

**MORAL GUARDIANISM AT THE INTERSECTION OF THE
HOUSEHOLD AND THE WORKPLACE:
WOMEN FACTORY WORKERS IN DENIZLI**

NURSEN AKSAY

KOÇ UNIVERSITY

2012

**MORAL GUARDIANISM AT THE INTERSECTION OF THE
HOUSEHOLD AND THE WORKPLACE:
WOMEN FACTORY WORKERS IN DENIZLI**

NURSEN AKSAY

**Thesis Submitted to the
Graduate School of Social Sciences and Humanities
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts**

in

Comparative Studies in History and Society

**Koç University
2012**

ABSTRACT

Moral Guardianism at the Intersection of the Household and the Workplace: Women Factory Workers in Denizli

This thesis examines how women factory workers in Denizli experience and give meaning to their labor through their household and workplace relations. Based on ethnographic research conducted in three factories in Denizli, which has a relatively high rate of female labor force participation in the country, I argue that women factory workers' subjectivities in the workplace are shaped through their religious practices and moral understandings. This research shows how women workers perform various religious practices in the workplace such as praying, wearing headscarves, attending religious meetings through which they give meaning to their labor. Although justifying their work with references to material needs, women workers also try to negotiate a spiritual existence and confirmation of their work on moral and religious grounds. Factory managements seek to control labor via religious and moral practices such as enforcing gender segregation in the workplace, obligation to wear headscarves, intervention in gender relations and a quest to have control over the private lives of women. While the factory management tries to create productive women workers through moral and religious codes and awards, it acts as a moral guardian by penetrating into their households and emotional world. Yet these top-down tactics do not lead to a total subordination. On the contrary, in their search for spiritual fulfillment, women workers, to a certain extent, both consent to and react against these policies through gossiping and creating discourses on being and acting as "ideal" religious and moral women. And they also use moral guardianism towards management's practices and towards co-workers at the level of everyday relationships. With this outlook, they actively construct their own moral interpretations and religious models. I analyze how the articulation of all these practices contributes to the shaping of women's subjectivities at the intersection of the shop floor and

the household as breadwinners, responsible mothers, moral and religious persons and workers.

Keywords: manufacturing industry, globalization, women's labor, household, workplace relations, labor control, subjectivity, moral guardianism, Islam, Denizli, Turkey.

ÖZET

Hane ile İşyeri Kesişiminde Ahlak Bekçiliği: Denizli'de Kadın Fabrika İşçileri

Bu çalışma, Denizli'de kadın fabrika işçilerinin emeklerini nasıl deneyimlediklerini ve anlamlandırdıklarını hane ve işyeri ilişkileri üzerinden incelemektedir. Çalışmada kadın işgücü katılımının görece yüksek olduğu Denizli'deki üç fabrikada yapılan etnografik bir araştırmaya dayanarak, kadın işçilerin öznelliklerinin işyerlerinde kurulumunun dini inanış ve ahlaki anlayışlara dayandığını savunuyorum. Bu araştırma, kadın işçilerin işyerlerinde gerçekleştirdikleri namaz kılma, başlarını örtme, dini toplantılara katılma gibi dini pratikler yoluyla kendi emeklerini nasıl anlamlandırdıklarını tartışmaktadır. Kadın işçiler, çalışmalarına gerekçe olarak maddi ihtiyaçlarını göstermelerine rağmen, maneviyata da önem vermekte ve yaptıkları işin ahlaki ve dini bir temeli olduğunun onaylanması için çaba sarf etmektedirler. Öte yandan, fabrika yönetimleri, erkeklerle konuşma yasağı, baş örtme kuralı, kadınlar ve erkekler arasındaki ilişkiler ve kadın işçilerin özel hayatları üstünde kontrol kurma gibi yöntemler kullanarak, kadınların emeğini denetlemeye çalışmaktadır. Fabrika yönetimi, ahlaki ve dini kurallar ve ödüller aracılığıyla üretken kadın işçiler yaratmaya çalışırken, aynı zamanda hane içi yaşama ve kadınların duygusal dünyasına nüfuz ederek ahlak bekçiliği yapmaktadır. Fakat tepeden uygulanan bu taktikler topyekün bir itaate yol açmaz. Aksine, kadın işçiler manevi doyum arayışları içinde bu politikalara hem belirli bir ölçüde rıza gösterirler, hem de dedikodu yaparak ve "ideal" dindar ve ahlaklı kadın üstüne söylemler yaratarak tepki gösterirler. Böylece, kadın işçiler de, günlük ilişkilerinde ahlak bekçiliğini fabrika yönetiminin uygulamalarına ve diğer çalışma arkadaşlarına karşı kullanmaktadırlar. Bu bakış açısı ile, aktif olarak kendi ahlaki yorumlarını ve dini modellerini geliştirmektedirler. Sonuç olarak bu çalışmada, hane ile işyeri kesişimindeki bu pratiklerin

ailenin geçimini sağlayan kişi, sorumluluk sahibi anne, ahlaklı ve dindar insan, çalışan beden ve işçi olarak kadınların öznelliklerinin oluşmasına nasıl katkıda bulunduğu incelenmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: imâlat sanayi, küreselleşme, kadın emeği, hanehalkı, işyeri ilişkileri, emek kontrolü, öznellik, ahlak bekçiliği, İslam, Denizli, Türkiye.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research project would not have been possible without the support of many people. First and foremost, I would like to gratefully acknowledge the supervision of Deniz Ykseker who was abundantly helpful and offered invaluable assistance, support and guidance during my three years journey in Ko University. She inspired me greatly to work on this project during our conversations in the Gender and Labor Reading Group meetings. Words are inadequate in expressing my debt and offering thanks to her. Her critical outlook, analytical thinking and to the points advices helped me to organize my ideas and place them on a sound ground thus enabled me to write this thesis. Beside her immense academic encouragements, she was always patient with me in case of hesitations stemming from my private life. She always tolerated my tides and excuses and found proper solutions with her warm friendship. Moreover, without her support I could not able to further my graduate studies. I will always remember her labor on me.

I would like to express my gratitude to my thesis jury member Őenay zden. In short conversations we had, I got long-term advices especially from her experiences of fieldwork. I am also indepted to zlem Altan Olcay who kindly agreed to participate in my thesis jury. She shared with me her valuable comments and constructive criticisms in different stages of my thesis writing especially in our discussion in the Gender and Labor Reading Group meetings and her globalization course. I am also grateful to Ayfer Bartu Candan who has always supported and encouraged me with suggestions about my thesis. Had she not been my professor in Boėazii University, I would not have the chance to learn her great anthropological outlook and this study would not come into being. I am also very thankful to Biray Kolluoėlu and Zafer Yenal because of their contribution to my academic life..

I would like to express my feeling of gratitude to my interviewees who shared their stories, their homes and their hearts with me. At the same time, my deepest thanks go to my

sister-in-law Hale Kazanç and her friend Günseli Akyürek Peköz who made me able to access the factories and get permission for fieldwork. I will always remember their warm care for me in their houses and the support of Günseli's mother Fatma Akyürek by opening her house and compassion. I also want to thank to my friends at Koç University's MA in CSHS Program, Anlam, Ayçe, Elif, Yağız and Onur who were always available when I needed support and encouragement. I wish to thank Onur specially because of his quick and immense help during the writing process of this thesis.

Finally, I would like to thank my family for their constant support, care and encouragement. My mother Sema Genç was always with me even in some part of my fieldwork in Denizli and always took care of my son when I was writing my thesis. My deepest gratitude is also due to my mother- and father-in-law, Haskız and Ahmet Aksay. They have always supported me and without her love, goodness and help I could not have done what I have done. Their home has been always a warm place for my son when I could not be available for him. My final and special thanks go to my husband Cüneyt without whom I could not find a meaning in the world. He was always with me to make me feel good even in most desperate moments. And I also thank to my little Muhammed Asaf for giving me peace and happiness even in the most stressful points while writing this thesis.

To the women workers

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	10
CHAPTER 1: GLOBALIZATION, WOMEN’S LABOR, LABOR CONTROL AND SUBJECTIVITIES IN WORKPLACES.....	18
I. Introduction.....	18
II. Gender and Labor.....	20
A. Gendering Globalization.....	20
B. Considering Subjectivities within Workplaces.....	27
C. Household within Labor Control.....	32
III. From Labor Control to Subjectivities of Women.....	40
A. Shop Floor Relations and Labor Control.....	40
B. “Selves are made at work:” The production of Subjectivities in the Factories.....	52
IV. Conceptual Framework.....	57
V. Methodological Approach: An Istanbulite in Denizli.....	60
CHAPTER 2: LABOR CONTROL AND LABOR PROCESS IN THE FACTORIES.....	72
I. Introduction.....	72
II. Denizli as a Case.....	73
A. The Local in the Global.....	73
B. Gendered Relations in the Household and the Workplace.....	76
III. Physical Control on the Shop Floors.....	84
IV. Management Strategies: Control through morality and religion.....	97
A. Moral Guardianism at Work.....	99
B. Religious and Moral Codes on the Shop floor: Work as a Spiritual Fulfillment.....	105
V. Conclusion.....	108
CHAPTER 3: WOMEN’S SUBJECTIVITIES AT THE INTERSECTION OF THE HOUSEHOLD AND THEWORKPLACE.....	110
I. Introduction.....	110
II. Women’s Subjectivities in Production.....	111
A. Reconstructing “Patriarchal” Relations: Women as Breadwinners.....	111
B. Pedagogical Control: Women as Responsible Mothers.....	115
C. Psychological Disasters: Women as Working Bodies.....	117
D. Performing Piety: Women as Religious and Moral Individuals.....	121
E. Resisting through unique ways: Women as Workers.....	128
III. Conclusion.....	131
CONCLUSION.....	132
I. Limitations of this Study and Suggestions for further Research.....	136
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	137
APPENDIX: List of Respondents.....	146

INTRODUCTION

In this thesis, I examine the practices of women workers within their own contexts, namely the household and the workplace, in order to understand how they give meaning to their labor through these experiences. My study is based on ethnographic fieldwork in Denizli in three textile factories where both men and women work. During the 45-day long fieldwork in the years 2010 and 2011, I conducted participant observation by working with them in the factories and the social spheres of women workers and interviewed 50 individuals most of whom were women workers. My research shows that female subjects are created at the intersection of households and the workplace. These conflicting subjectivities are in construction through labor control and moral guardianism by the management at the workplace and the relations within the household. There is a complex and relational connection between the households and managerial strategies. In this relation, women workers also act like moral guardians towards managerial activities and their co-workers with their own moral and religious understandings. I also claim that moral and religious norms play a very crucial role in this connection in terms of adjusting managerial aims but also in terms of fulfilling the spiritual needs of women workers. In this regard, this study aims to analyze labor control and subjectivity formation in a relational way in order to understand the mechanisms on the shop floor by reference to women's experiences.

Regarding the labor of women workers, there are several debates on globalization and women's labor. Globalization is a relational and produced process in which class, race and gender relations are structured within the local and it gains its shape in social institutions such as the household and the workplace (factory, office) through gendered understandings, assumptions and subjectivities. As such, in this study, globalization is not emphasized merely as an exploitative power marginalizing women within fixed roles and as victims of patriarchy. In this thesis, I maintain that globalization can be analyzed through ethnographic research, not

only in terms of experiences but also in terms of its production (Burawoy, 2001). At the same time, in terms of women's labor studies I advocate to add gender as an indispensable category, since gender operates throughout global production, framing decisions about technology, hiring and labor control (Salzinger, 2004, p. 10). Thus, even if this study is on women workers it focuses on women's subjectivities as gendered subjects in which gender roles must be considered as a given category.

Taken into account these points, in Turkey, there are two main approaches in studies on women's labor of which I am critical and build upon my main goals of studying women's labor. First, there is a persistent focus on the destructive and exploitative effects of "global restructuring" and patriarchal family relations more than the focus on women themselves, which points to women as the victims of the system. Second, there is a constant concern about the low rate of female labor force participation (LFP) which has the danger of presenting female LFP as "the" panacea for empowering women. Moreover, even though the material deficiencies and difficulties of "informal" and "formal" workplaces are discussed in the literature, policy discussions and even some research hardly see gender and subjectivity construction as analytical categories. Thus, they lack the voices and experiences of women. Indeed, labor is experienced bodily and emotionally by these women in different ways, they practice the workplace in relation to the domestic sphere, they give reactions to the contradictions in these places and they create their own strategies and subjectivities. Therefore, the inner mechanisms of "formal" labor cannot be understood without looking at the whole process of women's labor by close participation.

In that sense, the call for women to have access to formal employment is misleading since it may idealize entrance to the public domain by emphasizing a fixed subject position for women. There are a limited number of studies about women factory workers in Turkey many of which emphasize the effects of patriarchy, capitalism and globalization (Suğur &

Suğur, 2005, Ecevit, 1991; Dedeoğlu, 2008). Nevertheless, these studies do not focus on the experiences of women closely; therefore, they fail to show the different subjectivities of women through their experiences. Recalling Aiwa Ong (1987, p. 84), we must avoid studies on women and industrial capitalism in which “the women themselves are missing, rendered undifferentiated, homogeneous, faceless, and voiceless by analyses that attribute much more personality and animation to capital than to the women it exploits.”

It is evident that capitalist system is exploitative but by focusing on capital we cannot see the various experiences and understandings of this exploitation through which resistance against it is emerged. Therefore, my inclination is much more showing the heterogeneity of this effect in local level. Thus, most importantly my study is based on the idea that the effects of globalization and the gender relations in this process are built into the organization of daily life, but not in the same ways or with the same consequences for everyone (Acker, 2004). The experiences of “global” are heterogeneous and depend on contextual differences (Tsing, 2000; Appadurai, 1999; Burawoy, 2001). And I argue that in this way different constructed subjectivities which engage with “global” practices in the “local” appear with their own interpretations and meanings (Ong, 1987).

My study is intended to fill a gap in the literature on Turkey and make a contribution to the international literature on women’s factory work because it aims to look at both the workplace and the household in relation to each other. In this sense, I attempt to broaden the conceptualization of labor control by recognizing household mechanisms in its operation. In that relation, family issues, the relation between wives and husbands, economic problems and the feelings and thoughts on moral and religious contexts become a part of workplace relations and are used as a control mechanism by factory managements. However women are also active in this process and they create their own moral and religious interpretations and meanings with which they also act as moral guardians towards management and other

workers. I conceptualize these reciprocal relations as “moral guardianism” at the intersection of household and workplace. Referring to Hart (2007) and Ilcan (1996) moral and religious discourses, practices and codes are very crucial in authorizing, shaping, determining and evaluating what is appropriate and inappropriate social behavior. For my case, “moral guardianism” is a daily control mechanism within workplace relations in the way of structuring the appropriate and proper way of living a moral and religious life which is related with their households. In this sense, my findings in Denizli show the role of moral discourse as a technique of power in shaping social and economic behaviors and directing the action of people. The purpose of this study in this sense is describing the daily labor experiences of women factory workers. I want to look at the women’s labor experiences in a relation to the gendered discourses. However, I do not claim that the findings of this study are representative rather this study is an exploratory work which hopes to lay bare the labor control and subjectivation mechanisms in three factories in Denizli.

Denizli is one of the so-called Anatolian Tigers due to its robust textile industry especially on a global scale. In 2011, Denizli had the 8th highest rate of textile exports within Turkey especially with Germany (14.75 %), followed by the UK (9.44 %) and the USA (8.53%) (DSO, 2012). Denizli is a province which has been undergoing social change rapidly in the last several decades as a result of rural to urban migration and the development of the textile industry. However, this development in the province has its roots in the tradition of artisanal production of weaving, cotton fabrics and embroidery in two major districts Babadağ and Buldan (Pınarcıoğlu, 2000; Beyhan, Armatlı-Köroğlu, 2002; Türkün-Erendil, 2000; Penpecioglu, 2007). In this sense, textile production in Denizli is an old collective and social practice such that 87 % of the companies in Denizli were family firms in 2006 (DSO, 2006). This structure has a crucial role in the future developments of Denizli in the textile industry. There are such collective and cooperative relations among firms depending on trust in the

region that the province could compete with other international countries in global production (Türkün-Erendil, 2000; Penpecioğlu, 2007). However, recently because of the national and global crisis in 2001 and in 2008 the textile industry had hard times in Denizli which resulted in the unemployment of many workers and the closure of some factories. According to the statements of my respondents, these problems are related with the policies of the government and with the informal small-scale firms in the region. Despite these economic tensions, it is clear that Denizli's industrial complex has an effect on families and social relations in the region, which is also related with the labor control and labor process in the factories.

In spite of this recession in the region, there is a high female LFP in Denizli (29.50%) compared to the average rate for Turkey (23.74 %) (TURKSTAT, 2010). Moreover, in Denizli approximately 47 % of textile industry workers are women workers whereas in Turkey overall female LFP in manufacturing industry is only 15 % (DSO, 2010; TURKSTAT, 2012). Another important characteristic of the city is the high divorce rates which have increased rapidly compared to other Turkish provinces, which gives an indication about the painful transformation of patriarchal relations in the household and the workplace. TURKSTAT statistics between 2001 and 2011 indicate that in the Aegean region Denizli has the highest divorce rate after İzmir. Therefore, in 2011 while the divorce acceleration rate in Turkey was 1.62 %, Denizli's divorce acceleration rate was 2.24 % after İzmir (2.82 %) and Muğla (2.43 %) in the Aegean region. As such, Denizli has the 4th highest divorce acceleration rate in Turkey, the province with the highest rate being, 2.24 %. These pieces of information as well as my findings challenge the widely held argument, even shared by some researchers (Keyman and Lorasdağı, 2010), that Denizli is a religiously "conservative" province, and call for an examination of how religious pioussness operates on the ground.

With this general outlook, in Chapter 1, I provide an outline of the theoretical framework of my thesis by referring to the debates on globalization, women's labor,

households, labor control, labor process, and subjectivity formation. In this chapter, I also try to clarify my conceptual framework and methodological inclination for this thesis. In Chapter 2, after having contextualized Denizli within this discussion with its relation to global capitalism and gender relations in workplace and household, I explore labor control and labor process mechanisms in the three factories. I will refer to the public representation of women workers especially in textile industry in Turkey and in what sense it reflects in the management strategies. This means that how the publicly created discourses on women could affect the factory regime in the way of shaping labor control. I conceptualize the managerial strategies which are not independent of personal inclinations so that moral and religious codes as “moral guardianism.” After explaining women’s reciprocal relations with the management in terms of moral and religious interventions, I point at their behaviors towards management and other workers in the form of moral guardianism. I argue that their spiritual desires and moral norms let the management to some extent to penetrate into their lives.

