

Measuring the Level of Urbanization, Adoption of Urban Values: Case of Immigration to Denizli City

Tanzer Çeliktürk

Lecturer, Pamukkale University

Abstract

In this study, the case of Denizli province where the urban transformation projects are taken for the solution of the problem of uneven urbanization will be discussed. Within the scope of the Denizli example, it will be tried to measure the extent to which the urban values of rural migrants migrate to the city. In other words, the level of social urbanization will be tried to be determined. For this purpose, questions were asked about urbanization and social urbanization for those who came to work from surrounding cities and Denizli countryside. Within the framework of the answers given, efforts will be made to determine how the degree of social urbanization has changed in the context immigrants. In this framework, urbanization process and social urbanization process of Turkey in the first stage will be briefly summarized. In the second part; The development of Denizli and the migration movement to Denizli will be briefly summarized and the social urbanization grades of immigrants in Denizli context will be discussed. In the context of urbanization and social urbanization analysis in Denizli City case, questions including basic indicators of economic and social aspects of urbanization - occupation, income level, solidarity, solidarity, cooperation, education, organization, information, methods of seeking rights, religious and political issues and family relations- are tailored and asked to participants.

Keywords: Urbanization, Urban Values, Social Urbanization, Immigrants, Denizli City Sample

Introduction

The Western-type of modern urban structure, in which industrialization and migration have been marched in parallel, transforms immigrants into their own socioeconomic and cultural structure. The Western-type of the modern city is inadequate in explaining the city structure and urbanization level in developing countries as in the case of Turkey. In Turkey, the immigration wave that has been streamed from rural to urban

areas with an increasing momentum after 1950 has not been treated as a parallel process with industrialization. During the period from 1950 to 2000, 70% of Turkey's population flowed towards cities. The inadequacy of housing and employment and the lack of urban adjustment mechanisms and the inability to meet the socio-cultural needs of the immigrant masses have caused the cities to face new problems. While the solution that the masses produced for the settlement in the urban adjustment process was a slum, the solution produced for the problems of socio-cultural adoption was the adaptation of rural community relations.

Emigration from rural to the urban areas has continued to increase in the course of economic liberalization of Turkey after 1980. After 1980's, immigration wave to the urban areas cannot be explained as a phenomenon that is only the result of the transformation of agricultural production. In terms of economic and socio-cultural aspects, immigration has gained momentum as cities have become centers of attraction. That is to say, while the migration in Turkey between 1950 -1980 occurred with more repulsive causes, it can be said that the attractive reasons after 1980's were more effective in the immigration wave (Keles, 2013: 67-68).

Urbanization of Turkey after 1990's can be considered as 'cities that cannot be urbanized'. The basic features of cities that cannot urbanize could be listed as the uneven structure of cities, the existence of slum areas, problems caused by high unemployment, problems of adaptation to the urban life of immigrants. One of the cities that fit the definition of unurbanized cities of Turkey in some aspects is Denizli (Torlak and Polat, 2006: 168-169). After 1980, Turkey's adoption of the export-driven economic growth model has made Denizli an attractive economic center. The wave of migration that grew faster than the industrialization experienced in this period prevented the formation of a city culture and belonging, as well as laying the foundation for the formation of shantytowns. The lack of job continuity of immigrants was a factor that made it difficult for migrants to adapt to the city culture.

In addition to the 2001 economic crisis, the decline in export rate in the textile sector, which is seen as a result of China becoming a member of the World Trade Organization, has led Denizli to weaken economically. In the post-2001 period, the migration wave to Denizli was cut off with the disappearance of the appeal created by industrialization and job opportunities. In this period, Denizli Municipality and "TOKI-Presidency of Mass Housing Administration" have tried to rehabilitate distorted city structure with urban transformation projects.

In this study, it will be tried to measure the extent to which the migrants from rural areas have accepted the urban values in the case of Denizli city. In other words, the level of social urbanization - adoption of

urban values- will be tried to be determined. For this purpose, questions were asked about urbanization and social urbanization for those who migrated to the Denizli city center from other cities and from the Denizli countryside. Within the framework of the answers given, efforts will be made to determine how the degree of social urbanization and urbanization has changed within the context Denizli city center. At first chapter, in the context of "notion of city structure", "notion of urbanization", "notion of social urbanization", the urbanization process of Turkey and the major problems that faced in urbanization process will be briefly summarized. In the second part; The development of Denizli city and the migration movement to Denizli will be briefly summarized and the degree of social urbanization of migrants in Denizli will be discussed. In the framework of social urbanization analysis, questions involving basic indicators of economic and social aspects of urbanization were directed to participants. Questions are about occupation, income level, solidarity, assistance, education and training, organization, information, methods of seeking rights, religious-political issues, traditions and customs, family relations. Within this scope, i will try to analyze the issues related to "social urbanization" in Denizli city case.

