

AWARENESS OF IMMIGRANTS AMONG HEADMEN: ACCEPTANCE OF OTHER THROUGH SUBJECTIVE WAY

Selda Adiloglu

Bursa Technical University, Bursa, Turkey

Hüseyin Pehlivan

Bursa Yıldırım Municipality, Bursa, Turkey

Introduction

It is one of the current research tendencies in migration writing that the immigration/immigrant's response to the local population begins. Here, it is possible to consider the rapidly increasing migration as the main reason. Another factor that can be attached to this reason is that the local perception is valuable to determine the migration policies. The fact that countries meet migrants and migrants, even though they have different densities, raises the question of how the indigenous people see the migrants and how they treat the migrants. Research is also done in response to this question. As well as studies investigating attitudes/behaviors towards migrants (Espenshade & Hempstead, 1996; Hainmueller & Hopkins, 2014; Simon & Sikich, 2007; Saran, 2009; Ward & Masgoret, 2008) there are also studies on the perception of migrants (Espenshade & Calhoun, 1993; Berg, 2009; Hatton, 2017; Pietsch, 2015; Yavcan, 2013). In the case of developed countries, Hainmueller and Hopkins (2014) refer to a wide range of literature that explores the behavior of the locals on migration.

Nevertheless, researches are carried out by institutions and organizations on a universal scale. The institutions/centers that are known for research activities at global level such as Gallup ve Ipsos focus on the perception of migration/migrants

at the local level. In addition to these, research centers such as IOM (International Organization for Migration), CREAM (Migration Analysis and Research Center), Chatham House, MPI (Migration Policy Center) publish reports on the perception of immigrants. For example, IOM, *How World Views Migration* (2015), examines how the world perceives migration. One of the remarkable findings of the report is that, unlike the claim that migration is referred to with negative connotations, people in many countries of the world declare their views on increasing or decreasing the immigrant population in their country rather than reducing them. The case of a university research center, CREAM *Understanding Attitudes to Immigration: With the First European Social Survey* (2005) named report, looked at the response of the immigrant to the local population. This report reveals that the attitudes of the local people towards migration vary according to many variables (age, education, type of settlement).

A London-based think tank, Chatham House, wrote a report (2017), named *Understanding Public Attitudes towards Refugees and Migrants*, in which they focused on understanding opinions and attitudes about migrants and refugees. One of the main findings of the report reveals that people have different attitudes and attitudes, some of them are friendly and some are hostile. As a Washington-based think tank, MPI published a report (2009) on the same issue, focusing on the specific situation in Britain. Referring to the situation in Turkey, KONDA, HUMİ (Hacettepe University, Migration and Politics Research Center) TEPRF (Turkey Economic Policy Research Foundation), TIRSAC (Turkey International Relations and Strategic Analysis Center) as research centers within their -or overseas- funded partnerships work is done it is seen. What is noticeable in these researches is that the research centers in question have performed researches on perception/attitude focused on Syrians. In other words, HUGO's research (2014), KONDA's research (2016) and TIRSAC research (2018) scrutinize the perceptions of Syrians by the public. ASAM with the support of the European Union (Association for Solidarity with Asylum Seekers and Migrants) by prepared and *Suspended Lives & Life* reports bearing his name in *Perception* (2011), Turkey has examined the perceptions of asylum seekers and refugees in many provinces. Separated from the other side of the report is the report focus on the detection of a single group focused in general contain a headline from the local people through migration to Turkey and perceptions about refugees and asylum with public officials. The report claims that underdeveloped it is the most moderate definition of immigration awareness and asylum-related issues among the public. The claim that immigration consciousness is underdeveloped in the local is an important claim and an important determinant. However, whether or not it is developed - what is included in the current perception is also important. In this context, the study aims to address the nature of existing perception, based on the pre-acceptance that local people have a perception of immigration. Profile of immigrants in Turkey is an impediment to research the feasibility of that variety. In order to overcome such an obstacle, different groups of immigrants were selected, and the

associations/perceptions created by selected groups on a selected section of the local population were examined through semi-structured interview technique. The selected section, in other words, consists of the community headmen of the research community. While the universe of the study is the headmen in the central districts of Bursa, the neighborhood headman of the neighborhoods of Yıldırım district is the sample of the study. An important consideration has been taken in the selection of Yıldırım district. This is the district's first destination in the immigrant settlement, and the immigrant population in comparison to other districts. Within this scope, Yıldırım district, which houses 69 districts, is the research area where the negotiations took place. The research community is the neighborhood headman of 69 neighborhoods of Yıldırım. The headmen were asked what they thought about the selected groups of immigrants, about the immigrant groups in question. The selected groups are migrants from the Balkans - Greece, Bulgaria and (former) Yugoslavia. Meskhetian and Syrian migrants in the current group of migrants were excluded from this study. The main motivation to exclude those from the Balkans and to exclude Meskhetian, Syrian migrants and other immigrant groups in is to pay attention to the local people's understanding of immigrants through long-term subjective experiences. The effect of the media is obvious in shaping the first impressions about migrants. Moreover, the impact of the media on determining perceptions and discourses on migrants and refugees was also demonstrated by academic studies (Eşigül, 2017: 4). However, the aim is to determine the opinions of immigrants on the basis of personal experiences and experiences of individuals who are independent of the media or political/ideological discourses. Headmen who are always in touch with immigrants clearly separated from local people, having quite high level of individual experience and by these experiences they gain information and personal judgement. This is precisely because of this aspect, the headmen constitute the focus of the study and the nature of the perception that is considered to be present is exposed. In the next phase of the study, said Turkey's acquaintance with immigrant groups are to be examined, Yıldırım districts to look into the immigrant profile and headmen of thought and explanation will be given to the immigrants.

Yıldırım District and Immigrants

Yıldırım District was established in 1987 with the law numbered 3391 and it is one of the three districts of Bursa. In the study these information is given; Kestel and Gürsu districts are to the east of the district and Osmangazi districts to the north and to the west. According to the data of -2012 population census within the borders of Yıldırım Municipality, 631.482 people live (municipality official website). The majority of the population in the district comes with internal migrations. In terms of internal migrations, Artvin, Posof, Ardahan and Kars are densely populated. Among Balkan immigrants from abroad, Meskhetian coming from the former Soviet Bloc countries and Turkey's neighboring countries is available Syrians from Syria.