In Denizli, the global logic which portrays women’s labor as docile and malleable does not have so much weight, since as I argued the local context and factory relations reproduce global mentality in a very specific form. So, there are very distinctive and specific labor control mechanisms in each factory. Almost every manager and owner said that it is very hard to work with women, since, as one female manager Pinar (34) summarized it, “the problems of women have no end.” These problems are mostly related with the private lives and household relations of women. This thought of manager comes from the managerial strategy that the management itself knows all things about the personal lives of women workers which can lead them to get permission or affect their productivity in labor process. As Can (2009, p. 98) argues women workers in the textile industry in Turkey have always been represented with derogatory terms and the discourses intrinsic to these representations in turn play a crucial role in disciplining them. These places are often associated with dalliance

and flirting and with the escape stories of women to men. The important issue is not the reality or truth of these discourses, but rather, how the factory regime is shaped by these discourses. The factory regime is not just a technical structure rather it is shaped according to the discourses in the factories and working subjects are created in this relation.

In this thesis, I describe women workers' approaches to these labor control mechanisms in terms of creating their own subjectivities and transform them accordingly these subjectivities, since the management understands their inclinations and takes a position. As I describe in detail in Chapter 3, women workers' subjectivities are produced in the factories through the moral and religious inclination of the management, but women also have an effect on what the management does through their spiritual demands. As Ortner (2005) argues, subjectivity has an element of public culture; even if women workers live against the common rules in their daily lives, they are not totally free from gendered social norms. But at the same they form new "ideal" religious and moral subjectivities which question these norms and the acts of others. Labor politics of one factory works by knowing and controlling the private lives of women workers in respect to the public representation, but at the same time it is transformed by women workers. What is important is not saying that even in factories women cannot be "emancipated" from patriarchal and social norms (Hart, 2007, p. 26). Rather it is worthwhile to understand the experiences of women and the meanings they attribute to their labor within the very complex relations of the shop floor. As such, women are not trapped in a classical form of patriarchy (Işık, 2008, p. 534), but they try to negotiate a spiritual existence and confirmation of their work on moral and religious grounds. However, they also think, in line with what one of my respondents said, that "Woman's place is in the home" (*Kadın eve yakışır*) and most of them want to stay home and look after their children if they do not have to work. But at the same time they are very active workers who attempt to change the factory regime. In that sense, shop floor relations produce some kinds of relational

and conflicting subjectivities: woman as breadwinner, woman as responsible mother, woman as working body, woman as a moral and religious person and woman as a worker.

CHAPTER 1: GLOBALIZATION, WOMEN'S LABOR, LABOR CONTROL AND SUBJECTIVITIES IN WORKPLACES

I. Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to conceptualize the findings of this research in a broad literature discussion of globalization, women's labor, gender, household, labor control and subjectivity formation. Doing this, I intend to propose a theoretical framework which will construct the basis of this thesis. In this context, this chapter will concentrate on answering the main question of this research: "How do women factory workers recognize and conceptualize their labor at the intersection of the workplace and the household?" Deriving from this question, two more dimensions are also conceptualized in this research through the questions: First, "how do women experience their labor bodily and emotionally in their workplaces?" Second, "how do they attribute meaning to their experiences associated with their social and domestic lives?"

Women's labor recently has always been discussed within the globalization debates but most of them have been confined within the articulation of the gender dimension as a taken for granted phenomenon without problematizing it. Referring to Burawoy and Butler, in this section, I will show how globalization is a produced and gendered phenomenon. By doing this, instead of taking globalization as a huge exploitative power and taking women as a fixed and static category, I will approach the subject from a different standpoint. Therefore, I claim that globalization is produced within the local contexts in which women work and create new norms in relation to their labor histories; therefore, their experiences should be analyzed from a micro level perspective by taking the macro level impacts into consideration as well.

So, firstly I want to problematize the approach in which globalization and gender are taken as homogeneous categories. After that, I want to discuss the critics of this approach

from the perspective of subjectivity formation. I will adopt the critical approach and try to conceptualize labor control in a broader sense in which morality and religion also play crucial roles. To do this, I introduce the household into these processes with regards to social and cultural contexts. For doing this, in the first part of this chapter I will discuss globalization in relation to women`s labor and the household and, in the second part, I will extend the conceptualization of labor control by adding subject formation and the household.

When we reflect on the local contexts in which women workers are positioned, it is necessary to lay emphasis on household mechanisms in relation to their formal and informal labor. The household is a labor- and income-pooling unit, but in addition to cooperation, there is also conflict among household members depending on social, cultural and economic contexts. In that sense, the household is not a merely economic unit but it is also a sphere in which family relations, feelings, emotions, and altruism should be considered. These household relations become very important in terms of spreading into workplace relations and having a role in the formation of subjectivities in the workplace. On the other hand, workplace relations also have an effect on the household in terms of creating women as subjects.

All these conceptualizations in globalization and women`s labor are crucial for understanding labor process and labor control in factories, since the control of labor and the organization of labor process aim to create productive women workers in order to gain maximum profit. In this sense, labor control and labor process must be conceptualized within new modes of technologies and management techniques. However, apart from the physical organization of factories to control labor, I intend to point out that labor control is not independent of the moral, spiritual and religious demands and experiences of workers. Rather, workers` personal lives, religious beliefs and moral inclinations are at the heart of factory managements` scrutiny which makes sure that workers work for the sake of capitalists.

Therefore, not only the body but also the subjectivity of workers becomes an issue to be controlled.

After giving an account of the labor control processes in the factories, I will address the subject formation process of the workers through the relationships between the workplace and the household. I argue that subjectivities are not fixed entities, but rather they entail contradictions and complexities. In other words, subject formation is a paradoxical process through which a subject can reinforce rules and regulations practiced by the power even if he/she criticizes or reacts to them. Thus, even in the technical organization gendered subjectivities - set of emotions, perceptions, desires, thoughts and cultural constructions – are apparent at the same time. Lastly, I will address the conceptual framework and methodological approach.

II. Gender and Labor

A. Gendering Globalization

“Globalization is produced and consumed not in thin air, not in some virtual reality but in real organizations, institutions, communities, etc.”

(Burawoy, 2001)

Since Ester Boserup’s ground-breaking book entitled *Woman’s Role in Economic Development* (1970), globalization has been a debated issue among feminist scholars both due to its definition and its impact. For forty years, women, gender and global transformations have been researched in order to understand the relationship between global capitalism and gender. However, there is still not a fixed definition or a formula which will reveal its

impacts. The reason behind this is the fact that globalization is processual and contradictory as well as complex and multifaceted (Lenz, 2002 cited in Acker, 2010, p. 18).

Joan Acker (2004, p. 19) points out that the globalization can be defined as a system consisting of new forms of decentralization, relocation and reorganization of production and subcontracting. Moreover, free marketization, which means the reduction of state's control and an increase in the implementation of neoliberal politics in capitalism, can be included in this system. In this context, the classical capitalism has reached a global and neoliberal level that one can no longer define the globalization and capitalism separately from each other and also independent of everyday life. Therefore, we can call the new economic system global capitalism (Acker, 2004) or neoliberal capitalism. However, Acker (2004, p. 18) maintains that the globalization, in terms of its repercussions, is also about class, race/ethnic, and gender relations: it is political and cultural, as well as economic.

I will analyze globalization in relation to women's labor around three criticisms of the literature in order to clarify my approach. The first criticism is directed at the emphasis on the macro level impacts of the globalization, which is taken as a huge exploitative power, on women. The second criticism addresses the tendency of taking the roles of women and men as fixed and static. The third one reflects on the subject matter as to whether global production is a way of emancipation from patriarchal norms or a new form of enslavement. Concentrating on the theoretical frameworks put forth by Burawoy, Salzinger and Butler, I suggest we focus on "the production of the globalization" and the performances of gender roles in the local with reference to cultural, social and economic practices. I think that this way we can shed light on its relationship with household dynamics, subjectivities of women and labor control.

For the first criticism we have to look at the discussions all over the world and in Turkey. Scholars argue that "global restructuring" is a gendered process especially in terms of the effects of the global economy on women and work (Pyle & Ward, 2003; Salzinger, 2004;

Acker, 1990). In other words, they point out that there is a relationship between the global expansion of production, trade, finance and the increase in the number of women in gendered production networks. Problematically, the dominant idea is that women who are docile and dexterous and their labor which is cheap is a resource for globalizing capital (Beneria & Roldan, 1987; Beneria, 1995; Nash & Fernandez Kelly, 1983; Fuentes and Ehrenreich, 1983; Lim, 1983; Wolf, 1990; Elson & Pearson, 1981). So, earlier theorists¹ recognized women's overwhelming presence in transnational production as an integral part of the system. Especially, the gender of "globalization" was not only defined in terms of economic levels but it is also maintained that, within these global governance practices, "the gender of globalization is mapped in such a way that global: masculine as local: feminine" (Freeman, 2001, p. 1008).

Even though addressing the gender dimension in the analysis is a valuable enterprise, many of the earlier researches remained limited in scope "because they focused on labor markets and hiring processes, stopping their research at the factory gates, they were able to show the correlation between gender and job but not the processes through which such correlations were established" (Salzinger, 2003, p. 13). Globalization or neoliberal capitalism which can be called global restructuring, by extension, is represented as an unyielding, superhuman force, remaking everything in its path for its own purposes (Salzinger, 2004, p. 57). In this picture, women's "cheap, docile and dexterous labor" is constantly exploited and the scholars attach the highest priority to the impact of these processes on women's overall wellbeing (Fuentes & Ehrenreich, 1983; Lim, 1983; Wolf, 1990; Elson & Pearson, 1981; Gibson & Graham, 1996). Concentrating on manufacturing industry, the main concern of this approach is the impact of women's participation in industrialization on women themselves, on men, on family and on local culture (Cairolì, 1998).

¹ By early research I point Beneria & Roldan, 1987; Nash & Fernandez Kelly, 1983; Fuentes & Ehrenreich, 1983; Lim, 1983; Wolf, 1990; Elson & Pearson, 1981, Gibson & Graham, 1996 .

Some studies on Turkey talk about the increasing numbers of women workers in manufacturing, especially in the textile industry and their vulnerability as a result of the “global effects” on the production processes in the world (Tokatlı & Kızılgün, 2009; Suğur, 2005; Suğur & Suğur, 2005; Dedeoğlu, 2008, Dayıoğlu, 2000; Çağatay, N. & Berik, G., 1990). There is also women’s informal piecework labor and informal atelier labor in addition to the garment and textile factories in which there is a palpable presence of women workers (White, 1994; Dedeoğlu, 2008; Demiriz, 2002; Ergün, 2002; Çağatay & Özler, 1995; Ecevit, 1995). Nevertheless, although there are relatively more researches on informal labor, there are very few ethnographic studies on women factory workers in formal workplaces in Turkey. In addition, none of these works investigates the relationship between labor control and household mechanisms and the subjectivities of women workers.

One of these studies is Dedeoğlu’s book entitled *Women Workers in Turkey: Global, Industrial Production in Istanbul* (2008). She emphasizes that a significant percent of the women who participated in her study works in the informal sectors apart from their formal labor in the factories (Dedeoğlu, 2008, p. 128). She argues that especially women’s labor in the garment industry is not recognized because the tendency to see women workers as temporary workers is prevalent in Turkey. However, from 1980s on, the garment and textile industries have developed thanks to these “temporary” workers. I argue that it is worth seeing how the mentality of capitalism or local organizations can be transformed by the experiences of these women.

Ecevit (1991) makes an analysis of the new forms of women’s labor in urban economy. Her study is about the ideological construction of Turkish women factory workers as she pointed out in the title of her book; *Shop Floor Control: The Ideological Construction of Turkish Women Factory Workers*. She maintains that participating in the formal labor cannot keep these women out of the patriarchal structure because the employer’s mentality

works within the patriarchal norms to organize the control of the factory. She also argues that the women themselves reproduce this ideological construction. However, her study lacks the voices of women regarding their household dynamics and it is limited in terms of explaining the responses of women within this ideological control.

Another ethnographic study on factory workers in Bursa textile industry was conducted by Suğur and Suğur (2005). Again, the important point of this study is that the women reproduce the discourse of women in the domestic sphere by their words. They state that it is not proper for a woman to work outside the house. In this study, there are also women who stated that working makes them liberated and socially integrated, but they add that they know that the co-workers do not want them there and even if the women are married, they are sexually harassed by men (Suğur & Suğur, 2005). Duruoğlu (2007) conducted a similar quantitative study in Bursa Organized Industry Zone. His argument was based on the assumption that women are placed in less advantageous position compared to men in terms of employment and found that there was widespread sexual discrimination in the textile industry.

The main question of these studies, which I criticize also in the global literature, is “how do women and their households are affected by the global capitalism?” The informal labor is the labor which is marginalized and exploited the most openly in this system but manufacturing industry has an important place in women’s labor because it is argued that this industry underwent a remarkable change by the structural adjustment policies of 1980s and it led to crucial effects on women’s labor in Turkey. The main change is the move of the industry to export oriented production and the rising importance of female labor in the global economy. In Turkey today, the garment and textile industries, after agriculture, are the main sectors in which women are employed (TURKSTAT, Turkey Employment Report, 2010). In connection with the “global restructuring” processes in the world, it is argued that these

industries are not only labor intensive but also female labor intensive and so this leads to the feminization of employment both in formal and informal labor processes.

Women are confronted with gendered treatments and conditions in workplaces such as receiving lower wages, no promotions, difficult working conditions, medical bodily interventions (pregnancy tests), sexual harassment and emotional pressure (Selim & İlkkaracan, 2008). Dedeoğlu indicates that the women garment factory workers also state that they receive low wages for long working hours and have difficulties taking leave in factories (2008, p. 131). These studies are very important for pinpointing the working conditions of women physically and emotionally in factories. However, all these studies present women workers as subordinated objects of this process because, to them, women reproduce the ideological norms and do not regard their experiences or the mechanisms behind this suggested subordination.

At this point, we also come to the second limitation of the literature in this debate. The studies which make references to an exploitable, docile and dexterous femininity as a fixed entity when they analyze the impact of the globalization on women's labor, they fall into the theoretical traps of essentialism. Even though they do not approach the femininity as something biologically determined, they take womanhood as a static category whose roots are embedded in the patriarchal family structure (Salzinger, 2004, p. 14). This approach is based on the assumption that in patriarchal households women are constructed in such a way that they turn into individuals fit for global organization. Similarly, in global mentality, "the trope of productive femininity has become a cornerstone of transnational production, forming managers' expectations of workers before they even begin work in a particular global factory and thus shaping production itself" (Salzinger, 2004, p. 32). However, Gottfried (2010, p.12) argues that the globalization means more than the transnational mobility of 'reproductive' labor and the substitution of women performing domestic tasks. Moreover, intrinsic to this

essentialist argument, like gender, patriarchy is also assumed as a fixed and static category. On the contrary, gender and patriarchy are produced and reproduced in factories and may vary according to every single workplace and context.

Therefore, the third criticism will address the question asked by some researchers and feminists on patriarchy and global capitalism: Does women's participation in these new forms of labor mark their liberation from local "patriarchy," or point to a new kind of enslavement which meets the demands of foreign capital? This question is redundant in the sense that it refers to patriarchy and capitalism as fixed concepts rather than constructions. Although some findings suggest for the gendered mechanisms operative in the working conditions of women workers and some of these findings attempt to provide solutions to improve conditions, the problems cannot be done away with. In other words, even if some laws and rights are put into effect for working women, they fall short of covering and applying to all women workers in Turkey. These studies give the sense that women experience the labor process differently according to the contextual structure of the working area, co-workers, family background etc. It is clear that there are different patriarchal mechanisms and experiences at play. Most importantly, women's perceptions, practices and experiences are not taken into account for policy changes. Thus, these analyses miss the point that the labor is experienced bodily and emotionally by these women, they work in the workplace, they give reactions to the contradictions in these places and they create their own subjectivities and strategies. The argument points out that the women in the domestic sphere are produced not as workers but mothers, wives, sisters and daughters (White, 1994; Bora, 2008; Dedeoğlu, 2008; Suğur & Suğur, 2005).

However, if the globalization and patriarchal norms are constructed within local relations, how can we argue that women are trapped by these assumptions so strictly? They experience the labor process and contradict with their employers bodily exist within the harsh

conditions of textile work. Therefore, how can we say that they are not conscious of their labor or completely see their work as a leisure activity? In this sense, we must look at their experiences and try to understand them as subjects in order to explain the reason why the things they say sound like “obedience.” It is argued that women’s labor is invisible even in the “formal labor” production in terms of their rights and working conditions. Even if women work in factories as formal workers, the logic of the global economy leaves them in bad working conditions and different models of subordination and exclusion. All these arguments may be valid and I also accept that in every sphere of the society different forms of patriarchal norms are present, but the important point is to understand why women are in these discourses, how they produce, reproduce or resist within these relations. The way I try to proceed this study is by analyzing the experiences of women within the relationship between household and workplace through which they become subjects.

B. Considering Subjectivities within Workplaces

In terms of manufacturing industry and the changes after the 1980s, the impacts of these macro level processes are quite similar especially in the developing countries such as Turkey, Egypt (Singerman & Hoodfar, 1996), Morocco (Cairolì, 1998), China (Lee, 1995; Ngai, 2005), Mexico (Salzinger, 2003) and Sri Lanka (Lynch, 2007). Of course, these are issues of vital importance regarding the economic and social well-being of women in factories. However, if women’s voices, lives and agencies remained absent (Pyle & Ward, p. 469) they would not be more than rootless pieces of information and one would not be able to distinguish the contextual differences and experiences in these countries. Therefore, addressing Salzinger (2004, p. 44), “it is time to ask not how global processes affect women or men but how gendered understandings, assumptions and subjectivities structure global production itself.” It is very crucial to acknowledge the fact that, as I also argue, women themselves transform the factory (Cairolì, 1998) while the factory regime transforms their

subjectivities. Docility and dexterity are ascribed to women and presented as taken for granted characteristics. However, docile and dexterous women are produced in production relations which means that they are not autonomously enabled (Salzinger, 2004, p. 15). So, in this part I want to look at the studies I adopt which point the subjectivities and experiences of women workers in workplace and household by criticizing the homogenizing approach I criticized in previous part.