The Notions of City, Urbanization and Social Urbanization

The Notion of City

The most important differences between rural settlements and cities are; The social structure organized according to the division of labor, the economic structure in which the production of commodity and surplus production is made, and the intense population in which various social strata co-exist (Öztürk, 2009: 628-629). At the emergence of cities in time, trade has become more prominent because of its interaction with other civilizations and creating opportunities for market formation (Karatepe, 2005: 269).

According to Pirenne, city life has never developed independently in trade and industry in any civilization. The expansion of trade worldwide has changed socioeconomic status by influencing other countries and has provided the basis for the growth of cities (Pirenne, 1990: 98). The changes that took place in the socioeconomic structure of cities created different forms of the behavior, and way of thinking and life-style of inhabitants. The city culture, which emerged as a product of all these institutionalized attitudes, behaviors, lifestyles and beliefs, has led to centers of civilizations of humanity around cities. Cities with a civilization center are the settlements that carry the socio-cultural heritage of established communities. This common heritage has been formed the basis of urban culture by influencing

the physical structure of the city, such as squares, official and civil structures, settlements and trade areas (Karatepe, 2005: 270-271).

Ibn Khaldun emphasized the importance of the changes in the way of production and of the means of production in the formation of the city and civilization, thus revealing the importance of cultural interactions created by this change and by expanding trade transactions (Torlak et al., 2016: 76). Ibn Khaldun classified the settlements as urban and rural settlements according to the economic potential, production power and the abundance and prosperity created by this power. While at the same time he maintained that the settlements were constantly developing and changing in parallel with the development and capabilities of a human being (Ibn Khaldun, 1990: 302).

The accelerated migration movement from the rural area to the city, along with the industrial revolution, led to the growth of the cities on the one hand, and on the other hand to the structural changes that the urban centers would accommodate more people. The problems of the working class like housing, health, and education necessitated a new order in urban life. The modern city can be defined as a settlement area with a certain size and density and a social center with an organized social structure based on heterogeneous, secular and the whole production is supervised and its distribution is coordinated (Özer, 1983: 75-76).

The Notion of Urbanization

Industrialization and urbanization have made a transition to a heterogeneous society based on the division of labor and material interest, individuality, and secularism from homogeneous society structure in which traditions and values prevail. Although the city is a static concept, the concept of urbanization, which includes an expansion based on migration, has a dynamic structure. Urbanization includes a process of immigration to the city, which leads to socioeconomic and cultural change within a new settlement area and form (Torlak and Polat, 2006: 170). The notion of urbanization describes the change in a certain period of time. Especially the change in the form of production is the most important element of the urbanization process. Supervision of production and trade in the modern cities led the cities to expand with immigration and gaining population density. At the same time, this situation creates diversification in the economic sphere and increases integration in the sociocultural sphere (Keles, 2006: 24).

Today, the most distinctive feature of urbanization is the changes in the areas of communication and transportation. Urbanization in developed societies is generally parallel to the level of development, while the level of industrialization in developing societies is lower than the rate of urbanization (Keles, 2006: 28). The modern city, which was shaped by the 19th and 20th

century's capitalist production process and community structure, has generally undergone an irregular, unplanned and unsupervised urbanization process (Özer, 1983: 79).

The reason for the migration to cities from rural areas is not the attraction of cities but the lack of opportunity in rural areas, which makes the difference between underdeveloped country urbanization and developed country urbanization. Another difference is the inadequacy of the industrialization that can absorb the density of immigration experienced in the city. In the underdeveloped countries, this situation led to the accumulation of large masses that could not be integrated into the city life, but also to the formation of two different city types with different socio-cultural qualities within the same city (Özer, 1983: 80).