152 Evler, Balaban, Değirmenlikızık, Sinandede, Şükranıye, Davutdede, Anadolu, Cumalıkızık, Davutkadı, Yediselviler, Sıracevizler, Yenimahalle, Mollaarap, Umurbey, İsabey, Duacınarı, Yunusemre, Kâzımkarabekir, Maltepe, Yeşilyayla, Baruthane, Zümrütevler, Güllük, Selçukbey, Ortabağlar, Mimarsinan, Siteler, Şirinevler, Hacivat, Çınarönü, Karapınar, Değirmenönü, Yiğitler, Esenevler, Erikli, Bağlaraltı, 75.Yıl, Fidyekızık, Demetevler, Samanlı, Vakıf, Ulus, Arabayatağı, Mevlana, Kaplıkaya, Ertuğrulgazi, Akçağlayan, Teferrüç, Vatan, Millet, Beyazıt, Eğitim, Yavuzselim, Zeyniler, Hamamlıkızık, M. Akif Ersoy, Yıldırım, Kurtoğlu, Karaağaç, Karamazak, Namazgâh, Musababa, Haciseyfetin, Selimzade, Hocataşkın, Meydancık, Yeşil, Emirsultan and Piremir are 69 neighbourhoods that are connected to this district.

Domestic immigrants or foreign immigrants affect all the districts connected to Yıldırım. The differences are immigration intensity and the difference between immigrant groups. In other words, while some of the neighborhoods are domestic migrants, most of them have a large number of immigrants, including domestic migrants. In some neighborhoods (internal and external), the rate of immigrants is so high that the neighborhood headmen of the neighborhoods with a high rate of immigration are defined as immigrant neighborhoods. In order not to leave the scope of the study, if only the Balkan migrants will be focused, it is understood that the Balkan migrants do not live in only two neighborhoods (Ulus and Zeyniler) in 69 neighborhoods or in the neighborhood of the districts, while in the remaining quarters there are more or less Balkan migrants. In some neighborhoods, there are streets where Balkan migrants live intensively.

According to the information given by the headmen, immigrants of Balkan origin lives in two streets in the 75.Yıl neighborhood (immigrants from Bulgaria), on five streets in the Samanlı neighborhood (immigrants from Bulgaria), on four streets in the Beyazıt neighborhood (immigrants from Macedonia), in a street in the Yavuzselim neighborhood (immigrants from Greece), on 10-15 the street in the neighborhood of Mehmet Akif Ersoy (immigrants from Yugoslavia), on two blocks in Eylül street in Erikli (immigrants from Bulgaria) and in a region in the Balaban neighborhood (immigrants from Greece and Bulgaria). There is a remarkable point here. As can be seen, immigrants from Greece and Yugoslavia, especially immigrants from Bulgaria, are seen to be clustered in some regions/neighborhoods according to their habitats. In the case of Yugoslavia, there is no separate Albanian or Bosnian distinction among immigrants from Yugoslavia, as in other explanations. Because it is not possible to say that the Albanian immigrants are clustered in specific to the region of Yıldırım. On the other hand, the inhabitants of the Bosnia lived together (such as Mollaarap). While the reasons for non-agglomeration or non-clustering of Albanian immigrants can be clarified in a study with Albanian migrants, the current comments claim that it can be associated with political ideology. One of these interpretations is by the historian Raif Kaplanoğlu, who is known for his work on Immigrants in Bursa.. According to Kaplanoğlu

(2013: 494), Albanian immigrants were hardly resettled due to their stubborn and stubborn status. The historian Kaplanoğlu (2013: 495) shares that there are no Albanian villages with large populations of Albanian immigrants, and the small number of Albanian immigrants has more than 10 villages in Bursa.

Relation of Balkans and Turkey: Balkan Migrations

Turkey's relation with the Balkans, the period before the start of the Republic, and this bond, still maintain a presence in powerful ways. The connection between the two regions is a network of migrations from Anatolia to the Balkans. This time, migrations from the Balkans to Anatolia are effective. Turkey purification of the population of said migration can be noted that also play an important function in nationalization and purification (İçduygu, 2014; Karpat, 2013; Yıldırım, 2012). The majority of those coming from the Balkans consisted of kinsmen (like ethnic Turks), and some of them were from the religious tribes (Bosniac and Albanian), and this function continues with migration, partly due to the migration of those who are sensitive to the traditional identity, continue without any imposition or orientation.

Despite the current immigration, Turkish population continues to exist in the Balkan region. Bulgaria, Greece and the (former) Yugoslavia (today's Macedonia and Kosovo) are among the Balkan countries that contain Turks within the existing population structure. Balkan immigrants in Turkey are also immigrants who have come from this country again. Turkey faced by immigrants in the immigration experience only consists of immigrants from the Balkan countries concentrations of immigrants at different times and immigrated to Turkey. According to the report of Turkey Migration Administration (y.y), migration occurred after the proclamation of the Republic has been classified into nine categories. The first one is the migration from Greece in 1922-1938. The migrations that happened between 1923-1945 and ended approximately with 800 thousand people in the Balkans will result in migration to Turkey. In the same period, (1933-1945) and the same density of people emigrated from Germany to Turkey. After the Halabom massacre in 1988, it was from Iraq, because of assimilation efforts in 1989, from Iraq to escape the First Gulf War in 1991, from Bosnia in 1992-1998, from Macedonia in 1999 and from Macedonia in 2001 .

Thousands of people have emigrated from Syria to Turkey after the year 2011. To the mentioned migrations, about Adoption of Meskhetian Turks to Turkey and Meskhetians migration added with the Law, published in 1992, on Settlement (Özözen-Kahraman & Ibrahimov, 2013: 84), Burns (2013: 496). If Turkey's current demographic structure in overseas births kept between separate migrations that took place after 1990, a large portion originally is Turkey, which shares the information which formed the inhabitants who have emigrated from the Balkans. In

the 24562 numbered bulletin published by TSI (2016), it is seen that the first place within the population born abroad in the period of -2015 belongs to Bulgaria, a Balkan country.

According to this report (2016), Bulgaria ranked first with 23.8%, Germany with 16.5%, Iraq with 6.1%, Syria with 4.8%, and with average of 3.3%. Azerbaijan born people come to forefront.

The explanations of the headmen interviewed within the scope of the study seem to be covered with some of the data in the bulletin. Yet, as in the bulletin, in the explanations of the headmen, the immigrants coming from the Balkans were being told that the immigrants from Bulgaria were intense.

Method of the Study

Statistical numbers as well as personal narrations are the data sources that academic studies need. Kümbetoğlu (2012) states that; some studies require a qualitative method to help giving a cross-section and/or to understand the details. Such a need was seen at the starting point of this study and it was decided that a method that would help to understand the details rather than statistical data was more convenient in order to reach the target of the study. Because of this situation, a semi-structured interview which is considered as a qualitative research technique has been applied. For the interviews, the neighborhood headmen who are active in the research area within the boundaries of the Yıldırım municipality have been specified.

