

A Study of the Size of the Family Relations and Solidarity
in Terms of Social Adjustment in a Sample of Turkish
Bulgarian Immigrants Expelled from Bulgaria
Between 1950 - 1951

Oğuz Ari
Istanbul University

INTRODUCTION

In this article we wish to discuss one part of the results of a recent survey we conducted in Turkey. This is an empirical study and we hope that the results will be useful in formulating hypothesis about the social conditions in the Middle East and other areas. Social conditions reflect the patterns of the underlying institutions which influence behavior and information about the components of the configurational pattern of these institutions gradually may, with the collection of data on other dimensions also, lead to insight about the nature of the social conditions. We wish to present here the part of the data we obtained on the family institution in relation to its components of size and family relations and solidarity in a group of Turkish - Bulgarian immigrants, as they effect adjustment in the new country. The data pertains only to a sample of the Turkish - Bulgarian immigrants who were expelled from Bulgaria in 1950 - 51 and who settled in Turkey. We studied various aspects of social and occupational adjustment in the sample of Turkish - Bulgarian immigrants in the receiving country. An article on adjustment to conditions of work appeared elsewhere [1].

[1] Oğuz Ari, «The Assimilation to Conditions of Work in Turkey of the Turkish - Bulgarian Immigrants Expelled from Bulgaria Between 1950 - 1951», *Integration*, Nr. 3 (1959), pp. 198 - 203.

154.393 Turkish - Bulgarian immigrants in 37.351 families were forced to leave Bulgaria between 1950 - 51. These national refugees were settled in cities, towns and villages of forty provinces in Turkey [2]. Our attention, however, was concentrated on a sample among those who settled in Gümüşsuyu, Taştarla, Istanbul and in Hürriyet, Bursa. Both dwelling areas for these refugees were either built by the Government, or the construction was financed by public authorities. All national refugees expelled from Bulgaria during these years were settled by the Government. Bursa and Istanbul are two large cities as well as industrial centers and the refugees' settlement areas are annexed to these cities. A five-year tax exemption and exemption from military service for two years was granted to immigrants and credits exceeding 1.000.000 Turkish Liras were given to artisans and tradesmen among them.

Our group of immigrants do not represent the whole immigrant population from Bulgaria, since their settlement spreads over forty provinces as it was mentioned above. A survey conducted at the time of their entry indicates that, in terms of occupation, they were mostly agrarian. It was also determined at the time of entry that the reported occupations of those settled in the cities were mostly related with various kinds of crafts and trades [3]. This holds true for our sample living in the two urban and industrial areas also.

Some Consideration and Research on the Nature and Importance of the Family Institution and Their Implications in Our Survey.

According to Gillin and Gillin, the group consisting of husband and wife and their minor children is practically universal throughout human society, and is called the immediate or elementary family [4]. Again according to Gillin and Gillin, as we examine the family structures of the world we see that some place the major importance on the marriage relationship while others make the blood relationship dominant. Thus we may speak of two general types of family: the conjugal family in which the dominant rela-

[2] Directorate General of Land and Settlement (Turkey), *Land and Settlement Works* (in Turkish), (Ankara, 1955), p. 53.

[3] Ali Tanoğlu, «The Last Migration from Bulgaria» (in Turkish), *Journal of the Faculty of Economics*, 14, 1-4 (1952), p. 132.

[4] J. L. Gillin, J. P. Gillin, *Cultural Sociology*, (New York, 1950), p. 223.

tionship is between spouses; and the consanguine family in which the most important relationships are those of blood, i.e. bonds between blood kinsmen involve more obligations and activity than those between spouses^[5]. Lowie offers a more narrow definition somewhat similar to the former definition by Gillin and Gillin. Lowie states that the family is the association that corresponds to the institution of marriage, the socially approved form of sex relations. According to Lowie, in what Radcliffe-Brown calls its elementary form, it includes a single husband and wife with their child or children, this latter relationship to be understood in a sociological rather than physiological sense^[6]. Both authors recognize however, the extended family and its unilateral and bilateral forms.