Urbanization Process of Turkey

Urbanization process in Turkey has developed in the opposite direction to the processes in developed countries. The urbanization phenomenon in Turkey, which started in the 1950's and gained momentum after the 1980's, has not yet begun to emerge as urban migration from rural areas due to the demand of the industrial sector for labor. Migrants are more likely to be agricultural workers or sharecroppers, lacking capital and land. The only addresses of these desperate masses, who were left unemployed and forced to emigrate, have become big cities where they hope to find work. However, many of the families who migrated to the city in hopes of finding a job were disappointed that they could not find a job due to unfamiliar industrialization at the same rate as immigration (Kuntay, 2001: 317).

Cities that do not have the structural and economic capacities to absorb the influx of immigrants have faced new problems. The newcomers to the city have had to meet their needs for accommodation with irregular and unplanned jumpsuits. This problem of irregular settlement as well as the fact that rural life and congregational¹ relations are dominated by a disconnected lifestyle can be considered as the main factors that undermine the urbanization process (Saglam, 2006: 42).

Since the 1960's, there have been significant differences in the urbanization process of Turkey. The rapid wave of immigration and slum dwelling are the changes that marked the shaping of cities. In this process, Turkey has been faced the problems that the slum dwelling had created in the urban structure, and at the same time faced the problems of social

¹ "Congregation"; Face-to-face, a structure based on a solid community feeling that has blood relations between the members of the primary relationship and our emotion, and this structure corresponds to a rural social unity. "The Community" is based on a structure in which secondary and official relations exist, where the specialization grows, the individualism dominates, and it is related to city life (Saglam, 2006: 42).

urbanization of the migrants. The migrant population has not been able to find a regular and satisfactory job for that reason they have been a part of the informal service sector in order to survive in the city. The disadvantaged situation of immigrants, who are the main actors of slum dwellings and informal economy, have created new problems with social urbanization process. This situation also creates the potential risk of polarization in the sociocultural structure of the city (Çiçek, 2010: 48-49).

The Notion of Social Urbanization: Adoption of Urban Values

One of the problems caused by the rapid migration is the distress experienced by the individuals who migrated to the city in the process of adopting to the socio-cultural values of the city. Within this context, the process of socialization and the change in the attitudes of individuals within the urban culture is called social urbanization (Torlak and Polat, 2006: 170). According to Özer, social urbanization is the expected change in the lifestyles of those who migrate from rural to urban areas (Özer, 2004: 121). Social urbanization; The process of social change after urbanization, the change of behavior, relationship, value judgments and material-spiritual lifestyles of the individuals. In this process, the migratory person is transforming into an urban person by changing his behavior and adopting to the urban culture.

"Social urbanization" is the most important factor in the process of being an individual, independent of the congregation to which the immigrant is affiliated. In this process, the traditional attitudes and behaviors of the individual begin to disappear and then new patterns of behavior are adopted and assimilated. Behavior and attitudes related to solidarity, cooperation, education and training, organization, information, methods of seeking rights, religious-political issues, male-female and family relations can be considered as the main indicators of "social urbanization-adoption of urban values" in socio-cultural aspect (Torlak and Polat, 2006: 171).

The concept of "social urbanization" is closely related to the cycle of life in the city. The concept of social urbanization requires a lifestyle that needs to conform to certain rules and also requires adherence and dedication to it (Yalcin, 2010: 232). In this context, social urbanization also corresponds to the integration process. Urban integration process does not always occur positively. Demographic, socioeconomic and cultural characteristics of individuals and the internal dynamics of the city affect the integration process negatively or positively.

Analysis of Denizli's Urbanization and Social Urbanization Process Urbanization and Social Urbanization in Denizli City

Urbanization and social urbanization processes which do not parallel to industrialization in Turkey are closely related to each other and they are generally problematic. The type of urbanization in Turkey has undergone a "fast, distorted, excessive, fake, unbalanced and unidirectional" development within the underdeveloped country urbanization sample (Keles, 1990: 14). It is clear that urbanization is a sociological process and it directly affects "social urbanization" when it is considered that it influences and reshapes the sociocultural and socioeconomic structure of the city. In this context, the process of social urbanization in a city, where the urbanization is distorted and irregular, will also be distorted.