They were interviewed face-to-face with the headmen of the neighborhood and at the places of duty. Interviews were prepared on the basis of the proximity of neighborhoods and 69 meetings were planned to be completed in two months. However, due to the fact that three of the neighborhood headmen (Piremir District Headman, Yavuzselim District Headman and Vatan District Headman) did not meet the day and time of the meeting, the plan had been a failure, and the negotiations which had to be completed in two months were found to be in three months.

The interviews with the headmen were started with three main questions and the number of questions and the their content were formed depending on the interest and knowledge of the interviewers.

Standard questions that were asked to all headmen are the following:

- Is there an immigrant living in your neighborhood?
- Who are the immigrants that have from abroad?
- How would you describe the “...” immigrants?

The level of knowledge of headmen on immigrants has varied. Headmen can be divided into headman (enough), who have and do not have any comprehensive knowledge/ideas about migrants.

Değirmenlik ızık	Umurbey	İsabey	Yeşilyayla	Selçukbey	Siteler	Değirmenönü
Davutdede	Kâzımkarabe kir	Baruthane	Güllük	Hamamlıkızık	Çınarönü	Yiğitler
Ulus	Arabayatağı	Mevlana	Kaplıkaya	Ertuğrulgazi	Akçağlayan	Teferrüç
Kurtoğlu	Namazgâh	Musababa	Hacıseyfettin	Selimzade	Hocataşkın	Piremir
Demetevle r	Vakıf	M.A.Ersoy	Fidyekızık	Bağlaraltı	75. Yıl	Yavuzselim
Esenevler	Erikli	Millet	Zeyniler	Cumalıkızık		

Table 1: Ones who have not (enough) information about Balkan Immigrants

Headmen and their districts

The names of the neighborhoods in Table (1) show the neighborhoods where headmen who served with no (enough) knowledge about the immigrants of Balkan origin. According to this finding, the number of migrants in their neighborhood (enough) is 35. In this issue, 16 of them (neighborhoods written in bold font size) are partly informed, while 19 do not have any knowledge of Balkan immigrants.


Another important point that is needed to be mentioned here is that the inhabitants of Bursa are inhabited extensively in the neighborhoods named Cumalıkızık, Hamamlıkızık, Zeyniler, Fidyekızık, Değirmenlikızık, and the immigrant population of Balkan origin is too few to be generalized. Thus, it is not anticipated that the headmen, who are not sufficiently familiar with the migrant population, have an adequate knowledge/opinion about migrants, but will also contradict the purpose of the study, since they will have more information than experience. For this reason, the explanations of the headmen who worked in the settlements that had gained the status of neighborhood were ignored due to the purpose of this study together with the comments of the headmen who did not have enough information.

The migrants who come from abroad in these neighborhoods are not limited to those coming from the Balkan countries. During the interviews, migrants from different countries and foreign migrants who are still in the process of moving to the neighborhood were mentioned. However, other immigrant groups other than migrants from the Balkans -Greece, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia- were excluded from this study, and the explanations regarding Tatar, Circassian, Meskhetian, Syrian and other immigrant groups were not included in this study.

Information about Headmen/Research Group


There is no equality in terms of gender distribution among 69 district headmen active in Yıldırım Municipality. When it is compared, there are 63 men in the neighborhood of the headman for six heads of the woman headman. Most of the headmen (see Table 2) are middle-aged and older individuals. The young headman rate was quite low, and the rate was higher than the middle age. The headmen, who were born in the 1940s, are still working actively in the village.

Table 2: Birthdate Information of Headmen




When their educations are considered (see Table 3), most of the headmen were high school and secondary school graduates. However, a considerable amount of headmen are primary school graduate.

Table 3: Education Information of Headmen




As it will be recalled, the reason why headmen were chosen was to know the neighborhood in the beginning. However, the duty period of headmen is important in terms of the rate of communication with the neighborhood population. As can be seen (see Table 4), there are those who have been carrying out the duty of headman for 29 years. A great majority of the headmen have been performing out their duties for more than four years, and a considerable number of others have been working for more than nine years. However, there are headmen who have been in office for a year.

Table 4: Duty Periods of Headmen



Most of the neighborhood headmen (see Table 5) are neighborhood residents living in the neighborhood for 40-49 years. The new headman of the neighborhood is almost the same with the number of village headmen, who say they have been in the neighborhood for 70-79 years.

Table 5: Neighborhood Residence Time (Among Headmen)



Yıldırım's Headmen, Immigrant Perceptions of Headmen

“The neighborhood headman” phenomenon has long been in the practices of Turkey’s establishment. It gained its authority and structure after 1940 and was subject to managerial changes according to the needs of the period and people. Positioning in the administrative system brought about the functioning of the muhtar in the neighborhoods. As in a saying of Arıkboğa (2000), for the neighbourhood the confirmation, declaration and announcement duties are deputised. This, in a sense, has led to the limitation of the authority and duties of the headmen to a complete mapping of small-scale inhabitants and what is happening in the neighborhood. Small scale mapping of the inhabitants of a settlement was carried out more systematically during the Ottoman period. As it can be observed in the information quoted by Bal, Uysal ve Oğuz (2012), the headmen are obliged to follow the duties of the neighborhood as well as the economic cycle of the neighborhood, as well as those who have come and went with the purpose of settling in the neighborhood and those who have died. This task was a necessity for the headmen in the 1920s. However, by a legal decision dated 1920, the imams and headmen of each village and neighborhood were given the duty of registering and updating the population information of the villages and the neighborhood (Çakmak, 2009: 93). Today, due to the registration and/or follow-up of the population information, and the General Directorate of Population and Citizenship through the projects such as CCRS and Identity Sharing System (ISS), the level of knowledge and registration authority of the headmen on the neighborhood population has been limited. However, as in Koçberber's saying (2005: 105) it is wished to be a traditional organization and the headmen are

important actors in the common pattern of the neighborhood as well as many years ago. The study focuses on the “neighborhood population information”, which is included in the duty definitions of the headmen and transferred to different mechanisms in time. With the information of the population, not only the mobility as a result of death or birth, but also those who migrated to the neighborhood will be looked at by the headmen who have come from the Balkans.

Immigrants among Headmen

Canatan (2013) defends that the countries of origin of the migrants are effective in the development of attitudes towards migration in general. In other words, the author (Canatan, 2013: 322), in the form of looking for species refers to similar findings in his study of Europe specificity that people are more open and tolerant towards people they find closer to them. According to him, European societies are more open and tolerant to people of the same race and/or ethnic group. A similar commentary can be found in the work of Daniş and Parla. Authors (Daniş & Parla, 2009) state that Balkan immigrants are more privileged compared to other Iraqi immigrant groups. This privileged status “considering acceptable” statement is both they have the same cognate -thus in the same ethnicity- and their roots-coming from Europe- and when compared to other immigrants they are accepted by them. In this study, which will be a questioning of this determination, it will be examined whether the immigrants are “acceptable” in the local population and what for kind of factors they are being accepted.