I find Salzinger's (2003) study very valuable because it introduces subjectivities into the globalization and labor control discussions and shows the different construction of subjectivities of women workers in four free-zone factories of Mexico. In line with this, in the research conducted by Salzinger in four factories of Mexico, she (2003, p. 5) pointed out that in every single factory, gender has a distinctive architecture, structured and bounded by managers' on-going, sometimes contradictory efforts to constitute productive workers. From a structuralist approach, gender is both embodied and embedded in the logic and structuring of globalizing capitalism (Gottfried, 2010, p. 10). Even in different factories of the same area, different forms of subjectivities of women workers can emerge such as a woman like a covered girl or a woman like a man. In this sense, women's subjectivities are worth emphasizing because constructed subjectivities of women are embedded in their daily life experiences, practices and relations to others. These differences depend on the contextual issues in these factories such as worker profiles (which neighborhood they come from, the kin relationships with other workers), their relationships with the managers and the production process of factory (what they produce, how they produce it, the factory's position in the economic arena). Through these approaches, this study is a remarkable reference point for the studies of labor control, gender and subjectivity. However, it lacks the dimensions of the household and the social relationships of the women.

Due to the fact that there are limited amount of ethnographic studies on women factory workers in Turkey, I begin by presenting cases from other countries and draw a framework for the analysis of this study. Ethnographic studies throughout the world indicate that the experiences of women factory workers are at the intersection of household and workplace in relation to the religious and traditional practices of family. This means that becoming a garment worker is related to the household practices of women (Kibria, 1998). As in the case of Morocco's garment factories, Cairoli shows that the relationship between household and workplace is built in different ways. Women transform the factory and operate in it as they operate in the household before the factory transforms them, this way; they construct themselves as daughters, sisters, wives and mothers even within the formal workplace (Cairoli, 1998). Doing this, they try to give meaning to their labor through familial relationships. Lee (1995) argues that two distinctive patterns "localistic despotism" and "familial hegemony" emerge in the control of the shop floors of two factories owned by the same enterprise, managed by the same team of managers and produce the same range of electronics products in China. In order to control labor and ensure productive labor force, management uses local networks in "localistic despotism" and patriarchal norms in "familial hegemony." Moreover, Kim (1997) maintains that the lives of women factory workers are stuck between the family struggle and class struggle because they are not completely regarded as workers but they have to provide for the survival of their families.

It is clear that formal labor is experienced differently by women in factories and the subjectivity formations vary in different contexts. With respect to Ong's ethnographic study on the factory women in Malaysia (1987), forms of resistances and the agency of women must be considered within their cultural values. She indicates that the women workers use local cultural significations such as spirit possession in order to resist and deal with the new structure of capitalist production. Moreover, Ngai's study, which she entered the field like a

worker and conducted participant observations in dormitories and on the shop floor, gives me inspiration to share the experiences of women in order to understand them well. She points to the strategies of women situated among the competing demands of the global capitalism, the socialist state and the patriarchal family. This way, she shows how they are produced and reproduced as workers (Ngai, 2005).

Lynch (2007) reveals the experiences of factory workers in relation to their household and social practices with their own words. She states that, in Sri Lanka's global factories, women workers are stratified as "Juki girls" and "good girls." The unskilled and migrant workers of the urban garment factory are not seen as "good" girls, thus, they are called "juki girls" by the society and even the media use this term with a connotation of moral judgment. However, they try to be "good" girls within this moral control. This shows that the women are stigmatized and marginalized in different ways in the formal labor process and therefore they encounter more complicated problems than the material ones in these factories. Depending on the social and domestic realities of the Sri Lanka's family structure, these workers' experiences of labor turn into a struggle of "becoming a good girl."

Can (2009) has a valuable Master Thesis on the subjectivities of women workers in the Gazi neighborhood's textile ateliers. This is the only study which focuses on the experiences and subjectivities of women workers in Turkey. By taking the household mechanisms into consideration, she investigates the experiences of women workers and analyzes the way they give meaning to their labor through these experiences. Regarding informal sweatshops, she states "the physical and mental damages workers suffer in such places are generally much more acute than those of other workplaces," therefore, because of this very same reason "the struggles and protests against the work conditions at sweatshops have an unabated tradition in the history of capitalism." (Can, 2008, p. 3) In other words, the informal labor conditions are so harsh and evident throughout the history that the resistances of workers have been

inevitable. She claims that through these experiences, they become resisting worker subjects. However, she also argues that it must be shown “how various patriarchal discourses and practices become effective in women’s daily lives at workplace and home in such a way to create more control over women’s acts, but at the same time to create some space for women through which they raise various demands for themselves both at home and workplace.” That is to say, they give consent to these discourses in order to prevent gossip or other social pressures to a certain extent, however, at the same time they get what they demand as moral subjects of this process. This way, this study voices strong criticisms against the analyses of Bora, Özyeğin, Ergün and especially White who argue that women workers do not consider themselves to be workers or do not value their labor. Ergün (2002) conducted a very similar study to that of White and pointed out that the “traditional” forms of gender relations have an important role in women’s engagement with “secure” places in garment industry. I argue that “security” for woman can be an important strategy in order to legitimize their labor as in the case of Can’s study. Women workers seem to adapt to the rules of patriarchal structure such as defining themselves not as workers or accept their labor as worthless, but they also try to justify their labor by moral and secure connotations in the social realm.

As these ethnographic studies indicate, it is essential to analyze the experiences of factory women in their workplaces in relation to their experiences and values in household in order to see the inner mechanisms of this structure. These examples are very important to theorize labor control mechanisms in factories as well because labor control is not a systematic, technical and professional organization anymore; it also involves the control of moral, religious and social codes embraced by individuals. In other words, factory regime is shaped by the subjectivities of women whereas their subjectivities are shaped by labor control. Leaving this formal labor experience as an unexamined subject can lead to the misinterpretations of the needs of these women. This means that the political implementations

which attempt to increase female LFP or improve the material conditions of workplaces cannot provide solutions for the particularity of these women's lives per se. Even if the political implementations include some interventions and attempts of improvement, they are bound to fail unless they take the experiences of women workers into account.

C. Household within Labor Control

By adopting the approaches in which subjectivities are considered within globalization and labor process debates I want to conceptualize labor control in a broader framework and put into it household with its inner relations and problems. So that we can grasp how the labor control use the household relations as a mean for controlling productivity in workplace through moral and religious codes. In fact, I argue that women workers are not always produced as docile, but they strategically act as if they were so. At this point, it is important to keep in mind that without considering household mechanisms we cannot totally be convinced how and in what level docility is produced in workplaces. Although I agree with Salzinger in that certain forms of gendered subjectivities and gender roles such as docility are produced in factories, I also argue that household mechanisms must be taken into consideration in order to comprehend the underlying factors in a broader perspective as well. Globalization is not the deterministic power which shapes everything in the same manner; quite the contrary, "what we understand to be 'global' is itself constituted within the local, it emanates from very specific agencies, institutions and organizations whose processes can be observed first-hand" (Burawoy, 2001, p. 150). In this sense, globalization takes its form in social institutions such as household, workplace (factory, office), state etc. the manufacturing industry in particular, the move towards export-oriented and labor intensive production lead to female labor intensive sectors with low wages like textile and garment industries (Pyle, 1999; Pyle & Ward, 2003; Salzinger, 2004; Acker, 1990).

Even if early theorists and feminists focus on women and women's wellbeing, this does not mean that they produce a valid analysis of gender. Gender is shaped through the practices of individual within power relations depending on contexts. As an example, in Salzinger's (2004, p. 23) ethnography, the concrete reflections of contextual differences can be seen in factories. For example, "feminine" under one circumstance can be "masculine" under another. From this perspective, we can claim that patriarchy cannot have a fixed meaning because gender is not a category in which the roles of women and men can be defined in the same way in every context. Women's subjectivities are constructed in global workplaces whereas they also transform these workplaces as well. Women are not passive victims of patriarchy or of capitalism (Wolf, 1992, p. 20). Gender roles, patriarchal relations and even globalization are produced and reproduced by them through new meanings and connotations. Considering patriarchy or global capitalism to be tremendous enemies of women would fall short of explaining the process in which women create their own subjectivities by constructing relationships with patriarchy and global management mentality already transformed by them. The point of vital importance is the contexts in which they give meaning to their experiences and the way they create their own subjectivities through these experiences. Therefore, it is very important to analyze and understand their household mechanisms by entering the shop floor and observing their experiences. And gender must be considered not as women studies rather the construction of subjectivities within gendered meanings must be considered.

Domestic labor or household activities of women within the patriarchal family structure are regarded as practices which determine the fixed roles of women. Similarly, due to the fact that women are mostly employed in unskilled and low paid jobs, their domestic skills are asserted. The argument is that they are employed in jobs they are accustomed to doing at home in their everyday lives such knitting, carpet weaving, sewing etc. However,

contrary to these assumptions, patriarchy or the norms which attribute certain roles to women are not fixed. The distinction between domestic and public sphere does not carry much meaning because household itself is an interactive social place in which all private, social, political and economic issues are interrelated. Therefore, this is not a homogenous and stable construction, rather, as some researchers argue, the experiences in the domestic sphere can differ according to cultural and class dimensions as part of the discussion of “women’s invisible labor”(Young, 1997; Navaro-Yashin, 2000; Najmabadi, 1998). Women are not passive objects of this construction. They may reproduce this discourse differently in different layers. Thus, those patriarchal mechanisms may also be experienced differently and cannot be defined easily as the domination of men over women. Kandiyoti (1996) points to the strategic relationship women establish with the patriarchy in order to cope with its effects. So, I refuse the approach which assigns a fixed role to women in every context. Instead I argue that their roles and subjectivities are constructed within the household and workplace relationships which shape the market economy and even management strategies. In this sense, I agree with Singerman and Hoodfar’s argument that household is a mediator between the political economy, the social structure and the political life in such a way that it is an institution mediating the relationships between individuals, local communities, markets and states (Singerman & Hoodfar, 1996). And of course these relations contain emotions, feelings, thoughts and altruistic practices within households.

 Laboring household is defined as the world’s global labor’s basic unit (Dickinson and Schaeffer, 2001, p. 28). This includes the assumption that household is a unit in which women are produced as exploitable, docile women workers for global capitalism. In this approach, mainly household is seen as an economic unit of survival (Dickinson and Schaeffer, 2001, p. 12). Although I agree about the importance of household within the market economy, I also argue that it is more of a complex mechanism than merely being an economic unit of survival

regarding the social, cultural and political contexts in which not only economic but also familial and emotional structures play a crucial role. First of all, pointing out household as a unit of survival should emphasize class dimension because this approach can refer to the working class in which household is defined as a workplace for the economic survival of the family whereas in a middle class family household can be a sign of prestige with the role of the woman as “housewife” and man as the breadwinner. Moreover, although market is embedded in every single household within the consuming culture, there are other dimensions which make a household as it is. Household unit is a part of an interrelated set of institutions that constitutes the operational structure of the social system (Wallerstein, 1984, p. 17). It is within the relationship between the family, state, workplaces and religion. So, it is more than an economic unit which is complex in terms of its inner mechanisms which is related with feelings and emotions. And I want to point how these mechanisms enter into the workplaces and transform the relations in workplaces whereas the household relations are shaped at the same time.

Wolf (1992, pp. 12-17) argues that taking household as an economic unit by using the concept “household strategy” is not appropriate for two reasons. Especially if the factory work is maintained as a part of household survival strategy, works of women would be reduced to utility for the household. Therefore, the experiences of women and the meaning of labor become meaningless for them. In addition, the household might not be an egalitarian institution but rather might have a structure fraught with inequalities and conflicts. In this sense, Sen (1990, p. 8) conceptualizes household as “cooperative conflict” in which the interests of members of a family could clash with one another. She indicates that power has a central role in the “cooperative conflict” because both compatible and conflicting interests of women and men affect household relationships. Due to the fact that both parties have much to lose if the cooperation is terminated, decision making tends to have a cooperative outlook

with some agreed solutions on the conflicting aspects (Sen, 2003, p. 323). But this does not necessarily prevent the pursuit of self-interest within the structure of household. This way, men and women constantly bargain, negotiate and renegotiate for their positions within the household and community. As this cooperation goes hand in hand with some inequalities, it also reproduces and even reinforces the very same inequalities (Sen, 1990). In this context, I argue that certain patriarchal norms and familial ideologies are constructed within the cooperative conflict and that household must be taken into account when considering these dynamics. Thus, as Kibria (1998) argues, in order to become specifically a garments worker “an effective consideration of the household in relation to the garments entry process must take into account the dynamics of both co-operation and conflict that are a part of household life.”

My argument does not take the household merely as a unit of capital economy, but rather it aims to include other social, cultural and political mechanisms in it. Therefore, I do not argue that capitalism is irrelevant with household or that possible patriarchal relations are not structured in it; rather I argue that they are embedded in the household mechanism in varying degrees depending on the social and cultural contexts. In reality, the household is an institution of the world economy, an institution created by firms, states and workers themselves (Dickinson & Shaeffer, 2001, p. 28). For example, Wolf (1992, p. 27) analyzes the case of Taiwanese and argues that industrialization has actually reinforced and intensified traditional family patterns, particularly parental control over daughters. Namely, factory work itself can affect the household dynamics whereas the household relations can transform the factory regime.

However, in this formulation, capitalism is perceived as having an essentially parasitic relationship with a preexisting and entrenched household patriarchy (Salzinger, 2004, p. 12) and reproduce these assumed patriarchal rules (Dickinson & Shaeffer, 2001).

Some scholars such as Hartmann (1979, p. 19) claims that the combination of patriarchy and capitalism must be analyzed together and argues that capitalist production cannot destroy patriarchal norms. As a case in point, Ecevit (1991) argues that participation in the formal labor cannot provide emancipation for women because even if women participate in the labor market, they are not free from patriarchal rules. In these approaches, women are framed as victims of patriarchal states, Islam or brutal husbands and, therefore, in need of salvation by Western liberators (Abu-Lughod, 1990; Ahmed, 1992; Ortner, 2006). Some scholars (Lim, 1981, 1983; Salaff, 1981) claim that industrial employment liberates women from marginalization and local patriarchal control. As a mediating approach, Savran (2004, p. 46) argues that patriarchy and capitalism occasionally collide and reinforce each other. As Sen (1990) argues, household is a cooperative conflict in which inequalities are produced and reproduced within power relations. In this context, patriarchy is about practiced gender roles through conflicting self-interests. It is a dynamic concept that differs historically and cross-culturally (Safa, 1995, p. 38). In other words, men and women may have different kinds of practices and subjectivities which are not compatible with the suggested patriarchal norms within household depending on local, cultural and political structures.

For example, Safa (1995) argues that the primary assumption of the patriarchy which assigns the breadwinner role to men has shifted in the Caribbean and that the image of male as the breadwinner is a myth. Similarly, Judith Bruce, an anthropologist researcher in The Population Council, states that “the idea that the family is a stable and cohesive unit in which the father serves as economic provider and mother serves as emotional care giver is a myth” (Dickinson and Shaeffer, 2001, p. 28). Moreover, it is maintained that many of the households are not centered on the male or a married couple but rather it is the female headed households which are on the rise almost everywhere (Dickinson & Shaeffer, 2001). For the working class women in Egypt, Hoodfar argues that, after the migration of men, less educated women began

to undertake the responsibilities of men like paying bills, debts and arranging school for children. From the structuralist literature, Ong (1987, p. 4) argues that gender is a cultural construction depending on power relationships in households, factories and society in which the cultural values and practices are reworked and reconstructed by the migrant Malay women workers in the industrial production process. Thus, patriarchal norms of gender are not totalizing; there is a space for bargaining (Kandiyoti, 1988), negotiation (Hoodfar, 1997), and resistance (Lughod, 1993). Therefore, there are no uniform patriarchies but rather different forms of patriarchy (Kandiyoti, 1988).

In order to indicate the diverse experiences of women in relation to their household and labor, the studies of Macleod and Hoodfar on Cairo factories can be given as counter examples. Macleod (1999) explains the household mechanism of Muslim families in Cairo within the Islamic and traditional gender roles. She argues that even if the economic ideology pushes women into the work life, the gender ideology of Islam, which asserts that men should be financially responsible for their households, strongly opposes this process (Macleod, 1996, p. 30). Contrary to this, Hoodfar (1996) points out that women has become decision makers in the family after participating in the labor force in a different factory of Cairo. This is very similar to Wolf's findings (1992) which shows that even though household members attempt to interfere with the choices of women workers in Java, they control their own lives contrary to the idea that their labor is a part of the survival strategy of the household. In this sense, the existence of the patriarchy does not necessarily depend on Islam. There are no fixed households and patriarchal norms; therefore, one should also analyze the household dynamics of women before labeling them as ready-made women of patriarchy. By household mechanisms I mean merely the relations between the members in household depending on economic, social, cultural and political contexts such as the labor history of women;

education, marriage or divorce, effects of migration and most importantly the daily activities they do in their houses which depend on emotions, feelings and interests.

There are some works about the relation between work and households with reference to moral and religious codes and norms which show the articulation of inner mechanisms of household in workplaces. There is an ethnographic study conducted by Işık (2008) in Konya weaving neighborhoods to show the importance of different ways of experiencing patriarchal rules in relation to Islamic rules within work structures. The women workers point out the exploitative attempts of the employers, but they state that they must be patient since God recommends this to them. Işık (2008, p. 535) conceptualizes this inclination of women workers as “ethical practices of self-formation.” By performing piety based on a religious faith which advises *Sabır* (patience), they construct their subjectivities as workers and as women and motivate themselves against the exploitative relationships of capitalism through this religious command. Referring to her words, this study is important because “a focus on ethical practice is needed in studies of labor in order to comprehend the different kinds of ethical selves and different notions of agency that can be formed in various relationships (ibid).” However, these women as Sunni Muslims felt the need of a dialogue between their labor in capitalist system and their moral life in order to give meaning to their labor through performing piety (Hart, 2007). As Hart argues in a different article on Örselli village (2009, p. 289), the co-operative members perform piety by *hayır* (good deeds, charity) in order to avoid greed and isolation from humanity which the economic growth in the carpet weaving co-operative might lead to.

In both examples the patriarchal mechanisms are shaped by the women themselves through different experiences and meanings. These examples are very important for my argumentation because appealing religious and moral commands in labor relations are one of the main findings of this study. But even though I argue that women try to find a spiritual

existence in these factories by being a pious and moral person and construct their subjectivities in this line, I also maintain that factory management with its foremen (*ustas*) and managers (*müdür*) use moral and religious codes for labor control. So, household emerges with its social, emotional, economic and cultural mechanisms in workplace and transform the structure whereas it is also transformed by this very structure. Having clarified my approach to literature on globalization, women's labor, and household in further discussion, I want to conceptualize labor control, labor process and subjectivities with a detailed way in terms of the relationships in workplace and household.

