı, 2000).

Recent immigrants, in this context, emerged as more disadvantaged groups in terms of occupation, and also housing, whereas the formerly migrated had an occupation in the informal sector and/or ethnic, kinship and family relationships provided certain advantages. This unequal situation is explained as (Işık and Pınarcıoğlu, 2001) urban poor's transferring of their poverty to the new immigrants by developing living strategies based on all kinds of local network relationships. It is claimed that they have been so hardened that joining to such hierarchical and unequal informal communities became the only way for overcoming poverty in the rigid-exclusive urban context. This system called as 'nöbetleşe yoksulluk' has enhanced the 'capability' of immigrants and has provided many of them to be free from poverty not only in absolute sense but also relative one.

IV-1-4- Urban Poverty in 1990s

In general terms, it will not be misleading to state that urban conditions in this decade have changed in a manner that, both level of poor and their experience of poverty transformed in a negative way. This transformation has many aspects in terms of both causes and results of the problem. While number of poor in the cities has increased since migration to these places was still the "best" option for people living in rural areas want to reach better life standards, urban poverty deepened as a result of the real negative effects of economic policies, which Turkish state put into effect in the former decade, became more evident in 1990s. When increasing difficulties, in some cases impossibilities, to reach limited urban resources, such as housing and job, combined with the weakening role of traditional welfare systems, emergence of a more offensive and exclusive type of poverty, from which escape became harder. In addition to these developments, there has emerged another important fact that differentiates urban poverty in 1990s from the previous years. It is the wave of forced migration of the Kurds from the Eastern and Southeastern Regions of the country. Thus, when qualitative and quantitative characteristics of urban poverty in 1990s are analyzed, not only economic and social changes but also political developments caused forced migration should be considered both by its causes and results.

To begin with economic changes, the state's giving precedence to privatization due to the placement of neo-liberal policies, were intensified during 1990s and this decade has become the one in which Turkish economy lived its most terrible crisis. While the economic growth rate was % 5.1 until 90s, it receded to % 2.1 at the end of 2002 due to two economic crises (in 1994 and 2001) and earthquakes in 1999. Similarly, while the state's portion in the economic investments was more than % 50, it went back to %18 in 1995 and stayed at %32 in 2001 (Sönmez, 2004:15-17). Industrialization, which was a passion for the state in the pre-1980 era, passed out of state interference and decreased to % 5.4 from % 35. It was replaced with private investments engaging in finance, real estate, informatics and tourism sectors in the big cities. Thus, the role of industrialization in employment lessened and there emerged unstable and badly-paid jobs in the service sector. The portion of service sector in employment increased to % 38 (after 1990) from % 28 (before 1980) while agriculture decreased to % 46 from % 58 for the same period (Sönmez, 2004:12-13). Change in unemployment rate went on parallel to these changes it was 7.0 % in 1998, and 7.7 % in 1999, 6.6 % in 2000 and 8.5 % in 2001 (SIS).

It is stated that economic decline in 1990s was reflected as increase in the unequal income distribution that contributed to poverty. While the poorest (20 %) quintile's share of the of national income, which was 5.24 percent in 1987, decreased to 4.86 in 1994, the richest (20 %) quintile's share raised to 54.88 in 1994 from 49.94 in 1987 (SPO, 2001; 12-13). These statistics mean that, in Turkey, income differences between the lowest and highest quintiles was more than eleven times in 1994 while in advanced societies, where there is a relatively more equal distribution, it was less than 5 or 6 times (Yumuşak and Bilen, 2000;3) Infact, the Gini coefficient of Turkey (0.45)* in 1994 is closer to some countries such as Russia (0.47), CostaRica (0.47) and Bolivia (0.42) which are symbolized with their income inequalities (World Bank, 2000; 19). Turkey has the biggest Gini Coefficient indicator among OECD countries was 0.43 in 1987 and 0.49 in 1994 and has the lowest national income per person both in 1987 and 1994 (SPO, 2001;10).

* There is a incoherence about Gini Coefficient of Turkey in 1994: it is 0.49 for SIS but 0.45 for WB.

According to UNDP's Human Development Report (2004), economic growth in Turkey has lessened in 1990s and there has been only 2.0 % increase in national income per person between 1975 and 2001. This regression is also reflected in the Human Development Index; while Turkey was 66th on HDI in 1992, it became 82nd in 1999, 85th in 2000, 86th in 2001 and 96th in 2003. The report informs that, although there is an important development in 2004, when HDI progressed to 88th rank, this is not compatible with potential resources of the country.

Therefore, migration to the cities in the West, where the service sector the most developed, from villages and small cities, where agricultural activities lessened, continued to be the best option for living³². However, what would make living conditions in urban context difficult, not only the economic developments mentioned above but also its negative effects on shelter conditions. State's insistence on the neo-liberal economic policies during 1990s also required to open and sell new lands for the construction of international capitalist organizations, (Keyder, 2005) business district, private universities, gated communities, middle-class housing complexes and office towers. As a consequent, informal land corruptions for squatter housing had been begun to transform to the legal-formal one, which in the end erected the possibility of land occupation and informal housing construction. Thus, while the majority of new comers became shantytown tenants, squatter settlements were transformed on the base of division between ownership and tenancy (ibid, pp; 130-132).

These transformation affected urban poverty as to be more exclusive and, in some cases, conflictive one. What it is meant is not only the non-poor's exclusion of the poor categories but also internal exclusion developed among poor themselves. This is the case especially in the biggest cities' (İstanbul) inner-city and peripheral settlements. As Erder (1997) claims that state's failure in providing social equality

³²Furthermore, not only dissatisfactions in the economy but also developments in transportation and communication systems lead to progress in individualism. This has also strengthened the social mobility towards metropolitan areas. The urban population consisted of % 51.32 of whole population, with the % 43.9 growth rate, in the 1985-1990 period has reached to % 59.25 in the period between 1990-2000 though the growth rate decreased to % 32,6 (SIS).

tended poor's ethnic and religious based communities be more 'autistic' and exclusive and some other poor, who have no such communal ties, face new inequalities. When difference between generations is added, there nourished the three tension pivots which make urban poor try to solve daily problems by excluding other 'local' groups but not by acting collectively with other groups as in the past. Suni/Alevi distinction as a cause of first axis of tension and Kurd/Turk distinction (intensified after forced migration) as a cause of second axis of tension and third axis of tension stemming from conflict between generations due to the different socialization process have made urban problems related to poverty more unbearable. A recent research on the issue, for instance, evidences an internal type of exclusion among Alevi. It is claimed that, their solidarity networks to overcome poverty are disappearing since there has emerged both open and close competition and mutual distrust which prevent their collectivity (Şen, Mustafa, 2002).

There are some cases in which these exclusive attitudes among poor turns to the illegal ways of life; violence and crime. Erman (2002) states that, people living difficulties in terms of economic, social and cultural adaptation becomes alienated to their environment and enters in to the process of violence. Feeling of injustice and inequality emerge when people take advantageous people in the society as reference to their status. In 1990s, inhabitants of shantytowns were differentiated in terms of ethnicity, religion and gender and they were in pursuit of their heterogenic (Alevi/Sunni, Kurt/Turk) identity politics. Such developments had led to conflicts (Gazi Events in 1995 and 1 May 1996) and identification of some districts with their ideological beliefs. This identification, (Sultanbeyli with Islamism and of Küçükarmutlu with radicalleftism/terrorism) turned to stigmatization of them as 'inconvenient other' by the media effect (Erman and Tok, 2004). Another example is the conflict between Siirtians and Gypsies in 2002. It is called as Esenler case, an example of such an exclusive and violent tendency between the heterogenic poor groups due to gaining limited urban resources (Erman and Eken, 2004).

Media's role in hardening this social prejudice has been crucial phenomena for recent years. It affects perception of economically and socially weaker categories in a negative way and leads exclusion of them in different domains of life since

(Akkaya, 2002) it is the by contribution of the media that poor are stigmatized as dangerous other destroying social, cultural and economic harmony of the urban life. The poor became a disorder category, should be excluded from the perspective of wealthier section of the society due to the belief in their threatening the social order, resources, culture, identity and also future of the society.

The works orient to the inner world of poor are also important since (Erdoğan, 2002) the poor's interpretations of their marginalization and exclusion process and the ways through which they react these processes are meaningful to understand their future prospects. If the level of belief in individual failure or fatalism is high in their explanation of conditions of poverty, chronic type of poverty is likely to emerge. Whether such a tendency has started to emerge or not among urban poor in Turkey is subject of discussion since they have no any collective consciousness of acting politically against social hierarchies. They just do this by developing some silent strategies such as belief in moral inferiority of riches, being seen as obedient, keeping silence and patient and trick.

This situation, in some sense, reminds us their forced self-exclusion from the mainstream due to the sense of weakness and hopeless against governing and/or rich bodies. It is claimed that (Can, 2002) political canalization of poor in Turkey was more possible before 1980 since they have the belief and desire to change negative conditions. The post 1980 period, and especially recent years, have passed with some economic crises has shocking effects have created a type of more passive poor feeling themselves helpless and hopeless. Their exclusion and marginalization have lessened their capacity and stopped to the channel to struggle on the political base. The economic crisis in 1994 for instance (Koyuncu and Şenses, 2004), brought many social problems such as increase in unemployment, poverty, inequality in income distribution, crime and more external economic dependency but there was not any public reaction, except syndical performances, to these developments. Similarly, the people who reacted to the crisis in the year 2000 and 2001 were not poor but self-working artisans and craftsman.

IV-1-4-1-The Weakening Role of Traditional Welfare Regime Of Turkey

To annihilate, to lessen, to alleviate poverty and to cope with it refer to different aims and alternatives in the solution of poverty and, it depends on the development level of the countries while deciding to put one into practice. In advanced countries, where democratic processes are more open to poor to transform their needs into social action, adoption of the first two alternatives is more possible. In underdeveloped and non-democratic countries, where emergence of such social actions is problematic, the last two alternatives will be most effective (Tekeli, 2000). Turkey, as a country fits into the second category, poor have always coped with poverty by using their informal relationships. In fact, not only for the poor but for the majority of people in Turkey, such informal relationships and their articulations together with relatively modernized institutions have always been perceived as more efficient mechanism to gain desired goals and acted as alternative means of social control. The relationships based on ‘clientalism’ developed from below, have become meaningful strategies, since they provide people way of overcoming economic, social and cultural deprivations and adaptation to urban life (Rittersberger-Tılıç & Kalaycıoğlu, 1998). Many academicians come to an agreement on the existence of this type of relationships, and their importance and effectiveness to built solidarity networks while dealing with poverty. The base of these informal relationships, however, is diversified according to people’s dominant social characteristics. It can be ethnicity, religion, kinship, fellow countrymen and family or intersection of one or two of them.

No matter which of them is the base, they constituted the ‘traditional welfare regime’ in Turkey that substituted the welfare state of Western countries founded on citizenship rights. The risks would come from economic transformations are overcome through these ethnic, religious, family and kinship solidarity systems (Buğra, 2001). Işık and Pınarcıoğlu (2001), explain the non-existence of new poverty and culture of poverty with the existence of system called ‘nöbetleşe yoksulluk’. The term refers to urban poor’s transferring of their poverty to the new immigrants by developing living strategies due to all kinds of local network based on the hierarchical and unequal relationships. Although owner of the term explains non-existence of a (Lewis, 1969) ‘culture of poverty’ with the existence of

‘nöbetleşe yoksulluk’, both concepts resemble in their working mechanisms. While the latter are used by poor to adapt their marginal position, the former are used to escape from poverty, thus, nöbetleşe yoksulluk can be understood as ‘culture of escaping poverty’ developed in hard urban conditions by poor in Turkey. Kıray (ibid) calls these relationships as ‘patronage relationships’ needed by rural immigrants to meet their housing and job problems and provide welfare and security. They became gainful to the extent that they obeyed the rule of the head and served him economically and politically, and, by this way, provide him honor and prestige.

Kalaycıoğlu and Rittersberger-Tılıç (2003), pay more attention to the role of family, as a base of such communal/traditional solidarity systems, rather than ethnic, kinship and hemseri. They claim that, such traditional networks are powerful and have the priority if they are organized around the ‘large-family’ unit. The model they offer, as surviving strategy of poverty, is ‘family pool’ which bases on the collective and mutual effort of family members in fortifying the system by creating a fund from economic, social and also cultural capital. Therefore, while economic transfers prevent the poverty among the members of the family, social and cultural transfers between generations keep the system alive.

Works on the relation between poverty and gender, try to understand the women experience of poverty and (Kardam and Alyanak, 2002) focus on the strategies and understandings that women, as different from men, develop against poverty. Woman poverty, after understanding it within the general framework of poverty, should be re-thought within the economic, social and cultural relations dominated by traditional gender roles. Women are at the bottom in the patriarchal family relationship and they devote themselves to order the family life at the cost of their health, nutrition, cultural and social need. They are crushed under the heavy gender role and lose their self-esteem while they are coping with poverty for their family wealth (Kalaycıoğlu, 2002).

Until few years ago, it has been claimed that Turkey did not live a Western type of chronic poverty and social exclusion since its traditional welfare regime has always

been powerful. But, some recent works have started to insist on the existence or possibility of social exclusion due to the weakening capacity of such mechanisms. Structural transformations led to increase in the sense of helplessness and hopelessness among poor and decreased their sense of responsibility and capacity, thus, have created a type of traditional welfare regime in which (De La Rocha, 2003) ‘poverty of resources’ have started to dominate. Indeed, by accepting the benefits come from such mechanisms, it is claimed that (Kalaycıoğlu, 2006) they are the factors that caused ‘relative poverty’ by creating social and economic dependency among family members. Furthermore, solidarity mechanisms based on family, kinship, co-locality, neighborhood, ethnicity, religion and also on employer-employed relationships and NGOs both prevented development of institutional or state based welfare policies and social and political organizations about poverty.

Although, general tendency among social scientists is the weakening role of Turkey’s traditional welfare regime, it is observed that (Keyder and Buğra, 2003) such mechanisms are still in effect for poor in some degree. However, it is stated that this regime is effective when poverty is temporary and it can not function well when poverty is persistent or chronic. In Turkey, where poverty is becoming more persistent, it is observed that there are some newly emerging institutions such as, municipalities and NGOs, are being placed in the system to assist the poor. By considering the changing structure of poverty however, they do not seem very efficient since they mainly provide non-monetary and temporary aids, and some of them also regard target population’s religious tendencies in their actions. The importance of state based solidarity organization, in this sense, is growing.

In deed, the social protection system in Turkey is one of the most extensive in the region but some significant problems have been posing difficulties for an effective working mechanism. The social insurance system based on three different institutional bodies³³, which have inequalities in providing services to their registered members, just covers people working in the formal job sector and fails to

³³ Pension Fund (Emekli sandığı), Social Insurance Institution (Sosyal Sigortalar Kurumu) and Social Security Organization of Craftsman, Tradesman and other Self-Employed (Bağ-Kur) are “three major insurance and pension programs from which, civil servants and military members, private sector employees and self employed urban workers and farmers benefit” (WB, 2000;59).

reach the unemployed, unpaid (family) workers and informal sector workers. They mainly address at the formal sector and middle class and aim to maintain the living standards of the population rather than reducing inequalities (WB, 2000; 55-56). In addition, financial difficulties, the system's being open to political manipulations and technological incompetence in collecting and categorizing information about the registered persons lessen the system's effectiveness. It is stated that, for instance, the proportion of the population covered by the social insurance systems was given as 90 % in 2000 however, it is feared that this figure is upwardly biased due to double counting resulting from the weak information system in the institution of social security. Today the pension system in Turkey does not incorporate any "social", elements such as child-rearing benefits or insurance periods granted for education (Adaman, 2003; 35).

In the case of social assistance, payments are paid from state's general budget for vulnerable groups. The Social Assistance and Solidarity Encouragement Fund (Solidarity Fund) has been activated since 1986, the Old Age and Disability Assistance Scheme since 1977, Green Card Scheme³⁴ since 1992 and Social Services and Child Protection Agency since 1983. The importance of these institutions can not be underestimated but the level of aids they provide is very low and most of them is provided, not as cash transfers but in kind support such as combustibles, food, medicine and health service (WB, 2000; 61-62). Among these institutions, Solidarity Fund's project called as 'Social Risks Mitigation Project' financed by World Bank, seems to bring more long-term solutions to the poverty problem. This project was put in to effect in 2001, for a 'fifteen years' period, to lessen the impacts of economic crises in the same year on the poor and to strength their resistance to the similar events. In addition to rapid assistances, such as educational, health, fuel and food, and cash, the project also provided poor income bringing works and temporary types of employment. It is stated that 5.990 projects, from which 312.525 person benefit, are carried (The Head Office of The Solidarity Fund). Nevertheless, looking from a general perspective, they are inadequate to

³⁴ The Green Card (Yeşil Kart) health Insurance was officialy accepted in 1992 to provide poor out of social security system health service. It is reported that, in 2004 there were 13 miilion people that benefit from green card system (Ministry of Work and Social Security , 2005; http://www.calisma.gov.tr/birimler/sgk_web/html/beyazkitap.doc). accessed: 21 March 2007.

prevent social exclusion because of their having limited capacity to overcome growing and deepening poverty. Furthermore, institution's lack of regularity and freedom from ideological beliefs and individual perceptions of headman of districts (muhtar), mayors (belediye başkanı and vali) can prevent an equal distribution of the aids in a regular, transparent and systematic way. Infact this irregularity originates from their tendency take social assistance as something out of 'social and/or citizenship rights' should not be gained a permanent character. The logic that underlies this tendency is closer to the neo-liberal discourse which sees poverty a phenomenon resulting from individual laziness but not structural changes. In some cases, it is said that, it takes a racist form that labels poor immigrants from the Eastern Regions of Turkey with being accustomed to aids (Buğra and Keyder, 2003, pp: 31-45).

IV-1-4-2- Forced Migration

As stated earlier, the point that makes the post 1990 migration different from the former is it's containing the forced migration³⁵/displacement of the mainly rural population from the East and Southeastern regions of the country. It is estimated that, the main criterion that separate forced migration from the other type of migration is its realization on the base of reluctance. To be reluctant in the whole progress of migration (from decision to resettlement) turns all conditions to immigrants' disadvantages. If we look at the previous migration periods in Turkey, voluntary and chain type migrations are seen as the basic types since immigrants have always decided to migrate by their self or household decision though most of them may be reluctant or had to migrate due to the economic and social (education, health etc.) reasons. The self-decision is an important step -maybe the most- in the migration process since it affects the immigrants' motivation in changing conditions in favor of themselves.

³⁵ The real process that lead forced migration of Kurds from their villages is the result of the conflict between the state army force and PKK. State security forces' effort to deprive the PKK of its logistic base of support suspected of doing by villagers led to abuse of human rights in the region including forced migration. As a militant armed Kurdish organization aimed at an independent Kurdish state, PKK had also attacked some villages that join the village guard system or made collaboration with the state. (Human Rights Watch, 1996:13: www.hrw.org.) The law, which puts governor of East and Southeastern regions under the 'state emergency' (OHAL) programmed, in order to provide security, was accepted, in 1987, by The Grand National Assembly of Turkey (TBMM).

In Turkey, people forced to migrate; in this sense have had many material and non-material losses. But before the elaboration of results of forced migration, it is necessary to look at some numbers that evolved in this process. In fact, there was not adequate empirical research on the issue because of the official restrictions but for the last few years, some surveys have been carried out by some international and national institutions. They seem to be helpful that contributed the academic domain. According to Göç-Der, suspected number of people, who were displaced, is 4 or 4.5 million (Barut, 1997: 25) while, for a foreign institution³⁶, it is 2.5- 3 million.

The number of displaced people, even the lowest estimations are taken, and also the length of the process refer to the reality which can not be understood without emphasizing on the roots of the problem. This may also explain relation between Kurdish ethnicity and forced migration in Turkey, and emergence of forced immigrants as the new poor or excluded category being remembered with their ethnic identities.

IV-2-Social Exclusion in Turkey

The economic transformation, slowness in the dynamism of poverty, weakening role of solidarity networks and the forced migration have created an urban environment which originates new difficulties that can not be overcome by most of the new comers, except a small minority. The previous type of poverty that (Işık& Pınarcıoğlu, 2003; 53) can be coped with and, most importantly, can be transferred has changed and taken a new form: persistent, widespread, irregular, hard to cope with and exclusive. It should be mentioned that to face poverty has been a risk even for the formerly middle class and people living in a “formal” framework while for the new immigrants to change their poor life standards and integrate to the city life has become something impossible.

In Turkey, there is no official definition of the term ‘social exclusion’. But the deepening and expanding type of urban poverty led some academicians define, without hesitation, existing types of new negativeness (deep urban poverty, increasing social polarization, crime, violence etc.) as social exclusion. In other

³⁶ UK Home Office 2001, www.ecoi.net/pub

words they accept that urban poverty in Turkey has gained some similar characteristics of social exclusion. In fact, critics (Dui Toit, 2004) on the export of the social exclusion to the South, where majority of people has usually comprised the disadvantageous section of the society, is also prevalent for Turkey, since there has never been a Western type of welfare state (Esping-Andersen, 1996), that made social welfare and order something unquestionable for the population living in the country. But, keeping De Haan's (1998) insistence on the 'context-dependence' of the term takes us to the point which seek for the difference between urban poverty in the pre-1980 (and/or 1990) era and post-1990. That is to say, in Turkey's urban context, for the majority of poor there were opportunities to reach welfare or relatively better living standards, whereas in today's conditions poor deprive of these opportunities. Thus, no matter whether there is a Western type of individual deprivation, such as exclusion from informal labor market or welfare state benefits, to adapt the perspective of 'social exclusion' in Turkey. As reiterated earlier, increasing restrictions in job and housing opportunities and limited access to social services, in some sense remind of social exclusion.

The expansion and deepening of the problem directed some (Adaman and Keyder, 2006) to define some groups, such as street children, people aged over 65, disabled, forced immigrants, women and people have different sexual orientations, religious beliefs, and minorities, as the most vulnerable to social exclusion. It is stated that most of the exclusion they face is based on poverty but cultural and political based exclusions also exist (pp; 23-25). What is the key dimension of social exclusion changes according to groups' social characteristics and intersection of the economic, social cultural and political conditions in the society they exist in? Basing on Adaman and Keyder's (2006) classification and existing limited works on the issue, social groups and their experience of exclusion will be discussed as follows:

IV-2-1-Aged and Disabled People

There is no adequate study on the socioeconomic conditions of aged people over 65 and disabled people but it is stated that they face risk of social exclusion especially when they are out of formal social security and family systems (Adaman and Keyder, 2006). According to the result of 2002 Disability survey conducted by Turk

stat and Administration for Disabled People, there are 8, 4 million people with disabilities in Turkey which constitute the 12.3 % of the total population. Only 20 % of them participate into the labor market and the unemployment rate among the disabled is 15.5 %. Percentage of people with disability have right to benefit from social security services (through their own registrations and as dependants) is 60.2 %. The population at the age of 65 and over is 3.8 million which constitutes 5.7 % of the total population of which 75 % of men and 38 % of women have income. The old aged in need have right for monthly allowance (EU, 2006).

IV-2-2-Women

Since Turkey is a developing country, where traditional, religious and, in some places, feudal rules are still dominant, women emerge as another category that call to mind social exclusion. In fact, women in Turkey, as different from other Muslim countries, were given equal constitutional rights in the beginning of the foundation of republic. However, modernization style put in to the practice from above, existing religious, social and traditional structures, following government's weak efforts, and state' economic conditions could not transform the women equality in all domain of life on a desired level. It is known that this level has always been determined according to Western standards, which Turkey has always remained behind. Nevertheless, as a Western based international institution, UNDP evaluates the gender related development index of Turkey as progress. In the UNDP's last monthly newsletter³⁷, Turkey ranks 71 st, among 131 countries; in gender equality according to Gender related Development Index based on life expectancy at birth, adult illiteracy rate and estimated earned income values for females.

It should be expressed that, Turkish academicians are not so optimistic since there is a huge academic literature that points at the women inferior position in the social, economic and cultural lives. It is stated that (Kardam and Toksöz, 2004), in contemporary Turkey, the effect of cultural norms and pre-existing gender roles and subsequent social discrimination still determine the women's position in the labor market whether they are qualified or not. Essential domestic labor and prevalent

³⁷ UNDP. (2006). "Turkey Makes Progress According to Human Development Index", New Horizons, UNDP Monthly Newsletter, December: http://www.undp.org.tr/undp/Bulletin_Archive/2006/12/eng/bultenENG.htm, accessed: 2 Feb 2007.

cultural norms defining women's primary role as mother and housewife explain their disadvantaged and subordinated position in the labor market even they are educated and work as skilled.

Conditions of women working in informal sector are worse since division of labor in informal sector based on the patriarchal system. Moreover, it is full of risks, such as low-paid jobs, and non-existence social security system, its conditions only reproduce poverty for women and does not bring wealth (Gökbayrak, 2002). Not only in work places but also in their houses most of the migrant women in the poor families in Turkey can not change the traditional role of their husbands even if they are employed outside home to overcome poverty (Erman, Kalaycıoğlu & Rittersberger-Tılıç, 2002). Majority of women, working in informal sector, can not transform their inferior status in the family that is their economic contributions to the family welfare do not bring their empowerment as autonomous individuals.

IV-2-3-Children

Children take part at the top of the list since they are the most defenseless and visible category that suffer from the exclusive attitudes. This case is related to the increase in the level of the child labor and working street children that have become conspicuous phenomena for Turkey. According to ILO (2001)³⁸. In Turkey, some of the poor families who have more than two children have to send out their children in school age to work in informal sector and in streets, since they can provide family income. This attitude of families continues, in some cases, though their children can resort to illegal activities such as theft and drug dealing³⁹. It is indicated that socio-economic and socio-demographic profiles of the families are the main structural factors behind the working street children (mainly including children who return home to stay with their family after working in the streets during the day) and families of these children are defined as “the poorest of the poor”. According to a research, among the 188 children working in the streets of Istanbul, Diyarbakir and Adana, a considerable numbers (40 %) of fathers are currently unemployed and almost none of the mothers are working. Unplanned migration of the families form

³⁸ ILO, 2001 “Turkey; Working Street Children in Three Metropolitan Cities: A Rapid Assesments”, Switzerland.