The extended family is important in our discussion. In an analysis of the results of a questionnaire he administered to emergent Turkish administrators in the Faculties of Law and Political Science in Ankara, Matthews observed that families with four members were the most frequent. On the other hand, he obtained a higher frequency of eight member families than seven member families which lead him to conclude that, the dominant type of family in the Turkish society is still the extended type the son brings his wife to his father's house^[7]. However, since in the table he presents, the frequencies of 3, 4, 5 and 6 member families are higher than either 7 or 8 member families, his data may also indicate that the extended family is decreasing in size.

In the Philippines Stoodley found that the family continues to be the major social institution; family rights and obligations apply lineally to grand-parents on both sides and collaterally to cousins, aunts and uncles also on both sides. Thus, important rights and obligations and emotional responses are defined by the family structure and persist from the cradle to the grave. The occupational structure in urban areas is only just beginning to break into the web of relationships established by the family^[8]. It can be sur-

[5] Gillin and Gillin, op. cit., pp. 227 - 228.

[6] R. H. Lowie, *Social Organization*, (New York, 1953), p. 215.

[7] A. T. J. Matthews, *Emergent Turkish Administrators* (Turkish version), (Ankara, 1955), p. 11.

[8] B. H. Stoodley, «A Cross-Cultural Study of Structure and Conflict of Social Norms», *The American Journal of Sociology*, LXV, I, (1959), 40.

mized that as new industries are established, family size and subsequently family relations will be gradually challenged by the culture of modern industry. In the U. S. in 1790, when the first census in was taken the American family consisted of an average of 5.7 individuals; in 1850, 5.6; in 1900, 4.7; in 1930, 4.1 and in 1940, 3.78 persons per occupied housing unit. Many of these «families» as enumerated by the census were actually households, including unrelated members. There is also a decrease in the proportions of very large families and a corresponding increase in small families. Proportionately there were five times as many families in 1790 with ten or more members as there were in 1930. On the other hand, families consisting of one or two members were almost three times as numerous proportionately in 1930 as in 1790 [9].

The scope of family relations are also weakened. Close relationship within primary groups are indicative of solidarity and lead to the development of the «we» feeling [10]. The concept of familism should be relevant in this context although it entails more than close relations. According to Ernst W. Burgess and Howey J. Locke, familism refers to strong in-group feelings, emphasis on family goals, common property, mutual support and the desire to pursue the perpetuation of the family [11]. Panos D. Bardis, in a study of 68 White American college students enrolled in an introductory sociology course in Albion College, and their 136 native American parents found that this type of organization is no longer dominant. In analyzing the results of a questionnaire he administered, he found that the item represented by the highest means referred to helping one's parents with the support of one's younger siblings while that with the lowest means pertained to the married child's living in the parental home. The subjects disapproved most of policies depriving the individual of his independence with reference to finances, residence, conduct and ideologies. They approved most

[9] Gillin and Gillin, op. cit., p. 361.

[10] R. E. L. Faris, «Development of Small Group Research Movement» in M. Sherif and M. O. Wilson, *Group Relations at the Crossroads*, (New York, 1953), pp. 171 - 172.

[11] This paragraph is quoted by P. D. Bardis from E. W. Burgess and H. J. Locke, *The Family*, (New York, 1953), p. 60 in his article, «Attitudes Towards the Family Among the College Students and their Parents», *Sociology and Social Research*, 43, 5, (1959), pp. 352 - 358.

of practices conducive to the general security of the immediate family as a whole. The intermediate responses referred primarily to helping close relatives other than parents and siblings [12]. Thus a tendency was observed indicating the weakening of the scope of relationships and solidarity within the larger family. This is true in the industrialized countries. Observations about the underdeveloped countries are somewhat different.