III. From Labor Control to Subjectivities of Women

A. Shop Floor Relations and Labor Control

In this part, I will look at the discussion in sociology of organizations about labor process theory and labor control. Referring to Edwards, I will define labor process and labor control with his three classifications. With the contribution of Burawoy, I will develop the meaning of labor process by introducing the worker as a subject. Then I will point to the feminist critique of Burawoy and put forth my own criticism. This way, I aim to clarify that labor control is also about social relations, cultural values and moral inclinations of people in addition to the technical aspects of it. Moreover, I will indicate that, according to the moral mechanisms in and out of factories, the strategies of management and the subjectivities of workers are constantly produced and reproduced within these reciprocal relationships.

Taylor (1911) defines management as a role of establishing science independent of craft, tradition and worker's knowledge. This management does not consider the worker a creator and in their place constructs a docile body. His idea of "scientific management" points that there cannot be any judgment or enhancement of worker in labor process and this leads to dehumanization of labor process (Braverman, 1974). Braverman criticizes Taylor from a

Marxist point of view and argues that labor control turns the working subject into a worker object so that the labor of workers is deskilled by managers and capitalist owners. This way, it is argued that the scientific management renders worker's agency irrelevant to the success or failure of the capitalist labor process by preventing them from making any decisions for increased productivity (Salzinger, 2004, p. 16). However, as critiques of Braverman, Friedman (1977) and Richard Edwards, two Marxist scholars, argue that changing forms of control arise from the conflict between management and labor. Friedman (1977; 1986) refutes Braverman's thesis by emphasizing the resistances of workers against direct control. In other words, he argues that giving a space to unionized worker groups under controlled conditions can develop their skill and turn it into profit for employers.

Edwards (1978, p. 88) also criticizes Braverman for leaving the class conflict out of his analysis. He especially finds Braverman's "de-skilling" argument problematic by stating that even if "it seems correct to emphasize the tendency for capitalists to replace high skill (high wage) labor with low skill (low wage) labor, the development of both the forces and relations of production continually throw up new products, new technologies and a demand for re-skilled especially educated labor as well as de-skilled labor. Thus accumulation must be seen as simultaneously de-skilling and re-skilling the labor force (Edwards, 1978, p. 86)." He shows that the organization of labor process can be reorganized by new forms of labor control in order for the capitalist to gain more profit. He states that "capitalist are in business to make profits and to do that they organize society's production... they organize the labor process itself, whereby the constituents of production (raw materials, labor, machinery etc.) are transformed into useful products and services; and then, by selling the products of labor they re-convert their property back to money form (1978, p. 89)."

For Edwards (1978, p. 88), the Marxist distinction between labor and labor power (between work done and the capacity to do work) is the essential starting point for any

analysis of labor process. He argues that this distinction is “the worker’s ability to resist and in consequence re-shape employers’ scheme to transform labor power into labor.” This way, Edwards recalls his criticism to Braverman and argues that conflict is intrinsic to the labor process. So, capitalists seek to organize the labor process in order to reduce conflict and increase profit by providing more useful labor out of labor power. For organizing labor process, Edwards (1978, p. 89) points two tasks. The first one is the “coordination of social production” in which each person’s labor should merge with or contribute to the labor of other producers. The second task is “compelling” because the capitalist purchases labor power from the worker, since labor is inseparable from the body of the worker, the worker must be convinced through implicit or direct control mechanisms to produce goods and not to resist the fact that the capitalist will profit out of her labor (ibid.). In this sense, labor control is the organization of labor process and work to compel the worker by subtle or brutal means and convince her to convert her labor power into useful labor by minimum resistance to the conditions where the possessor of the labor power has little to gain in providing useful labor. That is to say, labor control is organizing the labor process with the aim of making the worker work more and efficiently. Edwards (1978) explains the concepts and organization process with his words:

The labor process becomes an arena of class conflict, and the workplace becomes a contested terrain. Faced with chronic resistance to their effort to compel production, employers over the years have attempted to resolve the matter by reorganizing, indeed revolutionizing the labor process itself. Their goal remains profits; their strategies aim at establishing structures of control at work. That is, capitalists have attempted to organize production in such a way as to minimize workers’ opportunities for resistance and even alter workers’ perceptions of the desirability of opposition. Work has been organized, then, to contain conflict. In this endeavor employers have sometimes been successful (p. 93).

Edwards (1978, p. 92) shows that a system of control prevails in the conflict-ridden workplace relationships between capitalists and workers and this system must embody three elements 1) the direction of work tasks, 2) the evaluation of the work done and 3) the rewarding and disciplining of the workers. As a means of organizing these three elements, Edwards (1978, p. 92) identifies three types of labor control; simple control in which power is exercised openly, arbitrarily and personally as in the whip of a foreman; technical control in which control mechanism is designed into very machines and other technical apparatus of factory; and bureaucratic control which is, in a Weberian sense, embedded in the social organization of factory with rules and regulations clearly defined. The last two forms are structural forms of control in which the exercise of power becomes impersonal and institutionalized in the very structure of the firm (ibid.). Although Edwards' arguments constitute the main resource for labor control, other Marxist scholars such as Burawoy contributes to his approach by introducing the subjectivity of worker and developing the concept of labor process.

Criticizing Braverman's argument about the dehumanization of workers in workplaces, Burawoy (1979), who pioneered factory ethnographies, was the first to suggest that workers are subjects, that they do not passively accept labor control, but also do not reject it outright. This way, he tries to answer the questions; "Why do workers work as hard as they do?" and "Why do workers routinely consent to their own exploitation?" By referring to Gramsci, he points out that workers themselves consent to labor control due to hegemony (Burawoy, 1979). He maintains that management "manufactures consent" by creating an illusion of choice in the workplace. That is to say, management detaches workers' interests by the "making out" game which workers try to achieve a level of production to earn incentive pay while they ignore the fact that management gains productivity with only minor increases in wages (1979, p. 51). The game generates consent and this way the management is able to

reduce conflict and increase the illusion that workers have a choice. In doing so, he points out how a despotic factory regime in which coercion prevails gives way to a hegemonic factory regime in which consent prevails (Burawoy, 1985). The concept of “factory regime” (despotic or hegemonic) with regards to the political apparatus of production originates from Burawoy’s theory (1985, p.87).

Different from Edwards who refers to hegemonic and political control in a workplace and argues that labor process is an arena of class conflict, Burawoy (1979, p. 65) claims that labor process is constituted as a game. This way labor process is “the relations of production combined with a corresponding set of relations into which men and women enter as they confront nature, as they transform raw materials into objects of their imagination” (ibid. p. 15). However, he also separates labor process into two aspects; relational and practical. Practical aspect refers to what Edwards defines as the set of activities transforming raw materials into useful objects with the assistance of instruments of production including “the translation of the capacity to work into actual work, of labor power into labor (*ibid.*)” The relational aspect is the relations of production like the relations of the shop floor in which workers interact with each other and with the management. This is an important contribution to the labor process theory since it emphasizes that the relationships on the shop floor are also a part of production which is affected by the subjects of employees. Thus, management implicitly provides consent for the production to make sure that the capitalist gains more profit. To him, “the defining essence of the capitalist labor process is the simultaneous obscuring and securing of surplus value... labor process, therefore, must be understood in terms of specific combinations of force and consent that elicit cooperation in the pursuit of profit” (Burawoy, 1979, p. 30).

Yücesan-Özdemir (2003) introduces ideological labor control as a new form of control which is applied to establish consensual relations in the factory. She states “ideological

control is directed towards generating legitimacy and developing some level of consent” (2003, p. 37). Her ethnographic study in the car company, Toyotasa, shows that even though there is an attempt for the ideological control in the factory, the workers are not in a hegemonic incorporation; rather this form of control prevents them from participating in an active labor movement. She argues that the despotic factory management controls the time and motion of the workers and, through a hegemonic approach; aims to solve the problems related to the worker’s subjectivity. However, it is not able to control their subjectivity because the dominant managerial ideology is partial and incomplete within the struggle of hegemony and consensual relations (Yücesan-Özdemir, 2003, p. 17). In other words, “management finds it difficult to establish a hegemonic relationship because its ideological discourses do not have a material basis that easily allows for the co-ordination of workers interests to their own” (Yücesan Özdemir, 2003, p. 53). Even though this despotic factory management did not prove to be successful in the Toyotasa factory, managerial attempts are implemented to realize ideological labor control. The technical management factory regime strives to penetrate into the personal and social lives of the workers to lay hold of the uncontrolled space.

Executed by the Japanese managerial organizations, this new type of control is referred to as Total Quality Management (TQM) which aims to improve the quality of products and processes. TQM began to be used actively in 1990s in Turkey (Yıldırım, 2010, p. 696). In order to provide quality in these realms, the focal point of the management would be workers with their physical and personal experiences and moods (Yücesan-Özdemir, 2003). In other words, TQM involves the organization of the labor process in the direction of increasing quality, but at the same time, includes the training of employees and the control of their personal lives in order to create a hegemonic participation. However, behind its ideological approach, which might be successful or not among workers, TQM is about the

global integration of Turkish industries by providing the internationally valid standards for export. That is why it also accommodates social audits which are done by international firms to evaluate the social responsibility rate of firms in terms of charity, relationships with workers, providing a work environment without discrimination etc. Therefore, human relations issue in organizations began to gain importance because the export market of Turkish industries depends on these standards. Stress and emotional mood are very vital for the management in Toyotasa; they stick magnets beside the names of the workers which designate the state of mind of the workers such as happy, sad, angry etc. As Yücesan-Özdemir (2003, p. 37) also states, “in contrast to the traditional picture of not intruding in personal lives, management attempts to know workers as individuals and to become involved in their family lives and in their social and economic problems.” To give a historical example, although it was effective in social platforms rather than in workplaces, Fordism also depended on such an ideological argument that workers themselves tried to be made consumers of the products they produced. In this sense, workers’ everyday lives were very important to the Ford companies (Aydoğanoglu, 1991, p. 60).

At this point, it can be said that the subjectivities of workers and their household mechanisms are very critical for labor control management with their social and personal practices embedded in gender, class and racial discourses. In addition to the common criticism raised against Burawoy due to the lack of gender and racial dimensions in his analysis, he can also be criticized for not reflecting on the household, out-of-factory relations and subjectivities of workers. He considers these relations to be independent of the labor process (Burawoy, 1979). However, with respect to the categorical factors such as gender, class and race, the subjectivities of workers and their household mechanisms are at the center of managerial logic. This reciprocal relationship with the workplace management is a

relational process through which different types of management approaches and different subjectivities in every single workplace can emerge.

In a similar vein, related to the two types of factory regimes put forward by Burawoy, Lee's ethnographic study on women workers in China presents a feminist criticism of Burawoy. She maintains that two different forms of factory management (localistic despotism and familial hegemony) come into the picture in two factories of China owned by same enterprise, managed by the same team of managers and produce the same range of electronics products (Lee, 1995, p. 378). In the localistic despotism, management controls a migrant workforce through coercive disciplinary regime whereas in familial hegemony management establishes control through shop floor discourses like patriarchy and family responsibilities (Lee, 1995). Management exploits the local ties of the workers to control labor or consciously facilitates women's fulfillment of their familial duties. However, Lee points out that management is not always interested in control through coercive means even though it has the capacity to impose despotism; rather it controls labor according to the contextual aspects of workers (Lee, 1995, p. 380). Women workers' gender is diversely constructed by the management and workers themselves and it is through these constructions that shop floor power relations are conceived, legitimized and naturalized (Lee, 1995, p. 382). Apart from ignoring the gender dimension and the possibility of various forms of management strategies, she criticizes Burawoy for "neglecting the organization of labor market as a critical determinant of worker's dependence" (Lee, 1995, p. 380). She means that labor market is intrinsic to the politics of production which can determine the management's labor control mechanism according to workers' dependence on labor market.

As I pointed out in the beginning of this study, Salzinger's ethnography shows that gender and gendered subjectivities are very important to the planning of labor control. The prime function of this ideology is to establish the framework in order to determine what is

fair, reasonable and possible in the workplace (Yücesan-Özdemir, 2003). In line with this, patriarchy can be a managerial ideology in factories because the global production mentality recognizes women within these gender roles. Therefore, Ecevit (1991, p. 67) who worked in garment factories of Bursa, asks whether it is a technical or patriarchal control. She decides that the management uses patriarchal control as a managerial strategy in order to discipline the women workers. In this context, as Salzinger (2004, p. 24) argues, the meanings of work and appropriateness of workers' behavior are established on each shop floor in gendered terms. The interesting point is that the management does not decide this type of control by itself rather it understands the workers' main tendencies and develops a kind of managerial strategy. During this process, the workers' subjectivities are also created and they transform the factory with their own values and moral understandings (Salzinger, 2004, p. 19).

Referring to Edwards, this transformation is about the possibility of resistance displayed by workers. Reminding his argument, the distinction between labor and labor power is the worker's ability to resist because obtaining labor from labor power, which is not separable from workers' bodies, depends in a way on workers. Consequently, this possibility reshapes employers' scheme to transform labor power into labor (Edwards, 1978, 88). Even if capitalists achieve to gain labor out of labor power in order to maximize profit, they must change the facilities of the factories according to desires of the workers in order to reduce resistance and convince them to produce.

Cairolì (1998, p. 181) states that "workers sought to imbue the factory with their most cherished cultural values, thus transforming the factory" and, therefore constitute themselves as mother, sister, wife rather than worker and find meaning in their labor through familial ideology of patriarchy. Management organizes labor process according to these inclinations. This way, they "not only accept the domination of the factory but also find in that domination their own sources of personal self-worth and power" (Cairolì, 1998, p. 182). In this sense,

neither the subjectivities of workers nor the management strategy of control is fixed in this relationship. The actors in factories are in constant relationship which includes opposition and negotiation at the same time. Burawoy (1985, p. 127) also states “I see regimes as negotiated orders rather than as institutional reflections of capitalism’s historical tendencies.” Moreover, in Taylorism this relationship is demonstrated as one dimensional taking place between the management and workers, however, there are more actors (*usta, şef, müdür*) within this complex relationship (Salzinger, 2003, 19). Workers also address one another; their managers and foremen (*ustas*) as well as they address the workers. In this sense, Salzinger (2004, p. 20) argues that “Managerial control operates through the constitution of shop floor subjects. This is fully a relational process. Workers are formed in dialogue with other shop floor actors through comparison, contrast, and opposition to both multiple imaginaries and other shop-floor inhabitants.” Salzinger’s ethnography is very efficient in terms of explaining the structure in factories where the subjectivities of women workers and control mechanisms are transformed in a relational way. However, she misses an important point by ignoring the household mechanisms of these women.

At this point, it can be argued that, in patriarchal or other ideological forms, a morality is created within the social organization of workplaces which is not independent of household mechanisms. In relation to religion, this morality refers to a kind of spiritual quest to fulfill the demands of workers so that the workplace is organized in such a way that it convinces workers to produce. Rudnyckyj (2009, p. 105) has an interesting ethnography in a steel company in Indonesia/ Banten in which the labor control is adjusted through spiritual training. In this factory, the management decides to arrange “spiritual” training sessions 40 hours over three days in total to increase productivity, eliminate corruption and become more competitive on an international scale. This training program is called “Emotional and Spiritual Quotient [ESQ] Training” including Qur’anic recitation, business leadership

training, Islamic history and popular psychology. He argues that this strategy “invokes both Islamic tradition and Euro-American management knowledge in the interest of creating a more disciplined, less corrupt, company employee in order to enable a purported ‘natural’ propensity for spirituality, believed an innate characteristic of every human being, to guide the work and home life of participants (ibid.)” In this sense, the management transforms workers into more pious religious subjects and more productive economic subjects (Rudnyckyj, 2009, p. 105). This study is valuable since it indicates that the labor control can be achieved through moral, spiritual and religious means in an organized way. However, he does not present any account of the workers’ reactions to these policies or their household mechanisms. I argue that if the management suggests gaining productivity from this application, it may also suggest that the workers tend to be convinced by these interventions.

Although it remains an uncharted area in Turkey, in most cases this moral and spiritual type of control also refers to Islam in relation to patriarchy. There are only two contrasting studies conducted on the religious control in factories even though their focus was on women workers. One of them is Durak’s research (2011) conducted in Konya Organized Industrial Zone. He introduced the term factory regime with Islamic tendencies as the consequence of neoliberal Islamist government policies and related it to Tuğal’s passive revolution argument which was borrowed from Gramsci. By emphasizing the rise of pious conservatism in Konya, he argues that through religious norms the factory management creates submission among workers through cultural hegemony. Durak (2011, p. 54) adds that they provide labor control by introducing the religious rules such as avoiding ill-gotten gain (*haramdan uzak olma*), respecting rightful share (*kul hakkı yememe*), and rendering the alms levy (*zekat*). According to him, this control creates a moral doctrine among workers in which the personal lives of workers are within the scope of management control. He conceptualizes this relation as the embracement of Islam by technical operations (Durak, 2011, p. 21).

Özdemir (2010) also conducted a study in Konya but she reported opposite results compared to those of Durak. Durak had pointed out that there were workers without social security while Özdemir claimed that she did not encounter such a thing. Nevertheless, she argues that even though the workers did not talk about their rights in the factory such as social security, they were very critical of the unionization issues. She adds that if the workers had talked about their class position and conflicts, we could have discussed the existence of some kind of a class consciousness. However, this was stated as impossible in Durak's study due to the cultural hegemony (2011, p. 130). Durak stated in some newspapers that they obtained different findings from those of Özdemir because she made the interviews with the permission of the employers in the factories. Afterwards, Özdemir published a paper on this issue in *Birikim* journal (2012). She explained that the fieldwork is always an area in which one cannot prove the truth of the findings; rather in qualitative researches, perspective and evaluation shape the analysis. At this point, I agree with Özdemir and argue that the resistance put up by the workers is not necessarily revolutionary in a Marxian sense because there had to be a discussion of class consciousness and class subjectivities of workers if they had taken a critical stance against the employer and state with an awareness of class differences and conditions. In this sense, "cultural hegemony" is not enough to explain the complex relationships on a shop floor because it cannot be powerful in a structure where neither the subjectivities of workers nor the management strategy is fixed or complete. To be fair, Durak's study is interesting in the sense that it shows the relationship between labor control and Islam in Turkey. I admit that the government affects the neoliberal construction of social lives and organization and see these changes as revolutionary especially in social sphere. However, I do not think that the use of religious codes on the shop floor can be determined by these changes because the workers have not become Muslims recently and most importantly the factory owners do not necessarily have a pious tendency.