The population of Turkey has a dynamic characteristic. This dynamism is mainly due to the fact that the rate of population growth is higher than that of developed countries. 75% of the population in Turkey has lived in villages between 1927 and 1950. In the year of 2000, the density of population in rural areas decreased to 35% due to intensive migration from rural to urban areas (Yalcin, 2010: 113-114). According to the 2010 data of Statistical Institute of Turkey; 76,8% of the total population (57.385.706 people) live in provincial and district centers while 23,2% (17.338.563 people) live in towns and villages (<http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreHaberBultenleri.do?id=10736>). Finally, according to the data of the Turkish Statistical Institute in 2014; 91,8% of the total population resided in provincial and district centers, while only 8,2% resided in towns and villages (<http://www.tuik.gov.tr/UstMenu.do?metod=temelist>). The main cause of this sharp decline in 2014 compared to 2010 was the adoption of Metropolitan City Law, which entered into force in 2012. With this law, a total of 1.023 small town municipalities and 16.082 village legal entities have been abolished. The town municipalities were abandoned and connected to the nearest district municipality as a neighborhood. The village settlements are connected to the district municipalities in the neighborhood status also. While the status of the inhabitants of the countryside does not change, only the peasants and the surrounding provinces are involved in metropolitan city administration.

In parallel with the rapid urbanization wave in Turkey after 1980's, the city of Denizli has been transformed into a rapidly growing and migrating city. Migrations mostly have been originated from surrounding cities such as Burdur, Afyon and Uşak and from the countryside of Denizli city center. Until the late 1970s, the significant portion of the population lived in the rural areas and engaged in agriculture in Denizli province. After 1980's existence of export-driven industrialization process in Denizli has

changed the social structure dramatically. Indeed, the population of the Denizli city center has shown a steady increase during the period from the “1927 General Population Census” to the present day. The main reason for this increase in the urban population is the internal migration, which is due to the developments in the industrial sector to a large extent, together with the attracting factors -education, employment, social status, transportation, communication, infrastructure, a better life expectancy, social and cultural activities-.

During the period of 1990-2000 period, a significant increase in employment in the industry and service sector has occurred in Denizli. Three-quarters of the new workforce of 12,980 persons recruited in the center of Denizli in the textile business sector (Arlı, 2009: 194) This data put forth the weight of the textile sector in the socio-economic transformation of Denizli. Urbanization process of Denizli, which settled in a unique position due to its industrialization in the period of 1990-2000 without decreasing its agricultural production, is closely related to the fact that Denizli countryside has fertile agricultural lands. As a matter of fact, according to the data of 2013, Denizli was in the 15th place in Turkey in terms of herbal production value (<http://www.tuik.gov.tr/ilgostergeleri/iller/DENIZLI.pdf>). Despite the rapid development of the industry, the protection of the power of agricultural employment has only been realized in Denizli among industrialized cities in Anatolia (Arlı, 2009: 206).

As a matter of fact, the 2001 crisis and the entry of cheap Chinese goods into the world markets led to the weakening of the textile sector after 2000’s, which constitutes Denizli's development engine and provides a large portion of employment. In this period, the textile workers, who were in the status of unskilled workers, mostly remained unemployed. A decrease in employment occasions has reversed the migration trend to Denizli (<http://www.tuik.gov.tr/UstMenu.do?metod=temelist>). At first sight, the migrations to Denizli has fallen. When it comes to 2011, migrations outside of Denizli have begun.

Figure 1. Population Registration System of Cities 2011

	Population	Immigration number to the City	Immigration number from the city	Net immigration number	Net immigration rate
TURKEY	74.724.269	2.420.181	2.420.181	0	%0
DENIZLI	978.700	23.454	23.853	- 399	%- 0,42

(http://rapor.tuik.gov.tr/reports/rwservlet?adnksdb2&ENVID=adnksdb2Env&report=wa_adnks_net_goc.RDF&p_kod=2&p_il=20&p_yil=2011&p_dil=1&desformat=html).

After the increase in the unemployment rate in Denizli, the return of immigrants coming from the surrounding provinces, districts, and villages, which is one of the important sources of migration, is one of the reasons for

Denizli becoming unattractive for immigrants. The other reason is that the rural area of Denizli and the surrounding provinces still have a strong agricultural employment capacity due to their fertile lands. As a matter of fact, 76,8% of the total population of Turkey (57.385.706 people) resides in provincial and district centers while 23.2% (17.338.563 people) live in towns and villages (<http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreHaberBultenleri.do?id=10736>). On the other hand, 68,8% of the Denizli population live in the city and 31,2% live in the towns and villages ([Http://denizli.gov.tr/webb/index.php?option=com_content & view = article & id = 118 & Itemid = 70](Http://denizli.gov.tr/webb/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=118&Itemid=70)). As this data show, the rural population in Denizli is above the average of Turkey.