³⁹ ILO, 2003, “Turkey; Poverty and Coping After Crises”, Main Report, Ankara.

Southeastern region of Turkey, as the results of political unrest and economic factors, result with generally unemployment of heads of households to which these children belong. Since average household size (7.8) is larger than the overall average household size in Turkey, working of children becomes an indispensable issue (ILO, 2001).

To work on the streets contains many risks and dangers for health, education, psychology and socialization processes of those children. Although families of these children are aware of these negative conditions, they are unable to find a solution since this issue requires the political solution of the ethnic based problem that has lead to forced migration (Hatun, 2002; Altuntaş, 2003). However, the urban context in Turkey is reproducing poverty and more children are being affected. The proportion of resources that state transferred to help the foundation for children (SHCEK) has been decreasing since 1990 and this may lead more children to live in street who are seen as potential guilty by the society (Alada, Sayıta and Temelli, 2002).

IV-2-4-Forced Immigrants

The position of working children is, in some sense, related to forced migration but the most important point is its composition of one of the elements in the vicious cycle of social exclusion. These elements can be defined as serious urban difficulties such as;

...(i) rupture from the traditional livelihood sources and can not reach these sources, (ii) can not use social citizenship rights, (iii) housing problems, (iv) can not struggle in labor force market and poverty, (v) child labor's exploitation, (vi) can not benefit from educational rights and opportunities, and (vii) to face discrimination in urban context and social exclusion (Yükseker, 2006; 216).

It cannot be said that all these events emerge at the same time, that is one or two of them can be provocative for others and in the end create a situation which verifies the cumulative character of social exclusion pointed by Silver⁴⁰ All these also refer

⁴⁰ Hilary Silver, "Fighting Social Exclusion"
<http://www.democraticdialogue.org/report2/report2a.htm>

to the multidimensional model of exclusion which rural immigrants from Southeastern region of the Turkey are not familiar with.

According to Şen (2006), forced immigrants' coming to the city without arrangements and properties made them "be the worst among poor" (p. 68). According to the result of his study in İstanbul, some of the forced immigrants' place of settlement cannot even be called as periphery. It is a place near the motorway and without basic infrastructural requirements such as water, electricity and transportation. Despite all these deficiencies, they have to live there since they cannot find better places because of their stigmatization on the base of their ethnicity. Infact, they may not have adequate material resources to live in better physical conditions, even they are not stigmatized, due to the causalities that they experienced during migration. A recent study reports⁴¹ that, among the forced immigrants had to migrate cities 93 % of them left their cultivatable lands, 97% vineyards and gardens (bağ ve bahçe), 96 % agricultural machines and 83 % left their animals. 38 % of them who could not find a work more than a month had sustained their livelihoods by borrowing money.

If it is wanted to be concretize by using result of another empirical research; according to Göç-Der's (2002) forced migration survey carried out in Diyarbakır, Batman, Van, İstanbul, İzmir and İçel, the majority, 90.2 %, of the respondents⁴² in these cities live in the slums and face serious infra-structural problems including problems of providing drinking and used water, electricity, muddiness roads, garbage, transportation, heating, health and education services (ibid, p. 82). 91.3 % of them are unemployment (ibid, p.135), 70.2 % have economic problems. 88.7 % of them did not receive material or psychological support after migration (ibid, p. 191) and 35.5 % of them state that they have problems of being regarded as potential criminals, while 65.8 % state that they have security problems. 43.4 % of

⁴¹ Hacettepe University, Institution of Population Survey, 2006, 107-108: http://www.hips.hacettepe.edu.tr/tgyona/TGYONA_rapor.pdf, accessed: 25 March 2007.

⁴² The sample size of the survey is 2139 and 86.7 % of the respondent state that they forced to migrate these cities between 1989 and 1999, and 86.4 % of them state that the underlying cause of migration as the practice of state security forces and emergency state rule (olağanüstü hal kanunu) practices including village-guard system, evacuation of villages and hamlets, ban on mountains and fear of death (pp:43-49) in Göç-Der, 2002 "Zorunlu göç Araştırma Raporu: 1999-2001.

the children aged 06-14 do not attend school because of poverty (75.4 %) and obligation to work (6.7 %) (ibid, pp: 174-175). 78.1 % of the young population state that they experience exclusion (ibid, p. 222).

Another research carried in Diyarbakır in 1999 (on 1072 families) and in Mersin in 1996 (on 253 families) showed that, lack of stable jobs and housing problem are two important difficulties that displaced people face. (Göktürk, 2000: 89). There are other similar but less comprehensive works that interpret social, economic and cultural results of forced migration in Batman (Çelik, 2006) and Hakkari (Aker, 2006). They point at the high unemployment rate among men, rise in the level of working street children, increasing health problems due to malnutrition and lack of shelter, and language barriers, adaptation problems of children in schools, and lack of confidence among people forcibly migrated to the these city centers.

The case studies in Batman and Hakkari show that both local governments' lack of material source and immigrants' weak economic conditions, due to the change in their status from production to consumption unit, have created an urban environment like in Western cities that can not be beard anymore. Infact, even before migration, the region had been suffering from low level of social and economic conditions. Most of the cities in the Southeastern Anatolia, except Diyarbakır, are classified as "Developed Cities Groups at Fifth Level" (beşinci derecede gelişmiş iller grubu)⁴³, which represents the lowest human development in terms of income, health, education. After forced migration however, the conditions worsened. Displaced persons in the Southeast Anatolia face adverse economic condition over 60% of the Kurdish population in the South-east region live below the poverty line compared to approximately 30% in other regions. (Global IDP, Oct. 2002: 63)

Although the metropolitan cities in the West mainly categorized as 'developed cities group at first level', this has not made a contribution to the forced immigrant's welfare after migration. In terms of economic deprivation, displaced people are identifiable by their speech and by their demeanor which made them turned down by Turkish landlords or employers preferring Turks rather than Kurds. Displaced

⁴³ SPO, 2003, İllerin ve Bölgelerin Sosyo-ekonomik Gelişmişlik Düzeyi Sıralaması Araştırması, Ankara.

people become street vendors or earn from city rubbish to find something recyclable since such discrimination becomes an obstacle to find a work⁴⁴. Many of the forcibly migrated villagers stated that they were poor before the displacement but lived reasonably well and were proud of their status as producers, whereas in the city they led an unproductive life, and were obligated to buy every mouthful of food with scarce cash (Human Rights Watch, October 2002: 21).

The point can be reached, after this information, is that this population has contributed to the poorest category in these cities, but with an impressive difference; it deepened urban poverty not only in peripheral but inner-city areas. It is claimed that (Adaman and Keyder, 2006), the places, where spatial concentration of urban poverty became visible in the form of ghetto-like places, exist especially in the inner-city settlements in İstanbul, Diyarbakır and Adana. However, forced immigrant's past and present conditions distinguish their spatial conditions from American type of ghettos since they neither had urban origin nor are non-working population depending on welfare aids. As a rural origin population they constitute the working poor or cheap labor force that cannot meet their basic needs due to the irregular, informal and badly-paid jobs (Adaman and Keyder, 2006).

It is claimed that, poor spatial segregation between periphery and inner-city has crucial effects on their experience of social exclusion. This claim is the result of the research carried out in Tarlabası, one of the oldest districts in the İstanbul city center. According to the research, social exclusion in this inner-city settlement is more evident than the one in squatters because of former's early identification with crime and prostitution in addition to poverty. People can be excluded and perceived as potentially guilty or immoral just because they live there. This situation relates to the spatial stigmatization of the place but there is something beyond it which can be defined an ethnic discriminative discourse. As one of the dwellers of Tarlabası, Kurds are stigmatized with terrorism, Gypsies and Kurds are stigmatized with crime and Africans are stigmatized as drug dealers (Yılmaz, 2006).

⁴⁴ Turkish Daily News, 26 January, 2001

As we mentioned elsewhere, the key point in their exclusion seems to be their ethnic identity rather than poverty. However, this does not mean all forced immigrants experience social exclusion that is there may be some who have reached better life conditions. Moreover, forced immigrants may also differ in their experience of exclusion. It should be noted that, Kurds that came to city with forced migration do not show homogeneity. It is stated that, for instance, among them who live in Tarlabası, one of the most deprived space in İstanbul, have to live there because of hierarchical relations within Kurdish groups. Kurds living in Tarlabası constitute the group who could not achieve to enter this hierarchical mechanism based on housing and job sector since they have not any capital and, therefore, power (Yılmaz, 2003).

V-DESCRIPTION of the FINDINGS

V-1-Demographic and Social Characteristics

Since demographic and social characteristics are important to define individuals existing living conditions and/or life patterns, enrolments of them had generally been an indispensable stage in such studies that focus on poverty and social exclusion. Likewise in this study, description of them is meaningful in order to understand whether there are some groups of people, such as illiterate, unskilled, long-term unemployed, women, ethnic minorities and mentally and physically handicapped that Silver (1995) defines as excluded, and whether they experience exclusion on the base of having one of these characteristics. However, this should not mean that they would be accepted as excluded in the case of observing of people have similar characteristics. That is to say, the categorization of individuals will only be the starting point of the process through which processes and mechanisms that may lead to social exclusion will be explored. For this reason, usage of whole theoretical body, in the analysis of findings of this study to reach a conclusion, is conditional. Keeping this comments in mind, it is necessary to look at the head of households' demographic and social characteristics on a table:

Table V: Demographic and social characteristics of Head of households

Head of households characteristics of	Criterion	Number
Age	20-35	6
	35- 50	9
Sex	Male	14
	Female	1
Birth Place	Village	13
	District	1
	City Center	1
Ethnicity	Turk	8
	Kurd	7
Household size	0-4 person	6
	5-8 person	8
	9+	1

According to data, there is no evident difference between number of the household heads whose ages between 26-35 and 36-50. While there are six heads of

household that form the former category, the other nine form the latter category. But the important point, in general sense, majority of head of households' being rather young or, at most, in the middle ages. The point makes differences among the household heads is their ethnicities. More than half of them expressed their identities as Turk while others as Kurd. Moreover, as expected, there is an evident distinction between the sexes of the head of household.

Nearly in all interviews male breadwinners were defined as head of household either by themselves or by their spouses. There is only one respondent that expressed herself as head of household due to her husband's position of detention. The main reason for such a distinction, as perceived during the interviews, relates to existing traditional, cultural and religious norms still dominate the family life. Women's position in the society, as domestic labor, is quite powerful. As a matter of fact, birth places of head of household and their spouses verify this statement. That is to say, majority of them, except the ones born in a city center and a district, were born in village. This may be an important point that explains why male were explained as head of household. However, it may be meaningful to give educational status of them since it seems complementary for such a statement.

Table VI: Educational level of Head of households and their spouses

Educational level		Head of household		HH' spouse	
		Male	Female	Male	Femal
Illiterate		1		1	7
Primary sch.	Graduated	7	1		7
	Not grad.	1			
Secondary sch.	Graduated	1			
	Not Grad.	1			
High sch.	Graduated	2			
	Not grad.	1			

As seen in the table, 2/3 of head of household' educational level is under secondary school. There is only two, despite one of them did not graduated, experienced secondary school education. Among other three head of household, high school graduation is valid only for two head of household. Comparing to the head of household, women's educational level, as their spouses, is lower. Only half of them

are primary school graduated while more than a half, including one male, is illiterate. They did not even go to school.

As seen in the table, educational level of head of household and their spouses appear as another important and complementary factor in such a description why women have inferior position. But it should be remembered that, (Kardam and Toksöz, 2004) cultural norms and pre-existing gender roles still explain women's primary role as mother and housewife even they are educated and work as skilled.

Size of household is another important social indicator that affects poverty conditions of people. In this study, number of respondent whose size of household is maximum four persons is less, while for the one have size between 5-8 is more than the half of the total. The only case with the biggest size of household has twelve persons which also show the single extended family type in the study. Another additional side is ethnic identity of households that makes difference at this point. The families have the biggest size of household are Kurds. One of them has twelve, three have eight and the other three has six, five and four household members respectively.

V-2-Migration Patterns of the Poor

Since migration is a serious and a painful event, it is crucial to note the reason, direction and type, while defining the patterns of it. In its relation to the experience of poverty and exclusion in the urban context, patterns of internal migration have been explanatory. That is to say, they give clues to understand the dynamics of existing type of poverty by making a comparison between the previous and existing living conditions.

According to findings of this study, although there are some cases of migration that welded by health and family problems, and a marriage, majority of the respondents have realized their last migration due to economic reasons. They states that they had been living difficulties of livelihood due to economic reasons based either on joblessness or low-paid daily, seasonal or causal works. As a housewife, 35-year-old, literate, Turkish, spouse of head of household says:

The reason of our coming to here was that there is not work, sit sit at home, hungry...if you a civil servant in Çankırı you substitute, we could not substitute

Buraya gelmemizdeki sebep iş yok, otur otur evde aç...ya Çankırı'da memur olursan geçinirsin, orada geçinemedik

A garbage collector, 33-year-old, literate, Kurdish head of household whose previous migration is forced:

...we were doing thing in Adana, we were going to gardens, doing grubbing...but that place was not good, daily wage was low, women started for five millions. They came to us and said work for five million as women otherwise...we left because of this.

...Adana'da biz şey yapıyorduk, biz bahçelere gidiyorduk çapa yapıyorduk...ama orası iyi değildi; yevmiye azdı, bayanlar başladı 5 milyona. Bize geldi dedi sizde bayan gibi çalışıyorsanız 5'e çalışın, çalışmazsanız...bizde o yüzden terk ettik.

But, an important point should be noted here that, for some economic difficulties are not so problematic until a definite point in their life. As Burchardt (1999) claims, there were some events that affected individual life to participate to society from economic side. At this point turning to the respondents' previous migration may be meaningful to examine, since their causes and results important to understand existing conditions of poverty. Accordingly, if the previous migration is considered, by its causes, there appears a picture including four forced migrations. All of them are Kurd and they were forced to migrate as a result of state displacement policies in their regions.

A garbage collector, 33-year-old, Kurdish head of household, whose previous migration is forced, says:

Actually, if we talk about our problems, it doesn't finish in two years. We immigrated from our vilage, left all our properties and came here. When we were in the village, we were like pasha, we were looking after our sheeps, properties. Now, we migrated from Hakkari, we have been walking around others trash pile.

Valla sorunlarımızı biz söylesek iki senede bitmez. Biz köyümüzden göç geldik, evimizi bıraktık, malımızı mülkümüzü bıraktık buraya geldik. Biz köydeyken paşa gibiydik, yani biz iş tutuyorduk, biz ot biçiyorduk, bizim koyunlarımıza malımıza mülkümüze bakıyorduk. A şimdi biz Hakkari'den buraya göç olmuşuz, gelmişiz sabaha kadar elalemin çöpünde geziyoruz.

A housewife, 35-year-old, Turkish, literate, spouse of head of household experienced 1999 Marmara earthquake states that:

I had better circumstances in Bolu because he was selling food in the bazaar,.... we, of course after the earthquake, fell down, lost our everything.

Benim eski durumum daha iyiydi Bolu'da, çünkü o pazarcılık yapıyordu....biz tabi depremden sonra düştük herşeyimizi kaybettik

In these two cases there is a different event, such as an earthquake and a forced migration that resulted with migration and, in the end, decline in their living conditions materially but the case of forced migration is more widespread as an event that created poverty. Therefore, it emerges as another type of migration, which had been a step to realize this last economic based migration and but as a type, which still have continuing effects on the immigrants' experiences of poverty. This issue strongly relates to ethnic identities of people migrated by force but a detailed elaboration of it needed to be touched in another part.

If the respondents' last migration is reconsidered, and by their directions at this time, it is seen that, in general sense, majority of them had been realized from economically less developed cities to Ankara with the hope of finding a job and belief in reaching to a better life. Thus, migration to the big cities after 1990 period emerge as still the best option for people living in rural areas and want to reach better life standards.

Another point that calls attentions is the non existence of a sharp difference between the numbers of families in terms of period of migration. Nearly half (7) of them had migrated between 1990 and 2000 and other half (8) between 2001 and 2006.

All of them, except the one a 36 years old female head of household migrated by herself, had migrated with their nucleus families including their wives and children. Thus, family migration is the dominant type with the evident impact of social network on the decision to migration. Nearly all of head of household or their spouses explained that existing of one or more relatives living in Ankara had been effective on their decision of the last migration.

A housewife, 35-year-old, literate, Turkish, spouse of a head of households:

Yes, well, there was a my brother in law, he brought us here. Our conditions were so bad then.

evet şey vardı kaynım vardı o getirdi bizi buraya. Durumumuz çok kötüydü o zaman

A housewife, 36-year-old, literate, Turkish, spouse of a head of households:

work, well..I had my uncle, when an occupation existed, through the help of my uncle, we came here.

işi, işte dayım vardı, dayım vasıtasıyla iş olunca buraya geldik

It is seen that, existence of kinship and family relationship defined as 'traditional welfare regime' by Buğra (2001), and its effect on the desicion to migrate is clear. Moreover, this point had also created a parallelism between the type of economic activities that they and their relatives engage in. For the majority of garbage collectors especially, it is more evident as 43-year-old, literate, Kurdish head of household whose previous migration is forced states:

When I was left without a job, I said that 'everyone is going and coming', I mean, 'they are going with taking their homes', and I thought that 'I can go too', my uncle was already here. After I came, I understand that it was really difficult... Supposedly it was paper, I mean, to tell the truth they were working in the garbage. But you find money to live on, eventually. So, I started to work with my uncle, then they gave me a car I don't know...

...işsiz kalınca dedim herkes gidip geliyor yani, gidiyorlar işte evlerini götürüyorlar ben bi gidiyim yani, dayılarım zaten burdaydı. Geldim hakkatten zor yani...baktım kağıt yani adeta deyim yerindeyse çöple uğraşılıyor. Ama bi ekmeğe geliyor sonuçta. Başladım yani dayılarımın yanında başladım, yani bi araba verdiler bana bilmiyorum....

Thus, it can be said that, as Buğra and Keyder (2003) observed in a later work, such mechanisms are still in effect for poor in some degree.

VI- ADAPTATION of De Haan CONCEPTUALIZATION

VI-1-Physical Dimension: Locational and Infrastructural Aspects of Squatters

De Haan (1998) starts his conceptualization of social exclusion with physical dimension. Although he gives example of rural inhabitants as physically excluded, in this study, urban population's physical conditions will be explored. In general sense, non existence of a regular job or/and an adequate income strongly affect locational aspect of people's place of residence. If most of the respondents' cause of coming to the city, which refers to economic hardship, is considered, their preference for settlements with low price emerge as something common. Squatter housings in this study locate both in the city center and peripheral areas of Ankara. According to respondents' expressions, all of them are tenant, as appropriate to Keyder's (2005) assertion on the new comers being squatter tenants after 1990 period, and majority of them had been living in squatter settlements since the migration to the city, because of squatters' lower prices of rent. In terms of location

Lower level of tenant in squatter housings is strongly relates to their being physically deprived settlements in the city which brings some discontents that can be generalized with some topics. First of these topics is the houses' being fairly narrow and having few room as a garbage collector, 43-year-ola, literate, Turkish head of household states:

...well we are not pleased in general but there is nothing to do. I want each my children has a seperate room, study in seperate rooms, sleep in seperate rooms but we do not have such a possibility

...ya genel olarak memnun değiliz yapacak bişeyimiz yok. İsterimki ben her çocuğumun bi tane ayrı odası olsun ayrı odalarda çalışsın, ayrı odalarda yatsınlar ama öyle bir imkanımız yok

Lack of a separate kitchen and, in most cases, unity of toilet and bath in a single place is the second topic that settlers complain about as an unemployed, 26-year-old, literate, Kurdish head of household says:

...No, anyway, in the living room...kitchen and bathroom are already there...toilet is outside..the bath is done in the living room since there is a fitler, I mean it does not have a seperate kitchen bath..

...yok salon içinde mutfagi banyosu zaten orda , zaten ayrı tuvalet dışarda...banyo..salonda yapılıyor yani süzgeç olduğu için normal ayrı mutfagi banyosu yok....

Dampness of the houses emerges as the next problems that they have to cope with as 35-year-old, literate, Turkish spouse of head of household expresses:

...that entrance has already been killing me; mud, scurvy..

.....şu zaten giriş beni öldürüyor: çamur, pislik...

Common usage of bills, especially water, is another problem for squatters' settlers but it is a more prevalent issue, where a single old squatter was divided to two or more parts for renting. One of the 35-year-old, housewife, literate, Turkish spouse of head of household expresses her discomfort about the issue as such:

...we, four persons, use water but the electricity single on us...the electric and telephone bills do not take more but we give 60 million for water in each month..yes when it is common it becomes like this..if there is not water problem we are satisfied...

...suyu valla dört kişi kullanıyoruz da elektrik tek bizde...valla elektrik ile telefonumuz fazla gelmiyorda suya her ay 60 milyon veriyoz...evet ortak olunca öyle oluyor..su sorunu olmasa memnunuz...

Physical problems are not only restricted to squatter housings but also their environments. Majority of them expressed their dicomfort with enviromental dirtiness caused both by people's and municipality's irresponsibilities. In general sense, they think that quarters that they live in look like a village but the more strong reason such a discomfort comes from a 35 years old, literate, daily house cleaning worker, Turkish spouse of head of households:

...there is cows and their smells, manures distrub us in summer. They never put rubbish in to buckets. As you see such a scurvey, everybody throw to surronding. A human, there is trash over there, lets's take it and put to there...

...inekler var onun kokusu gübresi yazın çok rahatsız ediyor. Çöpleri hiç kovalara koymuyorlar. Anlayacağın bir pislik gibi her gelen ortalığa atıyor. Bi insan alıpta şurda çöp var alıpta oraya koyayım....

Discomforts about municipalities' responsibilities on the environmental cleanliness are more common than people's and at this point another 35 years old housewife and Turkish spouse of head of household's statement may summarize the issue as such:

...well it can nat be considerd as clear...municipality does not sweep here, they take that scholl's surronding but there is no body coming to here. We sweep up here with neighbors.

...valla pekte temiz sayılmaz..hani belediye buraları süpürüyorki şu okulun oraları bi alıyorlar buraya da gelen hiç yok. Burayı komşularla beraber işte şey ediyoz, süpürüyo.

And a garbage collector, 43 years old, literate, Kurdish head of household focuses on the squatters' locational positions in the city:

..somewhat a peripheral quarter, of course, the other places are more lux..they are the places that municipality show intensive service care ..

...e tabi kenar mahalle biraz daha, diğer taraflar daha lükse kaçıyor...belediye tarafından hizmetlerin yoğun ilgi gösterilen yerler..

As seen from the expressions, inhabitants of squatter housings are more vulnerable to illness and injury because of having poor physical living conditions and services. Although these points, in some sense, resemble to slums, it should be said, as Wacquant (1999) asserts for European cities, there is no ghettoization in squatters areas respondents living in. Municipal services are rare but not absent. But nearly all of them, regardless of differences of their place location in Ankara, relates these worse conditions to their being of just places of poor. A 35-year-old, housewife,

literate, Turkish spouse of head of household residing in Ergazi Quarters in Yenimahalle District expresses her beliefs on this point as such:

These places are for poor not for riches. If my conditions are better I probably do not settle here..

Buralar fakire göre, zengine göre değilki. Durumum iyi olsa oturmam herhalde....

And a 50-year-old, garbage collector, literate, Kurdish head of households residing in İskitler Quarter, interpretes the issue from the occupational position of people residing there and by identifying himself with a special type of work that is garbage collecting as such:

All they are poor people...all they are living here are poor. I mean they are people who do not have income, collect paper in garbages, far and near, nothing else...

Hepsi gariban insanlar.... burda oturan hepsi gariban insanlar. Yani geliri olmayan insanlar hep çöpte orda burda kağıt toplamak, başka bişey yok...

As a result, squatter settlements, as Keleş (2000) claims resembles to slums in advanced societies in terms of their inhabiting poor but, they still differ from slums by their inhabiting rural origin people. However, high level of tenancy in and type of temporary residings in squatters, as oppose to the previous decades, are the points that close them to slums in some sense.

VI-2-Economic Dimension

VI-2-1-Labor Market Attachments of Heads of Households

Existence of a regular job with an efficient income is an important factor that prevents people to experience and/or face risk of poverty and social exclusion. However, as Sassen (1996) mentions, opportunity to find formal, stable, well-paid and secure jobs has lessened due to global developments led transformation in economic structure. Transformation from mining and manufacturing sectors to finance, consumer and services sectors made uneducated and unskilled people be worker at the bottom of service sector. This situation is valid for Turkey, as Sönmez (2004) points where unemployment and unstable, badly-paid, insecure and formal types of employment became dominant. To have weak attachment to labour market

is an important factor that lead people to experience poverty and social exclusion. For this reason, in this study, either head of household or their spouses were interviewed in order to collect the information about head of household's labour market status and working experiences. In the light of these information their experience of poverty and its potential to turn exclusion will be analysed. Thus, as indicated in the table, head of households labour market attachments are as follows:

Table VII: Economic sector and occupational status of the head of households

Sector	Number Of workers	Social Security Profile		
		SSK	No Social security	
			with Green Card	Without green card
Marginal (garbage collector)	6	0	5	1
Formal (worker as cleaner, cooker, pumper)	4	4	0	0
Informal (construction and causal worker, loader in Gimat)	3	0	2	1
Unemployed	1	0	1	0
Housewife	1	1	0	0

According to table, there are five domains that explain head of households' sectors of economic activities and positions. The first two of them seem as the main economic sectors/areas that poor become dense in. First of them is the marginal, in which nearly half (6) of the household heads engage in, while the second one is service sector, in which four of them engage. The other three household heads work in informal sector, three as seasonal and/or daily workers, There is only one as housewife, that defined herself as head of household and the one unemployed.