Especially regarding the manufacturing industry and women workers I argue that labor control can work over religious and moral codes in most factories since the workers define themselves as Muslims and their everyday lives and the organization of the factory are designed according to the performance of Muslim practices like veiling, perform salaat (*namaz*), religious discussions, etc. In other words, religious practices and moral tendencies are embedded in workers' everyday practices and these, in turn, can play a crucial role in the construction of gender and subjectivities in workplaces. Personal lives of workers inside or outside the factory are the focal point of attention of these relationships through which new subjectivities with regards to being a woman and worker by references to moral and religious codes are produced.

B. "Selves are made at work:" The production of Subjectivities in the Factories

In this section, I will discuss the subject formation process in relation to gender relations particularly in factories. Therefore, I will emphasize the constituted subjectivities in the workplaces and reach the point of defining what a subject is with references to mainly Salzinger's and Butler's analyses of subjects and gender. At this point, I refer to Ortner's articulation of contradictory forms of subjectivity and argue that subjects have individual and collective parts which may contradict with each other. I claim that subjectivity is not determined totally by social and moral norms within power relations. Even if they are produced in factories or organizational units through certain norms, they are not mere products of these structures. However, they are not free from the moral and social codes by which they are surrounded. It is the social norms and values which institutionally shape individuals as subject, but from that point he/she is a "subject" who acts upon the very social norms to transform. As Ortner (2005, p. 31) argues, subjectivity is "the ensemble of modes of perception, affect, thought, desire, fear, and so forth that animate acting subjects," but also

“the cultural and social formations that shape, organize, and provoke those modes of affect, thought and so on.”

Indeed, even in the most technical organization there are gendered subjects and gender roles. As Salzinger (2003) points out, even in Taylor’s theory, Schmidt who is a worker in her study is constituted as a worker and as a man. Referring to Althusser’s concept of interpellation, by recognizing himself/ herself in other’s naming, Schmidt is addressed as a worker and a male subject (Salzinger, 2003, pp. 16-21). Doing this, workers address each other and other individuals in the factory. In this sense, there is also the “Other Subject” in whose name ideology penetrates into individuals as subject in the process of interpellation (Althusser, 2008). In this context, Salzinger introduces the gendered subjectivities. Referring to Foucault (1982), this can be related to the productive power relationships by which the regime of truths is produced and leads the way to the production of subjectivities. For example, this regime of truths can refer to heterosexual roles in a factory where gender is constructed by the dominant heterosexual norms. However, as a criticism of Foucault, subjectivities are also active agents of their practices in this process. Concerning the Foucauldian researchers like Ong and Salzinger who conducted studies on factories, we can say that the subject formation is a cultural construction which is never terminated or fixed by certain forms of knowledge or social norms. As Salzinger points out, the self is always in reconstruction in the way that “selves are made at work” in terms of gender roles (Salzinger, 2004, pp. 16-17). In this sense, neither the factory regime nor the subject is fixed in this relationship of reproduction and gender roles are never static. Therefore, the docility or malleability of a person is also not a fixed or static situation. These processes shape managerial selfhoods with discernible consequences for both technical architecture and personal management in production (Salzinger, 2004, p. 19). However, regarding the effects

of gender, class and race, this construction does not follow the same trajectory for every actor of a factory. Supporting this idea, Salzinger (2004) argues that;

Subjectivity cannot be “held constant.” Rather, each case is analyzed as a unique configuration of structuring discourses within which the logic of local gendered meanings and subjectivities come to take the form they do as I underline the highly idiosyncratic mix of local managerial decisions, worker responses, and resulting gendered subjectivities. (p. 29)

As a poststructuralist critique of feminism, Butler (1993) argues that gender is a performative act of subject which can be shaped by the repetition of socially established norms or totally excluded anti heterosexual values. Butler (1997) opens a space for a self-conscious subject who is not totally determined by social norms but not totally free from those norms either. Butler (1997, p. 83) combines Foucault and Althusser and clarifies that subjectivation is a paradox in which individuals are subordinated by certain conditions but at the same time find ways to become a self-conscious subject. This way, they are not totally captured by power and truth regimes or ideology as argued by Foucault and Althusser respectively. Rather there are possibilities in which individuals may act independently of discourses or ideologies despite the fact that they are not totally free from them. They can act different from the truths of animating power or depart from the discourses and produce new ways which are not identical with the discourses which power creates. In line with this, contradicting subjectivities which are not constructed by the common social norms can emerge whereas these very same norms can be reproduced in a different condition. This means that the subject is constructed in such a paradoxical manner that even if he/she criticizes and acts against the rules through which power operates, he/she also can reinforce them. Butler (2009) defines this with her words as:

When I speak about the subject in such contexts, it is not a “subject” who is the sovereign precondition of action and thought. But it is socially

produced “agent” and “deliberator” whose agency and thought is made possible by a language that precedes that “I”. In this sense, the “I” is produced through power, though not the deterministic effect of power. Power relies on a mechanism of reproduction that can and does go awry, undo the strategies of animating power, and produce new and even subversive effects (p. iii).

For Butler, the dual existence of subjects is constituted in a symbolic and linguistic process, but my main approach is the experiences of women workers in their practical contexts and spaces in which symbols acquire meanings (Mahmood, 2001; Salzinger, 2003). Therefore, my main concern is the gendered subjects in factories. Turning to Butler’s account of gender in which gender is defined as a performative act and exists with the performance of certain tasks, the production of subjects is also achieved by repetition of norms in a certain way. However, in connection with the definition of subject I stated above, the performativity argument also explains the paradox because performing something in a repetitive manner means that there is the possibility of failure. That is to say, “as a system of norms depends on repetition, it also carries the possibility of failure, discontinuation or appropriation for purposes other than the consolidation of norms” (Mahmood, 2001). As Butler (2009) also points out:

To say that gender is performative is to say that it is a certain kind of enactment: the “appearance” of gender is often mistaken as a sign of its internal or inherent truth; gender is prompted by obligatory norms to be one gender or the other (usually within a strictly binary frame), and the reproduction of gender is thus always a negotiation with power; and finally, there is no gender without this reproduction of norms that risks undoing or redoing the norm in unexpected ways, thus opening the possibility of a remaking of gendered reality along new lines (p. i)

This means that even if individuals are surrounded by heterosexual norms, they also have some space to negate these norms; however, this negation does not lead to their autonomous existence from these norms. Therefore, this is the place for resistance and critique for subjects. However, the question still remains: Why do they keep reproducing the norms even though they are, to a certain extent, aware of the problems of these norms? By giving examples from some ethnographic studies, I argue that women as workers may act in accordance with the technical norms of the factory but at the same time it is a mask for resistance which they put up by gossiping about management, slowing down the production, ignoring a rule or using cultural norms as elements for the organization of the factory which they continue to work. The interesting point lies in the social and moral norms of a factory. Women workers, to a certain extent, criticize the moral application of the factory but at the same time as religious and moral subjects, they use these patriarchal and religious norms towards other workers because they are partially a subject of these norms. For example, they criticize the management because of its intervention in their private lives and moral issues on religious grounds but at the same time they act as moral guardians towards other workers by gossiping about and forming a morally judgmental perspective towards them. Even though they display contradictory actions, they also have some spiritual and moral feelings created in their cultural realm by which they judge others. In this sense they have dual consciousness in these discourses, therefore, consciousness is a part of subjectivities but also a part of public culture at the same time. As Ortner (2005) emphasizes:

By subjectivity I will always mean a specifically cultural and historical consciousness. In using the word consciousness I do not mean to exclude various unconscious dynamics as seen, for example, in a Freudian unconscious or a Bourdieusian habitus. But I do mean that subjectivity is always more than those things, in two senses. At the individual level, I will assume, with Giddens, that actors are always at least partially 'knowing subjects', that they have some degree of reflexivity about themselves and their desires, and that they have some 'penetration' into the ways in which they are

formed by their circumstances. They are, in short, conscious in the conventional psychological sense, something that needs to be emphasized as a complement to, though not a replacement of, Bourdieu's insistence on the inaccessibility to actors of the underlying logic of their practices. At the collective level I use the word consciousness as it is used by both Marx and Durkheim: as the collective sensibility of some set of socially interrelated actors. Consciousness in this sense is always ambiguously part of people's personal subjectivities and part of the public culture, and this ambiguity will run through much of what follows. At times I will be addressing subjectivity in the more psychological sense, in terms of the inner feelings, desires, anxieties, and intentions and so on, of individuals, but at other times I will be focusing on large scale cultural formations. (p. 34)

As an ethnographic inclination, Ortner (2005) advises subjectivity-oriented theory of culture in the way of analyzing the cultural formulation of subjectivities. Weber depicts a picture in which Protestantism intensifies religious codes to designate moral and proper ways at play. As in the argument of "Protestant work ethic," hard work was a moral, personal and social good (Rose, 1996, p. 103). In this relation, Ortner (2005, p. 37) argues that "this culturally/religiously produced subject is defined not only by a particular position in a social, economic, and religious matrix, but by a complex subjectivity, a complex set of feelings and fears, which are central to the whole argument." In this sense, women workers have a complex set of feelings and fears with regards to moral and religious values. Not only do they reflect spirituality onto their work as an organizational effect which can provide moral order in a factory but also they use religious and moral codes to judge and interpret each other and the management's applications.

IV. Conceptual Framework

In connection with the aim of this thesis which examines the practices of women workers within their own contexts, namely household and workplace, in order to understand

how they give meaning to their labor through these experiences, I observe several conflicting subjectivities. And their contextual framework refers in some way to the religious, spiritual and moral codes. These subjectivities are in construction through the practices within labor control and the household. In this regard, this study aims to analyze labor control and subjectivity formation in a relational way in order to understand the mechanisms on the shop floor.

Regarding the labor of women workers, there are several debates on globalization and women's labor because globalization is a gendered process explained by some scholars women workers' experiences in categories such as "inequality," "patriarchy," or "exploitation." However, I argue that these concepts are difficult to define and mostly prove insufficient to evoke and understand multilayered meanings and emotions in their experiences. I argue that the globalization is a relational and produced process in which class, race and gender relations are structured within local and it gains its shape in social institutions such as the household and the workplace (factory, office) through gendered understandings, assumptions and subjectivities. The household is an income and labor pooling unit. As such, it is an institution of the world economy created by firms, states and workers themselves and in which each member has distinct self-interests but also cooperates with the other members. But this does not imply that the household is a merely economic unit but rather it also contains emotions, feelings and altruism. Thus, by household mechanisms I mean the relations between the members of a household depending on economic, social, cultural and political contexts such as the labor history of women, education, marriage or divorce, effects of migration and most importantly the daily activities they do in their houses.

In this context, labor control in factories is not independent of household mechanisms. Some religious and moral norms and this labor control process assign practices and roles to the bodies of workers. By referring to Edwards, I define labor control as the organization of

labor process and work in order to convince workers to convert their labor power into useful labor by minimum resistance through subtle or brutal means. That is to say, labor control organizes the labor process with the aim of making workers more productive and efficient. The labor process is the duration in which labor power turns into productive labor through the relations of workers, managers and technical instruments to provide profit for capitalists by transforming raw materials into products. Taking one step further, Burawoy, for the first time, introduced workers as subjects into the labor process theory and argued that labor process has also a relational aspect which is the interaction of workers with one another and with the management of a shop floor.

At this point, I argue that, for labor control, managements have various strategies which consist of investigating the social and even moral demands of workers in order that they give consent and give way to resistance. Penetrating into the personal and social lives of the workers through moral guardianism and striving to adjust moral and religious codes and norms through several religious awards and *hayır* (charity), which are crucial for workers, provide the management with the opportunity to acquire consent from the workers to produce. But at the same time women workers re-conceptualize and reconstruct these codes and interventions and present their own subjectivities. In this relation, I conceptualize “moral guardianism” as a daily control mechanism within workplace relations in the way of structuring the appropriate and proper way of living a moral and religious life. So, it is a moral and religious control mechanism in factories which is used both by the factory management towards the workers in order to provide the technical and moral order in factory and also by the workers towards management’s practices and towards co-workers at the level of every day relationships.

This means that the subject formation process is paradoxical in the sense that even if these interventions in the bodies of workers cause subordination to a certain extent, this does

not prevent them from becoming self-conscious subjects (Butler, 1997, 83). The subject is constructed in such a paradoxical manner that even if he/she criticizes and acts against the rules which power operates, he/she can reinforce them at the same time. Therefore, even in the most technical organization, there are gendered subjects who are addressed as subjects by recognizing himself/herself in other's naming. In addition, subjectivities are never fixed and can never be held constant. As Ortner (2005, p. 31) argues, subjectivity is a dual consciousness working on two levels; individual and collective. In other words, subjectivity is the totality of modes of perception, affect, thought, desire, and fear in an individual manner but it is also social formation which shapes, organizes and advocates those modes in a collective manner.

V. Methodological Approach: An Istanbulite in Denizli

In this section, I will discuss my ethnographic fieldwork experiences. I will present some information as to how I chose the factories and the respondents, how I developed a relationship with them, how they reacted and attributed meanings to my presence and my research quest. In addition, as a responsibility, I will give an account of how my presence in the fieldwork affected the data gathering process and how I experienced this process.

I established my first contact in Denizli through a friend of my sister who is also a product manager in a small subcontracting textile firm. She helped me to find the factories according to my research aims and to contact their human resources managers. While I was establishing connections with the factories in order to get permission to conduct participant observation, I also had the opportunity to hear diverse stories from her and other individuals in this firm who had various experiences with women garment workers in Denizli. The place she works was also the first garment atelier I entered in my fieldwork. Throughout my search for factories in which to conduct fieldwork I spent my days in this big atelier and observed the

women workers there during dinner and tea times. The remarkable point was the effect of the *usta* over other women workers during the labor process and even during breaks. Moreover, contrary to the common global logic that women workers are malleable and docile, it was surprising to hear the production and human resources managers say “it is very hard to work with women workers.” There were even a lot of speculative complaints about the women who work in this firm as informal *fason* (contract manufacturer) workers regarding their marital status, race and morality. Moreover, an equally important issue for these managers was the actions of the AKP government being criticized in the textile industry, because they found the recent policies of the government as destructive for the development of the textile industry in Denizli. Further in my research, I observed that these issues were similar in the factories in which I had the opportunity to work.

I visited Denizli four times and stayed there for 45 days in total. I worked in three factories which I called Neotric, Moralist and Asylum. These pseudonyms, which will be explained in the further discussion, stem mostly from the impressions I received from the managers (*müdürs*) of these factories and the relations in factory between management and workers. Although I did not get the chance to work in these factories and conduct interviews for same amount of time due to permission barriers, based on my observations and interviews I will make some suggestions by comparing them to show in what ways different kinds of labor control mechanisms and women subjectivities emerge. From all the factories the first impression I received was the loud atmosphere because of the machines and the yarn dusts which make the clothes white and which also makes you cough after two days. For cleaning the dust there are air injection pistols. I worked in those factories as an *ayakçı* (errand girl). I occasionally helped the workers with minor works such as cutting labels, counting the finished products, fetching things, folding bedclothes and towels, packaging etc. Although I was warned not to interrupt the labor process by speaking to the workers or distracting them,

the women workers were very ready to speak and ask questions to me as a stranger who came from Istanbul. In tea and lunch breaks, we drank, ate and talked at the same table, prayed in the same *mescit* (small prayer room in factory called Masjid) and shared feelings, thoughts and experiences with each other.

I conducted semi structured in-depth interviews with 50 people inside and outside the factories each of which lasted about two hours. (See appendix for a list of respondents)² Especially the interviews with women workers outside the factory mostly took place after working hours or on weekends in their houses. Only two women wanted to interview outside. I took the factory bus together with the ones who wanted to be interviewed after work and they invited me to their places. On the bus, it was very difficult for me to decide where to sit or to whom to speak since the structure on the buses is in such a form that the groups that have close relations sit together and mostly speak about the other groups. At the same time the relations between men and women workers were also noticeable on the buses because even if they are careful not to sit together especially the men workers were trying to communicate with women workers through jokes referring to their personal lives. The houses of the workers also need to be described in order to visualize their daily lives and experiences in households. They do not eat at the table but use floor tables. They said that they liked eating sitting on the floor. Only two of my respondents have tables in their houses but anyway we ate on the low table. The physical conditions in the houses are relatively low. They have the essential pieces of furniture and most of them have no central heating rather for heating and making ready the stove is a very important duty in household. But especially the houses of married women were relatively better since they have some pieces of furniture from their dowries but the houses of divorced women are with little furniture and poorly furnished. Especially some of the buildings of flats were without stucco and with squat toilets. Even the

² All workers' names are pseudonyms in order to protect their identities, whereas I used the real names of persons whom I interviewed in their public roles.

toilet of one house was outside the living area although they live in the city. There are also reasons for the current condition of the houses because in Denizli owning a house is very important and the cheapest way for the migrants to own a house in the city is building it by themselves. In other words they buy a field and construct their own houses so they could sometimes be unfinished.

We cooked together and talked during the night. I remember the times we spend in their houses with the smell of a *sarımsaklı tarhana çorbası* which is a homemade traditional soup mostly made with garlic, because it is an easy food to cook. When other members of the household were present, they were also involved in the conversation; therefore, the records of these interviews lasted even five or six hours. This way, I found the opportunity to listen to the experiences of other members of the families about the textile industry in Denizli. I also attended to two meetings. One of them was arranged by Mine (Neotric, 45) in the form of *altın günü* (a special day for women which they all chip in a certain amount of gold or money to be given to the householder). The other meeting was by Emine (Asylum, 37) which was a visit to congratulate a woman worker for fulfilling *umrah*.³ In these meetings, the women were loudly talking about issues such as like their husbands, children, the issues in workplace etc. while the children were playing and sometimes crying around. Some of the women also do their hand work like knitting such as lace which is prepared for selling.

Although I had semi-structured question lists based on my ethnographic research method, the themes of the conversations were determined by the respondents' choices which means that even if I asked the same questions to every informant they told me the stories which deemed the most important to their lives such as a divorce story, working experiences or children. In general, I asked the questions related to my main research questions in three

³ Which is an important religious practice served by a lot of Muslims by going to Mecca and performing some rituals like *tawaf* (walking around Kaaba seven times) and *sa'i* (ritual walking, walking between two heels Al-Safa and Al-Marwah by praying).

aspects. Firstly, to seek answers for the question “how do women experience their labor bodily and emotionally in the work place?” participant observation was very important. In connection with this question, I observed both the labor processes of the factories and the roles of women workers in relation to other women, men workers, the foremen and the managers. In addition to my observations, I asked some questions in the interviews such as “Do you experience any conflict with your co-workers or managers?” and “Do you have close friends in factory?” The free times in the factory such as the lunch or tea breaks were very valuable in order for me to ask the women workers unstructured questions. For example, I heard stories predominantly about divorce cases and work stories of some women during these breaks. And they did not hesitate to talk about conflicts in the factory with forewomen (*ustas*) and managers (*müdürs*).