An important point about “immigrant” is what is understood from the mentioned notion. Adıgüzel (2013: 83) completed a perception study on the immigrants in the province of Eskişehir and Balkan and concluded that the people in Eskişehir first there were understood as “immigrants” and/or “Balkan immigrants”. According to the findings obtained from the interviews with the headman in Bursa, when it is considered from the notion “immigrant” headmen brought a meaning to the issue that the migrants coming from the Balkans and the alternative options are expressed along with the intense Syrian origin migrations in recent years. Intense migrations of the Meskhetian Turks to the region, like the Syrians, cause the headmen to categorize migrants. The most prominent category is “immigrants” against Syrians, Meskhetian migrants. There are two sub-categories in the English or the equivalent in the literature. If the headmen are only talking about “immigrant”, they mention about Balkan immigrants, including the recent Balkan migrations, or only Bulgarian immigrants. However the headmen, who use the term “old muhajir/immigrant” and “93 muhajir/immigrant”, said that the person/people is being localized “without any omit”.

Kümbetoğlu (2012) suggests that migrants are defined as “newcomers”, “foreigners”, “unknown” and these definitions are somehow suggest that immigrants are coincided with a group that is not integrate with the indigenous peoples.

According to this explanation of Kümbetoğlu, when the expressions of the headmen interviewed within the scope of the study are compared, it is understood that the groups mentioned by the headmen as “old immigrant” and/or “Balkan migrants” are seen as close to them and go one step further and considered as indigenous. The acceptance of their indigenisation is so obvious in the sentence of a headman, Ç-Şi. At a meeting with the headman, Ç-Şi, while the headmen mention the migrant groups eliminating the Balkan immigrants and considered those who had come from abroad. He explains the reason for not considering the Balkan immigrants: “Ones came from Balkans is our people, I am not considering them!” A similar approach is revealed in the explanations of the K-Ge: “People came from Bulgaria and other countries before year 89 are indigenous.” As it is seen the time is also important for the indigenisation of the immigrant. According to K-Ge, “89 year”, the migrants, who came after “year 89”, are immigrant but if they came before “year 89” they are indigenous.


What is noteworthy is that in the descriptions of the headmen, most of the ones in the category of, “old immigrant” are from Albanian and/or Yugoslavia immigrants. The immigrants of the countries where the concept complexity is experienced most that came from Yugoslavia. The majority of headmen from the term “immigrant from Yugoslavian” are able to understand the Albanian immigrants. However, there are also Bosniac and Turkish immigrants among (former) Yugoslavia immigrants. The term “Balkan immigrant” is also understood to mean Kosovar and/or Macedonian Albanians. Although it is rare (as seen in the statement of the headman, Y-Çe), the “Bosnian” inscription referred to Albanians and Bosnians (as seen in the statement of the headman of B-At) and-from “Serbian” inscription is referred to immigrants from Yugoslavian.

Immigrant Awareness among Headmen

The fact that Bursa is an immigrant city is frequently mentioned both in national media (opinion column in milliyet.com.tr news, yenidonem.com.tr) and in academic studies. Demirel (2008) puts down on paper that the province of Bursa is one of the most important migrant settlements in Anatolia, and shares the knowledge of those coming to Bursa from the Balkans and the Caucasus. Çalışkan and Akbulak (2010: 119-120) during the Balkan Wars, under the Treaty of Lausanne and Bulgaria during the problematic period of large immigration of immigrants to the Balkans are transferred to Bursa. Today, the migration of the Meskhetians from the surrounding countries especially from Syria- Syrians and the Turkish Republics has been added. The diversification of migrations -by country-


has transformed the well-known immigrant prototype of Bursa. For that reason, in the recent years, Meskhetian and Syrians have been added to the migrants from Bulgaria and/or Greece and/or Yugoslavia. The migrant group, which is the most familiar among the headmen in the Balkan countries, is Bulgarian immigrants as can be seen in the table (6). Migrants from Bulgaria are followed by migrants from Greece.

Table 6: Knowledge Level of Headmen about Immigrant Groups I



Among the headmen, the inscription “immigrant from Yugoslavia” is less widely used -or less known- under the category of “Yugoslavian immigrant” -Albanian and Bosnian- Albanian immigrants are more known than Bosniac immigrants.

Table 7: Knowledge Level of Headmen about Immigrant Groups II



Immigrant Perception among Headmen

In the previous title, it is understood that the immigrants from Balkan immigrants are well known. As a result of the awareness rates, there is also a high rate of explanation for immigrants from Bulgarian. What can be stated about the general explanation of the statement made before consideration of the individual statements is that the explanations are very positive. It can be commented that the relevant migrant groups have created positive opinions in the minds of the headmen.

a) Immigrants from Bulgaria

The most pronounced qualification for Bulgarian immigrants is related to the success of these people. Their success comes from the education they received in high school, according to headman called E-Du. According to the headman” ... they studied on many things in high school!” Another headman (Ç-Şi), who again brings the education they received into the foreground, connects them to a similar point: “They have received basic education.” The comments of the headman, K-Ba, are noteworthy, especially when it comes to girls' education: "A girl is very important!.. I just started from high school, sold the lands we had, just so that she could complete her education, how much they can defend themselves as for being a girl!"

Some of the headmen on the issue of success express the hardworking of the immigrants in Bulgaria, while others tell “immigrant”. They indirectly express that immigrants from Bulgaria are successful. In the statement of Kaplanoğlu (2013: 501), while referring to the fact that they are hard-working, with the main heading of “Balkan migrants” has generalized its qualifications. Kaplanoğlu (2013: 501) emphasizes that immigrants can adapt to their new dormitories in a short time and they make a significant contribution to economy of Bursa with their industriousness. The qualification of diligence is identified with many Bulgarian immigrants among the headmen. A-Ya suggesting a similar claim: “immigrants from Bulgaria are; hard-working, adaptable, calm, positive, introverted and environmentally sensitive.” M-Ef suggests a comparison between his comment about the subject and indigenous peoples: “Everybody who can make it then he/she works, not like us; five people sleep and the other one is watching them !.. 60 years old man is working without hesitating, there are four stents in his vein does and he does not stop, works! ..” “Immigrants are supportive, they back up each other. They are successful and honest.” This statement is what D-Ge said about the success of these immigrants. When it is being noticed, in this sentence it was determined that immigrants are “supportive”. Being supportive is used as “saving”. This expression is not the claim of a single headman, but the opinion of many headmen. A headman named B-At makes an explanation: Immigrants from Bulgaria are the saver person and person who are saver, said that “you are like a Kardzhali!” Another headman (M-De) again makes an explanation as if repeating

that expression: "There are one or two dishes on the table of immigrant, they are economical." If someone is like that they say "Are you from Kardzhali?". According to the headman called Y-Ay; "Bulgarian immigrants do not have any extra spending." M-Ef: mentions that "Since Wife-husband works they acquired something at an early time... Women work until they will get married." Ş-Yi tells their retirement in their workings: "They came after us but they got retired before us!". M-Ef also touches on the same point: "First generation immigrants from Bulgarian retired, second generation is worker..."