Marginal sector in this table refers to garbage collecting people, who collect different kinds of garbage by walking in the streets to search the apartments', building-blocks' and market' rubbishes and sell them to gain money. The main materials that they collect include paper, plastic, metal and glass. Among these garbage collectors, three of them are residing in the squatter housings in Türközü district administered by Mamak Municipality and they go to the nearest quarters or neighborhoods such as Gaziosmanpaşa, Esat, Tunalı street, Yıldız and Kızılay

adminstrated by Çankaya Municipality. For instance, when one of these garbage collectors, 50-year-old garbage collector, Kurdish households head, was asked he expressed his gladness about the quarter he is living now because of its nearness to their sons' working place:

We are happy actually...we like it here, our workpleace is close to here, children are working in Cankaya.

Memnunuz valla...hoşumuza burda iş yerimiz yakındır buraya, Çankaya'da çalışıyor çocuklar

The other three garbage collectors residing in Yıldırımdayezit and İskitler districts administrated by Altındağ Municipality gather materials in Ankara's industrial area called as Şaşmaz where factories' and automobile producers' are concentrated. M. A, 35 years old head of household, works collectively with his friends by using a big truck belong to one of them while the second work with his son by using small wheelbarrows. They sell their weekly possessions to the wholesalers have office and depot like places in İskitler. The last male breadwinner and head of household residing in Ergazi district in Yenimahalle municipality work in the same area by himself and by his truck. At weekends, his 17 years old son helps him.

Among six garbage collectors there are only two have their own small truck that they use during working hours. Others gather materials by using small wheelbarrows and save up them in the warehouse of their relatives, who are doing same work and residing in the same neighborhood. After two or three days they save these collected materials to a private company controlled by Ankara Metropolitan Municipality

There are only four heads of household that work in service sector's insured works. Two of them work as cleaner in the public hospital, the first in Etlik Doğumevi and the second in Sami Ulus Çocuk Hastanesi. The third one works as a pumper in an oil station and the last one in a luxury kebab restaurant in Bilkent. While first one has the highest monthly income is around 750 New Turkish Liras, the third one earns 550 New Turkish Liras and the others earn the minimum wage called as 'asgari ücret'.

Among other head of households there are two working as seasonal and casual worker. The former one's job, 40 years old building worker, seems more regular comparing to the other, 34 years old male, who works as he find a job. He may work as a transporter, as a daily garden worker or carrier. There is another, 34 years old, works as a loader and unloader in Gimat which is a center of food companies and markets. Although he went to there everyday, his job is not guaranteed by employer. The last male, 26 years old, head of household was unemployed for two week when he was interviewed. His special working plain had generally been restaurants and he, mainly, had worked as a waiter, but since he was not given a wage in his last work, he had left the work. The only female head of household, a 36 years old housewife, depends on her husband's pensioner wage.

Accordingly, number of household head have insurance is quite low. As seen in the table, there is no job require high job qualifications or skills. It is clear that the combination of service and informal sectors' badly-paid and unstable works constitutes the majority of the work that determined during the research. This situation is due to, as Kiray (1998) states, immigrants' low level of education and lack of job skills not proper to an urban type jobs. Since head of households have rural origin, their engaging in informal and service sectors is a situation that suitable to rural immigrants in the previous periods. However, as different from the previous periods and as oppose to the Şenyapılı's (2000) determination, informal sector does not seem as passing place that provide them to pass industrial sector and maket hem upward mobility. On the contrary, as Çolak and Bekmez (2005) claims, since informal economy has gained a permanent character because of modern urban sector's not creating effective opportunities for rural immigrants anymore. Four service sector workers, for instance, have been working since the beginning of 1990 without changing their works not because they satisfied with their job but fear of becoming jobless. Moreover, existence of considerable numbers of head of households have been doing marginal works, such as garbage collecting, strongly support the Işık and Pınarcıoğlu's (2001) determination, which puts out that recent immigrants have emerged as more disadvantaged group in terms of occupation. Garbage collector's position also reminds us to the Castells' (1983) occupational

marginality though it does not overlap with their spatial segregation called as urban marginality.

VI-2-2-Working Conditions of Heads of Households

For service sector workers working conditions and rules are determined by their employer. All they are insured but while hospital cleaner work 8 hours in a day, for oil station and restaurant worker it change between 10 and 12 hours. All of them, except the one walks to work, pay money for transportation to work. For hospital cleaners there are two free days in while for other there is only one.

For garbage collecting people working hours and the income they get depend on their self-decisions. They generally go work after six o'clock in the evenings when the rubbishes are put outside the buildings. All they, except the one, have green card. For two causal and a building workers conditions of work are determined by their employer. The common point among these three workers is that, in winter, they work less.

It is understood that, people's accessing to a formal and a permanent job with insurance and normal working hours is decreasing. This inequality seems to emerge not only from economic transformations or educational level of individuals. If it is looked more detail, it is seen that ethnic background is also important in their existing labor market positions. Majority of Kurds are garbage collectors, whose attachment to labor market is the weakest. Formally it is not accepted as a job by themselves and working conditions of them quite differs from others working in service sector or other informal works. There is not an employer and even a definite working place.

VI-2-3-Income: The Main Source of Dissatisfaction

In general sense, none of them pleased from their work materially due to its not ensuring an adequate income for a normal life. Majority of the heads of households are alone in getting income. Among fifteen interviews there are only two cases in which one of the members of household, other than the head, is working. One of them is spouse of head of household who works as a housing cleaner two or three

times in a week. The other is the sixteen years old son who left his education due to economic difficulties. The basic obstacles in front of women's working appear as existence of children needed to be looked after and burden of housework. Infact most of them had never worked before but, for Kurdish women, working outside is something that had never been thought in Ankara. One of them had just experienced it as agricultural worker when she was not married.

Thus, to work with a minimum wage creates difficulties for all families in terms of sustaining life as a housewife, 39-year-old, literate, Turkish spouse of head of household expresses:

He is not happy. With 400 million, rent, water, phone and supporting the family...

Memnun değil..400 milyonla hem kira, hem su, hem telefon hem ev geçindirme....

and as a 35-year-ola, literate, Kurdish head of household, collecting garbage states:

Believe me... it is maximum 600 million that we eran.. It is not enough for anything.. Believe me in some months we pass another month with debit.

Inanın...en fazla kazandığımız en fazla 600 milyon..yetmiyor işte birçok..inanki bazı aylar gelince borçla öbür aya geliyoruz.

When they were asked about the income needed for a better life, they expounded an amount two or three times much more than they earn, such as from 1to 1,5 million New Turkish Liras. There is also some who defines higher levels such as 2,5 or 3 millions New Turkish Liras as 33-year-ola, literate, garbage collector, Kurdish head of household states:

Well, I am..just three thousand million ..six persons in a month..I mean to take care of themselves, to eat and drink and look after his children in a good manner...

valla benim 3 milyar ancak ayda altı kişi..yani iyice kendine baksın yesin içsin çoluk çocuğuna güzel şekilde ancak...

Despite the dissatisfaction with their earnings, they do not search for another job since they believe that they can not find a better one because several reasons. Lack of networks, age, low level of education and ethnicity emerge as some important reasons that they point. When looking at their occupational backgrounds, it is seen that these points have been negative effects in their working life but, rural origin and low level of education seem as the most preventive factors to find a better job. Most of them had started to their working life as worker in buildings, seasonal workers in agriculture, bazaars or service sector which form low-paid urban types work which, in the end, provoked their falling to pliers of absolute poverty.

VI-2-4-Households' Conditions of Subsistence: Absolute Poverty

It is known that absolutist perspective describes a manner in which there is a strong tie between poverty and being deprived of income or adequate income to have minimum living standards. Nearly all of the heads of households are alone while they are getting an income for providing their families' livelihood. When single and a limited income is considered conditions of subsistence, that is to meet some basic necessities such as food, shelter and clothing, to sustain his/her life becomes something hard to cope with, as 43-year-old, Kurdish head of households collecting garbage states:

...livelihoods are difficult, I mean in a place like Ankara, you pay rent, what is your earning now...that is if you count...I am causing to read five students...there is kitchen expenses that is you will eat, drink, that is so you should not make children victim.

...geçimler zor yani Ankara gibi bir yerde sen kira ödüyorsun, şimdi senin kazandığın ne...yani hesabı kitabı çarparsan...ben şu anda beş tane öğrenci okutuyom..mutfak masrafı var yani yiyecek içecek, bu böyle yani, çocukları mağdur etmemen lazım.

one of the most bothered things for heads of households and their spouses is to pay rent. Nearly all of the respondent and their families are living in a rented squatter house. This situation is fitting to Keyder's (2005) determination about the majority of the new comers' status of tenancy. Totality of respondent express that they first pay house tenant in order to not live a difficulty with the owner since this situation

may become a stressful issue as 35-year-old, housewife, literate, Turkish, spouse of households head says:

...when I pay the rental late, my householder gets more angry. I can't do anything, with 15, 20 or 30 millions, saving is not possible. The money comes and goes. We have too much expenses. My householder gets more angry, you know why, he says that "you don't give my rental on due date"...

...ben kirayı geç verdiğim zaman ev sahibim daha çok kızıyor. Hani şey yapamıyorum 15 milyonla, 20 milyonla, 30 milyonla bir birikinti olmuyor yani birikmiyor. Gelen para hemen gidiyor, gelen gidiyor. Bizde masraf çok. Ev sahibim daha çok kızıyor niye dersin "benim kiramı günde vermiyorsunuz" diyor ...

The second difficulty emerges in the case of paying bills. These, as Adaman and Keyder (2006) observed, mostly depend on the irregular and badly-paid jobs that lead them not meet basic needs. 50 years old Kurdish, literate, households head tells his helplessness in front of the institutional bodies as such:

Actually the problem is job: we collect paper, if we can find the paper then the bread comes, if not... We hardly pay our electricity and water bills... They cut our water, took the water meter, we attached a rubber pipe here.

Valla problemler iş: kağıt topluyoruz, bulabilirsek ekmek geliyor bulamazsak öyle. Elektrik parasını, su parasını zor veriyoruz...sularımızı kestiler, saati götürdüler bu araya bi hortum taktık..

Or as in the case of 36 years old, literate, Turkish woman's boredom in meeting her children's school expenses:

Everyday, they want something for the school... actually we have to buy it, otherwise they give a negative mark to the children. You won't eat, won't drink but you will buy it.

Hergün okula bişey istiyorlar...valla almak zorundayız yoksa çocuklara eksi atıyorlar. Yemeyecen içmeyecen alacan onu..

A difficult situation with school expenses may not become so hard as in the case of a 40-year-old, housewife, literate, spouse of head of household:

...since we don't pay the revenues for the school, I went two or three times to clean the school's windows... But it was usually humiliating for our children in the class. At the end, I went to school to say that "I can't do it, I can't pay the revenues. If I could, I would do it without talking about it". They asked what I could do and wanted me to clean the windows. I cleaned the windows, brought the curtains, washed them, ironed them, and hanged them back to make him/her happy. I was compelled....

....biz aidat ödemediğimiz için be iki kere üç kere okulların camlarını silmeye gittim...ama çocukları rencide ediyordu devamlı sınıfın içinde..en sonunda gittim dedim yapamam ben dedim veremem hani ben verecek olsam hiç sizi konuşturmam burada. Ne yapabilirsin o zaman camları sil. Camları sildim, perdeleri getirdim, yıkadım, ütiledim, götürdüm taktım, memnun olması için mecbur kaldım....

As seen in these expressions, majority of them suffer from absolute poverty and they, in order to alleviate this difficulty, receive help from several institutions and NGOs. Most of them, regardless of their household sizes and ethnicities, state that they could not make their livelihood if some institutional helps did not exist. They have been taking assistance for a noteworthy time such as eight and six years. However, the most prevalent and regular help is the one provided by Ankara Metropolitan Municipality. The important point here, as expected, is that families' positive attitudes towards these helps. Majority of them insisted importance of such helps on their livelihood but for some they seems more crucial as 35-year-old, literate, Turkish, spouse of head of households states:

...moreover if those help don't come, our subsistence get more difficult. Our house is rented, and think about it, if we pay for the firewood, coal and the stored food....

...zaten bu yardımlar gelmeyince bizim geçimimiz çok zorlaşıyor. Evimiz kira, bide düşün oduna, kömüre, erzağa para verirsek...

or as 39 years old, housewife and Turkish spouse of head of household states:

We already live on with their givings, if they didn't give, we wouldn't handle, with his help we are more comfortable.

Zaten onların verdiğiyle geçiniyoruz, vermeseler geçinemezdik, onun katkısıyla daha rahatız.

The most striking point here is that, as Buğra and Keyder (2003) observed, municipalities and NGOs are being placed in the system to assist the poor. As seen in the appendix including a table, the number of poor taking material support from their relatives is rather low. This is related to the weakening role of informal support systems started to be dominated by 'poverty of resources' (De La Rocha, 2003) because of general economic transformation turned to lower classes' disadvantages. In all fifteen interviews, majority of respondents either directly expressed or implied that they did not have close family members, relatives or kinship units, whose conditions are materially better to form a 'large family unit' (Kalaycıoğlu and Rittersberger-Tılıç; 2003) or other types of solidarity systems that they organize themselves around to cope with poverty. As a 35-year-old, garbage collecting Kurdish head of household states:

...hayır hayır deminde söyledim akrabalarımda benim gibi işsiz olmuş...

..no, as I have just said my relatives had become unemployed like me..

Thus, as opposed to poverty conditions in the pre-1980 period, this situation does not only leave the poor without help that comes from informal networks but make them expect and take help from institutions as a 26-year-old, unemployed, Kurdish head of household's statement proves:

My brother was helped by Deniz Feneri but they have not come to me yet. But the servant working for Deniz Feneri said that clothing, electricity machines will come in order. We are waiting for them now...

Deniz Feneri'nden kardeşime yardımcı oldular bana hala gelmediler ama Deniz feneri'nde çalışan memur .. giyim beyaz eşya falan onlar sırayla gelecek dediler. Şu an onları bekliyoruz...

Therefore, kind of support comes from informal network may only be financial help or irregular food help from their villages as determined in few cases. But, even in this sense, traditional welfare regime in Turkey, as seen in the examples above, seems still in effect and also fits to the one in the Southern European Countries; monetary deprivation is high but social deprivation is low (Muffels and Didier,

1999). However, this does not hide the sense of poverty that observed as something widespread among poor. There are only few respondent stated that they did not feel themselves as poor by referring to their belief in God (Allaha şükür) and a one stated she did not feel if the poorets were considered. Moreover, they defined poverty, in a similar way, with laziness of individual or God's work. Others, who constitutes the majority, stated that they fell themselves as poor with the clear expressions causing to remember relative poverty.

VI-2-5-Respondent's Perceptions of Relative Poverty

For some of the respondent poverty, in absolute sense, has been continuing for long time as they state, while for some it happened after a definite point in the their life. In relative sense, however, majority of them seem to feel it after migration to Ankara. While base of being relatively deprived can be being away from hometown, as a 33 years old, Kurdish garbage collector and head of household experienced forced migration expresses

... ..if you leave your hometown you have already become poor...

.....e sen kendi memleketini terk ettin sen zaten fakir olursun...

This kind of deprivation is valid for all respondents experienced forced migration. They, basically, compare living conditions in their hometown with the city life. But, in some other cases, a comparison can be made by referring to different living conditions had never been experienced, a 35 years old, literate, Turkish spouse of head of households working as daily house cleaner expresses:

..how can I say, attitude, speaking, clothing, I mean behavior; squatter district resembles to a district of poor section, I mean. Look, for instance, I go to cleaning in Çankaya, Ümitköy; there is a high snowy mountain between their and our life. When going to there and coming to here, for instance, a person, some times, do not want to live. When I look at conditions of their and our houses, there are many differences between. I would like to live and clothnig like them...

..nasıl desem tavrı olsun, konuşması giyimi yani hareketleri yani bir fakir kesimin semtini andırıyor gecekondu semti. Mesela ben temizliğe gidiyom bak Çankaya, Ümitköy, bunların yaşantısıyla bizim yaşantımız arasında şöyle yüksek bir karlı dağ var. Mesela oraya gidince buraya gelince insan bazen

oluyorki yaşamak istemiyor. Onların evinin durumuna bakıyom bizimkinin durumuna bakıyom çok fark var arada. Bende isterim onlar gibi yaşamayı, giyinmeyi...

This comparison was made between fairly different living conditions but all of the respondents are aware of their living standarts below the normal standarts. A 35 years old, literate, Kurdish head of household expresses his senses by insisiting on the physical aspect of the living conditions:

...for instance, I would like to live in a tidy house...a beautiful quarter, silent, a society with social insurance....Çankaya, Kızılay.. I mean, they give importance according to social status. They do not care citizenship, equalitarianism. I mean they don't give a person his/her rights or a chance. For example, the value given to the Kizilay is not even a quarter size of Cankaya. I mean, 3% value is not given

..örneğin daha düzgün, daha düzenli bir evde oturmak isterdim..güzel bir mahalle, sakin, sosyal güvencesi olan bir toplum...Çankaya Kızılay..bunlar işte sınıfsal şeylere göre önem veriyorlar yani. Bunlar insana, yani vatandaşlık, eşitlik derecesinde bir şey tanımıyor. Yani bir hak, bir imkan tanımıyor. Örneğin bir Kızılay'a verilen değer, Çankaya'ya verilen değerın buraya çeyreği verilmez. Yani yüzde üçü verilmez.

Nevertheless, majority of them suffer from poverty in absolute sense and depend it on material conditions. Appropriate to this, they state that working is the sole way to cope with. That is to say they do not have fatalistic beliefs. However, as oppose to the Erdoğan's (2002) assumption, they are not hopefull in their future prospects. None of them, except the one emphasized on democratic struggle, refer to political actions or have collective consciousness in their escape from poverty. This situation, on the other hand, verifies the Can's (2002) assumption about less possibility of political chanalization of poor in Turkey, after 1980 period.

VI-2-6-Respondents' Positions of Having Assets

Since for the majority there is no other source of income, they suffer economic deprivation to sustain their life. Having possessions that bring them extra income is not a widespread phenomenon. Only Kurdish immigrants experienced forced migration have land and a house in their villages but, since there are legal restriction they can not use them to make extra source of income. Thus they can not make

saving and in fact, some of them especially Kurdish families have big household size, are under the burden of dept that they borrowed to make their livelihood.

VI-3-Dimension of Human Capital

VI-3-1-Health Statuses of Respondents and Their Families

In Dee Haan's formulation of social exclusion, health is one of the important aspects that form the dimension of human capital since, as stated earlier, people's health status is an effective factor for their participation to social life. Disabilities or chronic illness together with their relations to countries's social welfare systems and development levels, may create base for exclusion. Although disabled people are defined as one of the groups that more open to risk of social exclusion in Turkey (Adaman and Keyder, 2006), in this study, in terms of health status, it is observed that there is not a household member has a mental or physical disability. There are only three housewives, as spouses of heads of households, who have chronic illness such as tension, diabet and Hepatit- B and have to take medical treatment regularly. Thus there is no person who can not participate the society, economically, socially, politically or culturally, because of their health statuses.

Although chronic type of illness is not something widespread among household members, majority of head of household, as they express suffer from back-ache caused by hard working conditions. For garbage collectors and causal workers working outside both in cold and hot weathers, to lift heavy materials and walking for a long time, and for service sector workers, standing on foot during the working hours reported as main causes of this problem. For insatnce, 26 years old housewife expresses his husband's illness and his helplessness in this issue as such

..my husband's arm is aching, and aching very bad, it never pass. The doctor says that he should change the job, as if, I mean, is there a job that done without arm he had said. He had said , that is to say, let's find a job and I do...

..eşimin kolu çok ağrıyor hem çok fena ağrıyor, hiç geçmiyor. İşi değiştireceksin diyor (doktor) sanki yani işmi var orta yerde kolsuz bir iş yapılıyorsa o da demiş. Yani bana kolsuz bi iş bulda yapayım demiş.

They also state that, because of economic starits, have to continue their jobs even they are aware of dangers come from them as 50 years old Kurdish garbage collectors says:

We are in rubbish. If there is paper in it, for instance, there is every kind of dirts, there is nylon, plastic and you have to take them from inside. If you do not take, you can not earn anything.

Çöpteyiz, çöpü karıştırıyoruz. İçinde kağıt olsa mesela her pislik var, naylonu var, plastiği var içinden mecbursun almaya. Almadığın zaman sende bişey kazanamazsın.

In terms of insurance sheme of households, among fifteen interviews, Green Card is the most prevalent (eight family) one, while SSK comes as the next (five families) before two without any health insurance. Nearly, all of the respondents expressed their gladeness about access to health services in terms of existence of close health centers and not paying extra money. But they insisted on some other difficulties in the process of medical treatment. These are generally explained as crowded in the hospitals and long process of waiting to see the doctor. However, for some of Kurdish household members linguistic differences had created extra difficultiy as 33 years old Kurdish head of household states:

...my chest was aching a bit...I put green card in to my pocket...I went to Ankara Hospital..I made my entrance and went to a doctor. I forgot the here (chest) in Turkish. What is said for here. I sat, the doctor said “what problem do you have, it was a female doctor. Well, I tried but my chest could not cross my mind that I say. I said, at that time, I did not know a part of may body was aching. She said “where is it”, I said, with my hand, “it is here”. But, for instance, if it was in Kurdish, I would say.

...benim biraz bu göğsüm ağrıyordu...yeşil kartı cebime koydum..Ankara hastane'sine gittim..girişimi yaptım bi doktora gittim. Türkçe burası (göğüs) ne unuttum buraya ne diyorlar. Oturdum doktor dedi senin ne şikayetin var, bir bayan doktordu, valla ben ettim etmedim göğsüm gelmedi aklıma ben söyleyim. Ben dedim o zaman benim bir yerim ağrıyordu ben adını bilmiyorum. Dedi neresidir, dedim elimle aha burasıdır. Ha mesela bak Kürtçe olsaydı mesela söyledim.

For other two households head and members have not health insurance, to meet all these health services depend on their own expenses but they generally use their possibilities for their children as 43 years old Turkish garbage collectors says:

...we never think our health, we do not go but it is compulsory for children. A treatment is 10 million...we also pay for medicines...children, compulsory, we take them by managing to find...

...biz kendi sađlıđımızı hiđ dűşünműyoruz, kendimiz gitmiyoruz ama çocuklara mecbur. Bi muayene 10 milyon...ilaçlara bide para veriyoz..çocuklar, mecbur işte denkleştirip götürűyöz işte....

It can be said that, there is no observation about deprivation in terms of access to the health services, if the base that green cards depend on is not considered. Most of the respondents have green card since they were not integrated to the formal economic sector that provide them another type of health insurance. In fact, most of them out of the private health services that open to other health insurance. For some, who can not make use of even Green cards, their limited properties become source of this kind of exclusion from health services.

VI-3-2-Educational Levels of Respondents

According to the findings of study, educational level of poor is not an exhilarating situation that take attentions. If total number is considered, among fifteen head of households one in two appears as primary school educated. For upper grades, this level is lower that is one of them is second and two of them high school educated and there is one scholl-drop out for each category. If their spouses' situation is considered, one in two appears as illiterate and one in two as primary school garduated. For other levels the situation is not subject of matter. Therefore, the most striking point about education is the difference has gender dimension. Women are less educated and more illiterate.

All of the respondents expressed their dissatisfaction about educational level that they have. Main reasons for such a situation was explained as lack of consciousness and/or schools other than the primary one in their villages. When they are asked, regardless of gender difference, they either referred to high school or university degree as the level that they wish to reach in order to have a good job and a wealthier life as 43 years old Turkish head of household interpretes:

I mean, after this time in Turkey, including high school, it is inevitable to study the more high. The one below high school, do not look for any job for himself, anymore...even he goes to industry,

industry also wants high school graduated persons. They say, they want high school graduated worker, at least his culture become high, he can talk to a person...I mean, if I had my current opinion in that times, I would study. I would like to study until the highest level.

Yani bundan sonra Türkiye’de, lise de dahil olmak şartı ile, daha yüksekini okumak şart. Liseden aşağısı artık Türkiye’de hiçbir iş bakmasın yani kendisine...isterse sanayiye gitsin, sanayide de artık lise mezunu istiyorlar. Diyoki ben lise mezunu işçi isterim en azından kültürü yüksek olur, karşısındaki kişiyle konuşabilir...yani şu andaki aklım o zamanlarda olsaydı okurdum. En yükseğine kadar okumayı isterdim.

All of them think that education is crucial for a wealthier life and, for this reason, pay attention to the create suitable conditions for their children. This situation is also valid for Kurdish households, whose spouses had become illiterate. They pay attention to education of their children without making distinction based on their sexes as in the case of 43 years old Kurdish head of household, who has five daughters and tries to make them be educated:

.....education is very important, that is to say, for this reason we..to our children..at this level...to send five children to school, in this absence, is a beyond everybody’s means. I..speak clearly. But, I could do this and I could have much Money: I would send my children to street and make them sell wips but, is it something possible. Are children so worthless, I mean....

...yani eğitim çok önemli, onun için çocuklarımıza bu kadar..bu yoklukta beş kişiyi göndermek her babayığidin harcı değildir. Ben ..açık açık söylüyorum. Ama ben şunuda yapardım ve şimdi benim çok param olurdu: beş tane çocuğumu sokağa salardım, mendil sattırardım, yani şimdi bu olacak şeymi. Çocuklar o kadar değersizmi yani....

There is no concrete event that respondents or their family members experienced an exclusion in social, cultural or economic domains of life due to their educational level. All of them think that being educated is crucial for a good job and a wealthier life. The only problem that some of them had experienced on the issue is getting a job. But, when the possibility of getting a good job was asked, they paid more attention to the lack of social networks than education as reason.

VI-4- Dimension of Social Capital

VI-4-1-Social Background

VI-4-1-1-Gender's Impact on Exclusion

Gender is an important indicator in Dee Haan's formulation of social exclusion that may lead people's exclusion in a direct or indirect way. In this work, no rigid gender based deprivation was mentioned by women respondents that could refer to their social exclusion. This is, in most part, due to women's lack of experiences outside home neither in economic domain nor social and cultural domains. As mentioned earlier, women's, as spouse of head of households, educational level is lower than the men. There is no women went to secondary or high school moreover, if ethnic dimension is added, at this time, there is not a Kurdish women that neither have a basic school experience nor literacy. Kurdish women, in this sense, emerges as the double disadvantaged category. As illiterate women with linguistic barriers, their participation to society seems more difficult comparing to those Turkish women.