Presthus considers the family in its relation to bureaucratic behavior in Non-Western countries and stresses its importance in that context. He states that cultural parochialism has obscured the fact that the nepotism and subjectivity seen in bureaucratic systems of many less developed societies are a manifestation of their pattern of family relations in which personal loyalties outweigh the demands of technical supremacy. In the West, a similar conflict - bureaucratic needs vs. family and political loyalty - exist, but the demands of objectivity usually persist; in the Middle East the breakdown of the extended family has not yet occurred... Non-Western family structure with its demands for highly personalized decisions inhibits the development of rational, bureaucratic operations [13]. Riggs differentiates between agrarian and industrialized societies on the basis of similar organizational patterns. According to Riggs, in terms of underlying organizational patterns, the primary type tends to dominate in agricultural, rural, relatively immobile situations and membership is largely by birth e.g. the extended family in agraria. Secondary organizations - less personal, less traditional and less selective associations such as fraternal orders, unions, schools and country clubs - characterize the industrial urban society [14]. Stoodley observed that Non-Western cultures have particularistic norms which, by definition, favor a concrete personal relationship in contrast to all relationships of the same type... Universalism as a normative orientation favors the kind of role structure that has been generally adapted to the industrial revolution in the Western world [15].

[12] Bardis, op. cit., pp. 354 - 355.

[13] R. V. Presthus, «Behavior and Bureaucracy in Many Cultures», *Public Administration Review*, XIX, I, (1959), p. 27.

[14] F. W. Riggs, «Agraria and Industria - Toward a Typology of Comparative Administration», in W. J. Siffin, ed., *Toward the Comparative Study of Public Administration*, (Indiana University, 1957), in Presthus, op. cit., p. 29.

[15] Stoodley, op. cit., pp. 39, 40.

The above mentioned findings and statements indicate general trends. We maintain that modifications in this general scheme may occur in countries where agriculture is the main branch of economic activity. The family size and subsequently family relations and solidarity in these countries may be modified as industries and manufacturing plants are established. The effects on the establishment of more objective norms remains to be seen. Cities and towns in Bulgaria where the immigrants came from retained their agrarian character generally prior to the Russian invasion in 1945. We conducted the survey in Turkey, a country in the Middle East, where agriculture is the main branch of economic activity. In terms of the 10% sample surveyed in 1956, 9,317,581 persons among 14,498,438 people over 15 years of age who are gainfully employed were working in agriculture [16]. In 1954, the share of agriculture in the percentage distribution according to industrial origin of the total national income at constant prices (at 1948 factor cost prices) was 45.0% [17]. This agrarian predisposition is reflected in the size of the households. In terms of the size of the households the highest percentages according to a 10% sample surveyed in 1956 were those of 3 member families (16.8%) 4 member families (18.8%) 5 member families (16.4%) and 6 member families (11.7%) in urban areas; and 4 member families (14.6%) 5 member families (15.9%) 6 member families (14.4%) and 7 member families (11.2%) in rural areas [18]. It can be seen that the family is slightly larger in rural areas than in urban areas. We should repeat here, however, that many of these «families» as enumerated by the census are actually households, including unrelated members. A corresponding decrease in the size of the family can be expected in areas where industries are established.

Our sample is not representative of a population undergoing a transition from agrarian to industrial; they were mostly craftsmen and tradesmen in Bulgaria and they either continue with their vocations or work in the factories in Turkey. The sample is not ag-

[16] Republic of Turkey, Prime Ministry, Central Statistical Office, *Bulletin of Statistics*, 33, (Ankara, 1956), p. 129.

[17] Central Statistical Office, *Bulletin of Statistics*, 18, (Ankara, 1955), p. 95.

[18] Central Statistical Office, *Bulletin of Statistics*, 33, (Ankara, 1956), p. 146.

rarian but the results point at a process taking place in these countries. The results which may be tested further later on indicate that tendencies of change in the size of the family institution have occurred in a predominantly agrarian society in comparison with the situation in Bulgaria prior to 1950 - 51 when the immigrants were expelled from that country. To repeat, these changes do not refute previous assumptions but point at possible modifications. On the other hand, industrialization is not the only reason why the size of the family is getting smaller in this group. However, as the size of the family diminishes more independent units may begin to exist gradually with less solidarity between them.