When the "social urbanization" and the formation of urban identity in Denizli is analyzed, it can be said that being immigrated to the periphery of the province and rural areas does not lead to identity discrimination and polarization between the urban residents and immigrants (Torlak and Polat, 2006: 174). The fact that immigrants come from the same sociocultural origins as the residents of the city has been the factor that facilitates the process of urban alignment and "social urbanization". In addition, the growing economy is another factor for the city to offer opportunities for everyone, which does not lead to a clear polarization between residents and immigrants. However, the decline in industrial production after 2000's and the emergence of unemployment could be one of the factors that could trigger the socioeconomic polarization (Torlak and Polat, 2006: 174).

After 2000's, it can be said that there is a polarization in Denizli's living quarters. Especially in the neighborhoods such as Servergazi, Çamlık, Kınıklı, Bereketli, luxury houses are seen to rise; In the districts such as İlbadi, Anafartalar, Dokuzkavaklar, Sevindik, the structure of the squatter housing is seen. Nevertheless, it can not be said that this differentiation of living spaces has led to the social polarization in the same manner. In this period, the implementation of urban transformation projects with the initiative of the Denizli Metropolitan Municipality or TOKI has been a factor preventing the spatial and sociocultural polarization to increase further.

Field Survey on Social Urbanization in Denizli City

According to the concept of urbanization, the city unites its residents around similar cultural codes. Thus the common city identity is revealed and adopted by all the city dwellers. According to the assumption of urbanization, this identity of urbanism transforms the people who have immigrated to the city in time, in a socio-cultural sense.

Thirty-five questions were prepared in relation to the theoretical frameworks in the previous sections of the study of the citizens who emigrated to Denizli in order to measure urban identity and degree of social

urbanization. Participants were mainly selected from the employees of the textile sector. In addition to the blue-collar workers in the textile sector, white-collar employees who came to the city due to university education and appointment were also included in the survey. Due to the presence of men as well as the weight of women in the employment of the textile sector, the research has not been discriminated against men and women.

The created questionnaire form was applied to 411 participants in the research universe at march 2015. It is easy to use the easy sampling method. It is thought that it is difficult to determine a sample with probable methods from the main mass because of the individuals in the stage work in various enterprises. The questionnaire forms were examined by the researcher and the presence of participants who did careless coding over a single answer was checked. As a result of the examinations and checks made, 380 available questionnaires were obtained. For this reason, it was decided to continue the analyses with 380 observations. Data obtained within the scope of the study were analyzed and reported using the SPSS 20.0 package program.

58% of the participants were women and 42% were men. 76% of the participants were from the age group 26-45, 15% from the age group 18-25. The proportion of the population aged between 18 and 45, which can actively work due to the attractive power of the industrial sector in Denizli, is above the Turkish average ([http://www.denizli.bel.tr/userfiles/file/2012-2016%20 STRATEJIK% 20PLAN.pdf](http://www.denizli.bel.tr/userfiles/file/2012-2016%20STRATEJIK%20PLAN.pdf)). Participants included in the survey consist mainly of this group in accordance with this database.

While 43% of the participants were university graduates, 21% are high school graduates. The ratio of primary school graduates was around 16%. The fact that the ratio of university graduates in women is 68% indicates that women who come to the city due to education are easier to adapt to business life and urban life.

While 40% of the participants come in less than 1000 TL, 23% of them come in the range of 1000-1900 TL. The excess of the minimum income is a natural result of the textile sector, which does not require qualified employment. Considering that the weight of university graduates is high among the employees, studying for less than 1000 TL indicates that university graduates can not work in a job they desire. On the other hand, this data can be seen as data showing hidden unemployment for university graduates.

73% of the participants were married and had a family structure consisting of the mother, father, and children within the core family formation. 26% of respondents have lived in the same house as two people and 71% have lived between 3 and 5 people. This data shows that the extensive family structure that constitutes one of the characteristics of the slippery settlement structure was not very common in Denizli. This data

stems from the fact that migration to Denizli mostly comes from the surrounding districts and cities. Another reason for not seeing the extended family structure is that parents prefer to stay in villages with fertile lands instead of migrating. This shows that immigration takes place predominantly by the younger population, both in terms of attractiveness of the city and economic reasons. The spouse of 67% of the participants was working. This data confirms that the migration to Denizli is experienced in the form of a nuclear family. Due to unskilled employment in the textile sector, the low wages have brought the spouses to work as well.