Nevertheless, as women, they can not participate to economic domain because of their determined traditional roles of carrying burden of domestic works. Results of findings showed that, there is not a woman, as spouse or other member of households, who is working now or had a serious working experience in the past. Thus gender based exclusion at work is out of question since, for some, opportunity to work was impeded by their fathers or husbands, as 36 years old, Turkish spouse of head of household states:

I would like to work of course, my husband did not permit. I was entering to Consulate of Foreign Affairs. My husband did not permit. My husband said that "if you eat, onion, bread with tea. Otherwise, go to your father's house. I had son at that time, my child, my mother did not want him, she said she could not look for a foreign's child, my mother said she did not want. She said sat in your house. They said " if he do not want, you will not work....

Çalışmayı tabii istedim, eşim izin vermedi. Dış işleri konsolosluğuna giriyordum. Eşim izin vermedi. Eşim dediki yiyosan soğan ekmek dedi çayınan dedi. Yemiyosan babanın evine git git dedi. O zaman oğlum vardı, çocuğum, onu annemgil istemedi, ben dedi elin çocuğuna bakamam dedi, annem istemem dedi. Evinde otur dedi. Madem istemiyorsa dedi çalışmayacaksın dediler...

Not only in economic but daily participation to social life can also emerge as something being restricted as in the case of 39 years old another Turkish spouse of head of households, who does not know the reason why his husband restricts her going outside

My husband says “do not go out, sit at your home”...I do not know, we had seen and learned like this....we had learned from elders of our family as woman sits at home and still my husband does not want.

Eşim çıkma diyor evinde otur...bilmiyorum biz öyle görmüşüz öyle yetişmişiz..biz ailemizin büyüklerinden kadın evde oturur diye görmüşüz halada eşim istemiyor yani.

It is seen that existence of a culture dominated by feudal ideology or rural elements have been a preventive factor for women’s participation to social and economic life. Since nearly all of them were born and lived in villages for a definite time, women accepted this way of looking in order to keep it without interrogations after migration. Therefore, child rearing and domestic works continued to be main traditional duties of women in city life and impeded their engaging in an economic activity despite poverty that they suffer from. This situation is even prevalent for Kurdish women that is cultural and traditional elements are quite strong in their way of life. However, there is an additional and important reason in their non-participation to economic, social and cultural life in the city. It is their ethnic identities have strong political and cultural peculiarities, which make them feel as stranger and be unfamiliar with existing social environments. Thus, examination of Kurdish women’s experience of exclusion, at this point, seems more meaningful in its relation to their ethnicities.

VI-4-1-2-Ethnicity’s Impact on Exclusion

In this study, ethnicity is analyzed as another components of the social capital in Dee Haan’s formulation. Since the second half of the 1990, it has been placing in academic works on poverty and social exclusion in turkey. As mentioned previously, forced migration of Kurds has created a new category has ethnic connotations and called as the most disadvantaged, as Işık and Pınarcıoğlu (2001) claims. As a result of work carried in the field, an important number, nearly half

(seven), of the fifteen respondents identified themselves with Kurdish identity. It was emphasized as the most important source of identity by Kurdish respondents while sense of peasantry and existing kinship relationships were also expressed as complementary characteristics. Such a type of identity, on the one hand, as Pınarcıoğlu and Işık (2001) claims, provided them many advantages in the period after migration, but, it , on the other hand, also became an important factor that created some difficulties. For instance, a 33 years old Kurdish head of household says:

35 years old Kurdish head of household:

When we found a house in Asikpasa, you know, we argued a lot... There was a woman. She saw us that we were Kurdish and we were speaking Kurdish, she said 'I don't give a house to the Kurdish people. I don't want Kurdish people to come close to us', she said 'I will call the police, I will call someone else'. I said 'If you want, call the police or call whomever you want', I said 'that is what you have been doing is out of politics. "This is Kurdish, this is someone else", there is no such a thing. The house is empty and householder gave it to me, that is it. Householder gave the house to me but that woman called him and told him not to give the house to us, he asked "why", she said "because they are Kurdish". Swear to god she did everything, she thought that if she talks about police we would be scared, then she saw that we are not afraid of the police, because there was no reason. She said that, "the police will come, they are almost here, give them your statement" What shall I tell to the police. The police will ask if we did something bad or wrong to her, she will tell "no", so why we are not allowed to live in that house.

Biz ilk o eve girdiği zaman varya Aşıkpaşada, biz orda ne kavgalar yaptık ev için...Bi kadın orda çıktı dedi..baktı biz Kürtçe konuşuyoruz, kürdüz, dedi kesinlikle ben kürtlere ev vermiyorum. Kürtler bize yaklaşmasınlar, dedi ben polis çağıracağım, bilmem ne çağıracağım. Ben dedim istersen polisi çağır kimi istersen çağır. Bu senin yaptığın siyaset dışındadır. Bu Kürttür bu bilmem nedir öyle bişey yoktur. Ev boşsa sahibi bana vermişti ev sahibi. Ev sahibi bana Verdi onun komşu dedi ev sahibine telefom açtı dedi bunlara biz verme çıksın içinden, dedi niye dedi Kürttür. Valla o etti etmedi o zannetti biz polis molislerden bahsedeceğiz bunlar korkacakla, bi baktı bizim hiç korkumuz yok polisler gelsin bizi şey yapsın ne yapacak. Dedi polisler gelecek..ha geldi polis geldi..hadi polise ifadeni sen ver. Ne diyeceksin polislere. Polisler diyecek sana sen bunlardan bi kötülük gördünmü, size bişey yaptımı, yok diyeceksiniz, e niye oturmayacaklar

Or as another, 35 years old Kurdish head of household expresses

If there is a job exam at somewhere, we go there to ask about it and, they ask us about our hometown first of all, like "where are you from?". Yes, of course, the other day there was an East Blacksea company, I applied for it but the people who go there after us were taken for that job. Besides, we applied for a garbage bid, they had our telephone number but, I didn't understand why they didn't let us know about the bid day. As a second, when our friends applied for it, their security chief or officers investigated us deeply from the MIT to explore who we are, one is from Mardin, other is from Diyarbakir are going to take the bid of here... They told that us.

Herhangi bir yerde iş imtihanı olsa gidip soruyoruz ve bunuda öncelikle memleket soruyorlar işte nerelisin diye bişey karşımıza çıkıyor..tabii işte geçenlerde bir Doğu Karadeniz firması vardı, başvurduğum bizden sonra gidenler işe alındılar..zate bi ihaleye başvurduk çöp ihalesine, telefonumuz orda ihale günü niye bize haber vermediklerini ben anlayamadım. İkincisi bizim arkadaşlar başvurduklarında oranın güvenliğin şefleri falan bizi te mite kadar araştırma yapmışlar. İşte bunları araştırın neyin necisidir, biri mardin'li biri Diyarbakır'lı buranın ihalesini alacaklar....kendileri söylediler.

as one them, a 35 years old, Kurdish head of households, states:

I mean health system is like that, my wife goes to hospital, reactions as "go to a Kurdish hospital"...she, for instance have gone to Etlik hospital recently, well "why do not you speak Turkish, learn Turkish, you live under Turkish flag"..but she do not have to learn it, my wife does not know....

Yani sağlık sistemi şöyledir; eşim hastaneye gidiyor, bir Kürt Hastanesine gidin diye tepkiler..mesela geçenlerde Etlik hastanesine gitmiş işte niye Türkçe konuşmuyorsunuz, Türkçeyi öğrenin, Türk bayrağı altında yaşıyorsun...ya bunu öğrenmek mecburiyetinde değilki, bilmiyor karım..

Here Atkinson's (1998) formulation of social exclusion based on agency is more suitable since there is a governmental unit through which employer exclude a Kurdish worker from job opportunities.

VI-4-2-Civic Engagement

VI-4-2-1-Level of Membership Organizations

In De Haan concept of social exclusion, membership organization is one of the indicators that measures aspect of civic engagement. It provides participation to society through formal or semi-formal organizations such as Ngos, associations and foundations. In this study, it is observed that there is no widespread membership organization among respondents due to lack of consciousness or sense of need.

Nevertheless, there are some type of membership organizations that fit in to this category. One of them is based on fellow countryman that tries to keep cultural identity and the other is based on locality that tries to construct and maintain sense and activities of solidarity among people comes from same village. There are only two respondents that have contact to such organizations and the latter, 43 years old Turkish head of households, explained his membership as such:

...now, there is an association of our village, solidarity, I have a membership to there..it has become a year more or less. We pay five million monthly. It turns and comes to us that is to say. What is it, there is a funeral house there, a man will pay attention to his corpse or entertain with his guests, or I do not know, meet expenses. We found such a association. Now, in funeral, wedding seremony, we bought small things, that is to say, such as chair, table. When there is a corpse, our associations will come between, the need of that citizen is met at that funeral day..

„şimdi köyümüzün bir derneği var, dayanışması oraya üyeyim..bir sene oldu aşağı yukarı. Aylık beş milyon lira veriyoz. Bide bize yani geri gelip dönüyor yani. Nedir, bizim köyde cenaze evi var, adam kendi cenazesini uğraşacak, veyahutta misafirlerini ağırlama yapacak, ne bileyim masraflarını karşılayacak. Biz böyle bir dernek yaptık işte. Şimdi cenazede, düğünde ufak tefek şeyler aldık, yani sandalyedir, masadır böyle. Bir cenaze oldumu hemen derneğimiz araya girer o cenaze günü o vatandaşın ihtiyacı karşılanır....

The one another kind of membership is based on profession, which tries to keep professional interests of garbage collecting people. One of them, a 43 years old, Kurdish head of household, explains the reason why he has membership in this organization as such:

...since someones always are pressing you, materially I mean....someones are exploiting you...such cooperatives and associations are necessary for this. For this reason being organized is necessary..at that time, you have Money I mean...why I engage in 15 millions instead of earning 100 million....

...çünkü sürekli olarak birileri seni eziyor yani maddi olarak..birileri seni sömürüyor yani...işte kooperatifler ve dernekler bunun için gerekiyor yani. Bunun için örgütlenmek gerekir..o zaman para tutacan yani..neden 100 milyon kazanacağın yerde neden 15 milyonla uğraşayım...

VI-4-2-2- Social Networks and Contact with Society

Social networks, which include relationships based on family, ethnicity, religion, kinship and/or other informalities, are seen as important mechanisms that provide people some kind of profits. Although De Haan (1998) does not place it in his theory, it seems meaningful to point on before the elaboration of social contact since, social networks have crucial effects on poverty alleviation of poor in developing countries and Turkey. In fact, weakness of such mechanism is asserted, by Mingione (1996) as one of the current factors that has brought the problem of social exclusion.

According to findings of this study, poor people's usage of such networks appeared as a fact that had been effective especially at the beginning of the migration process. To clarify the point, it is seen that, from the expressions of respondents, existence of relatives in Ankara seems as one of important factor in immigrants' decision of migration. Nearly all of them stated that, although main reason was economic, they had migrated because of their relatives' effects in a direct or indirect way as 35 years old Turkish spouse of head of household says:

...yes, there was a brother of my husband, he took us to here. Our conditions were bad at that time...

..evet, şey vardı kaynım vardı, o getirdi bizi buraya. Durumumuz çok kötüydü o zaman...

or as another 35 years old Turkish housewife expresses:

..well, there was my uncle, we came when the job became by the means of my uncle....

..işte, dayım vardı, dayım vasıtasıyla iş olunca buraya geldik...

Not only at the beginning of migration but also after migration period existence of social networks seem effective to prevent difficulties as 50 years old Kurdish head of households states:

.....when we came to here, my brothers had prepared a house for us in advance...our problem did not emerge, that is to say...

.....ya biz buraya geldiğimizde önceden bize ev hazırlamışlardı kardeşlerim..bi sorunumuz çıkmadı yani...

or as in the case of 36 years old, Turkish spouse of head of household:

...I had lived in Mamak, in my father's house for two years, I had not paid rent..here is rent..the owner of my house is from Çankırı, he is acquaintance, here is house of my mother's uncle.

...Mamak'ta babamın evinde oturmuştum iki sene..kira vermemiştim....bura kira...ev sahibimde Çankırı'lı, ya tanıdık annemin dayısının evi oluyor burası..

This situation is also valid for the economic activity that poor engaged in after migration. Effect of relatives living in Ankara is valid not only in decision to migrate but work to do as 43 years old Kurdish head of household says:

..of course the relatives are important here. The main reason for me to come here is economical but also the relatives. Since everyone does the same work, I said I should go. Because I don't know Istanbul at all, actually I don't have anyone.

..e tabi yani biraz akraba çevresinde önemli burda. Benim asıl gelmemin sebebi ekonomik ama akrabalarda..çünkü herkes aynı işi yapıyor ya, ben bi gidiyim. Ya çünkü İstanbul'u hiç bilmiyorum zaten, e kimsem yok doğrusu...

or as 33 years old another Kurdish head of household says:

...collecting papers, earlier our a few relatives were here, doing that job...we said that our relatives are in Ankara, we will also go there, we will try ourselves...to see how collecting papers works...

..valla kağıt toplama işi, daha önce bizim birkaç tane akrabalarımız burdaydı o işi yapıyorlardı...bizde dedik bizim akrabalarımız Ankara'da bizde gideceğiz, orada bir deneyeceğiz kendimiz..bu kağıt toplayınca nasıl bir iş çıkacak...

However, such informal relations had not been so effectful especially for some cases that require more powerful contact. A 35 years old Turkish head of households, who migrated Ankara because of effect of his sister, expresses his difficulty in finding a job as such:

For the first few years, I didn't have a job, we didn't know anybody, we didn't have surroundings, I got into the companies but with minumum salary and no insurance. The minumum wage was 223, I had really difficulties, then I had depression and I didn't know what to do, I was quite confused.

1-2 sene boş gezdim, tanımamız yoktu, çevremiz yoktu, şirketlere girdik asgari ücretle sigortamızı yatırmadı, artık o zaman 223'tü asgari ücret çok sıkıntı yaşadım ben o amaçla bunalım geçirdim ben ama bunalıma girdim ne yapacağımı bilemedim şaşırđım o anda...

Thus, existence of social networks do not work properly for being not excluded from a well-paid or/and a permanent job. What their basic functions are seem as their providing individuals contact with their society. At this point, according to De Haan's formulation of social exclusion, social contact needs to be analysed to see the dots that affect respondents' and their family members' level and kind of participation to society. Thus, people' tendencies or attitudes and base of justification on the issue will be understood.

To start with YıldırımBayezit and Dođantepe, as inner city squatter settlements in Altındađ district; when respondents were asked about person that they meet in and out of quarter, and frequency and reason of these meetings, the answer became that they only meet to their fellow-countrymen or closest neighbors living in the same street as 26 years old Turkish spouse of head of household expresses:

I have a neighbour that I get into touch mostly with him, once a week or once in a two week, he is from my village. I don't go anywhere else or speak to anyone else. Hello hello... I don't like to go houses of any of them. If I speak to them outside I would say "merhaba"... I don't know, I hesitate, I fear. I mean it is too bad around here, you don't know who is who...

...bir komşum var en çok onunla görüşürüm, bizim köylüdür..haftada bir, onbeşgünde bir. Başka yere gitmemde konuşmamda. Merhaba merhaba...sevmiyorum hiç birisinin evine gitmeyi sevmiyorum. Burda dışarda konuşursam "merhaba" derim...ne bileyim çekiniyorum, korkuyorum hani ortalık çok fena kimin ne olduğunu bilmiyorsunki...

The main reason such a tendency was explained with their feelings of discontent and lack of confidence towards living environment due to several reasons. For instance, existence of gossip, as a 36 years old, female Turkish head of household states, are some of these reasons:

Actually, I go to neighbour just for a short time...In fact, if you tell about your problem to someone, then you see that it is spreaded.... I mean, you share with someone to feel better but then you have a headache. Neither get feel better nor have a headache, I mean I solve my problem by myselfes...

...valla en çok komşuya bi ayaküstü girer çıkarım yani..valla burda canın sıkılınca derdini anlattırısın ondan sonra bide bakmışsın yayılmış...yok yani ne içim rahatlasın diye anlattırısın bu seferde başın ağrımış. Ne rahatla ne başın ağrısın yani kendi kendime çözerim ben...

as the same respondent says, other reasons include deviant behaviours that prevent social interaction with the people living in the closest area:

When you see people here, you don't trust many of them, there is two or three people you can trust...everyone has a bottle of alchool...how will you trust him or his wife...You can't go anywhere locking and leaving your house abandoned...

Burda insanlara baktığınız zaman yani çoğuna güvenemezsin, güvенеceğın ya iki kiři var ya üç kiři..herkesin elinde bir řiře içki...nasıl güvенеceın karısınada..ya kapını kilitleyipte evini boş bırakıpta hiçbir yere gidemiyorsun....

Like alcohol dealing, criminal events appear as other reasons to put distance as 35 years old Kurdish head of household says:

.....the surroundings, smoking joint everyday, using drug, burglary make people uneasy, irritated. We are anxious for tomorrow, what if our children become something like that... we do as much as we can, our children can not even go out to play. Now afternoon, there is a cultural center that I send the children there, they are there until the evenings...Even on sunday they are there....

.....çevre hergün esrarın içilmesi, uyuřturucunun kullanılması, hırsızlık olması işte insanı tedirgin ediyor, huzursuz ediyor. Yarın birgün çocuklarımda böyle bişey olurmu acaba diye bir kaygı içerisine giriyoruz...işte elimizden geldiğı kadar çocuklarımız doğru dürüst sokağa çıkıp oyun bile

oynamıyor. Şimdi öğleden sonra, okuldan geldikten sonra bir kültür merkezi var oraya gönderiyorum, akşama kadar ordalar...Pazar günleri bile ordalar...

as another 39 years old spouse of head of household says:

For example we are afraid of everything..there are very nasty children, who smell thinner, who steal by snatching. They are burglaring car in front of our eyes, so we are afraid of that our children may become like them...

..mesela burada herşeyden korkuyoruz..burada çok kötü huylu çocuklar oluyor, tinerciler, kapkaççılar gözümüzün önünde araba soyuyorlar, işte o tür şeyler çocuklar öyle yetişir diye korkuyoruz...

The statements above remind us the Wilson' s (1991) concept of 'concentration effects' refers to effects of social milieu on the individuals' behavior, beliefs, orientations to affect them in a bad manner. Existence of some illegal ways of life are source of fear for the families but the point that differs this environment from ghetto that defined in Wilson's (1991) work, is the non-existence of a race or single ethnicity. Moreover, as Adaman and Keyder (2006) observed in some of the inner city settlement of Turkey, there are neither urban-origin nor non-working population totally depending on welfare aids. That is to say there are several ethnically and culturally different groups migrated in two past decades, and for this reason, there is, in some degree, an internal social segregation based on cultural and ethnic origins among them. But the more stigmatized group seems like Gypsies as 26 years old spouse of head of household states:

Here is so mixed in everything. There are gypsies and also other ordinary people. For example we send someone for something and then we start concerning for the afterwards, we are afraid of our neighborhood anyhow.

Burası ne kadar olsa herşeyle karışık, çingeneside var normal insanıda var mesela bişeye gönderiyoz bişeymi olacak diye arkasını gözlüyo, ne kadar olsa mahallemizden korkuyoz

Moreover, it can not be said that there is a rigid social isolation from outside like ghettos since, they expressed that they go to other parts of the city, to the near ones at least, for work, health or other issues. However, majority of them aware of the labelled or stigmatized social character of the quarters made by outsiders. Therefore,

when the neighborhood's being part of Ankara was asked, an impressive answer came from 35 years old Kurdish household head living in the same area as such:

I don't think so, because for example the distance between Kızılay-Cankaya is 500 meter or maximum 1 km. I mean, there are gaps like a world, aren't they, of course knowing this difference how can you be a part of it... of course we almost see something excludued, neglected. I mean, you see it in yourself.

Zannetmiyoruz, çünkü örneğin, Kızılay, Çankaya aramızda 500 metre bilemedin 1 km. mesafe var. Yani dünyalar kadar uçurumlar kadar fark var değilmi, e bu farkı gözeterek bunu nasıl bi parçası haline...tabi adeta dışlanmış, boş verilmiş bişey görüyoruz. Siz kendinizde görüyorsunuz yani

In peripheral squatter settlements such as Türközü, Mamak and Ergazi quarters, tendency to keep social contact in a minimum level is also a general tendency. However, this is not because of criminal events seen in the inner city squatter settlements but, lack of confidence welded by unfamiliarity. A 43 years old Turkish head of household interpretes this situation as such:

...Now...in this district no one knows each other. They all come from different places. Earlier, you know, there were people like they all from the same village...Now they have all gone, other unfamiliar people came. Each one is from different place; there are people from Agri, Erzurum, I mean noone knows each other here. There is not much connection.. I don't stop my connection with my friend, I mean sitting together with my countryman, having a talk...I mean, I meet and speak with the friend or relatives who are living in Ankara... As I said there is not much connection, they all come from outside of the Ankara...

..şimdi... bu mahallede kimse kimseyi tanımıyor. Hepsi yabancı yerlerden gelmiş kişiler. Eski hani bir köyü bölmüşünde getirmişsin..dedimya o gelen kişiler gitti, yerlerine dışarıdan yabancılar geldi. Herbirisi bir taraftan; ta Ağrı'lısı var, Erzurum'lısı var yani kimse kimseyi burda tanımıyor. Fazlada bir irtibat yok yani...arkadaşlarımla irtibatımı kesmem, yani kendi köylümle oturmasını, sohbet etmesini...yani burda Ankara içinde oturanla görüşmeye giderim, konuşmayada giderim, akrabamada giderim..burda zaten dedimya hani burada fazla bir irtibat yok hepsi dışarılardan gelmiş kişiler...

A 36 years old Turkish housewife and spouse of head of households points on the same issue as such:

..actually, since they are all tenant, not many people come and go. We were keeping in touch with the former ones, they were already householder, they went and give the house as rental.

..valla şimdi hep yeni kiracı olduğu için öyle fazla giren çıkan yok. Öncekilerle yine görüşüyorduk, öncekiler burda zaten hep ev sahibiydi, gitti kiraya verdi burayı.

and as 50 years old Kurdish head of household says:

there is my sister, we go to her, she comes to us, that's it. I have a brother in Sincan, we go there too.

burda kızkardeşim var biz ona gidiyoz o bize geliyor başkada yok. Bi kardeşim var Sincan'da oraya gidiyoruz..

As seen, in peripheral squatter settlements unfamiliarity is the main reason for such a distance. But, both in inner-city and peripheral squatter settlements existing kinship and fellow-countrymen relationships are main provider of social contact between people. For Kurdish immigrants For all Kurdish immigrants, their relatives form a category should be met more, as 43 years old, Kurdish head of household expresses:

..most of the times we contact with our relatives, because we need each other.. in any matter...

..en çok akrabalarımızla görüşürüz, çünkü çok ihtiyacımız var birbirimize..her konuda...

or as 33 years old Kurdish head of households says:

..neither they come to me nor I know them.. Actually "our" and their things are not the same. I mean, all of them are from Yozgat... Neither they come to us nor we go to them. Never never a contact with each other. I mean they think us as... we are Kurdish, as if we come from the different country... I have a brother up there, sometimes we go and come to each other... I have lived in a district, previously...I liked there very much... why did I liked there very much?, I have a few relatives in around a 100 meter distance, other relatives were there too. We were seeing each other, either in going or coming back. It was really nice...

...ne onlar bana geliyor ne ben onları tanıyom..zaten "bizimkiyle" bunların şeyleri bir değildir. Şimdi bunların hepsi Yozgat'lıdır...ne onlar bize gelir ne biz onlara gideriz..hiç hiç görüşmek yok...yani bizi şey zannediyorlar...biz Kürdüz sanki biz yabancı bi devletten gelmişiz...benim abim var yukarda ara sıra gidip geliyoruz....eski mahallede oturdum iyiydi...orası çok hoşumuza

gidiyordu, neden hoşumuza gidiyordu, benim iki üç tane akrabam böyle hepsi 100 metre yakındaydı, öbür akrabalarım o çevredeydi. Biz hem gelişte hem gidişte birbirimizi görüyorduk çok hoşumuza gidiyordu....

Here the word “we” not refer to kinship but ethnic identity that became an important reason to limit social contact. This sense of feeling is more prevalent among Kurdish forced immigrants and in fact, some of Kurdish head of households and family members expressed their membership to a political party has ethnic claims.

In general sense, it can be said that social network system based on kinship, ethnicity and fellow-countrymen is effectful than those based on neighbor, friends or other informalities. This situtaion can be adapted to Paugam’s (2001) determination of social exclusion in Europe. Like poor people in Southern countries in Europe, monetary deprivation of respondents’ in this study is high but social contact with such informalities is greater. However, main reason for such social contacts is to satisfy social deprivation rather than economic since, as Buğra and Keyder (2003) claim, they can not function well because poverty among respondents and their social environments seem to be persistent.

VI-4-3-Psychological Dimension

VI-4-3-1-Respondents’ Adaptation to City Life

De Haan does not focus on the problem of adaptation in his theory of social exclusion but, to examine sense of adaptation, as a socio-psychological aspect, is common in studies relate to poverty and migration. Thus, in this study, respondent were asked about their experiences and beliefs about different domains of life in order to understand their senses and processes of adaptation to city life after migration period. In physical terms, squatters’ appearences like village, especially in periphery, had became a facilitating factor for immigrants’ adaptation to city life. As 36 years old Turkish spouse of head of households says:

I mean it is like a village, nothing is different in here...

Yani köy gibi deęişen bir şey yokki burda...

In addition to this, to settle in a place densified by relatives became a positive factor. However, for others, who did not have such an opportunity to live in periphery and with relatives, being not accustomed to social environment emerged as a problem, as 39 years old, Turkish spouse of head of household says:

Yes, for the first few years, we couldn't get used to it...for a few years I had difficulties, but then I got to know the environment, after that I didn't have any difficulty.