PROCEDURE

Questions on the Family :

In order to investigate the size of the family, questions were asked on how many people there were in the family and who they lived with. On family relations and solidarity, questions were asked as to who they consult with when they have problems; whose advice they listen to; do they work together with the members of the family or does everyone earn his living individually; whether they wish to continue to live together with the present family members in case everyone earns his living individually; whether women are working and whether the immigrants consider this to be proper. As it can be seen, the questions on family relations and solidarity only cover certain areas of that field. Consequently, the answers and conclusions pertain to the areas covered. Comparisons with the conditions in Bulgaria were made in all cases. The questions on whether women are working and whether the immigrants consider this to be proper were asked in line with Gillin and Gillin's assumption that the increased earning capacity of women and the opportunities offered them to make their own living, by enabling them to be more independent, has impaired the old-time unity of the family group [19].

[19] Gillin and Gillin, *op. cit.*, p. 355.

The Sample :

A total of 2,037 families were settled in Taşlıtarla and 608 families in Hürriyet and the adjacent İstiqlâl. The questionnaire was administered to 45 persons in Hürriyet and 93 persons in Gümüşsuyu —a settlement area composed of 500 house in the rather widely spread Taşlıtarla. Therefore, our total N consisted of 138 persons; men and women about equally represented. Measures were also taken to obtain a fair representation of all age groups. However, only a section of Taşlıtarla, namely, Gümüşsuyu was covered in that way; and since Hürriyet is smaller in area, we had a chance to give the questionnaire to people in all parts of it. Furthermore, the survey was conducted every day for a fortnight in Hürriyet whereas in Taşlıtarla, a group of interviewers administered the questionnaire on Sundays only. Consequently, more persons who stay and or work at home were interviewed in Hürriyet than in Taşlıtarla. For the reasons mentioned above, our N does not cover all Turkish - Bulgarian immigrants settled in Taşlıtarla and Hürriyet in terms of size and an equal chance for inclusion of everyone in the total N and, therefore, the results have to be taken with caution. Our survey is more in the nature of a pilot study.

The answers are coded and presented in terms of percentages. Below, we shall discuss the answers to the questions related with the family. The conclusions are valid for the N we have studied but they may give an idea about the total group in Hürriyet and Taşlıtarla.

RESULTS

TABLE I.
Questions on the Family Size

	<i>How many people were there in the family when you were in Bulgaria?</i>		<i>How many people are there in the family in Turkey?</i>	
	<i>Hürriyet</i>	<i>Gümüşsuyu</i>	<i>Hürriyet</i>	<i>Gümüşsuyu</i>
2 — 5	46%	65%	68%	69%
6 — 10	40%	33%	32%	30%
Other answers	14%	2%	—	1%
Total percentage	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of Participants ...	(45)	(93)	(45)	(93)

	<i>Who did you live with in the family in Bulgaria ?</i>		<i>Who did you live with in the family in Turkey ?</i>	
	<i>Hürriyet</i>	<i>Gümüşsuyu</i>	<i>Hürriyet</i>	<i>Gümüşsuyu</i>
With wife and children.....	40%	51%	66%	78%
With close relatives in father's house	37%	37%	20%	14%
With wife's relatives '	4%	4%	14%	7%
Other answers	19%	8%	—	1%
Total percentage	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of participants ...	(45)	(93)	(45)	(93)

Following the migration there is an increase in the percentage of relatively small 2 - 5 member families and a corresponding decrease in the percentage of relatively large 6 - 10 member families both in Hürriyet and in Gümüşsuyu in our sample. This indicates that small families exist as well as large families. In these answers, the reported increments and decrements in size are smaller than in the answers where they tell who they live with in the family in both countries. In other words, more people report that they live with their wives and children only than those who state that the size of the family decreased since they came to Turkey. Possibly, unrelated members have been included in the former answers the latter questions did not allow for such inclusions.