According to headman, the immigrants from Bulgaria work with two motivations. One of them is retirement and the other is building a house. D-Ge's statement on the subject is as in the following: "The first goal of the immigrants is to build a house". According to A-Ya; "immigrants from Bulgaria try to buy house / environment / cars." Using of house and streets for immigrant families from Bulgaria a headman named Ş-Yi expresses that: "In the first floor of immigrants there is a garage, in front of their house there are trees... There is no garbage man passing through their streets!" In neighbour's relationships there are sayings that headmen have. In the F-Ka's statement: "They are role model in the issue of not harming the neighbours."

The headman named S-KO, giving information that there are people among the immigrant groups, they do not witness such behavior in Bulgarian immigrants with these sayings: "Among immigrants from Bulgaria there are no beggars." An information about the related immigrant group there will be no beggars and also no workers. As the saying of headman of A-Ya: Among Bulgarian immigrants "You cannot find an immigrant that has no job!" A headman named K-Ça, mentions the difference between indigenous peoples in Bursa and immigrants from Bulgaria with giving working understanding of between both of the group: "In any case there will be somebody at houses. There is not any whole family work here just like immigrants from Bulgaria." In the aspect of working there are explanations of headmen given. In the statement of E-Re, this issue is expressed as in the following: "Immigrants are disciplined and clean. They do all things with love" and according to D-Ge "Immigrants work freely!" In the explanation of B-At mentioned immigrants saved many things in a short time:" immigrants from Bulgaria have bought workplaces in three years!"

The headmen have ideas about the areas they work. According to Y-Er;"... Most of the immigrants from Bulgaria are workers and women go to houses for cleaning. The immigrants do not avoid from any kind of work." In the fields of work, the headman E-Rd says: "5% of immigrants from Bulgaria do their work, usually carpenters do furniture work." And according to the other headman (T-Al), "immigrants from Bulgaria work as factory workers."

There are also people who tell about immigrants through comparison. The headman named D-Ge, made this comparison through the indigenous-immigrant distinction: “Indigenous peoples learned the mastership from them (immigrants from Bulgaria). The decorations of the outer tiles (such as the diamond shape) are brought by immigrants from Bulgaria. The other indigenous peoples look forward for immigrants from Bulgaria to do their houses’ works.” In another meeting where the indigenous peoples of Bulgaria were interviewed, the headman, Y-Mu, stated that the immigrants from Bulgaria had a tendency to open cafés with chat corners and the indigenous peoples opened coffee houses. The headman named A-Ya puts forward the distinction between internal migrants and immigrants from Bulgaria: “If a child has fought in immigrants from Bulgaria, the fight is the child's personal fight, a fight of a child can turn to a fight of people from Muş or Erzurum in Easterners!”

Again, another headmen (M-Ef) statement on the same issue is as in the following: “immigrants from Bulgaria cannot hustle, they do not have any commerce, or any cheat! Even if it does not have any benefit to anyone they do not have any harm too.” They do not have any cheat and also they do not behave against laws. M-Ef made a similar statement to another group of Balkan immigrants: “None of the Bulgarian immigrants received an execution paper.”

b) Immigrants from Greece

Considering the headmen’s comments, the main difference between immigrants from Greece and immigrants from Bulgaria arises in factory labor. It is because the immigrants of Bulgaria work in the factory unlike the Greek immigrants. According to E-Rd, the immigrants from Greece do not work in the factory. They do “... textile work, 90% of... Olds look after their grandchildren, their uncles go to the mosque, the young do their job.” In this context of habiting, the muhtar, O-Bu, has some sayings: “The houses of immigrants families from Greece; the 1st floor garment, the second floor is flat.”

According to another headman (E-Öz), Greek immigrants do weaving. Women do garment work. Immigrants from Greece working at the start of their working motivation are children as in the saying of B-At. According to B-At; “Immigrants from Greece work for children.” The same headman states that there is a similarity between Albanian immigrants and immigrants from Greece and explains that both groups of immigrants look after to their children. M-De: “Immigrants from Greece are clean, respectful, people in trade.” An addition made from headman named E-ka. According to the headman, immigrants from Greece who take care of the distance, “Immigrants from Greece wait for 5-10 years; they do not make any connection. Thus they do not break down quickly like us.” Besides their distance stand from another headman’s, named M-De, information the mentioned immigrants also obey the laws.

M-De explains that the vast majority of migrants from Greece live in their own homes and there are car garages in their homes. According to M-De, the immigrants from Greece “...loves working! As for their work in field the garment work is at the forefront.” Immigrants from Greece, like headman M-Çe’s saying, “they work on baby garments.”

In the explanations about the immigrants from Bulgaria, the result was that the migrants worked by making houses and paying attention to building houses. Here, it was shared that similar behavior was valid for immigrants from Greece and that the priority was to make a home. According to the description of the headman O-Bu; “The immigrants from Greece have made houses with the tobacco money!...” Again another aspect that is similar to that of the immigrants from Bulgaria is that they exhibit behaviors that are in accordance with the law as seen in the statement made by the headman M-De: “Immigrants from Greece... Obey the laws!”

c) Yugoslavian (Albanian and Bosniac) Immigrants

The first definition of headmen about the immigrants from Yugoslavia is that they are “old comers”. According to the headman named Y-Ov, the immigrants from Yugoslavia are tradesmen. As tradesmen, they work in business lines such as tailoring, bagel seller, soup seller and chicken shawarma working fields. According to E-Rd, “the immigrants from Yugoslavia do carpenter work / furniture.” The only similar aspects of immigrants from Yugoslavia with immigrants from Bulgaria are that they are frugal, according to E-Ka’s statement. K-Ba, Yugoslavia conveys immigrants in the 40s they were composed of Albanians and Bosnians who migrated to Turkey. The idea that the immigrants from Yugoslavia consisted of Albanians and Bosniac immigrants came to light during the interviews with other headmen (Y-Çe, D-Y₁, M-Çe, B-Şe et. al.). For that reason, it can be stated that this perception includes prevalence.