Evet bir iki sene alışamadık...bir iki yıl çektim sonra çevreyi tanıdım ondan sonra çekmedim.

In economic terms, opportunity to work made immigrants adapt to urban life easily as 36 years old Turkish spouse of head of households say:

The city is better, the village is nice but just for visiting, not for staying, there is not any income in the village, that's why...

Şehir daha iyi..köy güzelde gezmek için, kalmak için değil, gelirimiz yok köyde o yüzden...

These expressions are valid for all of the Turkish respondents who lived adaptation problem temporary since it had been overcome in few years. Looking from the side of Kurdish respondents, however, brings out the same problem with its permanent character. Nearly all of Kurdish respondents expressed that they have had problem of adaptation in the first few years of migration. But, as different from Turkish respondents, all Kurdish respondents also emphasised on the continuing problem of adaptation to the city life. A 35 years old Kurdish head of households expresses his difficulty in terms of economic adaptation as such:

For the village life, I can give an example... For instance if I don't work in the village for months or years I would be able to support my self. But in the city if you don't work, you don't have even two days...You can't have from your neighbour, they don't give too...That is an example for the difference between village and city...Of course there are some difficulties in the village, you feed the animals, work in the farms but in the city you work in the constructions...A very hard job, even about the risks. So the life in the village is much nicer for us...

Şimdi köy hayatı şöyle bir örnek vereyim..mesela köyde aylarca, yıllarca çalışmasan geçimini sağlayabilecek durumdaydım. Ama bu şehirde çalışmasan iki gün yoktur yani insanın

elinde...komşudan da alacak durumun yok, onlarda veremez. İşte bu gibi bir fark var köyle şehir yaşamı arasında...tabii köyde biraz zorluklar var, hayvanı beslersin, çiftçilikle uğraşırın ama bu şehirde inşaatlarda çalışırın..ne kadar ağır bir iş, tehlike konusunda olsun. İşte köy yaşantısı bize göre daha güzel....

33 years old Kurdish head of households expresses his feeling on the issue by emphasising emotional aspect as such:

...if I talk about my village I can't finish, I mean I was feeling so good there... we are not in our homeland. It is like as how everyone wants to live in his home land. Even this Ankara was mine all together, I wouldn't care.

..ben köyümü söylesem bitmez yani o kadar kendimi iyi hissediyordum köyde...biz memlekette değiliz. Nasıl yani şimdi herkes kendi toprağında yaşamak ister. Yani bu Ankara varya hepsi benim olsun benim gözüme pek iyi gelmez.

when he was asked about problems experienced in the first years of migration, he answered it by depending his recent experiences as such:

of course it happened but now we feel strangeness here...Last year there was, mmm, some events, manifestations happened in Diyarbakir, you had seen them, they have lasted for a week. So my neighbour also came out. There were some junk over there, those people, who were drunk, went there and fired the junk.... I saw my neighbour, who doesn't like people, came out and said that 'all purse-snatching Kurdish people are you who come here'.

Tabii oldu ama şimdi burda da yabancılık çekiyoruz...şimdi burda geçen sene şey oldu şu Diyarbakır'da olaylar molaylar yürüyüşler oldular, gördünüz bir hafta öyle sürdü. A benim burda kapıkomşumdu çıktı şu bizim yan tarafta bir hurda vardı, burda bu berduşlar merduşlar gitti içti ...bilmem ne yaptılar, ateşe verdiler...baktım bu benim komşum hiç milleti sevmiyor, çıktı dedi içimizde şey var..ne kadar kapkaççılar Kürtler varsa siz buraya gelmişsiniz.

Another Kurdish head of households state that they had reached calm, but he still makes strong emphasis on his feeling about living environment

43 years old Kurdish head of Household:

It is a question that I don't want to talk about it because even if I live a hundred years, and even if I live a hundred years in Ankara, I have never and never become close to here. Personally, I haven't felt close here but I have children who were born here. Sometimes I tell them that 'we will go back to

our vilage', or somethig like that,...they have strongly been against to me. I am just talking about for myself, there are too many people like me. I don't want to say 'I dont like urban life' but for example I came from the east, I have lived 20-25 years in there, since I got used to live in there, with my soil, with my water, I think different here, that is first. As a second, the economic situations are also important. Lets say you imigrated here, though you immigrated compulsory, if you have enough money, at least you can support yourself easily. But if you don't have anything, and also if you don't like here because you don't have your land, your water, you are apart from your hometown, your family is fallen apart, each one is in each different part of the metropol for months, years, for example I haven't seen my brother or nephews for 9 months...

Bu benim açıklamak istemediğim bir soru çünkü ben yüzyılda yaşasam, yüz yılda Ankara'da olayım asla ve asla ısınamdım. Şahsen ısınamadım ama burada doğan çocuklarım var yani..zaman zaman çocuklarıma diyorum işte köyümüze gidecez filan...şiddetle karşı çıkıyorlar. Ben sadece kendim için bunu söylüyorum benim gibi çok insan var. Ya ben kent yaşamını sevmiyorum demiyorum ama mesela ben doğudan gelen biriyim, yaşamımı 20-25 yıl kadar orda sürdürdüğüm için, oralara alıştığım, toprağıma suyuma alıştığım için. Çünkü burda çok farklı düşünüyorum. Bu bir ikincisi bunun yanında ekonomik de önemli. Şimdi tamam göç etmişsiniz, zorunlu göç ama senin elinde avucunda varsa hiç olmasa geçimini rahat bi şekilde devam ettririsin. E bunların hiç biri olmayınca ne gelirin var...bi kere sevmiyorsun yani taşın tıprağın yok, işte suyundan ayrısın, memleketinden ayrısın işte ailen dağılmış, herbiri bir metropolün köşesinde aylarca yıllarca hatta ben mesela kardeşimi 9 yıldır hiç görmemişim veya yeğenlerimi....

In general, for all immigrants adaptation had become a problem in the first years of migration. Existence of relatives and physical appearences of squatter housings made immigrants adapt urban life in a more easy way. However, the point that take attentions is that, while Turkish respondents seem to be adapted better because of voluntary migration they had realized, for Kurdish immigrants, whose first and, previous at the same time, migrations are forced, to adapt urban life is still a difficulty. Coming to city without material, social and psychological readiness, as a result of forced migration, have still been affecting immigrants' adaptation to their new context in a negative way. Infect, Kurdish forced immigrants' material well-beings, in terms of income and physical living conditions can not be defined as the worst among poo,r as Şen (2006) observed in his recent work in İstanbul. Their living conditions are not below the Turkish respondents' but, type of work that they engage in seems as one of the important factor that makes them feel low level of self-esteem and, in this way, adaptation something hard.

VI-4-3-2-Respondents' Senses of Self-esteem

The concept of self-esteem, as an indicator of psychological aspect in De Haan's table of social exclusion, strongly relates to social, cultural and economic factors. That is to say, sense of self-esteem can be low or high in accordance with satisfaction of people in these domains of their life. In this study, in order to see people's sense of self-esteem and its relation to deprivation or exclusion processes that they had experienced, respondents were asked whether they consider themselves as a useful part of the society or not.

It can be said that economic deprivation is the main problem that creates dissatisfaction in working life of all respondents. But impact of kind of work is more negative since, it is seen that, it has become source of negative sense of self-esteem among respondents. The issue is uneasy especially for garbage collectors. All of them think that they are not worthy of this job but they have to do as in the case of 43 years old Turkish head of household:

I am not someone who deserves that job. That's why I am sorry but on the other hand, I work for my bread, to support my children...Nobody wanted to humiliate me for the job I am doing but I think it by myself. I mean, there may be people who thinks like that, for example when people come together, I feel like they would say that "hey, look, the paperman is here".

Ben bu işe layık bi kişi değilim. Ben ondan üzgünüm ama diğer taraftan ekmeğime çoluk çocuğumu geçindirmeye çalışıyorum, benim yapmak istediğim bu değil...Kimse bana sen bu işi yapıyon falan diye kimse beni rencide etmek istemedi ama tabi ben kendi kendime düşünüyom.. yani öyle düşünenlerde vardır, bir toplum toplandığı zaman aha lan kağıtçı adam geldi derler gibisinden bana öyle geliyor.

They explain their uneasiness by referring to the way of doing it. To search rubbishes for needed materials makes them feel inferiority. A 33 years old Kurdish head of household says

I feel embarrassed to hold that car, those filthy bags and go to work.

Utaniyorum o arabayı elime alıyım, o pis çuvalları işe gidiyim

Or 43 years old Kurdish head of household:

In fact as I said before, we already say that we don't have a job. The job is not something too much, one does it but although he does it, it isn't something nice. I mean, I feel like that. I feel and understand that people thinks very different about other people who collects paper.

Hakkattende az once söyledim, işimiz olmadığını söylüyoruz zaten. İş çok şey bi iş değil, insan bunu yapıyor ama her ne kadar yaparsa yapsın çok şık bir iş değil. Ben böyle hissediyorum yani..insanların bu sokakta kağıt toplayan insanlar konusunda çok farklı düşündüklerini anlıyor hissediyorum.

There is no other respondent, except garbage collecting people, whose sense of self-esteem was affected in a negative way either by their occupational or educational and gender statuses. In fact, most of them stated that they perceive themselves as a useful individual for society. However, their point of reference for society is their close social environment composed of relatives and/or neighbors. For Kurdish respondents, being part of and a useful individual in the society were accepted only with the empasis made on ethnic and kinship relationships.

VI-4-3-3-Future Prospects of Respondents

The issue of future prospects, like adaptation, is an added category that does not exist in De Haan (1998) but, considered as important for the aim of this study. Since people's sense of hope is important in their efforts to overcome difficulties, it seemed meaningful to ask their motivations and existing efforts for future expectations. According to their answers, a general interpretation ca be made as such: majority of them seem hopeless about their future because of existing living conditions caused by lack of an adequate income. A 36 years old, Turkish housewife and spouse of head of households states as such:

By staying here I don't think I will have better circumstances. How will I have? I mean only with a salary I don't think it will be better.

Burada kalarak yani durum iyi olacak gibi hiç değil. Nasıl olacak yani bi maaşla hiç iyi olacağımı zannetmiyom

Or as 36 years old another Turkish spouse of head of households states:

We are following-through to the future in a hopeless road... What can we expect?.We will work, I think of my children.

Ya geleceğe umutsuz bir yolda devam ediyoz artık..bir beklentimiz ne olacakki, çalışcaz..çocuklarımı düşünüyom ben

As seen in this expression, they are hopeless about their future but they are quite bound to put efforts for their children' future. In fact, most of them refer only to their children while they say they have hope as 33 years old Kurdish head of household states:

....I mean, I think of them, I have already left myself in a side, I'm already gone....

..yani ben onları düşünüyom, ben kendimi zaten bi köşeye bırakmışım zaten ben gittim..

or as a 39 years old Turkish housewife spouse of head of households states:

...actually if my child studies I would be happy but in this circumstances I don't think so.

..valla çoluğum çocuğum okursa mutlu olurum ama bu durumda sanmıyorum

Children are the unique reason for their being hopeful since they are perceived, in some sense, as a way of escaping from their existing deprived living conditions. Expression of a 43 years old Turkish head of households is the one, which tells other respondents' implications in a clear way:

The only hope that I have is to make it possible for my children to be educated to the end and waiting for their help, I don't have any other opportunity.

Tek umudum çocuklarımı okutabilirsem en sonuna kadar okutup onların yardımını beklemek baska carem yok yani

There are also some others, who expressed their being hopeful in a direct way. For instance a 50 years old Kurdish garbage collector says:

We have hope, we will have, The god is almighty.

Umudumuz var, olacak, Allah büyüktür

His referring to God, by saying “God is big” is not a something common among respondents. But even they refer, the emphasis is still on the future of their children not on their future eventhough they are young. A 36 years old, Turkish housewife and head of household says:

Of course I have hopes. I can't stop wishing from the God but I don't know may be something happens and we may provide an arrangement for their education... In that sense of course I have hope but if it goes like this, if my spouse lie down for eight years I wouldn't have any hope because I can't bring the money that s/he brings by working, because it is with money to educate children... So, now I don't have any hope...Hopefully, I can't stop wishing from the God...

Yani umut tabiki kuruyorum Allah'tan umut kesilmez ama belli olmaz ne bileyim bir yandan bi şey olur belki okumalarına bir düzen sağlayabiliriz...o yönden tabi umut sağlıyorum ama böyle giderse, eşim sekiz sene yatarsa hiçbir umudum yok çünkü onun çalışıp getirdiği parayı ben getiremiyorum, çünkü bunları okutmak parayla...onun için şu anda bir umudum yok. İnşallah yinede Allah'tan umut kesilmez...

There are also some, who constitutes minority, express their future expectations about children by emphasising on political and economic reasons on a country level. A 35 years old, Kurdish head of household says as such:

..generally I can't prepare a future for my children... for example if I am indebted around 2600 \$ - 4600 \$ when my children are born, what kind of future can I arrange for them. In this unemployment, hopelessness. For me..if there is a tendency on the way of democratisim a person can prepare a future for themselves, educate their children better, prepare better circumstances...

..genel olarak ben çocuklarıma bir gelecek hazırlayamıyorum...örneğin çocuklarım dünyaya gelirken 2600-4600 \$ borçluysa bunlara ne gibi bir gelecek hazırlarım. Bu işsizlik içinde, bu çaresizlik içinde. Ya bence..bu ülkede demokratikleşme yönüne doğru gidilirse insan kendine bir gelecek hazırlar, çocuklarını daha iyi eğitir, şartları hazırlar...

As seen in these expression respondents are quite hopeless about their future because of their beliefs in having lack of ability to change poor conditions. However, this does not make them be passive and live chronic type of poverty since children emerge as the only source that they set their hopes on. But they are not so optimistic about their children since most of them think that they can provide limited but not adequate conditions for them.

VI-5-Political Dimension

De Haan defines political dimension of social exclusion by using the aspect of rights, freedom of association and citizenship statuses. In Turkey, since there is a legal equality that provide all Turkish citizens access to courts, aspect of rights that defined by access to courts by De Haan does not seem applicable to this study. All Turkish citizens have rights to use legal way in the case of need. The similar equality was provided in terms of freedom of association and getting citizenship statuses. Therefore, it is an expected point that respondents do not face deprivation in terms of political participation. However, this does not mean political participation is something unproblematic for people and/or performed by them fully.

VI-5-1-Respondents' Membership of Organizations

The results of field work showed that, all of the respondents give importance to vote in the national elections. However, in terms of stability in supporting the same political party, the situation is different. That is to say, some of them stated that they are not clear on choosing the same political party that they voted in previous period. Most of them insisted on not to explain the reason, since political issues are considered dangerous. But one of them, a 39 years old Turkish housewife, explained her hesitation by referring to his husband's income:

..actually I have to think about it...what has changed, they didn't raise the minumum salary, very little 20 million, what else...

..valla düşünmem gerekiyor...ne değişti asgari ücretlilere zam vermedi, çok az 20 milyon, ne olacak...

The respondents, who are stable about their political choices constitute the majority. For example a 35 years old, Turkish spouse of head of household stated that she would give the same party, since:

"I would give to the Tayyip Erdogan...I would give my friend, to the place where I eat bread".

“ Tayyip Erdoğan’a veririm...ben veririm arkadaş ben ekmek yediğim sofraya...”

She meant that she did not betray because of helps comes from Prime Ministry and Metropolitan Municipality belong to same party. The political devotion is more strong in the case of Kurdish respondents especially of the forced immigrants. All they stated that they would give the same party as 33 years old garbage collector says:

I will give to the that same party, even if it wins or not, it will be the same party.

Aynı yine o partiye vereceğim, kazansada kazanmasada aynı partidir..

And these respondents also have an active membership to a party. It would not be wrong to say that ethnic difference use its’ influence in terms of institutional reliance since there is a, more or less, division between Kurdish and Turkish respondents’ reference institution. Among eight Turkish respondents, five of them referred to state as an institution, to which they trust in and feel close, while this number is only one for Kurdish respondents. They generally referred to NGOs, political parties and religious institutions as reliable. There are only two respondents who said that they did not trust none of these insitiutions since as

State can get a tax from me I don't say it shouldn't get but it must return it to me. The state doesn't give what it takes, it takes from me and for example, give the influential, powerful one.. the state should possess and give employment possibilities everyone, more or less it should give employment facilities everyone.

Devlet benden vergi alsın almasın demiyom ama tekrar bana döndersin. Devlet aldığı döndermiyor. Benden alıyor, atıyorum, benden alıyor yukarıdaki kodamana yidiriyor..ya devlet burada sahip çıkacak herkese iş imkanı tanıyacak, herkese az çok iş imkanı tanınması gerekir devletin

This statement also contains the one of the answers of the question that directed to respondents, on the basic responsibilities of state. Some of them perceive state as the institution should provide job while some, at first, points on the political processes should be started by state in order to solve Kurdish problem in a peaceful way. Here, there is a clear ethnic distinction since all of the respondents point on the Kurdish problem are Kurd. In fact, this is directly related to their perception of the main problem in Turkey. While all of Turkish respondents answered question about the biggest problem in the country by referring to unemployment, poverty and problem of subsistence, Kurdish respondents emphasised on democracy, Kurdish problem and peace, in addition to unemployment.

VI-5-2-Respondents' Perception of Citizenship

It is one of the important concept that help to understand relationship between state and people. As stated earlier, there is an legal framework in Turkey that provide equality of people by citizenship status. In terms of people's perception of their relations with state, first the concept of citizenship and , then, senses of citizenships were asked to respondents. Some of female respondents could not answer the question but expressed their senses of being citizenship positively but, in general, they referred to "human" while they were defining the concept.

People I think...yes

İnsanlar herhalde...evet

One of them, 50 yeras old Kurdish head of households, defined citizen by using concept of devotion

A citizen, who is loyal to his state

Vatandaş, devletine bağlı insan

While one another qualified human, as equal to citizen, with being poor.

A citizen... who can it be..People who are poor like me are citizens...

Vatandaş ne...eee işte ne olacak..benim gibi yoksul insanlar vatandaş işte

The general definition of the concept of citizen, among Kurdish respondents, is the same but they differs from Turkish respondents by expressing their perceptions of being citizenship of this country in a negative way. A 33 years old Kurdish head of household says:

We are the citizens but who... I don't see now, because they don't let it be.. They don't accept me. They try to close my mouth.. I see myself in a prison if I don't have my language...

Vatandaş biziz ama kimdir..ben şu anda görmüyorum, çünkü onlar bırakmıyorlar..beni kabul etmiyorlar. Benim dilimi kapatmaya çalışıyorlar..ben kendimi şey görüyorum cezaevinde görüyorum benim dilim olmadıktan sonra...

Or as 50 years old another Kurdish head of households says:

.....okey I am a citizen but I we give our hands, nobody give us their hands..

...tamam ben vatandaşım ama elimizi uzatıyoruz kimse bize elini vermiyor..

As understood, forced immigrants' perceptions of citizenship status refer to a problem relates to desires for the recognition of their ethnic identities and languages.

VII-CONCLUSION

The concept of social exclusion has increasingly gained importance in contemporary social sciences because it offers a wider framing of social disadvantages in the society, being an understanding not limited to poverty alone. There are many theories that stress the concepts multidimensionality, and emphasize on process and agency. There exist also important critiques of the concept of social exclusion, such as being vague and being inapplicable to developing countries. The multidimensionality and context dependent characteristics of social exclusion are seen as barriers for its applicability.

This study, taking multidimensionality and dynamism as the bases, has been carried out to examine the different dimensions that lead to the experiences of social exclusion in some neighborhoods of Ankara. For this reason, De Haan's (1998) operationalization of social exclusion for the case of India, as a developing country, was used. He integrated two main questions into his approach, firstly he asks "exclusion from what?" and analyses by emphasizing on multidimensionality and; secondly, he formulated the question "exclusion by whom?", here emphasizing on processes and agents underlying social exclusion. These points, were tried to be adapted to Turkey's conditions by specifically stressing the "context-dependence" of social exclusion. In general, people's experience and perceptions of social exclusion were explored in detail addressing at economic, social and human capital as well as psychological and political dimensions.

Ankara was selected as site for the empirical field work, on the one hand there exist no new or only few studies stressing social exclusion. Ankara is however still a center of attraction for internal migration processes, which finds its reflection in spatial terms with the great number of squatter housing areas in the urban periphery. Squatter settlements i.e. low-standard housing areas are considered as potential areas in which people who experience and perceive social exclusion do live. In Ankara, some of the poorest areas were selected: Küçük Kayaş, Türközü, Yıldırım Beyazıt, Doğanatepe, Ergazi and Mehmet Akif Ersoy. The selection of the quarters is based

on Güvenç's (2001) map of status groups, in which settlements in the northern part of Ankara are characterized as areas with lower socio-economic conditions.

In the theoretical sections a frame was set in which social exclusion and poverty were examined separately but also emphasizing the inter-relatedness of the two phenomena. Firstly, theoretical approaches stressing the concept of social exclusion's functionality for understanding, defining and developing appropriate solutions to social problems were investigated. Global economic transformations, changes in welfare state system and social structure were examined as main reasons that led to social exclusion. The term's differences from poverty were also scrutinized to see the complex structure. Secondly, studies on social exclusion in advanced and some developing countries were investigated in order to see dynamics and dimensions that led individuals or groups of people experience social exclusion in different domains of their life. In regard to Turkey, thirdly, the social exclusion debate was investigated through stressing literatur on the process of internal migration, urban poverty and economic developments after 1980 .

The Turkish case was investigated through an intensive study of urban poverty studies In Turkey social exclusion is seen frequently as interlinked with a shift from advanced forms of urban poverty carrying risks of social exclusion. In this regard, social, economic and political dynamics of urban poverty, in this regard, were investigated through different time periods, taking 1980 as crucial year of change. Mechanization in agriculture resulting in internal migration from rural to urban areas was discussed as main dynamics or push factors leading to conditions of urban poverty in the pre-1980 era. Interlinkages with neo-liberal economic changes and a lack of political culture able to effectively form social policies were elaborated . Other dynamics that manifested in a more stable form of urban poverty started to emerge in the post-1980 era. In this context, forced migration after 1990 was considered as crucial in understanding and analysing urban poverty and its relation to social exclusion in the urban Turkish context.. Thus, in this study, the conditions of urban poor were examined to see whether they can be defined as socially excluded or not and most importantly if the individuals themselves have had experiences and perceptions about being socially excluded.

Before elaborating the key points of this thesis, it should be noted that, this study has a limited scale. It cannot and should not be understood as a representative study, neither for Ankara, nor for Turkey. The results do only provide insights into a part of the Turkish society. Nevertheless, it gives some clues about social exclusion and may prepare the basis for further investigations. Keeping these comments in mind, it is crucial to point out some important results that were reached at throughout the field work.. Firstly, it seems important to look at the migration patterns of the respondents and then to reflect on the impacts of these migration processes on the poverty/social exclusion conditions of the respondents.

As in the pre and post-1980 eras, a type of migration we might call economic based migration seems to be still most typical to describe rural to urban migration processes in Turkey and respectively also Ankara. The majority of the respondents came to Ankara in an attempt to overcome economic difficulties. Their decision and stay in Ankara is strongly interlinked to job opportunities. Another point that seemed to be important for their decisions to migrate and to stay is the existence of relatives, kin and fellow villagers living in Ankara. These aspects actually strongly confirm the important role of informal relations, specifically family and wider kin networks, in initiating and perpetuating migration processes.

Some of the important findings in relation to the multidimensionality of social exclusion can be summarized as follows:

1-Exclusion from physical dimension: Squatter settlements in this study seem to be excluded physically, since they are living in deprived areas characterized with structural and infrastructural inadequacies. Being old, neglected and narrow buildings with irregular or inadequate municipality services, squatter buildings and their environment are open to disadvantages for their inhabitants. They seem to be just meeting the need of sheltering on low rent levels. To live in squatter settlements leads among their inhabitants to a sense of deprivation and exclusion among their inhabitants, evoked by a feeling of compulsion to settle in these areas. Thus, when expressions of respondents are combined with the field observations. The dimension of social exclusion in De Haan's (1998) work can be adapted as such: squatter

dwellers are examples of excluded, whose exclusions, in respect of physical dimension, have two different aspects, which are location and infrastructure. While the former aspect was indicated by squatter quarters, the latter by lack of regular municipality services.

2- Exclusion from economic dimension: This has appeared as the main factor that made respondents perceive themselves as excluded. Lack of a regular and/or low income, as usual consequence of weak market attachments of householdheads, cause this situation in two ways. First, it creates difficulties for conditions of subsistence, which can be defined as absolute poverty. Majority of respondents defined themselves as poor and clearly defined that they have difficulties in meeting basic needs such as nutrition, clothing, etc. Secondly, it leads sense of relative deprivation among the respondents, though it was not declared as strongly emphasised in the interviews. Thus, all of the respondents are examples of the excluded since they are absolutely poor and relatively deprived.

The labor market positions of the respondents, as garbage collectors, and casual and construction workers make them examples of the excluded in terms of the economic sector they occupy. Their occupation in mainly marginal, service and informal sectors are indicators of their exclusion from formal job opportunities, which was caused by low level of education, lack of qualified job skills and as they expressed their ethnicity.

In terms of having assets, respondents seem to be examples of the excluded too, since none of them, with the exception of the Kurdish forced immigrants, have property. Their being non-owners of any capital makes them be excluded. But the significant point in their being propertyless is not only their lack a higher income, but also that they lack inherited property. Regarding the Kurdish forced immigrants, having capital does not contribute to their subsistence since they are not able to rely it.

3-Exclusion from dimension of Human Capital: This is not a much striking dimension, in terms of the result of the current study, since all of the respondents

and their spouses have basic school education. However, it might be mentioned that they had only a limited chance to reach a higher level of education in their places of origins, in this sense, they can be categorized as being excluded from educational opportunities. Being aware of the importance of high education, all respondents have the aim of making their children access to educational services. However, difficulties in paying school expenses leads them and their children experience and perceived exclusion. The fact that, some of the respondents and their children are insulted at the school because they did not pay school revenue or other expenses, implies, to a degree, their exclusion from basic educational services. This case shows the multidimensionality of exclusion, since it has educational aspect and economic dimension.