Conjugal families consisting of a husband wife and children increased following settlement in Turkey whereas extended families living in the father's house with close relatives decreased. In terms of the percentages obtained, only a few live with wife's relatives in both countries. The economic factor is not by itself responsible for the decrease in family size. Migration might have altered family size since some family members were left back in Bulgaria. On the other hand, the Turkish Government settled the immigrants in small family units, sometimes giving different dwellings to members of larger families in different parts of the country without regard to the regions or cities they come from. This may partially indicate the reason why the split has occurred. On the other hand, six years had passed since the settlement of the immigrants in their new homes when we administered the questionnaire and many children grew up and got married during that time. Yet the extended family

where the son brings his wife to the father's house is no longer dominant.

The decrease in the percentage of extended families in our sample following settlement in Hürriyet and in Gümüşsuyu is indicative of adjustment. However, patriarchal extended families are distinctive in Moslem societies. Nevertheless, the existence of extended families is not indicative of a family type similar to the Yugoslav zadruga. The zadruga was found to embrace the males of a patrilineage plus the wives and unmarried females begotten by the members. It is thus not identical with such a lieage, for though it comprises the male core thereof, it excludes its females so far as they are married; and, on the other hand, it includes the wives, who come from other lineages and fulfill important duties in the house community after their entrance [20]. On the other hand, according to the codification in 1917 of the Turkish Family Law in the Medjelle based on Sheriat, moslem religious sanctions, which the Turks observed until the reception of the Swiss Civil Code in 1926 and in Bulgaria although partially, unofficially until the Russian invasion in 1945, women had all inheritance rights. Furthermore, women could exercise all rights of ownership and make transactions after the age of puberty. However, although the Sheriat granted them the rights mentioned above, their course of action was restricted in these matters in practice, since they dealt under the supervision of men [21]. Modern laws grant equal rights to women. The emancipation of women may also be important in diminishing the size of the families in industrial and urban areas.

[20] Lowie, *op. cit.*, pp. 217 - 218.

[21] This statement is quoted by Z. F. Fındıkoğlu, in *Sociology, Volume Three, Sociology of Law* (in Turkish), (Istanbul, 1958), p. 248, from Ahmet Cevat, *Women in Turkey* (in Turkish), (no date), p. 40.

TABLE II.

The following tables are on family relations and solidarity

	<i>Who did you consult with when you had problems in Bulgaria?</i>		<i>Who do you consult with when you have problems in Turkey?</i>	
	<i>Hürriyet</i>	<i>Gümüsuğu</i>	<i>Hürriyet</i>	<i>Gümüsuğu</i>
No one	40%	23%	46%	22%
With father, mother and elder brother	17%	30%	13%	28%
With seniors (including relatives)	17%	19%	13%	11%
With the old Turks	7%	12%	2%	5%
Other answers	19%	16%	26%	34%
Total percentage	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of Participants ...	(45)	(93)	(45)	(93)

	<i>Whose advice did you listen to in Bulgaria?</i>		<i>Whose advice do you listen to in Turkey?</i>	
	<i>Hürriyet</i>	<i>Gümüsuğu</i>	<i>Hürriyet</i>	<i>Gümüsuğu</i>
Does not ask for advice ...	32%	28%	28%	21%
Asks for advice to father, mother, elder, brother ...	22%	30%	20%	17%
To seniors (including relatives)	17%	12%	13%	30%
To old Turks	4%	10%	4%	5%
Other answers	25%	20%	35%	27%
Total percentage	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of Participants ...	(45)	(93)	(45)	(93)

Those who consult with their fathers, mothers and elder brothers; with seniors, including relatives; and with the old Turks follow those who consult with no one in Bulgaria. The same sequence is retained after coming to Turkey.