The important issue is that I observed some practices on the shop floor which were most of the time not the representation of the factory rules. Therefore, the questions about the organization of the factory worked well. I also asked questions on their emotions and ideas about working such as “How do you feel as your work?,” “Do you want to work more or quit the job immediately after you reach the age of retirement or you reach a point in your life where you do not need to work to earn money anymore?,” “What, for you, are the difficulties of working?” etc. in order to clarify how they give meaning to their labor experiences.

In order to analyze how these experiences and meanings are related to their social and domestic lives, I had prepared questions such as “Who spends money in the house?,” “Who makes decisions?,” “Who decides about children’s school?” etc. Regarding the social effects I had intended to pose questions such as “Do the members of your social community have any reactions to or any gossip about you working in the factory?” etc. For the religious inclination of the family I was to pose the question “Have you attended any meeting of a religious group recently?” However, I did not need to ask these questions since the informants were willing to

explain everything about their private lives, problems with their husbands, with the families of their husbands, religious inclinations and doubts etc. I think that my social background has a crucial effect on the openness of the informants because I am also married and wear a headscarf; therefore, they felt as if I was one of them as a woman. However, in terms of working conditions, life standards and education history, it was very clear that I was, to them, an Istanbulite, as they called me. Therefore, they had questions for me as I had for them; “Am I married, do I have any children, how much money do I make, what does my husband do for a living, how much money does he earn, do we have a social security, do we have a house of our own, how much rent do we pay?” Indeed, all these questions give a broader picture of their priorities in their lives.

A survey might seem practical to gather demographic data such as age, marital status, income, number of children, years of working, education, migration etc. However, I thought that this could affect the relationship I established with the workers in a negative way and create an official distance between us. Therefore, I asked these questions at proper points during the interviews. In Neotric and Moralist, the men workers complained about my scholarly interest in women workers by asking “why do you not speak with us?” This was crucial in terms of hearing their experiences regarding women workers in the factory. I spoke to several male workers some of whom were the husbands of my women respondents, as well as with male managerial assistants, managers, headman and the factory owner. Although this is a research on women workers I also needed to see the men’s inclinations in order to better analyze the structuring of women worker subjectivities. Even if some men claim that they deserve more money than women because they work harder than them and that it is unfair to receive the same salary as the women workers do, they also point out that working with women makes them more polite and gentle. In these statements, we can clearly see how the gendered subjectivities are constructed. In addition to this, talking with the managers and

employers of the women workers was especially very helpful to analyze the inner mechanism of the factory and reflect on the relationship between them and the workers. Moreover, this provided me with the opportunity to see the lives of the women in relation to the production processes of the factories and looking at them from the eyes of the management. Having a similar background with that of the managers in terms of education, life standards etc., they openly explained to me their capitalist inclinations and their relationships with the workers with the assumption that I could understand them. However, it was very difficult for me to talk to them. This is due to the fact that they thought of me as partially “one of them” because of the educational background but I did not want to be regarded as one of them.

Nevertheless, convincing the factory managers to work as a participant observer in the factories was very difficult. I spoke to seven big textile and garment factories in Denizli some of which are the production factories of the famous brands of home textile in Turkey. The interesting point of these interviews I conducted with the factory management was their reference to TQM in terms of certificates such as ISO 9001 and international applications like social audits in the factories. They did this because they did not understand why I wanted to do such a research and told me that they were inspected by big international firms several times a year and there could not be any problems regarding social security issues or the contentment of the workers. In this sense, TQM is used in an ideological manner in order to legitimize the labor control of the factory by referring to universal production standards (Yücesan-Özdemir, 2003), however, these standards and audits are not reliable and can be used manipulatively as I confronted in the factories in which I worked. The second remarking and common point in these meetings was the reference to the increasing rates of divorce in Denizli and “moral panic” expressions in their statements when they talked about women workers. They indicate the working of women as a reason behind the increasing rates of divorce and corruption in the family.

After the meetings with the factory managers only one of them, the manager of the Neotric (*Yenilikçi*), let me enter the factory to do a pre-field research and work there. I found this pseudonym suitable for the factory because its new managerial department commits to a role of being “modern” and “professional” rather than emphasizing a moral and religious perspective. This, in turn, affects the labor control process and the workers’ practices in terms of pray hours, dressing style etc. Most of the women in this factory wear headscarves but I realized that they attempt to be more “modern” because they were interested in my veiling style as an example coming from Istanbul. The production manager, Pınar, who is a 34 year-old female textile engineer and worked in the USA for five years, has been the face of the factory for this “modern” perspective. Pınar is also the one with whom I met to get the permission for my research. She encouraged me by working as a mediator between the owners of the factory and me. She and the owner of the factory explained to me that they attached a big importance to education and therefore, they were pleased to encourage my study. Neotric is the sewing part of the entire enterprise which has also other factories responsible for the yarn, weaving and dyeing in the organized industrial zone of Denizli. This is a producer/exporter of woven towels and bathrobes. I spent 15 work days in the Neotric. I did in depth interviews with 9 women out of the factory and short interviews with 15 individuals in the factory. 3 of the interviews I conducted in the factory were with male workers. 12 of my respondents in the Neotric were divorced. After the 2002 crisis this factory contracted its business and now has 142 women workers. However, not all the workers work the same weeks and due to the lack of defined rules, workers are forced to take annual leave and when they have no annual leave they take unpaid leave. The workshop has four parts machine (*makine*), quality control (*kalite kontrol*), embroidery (*nakış*), and sample (*numune*) with different female foremen namely forewomen (*ustas*). There are three machine lines which end with the packaging of these products. These *ustas* also have a male headman (*şef*)

Ahmet (48) who works for the product manager (*üretim müdürü*) Pınar, as *usta* does. The room of the manager is in the shop floor from where she can see all the workers and the process of production. I did interviews with one of the *ustas*, the *şef*, the *müdür*, the owner of the factory and the doctor of the factory. The work in the factory begins at 7.30 in the morning and finishes at 18.00 in the afternoon. They have one 45-minute lunch break and two 15-minute tea breaks a day.

The second factory in which I worked is the yarn factory of the Neotric which I designated the pseudonym “Moralist” (*Ahlakçı*). In the interview with the owner of the Neotric, so the owner of Moralist as well, I asked whether I could see the other factories to which they responded positively. I thought that seeing a different kind of labor process would enable me to make a comparative analysis. When I first entered Moralist, the smell and the temperature of the factory were very disturbing. There was a sour, acidic kind of smell and the temperature was 35 centigrade. Especially during the shift change times, the masjıt and the changing room for women became crowded and noisy as women wanted to change clothes for the prayer. The yarn machines which are mostly used by women workers and the other machines were very different from each other. Because of the organization of this technical structure men and women did not work close to each other, but in some stages of production all the workers came together and prepare the machines. The *müdür* (production manager) of this factory describes their role and success by being very careful about the moral relationships between male and female workers. She states that they try to control the moral environment of the factory. From the interviews I conducted with her two male assistants, I realized that they legitimized their labor control strategies through the criticism of other parts of the factory. For example, they describe dyeing factory as a place where it is not certain who has a romantic relationship with whom (“*Kimin eli kimin cebinde belli değil.*”). This is a strategy for the organization of the labor process and the labor control, because if moral

problems arise in the factory owing to the relationships among the workers, the production would be interrupted. In this factory in which I worked for a week, men predominantly work in shifts and it has a very different labor organization with technological machines compared to the garment ateliers. In order to see the difference, I also interviewed some of the men and women in the factory where men workers outnumber women workers. I did long interviews with the *müdür* of the factory and her male assistants. I talked to some men and women workers in the factory and also did in-depth interviews with three married couples who still work in this factory in different shifts or worked in the past. This was a very valuable experience in terms of sharing their domestic life practices. In this factory approximately 120 people work. 24 of them are women workers. Their eight-hour shifts are 07.00-15.00, 15.00-23.00 and 23.00-07.00 with a 30-minute lunch or dinner break and a 15-minute tea break.

The third factory is the Asylum (*Koğuş*) from which, after several trials, I could get only three days of permission for a participant observation. When I was there for the first time it was Friday and all the male managers and administrative workers were at the Friday prayer so I waited in the waiting room for half an hour. In this place there was a small library in which there were about twenty books of Said Nursi, who was a religious alim (scholar), and the book called *Risale-i Nur* which is a pamphlet giving suggestions on religious and moral order in society. There were also books criticizing evolution theory which shows the religious stand of the factory. I worked for three days in this factory and did 7 in-depth interviews and one focus group in addition to 6 short in-factory interviews. We also visited a woman worker with other four women workers to congratulate her for her *umrah* visit. This factory has a male *müdür* (human resources manager) Şenol who is in charge of the atelier department and of all the workers. The first time I was in his room he seemed very serious and rigorous. The interesting point was a telephone call he made while I was sitting there. On the other end of the line was a person who wanted to get married with a woman worker in the garment atelier

and asked *müdür* for an evaluation of this woman and permission. The manager especially talked about new divorce cases of the workers in the factory and how they “supported” couples emotionally and economically to prevent it.

This factory is a home textile factory which is a producer/exporter of duvet cover, towels and bathrobes. There are 126 women workers. In this factory the parts are separated according to the products; duvet cover (*nevresim*), towel (*havlu*) and bathrobe (*bornoz*). Again all these parts have female forewomen (*ustas*) in addition to a headman (*şef*) who is in charge of all the parts of the atelier. I also did short interviews with the owner, *müdür* and all *ustas*. This factory has peculiar rules because of the owner’s inclination towards *Nurcu*⁴ religious order. Therefore, all the women workers have to wear headscarves as soon as they get off the shuttles of the factory. Their meal and tea breaks are gender segregated and women are not allowed to talk to the men in the factory. The shifts of women and men are also organized separately such that they don’t run into each other at the end of the shifts. Women come to work at 7.30, half an hour before men do, and stop at 17.00 before the men. The management legitimizes this in a gendered way saying that women can thus go home earlier and take care of their children and home. This is a factory which is dependent on the *Nurcu* order rules in terms of labor organization and social relationships. Even though the manager defines this factory as a reliable shelter, the workers encounter some psychological problems here and state that they feel that it is like an open prison.

The ongoing relationships I built with these women are very valuable. From the beginning of my fieldwork, I learnt so much from their perspectives and thoughts. In general, their main concerns were their unemployed husbands, divorce stories and their means to survive. Therefore, their stories can be seen as the reflection of the main issues in Denizli.

⁴ It is an order established by the students of Said Nursi, who was a religious *alim* (scholar) and has a pamphlet entitled *Risale-i Nur* which gives suggestions on religious and moral order in society. Now, this order is known as a part of *Gülen* Movement whose Fethullah Gülen is the sheikh.

Almost half of the respondents are divorced and most of the married women workers' husbands have no stable jobs. As women workers stated "their dream" is to own a house, retire and save enough money which will enable them not to work anymore, and provide a proper life for their children. In this sense, I do not regard their desire for not working as a kind of subordination or false consciousness. To me, it is rather the fact that they do not want to struggle anymore in these harsh conditions.

CHAPTER 2: LABOR CONTROL AND LABOR PROCESS IN THE FACTORIES

I. Introduction

In this chapter, my aim is to conceptualize and give an account of labor control and the labor process through the experiences, narratives and practices of women workers and the managerial strategies in the factories. I argue that labor control and labor process are related to the structures and relations within households. I also seek to show that women workers actively participate in managerial strategies in order both to resist labor control and fashion their subjectivities.

For doing this first of all I will discuss the history of the local textile industry in Denizli. The transformations within the production processes also lead to transformations in the social realm in terms of local parameters. I will also discuss household mechanisms in Denizli based on my observations and interviews. The household is significant in shaping labor in the shop floor. I will mention labor history (beginning of work experience, migration) and family history (family, education, marriage, divorce, children, religion) as interrelated factors.

Moreover, I will focus on labor control in these three factories both in its physical and moral aspects. In this analysis, I also refer some discrepancies between these factories in terms of organization of labor and managerial strategies. In this sense, first of all I will give an account of physical control within the labor process, based on the argument that even though there is a control through moral and spiritual rules in these factories, there is also a crucial physical control in the labor process in order to provide efficiency. Referring to Edwards (1978) by physical control I mean structural forms of control, that physical control is technical control in which control is maintained through machines and technical means; and bureaucratic control which is the written rules and regulations of factory.

I claim that these structural forms of control could be transformed by moral, social and cultural norms. This way, I want to discuss ideological control in the hegemonic sense by referring to Burawoy and Yücesan-Özdemir. In line with this, I will clarify that labor control is also about moral and social relations in the factories which are used strategically by the managements. In this sense, physical control is not independent of these social and cultural relations. Therefore, I will put forth the term “moral guardianism,” as a mode of labor control in factories in moral, social and cultural terms. I will also point to the play of religious and moral codes in the workplace in terms of both the management’s and workers’ moral and religious performances. Particularly, I will note how moral and religious codes play a crucial role in labor control. I argue that the management has an understanding of the spiritual and moral demands of the workers, and it organizes the labor process and awards according to these demands in order to create consent. I will discuss how workers interpret such management strategies, and how the whole process contributes to workers’ subjectivities.

II. Denizli as a Case

A. The Local in the Global

Denizli province is one of the so-called “Anatolian Tigers” due to its developed textile industry. 74.58 % of towel exports and 65.19 % of bathrobe exports of Turkey are from Denizli (DSO, 2011). Denizli is home to 720 export factories and 140,000 workers. Keyman and Lorasdağı (2010, p. 180) argue that the city is a self-contained city which experiences all the effects of globalization and Europeanization processes very deeply, and that it succeeds in rendering these effects as profits and gains at the economic level. Although recently it has gone through a difficult time due to economic crises and the decrease in export rates, it has a unique development story in terms of the textile and garment industry in Turkey. Therefore, Denizli’s history is shown as an old success story in terms of its developed export oriented

textile industry and its unique local mechanisms that go back to the 1930s (Türkün-Erendil, 2000; Penpecioğlu, 2007).

Denizli was a province where an important textile production tradition developed by artisanal textile products at the household scale even before the 1930s. Two major districts Babadağ and Buldan experienced artisanal textile production and later Kızılcabölük started to be involved in artisanal production in the form of weaving, cotton fabrics and embroidery (Pınarcıoğlu, 2000; Beyhan, Armatlı-Köroğlu, 2002). However, the 1930s was an important turning point for Denizli because local textile producers established cooperatives to protect themselves from the small number of tradesmen working through subcontracting and buying cotton (Türkün-Erendil, 2000). These cooperatives structured the basis of cooperative groups in Denizli (Penpecioğlu, 2007). Especially in the hard years of the Second World War these cooperatives gained important responsibilities for the distribution of yarn given by the state economic enterprise Sümerbank and reinforced the collaborate mutual trust and reciprocity in this industry (Mutluer, 1995 cited in Beyhan, Armatlı-Köroğlu).

Therefore, during this period, some producers migrated from Babadağ to the center of Denizli province and established family factories. In this sense, Türkün-Erendil (2000, p. 99) argues that the actors in the production organization of Denizli are mostly family groups rather than individuals, thus social relations are of utmost importance in work relations, providing capital, marketing and operating in the market. According to a survey conducted in 2006 by the Denizli Association of Manufacturers (DSO) 87 % of the companies in Denizli were family firms (DSO, 2006). Türkün-Erendil (2000) points that these social trust relations allow Denizli to endure the exploitative and competitive atmosphere of global capitalism. This structure in Denizli is important in terms of the development it goes through the success in export production by the 1980s onwards. The story of Denizli shows its uniqueness in this social network relations in textile and garment production since the collaboration, solidarity

and trust relations among the producers and factories give them more leverage in entering Western markets for exporting towels and bathrobes (Türkün-Erendil, 2000; Penpecioglu, 2007).

In addition to this local network structure in Denizli, the technological improvements also led to its development in export production. As Türkün-Erendil (2000, p. 98) emphasized, the electrical looms in the textile sector emerged as an opportunity to increase productivity for producers in the early 1960s and onwards. Especially after the neoliberal transformations of the 1980s, Denizli entered into the export relations within global networks (Penpecioglu, 2007, p. 81). As I stated above especially the district of Babadağ is noteworthy in the history of textile production in Denizli as a local network whose members have crucial roles in the textile production in the provincial center. This was expressed by the chairman of DSO (Denizli Sanayi Odası-Denizli Chamber of Industry):

Babadağ is the basis of this work (textile). It is the source of weaving. In 1980s, when home weaving was abandoned, people left Babadağ. This was a city where people did not know about export. It has made headway in 25 years. An important amount of qualified employees emerged in textile. The best thing Denizli has learned in 25 years is to sell products to the world (İsmail Yılmaz, 50, DSO, chairman).

In 2011 (TURKSTAT), Denizli was the 8th province in Turkey in terms of export rates. It mostly has export relations with Germany (14.75 %), followed by the UK (9.44 %) and the USA (8.53 %) (DSO, 2012). Denizli's export industry is considered to be in crisis in the past few years, although its export rates are not very low. At the local level it is argued that this is related to the new policies of the ruling Justice and Development Party (AKP) which has not given any incentive credits to the firms as it was done in the past. Denizli also has to compete with other exporters that provide cheaper labor power in production such as China (Türkün-Erendil, 2000, p. 98). This competition also leads to a local polarization between large and small firms. Big firms began to produce according to international

standards as the international firms demand global standards but there are also subcontracting firms. In this sense, the producers have a local tension because the large-scale firms see the small-scale firms as a barrier for their own development and that's why they suggests that the family firms become institutionalized in cooperatives as it was done in the past (Türkün-Erendil, 2000; Penpeciöđlu, 2007). They even call the small-scale unregistered firms as "the Chinese among us" (*İçimizdeki Çinliler*) according to Penpeciöđlu (2007, p. 92).

Thus, the unique local transformations in Denizli produce globalization in the local and situate the local in a global process. The social trust and family relations in networks also show the fact that the labor relations are not independent of local networks in terms of the social and moral norms that operate within the labor control process, as I will argue in the next chapter.