As in saying of A-Ya related to Albanian immigrants, the general perception is that they are understood as ex-emigrants. According to a headman named Y-Çe, “Albanians are in an effort to establish their own business.” A comparison is seen about women’s working by forcing of them made between other immigrant groups and Albanian immigrants. According to another headman (E-Öz), Albanians are engaged in weaving. The other immigrant groups reported by the headman, T-Al, women in the Albanian immigrants are not employed too much, as is the case with Bosniac and immigrants from Greece.

Another group of immigrants, in the saying of M-Çe, is the Bosniacs. K-Ba tells that the only thing they know about Bosniacs they came in 1940s. According to M-Se, the immigrant group in question is composed of people arrived in 1953 and this group organizes “Pita Days” and come together once a year. One of the similarities between Bosnian and Albanian immigrants is that both groups of migrants are

mainly fed pastry. Another explanation regarding the Bosniac immigrants is that the immigrants in question see the country as their homeland. M-Se summarizes this issue as follows: “They considered here as their motherland!...”

Result and Evaluation: Let a human to recognize other one!

Although the said region (Bulgaria, Greece and the (former) Yugoslavia) immigrants, different geographical and administrative boundaries from each other coming from different countries, even though they come from different countries the local perception in Turkey is that they prefer to collect region migrants under one roof with “Balkan” main heading. However, there are differences between them. The first of these differences is that the region where they come from is not surrounded by a single border, but includes countries separated by different national and geographical boundaries, so migrants in terms of experience are more or less different from each other. Another distinctive side is that the migrants in the post-migration period are working in clustered areas. In the explanations of the headmen, the immigrants from Bulgaria are often referred to as factory labor. Immigrants from Greece and from Yugoslavia are kept away from factory labor. According to the headmen, the immigrants from Greece are too busy with the apparel. If we look at the situation in the immigrants from Yugoslavia, the general opinion is that the migrants are trying to establish their own businesses. According to some headmen, the behavior of establishing their own business is also observed in immigrants from Greece. According to them, the migrants from Greece make their garment work in their own homes and in the basement of their homes.

When the differences in detail are ignored, immigrants with the Balkan title are among the groups that the Turkish community - the headmen-accepted here. The same “region” (from the Balkans or from Rumelia) and the same race (kin) are not coming, they assumed to know that or know the Turkish language, religious and cultural practices to be Turkey coincides with the society in the sense of the question for Turkish society seems to have facilitated the adoption of immigrant groups. As regards the adaptation processes, Sezik (2017:148) states that the immigrants in question do not have disagreements that will reach to the level of dissociation and that this does not happen for a number of reasons. According to the author, the fact that the immigrants have Turkish and Muslim identities facilitates the adaptation of their homeland as their homelands, their situation of being educated, the work of all the family members who are able to work and the recognition of the possibilities of being able to host migrants. In the study findings, there was no data indicating that the possibilities of home ownership were facilitated by the local population and the other claims of Sezik gained validity for this study.

In addition to the previous paragraph, one of the factors that increased the acceptance of the immigrants in the local community is that the groups concerned should adapt easily and willingly to the society/communities they come from and make this request to the local people and to bring the local people to the idea that they do not create a danger to the local people. In the aspect of mentioning this thought the explanation of Ş-Yi is important: "Maybe you string along with them, but they do!" or the words of the headman, Z-Ça, are important in that they do not create any danger: "Immigrants are constructive and harmless!"

In addition, it is also a factor for the immigrant groups in question to create a street/neighborhood culture that is associated with them. In this regard, many of the headmen contacted this point. For example, A-Se mentions the simple streets: "The immigrant streets are plain; apartments are in an order who Özal brought." According to the headman named V-Sa; "Immigrants from Bulgaria [...] live in the known streets... There is a dignity in their streets!" Another headman (Ş-Yi) states the following information: "There is no garbage collector seen in their streets!" And a headman named E-RE grabs attention that their street should be seen: "Immigrants live under Arabyatağı wood yards, as an example it can be seen!"

The perseverance and discipline of the immigrants also attracted the attention of the local people - the headmen. As one of the headmen (D-Ge) stated, "Immigrants are supportive, they support each other. They are hard-working and honest." As well as their honesty, the parties who have obeyed the law have attracted the attention of the headmen. M-Ef, shows the immigrants of Bulgaria as an example: "None of the immigrants from Bulgaria received an execution paper." As it is remembered the headman K-Ge suggested that people who came before 89 years were indigenous peoples. It can be understood from this suggestion ones who came after "89 year" were considered as immigrants. 89 year refers to indigenous peoples and here in Bulgaria in 1989 to escape the assimilation of immigrants took refuge in Turkey to Bulgaria between -here headmen- therefore experienced this year, the Turkish immigration was implied which was derived from Bulgarians. Referring to a finding acquired from meetings another important factor that can be said about "89 year", the mentioned year was placed as a distinction tool specific to Bulgarian immigrants. It is because this history classifies migrants arriving before and after the year 89 in terms of their characteristic and the local-immigrant distinction. According to this, those who came before 89 years are now an "indigenous" and those coming after 89 are still "immigrants". The immigrants, who are indigenous to this own age, are referred to as positive connotations, while as in a few examples, the ones that came after 89 are slightly different. There is some negativity in this otherness. The commentary made by the headman, H-Y1, on the followers of the period of 89 is as in the following: "New generations, use mestika in the morning breakfasts!" Another headman (K-Ba) uses the following statements regarding the immigrants from Bulgaria in his own neighborhood: "(Among) Ones who came from Kardzhali there are 51-68-71-89 year immigrants

seen. 89 year immigrants forgot the communism but they have sympathy to it, they speak Bulgarian with each other!" Indicating the otherness made by them M-Gö have an explanation: "Between 89-90 years comers there is a characteristic, they do not have any problem with anybody."

If the migrants return to the subject of hard work in the beginning of the previous paragraph, the dilemma of migrants is often repeated. The mentioned immigrant groups are so diligent that according to K-AI they have passed the indigenous peoples: "Immigrants are richer than indigenous people with their successful side!" Their successfulness let them have a house. According to one of the headmen (M-Ef) this situation provide them hirers: "Immigrants have hirers but they are not hirers!" There successfulness lets them not being unemployed or being a beggar. Y-Ov summarising the issue and give this information: "Immigrants from Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and Greece have jobs. I have not seen one of them begging!" A headman named S-Ko touches on a similar subject: "There are no beggars from immigrants from Bulgaria." Another important factor about immigrants they consider the country like their homelands. This issue is the common point that is told by the headmen. A headman named V-Sa said: "Migrants are patriotic, loyal to the country; they do not get involved to an issue." Another headman (E-Ay) tells that: "We are learning the patriotism from them!"