Health status of respondents and their family members does not emerge as an indicator that creates an exclusive situation in their life. The majority of respondents, except two, and their family members use free public services. However, quality of health services depending on the type of insurance that respondents have implies exclusion. For instance, people with *green* cards can not use health services, such as university and/or private hospitals that are open to civil servants and upper classes. While this implies exclusion from better health services, position of people without any health insurance implies further exclusion since they can not access even to free public health services.

4-Exclusion from Dimension of Social Capital: This is one of the important factors through which some of the respondents had experienced exclusion. Gender is one of the indicators, which makes women be deprived of or excluded from many spheres of social life. However, according to their expressions, though women spend most of their times at home doing house works and child rearing activities, and they participate only little in public social life, is not perceived as a situation of exclusion by them. In contrast, it has been perceived as usual. Thus, the majority of women neither had engaged in an income generating economic activity nor had ever attempted to work outside home. However, it should be pointed out that, this situation is not only because of women's passive position in the traditional system, but also their lack of confidence towards their social environments. Since, these

social environments are thought as dangerous, especially for their children, women showed the tendency to isolate themselves from their social environments.

Some of the respondents and their family members' expressions call for attention to ethnicity as a more striking indicator for exclusion from different domains of life and perceiving themselves as excluded. According to the findings of this study, ethnicity has caused difficulties for Kurds in terms of finding house, job and social interaction. Some of the Kurdish householdheads, for instance, housing problems because of discriminative attitudes of non-Kurdish population. Since, as understood from their expressions, the excluding side is also a poor, themselves living in the same squatter areas, not their social class position but ethnic based exclusion was perceived.

Similarly, some householdheads' statements imply that, their experiences and perceptions of exclusion have also ethnic reference. The process of their application to work or collecting materials, for instance, were not impeded until their ethnic identities were known by the excluding side.

Negative reactions to people speaking Kurdish, accrossed in public spheres, such as public hospitals, streets and buses, imply exclusion of some Kurdish respondents from these domains on the basis of their ethnic identities. According to their statements, exclusive attitudes towards them do not seem to have economic, location and human capital dimensions since both the excluding and excluded sides had similar economic and social characteristics..

Indicator of 'contact with society' has emerged as a complex issue which needs to be explored attentively. First of all, none of the respondents answered the question "whether they perceive themselves as a part of society" in terms of economic, social, cultural and political participation and integration negatively. However, what they mean by society is not the society at large but limited community of their closest social environment, which includes relatives and/or co-villagers living in the same or other neighborhoods of the city. It is the most reliable social context for them both in terms of covering material as well as non-material needs. Respondents

seem to have a persistent tendency to put distance between themselves mainly arguing that they are afraid of being harmed. However, while in inner-city squatter settlements, a dominant reason to create such a social distance was defined to be disorder caused by criminal and immoral events, in peripheral areas, it appears to be the unfamiliarity with the social environment itself. A high level of tenancy, which is increasing the temporary type of settlement and decreasing the possibility of stable relations among people, seems to be a factor preventing people from participation to a broader social context and makes them restrict their social environment to few social contacts. Thus, their social contexts seems could be described by the term “semi-isolated” since they are neither totally isolated nor excluded situation but strongly embedded in a family, kin and fellow-villager network..

Another point that should be noted here is that, both for inner-city and peripheral squatter settlements, ethnicity appears as an additional but important dimension that has impacts on creating social distance. Most of the Kurdish respondents, especially those who experienced forced migration, have expressed their attitudes of not making relations with Turkish neighbors because of problems that either they or their relatives had experienced after migration. In fact, problems they lived are not only restricted to the period after migration to Ankara. Some of the migrant who were forced to leave their villages actually first settled in Adana, and only after some time remning there, they decided to go to Ankara. The majority of these had lived problems with non-Kurdish population and in institutional bodies in Adana since the beginning of migration. These had hardened their ethnic identities by making them perceive themselves as different which became more obvious in the changed social, cultural and political context. This situation, as will be explained in the following paragraphs, complicated their adaptation to the city.

Adaptation to the city life, as an indicator of psychological aspects, has many dimensions such as economic, physical, social and cultural. Nearly all of the respondents think that, squatters, in their resemblance to village, and the existence of relatives and co-villagers in the same neighborhoods had eased their adaptation to city life culturally, physically and socially. However, the important point here is

that, how they defined the term adaptation. Thus, especially for women, not participation to city life by living an urban way of life, such as working outside, participation to social and cultural events, and interest in politics, but rather familiarity to their living environments restricted to a neighborhood or to the street they live in, were seen as basis for their context of integration. The main factor that can be interpreted as leading to their adaptation to city life is economic activities that householdheads engage in. Being worker in the service sector, in seasonal and casual works and, in this specific case collecting garbage promoted their adaptation to city life to a degree. Economic hardship had made them migrate and the fact that, they found a job, although in the informal sector, can be considered as some level of integration

At this point it should be noted that, for the respondents, who experienced forced migration, neither adaptation nor familiarity to city life are the problems that have been resolved. Kurdish forced immigrants, as different from those who experienced “voluntary” migration, have greater problems to adapt to urban life. All of them expressed their desires wishing to return to their villages. They claimed that they had better living conditions there, in terms of social, cultural and economic dimensions. Although, they have created, more or less, a social environment maintained by family, kinship and ethnic relationships, forced immigrants’ experiences of adaptation to urban life are still a problematic issue. The type of work, in particular collecting garbage, makes them feel inferior. Though some of them, actually do earn higher incomes better than their counterparts in the service sector and as casual workers. All of garbage collecting respondents expressed their strong feelings of being excluded due to the type of work they do but not because of the level of income they earn.

5-Exclusion from Political Dimension: This was not explored, as De Haan formulates, by the aspect of rights indicated as access to courts, since in Turkey, people holding the status of Turkish citizenship have equal political right. Similarly, all Turkish citizens have rights to vote in the elections to make their political choices. However, according to findings of the study, while Kurdish respondents, especially those forced immigrants seemed to be more stable in terms of their

political preferences, Turkish respondents seemed less. The majority of Kurdish respondents clearly expressed their stability by voting for the same political party since the foundation of it. Nearly all of the Turkish respondents, on the other hand, expressed their indecision by emphasising on the sense of distrust about political parties and leaders and they clearly stated their undecidedness about which party to vote for. Interestingly they emphasized their disadvantaged economic position in society and stressed that politicians do not pay enough attention to growing poverty in Turkey. On the other hand, it can be said that the Forced Kurdish respondents in this context frequently referred to human rights, democracy and the difficult and violent conditions in the regions they used to live.

Asked for the ‘most reliable institution’ they refer to again their ethnic origins seem to make a difference in their attitudes and perceptions. In general, while Turkish respondents refer to the state as an institution, they trust and feel themselves close to, Kurdish respondents refer to NGOs, political parties and religious institutions instead. Some of the respondents expressed this kind of conflictual attitude to the state using statements like: We think that we are Turkish citizens but the state does not reach out its hand.” The Kurdish respondents thus seemed to have weak citizenship ties because of their belief in state’s exclusive political policies towards their ethnic identities.

A major attempt in this study was to use and adapted the results of the fieldwork in Ankarar to De Haan’s (1998) theory of social exclusion. While it can be stated that the model of De Haan can be used, some of the important differences showed be mentioned before summarizing it in the following table. A crucial difference has to be seen in the fact that in De Haan’s case of an Indian village, where the legal system obviously excluded certain strata of the society, the case in Turkey, Ankara, is quite different. The people themselves and especially the Kurdish migrants do perceive themselves as excluded. In legal terms however, they do have the same rights as any Turkish citizen. What is also interesting is the fact that in spite of their feeling of exclusion, especially in political terms they have a high level of organization and solidarity, shortly, they can be described as “highly” politicized. This on the other hand can be also seen as a “citizen’ characteristic” and this kind of

“urban” behaviour is less present among the poor Turkish respondents in this study.

VIII Multi-dimensionality of social exclusion:

Dimension	Aspect	Indicator	Manifestation in group/ urban quarter
Physical	Location	Squatter quarters	Squatter dwellers
	Infrastructure	Lack of regular municipality services	Dwellers of squatter areas
Economic	Income	Minimum wage	Absolutely poor, relatively deprived
	Labor market	Economic sector	Causal/seasonal and marginal sector workers
	Assets	Capital ownership	Property less people
Human Capital	Health	Having health insurance	People with Green card or no health insurance
	Education	Illiteracy	Low level of education and illiteracy
Social capital	Social background	Gender	Woman
		Ethnicity	Kurdish
	Civic engagement	Membership organizations	Low level
		Contact with society	Semi-isolated
	Psychological	Adaptation	Non and/or semi-adapted
		Self-esteem	Garbage collectors feel inferiority
Political	Citizenship status	Perceived citizenship	Kurdish forced immigrants with weak perception of citizenship

As seen in the table, there are many examples that support the existence of social exclusion and its’ multidimensionality. Physical and economic and human capital dimensions based exclusions find their manifestations in a strong attachment to the material poverty that respondents suffer. Dimension of social capital and political dimension, however, change types of these manifestations by depending them on gender and ethnicity. Nevertheless, it should be pointed out that, gender is not perceived as a factor that causing exclusion also not by women themselves. Ethnicity, on the other hand, has stronger impact on the respondents’ experiences and perception of their exclusions. Before elaborating of the causes that lead such experiences and perceptions, it is necessary to look at the processes, actors and institutions, which make social exclusion a dynamic process.

Table VIII: Actors, institutions and processes of social exclusion

Aspect	Example of excluded	Institutions/agents	Processes
Infrastructure	All dwellers of squatters	District Municipalities	Discontinuous cleaning services in the districts
Income	Absolutely poor/ under poverty line	Governmental authorities	Minimum wage (asgari ücret)
Labor market	Service sector Worker and casual worker	Private employers	Low paid, no social insurance
Assets	Tenants	Governmental Authorities	Not providing public housing
Health	Unhealthy Kurdish Woman → Families without health insurance →	Health personal → Health Ministry →	Reaction to speaking Kurdish Payment in public hospitals and pharmacies
Education	Students can not pay school revenue,	Public school authorities	Make student's mother clean school or give low mark as equivalent of school revenue
Social Background	Kurdish garbage collectors	Market manager → Administer of district municipality →	Prevent from collecting market's waste materials Drop out from bid
Psychological	Kurdish householdheads and their spouses can not adapt to city life	Non-Kurd population living in the same area	Make them feel strange and lone
Political	Kurds with weak perception of citizenship	State Authorities	Not recognizing their ethnic identities.

As seen in the table, in some cases, agents operating processes of exclusion can be an institutional body such as the municipality or a market manager and non-Turkish population. Nevertheless, all respondents are the examples of exclusion according to one or two of these dimensions. Economic, physical and human capital are more common dimensions through which respondents experience exclusion. However, when social capital and political dimensions are the subject of matter, ethnicity makes a difference in the profile of exclusion. For Kurdish immigrants, especially the forced ones, ethnic identity is a stronger factor for their being excluded in terms of social capital and political dimensions. They perceive that they experiences exclusion because of their ethnic identities. At this point, to look at state's tradition

of nationalism, as Silver (1995) formulates, and its impact on the perception of citizenship is meaningful. Turkey's tradition of nationalism is the one, which has been denying different national, regional and religious cultures since the foundation. The efforts to assimilate these differences into a single citizenship strongly embedded with Turkish national identity and can be called as "exclusion operationalized" by state. In the case of Kurdish population, state's exclusive attitudes have created a political context in which Kurds' claims on their identities are seen as threat to national and cultural unity of the state. While war-like conditions in the southeastern region of the country led to displacement of Kurdish population, the impact of state's exclusive policies on the society had created a social context in the cities in which that they re-settled. As exemplified in this study, though they are not the poorest, Kurdish respondents experience social exclusion stronger and relate this exclusion to their social capital.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abrahamson, P. (2005). "New Forms of Inequality in contemporary Societies" a paper presented at the Danish Congress of sociology, Roskilde University, August 2005, available:
http://www.sociologkongres.dk/papers/socialulighed/socialulighed_Peter_Abrahams_on_pap.pdf.
- Adaman, Fikret. (2003). "Study on the Social Protection Systems in the 13 Applicant Countries", Turkey Country Study, financed by European Commission.
- Adaman, Fikret and Keyder Çağlar. (2006). "Türkiye'de Büyük kentlerin Gecekondu ve Çöküntü Mahallelerinde Yaşanan Yoksulluk ve Sosyal Dışlanma" Report Prepared for European Commission on Work, Social Issues and Equality of Opportunities available:
http://www.deltur.cec.eu.int/_webpub/documents/study_turkey_tr.pdf
- Akder, Halis. (2000). "Türkiye'deki Bölgesel Eşitsizlikler ve Kırsal Yoksulluk" in Yoksulluk, TESEV pub. 21, İstanbul,
- Aker, A. Tamer. (2006). "Hakkari İli Alan Araştırması Değerlendirmesi: Yerinden Edilmenin Nedenleri, ruhsal ve Toplumsal Sonuçları, Geri dönüş Süreci" in Zorunlu Göç İle Yüzleşmek: Türkiye'de Zorunlu Göç Sonrası Vatandaşlığın İnşası, Tesey, İstanbul.
- Akkaya, Yüksel. (2002). "Göç, Yoksulluk ve Kentsel Şiddet" in *Yoksulluk, Şiddet ve İnsan Hakları*, ed. Yasemin Özdek, Ankara, TODAIE, pp: 203-215.
- Alada, Adalet B, Sayıta, Sevgi and Temelli, Sezai. (2002). "Küreselleşme, yoksulluk ve Şiddet Bağlamında Sokak Çocukları". in *Yoksulluk, Şiddet ve İnsan Hakları*, ed. Yasemin Özdek, Ankara, TODAIE, pp: 235-269.
- Alpaytekin, Filiz. (2006). "Urban Dynamics in Turkey" available:
<http://www.ecomod.org/files/papers/1205.pdf>
- Altımir, Oscar. (1998). "Income Distribution and Poverty Through Crisis and Adjustment", in *Poverty, Economic Reform and Income Distribution in Latin America*, ed. Albert Berry, USA, Lynne Rienner Publisher.
- Altuntaş, Betül. (2003). *Mendile, Simide, Boyaya, Çöpe: Ankara Sokaklarında Çalışan Çocuklar*. İstanbul, İletişim.
- Arthurson, Kathy. (2003). "A Critique of The Concept of Social Exclusion and Its Utility for Australian Social Housing Policy", Australian Housing and Urban Research Institution, Paper presented at the UK Housing Studies Associations Conference, Bristol, September

- Armatlı Koroğlu, Bilge. & Özge Yalçiner Ercoşkun. (2006). "Urban transformation: A case Study on 7 Çukurambar, Ankara", *Gazi University, Journal of Science*, 19 (3).
- Atkinson, A.B. (1998), 'Social Exclusion, Poverty and Unemployment' in *Exclusion, Employment and Opportunity*, eds. A.B. Atkinson & J. Hills, Case Paper 4, January 1998, Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion, London School of Economics, available: <http://sticerd.lse.ac.uk/case/publications/casepapers.asp>.
- Barry, Brian (1998) "Social Exclusion, Social Isolation and The Distribution of Income", Case paper no: 12, August.
- Başlevent, Cem & Meltem Dayıoğlu. (2005). "The Effect of Squatter Housing on Income Distribution in Urban Turkey", *Urban Studies*, V:42, No:1, January.
- Beall, Joe and Laure-Helena Piron. (2005). Social Exclusion Review, DFID, May.
- Becker, Saul. (1997). *Responding Poverty*. Great Britain, Longmann.
- Bircan, İsmail. (2002). "Türkiye'de Yoksulluk ve Kadınlar" in *Yoksulluk, Şiddet ve İnsan Hakları*, ed. Yasemin Özdek, Ankara, TODAIE, pp: 119-127.
- Bouillan and Buvnich. (2003). "Social Cohesion in Latin America and The Caribbean: Inequality, Exclusion and Poverty in Latin America and the Caribbean: Implications for Development", EC/IDB Seminar, Brussels, June 5-5, 2003: <http://www.iadb.org/sds/doc/soc-IDB-SocialCohesion-E.pdf>
- Böhnke, Petra. (2001). "Nothing Left to Lose? Poverty and Social Exclusion in Comparison: Empirical evidences on Germany" Social Science Research Center, Berlin, FS 111-402.
- Buğra, Ayşe. (2001). "Kriz Karşısında Türkiye'nin Geleneksel Refah Rejimi", *Toplum ve Bilim*, 89, pp: 22-30
- Buğra, Ayşe. (1998). "The Immoral Economy of Housing in Turkey" *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 22 (2), 303-307.
- Burchardt, Tania, J. Le Grand and D. Piachaud. (1999). "Social Exclusion in Britain: 1991-1995" *Social Policy and Administration*, V. 33, No. 3, September.
- Can, Kemal. (2002). "Yoksulluk ve Milliyetçilik", in *Yoksulluk Halleri-Türkiye'de Kent Yoksulluğunun Toplumsal Görünümleri*. ed. Necmi Erdoğan. İstanbul Demokrasi Kitaplığı Yayınevi, pp:116-134.
- Carr, Marilyn and M. Alter Chen. (2001). "Globalization and the Informal Economy: How Globalizing Trade and Investment Impact on the Working Poor" *Women in Informal Employment Globalizing and Organizing*.
- Castells, Manuel. (1983). *The City and the Grassroots*, University of California Press, pp: 175-212.

- Castells, Manuel. (1977). *The Urban Question*, London, Edward Arnold Pub.
- Chamber, Robert. (1995). "Poverty and Livelihoods: Whose Reality Counts?" *Environment and Urbanization*, Vol: 7, No: 1, April 1995, pp: 173-204.
- Çelik, A. Betül. (2006). "Batman İli Alan Araştırması Değerlendirmesi: Ülke İçinde Yerinden Edilmenin Sosyo-ekonomik Sonuçları ve Geri Dönüş Önündeki engeller" in *Zorunlu Göç İle Yüzleşmek: Türkiye'de Zorunlu Göç Sonrası Vatandaşlığın İnşası*, Tesev, İstanbul.
- Çolak, Ö. F. and Selahattin Bekmez. (2005). "Interconnectedness of Informal Economy and Political Preferences in Turkey", Muğla University, *Journal of Economic and Administrative Sciences*, Summer 2005, No:1.
- Dağdemir, O. (1999). "Türkiye Ekonomisi'nde Yoksulluk Sorunu ve Yoksulluk Analizi: 1987-1994", *H.Ü. İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi*, Cilt 17.
- Dansuk, Ercan. (1997). "Türkiye'de Yoksulluğun Ölçülmesi ve Sosyo-ekonomik Yapılarla İlişkisi", DPT Uzmanlık Tezleri.
- De Haan, Arjan. (1995). "Bibliographical Review on Social Exclusion in South Asia" in *Social Exclusion and south Asia*, International Institution for Labor Studies.
- De Haan, Arjan. (1998). "Social Exclusion in policy and Research: Operationalizing the Concept" in *Social Exclusion: An ILO Perspective*, ed: Figueredo, J B and Arjan De Haan, Geneva, ILO.
- De Haan, Arjan. (2001). "Social Exclusion: Enriching the Understanding of Deprivation", a paper prepared for the World Development Report.
- De La Rocha, M. (2003). "The Construction of The Myth of the Survival" a paper presented for The International Workshop 'Gender Myths and Feminist Fables: Repositioning Gender in Development Policy and Practice, Institute of Development Studies, Sussex, 2-4 July.
- De Navas, C., Bernadette D. Proctor and Cheryl Hill Lee. (2005). "Income, Poverty and Health Insurance Covarage in the US:2004", US Census Bureau, Issued August 2005:www.census.gov/prod/2005pubs/p60-229.pdf
- Dennis Ian and Anne- Cathrine Guio. (2003). "Monetary Poverty in EU, Acceding and Candiadte Countries" in *Statistic in Focus, Population and Social Conditions*, Eurostat, Theme 3- 21/2003 http://www.mszs.si/eurydice/posvet/eurostat/monetary_poverty.pdf
- Du Toit, Andre. (2004). "Social Exclusion Discourse and Chronic Poverty: A South African Case study", *Development and Change*, 35 (5).
- Erder, Sema. (1996). *İstanbul'a Bir Kent Kondu: Ümraniye*. İstanbul, İletişim.

- Erder, Sema. (1997). *Kentsel Gerilim*, Ankara, Umag.
- Erdoğan, Güzin. (1997). “Poverty Definitions and Poverty in Turkey”, Seminar on poverty Statistics, Santiago.
- Erdoğan, Necmi. (2002). “Garibanların Dünyası: Türkiye’de Yoksulların Kültürel Temsilleri Üzerine İlk Notlar” In *Yoksulluk Halleri-Türkiye’de Kent Yoksulluğunun Toplumsal Görünümleri*. ed.Necmi Erdoğan. İstanbul Demokrasi Kitaplığı Yayınevi, pp:21-33.
- Erman, Tahire. (1998). “Becoming “Urban” or Remaining “Rural” the Views of Turkish Rural-to-Urban Migrants on the “Integration” Question, *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, V: 30, N:4.
- Erman, Tahire. (2002). “Kent Yoksulu ve Şiddet: Gecekondu Bağlamında Eleştirel Bir Yaklaşım” in *Yoksulluk, Şiddet ve İnsan Hakları*, ed. Yasemin Özdek, Ankara, TODAIE.
- Erman, Tahire. , Kalaycıoğlu, S., Rittersberger-Tılıç, Helga. (2002). “Money-Earning Activities and Empowerment Experiences of Rural Migrant Women in The City: The Case of Turkey” *Women’s Studies International Forum*, Vol: 25, No: 4, pp:395-410.
- Erman, Tahire and Eken, Aslihan. (2004). ““The Other of The Other” and “Unregulated Territories” In The Urban Periphery: Gecekondu Violence In The 2000s With a Focus On The Esenler Case, Istanbul” *Cities*, 21 (1),pp: 57-68.
- Erman Tahire and Tok, Naslihan. (2004). “Gecekondu Çalışmalarında ‘Öteki’ Olarak Gecekondu Kurguları”, *European Journal Of Turkish Studies*, no:1.
- Esping-Andersen. (1996). *Welfare States in Transition*, London, Sage Publications.
- Esping-Andersen. (1999). *Social Foundations of Post-industrial Economies*, Oxford, Oxford University Pres.
- Estivill, Jordi, (2003) “*Concepts and Strategies for Combating Social exclusion: An Overview*”, ILO, <http://www.ilo.org/ciaris/pages/english>.
- Farcas, George. (2003). “Racial Disparities and Discrimination in education: what do we know, how do we know it, and what do we need to know?” Teachers College Record, V: 105, N: 6, August, <http://www7.nationalacademies.org/cnstat/Farkas.doc>
- Fiss, Owen. (2003). “A Way Out”, *Princeton University Press*, <http://www.press.princeton.edu/chapters/s7492>.
- Fletcher, Farrington. “Towards a Useful Definition: Advantages and Criticisms of Social Exclusion”, *The Journal of Geography, Environment and Oekumene Society*. <http://www.ssn.flinders.edu.au/geog/geos/farrington.html#footnote>

- Flodman, Becker Kristina. (2004). "The Informal Economy" Fact Finding Study, Department for Infrastructure and Economic Co-operation, SIDA.
- Firedrich Ebert Vakfı. (1996). *Türkiye'de Gecekonduunun 50 Yili*, İstanbul, Ozan yayinlari.
- Geronimus, Arline T and J. Phillip Thompson. (2004). "To denigrate, ignore or disrupt. Racial Inequality in Health and the Impact of Policy-Induced Breakdown of African-American Communities", *Cambridge Journals*, V: 1, Issue: 2, September.
- Güloğlu, Tuncay. (2005) "The Reality of Informal Employment in Turkey", International programs visiting fellow working papers, Cornell University.
- Güvenç, Murat. (2001). "Toplumsal Coğrafyalar Farklılıklar-Bezerlikler", *İstanbul*, sayı: 36, Ocak
- Gökbayrak, Ş. (2002). "Yoksulluğa Karşı Bir Strateji Olarak Enformal Sektörde Kadınların Çalışması ve Kadınlara Yönelik Sosyal Koruma Modelleri", in *Türkiye İnsan Hakları Hareketi Konferansı 2002 Bildirileri*. Ed. Gül Erdost, Ank, Buluş Tasarım ve Matbaacılık, pp: 295-311.
- Göktürk, Atilla. (2000). "Diyarbakır'dan Mersin'e Zorunlu Göç", in *Turkey Human Rights Action 2000's Declarations*, Ankara, Buluş Tasarım ve matbaacılık.
- Guio, Anne-Catherine. (2005). "Income Poverty and Social Exclusion in the EU 25" in *Statistic in Focus, Population and Social Conditions*, Eurostat, 13/2005
- Galafassi, Guido Pauscal. (2002). "Ecological Crisis, Poverty and Urban Development in Latin America", *Democracy and Nature*, V. 8, N: 1, 117-129.
- Hatun, Şükrü. (2002). "Yoksulluk, Çocuklar ve Sağlık" in *Türkiye İnsan Hakları Hareketi Konferansı 2002 Bildirileri*. Ed. Gül Erdost, Ank, Buluş Tasarım ve Matbaacılık, pp:51-73.
- Hobcraft, John. (1998). "Intergenerational and Life-course Transmission of Social Exclusion: Influences of Childhood, poverty, Family Disruption and Contact with The Police", Case paper: 15, November.
- Holton, Robert J and Turner, Bryan S. (1990). *Max Weber on Economy and Society*, London, Routledge.
- Hugby, Meg, Bradshaw, Johnatan and Carden, Anne. (1999). "A study of Town Life: Living Standards in the City of York 100 Years after Rowntree", Joseph Rowntree Foundation, Sociology Since 1995, York.
- Hughes, Kirsty. (2004). "Turkey and the EU: Just Another Enlargement?" Exploring the Implications of Turkish Accession, European Policy Summit of 17 June 2004.