B. Gendered Relations in the Household and the Workplace

By the effects of these transformations after 1980's, the labor history of women workers is shaped in Denizli. The remarkable point for the city is its high female LFP (29.50%) compared to the average rate for Turkey (23.74 %) (TURKSTAT, 2010). In Denizli approximately 49% of textile industry workers are women workers whereas in Turkey overall manufacturing female LFP is just 15% (DSO, 2012; TURKSTAT, 2012). Despite the fact that after the crisis of 2008 many women workers were dismissed, the importance of women in economic development has constantly been emphasized by the politicians and officials of Denizli. Indeed, after the crises, employers portrayed a desperate picture for being helpless to support women workers of Denizli. Recently, a policy has been presented ("Denizli Tekstilinde Kadının Adı Var Projesi") in Denizli by the DSO. This project aims to emphasize the importance of women workers in Denizli and integrate more women to the textile industry. Neotric and Asylum are among these factories which were affected by the crisis and fired many women workers.

My worker respondents are also migrants from nearby provinces (Afyon, Isparta) and districts (Babadağ, Buldan, Acıpayam, Çivril, Çal, Tavas, Honaz etc.) of Denizli. According to narratives of women workers, there are three types of migration in Denizli. The first type is the all family with children migrates to city to find jobs and the children at the age of twelve or thirteen begin to work in informal textile ateliers. They go to school, if the family can afford to send them. The second type is that they migrate after marriage because of the hard working conditions and problems with the mother in law in village and come to city to work. The third type is the young women and men come to work or study alone. There are also some stories in which men must be convinced to migrate to the city. For instance, Azize's (Neotric, 48) family supported her in her decision to migrate to the city despite her husband's resistance:

How I did convince him? We went to my brother in the city. Divorce was not the issue but if he (her husband) had refused to come with me (to the city) it could happen. He said "Let's return to the village!" My brother asked whether I was pregnant or not. I said "No." Then he said "let him go." My father also used to tell me "if he does not go I will accept you." He used to say "my daughter becomes miserable, if she does not go to Denizli" (Azize, Neotric, 48).

In stories like this, it is women who wanted to migrate to the city and men were still trying to go back to their village. In addition, mostly the women work in the textile factories which have expanded after the 1980s. Beside the effects of the labor history, household structures are also related to modern transformations. Women workers' families are often peasants and many of them have no social security. Therefore, the women also look after their families. In these cases, the men have also no regular jobs and social security, so they are covered by their women's social rights. At the same time, social security is vital for the banks from which these men can get credit. So, a woman worker Sabiha (Neotric, 28) explains that she found out about her husband's debt after she got married with him and she had to begin to

work to pay the rest of the debt. Fazıla (Asylum, 32) who was married twice talked about men in Denizli and her ex-husband in the following way:

In my opinion, they should visit all the houses in Denizli. The state should come up with something. They should collect the unemployed men from their houses and take them to a place and give them a lecture. They do not like the jobs and so do not work. My husband was, God knows, a good person. He used to love me. All the things were well but when he got a job he used to beat either his foreman (*usta*) or his boss. He even used to cook and make all the things but he fight because of small things (Fazıla, Asylum, 32).

The type of marriages has also an effect because about more than half of the marriages are arranged marriages (*görücü usulü*). However, there are also love match marriages (*severek*) and second and third marriages among these women, especially in recent years. Also, marriage might be a way of social mobility for some men in Denizli, such that they prefer their wives to be working. Sena's story exemplifies this. She said that she had hard times when she was forced by his husband to work:

He had bought a new car at that time. He did not have a steady job, he was going to establish it soon. We had dept for the car and for the wedding ceremony. Actually he found my job at this textile business himself, by applying to the factory rather than telling me that there is such a job. Then he took me there. Mr. Ahmet tried me then. They used to hire the machine workers after a trial back then. I was notified to come immediately afterwards. I went and started (Sena, Neotric, 28).

Sena had had a love match marriage with this man, but was divorced after 11 years and now lived with her two children alone. Her story is exemplary of some of the common stories in Denizli in terms of the household mechanisms. She migrated from Babadağ with her family and began to work in textile when she was 12. She thought that she would not work after marriage but because of her unemployed husband's debts she had to work. After getting a divorce she finished distance elementary school and high school and even got some training

certificates on computer programs in order to find better jobs. At the same time, she brought a lawsuit against her ex-husband because on the grounds that he did not pay child support and consequently her husband got a prison sentence.

In this sense, divorce is also no more a social taboo in Denizli that in Neotric and Asylum approximately 15% of the women are divorced, but still in the factory some women have social fears because of which they do not divorce their husbands. The 2011 TURKSTAT statistics show that 2,101 couples were divorced in Denizli and making it the 11th ranking province in divorce rates in Turkey. In that year, Denizli has only 3 divorces shorter than Aydın in which 2,104 divorces took place and since 2001 it was just the second time Denizli had fewer divorces than Aydın (TURKSTAT, 2011). In the Aegean region, Denizli has the highest divorce rates following İzmir. Therefore, for 2011 while the divorce acceleration rate in Turkey is only 1.62 % Denizli's divorce acceleration rate was 2.24 % following İzmir with 2.82 % and Muğla with 2.43 %. However, it is also the 4th ranking province in Turkey because of its high divorce acceleration rates. For 2012 the statistics also show that in the first quarter of 2012 which was measured until May, the number of divorces in Denizli was 642 and for the second quarter it was 612.

An important number of my respondents were divorced and expressed contradictory views about divorce. That is, even if they are very confident about their decision the social and moral norms are still their main fear and concern. Even in Asylum, a woman hid her divorce for three years from her colleagues and asked me not to tell anybody. Especially, there is a lot of gossip about divorce and even the divorced women participate in the gossip with a cynical approach. Nevertheless, the interesting and controversial issue in Denizli is the high divorce rate, despite the religiously “conservative” mechanisms which are supposed to be influential. In addition to Keyman and Lorasdağı, Buğra (2010) also argues in her project report on women's labor that conservative mechanisms in Denizli have effects on some

spheres. She indicates that there were some respondents in her research who pointed to the high divorce rates as the consequence of high female LFP in Denizli (Buğra, 2012, p. 11). However, I argue that the high female LFP and divorce rates show that there is no dominant religious conservatism in the social sense and my findings show that naming Denizli as a “conservative” province is meaningless from a conceptual perspective.

In my case, there were also some respondents expressed a sense of “moral panic” because of the increase in divorce rates and corruption in family relations.⁵ Other respondents were aware of this panic and even they themselves reproduced this moral panic in some cases. But my personal observations on Nur and our conversations also include that she also often has thought about divorce but could not do because of her family.

There are some women who divorce for pleasure and some who have no other choice but divorce. When a man does not mend his ways, his wife has no patience at all. She says “why should I work and feed him.” They elaborate on the idea of divorce. And a man’s not being around suits her interest; she would do and wear freely whatever she wanted to and would travel around however she wanted, why would she stay with her man? For example, there are many women who quit veiling after divorce. (Nur, Neotric, 39).

The women workers also discuss the divorce issue in their conversations. In a meeting, which took place in one of my respondents’ house Nermin (Asylum, 30) states that “in Turkey Denizli is comes first in divorce rates. Because women work they do not need men. So, they can get a divorce.” However Eda (Asylum, 35) asks; “I do not understand. Don’t the women work in Istanbul and Ankara? Why do they not divorce?” Fazıla (Ayslum, 32) who divorced once and married her second husband now gives an immediate answer; “This means women in Istanbul have things to be afraid of. For example, if you say I want to divorce you

⁵ The term moral panic was introduced by Stanley Cohen, author of *Folk Devils and Moral Panics* (1972), as a situation that occurs when “[a] condition, episode, person or group of persons emerges to become defined as a threat to societal values and interests.”

can easily rent a house and live since everything is simple here.” This also shows their conflicting subjectivities since in spite of gossip and certain social barriers to their lives they talk about divorce as an unproblematic issue but nevertheless most of them lived alone after divorce.

Moreover, especially in Denizli this panic is related to the women working and the increase in education levels of women. Nevertheless, if a woman in a village has a chance to go to school in Denizli, they marry after high school. However, even if they had no opportunity to continue school, they try to finish distance high school. Interestingly, in Neotric and Asylum the percentage of primary school graduates is approximately the same 63%. In the Neotric, 25% of the women graduated from high school, whereas 20% in Asylum. In each factory, among blue collar workers there are 3-4 university graduate. At the same time, several women try to graduate from high school and even university by open high school exams.

Moreover, “modern” life in Denizli compared to that in villages has changed the lives of women workers in terms of family relations, consumption patterns and social norms. As it is argued by some scholars migration and modernity affects the lives of women in Turkey in terms of changing roles in household according to rural and urban mechanisms (Özbay, 1981), the value of children (Kağıtçıbaşı & Ataca, 2005) and creating a new form of “modern” woman of Turkey (Abadan Unat, 1981; Tekeli, 1994). In terms of family and social relations women workers’ lives are in change, because they encounter different behaviors towards them in factories or in other forms of social spheres compared to their previous life and household observations. In this sense, especially *ustas* and *müdürs* recall gendered arguments that the women began to see a kind and interested model of man compared to their fathers and husbands. The assistant of the Moralists’ *müdür*, Can (32) said that “the women became extremely desirable of this ‘modern’ life. They have never heard such beautiful

words, compliments before, and never walked around like lovers.” They argue that this leads to the runaway of married women and men. Therefore, these prejudices also represent the general view and bad reputation about textile women workers as immoral. In terms of consumption patterns, although they do not want to break their old habit of eating on the floor table they have dish washer and can buy ready meals, fruits and vegetables they have not seen before. In addition, even if they get the minimum wage they try to buy brand clothing and shoes to their children or they buy luxury telephones for themselves.

As an important role of the “modern” woman they give utmost attention to their children’s personal development and education. In a relation to their complaints about working they are obsessed with their children’s religious education, education in school, health and needs. In *Moralist*, children are an important issue since some mothers had to leave their children behind in the village or the town with their families and could only see them once a month if they are lucky. So, yearning for children is a common issue among them. The letter of Ece to her son, who has stayed for four years with his grandparents in the village because his mother and father have to work in Denizli, shows their feelings:

The hardest separation for me was when your grandmother took you away to the village. You were 15 months old. She took a part of my soul with her. I could not forget that day. Your clothes and toys remained back. I felt guilty the whole time. I had to work, I was obliged to send you to the village. I was not cooking the foods and cakes you liked. I was looking forward the weekends. I was said that you count your fingers and knew the days we would come and watched the road. Four years have passed like this. One day when I went to work, I had a piece of good news. I found out my shift was switched to the day shift, so I could take you back. (Ece, *Moralist*, 32).

At the same time, they try to be more “educated” and “conscious” mothers. In the *Neotric*, the workers are allowed to listen to the radio or to music on mp3 players or phones. Interestingly, I noticed that a considerable number of women listen to a radio program in

which a famous pedagogue Adem Güneş, who is also known for being a religious person, talks about raising children, how to treat them. In their daily routines they always mention a part where they do homework of their children, or where they go out with their children for shopping and having fun. Moreover, if they have a chronic disease they search for professors and the best treatment. In Asylum, especially some of the women asked me for help about their children's problems such as not studying or lying and they made me talk to their children. This indicates the "modern" madness about raising a child with the help of the pedagogues, doctors and supervisors. In other words, they are created as mothers with the question how to be "good" parents.

The case of Denizli is often contextualized within national economic discourses that emphasize the significance of its textile industry and discourses that focus on the dominance of Islamist communities in the province. Keyman and Lorasdağı argue that Denizli is a city which connects its religious values strongly with their life styles and at the same time very open to the modernization process (2010, p. 181). As such, it would be expected that in a city that is considered "conservative" patriarchal relations would play a crucial role in labor relations but there is much more a complex and distinct structure in Denizli. As a challenge to this argument the structure of Denizli could not be defined as conservative, that I observed throughout my fieldwork, the majority of workers in textile factories are women, and also the majority of whom wear headscarves.

The personal religious history of a woman is very important, because there are several different Islamic orders or brotherhoods are active in Denizli. However, I saw that wearing a headscarf or conducting religious activities are a "traditional" custom for them until they step into social spheres. That is to say, the meetings in the factories, the conversations on religion, reading books on religion are very affective in creating the religious subjectivity of these women. For example, in Asylum, a lot of women stated that they were not veiled and did not

pray until they came to this factory but that they were accustomed to these practices here and read about religious issues, therefore they claimed that this was an opportunity for them. Nevertheless, they create their subjectivities partially and in a controversial way; apart from being a religious woman they also become also resisting workers in this process. I argue that their religious and moral subjectivities are in relation to the social norms of society which represent these women as morally notorious. These subjectivities are constructed in the very process of labor which includes physical and social parts in relations.

III. Physical Control on the Shop Floors

In this section I will discuss the structural organization in the factories in order to explain the discipline, rules and regulations with their effects on women's bodies and mentality. Edwards, while classifying types of labor control, talks about structural forms of control, in which the exercise of power becomes institutionalized in the very structure of the firm and is thus made impersonal (1978, p. 92). These forms of control are technical control in which control mechanism is designed into the very machines and other technical apparatus of the factory, and bureaucratic control in a Weberian sense is embedded in the social organization of the factory by being written in rules and regulations. However, I argue that these structural forms sometimes become personal in some cases in which workers, forewomen (*ustas*) or managers (*müdürs*) could manipulate the rules and regulations in the factories, so that the workers see these individuals for pointing their resistances.

In Neotric and Asylum, there is an order of work on the shop floor like an assembly line. The workers must produce a certain number of products (*sayı vermek*) within an hour in order to give them to other parts of the production process and this is determined by the forewomen (*usta*) with the help of errand girls (*ayakçı*). The products are counted before they are sent to the next step in the assembly line. In Neotric, the atelier has four main parts

(machine-*makine*, quality control-*kalite kontrol*, embroidery-*nakış*, samples-*numune*) with different *ustas*. However, in Asylum which is a much bigger atelier, the segments of production are also separated by the type of product such as duvet cover (*nevresim*), towel (*havlu*) and bathrobe (*bornoz*) again with different *ustas*, but the same manager (*müdür*). The models of products reach to the *makine* part, where the women workers sew from *numune* at sewing machines. The workers working with sewing machines (*makinacılar*) have also a division of labor through which, for example, a towel or a bathrobe is sewed in stages. For example, the first machine begins to sew the cut clothes from ragged parts, and then the next machine sews the arm part if it is a bathrobe and the next machine sews the label and goes in this way. If there is embroidery on the product design the cloths come from *nakış* part with applied embroideries. After that these are ironed by the *kalite kontrol* part and the workers begin to control the products to check to see if there is any kind of flaw in the products. In this process every worker has a definite number as a small sticker which is pasted on product, therefore, any kind of problem occurs with the product, management knows who or which part is responsible for it and the punishment would be deduction from wages. In *kalite kontrol* the products are packed by colorful and various packages. This process is organized and controlled by *ustas*, and *şefs* who are also controlled by the *müdür*.

Also the technical structure forces the workers to do everything in a certain amount of time because of the assembly line and the determined number of products which must be produced in a day. That is to say, the management especially the production manager in relation with *ustas* designates the amount of production which must be produced in a day so that every worker has to produce a certain number of products. In Neotric, for every worker the number of towels which must be produced in an hour was 60-70 and if the worker cannot reach this number, she is warned by the *usta* in a strict way. *Usta* comes immediately if the *ayakçı* notifies her that the number was not reached. This warning can be in the form of

inveighing and even yelling. In order to get the number right, workers must work without any pause, as Ayşen said they have no time even to talk. Sema (Neotric, 33) explains her situation in a similar way, “Let’s say you do 60-70 pieces in an hour, you make the belts of bathrobes alone in a line. When you lag behind it is understood. But *aba*⁶ is very good, although she also has some issues. She shows her attitude.”

Although they state that the *usta* is a good person, they are also very critical of the organization of the assembly line that is why they criticized the working of *ustas* and the rise in their wages:

Ustas got a pay raise. Why did they get it and not us? They said there is no work, that we will be sent to unpaid leave. But Nur *aba* says “Girls your numbers do not match each other.” But there is not more work. She send us enough goods (*bizi mala doyurmuyor*). *Ayakçı* said “there is no more work, what can I give you?”, so she gets into trouble. Than we slow down but then the *usta* comes and asks why the number is not enough (Sena, Neotric, 28).

However this also shows that the structural control can be adjusted by the *ustas* and, depending on the relations between the workers and *ustas*, labor control may become personal. In this sense, this personalization reminds one of Edwards’s (1978) description of simple control in which power is exercised openly, arbitrarily and personally beside the technical control in factory. At the same time, there can appear some conflicts between workers because the performances of workers depend on each other. Even if there is not a game like “making out game” that Burawoy (1979) described in his well-known study of a Chicago engine factory, the workers give consent to this process since most of them do not want to risk their wages and have trouble with the *ustas* and the *müdürs*. Therefore, tensions and even struggles may appear between workers about reaching the expected number in a day or making it out, since the balancing the number of productions is a sign of solidarity among

⁶ The workers call the forewoman as *aba* which means older sister in Denizli’s local dialect.

women. Aysu (Asylum, 34) explains how this plays out in the production section where she works in this way, “For example in the towel section there was more solidarity. We could all manage the numbers. Nobody was sad or anything like that. Everybody was comfortable. But it is not the case in the duvet cover section.”

And if there is a worker who interrupts the understanding on the numbers on a particular production line, she is not accepted by anybody else:

There was a worker who did not care about anybody and tried to produce above the expected number. She got into depression because of family issues or work. She stayed in the hospital. After a while after she came back, the *usta* sent her away regardless of whether she worked a lot or not because she had brought her cell phone into the shop floor and someone had informed on her. We did not like her so much because she produced over the required number (Aysu, Asylum, 34).

When I asked about the physical hardship of working most women said they managed to fulfill their job requirements in a restricted amount of time but it was difficult. The following response shows the physical and as well as psychological effect of the labor process.

Of course, it is difficult, how can it not be? If they said “you must finish the work,” you have to do it. They are right, the work must be finished, but it is so hard. What can you do, you try to bear with it, since you need this job, and you are obliged to do it. You can sit down and simply do it. But if someone pushes you from behind and forces you, then you become unable to do the things you can normally do (Emine, Asylum, 29).