Those who migrated to Denizli; 34% due to economic reasons, 14% due to education and 14% due to the appointment. 27% of the migrants came from the surrounding cities, 21% from the villages of Denizli and 16% from the district centers of Denizli. When immigration periods of immigrants were examined it was seen that; the rate of living in the city during the period of 0-5 years was 20%, the rate of living in the city during the 6-10 years was 22%, the rate of living in the city during the period of 11-15 years was 17%, the rate of living in the city during the period of 16-20 years was 20%. The proportion of those who are more than 20 years old was 20%. This data show that Denizli has formed a center of attraction as a result of the economic breakthrough after 1980's.

In the survey, the main factor in finding employment was the very large proportion of migrant workers (73%) taking their own efforts and receiving 15% of friendship support. This data reveals that the relatives and citizenship solidarity, which is one of the main features of slum settlement, was not seen in Denizli case. The fact that the textile sector, which constitutes the main employment area in Denizli, has a high rate of unskilled labor and a high rate of the changing job (35% of the participants once, 32% of them have made many job changes) is another factor that job seekers do not need extra support.

Given the frequency of visits of migrants to their homeland, 50% have visited several times a year. The reason for the visit was 73% in the form of a family visit. This rate shows that immigration takes place in the form of a nuclear family, but also immigrants show strong family ties parallel to the classical Turkish family. In other words, the parents or some of the relatives remained in their living place. This data shows that the migrant movement in Denizli is not in the form of classical shantytowns where the parents and the relatives live together. As a matter of fact, this data can be seen as an indication of the absence of sociocultural polarization between the developed regions of Denizli and the neighborhoods where the slum dwelling is located.

80% of those who migrated to Denizli had no income-generating assets in their homeland and 60% has received food aid from their

homelands, which is another indication that the cause of migration was economic. Considering that the majority of migrants to Denizli are from neighboring cities and Denizli's countryside, but those who do not own land or property. This data reveals that the ratio of rural population in Denizli and its surroundings is above the Turkey average and migration to Denizli proves to be largely economic reasons than the attraction of the city.

The reason why 43% of the migrants preferred the neighborhood selection was its closeness to the city center. Only 18% of them have settled in the neighborhood in order to be close to their relatives or cronies. This data also shows that the classical slum dwelling structure is not valid in Denizli. It is seen that the city center was preferred because of easy transportation facilitates and cheaper rentals. It is important to say that 80% of migrants to Denizli were happy to migrate to town and 78% of them were satisfied with coming to town in terms of being a sign of the sense of belonging to the city. These data is important in showing that urbanization in Denizli and sense of belonging to the city are strong. Considering that the reasons for the migration are largely economic, it is seen that the Denizli economy is still able to generate employment despite the contraction in the textile sector in recent years. In addition to investments provided by the municipalities, TOKİ has facilitated the process of city adaptation and increased its satisfaction with those who migrate to produce new housing within the scope of urban transformation projects. At the point of social urbanization and the formation of urban consciousness, it can be said that it has made the duty of the municipality in particular. While 55% of participants are on the rent, 39% have their own home. The fact that 39% of the lower income groups are homeowners, reveals the high level of satisfaction that the city migrated.

The answers to the foreground in the evaluation of leisure time were; 23% spent time with friends, 15% watching television, 15% reading books and 13% visiting the relatives. Spending time with friends and other answers was more often than not having to spend time with the relatives because relocation to Denizli is more like a nuclear family. Given the frequency of visits to neighbors, it was stated that 34% of participants reported occasionally. The rate of frequent visitors was only 13%. This data could be evaluated in line with metropolitan city characteristics where the core family structure is dominant. Therefore, it can be said that there is no slum structure in Denizli where kinship relations dominate

73% of the participants stated that they would move with other residents in a problem that the locals are experiencing. But 83% said they would not attend the meeting to be held on such problems. These answers reveal a contradictory situation. When there was a problem with the neighborhood, the main authority applied was the "neighborhood headman"

of 63%, followed by the related institutions by 19% and the municipal response by 11%. This data shows that the low level of political participation at the country level (except for the voting) is also reflected at the local level. In the same way, it shows that the locality and the urbanization consciousness are not fully occupied either. It can be said that the centralized politics in Turkey clogging the political participation channels cause the inability of the development of localism and the weakening of the urbanization culture.