Those who ask for advice to their fathers, mothers and elder brothers; to seniors, including relatives; to the old Turks follow those who ask for advice to no one in Bulgaria. The answers appear in the same order after settlement in Turkey.

There have been a large number irrelevant answers indicated under the heading of «other answers» in response to all four questions which render interpretations difficult. This might show that either the questions were too vague for the respondents or else that they thought that they were too personal and did not answer. Vagueness might have been caused by the wording of some questions, like «problems» is not specific enough in the question, «Who do you consult with when you have problems?». On the other hand, the immigrants were not used to being approached by interviewers in attitude and opinion surveys. Therefore, difficulties were experienced in getting responses. This is especially true for the questions which might be interpreted as being too personal by the immigrants.

Family relations and solidarity seem to be closer in the immigrant group in Gümüşsuyu than in Hürriyet. In Gümüşsuyu more people consult with family members and ask for advice and less are independent. This relationship also extends to seniors and relatives in Gümüşsuyu. Socio-economic surroundings are about the same for the immigrants in Hürriyet and in Gümüşsuyu. They do not own land and they have to work in the factories or as craftsmen and tradesmen. However, there is an ever increasing number of built-in-night houses surrounding Gümüşsuyu occupied by low income groups consisting of other immigrants and peasants constantly migrating from various parts of Anatolia. Since the surrounding land is owned by the Department of Agriculture, no such conditions exist in Hürriyet. In Gümüşsuyu and in Taşlıtarla, people build houses on the land owned by the Treasury without formally acquiring it. Relation between the immigrants may be closer in Gümüşsuyu due to the threat created by the newcomers. This point should be further investigated, however, before any assertions are made. For one thing, according to our data, the immigrants in Gümüşsuyu, more than the immigrants in Hürriyet, seem to have depended on others for consultation and advice in Bulgaria than they do in Turkey. Therefore, the nature of these relationship can not be explained only by the conditions that exist in Gümüşsuyu and their past experiences as a group in Bulgaria have to be studied.

The role of the old Turks, although mentioned, is not as important in both countries as expected in societies where seniority counts so much. Due to the limitations mentioned above, however, no definite conclusions can be drawn from our data. On the other

hand, it may be observed that although the size of the family decreased, family relations and solidarity have not changed since coming to Turkey, as far as they are covered by these questions. Except for the responses of the immigrants in Gümüşsuyu which we discussed above, there is no important change in the percentages obtained and a concentration of replies in any category that would indicate a shift in preferences.

Contrary to our expectation that in industrial, urban areas family size and subsequently family relations and solidarity will be modified, no such modification seems to have occurred yet in family relations and solidarity in the group of immigrants we studied. The analysis of the other answers presented in the following tables also supplement this conclusion. One reason for this may be that since the immigrants have to be away from so many of their former acquaintances and relatives they wish to continue their relations and they stick together with the ones who are in the neighborhood, if not in the country. On the other hand, the economic factor responsible for the modification of family patterns may not be accompanied in this case by relevant cultural, educational, and ideological changes which would narrow the scope of family relations and solidarity. Most of the immigrants went to elementary school only, therefore they may not be readily susceptible to the influence of educational changes. Furthermore, considerable time is required for the introduction of cultural, ideological and educational changes in order to overcome the resistance to change. In order to reach a conclusion on this matter, the nature of family relations and solidarity should be studied further among the residents as well as among the immigrants. On the whole the immigrants might have adjusted to the settlement conditions in industrial urban areas in Turkey in terms of family size, however, modifications in family relations and solidarity brought about by cultural, ideological and educational changes are expected.

Table III is again on the aspects of the economic factor:

TABLE III.

	<i>Do members of your family who live together earn their living individually ?</i>		<i>Or do they chose the same vocation and collaborate ?</i>	
	<i>Hürriyet</i>	<i>Gümüßsuyu</i>	<i>Hürriyet</i>	<i>Gümüßsuyu</i>
Yes	80%	53%	6%	8%
No.	13%	45%	80%	87%
Unknown	7%	2%	14%	5%
Total precentage	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of participants ...	(45)	(93)	(45)	(93)

Did you and the members of your family earn your living individually in Bulgaria or did you work together?