As it can be seen, local people - headmen here - are very optimistic about migrants. In this optimism, personal experiences, personal observations, and face to face communication have a great effect. However, it is clear that the interaction in this optimism must be spread over a certain period of time. As it can be remembered, in 1989, in a sense, is a determinant for migrants to be located within the "we-other" in distinction. In the year of 1989 means that it is 29 years before the current time in history, and this period is a long time for the development/progression of interpersonal interaction. However, the present explanations show that in some cases, even 29 years may be perceived as a short time and the migrants cannot have a sufficient time to settle.

The fact that the indigenous populations -headmen here- where there is a sufficient period for them and interaction directly with the migrants during this period reduces the influence of ideological or idealistic discourses among the headmen and leads to the occurrence of individual attitudes/behaviors related to personal experience. Thus, allowing the establishment of disinterested and spontaneous relations/communication between the headmen and the migrants and/or the creation of opportunities will suffice to eliminate the so-called "disagreements" between the migrants and the local population. In brief, this study shows the adaptation between the immigrant and the indigenous, which is ignored, but also indicates the fact that the optimism can be spontaneously developed by other groups of immigrants and the local population, if they can communicate directly and without intervention.

References and notes:

- Adıgüzel, Y. (2013). Dayanışma ağları üzerinden Eskişehir’de siyaset ve göçmenlik algısı. *Sosyoloji Dergisi*, 3. Dizi, 27. Sayı, 73-94.
- Arikboğa, E. (2000). Boşluk doldurucu ve aracı kurum: Mahalle muhtarlığı. *Yerel Yönetimler Sempozyumu Bildirileri*. Ankara: TODAİE YYAEM Yayınları. <http://mimoza.marmara.edu.tr/~earikboga/yayin/sempozyum%20muhtarlik.pdf>
- Bal, A. A., Uysal, A., & Oğuz, A. (2012). Muhtarların sosyal-ekonomik özellikleri ve mahalle-kentsel sorunlara yaklaşımları (Isparta örneği). *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 17(2), 17-40. <http://dergipark.gov.tr/download/article-file/194393>
- Berg, J.A. (2009). White public opinion toward undocumented immigrants: Threat and interpersonal environment. *Sociological Perspectives*, 52(1), 39-58.
- “Bursa göçmen şehri” haberi. (2015). <http://www.milliyet.com.tr/bursa-gocmen-sehri-bursa-yerelhaber-892134/>
- Canatan, K. (2013). Avrupa toplumlarının göç algıları ve tutumları: Sosyolojik bir yaklaşım. *Sosyoloji Dergisi*, 3. Dizi, 27., 317-332.
- Çakmak, F. (2009). Cumhuriyet’in ilk yıllarında nüfusu kayıt altına almaya yönelik girişimler. *CTTAR*, VIII/18-19, 89-115. http://ataturkilkeleri.deu.edu.tr/ai/uploaded_files/file/dergi%2018-19/06_Fevzi_cakmak.pdf
- Çalışkan, V. & Akbulak, C. (2010). Bursa kentine yönelik göçlerin gecekondulaşma sürecine etkileri: Uludağ yamacındaki gecekondu. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 3(12), 115-122. http://www.sosyalarastirmalar.com/cilt3/sayi12pdf/caliskan_vedat_ve_cengiz_akbulak.pdf
- Danış, D. & Parla, A. (2009). Nafile soydaşlık: Irak ve Bulgaristan Türkleri örneğinde göçmen, dernek ve devlet. *Toplum ve Bilim*, 114, 131-158.
- Demirel, M. (2008). XIX. Yüzyılda Bursa’da göçmen iskânı. İç. Bursa’nın zenginliği göçmenler. Ed. Dörtok-Abacı, Z. Bursa: Osmangazi Belediyesi Yayınları.
- Espenshade, T. J. & Calhoun, Ch. A. (1993). An analysis of public opinion toward undocumented immigration. *Population Research and Policy Review*. 12, 189-224. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40217598?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents
- Espenshade, Th. J. & Hempstead, K. (1996). Contemporary American attitudes toward U.S. Immigration. *The International Migration Review*, 30(2), 535-570.
- Eşigül, A. vd. (2017). Bilgiden algıya: Türkiye’deki sığınmacı, göçmen ve mülteci algısı üzerine bir çalışma. Viyana: PS:EUROPE (Avrupa Siyasal ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Enstitüsü). <http://ps-europe.org/tr/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/T%C3%BCrkiyedeki-S%C4%B1%C4%9F%C4%B1nmac%C4%B1-G%C3%B6%C3%A7men-ve-M%C3%BClteci-Alg%C4%B1s%C4%B1-%C3%9Czerine-Bir-%C3%87al%C4%B1%C5%9Fma.pdf>
- Göç idaresi raporu: [http://www.goc.gov.tr/files/files/goc_tasar%C4%B1m_icler.pdf\(y.y.\)](http://www.goc.gov.tr/files/files/goc_tasar%C4%B1m_icler.pdf(y.y.))
- Hainmueller, J. & Hopkins, D. J. (2014). Public attitudes toward immigration. *Annual Review of Political Science*. 17, 225-249. <https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev-polisci-102512-194818#article-denial>
- Hatton, T. J. (2017). Public opinion on immigration in Europe: preference versus alienation. IZA Institute of Labor Economics. <http://ftp.iza.org/dp10838.pdf>