Asked whether the political preferences of immigrants have changed, 83% of respondents said they did not change their political preferences. The reasons expressed by those who change political preferences were related to economic reasons rather than ideological reasons. Migrating from nearby cities or from the surrounding villages to Denizli didn't cause any change in the current political attitude of migrants. Moreover, employment opportunities in Denizli, TOKI's and the Denizli Metropolitan Municipality's adequate social housing production have prevented socio-cultural polarization, which has reduced the volatility of political preferences. While 50% of the participants read both newspapers and magazines, only 5% of the respondents said that they do not read newspapers or magazines. 70% of the newspaper readers bought the newspaper by himself, 12% of them read the newspaper that was bought by the family members, and 12% of them read the newspaper that was bought by their friends.

In familial issues, 65% of respondents said "we will make a joint decision", while 13% answered, "my father will decide". The vast majority of those who say "My father decides" are single participants living with their parents. The vast majority of married participants gave a "joint decision". In response to "a joint decision", both spouses work, and especially the married couples living as a nuclear family are influential. The male dominant family structure in Turkish society still maintains its validity, especially in the extended family model.

Conclusion and Suggestions

The concept of social urbanization is directly related to urban lifestyle. In other words, the concept of urbanization requires that the inhabitants of the city live a life that conforms to the rules - to be respectful to others, to not harm urban common objects and places, and to avoid behaviors that disturb others. At the same time, residents of the city must love the city and feel themselves to be a part of the city.

The biggest obstacle to social urbanization can be seen as the problems of employment and housing for immigrants. In addition to solving these two problems, providing equal service to disadvantaged groups by local governments could support to develop the awareness of urbanism. It is

wrong to expect that people living in urban areas will develop their urban behavior by themselves. In order to ensure the abandonment of misconceptions that are frequently seen in cities in Turkey, local governments have to enforce the practices which are the absolutely sanctioning force (Yalcin, 2010: 240).

Denizli province, which has been greatly influenced by the changes in the economic area after 1980's, has become a city where the unemployed immigrants have been intensified by the growing industry. Parallel to the developing industry, besides the immigration wave towards Denizli, it brought with it problems such as education, health, not getting enough benefits from urban services, and being unable to integrate with the city. One of the most important problems that arise for urbanization is the shanty town construction produced by poverty. Particularly in the neighborhoods such as Sevindik, Dokuzkavaklar, Anafartalar. However, in recent years, the municipalities and TOKI's urban transformation projects have been deceived and the expansion of shanty towns has been prevented. This decrease in slum settlement also reduced the risk of potential sociocultural polarization.

Urbanization problems prevent the development of local urbanism and constitute an obstacle for individuals to feel belonging to the city. These problems, on the other hand, cause the residents of the city to be dissatisfied with the city and create a risk of sociocultural polarization. Denizli grew rapidly after the 1980s, with immigration from the surrounding provinces and districts. The inadequacy of infrastructure and housing in Denizli, which is unprepared against the rapid migration wave, triggered irregular settlement. On the other hand, economic development and enrichment have led to the construction of luxury housing, which has resulted in the growth of regional differences in the city. The major reason why this difference in the spatial plane does not lead to polarization or conflict at the social dimension is that the wave of migration is predominantly composed of the same socio-cultural origins and surrounding districts. However, there is a serious risk of socio-cultural polarization especially with immigrants coming from the southeastern part of Turkey and settling in the vicinity of the Sevindik neighborhood. This polarization, especially due to the terror problem of PKK, carries the risk of further deepening.

Another obstacle to urbanization in Denizli is that the economic shrinkage in the textile sector, which has lived in recent years, leads to unemployment. As a matter of fact, in 2011, Denizli was one of the cities where the current population decreased for the first time. It is clear that sociocultural polarization will increase if this shrinking of the textile sector can not be compensated in a certain way. In addition, this progress will harm the consciousness of local identity in Denizli and the process of urbanization.

Despite the little increase in unemployment, there is a high rate of satisfaction in Denizli, where social polarization and crime rates are not very high. The basis of this success is the successful urbanization policy implementations of the Denizli Metropolitan Municipality in recent years. Denizli Metropolitan Municipality, which makes important investments in infrastructure as well as superstructure in the frame of urbanization policy, has also reduced the exclusion of the slum areas with the urban transformation projects at the same time. In the same way, marketplaces, sports fields, parks and green areas have tried to increase the belonging of the residents of the slum district neighborhoods and they succeeded in this.