- Işık, O. and Pınarcıoğlu, M. (2001), *Nöbetleşe Yoksulluk: Sultanbeyli Örneği*, İst, İletişim.
- Işık, O. and Pınarcıoğlu, M. (2003). “Yoksulluğun Değişen Yüzü: Nöbetleşe Yoksulluktan Kuralsız Yoksulluğa”, *Görüş*, Temmuz.
- İçduygu, A. and Unalan, T. (1998). “Türkiye’de İçgöç: Sorunsal Alanları ve Araştırma Yöntemleri” in *Türkiye’de İçgöç*, İst, Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı.
- Justina, P. and Arnab Archanya. (2003). “Inequality in Latin America: Processes and Inputs”, April, 2003, Prus Working paper: 22.
- Joe, Beall and L. Helene Piron. (2005). “Social Exclusion Review”, DFID, May, pp: 45-47).
- Kabeer, Naila. (2000). “Social Exclusion, Poverty and Discrimination: Towards an Analytical Framework”, *IDS Bulletin*, V. 1, N: 4, October.
- Kalaycıoğlu, Sibel. (2002). “Kadın Yoksulluğu Nasıl Anlaşılmalı?”, in *Türkiye İnsan Hakları Hareketi Konferansı 2002 Bildirileri*. Ed. Gül Erdost, Ank, Buluş Tasarım ve Matbaacılık.
- Kalaycıoğlu, S. And Rittersberger Tılıç, H. (2003). “Yapısal Uyum Programlarıyla Ortaya Çıkan Yoksullukla Başetme Stratejileri”. *Sosyal Bilimler Derneği yayınları*, pp: 197-246.
- Kalaycıoğlu, Sibel. (2006). “Yoksullukla Başetme Stratejileri ve Yoksulluğa Etkisi” paper presented at ‘Poverty Symposium’ on 12 February 2005 ,Ankara, Association of Social Democracy, No: 7, Ankara
- Kardam, Filiz and Yüksel Alyanak, İlknur. (2002). “Kadınların Yoksullukla Başetme Yolları” in *Türkiye İnsan Hakları Hareketi Konferansı 2002 Bildirileri*. Ed. Gül Erdost, Ankara, Buluş Tasarım ve Matbaacılık Hizmetleri, pp: 209-224.
- Kardam Filiz and Gülay Toksöz. (2004). “Gender Based Discrimination at Work in Turkey: A Cross Sectional Overview” *Ankara University, SBF Review*, 59 (4) October-December.
- Karpat, Kemal, H. (1976). *The Gecekondu: Rural Migration and Urbanization*, NewYork, Cambridge University Press.
- Kartal, K. (1978). *Kentleşme ve İnsan*, TODAİE yayınları, Ankara.
- Keles, Rusen and Hirimasa, Kano. (1987). *Housing and The Urban Poor In The Middle East*, Tokyo, Institute Of Developing Economies.
- Keleş, Ruşen. (2000). *Kentleşme Politikası*. Ankara, İmge.

- Keyder, Çağlar and Buğra, Ayşe. (2003). *New Poverty and The Changing Welfare Regime of Turkey*, Report Prepared For The UNDP, Ankara, Ajans Turk A.S.
- Keyder, Çağlar. (2005). "Globalization and Social Exclusion in İstanbul", *International Journal of Regional Research*, V: 29.1, March.
- Kıray, Mübeccel. (1998). *Kentleşme Yazıları*. İstanbul, Bağlam.
- Koyuncu, Murat and Fikret Şenses. (2004). "Kısa Dönem Krizlerin Sosyoekonomik Etkileri: Türkiye, Endonezya ve Arjantin Deneyimleri", *Çalışma ve Toplum*, 3.
- Levitas, Ruth. (1999). "Defining and Measuring Social exclusion: A Critical Overview of Current Proposals", *Radical Statistic*, No: 71, summer.
- Lewis, Oscar. (1968) "The Culture of Poverty" in *Man Against Poverty World War III*, ed. Blaustein I. Arthur and R. Roger Woock, 1968, Random House, USA .
- Loury, Glenn. (1999). "Social Exclusion and Ethnic Groups: The Challenge to Economics", a paper prepared for the Annual world Bank Conference on Development Economies, Washington D.C., April, 28-30.
- Machin, S. (1998) "Intergenerational Inequality" in Persistent Poverty and Life-time Inequality: The Evidence, Proceedings from a workshop held at H M Treasury 17th and 18th November.
- Malusardi, Federico & Guisepre Occhipinti. (2003). "Informal Settlements Upgrading: The Gecekondus in Ankara", 39th. IsoCarp Congress, 2003, Cairo www.isocarp.org/Data/case_studies/374.pdf
- Marcuse, Peter, (1996). "Space and Race in the Post-Fordist City: the Outcast Ghetto and Advanced Homelessness in the United States Today" in *the Urban Poverty and the Underclass*. Ed. Enzo Mingione, USA, Blackwell, pp:176-217.
- Maxwell and Kenway, (2000) "New Thinking on Poverty in the UK: Any Lessons for the South?" 9 November.
- Mingione, Enzo. (1996). "Urban Poverty in The Advanced Industrial World" in *The Urban Poverty and The Underclass*. Ed. Enzo Mingione, USA, Blackwell, pp:3-41.
- Muffels, Ruud and Didider Fourage. (1999). "The Role of European Welfare State in Explaining Resource Deprivation" The research was carried out as part of the work of European panel Analysis Group (EPAG) on The Dynamics of Social Change in Europe: www.uvt.nl/osa/producten/wop/oswp03).
- Nayak, Pulin. (1995). "Bibliographical Review on Social Exclusion in South Asia" in *Social Exclusion and south Asia*, International Institution for Labor Studies.

-Özler, Ş. İlgü. (2000). "Politics of the Gecekondu in Turkey: The Political Choices of Urban Squatters in National Elections", *Turkish Studies*, V:1, No:2, Autumn, London.

-Paugam, Serge. (2001). "The Subjective Experience of Poverty in Europe" <http://www.brown.edu/Departments/Sociology/faculty/silver/sirs/papers/paugam-english.pdf>

-Perlman, Janice. (2007). "Marginality from Myth to Reality: The Favelas of Rio De Janeiro 1968-2005", January 20: www.megacitiesproject.org/marginality_from_myth_to_Reality.pdf

-Portes, Alejandro and Byran R. Roberts, (2005) "The Free Market City: Latin America Urbanization in The Years of The neoliberal Experiment", *Studies in Comparative International Development*, spring, V: 40, No: 1, pp: 43-82.

-Rahman, Atigur. (2004). "Rural Development is Key to Tackling Global Poverty", *Habitat Debate*, September, V: 10, No: 3.

-Rittersberger-Tılıç, H and Kalaycıoğlu,S. (1998) "The Nation State and The Individual: Alternative Strategies of Consent 'from below', *Asian and African studies*, V:7, N.1.

-Roberts, Bryan R. (2004). "From Marginality to Social Exclusion: From Laissez Faire to Pervasive Engagement", *Latin America Research Review*, v:39, N: 1

-Rodgers, Gerry. (1995). "What is Special about a Social Exclusion Approach?" in *Social Exclusion: Rhetoric, Reality and Responses*, ed. By Gerry Rodgers and Charles Gore, International Institute For Labour Studies.

-Ruhi, Saith. (2001). "Social Exclusion: The Concept and Application to Developing Countries", *Queen Elis Working Paper Series: 72*, University of Oxford.

-Runciman, W. G. (1969). *Relative Deprivation and social Justice*, London, Routledge.

-Sassen, Saskia. (1996). "Service Employment Regimes and the New Inequality" in *the Urban Poverty and the Underclass*, ed. Enzo Mingione, USA, Blackwell, pp: 64-83.

- Saunders, Peter and Kayoko Tsumari. (2002). "Poor Concepts 'Social Exclusion', Poverty and Politics of Guilt", *Policy*, Vol: 18, No: 2, winter.

- Saunders, Peter. (2003). "Can Social Exclusion Provide a New framework For Measuring Poverty", *Social Policy Research Centre Discussion paper No: 127*

-Schneider, Friedrich. (2002). "Size and Measurement of the Informal Economy in 110 Countries Around the World" a paper presented at the workshop of Australian National Tax Centre, ANU, Canberra, Australia, July 7 2002.

-Sen, Amartya. (1983). "Poor, Relatively Speaking", *Oxford Economic Papers*, New series, V: 35, No: 2, July.

- Sen, Amartya, 2000, "Social Exclusion: Concept, Application, and Scrutiny", Social Development Papers no. 1, Office of Environment and social Development, Asian Development Bank, June.

-Silver, Hilary. (1994). "Social Exclusion and Social Solidarity: Three Paradigms", *International Labour Review*, V: 133, pp: 531-578.

- Silver, Hilary. (1995). "Reconceptualizing Social Disadvantages: Three Paradigms of Social Exclusion" in *Social Exclusion: Rhetoric, Reality and Responses*, ed. By Gerry Rodgers and Charles Gore, International Institute For Labour Studies.

-Silver, Hilary. "European National Policies to Promote the Social Inclusion of Disadvantaged Groups", www.democraticdialogue.org/report2/report2a.htm

-Silver, Hillary and S. M. Miller. (2003). "Social exclusion: The European Approach to Social Disadvantage", *Indicators*, Vol: 2, No: 2, spring, pp: 1-16.

Sönmez, Mustafa, (2002). *100 Göstergede Kriz ve Yoksullaşma*. İstanbul, İletişim.

-Staveteig, Sarah and Alyssa Wington. (2000). "Racial and Ethnic Disparities: Key Findings from the National Survey of America's Families", *The Urban Institute Series B-5*, February.

-Steawart, Kitty, (2002) "Measuring Well-Being and Exclusion in Europe's Regions" Case paper: 53.

-Şen, Mustafa. (2002). "Kökene Dayalı Dayanışma: Zor İş". in *Yoksulluk Halleri-Türkiye'de Kent Yoksulluğunun Toplumsal Görünümleri*. ed.Necmi Erdoğan. İstanbul Demokrasi Kitaplığı Yayınevi, pp:164-193.

-Şen, Mustafa. (2006). "Etnik Gruplar ve Yoksulluk" paper presented at 'Poverty Symposium' on 12 February 2005 ,Ankara, Association of Social Democracy, No: 7, Ankara.

- Şenyapılı, Tansı. (1978). *Bütünleşmemiş Kentli Nüfus Sorunu*, METU, Ankara.

-Şenyapılı, Tansı. (2000). "Enformal Sektor: Devingenlikten Duraganliga/Gecekondulasmadan Apartmanlasmaya" in *Yoksulluk*, İstanbul, TESEV, pp:161-180.

-Şenyapılı, Tansı. (2004). "Charting The Voyage Of Squatter Housing In Urban Spatial 'Quadrupad'", *European Journal Of Turkish Studies*, no:1.

-Tekeli, İlhan. (2000). "Kent Yoksulluğu ve Modernitenin Bu Soruya Yaklaşım Seçenekleri Üzerine", in *Yosulluk*. İstanbul, Türkiye Ekonomik ve Sosyal Etüdler Vakfi, pp:139-161.

- Tok, Evren. (2005). "Rethinking Squatters (Gecekondus) as a New State Space: Informal Mechanism of Maintaining Social Cohesion in Turkey's Neo-liberal Era" paper prepared for the conference "Towards a Political Economy of Scale", February 3-5 2005, York University, Toronto, ON.
- Townsend, P. (1985). "A Sociological Approach to the Measurement of Poverty-A Rejoinder to Professor Amartya Sen" *Oxford Economic Papers*, New Series, V: 37, No: 4, December.
- Townsend, P and Gordon, D. (2000). "Conclusion" in *Breadline Europe* ed. By Gordon, D and Townsend, P, Great Britain, Policy Press.
- Wacquant, Loic. (1999). "Urban Marginality in the Coming Millennium", *Urban Studies*, Vol: 36, No: 10, pp: 1639-1647.
- Wilson, William Julius. (1991). "Another Look at Truly Disadvantaged", *Political Science Quarterly*, V: 106, No: 4 (Winter, 1991-1992), pp: 639-656
- Wilson, W J, (1993) "New Poverty and the Problem of Race", The Tanner Lectures on Human Values, delivered at University of Michigan, October 22 and 23, 1993: <http://www.tannerlectures.utah.edu/lectures/Wilson95.pdf>.
- Yılmaz, Bediz. (2003). "Coping with the Metropolis: Kurdish Immigrants Living in an Inner-City Slum of Istanbul", a paper presented at International Conference on IDPs. Researching Internal Displacement. State of the Art 7-8 February, Trondheim-Norway
- Yılmaz Bediz. (2006). "Yakındaki Uzak: İstanbul'un Bir Kentiçi Mahallesinde Sosyal Dışlanma ve Mekansal Sürgün" in *Türkiye'de Büyük kentlerin Gecekondu ve Çöküntü Mahallelerinde Yaşanan Yoksulluk ve Sosyal Dışlanma* ed. Adaman, Fikret and Çağlar Keyder, Report Prepared for European Commission on Work, Social Issues and Equality Of Opportunities available:
- Yumuşak, I, G. and Bilen, M. (2000). "Gelir Dağılımı- Beseri Sermaye İlişkisi ve Türkiye Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme", *Kocaeli Uni. Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, n:1,pp:77-96.
- Yükseker, Deniz, 2006 "Diyarbakır'da Yerinden Edilme Sorunu: Geri Dönüş, Kentsel Sorunlar ve Tazminat Yasası Uygulamaları in Zorunlu Göç İle Yüzleşmek: Türkiye'de Zorunlu Göç Sonrası Vatandaşlığın İnşası, Tesev, İstanbul.
- Göç-Der (Göç Edenler Sosyal Yardımlaşma ve Kültür Derneği) 2002 "Zorunlu Göç Araştırma Raporu, 1999-2001.
- ODTÜ. (1999). Kentsel Politika Planlaması ve Yerel Yönetimler Ana Bilim Dalı. Kentsel Yoksulluk ve Geçinme Stratejileri: Ankara Örneği. (1999 Yılı Studyo Çalışması) Ankara, ODTÜ Mimarlık Fakültesi Basım İşleri.

-TESEV (2006), "Zorunlu Göç" ile Yüzleşmek: Türkiye'de Yerinden Edilme Sonrası Vatandaşlığın İnşası, Yayına hazırlayanlar: Derya Demirer ve Mert Kayhan, İstanbul, Sena ofset.

-Global IDP (2002) "Profile of Internal Displacement: Turkey" Norwegian Refugee Council/ Global IDP Project, Geneva, available: www.idpproject.org.

-Human Rights Watch. (2002). "Displaced and Disregarded: Turkey's Failing Village Return Programme", V:14, N: 7, October.

-ILO. (2001). Turkey: Working Street Children in Three Metropolitan Cities: A rapid Assesments, Switzerland, ILO Publications.

Appendix A-1 Respondents' migration patterns, job statuses and social demographic characteristics.

	1 st. interview	2nd. interview	3rd. interview	4 th interview	5 th. interview	6 th. interview	7 th. interview
Date of interview	13 Febr. 2007	14 febr. 2007	14 febr. 2007	15 Febr 2007	16 Febr. 2007	16 febr. 2007	19 febr. 2007
Place of interview	Ymahalle-Ergazi district	Ymahalle-Ergazi district	Ymahalle-Ergazi district	Ymahalle-Mehmet Akif Ersoy distr.	Altındağ-yıldırım bayezit district	Altındağ-yıldırım Bayezit distr.	Altındağ-Yıldırım bayezit distr.
Sex of person interviewed	Woman, spouse of householdhead	Woman, spouse of head of households	man(head of households)	Man(head of households)	woman (spouse of head of households)	man(head of households)	man(head of households)
Age of person interviewed	40	34	43	34	39	26	35
Ethnic identity of person int.	kurdish	Turkish	Turkish	Turkish	Turkish	Kurdish	Kurdish
Educational level of person int.	illiterate	primary school	primary school	primary school	primary school	High school drop-out	primary school
Date, reason, type and direction of migration	1993, economic, family migr from Mardin	2002 economic, family migr from Bolu	1991, family problem, fami,ly migr, from a village of Ankara	2002, economic, family migr. From Kırıkkale	1995, health based, fami,l migr from Tokat	2006, health based, fam,ly migr. From Siirt	2004, economic, family migr. From Adana
Job of head of household	Construction worker	Seasonal, causal worker		Seasonal, causal worker	Cleaning worker in hospital	unemployed	garbage collector
Housing type and situation of ownership	Squatter, tenant	squatter, tenant	Old village type house, not paying rent	squatter, tenant	squatter, tenant	squatter, tenant	squatter, tenant
Social and health insurance	Green Card	No	no	Green Card	SSK	Green Card	Green card

Appendix A-2- Respondents' migration patterns, job statuses and social demographic characteristics.

8th. Interview	9th. Interview	10th. Interview	11th. Interview	12th. Interview	13th. Interview	14th. Interview	15th. Interview
23.Febr.07	25.Febr.07	1.March.07	3.Apr.07	3.Apr.07	6.Apr.07	9.Apr.07	12.Apr.07
Altındağ-Yenidoğan distr.	Mamak-Türközü distr.	Mamak/Çankaya-Bademlidere distr.	Altındağ-Doğantepe distr.	Altındağ-doğantepe distr.	Altındağ-İskitler distr.	Mamak-Kayaş distr.	Mamak-Türközü distr.
Woman (head of households)	man(head of households)	man(head of households)	woman (spouse of head of households)	woman (spouse of head of households)	man(head of households)	woman (spouse of head of households)	man(head of households)
36	33	43	25	35	35	35	35
Turkish	Kurdish	Kurdish	Turkish	Turkish	Kurdish	Turkish	Kurdish
primary school	primary school	high school	primary school	primary school	primary school drop-out	primary school	primary school
1991, marriage, individual, migration from Tokat	2001, economic, family migr from Adana	2001, economic, family migr from Adana	1998, magr by marriage, from Kastamonu	1992, economic, family migr. From Çankırı	2003, economic, family migr from Iğdır	1991, economic, family migr from Kayseri	2002, economic, family migr. From Hakkari
housewife	garbage collector	garbage collector	resaturant worker	oil-station worker	garbage collector	hospital worker	garbage collector
apartment, tenant	squatter, tenant	squatter, tenant	squatter, tenant	squatter, tenant	squatter, tenant	apartment, tenant	squatter, tenant
SSK	Green Card	Green Card	SSK	SSK	Green Card	SSK	Green Card

APPENDIX B: Respondents' Position of Taking Institutional Helps

Respondent's place of residence and ethnicity	Name of Institutions and kind of helps				
	Ankara Metropolitan Municipality	Solidarity Fund	Deniz Feneri	Other	
Altındağ-Turk	Fuel + Food	Meal	X*	X	
Altındağ-Kurd	X	X	X	Fuel from brother	
Altındağ-Turk	Fuel +Food	X	X	Clothes from Altındağ Mn.	
Altındağ-Turk	Fuel + Food	Scholarship	X	X	
Altındağ-Turk	Fuel +Food	X	X	X	
Altındağ-Kurd	Fuel + Food	Meal	X	X	
Altındağ-Kurd	Fuel + Food	Scholarship + Meal	X	X	
Yenimahalle- Kurd	Fuel + Food	X	X	Food from village	
Yenimahalle- Turk	Fuel + Food	X	X	X	
Yenimahalle- Turk	Fuel + Food	X	X	X	
Yenimahalle- Turk	Fuel + Food	Scholarship and a sheep for a sacrifice	Furniture food stationery	+	X
Mamak-Kurd	Fuel + Food	X	X	X	
Mamak- Kurd	Fuel + Food	Scholarship	Food furniture	+	X
Mamak-Kurd	Fuel + Food	Scholarship	Food clothing	+	X
Mamak- Turk	X	X		Food from village	

* Not receiving help

APPENDIX C: Questionnaire form in Turkish

**ANKARA'DA Kİ GECEKONDULULARIN KENT
YOKSULLUĐU
DENEYİMLERİ
ARAŐTIRMASI GÖRÜŐME FORMU**

Görüşülen kiři no:

Hane no:

İsim:

Adres:

Tarih:

Başlangıç ve bitiş saati

Sosyal ve demografik özellikler: Tablo 1

Hane satır no	Hane halkı Listesi	Hanereisine yakınlık derecesi	Cinsiyet	Yaş	Doğum Yeri	
	Lütfen bana hanereisinden başlayarak bu evde yaşayanların hane reisine yakınlıklarına göre söylemişsiniz hanereisinin nesi olur? Kod listesini kullanın erkek mi, kadın mı? 1.kadın 2. erkek kaç yaşında? (95 yaşından büyükse 95 yazılacak)	Hangi ilde doğdunuz? (ilin trafik kodunu yazın, yurtdışı için 90 yazın)	İlin neresinde doğdunuz 1.il merkezi 2.ilçe merk. 3.bucak/köy 4.yurtdışı
01	02	03	04	05	06	07
01			1 2			1 2 3 4
02			1 2			1 2 3 4
03			1 2			1 2 3 4
04			1 2			1 2 3 4
05			1 2			1 2 3 4
06			1 2			1 2 3 4
07			1 2			1 2 3 4
08			1 2			1 2 3 4
09			1 2			1 2 3 4
10			1 2			1 2 3 4

Hanehalkı reisine yakınlık kodları:

01-Hane reisi	08-Kardeşi	15-Büyükannesi/babası
02- Karısı/kocas	09-Kardeşinin eşi	16-Eşinin b.annesi/babası
03-Oğlu/kızı	10- Kardeşinin çocuğu	17-Eşinin kardeşi
04-Gelini/damadı	11-Halası/amcası	18-Eşinin kardeşinin eşi
05-Torunu	12-Teyzesi/dayısı	19-Eşinin kardeşinin çocuğ
06-Annesi/babası	13-Üvey çocuğu	20-Eşinin halası/amcası
07-Kayınpederi/validesi	14-Kuzeni	21-Eşinin teyzesi/dayısı
22-ikincieşi	23-Kuması	24-akrabası değil
		98- bilmiyor

TABLE 2

Okuryazarlık ve öğrenim durumu (6 yaş +)					Bir işte çalışma durumu				*
	Okuma yazma biliyormu 01-evet 02-hayır 03-	Hiç okula gittimi 01evet 02hayır 03bilmiyor	Gittiği en son okul hangisi? Bu okulda en son kaçınıcı sınıfı tamamladı? (Kodlistesi)	Bu okuldaki diplomasını aldı mı 01- evet 02- hayır 03bilmiyor	Bir işte çalışıyor mu (hayır ise 14 e geç) 01- evet 02- hhayır	Çalışıyor olsa tam olarak ne iş yapıyor? ?	Çalışılan işin statüsü	Çalışma nedeni	1- var (15. tabloyu kullan) 2- yok
0	7	8	9A 9B	10	11	12	13	14	
0	1 2 8	1 2 8		1 2 8	1 2				
0	1 2 8	1 2 8		1 2 8	1 2				
0	1 2 8	1 2 8		1 2 8	1 2				
0	1 2 8	1 2 8		1 2 8	1 2				
0	1 2 8	1 2 8		1 2 8	1 2				
0	1 2 8	1 2 8		1 2 8	1 2				
0	1 2 8	1 2 8		1 2 8	1 2				
0	1 2 8	1 2 8		1 2 8	1 2				
0	1 2 8	1 2 8		1 2 8	1 2				
0	1 2 8	1 2 8		1 2 8	1 2				
1	1 2 8	1 2 8		1 2 8	1 2				

*sosyal güvence durumu

9A Okul Kodları	9B Sınıf Kodları
1 ilkokul	
2ortaokul	00 Bir yıldan az/hazırl
3İlköğretim	66 Lisansüstü
4lise	98 Bilmiyor
5Üniversite	
6Lisansüstü	
7Bilmiyor	

13-Çalışılan işin statüsü	
01 çalışan maaşlı	06-Kendi hesabına profes.
02 Çalışan- ücretli	07-Çiftçi
03- işveren	08-Marjinal işler
04-ücretli aile işçisi	09-Günlük/mevsimlik İşçi
05-kendi hesabına esnaf/zanaatkar	10-Diğer

14 Çalışmama Nedeni

01 İşsiz, iş arıyor	05 Günlük/ mevsimlik İşçi
02 Ev kadını/ kızı	06 Çalışamaz Halde
03 Öğrenci	07 İrad Sahibi
04 Emekli	08 Diğer

15 Sosyal Sigorta Durumu

01 SSK	05 Sigortasız
02 Bağ-Kur	06 Yeşil kart
03 Emekli Sand.	07

I-Göç Statüsü

1-Doğdunuz zamandan başlayarak yaşadığınız göçleri anlatırmısınız?

1.göç	Nereden	Nereye	Tarih	Neden	Karar şekli (kişisel, aile, yada topluluk kararı)	Göç edilen yerde kaç yıl kalındı
Son göç		Ankara				

3-Neden Ankara'yı seçtiniz? (Burada daha önce oturan aile, akraba yada hemşerileriniz var mıydı ve göç etmeniz de onların bir etkisi oldu mu?)

4-Ankara'ya gelişinizden bu yana kaç kez semt, mahalle yada ev değişikliği yaptınız, neden?

5-Göç ettiğiniz ilk yıllarda ne tür sorunlarınız oldu? (iş ve ev bulma, parasızlık, çevreye yabancıklık, yalnızlık v.s)

6-Eğer olduysa bunları nasıl giderdiniz?

7-Şu an ne tür sorunlar yaşıyorsunuz? (işsizlik, geçinme sorunu, ev, komşular yada mahalle ile ilgili sıkıntılar)

II-Physical Dimension (Mekan, mahalle, konut, alt yapı hizmetleri)

8-Kaç yıldır bu evde oturuyorsunuz?

9-Oturduğunuz ev size mi ait, kiracı mısınız yada ücretsiz olarak mı oturuyorsunuz? (akraba yada başka bir yakının evinde ücretsiz oturma)

10-Oturduğunuz evin tipi nedir (apartman, gecekondü, baraka vb.)

11-Ev kaç odalı? (ayrı mutfak, banyo ve tuvalet var mı).

12-Tuvalet evin içindemi (kanalizasyona bağılımı) ?

13-Evinizin su, elektrik ve telefon abonelikleri var mı?

14-Bunlar sadece size mi ait yoksa ortak kullanım var mı?