- How world views migration. (2015). https://publications.iom.int/system/files/how_the_world_gallup.pdf
- İçduygu, A. (2014). Bir siyaset ve siyasa alanı olarak uluslararası göç: Son yüzyılda dünya ve Türkiye. İç. Türkiye'nin uluslararası göç politikaları, 1923-2023. Ed. İçduygu, A., Erder, S., Gençkaya, Ö. F. İstanbul: MireKoç.
- Kaplanoğlu, R. (2013). Bursa'da Balkan göçmenleri. İç. Balkanlar ve göç. Ed. Örenç, A. G. & Mangaltepe, İ. Bursa: Bursa Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kitaplığı.
- Karpat, H. K. (2013). Osmanlı'dan günümüze etnik yapılanma ve göçler. (2. Baskı). İstanbul: Timaş.
- Koçberber, S. (2005). Yeni belediye yasası ile mahalle yönetimi. Sayıştay Dergisi. 56, 103-114.
- Kolaylı, H. G. (2017). Göçlerin şehri Bursa. <http://www.yenidonem.com.tr/yazarlar/h-gul-kolayli-55/goclerin-sehri-bursa-5584.html>
- Kümbetoğlu, B. (2012). Göç çalışmalarında "nasıl" sorusu". İç. Küreselleşme çağında göç kavramlar, tartışmalar. Ed. Ihlamur-Öner, S. G., Şirin Öner. N. Aslı. İstanbul: İletişim.
- Özözen-Kahraman, S. & İbrahimov, A. (2013). Kafkaslardan sürgün bir toplumun bitmeyen göçü: Çanakkale'de Ahıska Türkleri. Ege Coğrafya Dergisi. 22. 77-90. <http://dergipark.gov.tr/download/article-file/56736>
- Pietsch, J. (2015). Public opinion towards new migration flows in Europe and the increasing role of the EU Chapter. İç. Migration and integration in Europe, Southeast Asia, and Australia. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Saran, A. (2009). Public attitudes on immigration: The United Kingdom in an international context. Bellagio: MPI.
- Sezik, M. (2017). Yurt dışı zorunlu göçlerin Türkiye kentleri üzerindeki etkileri. Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 7(2), 139-156.
- Simon, R. J. & Sikich, K. W. (2007). Public attitudes toward immigrants and immigration policies across seven nations. International Migration Review. 41, 956-962.
- Suriyeli sığınmacılara bakış. (2016). http://konda.com.tr/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/1602_Barometre62_SURIYELI_SIGINMACILAR.pdf
- SGDD Raporu: Askıdaki yaşamlar & algıdaki yaşamlar. (2011). http://sgdd.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/Askidaki_Yasamlar_Algidaki_Yasamlar.pdf
- TÜİK rapor: Ülkemizde her 10 kişiden 3'ü doğduğu ilden farklı bir ilde yaşamaktadır. (2016). <http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreHaberBultenleri.do?id=24562>
- Ward, C. & Masgoret, A. (2008). Attitudes toward immigrants, immigration, and multiculturalism in New Zealand: A social psychological analysis. International Migration Review. 42, 227-248.
- Yavçan, B. (2013) Public opinion toward immigration and the EU: How are Turkish immigrants different than others? Turkish Studies. Sayı 14. 158-178. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14683849.2013.766990?scroll=top&needAccess=true>
- Yıldırım hakkında. (Resmi internet sitesi) <http://www.yildirim.bel.tr/tr/kurumsal/yildirim-hakkinda>
- Yıldırım, S. (2012). Balkan savaşları ve sonrasındaki göçlerin Türkiye nüfusuna etkileri. Cumhuriyet Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi, 8(16). http://www.ctad.hacettepe.edu.tr/8_16/5.pdf

XÜLASƏ

İmmiqrantların bölgə rəhbərləri tərəfindən anlaşılması: Hədəf danışıq vasitəsilə digərinin qəbul edilməsi

Selda Adiloğlu
Bursa Texniki Universiteti, Bursa, Türkiyə

Hüseyin Pəhləvan
Bursa İldırım Bələdiyyəsi, Bursa, Türkiyə

İldırım Bələdiyyəsi Busanın üç mərkəz bölgəsindən biri olub, daxili və xarici miqrasiyaya açıq bir məkandır. Əsasən, Balkan ölkələrindən, köhnə Sovet ölkələrindən, Suriya və digər qonşu ölkələrdən olan miqrantlar burda yaşayırlar. Miqrantların çox olması, bölgənin idarə olunmasında, siyasi-mədəni və iqtisadi cəhətdən formalaşmasında böyük rol oynayır. Bu baxımdan İldırım bölgəsi üçün miqrantlar bölgənin əhali sayının böyük qismini təşkil edir. Yerli əhalinin miqrantlarla ünsiyyət qurması çox önəmlidir. Elmi araşdırmalarda əks olunan nümunələr, yerli əhali və miqrantlar arasında uyğunsuzluq və ya qismən razılaşma olduğunu göstərir. Bu məqalə yerli əhali və immiqrantlar arasında harmoniya ola biləcəyini, eyni zamanda miqrantların yerli əhali ilə uyğunlaşması üçün ünsiyyət qurma imkanlarının yaradılmasını tələb edir.

Bu arqumentin etibarlılığı İldırım rayonu 69 məhəllədəki 69 bölgə rəhbəri ilə yarı-strukturlaşdırılmış müsahibələrlə test edilmişdir. Əsasən Balkan ölkələrindən olan miqrantlar (Bolqarıstan, Yunanıstan və (köhnə) Yuqoslaviya) araşdırmalara cəlb olunmuşdur. Miqrantlarla bağlı yaranan əsas suallar, bölgə rəhbərlərinin bu mövzuda olan maraqları və bilik səviyyəsinə görə hazırlanmışdır. Müsahibələrin nəticələri elmi-tədqiqat araşdırmanın əsas arqumentini təsdiqləyir.

Açar sözlər: Miqrant dərkətmələri, Balkan miqrantları, Muxtar/bölgə rəhbəri, immiqrantlar

РЕЗЮМЕ

Понимание иммигрантов региональными руководителями: цель – принятие других посредством переговоров.

**Селда Адилоглу
Бурский технический университет, Бурса, Турция**

**Хусейн Пехливан
Муниципалитет Йилдирим, Бурса, Турции**

Муниципалитет Йилдирим - один из трех центральных регионов Пусана, являющийся открытым пространством для внутренней и внешней миграции. Там в основном проживают мигранты из балканских стран, стран бывшего СССР, Сирии и других соседних стран. Присутствие большого количества мигрантов играет важную роль в управлении и политическом, культурном и экономическом развитии региона. В связи с этим мигранты региона Йилдирим, составляют большую часть населения региона. Очень важны взаимодействия местных жителей с мигрантами. Примеры академических исследований показывают, что существует несоответствие или частичное согласие между местными жителями и мигрантами. Эта статья требует возможной гармонии между местным населением с мигрантами, а также с целью адаптации местного населения создания возможностей для общения с иммигрантами.

Достоверность этого аргумента была проверена в полуструктурированных интервью с 69 главами провинций в 69 районах в округе Йилдирим. Мигранты из балканских стран (Болгария, Греция и (бывшая) Югославия) были вовлечены в исследование, другие же группы мигрантов были исключены из примеров исследований. Основные вопросы, возникающие в связи с мигрантами, основаны на уровне интересов и знаний в этой области региональных руководителей. Результаты собеседований подтверждают основной аргумент научного исследования.

Ключевые слова: понимание мигрантов, балканские мигранты, глава автономного округа, иммигранты