	<i>Hürriyet</i>	<i>Gümüßsuyu</i>
Individually	33%	40%
Together	20%	21%
First together and then individually	6%	7%
Did not work at all	22%	16%
Unknown	19%	16%
Total precentage	100%	100%
Number of participants	(45)	(93)

It seems that the majority of the respondents in Hürriyet and in Gümüßsuyu are inclined to state that members of their families who live together earn their living individually; and do not chose the same vocation and collaborate. The percentage of affirmative answers to earning their living individually is smaller in Gümüßsuyu than in Hürriyet; however, this may be due to a misunderstanding of the question on the part of the immigrants since there is a substantial increase in the percentage of those in Gümüßsuyu stating that members of their families do not chose the same vocation and collaborate in answer to the next question.

Among the immigrants in Hürriyet and in Gümüßsuyu the tendency to work together was stronger in Bulgaria as compared to the situation in Turkey. However it should be remembered that a

number of the immigrants were too young to work while they were in Bulgaria and therefore they are unable to make comparisons. The situation in Bulgaria cannot be determined exactly from our data in this respect. The effects of the Russian invasion have to be studied also. Nevertheless, the tendency to earn one's living individually seems to be stronger in Hürriyet and in Gümüşsuyu. The immigrants may become economically independent in this way.

TABLE IV.

If everyone in the family earns his own living would you rather live together with the present members of the family or separate?

	<i>Hürriyet</i>	<i>Gümüşsuyu</i>
Together	75%	80%
Separate	17%	19%
Unknown	8%	1%
Total percentage	100%	100%
Number of participants	(45)	(93)

Did you feel the same way when you were in Bulgaria?

	<i>Hürriyet</i>	<i>Gümüşsuyu</i>
Yes	73%	84%
No.	6%	8%
Unknown	21%	8%
Total percentage	100%	100%
Number of participants	(45)	(93)

Family relations do not seem to be altered by the economic factor as yet in terms of the desire to live together. The majority of the immigrants responding to our survey feel that they would rather live together with the present members of the family if everyone earns his own living and they state that they felt the same way about it in Bulgaria. Only about one fifth of the respondents think that they would not live together with the present members of their respective families in that case. Consequently, no significant changes in family size might be expected in the near future.

It should be remembered that there was a decrease in size in several families since they settled in Gümüşsuyu and in Hürriyet.

TABLE V.

	<i>Did the women living in urban areas work in Bulgaria?</i>		<i>De the women living in urban areas work in Turkey?</i>	
	<i>Hürriyet</i>	<i>Gümüşsuyu</i>	<i>Hürriyet</i>	<i>Gümüşsuyu</i>
Yes	73%	92%	95%	90%
No.	13%	6%	—	9%
Unknown	14%	8%	5%	1%
Total percentage	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of participants ...	(45)	(93)	(45)	(93)

Do you approve that women should work?

	<i>Hürriyet</i>	<i>Gümüşsuyu</i>
Approve because of necessity ...	55%	34%
They should always work	8%	16%
Do not approve even if there is necessity	15%	34%
Unknown	22%	16%
Total percentage	100%	100%
Number of participants	(45)	(93)

The unity of the family group is impaired, however. The majority of the immigrant women living in urban areas in our sample used to work in Bulgaria and they continue to work in Turkey. «Working» was phrased in Turkish to mean being economically active. However, many immigrants have ambivalent attitudes towards women working. Many approve it because of necessity. A similar result was obtained in a survey conducted in Ankara using a larger population (N=2000) covering various socio-economic strata on why are women working and the effects on the family budget [22]. The majority of the women participants who were employed reported that they work because of necessity.

[22] H. Topçuoğlu, *The Causes for the Working of Women and the Role on the Family Budget* (in Turkish), (Ankara, 1955), p. 22.