However, the business contraction experienced in the textile sector and the unemployment it creates are the biggest obstacles in front of the social urbanization as well as the potential for creating social polarization. As we can see from the survey, the satisfaction rates of working individuals are very high. The most important thing to do at this point is to introduce new investments and incentives that will prevent unemployment. As a matter of fact, according to the strategy decision taken on this issue, the government and the municipality are trying to increase the tourism potential of Denizli. In this context, the ruins of Pamukkale have been reorganized and it has been decided to build a large museum complex in which monuments of Denizli can be exhibited.

One of the obstacles to urbanization, according to my research, is the lack of participation seen in the issues that concern the city. When it is expressed that the problems related to the city or the neighborhood will move together, participation decreases suddenly in case of taking initiative. At this point, it is especially necessary for the municipality to enact governance mechanisms that will inform the public or involve them in decision-making mechanisms. It is important that mechanisms such as city councils, neighborhood councils be supported and encouraged. It is evident that people who are somehow included in the decision-making process will have more possession of the city and thus social urbanization will increase.

References:

- Arlı, Alim (2009). *Sosyal Mekânda Farklılaşma: Denizli’de Kırsal/Kentsel Dönüşüm (1990–2000)*, İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Sosyoloji Anabilim Dalı, Doktora Tezi, İstanbul
- Çiçek, Zuhâl (2010). *Kentsel Dönüşüm ve Kentsel Yoksulluk: Denizli Örneği*, Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Genel Sosyoloji ve Metodoloji Ana Bilim Dalı Sosyoloji Bilim Dalı, Denizli
- Elmacı, Süleyman ve Bekdemir, Ünsal. (2008). *Ortaçağ İslam Aleminde Şehir: İbn Haldun’un Şehre Bakışı*, Doğu Coğrafya Dergisi, Sayı:19

- Ibn Haldun (1990). *Mukaddime I, II, III*, (Çeviren: Zakir Kadiri Ugan), M.E.B. Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Karatepe, Şükrü. (2005). *Şehirler Sahibini Arıyor*, ‘İslam Geleneğinden Günümüze Şehir Hayatı ve Yerel Yönetimler’ içinde, (Editör: Prof. Dr. Vecdi Akyüz), Cilt 2, İlke Yayıncılık, İstanbul
- Keleş, Ruşen (2006). *Kentleşme Politikası*, İmge Kitabevi Yayınları, Ankara
- Keleş, Ruşen (2013). *Kentleşme Politikası*, İmge Kitabevi Yayınları, Ankara
- Pirrenne, Henri. (1990). *Ortaçağ Kentleri*, (Çeviren: Ş. Karadeniz), İletişim yayınları, İstanbul
- Özer, İnan (1983). *Toplumsal Değişme ve Kentsel Olgular*, Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, Sayı: 1
- Özer, İnan (2004). *Kentleşme Kentleşme ve Kentsel Değişme*, Bursa: Ekin Kitabevi.
- Öztürk, Mustafa. (2009). *Tarihî Seyrin Şehirlerin Fizikî ve Sosyal Yapısına Etkileri Üzerine Bazı Tespitler*, Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, Prof. Dr. Reşat Genç Armağanı Özel Sayı I, Ankara, Temmuz 2009
- Sağlam, Serdar (2006). Türkiye’de İç Göç Olgusu ve Kentleşme, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Dergisi, Sayı: 5, Güz 2006
- Torlak, S.Evinç ve Polat, Ferihan (2006). *Kentleşme Sürecinde Kimlik Farklılaşması Açısından Denizli’deki İki Mahallenin Karşılaştırılması Analizi*, Gazi üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 8/2
- Torlak, S.Evinç, Çeliktürk Tanzer, Kulaç Onur, Arslan R. (2016). *A Medieval Islamic City: Case of Cordoba*, Journal of Life Economics, Sayı:8
- Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu (2011). *Bölgesel Göstergeler TR32 Aydın, Denizli, Muğla 2010*, Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu Matbaası, Ankara
- Yalçın, Cemal (2010). *Türkiye’de Kentleşme Sorunları Üzerine Bir Tartışma*, Hacettepe Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, Cilt 28, Sayı 1