15-Ortak kullanım varsa neden ve ne zamandan beri var?

16-Nasıl ısınyorsunuz (odun, kömür v.s yardımcı alıyormu) ?

17-Ortalama aylık elektrik, su ve telefon masraflarınız ne kadar?

18-Oturduğunuz evden memnun musunuz?

19-Eğer değilse neden?

20-Bu mahalleyi, özelliklede sizin oturduğunuz yerde oturan kişileri iş, gelir ve eğitim durumlarına bakarak, nasıl tanımlarsınız ?

21-Diğer mahalle ve semtlerle karşılaştırırsanız hangi açılardan daha iyi yada kötü diyebilirsiniz?

22-Bu mahallede oturmaktan memnun musunuz ?

23-Değilseniz neden (suç oranındaki yükseklik, güvensizlik, altyapı hizmetlerindeki yetersizlikler, ulaşım sorunu, çevre sorunları, sosyal hizmetlere ulaşmada güçlükler).

24-Belediyenin bu mahalleye sağladığı hizmetler hakkında ne düşünüyorsunuz? (memnuniyet ve şikayetler)

25-Nasıl bir mahallede yaşamak isterdiniz?

26-Sizce kent merkezi neresidir?

27-Ne kadar sıklıkta, ne için ve nasıl gidirsiniz?

28-Bu mahallenin Ankara'nın bir parçası olduğunu düşünüyor musunuz?

29-Bu kentteki yaşam biçimine alıştığınızı yada mutlu olduğunuzu söyleyebilir misiniz ?

30-Ankara'da kalarak daha mutlu ve refah bir hayat yaşayabileceğinize inanıyor musunuz ?

31-Başka bir şehre (memleket de dahil) göç etmeyi düşünürmüsünüz?

Neden?

32-Ankara'ya yerleştikten sonra ihtiyaçlarınıza (iş, para, eğitim, sağlık, güvenlik, daha iyi bir yaşam v.s.) cevap bulabildinizmi?

33-Evet yada hayırsa hangilerine?

34-Şehir ve köy yaşamını karşılaştırırsanız hangisini neden tercih edersiniz?

III-Economic Dimension (İş, meslek)

35- Hayatınız boyunca ne tür işlerde çalıştınız? (iş tarihçesi göç öncesi dönemde kapsayacak şekilde sorulacak. Kadınlara fason işler, ev temizliği ve evde gelir getiren işler, çocuklara da sokak satıcılığı v.b ve düzenli bir işte çalışıp çalışmadığı sorulacak)

İşin adı	İşyerinin türü (kamu, özel)	İşe başlama tarihi	Ne kadar çalıştı	Günlük çalışma saati	İşe nasıl alındı	Sosyal güvence durumu	Ayrılma nedeni	İşsiz kalma süresi
Son iş								

(eğer son satırda bir iş sahibi olduğu yazıyorsa)

36-Yaptığınız işten ve elde ettiğiniz gelirden memnun musunuz?

37-Evet yada hayırsa neden?

38-Kentte ki işlerin size uygunluğu hakkında ne düşünüyorsunuz ?

39-Sizce aileniz ve çevrenizdeki insanlar yaptığınız iş ve geliriniz hakkında ne düşünüyor?

(eğer son satırda işsiz olduğu yazıyorsa)

40-İş arıyor musunuz?

41-Eğer arıyorsanız, iş bulmak için neler yapıyorsunuz?

42-İş bulabileceğinizi düşünüyor musunuz?

43-Eğer aramıyorsa, neden?

44-Sizce işsizliğin en önemli nedeni nedir?

(Gelir, mal mülk edinme, tüketim)

45-Aylık geliriniz aşağı yukarı ne kadar?

46-Aylık gelirinizi neler oluşturuyor? (maaş (asgari ücret, diğer aile üyelerinin getirileri, kira, toprak geliri, yardım, aylık, birikim, borç v.b)

47-Sizce elde ettiğiniz gelir geçinmeniz için yeterlimi?

48-Değilse ne kadar olmalıydı?

49-Geçinmenize yardımcı olan kurum, kuruluşlar ve kişiler (akraba, tanıdık) varmı?

50-Varsa kimler nasıl yardımcı oluyor ve bu yardımları ne kadar zamanda (hafta, ay yada yıl) bir alıyorsunuz?

51-Ankara'ya göç ettiğinizden beri herhangi bir mal mülk edindinizmi?

52-Evetse, ne tür (tarla, tapulu arsa, ev, ev enkazı, araba, ev eşyası v.s)

53-Bunları nasıl edindiniz? (ortaklık, miras v.s.)

54-Göç etmeden önce ne yukarıda saydığım yada buna benzer küçük ve büyükbaş hayvan, traktör, kamyon v.b. mal varlıklarına sahipmiydiniz?

55-Evetse, bunlar sadece size mi aitti yoksa aile yada başka tür bir ortaklık var mıydı?

56-Bu mallar şimdi ne durumda?

57-Göç etmeden önce herhangi bir maddi birikiminiz var mıydı?

58-Şu an herhangi bir maddi birikiminiz varmı yada tasarruf yapabiliyor musunuz?

59-Şu an herhangi bir borcunuz varmı?

60-Varsa ne zaman, nereden ve ne amaçla aldınız?

61-Aylık giderlerinizi neler oluşturuyor? (kira, faturalar, yakıt, yiyecek, giyecek, ulaşım, eğitim masrafı, sağlık , sosyal etkinlik, tatil, taksit, temizlik malzemeleri v.s)

62-Bunlar içinde sizin için en önemlileri hangileridir? (hangisini yada hangilerini kesinlikle kısıtlayamazsınız)

63-Şu anda en acil ihtiyacınız nedir? (ev, iş, nakit para, yakıt, yiyecek, giyecek v.s)

64-Göç etmeden önceki geçinme durumunuzu şimdi ile karşılaştırırsanız, sizce göç etmeniz bu durumunuzu iyileştirdi mi yoksa kötüleştirdi mi?

65-Şu anki maddi durumunuzu ve geçinme koşullarınızı 5 yıl öncesi ile karşılaştırırsanız, sizce bir iyileşmemi yoksa kötüleşmemi var?

66-Sizce yoksulluk nedir ve kimler yoksuldur?

- 67-Kendinizi yoksul olarak hissediyor musunuz?
- 68-Eğer öyleyse sizce bu ne zaman gerçekleşti?
- 69-Sizce yoksulluk neden olur?
- 70-İnsan yoksulluktan kurtulmak için neler yapmalıdır?

IV-Dimension of human capital

(sağlık)

- 71-Ailede ciddi (kronik) rahatsızlığı olan kimse (ler) varmı?
- 72-Bu kişilerin sağlık güvencesi varmı?
- 73-Sağlık güvencesi olanlar, sağlık hizmetlerinden düzenli olarak yararlanabiliyor mu?
- 74-Hayır, neden? (bu hizmete nasıl ulaşacağını bilmiyor, yararlı olacağına inanmıyor, sağlığı önemsemiyor, dilsel problemler v.s.)
- 75-Sağlık hizmetlerinden yararlananlar, bunlardan memnun mu?
- 76-Mahallenizde yada yakınlarında kolayca ulaşabileceğiniz bir sağlık ocağı varmı?
- 77-Göç etmeden önce de sağlık güvenceniz varmıydı?
- 78-Aile üyelerinin ne tür problemleri olurdu?
- 79-Tedavi için nereye, nasıl giderdiniz?
- 80-Hangi zorluklarla karşılaştınız?
- 81-Sizce ailenizde göç sonrası yaşanan sağlık problemlerinin nedeni nedir?
- 82-Sizce çalışma koşullarınızın sağlığınıza herhangi bir zararı varmı?
- 83-Varsa, bundan korunmak yada bunları değiştirmek için neler yapıyorsunuz?
- 84-Sizce oturduğunuz mahallenin veya evin sağlığınıza açısından olumsuz etkisi olabilir mi?
- 85-Sizce bir insanın sağlıklı olması neye bağlıdır?

Beslenme

- 86-Evde ne kadar sıklıkta et tüketiliyor?

87-Evde ne kadar sıklıkta süt ve süt ürünleri tüketiliyor?

88-Almak isteyip de alamadığınız yada tüketemediğiniz besinler nelerdir?

(Eğitim)

89-Eğitim durumunuzdan memnun musunuz?

90-Değilse, eğitim durumunuzun nasıl olmasını isterdiniz?

91-Neden?

92-Göçten önce okula devam edip sonrasında bırakan varmı?

93-Varsa, neden? (ekonomik sorunlar, dil ve uyum sorunu, güvensizlik, okulun uzak olması, eğitimin yararına inanmama v.s)

94-İyi ve rahat bir gelecek için çocuklarınızın eğitimlerine devam etmelerini gerekli görüyor musunuz?

95-Eğer evetse, bunu sağlamak için neler yapıyorsunuz? (Onların okuldaki durumlarıyla nasıl ilgileniyorsunuz?)

96-Devletin eğitim konusunda görevini tam olarak yerine getirdiğini düşünüyor musunuz? Hayırsa neden?

V-Dimension of Social Capital

Identity, culture

97-Size kim derler (Türtk, Türkmen, Yörük, Arap, Çerkez, Laz, Kürt, Alevi, Dadaş, Doğulu v.b.)

98-Ankara' ya göç ettiğinizden beri siz yada ailenizden birisi bu sebeple herhangi bir sorun yaşadımı?

99-Anadiliniz nedir?

100-Anadiliniz dışında başka hangi dilleri konuşabiliyorsunuz?

101-Ailenizdeki diğer bireylerin adilleri nedir?

102-Ailede Türkçe bilmeyen varmı?

103-Evde, evin dışında yada işte hangi dilleri konuşuyorsunuz.

104-Buralarda dil ile ilgili bir problem yaşadınızımı, yaşıyormusunuz?

105-En çok ne zaman ve nerede dil ile ilgili problemler yaşıyorsunuz?

106-Düğün, bayram gibi geleneksel kutlama günlerinizi nerede ve nasıl geçiriyorsunuz?

VI-Sosyal İlişki Ağları/ Dayanışma

107-Gününüzü genel olarak nasıl geçiriyorsunuz ?

108-Ankara'ya göç etmeden önce yaşadığınız yerde bir gününüzü nasıl geçiriyordunuz ?

109-Oturduğunuz mahallenin içinde yada dışında en çok kimlerle görüşürsünüz?

110-Bu kişilerle hangi sıklıkta ve ne için bir araya gelirsiniz?

111-Evde herhangi bir sorun olsa bunu nasıl hallediyorsunuz?

112-Sizce evde yaşadığınız sorunların temeli nedir?

113-Sizce yaşadığınız sorunlar aile ilişkilerinizi nasıl etkiliyor ?

114-Akrabalarınız ve hemşerilerinizle aynı mahallede (semtte yada şehirde) oturmak size ne anlam ifade ediyor ?

115-Onlarla olan ilişkilerinizde zaman içinde gerçekleşen bir değişim varmı ? (zayıfladığını yada güçlendiğini düşünüyor musunuz ?)

116-Onlarla herhangi bir problem yaşadınız mı, neden ?

117-Herhangi bir şeye ihtiyacınız olsa ilk kime gider ve yardım istersiniz?

118-Boş vakitlerinizde neler yapıyorsunuz? (komşu ve akraba gezmesi, alışveriş, eğlence v.s.)

119-Bunların hiçbirini yapmıyorsa neden?

120-Dini toplantı, okul-aile birliği çalışmaları yada benzeri aktivitelere katılıyorsunuz?

121-Kendinizi toplum içinde nerede görüyorsunuz? (topluma faydalı olabildiğini yada toplumun bir parçası olduğunu düşünüyor mu)

122-Siz ve ailenizin diğer üyeleri en çok hangi t.v. programlarını izlersiniz?

VII-Political Dimension

123-Bu mahallenin muhtarlığında kaydınız varmı ? Yoksa neden ?

124-Sizin yada ailenizden birinin herhangi bir vakıf yada derneğe üyeliği varmı ?

125-Varsa hangisine ve ne zamandan beri ?

126-Herhangi bir partiyle ilişkiniz varmı ?

127-Varsa hangisi ile ne zamandan beri?

128-En son genel ve yerel seçimlerde oy kullandınız mı ? Hayırsa neden ?

129-Şimdi seçim olsa tekrar aynı partiye oy verirmisiniz ?

130-En çok güvendiğiniz kurum hangisidir? (ordu, hükümet, polis, belediyeler, sivil toplum kuruluşları, dini kurumlar v.s)

131-Sizce bu ülkede yaşayan insanların en ortak sorunu ne (ler) dir?

132-Bunları çözmek için ne yapmak gereklidir?

133-Sizce devletin en öncelikli sorumlulukları nelerdir ?

134-Sizce vatandaş nedir?

135-Kendinizi bu ülkenin vatandaşı olarak hissediyormusunuz?

136-Hayırsa neden?

Siz kendiniz, aileniz ve en yakınlarınız için nasıl bir toplumda yaşamak isterdiniz?

Gelecekle ilgili beklentileriniz nelerdir?

APPENDIX D:Questionnaire form in English

THE RESEARCH OF EXPERIENCES ABOUT CITY DESTITUTION OF

PEOPLE WHO LIVE IN SQUATTERS IN ANKARA

INTERVIEW FORM

The number of interviewed person:

House number:

Name:

Adress:

Date:

Beginning and ending time:

TABLE1: SOCIAL AND DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

House number	Household list	Relation to the head of household	Gender	Age	Birth place	
	Starting from the head of household, name the people living in this house in respect to their relationship to the head of household's relation to the head of household Use the code list below	Is a man or woman? 1.women 2. man	How old is? (if s/he is over than 95 write 95)	Where were born? (write the traffic code of the city, for out of Turkey write 90)	In which part of the city was born? 1.city 2.borough 3.village 4.out of Turkey
01	02	03	04	05	06	07
01			1 2			1 2 3 4
02			1 2			1 2 3 4
03			1 2			1 2 3 4
04			1 2			1 2 3 4
05			1 2			1 2 3 4
06			1 2			1 2 3 4
07			1 2			1 2 3 4
08			1 2			1 2 3 4
09			1 2			1 2 3 4
10			1 2			1 2 3 4

The code list of the relation to the head of household

01-Himself/Herself

02-Wife/Husband of spouse

03-Son/Daughter spouse

04-Son/Daughter in law of spouse

05-Grand son/daughter of spouse

06-Mother/Father

(from the father's side)

07-Mother/Father in law (from the mother's side)

22-Second wife

08-Brother/Sister

09-Brother/Sister in law

10- Brother /sister's child

11-Aunt/Uncle (from the father's side)

12-Aunt/uncle (from the mother's side)

13-Step child

14-Cousin

23-Fellow wife

24-Not relative

15-Grand mother/father

16-Grand mother/father

17-Sister/brother of

18-Sister/brother in law

19-Sister/brother's child

20-Aunt/uncle of spouse

21-Aunt/uncle of spouse

98- Does not know

TABLE 2

House number	Education Level (age 6 +)				The situation of employment				*
	Does knows reading-writing?	Has ever gone to school?	Up to what level has gone to school? Up to which class has completed at the school? (see code list)	Did graduate from that school? Did he get the diploma?	Is working? (if not go to 14)	If yes, what kind of work is doing?	What is the status of the job?	The reason for not working	
	01-yes 02-no 03-does not know	01-yes 02-no 03-does not know		01-yes 02-no 03-does not know	01-yes 02-no				1 5
01	7	8	9A 9B	10	11	12	13	14	
01	1 2 8	1 2 8		1 2 8	1 2				
02	1 2 8	1 2 8		1 2 8	1 2				
03	1 2 8	1 2 8		1 2 8	1 2				
04	1 2 8	1 2 8		1 2 8	1 2				
05	1 2 8	1 2 8		1 2 8	1 2				
06	1 2 8	1 2 8		1 2 8	1 2				
07	1 2 8	1 2 8		1 2 8	1 2				
08	1 2 8	1 2 8		1 2 8	1 2				
09	1 2 8	1 2 8		1 2 8	1 2				
10	1 2 8	1 2 8		1 2 8	1 2				

* Social insurance

9A The codes of school	9B Codes of class	13-The situation of employment
1 Elementary school 2 Junior high school 3 Primary education 4 Senior high school 5 University 6 Graduate 7 Does not know	00 Less than 1 year/ 66 Graduate 98 Does not know	01 Salary worker 02 Paid worker 03- Employer 04-Paid house worker 05-Tradesman/Shopkeeper 06-Professional for himself 07-Farmer 08-Marginal works 09-Daily/seasonal worker 10-Others

14 The reason for not working

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 01 Unemployed/looks for a work | 05 Daily/Seasonal worker |
| 02 Housewife/woman | 06 Unable to work |
| 03 Student | 07 İrad Sahibi |
| 04 Retired | 08 Others |

15 Social insurance situation

- | | |
|-----------------|---------------|
| 01 SSK | 05 Uncovered |
| 02 Bağ-Kur | 06 Green card |
| 03 Emekli Sand. | 07 |

I-Immigration Status

1-Explain the immigrations you have experienced, since you were born.

1.immigrati on	from where	To where	date	reason	the way of decision (personal, family, assembled decision)	or	the length of immigrati on
Last immigratio n		Ankara					

3-Why did you choose Ankara? (Have your relatives been living here before? Was there any family member, relative or fellow countryman who has been living here? Had they any influence on you for immigration?)

4-Since you came to Ankara, how many times have you changed your district or house, why?

5-In the beginning of the immigration, what kind of problems did you have? (finding a job and house, lack of money, unfamiliarity to the environment, etc.)

6-If you had any problems, how did you eliminate them?

7-What kind of problems do you have, recently? (unemployment, subsistence problems, house, neighborhood or district problems)

II-Physical Dimension (Locality, district, housing, infra-structure services)

8-How long have you been living in this house?

9-Is the house that you live in belong to you, are you tenant or are you living in that house without paying? (living in a relative's house without paying)

10-What kind of house are you living in? (apartment building, **squatter**, hut, etc.)

11-How money rooms are there in the house? (Are there any separated kitchen, bathroom and washroom?).

12- Is the washroom inside the house? (Is it connected to the drainage?)

13-Does your house has subscription for the water, electricity and telephone?

14-Are they only belong to you or are you sharing them with others?

15-If you share them with others, why and for how long you have been saharing with them?

16-How do you heat the house? (Does the family has support for wood, coal, etc.?)

17-What is the average monthly expenses for electricity, water and telephone?

18-Are you satisfied with the house that you live in?

19-If not, why?

20-How do you define this district, especially your close neighborhood, according to work, income and education level distribution?

21-If you compare your district with others, in what aspects would you say better or worse?

22-Are you pleased to live in this district?

23-If not, why? (high level of crime ratio, disbelief, lack of infra-structure services, transportation problems, environmental problems, difficulties for reaching the social services)

24-What do you think of the municipality's provided services? (satisfaction and complaints)

25-What kind of district you would like to live in?

26-Where is the downtown according to you?

27-How often, why and how do you go there?

28-Do you think this district is a part of the Ankara?

29-Can you tell that you got used to live here or you are happy?

30-Do you believe that you will be happy and in comfort by living in Ankara?

31-Do you think to immigrate in another city (including your hometown)? Why?

32-After settling down here, have you been able to meet your needs? (work, money, education, health, safety, a better life)

33-If yes or no, which of them?

34-If you compare city and village life, which of them would you prefer and why?

III-Economic Dimension (Work, Profession)

35- What kind of work have you worked on, up to now? (work history will be asked including the previous term of immigration) The questions to the women will

include; **fason** works, cleaning the house and home made works that provide income, the questions to the children will include; street vender, etc. and whether s/he works in a regular work or not)

Work s title	Title of the work place (public, private)	Starting day in the work	How long has been worked?	Daily worki ng hours	How was accepted to the work?	Social insuranc e situation	Reason for leaving the work	Duration of unemplo yment
Last wor k								

(if it is written at the last line that s/he is working at the moment)

36-Are you happy about the work you are doing and your income level?

37-If yes or no, why?

38-What do you think of the works in the city in respect to their suitability to you?

39-According to you, what are your family and people around you thinking about your work and income level?

(if it is written at the last line that s/he is not working at the moment)

40-Are you looking for a job?

41-If yes, what are you doing for this purpose?

42-Do you think you can find a job?

43-If s/he is not looking for a job, why?

44-According to you, what is the most important factor for the unemployment?

(Income, having properties, consumption)

45-What is your income level for a month?

46-What kind of earnings constitute your monthly income? (salary, minimum salary, earnings of other family members, rental revenues, farm earnings, economic support, savings, owed money, etc.)

- 47-Do you think your income is enough for the subsistence?
- 48-If not, how much would it be?
- 49-Are there any foundations or people that helps you to support your life? (relatives, friends)
- 50-If yes, who are they and how often do you get those supports? (weekly, monthly or yearly)
- 51-Have you got any properties since you have immigrated to Ankara?
- 52-If yes, whit kind of properties were they ? (field, registered land, house, house debris, house ware, etc.)
- 53-How did you acquire them? (partnership, inheritance, etc.)
- 54-Before you immigrated, did you have any properties that I mentioned earlier or other properties such as; cows, sheeps, tractor, truck, etc.)
- 55-If yes, did they only belong to you or were there any partnership like family or else?
- 56-What are the conditions of these properties?
- 57-Did you have any savings before you immigrated?
- 58-Do you have any savings or can you make any savings, at the moment?
- 59-Are you indebted to someone?
- 60-If yes, when, from where or who and why did you get that debit?
- 61-What are your monthly expenses? (rental, bills, wood or coal, food, clothes, transportation, education, health, social activities, holiday, instalment, cleaning articles, etc.)
- 62-What are the most important ones according to you? (which of them are indispensable?)
- 63-What is your most immediate need? (house, work, cash money, wood or coal, food, clothes, etc.)
- 64-If you compare your subsistence situation regarding to before and after immigration, do you think you are improved or got worsen?
- 65-If you compare your present economic level and subsistence conditions with 5 years earlier, do you think there is an improvement or deterioration?
- 66-According to you, what is the "destitution" and who are "destitute"?

67-Do you feel that you are destitute?

68-If yes, how long have you been destitute?

69-What do you think the reason for destitute?

70-What a person should do to avoid destitution?

IV-Dimension of human capital

(health)

71-Is there any people in your family who has a serious (chronic) illness?

72-Do they have social insurance?

73-Can people who have social insurance use the health services sufficiently?

74-If not, why? (does not know how to reach those services, does not believe to be able to get benefit, does not care his/her health situation, language problems, etc.)

75-Those who use health services, are they satisfied?

76-Is there any health center in your neighborhood?

77-Did you have social insurance before you immigrated?

78-What kind of problems did family members have?

79-Where and how did you go for the treatment?

80-What kind of difficulties have you faced with?

81-According to you, what is the reason for the health problems of your family members after the immigration?

82-Do you think your working conditions have detrimental effect on your health?

83-If yes, what are you doing to avoid or to change those conditions?

84-Do you think your district or house could have detrimental effect on your health?

85-According to you, which factors are influential on the healthiness?

Nutrition

86-How often do you consume meat?

87- How often do you consume milk and milk products?

88-Which food do you want to consume but you could not consume?

(Education)

89-Are you satisfied with your education level?

90-If not, up to what level would you want to study?

91-Why?

92-Is there anyone who has continued to study before the immigration but stopped after immigration?

93-If yes, why? (economic problems, language and adaptation problems, insecurity, not having school in the neighborhood,, not to believe that education will be beneficial, etc.)

94-Do you think that your children's education is necessary for their good and comfortable future?

95-If yes, what are you doing for providing this future to them? (How do you pay attention to their school situation?)

96-Do you think that the government perform its administrative function about education sufficiently? If not, why?

V-Dimension of Social Capital
Identity, culture

97-How are you known in the society? (Türk, Türkmen, Yörük, Arap, Çerkez, Laz, Kürt, Alevi, Dadaş, Doğulu, etc.)

98-Have you or your any of your family member experienced any problem about this reason after immigrating to Ankara?

99-What is your mother language?

100-Can you speak any other language except your mother language?

101-What the other family members' mother languages are?

102-Is there anyone who does not know Turkish?

103-In which language are you communicating, either at home or out home?

104-Have you ever experienced any difficulties in here related to the language?

105-When and where do you have the most difficulties related to the language?

106-Where do you celebrate your traditional celebrations, such as wedding, or national or religious holidays?

VI-Social Relationship Network/ Cooperation

107-How do you spend your one day generally?

108-How were you spending your one day before you immigrate to the Ankara?

109-Inside or outside of your district whom do you converse with?

110-How often do you meet with them and why?

111-If there is any problem at home how do you handle it?

112-What is the main reason for the problems that you are having at home?

113-According to you, how those problems effect your family relationship?

114-What is the meaning of living together with your relatives or people from your hometown, at the same district (or city) ?

115-Has there been any alteration in your relationships during the time? (do you think it gets weakened or strengthened)

116-Have you had any problem with them, why?

117-If you need something, to whom would you go to get help?

118-What are you doing in your spare time? (going to neighbors or relatives, shopping, entertainment, etc.)

119-If s/he does not do any of them, why?

120-Are you joining the activities such as religious meetings, school-family union works or etc.?

121-Where do you put yourself in the society? (does s/he think s/he is a part of the community or helpful for the community)

122-Which T.V. programs do you or your family members prefer to watch?

VII-Political Dimension

123-Are you registered for the **muhtar**? If not, why?

124-Do you or your family members have a membership to a foundation or association?

125-If yes, which foundation or association and for how long?

126-Do you have any relationship with a political party?

127-If yes, for how long?

128-Did you attend to the last general and local elections? If not, why?

129-If there is an election now, would you give your vote to the same party that you gave before?

130-Which foundation do you trust most? (army, government, police, municipalities, civil society foundations, religious foundations, etc.)

131-Which problems do you think people who live in this country have common?

132-What should be done to resolve those problems?

133-What do you think of the government's prior responsibilities?

134-What do you think the "citizenship" is ?

135-Do you feel as a citizen of this country?

136-If not, why?

What kind of society would you prefer to live in either for yourself, your family or your closed relatives?

What are your future expectations?