In this sense, the garment ateliers have a repressive atmosphere in terms of its structural organization in which the labor process turns into a structural violence (Can, 2011, p. 27). The daily experiences of garment workers are the application of violence on their bodies in the physical and mental sense. Every woman’s narrative includes especially a period

of “crying” both in the first days of working in their lives when they were 12-16 years old and during periods in which they had a quarrel or conflict with other workers or *ustas* because of the stress of working. Thus, Zümürüt (Neotric, 30) states, “I was crying all the time. An unfamiliar place, unfamiliar people. The job is very hard, I was not able to use the sewing machine yet. Crying, while crying I got used to it.” Working while pregnant could turn into a nightmare but by crying they sought to bear with the situation:

I cried so much in order not to go to work when I learned that I was pregnant. Do you know how it is to work when you are pregnant? Sleeping in the morning is so sweet that you don't want to wake up. I cried so much that I wouldn't go to work. I was like a child, actually I was a 16-year-old child (Sena, Neotric, 28).

The most challenging part is when they had problems with the *ustas* and other workers beside the structural difficulty of garment work. In this sense, the structural organization become personal and the workers were affected most by this psychological violence.

It is hard to bear. Something happened again the other day. Goods are coming constantly but others do not take them. I was angry. So I went to the bathroom and cried. Goods accumulated at my station. Goods were coming constantly and they are not giving somebody to help. I could not cope with it. I would have cried more but my friend was by me and I did not want to cry more. I cry when I cannot bear with it, what can I do? I asked for help but she (*usta*) did not give me any. When I would not go one day there is nobody instead of me. They do not want to learn. Anyone who comes from outside also would not stay when she sees the atmosphere. They know that I can do that's why they did not do. They say “You will do, you will do”. I am doing my best (Ayşen, Asylum, 29).

These stories of crying and psychological stress are mostly unique to Neotric and Asylum since the textile shop floor has a very different form from yarn factories in terms of

the physical system and time planning. In this sense, in Moralist there is a different form of subjectivity formation related to the characteristics of the shop floor. Because of the fact that there are more men than women in Moralist the relations between men and women are heavily controlled within the workplace and the men and women respondents have a wary attitude on these issues. So, now I want to give an account of the structure in Moralist since the most distinct issue is this physical system in which the subjects are positioning themselves differently.

In the Moralist, the organization of labor is very different from that of the garment shop floors in terms of technological machinery. The yarn factory has a more technical organization which depends on the machinery. That is why the most important thing is controlling these machines and providing the steps for the spinning process. Spinning is the process of converting cotton fiber into a yarn. This involves various process stages like blow room, carding, comber preparatory, fly frame, ring frame and winding. Blow room (*harman*) involves a set of machinery which opens and cleans the raw cotton. The second step is carding by a machine whose main function is removing the neps from cotton. Combing is the process of removal of short fibers and neps from the laps formed by comber preparatory section. Draw frame (*fital*) is the machine which combines many comber slivers and gives a single combined sliver. Spinning process is carried out by the machine called ring frame. Ring frame (*vater*) converts the bobbin into a yarn. The bobbin taken from the previous process of fly frame is mounted on ring frame either automatically or manually. Auto winding is the process of converting the cop yarn from ring frame into a larger package. 22 women workers out of 123 workers in Moralist work in the ring frame stage of this process. There are also women who carry the barrels which come from fly frame but especially their job is controlling the machines in the ring frame in which the bobbins are mounted manually by them and controlled in order to ensure that the bobbins, approximately 120 numbers, are

converted into yarns. For example, if the yarn splits the women must fix it quickly so that the process can continue. They are also responsible for the cleaning of yarns from cotton dust. In that sense, they use a machine which must be controlled in every minute and they are responsible in any kind of problem these machines might have.

They work in shifts, 07.00-15.00, 15.00-23.00, 23.00-07.00 for 8 hours a day. The temperature in the factory is about 35 centigrade because of the heat caused this process, but they are happy with the 8 hours of work. Among women workers there are also some who used to work on garment shop floors, that is, in the sewing part of textile. They stated that it was harder than their job in the yarn factory. They also said that it is not so hard to work with men since they help and treat them in a very considerate way. However, *müdür* says that there is a lot of gossip and illegitimate relations between men and women. As a response, to my question regarding the comparison of the shop floor and the yarn factory and working with men, Kübra (Moralist, 37) stated in this way:

Garment is difficult. There is a lot of overtime and you constantly stand. However, our shift is certain. We come and then leave after 8 hours. You can work as long as you do not have bad intentions... We have been in these jobs for years. These kinds of people appear in the factory and then they are fired. They have fired several people. They are human, human soul, but thank god in our shift there are not such issues. Our machines are separate from their's (men's).

In Neotric, women are not allowed to talk and use telephone during the working hours, but they are allowed to keep them just like the workers in Moralist. In most cases the rules are ignored by the women in Neotric, because within the production process they have to talk about work and they also talk about other issues. They use also telephones with headphones by saying that they are listening to the radio. In all three factories, the workers are not allowed to speak during working hours but women find ways of ignoring these rules. *Usta* and *müdür* notice this but they do not always object to it. In that sense, the rules in the factories are

flexible and can be reorganized according to context of the factory or a mistake made within factory. Therefore, the managers and the foremen strategize in the way of providing maximum profit and organize labor process in this way. This also means that labor control mechanisms are also not fixed or certain. Nevertheless, this causes conflicting relations in the workplace since the workers argue that foremen do not treat everyone equally. For example, one worker said that the forewoman (*usta*) calls her down constantly even though she does nothing, she never shouts at Ayşe, Fatma etc., since they are her friends.

These relations are similar in Asylum but unlike the other factories this factory has more challenging rules. They cannot carry telephones and their families can get through to them only by calling the factory. In the mornings the telephones are gathered by the security guard and at the end of the work day, the forewoman controls all the workers's bags and purses at the door. What is noteworthy is that this rule applies only to women workers; male workers can bring their phones to the shop floor. In addition to other discriminatory policies, women workers also criticize this rule and do not find it fair. They are also critical about the gendered organization of factory even if they praise it in some cases.

They can bring their phones with them. For them it is permitted. But why can't we? Once they said that phones damage the computers. Then what they said is that the girls can escape by speaking on phones. When one wants to run away one can do this by speaking on a telephone booth too, but they give this as a reason. However, there were a lot who escaped but it had nothing to do with cell phones. She goes and her family calls to ask where she is. She says to her parents that she would work overtime and then run away (Ayşen, Asylum, 28).

There is the idea of expressing the rules as moral order applications for providing a moral workplace and individuals so that the management tries to get consent. The unequal treatment of the factory management causes women workers' reactions in Asylum. Even if they praise for being separate from men in tea and meal breaks they resist this situation and

ask reasons as to why men have more rights than them; “They discriminate between women and men. They use telephones but for us it is forbidden” (Zeynep, Asylum, 30). Therefore, Fazıla (Asylum, 32) asks the reason behind this and criticizes this attitude of the management, because they have very valid causes for demanding telephone use in breaks.

I asked it to Mr. Şaban. I said there is discrimination between men and women here. He said “Why?” I said we could not use cell phones. He said “one woman brought it into shop floor, this is the reason.” I said why we all suffer from the thing one woman did. For example, I leave my child with a nanny. I want to call my child. Ok, I would not bring it to the shop floor during working hours and obey all the rules. At least it could be on my bag that I can talk with telephone, call my nanny. It takes too long to go to telephone box and make a phone call.

Asylum, at the same time, is a much more organized and disciplined shop floor. For example, except for breaks, they have only seven minutes a day to go toilette, and when they use eight minutes they are asked for reasons the next day. There is a card machine they use for entering to the factory and for the tea and meal breaks which controls their time schedule in a day. In Asylum and Neotric they have 45 minutes meal break and two tea breaks which last 15 minutes. In Moralist, they have one meal break and one tea break. When they have this kind of physical control by referring to these cards such as what time they come to work, how much spend they in the meal or tea room etc., they can also punish them by making reductions from their wages (Lee, 1995). In Asylum, they also have a leave card for bathroom through a tourniquet which is strictly criticized by women workers, which also show active positions of women as workers.

The forewoman even times us when we go to toilet. I am against this, write and tell everywhere. This toilet minutes make me mad. There are pregnant women, you can have the stomach flu, and this is not their business. It is inhumane. We are women anyway. We have diseases and similar things. You can get out only in 4 minutes. It

was 10 minutes before, she made it 7 minutes. We pray, we have to be very clean, our trousers legs, everything...but she does not pray. Ok, she is right in some points. I was also responsible as a headman, she has right. One goes to toilet and spends long time to put on her scarf. Then she should follow them. There are fifty people there. What they get money for? She has to learn who is who. She should go follow them and go behind them. One made a mistake, ok, new rule, tourniquet. It is decreased to 7 minutes. Also, I drink so much water. I go toilet twice, three times. Lastly, I went for 8-9 minutes. When she comes to me to reduce it from my wage, I will say “do not come to me”. She says you exceed 7 minutes, 8 minutes. Even when I was pregnant she said this to me, even I was pregnant think of it (Fazıla, Asylum, 32).

This leave card problem is stressed also by some scholars (Lee, 1995, p. 383).

However, in my case it is also interesting that they do not see this mechanical control as impersonal rather as a decision of *usta*. As Fazıla points out, due to some disobedience to rules, new implications by forewoman emerge in relation to management. In this sense, the relations in factory also depend to some extent on the thoughts about foremen. In terms of bureaucratic control, there are certain rules in the factories. Especially the case of asking for permission must be as structured, but in most of the cases the workers have to convince the management by revealing their private lives. And this is a dual process which in most of the situations workers ask the *usta* for permission and tell their reasons, then the forewoman goes to *müdür* and tell everything to her/ him and gets the permission. Workers argue that the forewoman acts according to the level of closeness to the workers because some of the workers are friends with *ustas*.

I usually say it a week before so that I stay relaxed by convincing her in advance. I said “my daughter has a health issue.” The first one I arranged on a Saturday, she said “ok, we will set it up.” In the afternoon, I went to her and she said to me, “did I give you permission?” She either forgets or acts as if she forgets. Or she discriminates and

favors some. She does that, she discriminates. I sometimes see her giving permission right away by handing out the allowance paper and let go (Sena, Neotric, 28).

Thus, for the permission to be received an informal atmosphere is formed in which the worker has to convince the forewoman and explain everything to her. When I was in Asylum, in the office of the human relations manager, a woman came to get permission and the manager asked every personal detail about her while we were sitting there. This is how a worker interprets this situation:

You say “I am sick and need to go and see a doctor.” She looks at you and says “you are fine and can work.” What would you do and where would you go? She asks everything. When you ask for permission, you have to tell everything anyway. (Hasibe, Neotric, 40).

Thus, the decision on giving permissions becomes so uncertain that the manager or the forewoman decides according to his or her mood and personal beliefs, i.e., depending on whether she or he feels well on that particular day or what opinion she or he has about a particular worker. In this way, they also could decide on the workers’ lives according to their own values and understandings:

One day he held a meeting. He said “Do not request permission. Workplace now takes care of you, but the times comes when it will not take care of you.” I must get an exam for driving licence. He continues “Do not ask for permission. If you do, this or that could happen.” I runned after him, I said “Mr. Efe, mr. Efe I have an exam.” Immediately someone else came and said the same thing. He said “you work here when will you drive a car?” I said, “I have to get it because my husband cannot drive.” He said “we will evaluate it” (Eda, Asylum, 38).

In Asylum, women who are critical about the forewoman talked about lickspittles (*yalakalar*) of the *usta* and they pointed them out to me so in order for me to be careful when talking to them. They said that if *usta* did not like you and you were not lickspittle of her then you would struggle here. They also informed me that *usta* warned workers not to talk to me if I ask questions on the grounds that they could complain about her *usta*, *müdür* or the factory and the production process could slow down. At the same time, *usta* of Asylum are not so personally close to all workers as she is in Neotric. They use their personal stories and personal relations in the level of controlling the labor process in the factory. Interestingly, when I asked they said that it was always easy to work with men than women because men were respectful and did what they were told to. Therefore, the production manager Pınar (34) in Neotric referred to the women's private lives:

The worse thing working with women is the permission issue, when their children become sick, they take them to see a doctor, a child becomes sick, mother says "I have nobody to leave my child" so she asks for permission. Then there is also a bank issue. Ofcourse they earn the money, their husbands stay at home, so the bank cards are also on their names. So, she said "I must go to bank, I must pay receipt." Recently, the divorce and court issue is common. When there is a meeting in school, they go. For example, there are pregnancy problems, they undergo treatment for this. they have psychological problems. The problems of women never end.

Forewoman (*usta*) and headman are the mediators between the relation of workers and manager (*müdür*). Therefore, if the forewoman (*usta*) does not want to bother *müdür* then your complaints or demands could not reach the managerial part. However, *usta* explains all the personal issues of the workers to *müdür* in the case of permission or in factory problems especially in the Neotric case because the workers share their lives with the *usta* or the other workers tell the *usta* by way of gossip. Thus, every worker has a different relationship with the forewoman; therefore they can clash with the forewoman:

I say something to the forewoman and she tries to apply this. When she tells the worker, she objects and shouts at the forewoman for example. And she came to me and said what happened. So, I called in the worker and said that she could not shout at the forewoman. The forewoman does not care about her and for example she said “you cannot tell my problem so I will go.” For example I do not say anything to the workers but tell the forewoman. I do not develop a relationship with them. I ask the forewoman about the reasons for permission.

These factories are controlled by international organizations in order to check the properness of labor standards. Some of the international companies, which order export products, apply social audits in these factories through private companies like CDG and SGS. These companies control the physical security in factories as well as conduct interviews and surveys with workers and ask questions about wages and discrimination in factories. Some workers in Neotric achieve to change some rules by complaining to these organizations in interviews such as extending of meal and tea breaks or working 3 hours less in a day during pregnancy. However, they do not praise some of the revisions demanded by these companies like the cards they have to use in breaks when they enter and exit the dining hall. In Asylum this control is like a game, which depends on the relation between worker, forewoman (*usta*) and manager (*müdüir*) because, apart from the arrangements on the shop floor, all the workers are warned about what they say and how they behave before these controls. And if they did not obey, they would be fired immediately. At this point, the standards of these organizations are debatable, since they arrange the limits of social standards in favor of the factories by making some agreements with them. The workers do not fully rely on these controls anyway.

We never wrote the truth in these surveys because I said to myself “it has never been solved anyway.” A lot of surveys were done but there is no solution so I filled them up as good, good. I even filled the survey of my friend as good, good. But I saw there is no solution. They want this, so I did not write the truth (Münire, Asylum, 36).

Therefore, the fact that some workers made jokes about the warnings of manager and forewomen so that they would give unreal answers also show the ironic situation: “He warned me. Your wage is such, memorize it. I could not memorize it. My wage is so high that I cannot calculate it (laughing) (Deniz, Asylum, 33).” In this sense, the structural control of labor in factories is strict in specific cases but because the forewomen and the managers are mainly responsible for the implementation of the rules, the workers see them as personal decisions. This way, they are very active as workers since they do not see this structure as a mechanical obligation, but rather they try to resist to the management personally. However these resistances vary according to the managerial strategies in factories which influence worker’s experiences and in this way their subjectivities. Therefore, my aim is not proposing a comparison of factories, rather I want to look at what kind of mechanisms they have which can lead to different management practices and thus to different subjectivity formation processes. In this sense, the physical structure of the factory and the managerial style determine the labor control system in the workplace.

IV. Management Strategies: Control through morality and religion

“Working with people is so hard, since human meat is very heavy, otherwise why wouldn’t we want to work?”

(Deniz, Asylum, 33)

This phrase indicates that working depends on the relations between individuals and the problems emanate from these relationships. Most importantly, the subjectivities and strategies of women are produced within these relationships. Therefore, in any case women have a place to maneuver by gossip, ignorance and negotiation. However, surveillance by

management and also by co-workers on personal lives, thoughts and feelings as well as physical structures is everywhere.

On the shop floor, the daily organization of labor is centered on the social relationships between the manager (*müdür*), *usta* and the worker (*müdür-usta*, *usta-usta*, worker-*usta*, worker-worker). These relationships are dependent on social and religious activities since during the breaks they eat together, talk about their lives, and pray together in the masjid (*mescit*) and go home by the same factory buses; or out of factory they meet in each other's' homes for religious meetings, talking about religious books and how they can renew their lives according to religious rules. Based on some commonalities grouping appears in the factory conflicting with each other on some issues. The personal lives of the workers inside or outside the factory are at the center of these relations, therefore, they produce their ways about being a woman and working by references to moral and religious codes.

In this section, I want to conceptualize the moral and religious mechanisms, which show themselves in two types of control system, namely “moral guardianism” and “spiritual fulfillment,” in the factories in relation to the workers' way of shaping their subjectivities. Especially, in the textile sector the immoral representation of workplaces show itself in the practices of the management and at the same time in the statements of women workers (Can, 2010). Morality in this relation is as a disciplinary tactic in the factory as much as it is in the household. Women workers are aware of the moral criticisms directed at them, therefore, they give consent to the controls in the factories, to some extent. However, at the same time they try to find a way of self-fulfillment in order to prevent this representation. Therefore, I will first discuss moral guardianism at work in the form of controlling the lives of women workers by reference to their private lives and moral and religious inclinations. Even if this is a strategy of the management the workers themselves also act as moral guardians on the lives of their co-workers.

Secondly, because of the fact that the women workers seek a kind of moral and spiritual fulfillment in order to prevent the moral criticisms they also consent to some of the moral and religious codes of work in the factories. In that sense, the factory management also realizes this tendency and offers religious and moral fulfillment possibilities. Thus, the factory rules contains moral and religious codes which are constructed in the relation between the management and the workers.

A. Moral Guardianism at Work

Before analyzing the narratives of my informants I will briefly discuss the concept of moral guardianism based on the moral and religious performances of the management and also the workers in the way of creating in discourses and subjectivities. Moral guardianism is a moral and religious control mechanism in factories which is used both by the factory management towards the workers in order to provide the technical and moral order in factory and also by the workers towards regarding the management's practices and towards co-workers at the level of every day relationships.

Moral guardianism is about "how everyday moral discourses and practices incite, undermine and authorize women's and men's relations as well as mediate economic transformation" (Hart, 2007). In this sense, my findings in Denizli show the role of moral discourse as a technique of power in shaping social and economic behaviors and directing the action of people. Like Ilcan (1996) points out, moral and religious codes are used to determine and evaluate what is appropriate and inappropriate social behavior. Despite the fact that it does not have to depend on religious resources the moral pressure within the institution leads to the control of social behavior of other individuals. In this context, morality is also structured within the subjectivities of individuals. İshak (50), a factory owner I interviewed, argues that working is not about learning skills it is also about learning to be a kind and good

person. His following comments are reminiscent of total quality management methods used in factories:

We don't teach people how to weave here. We bring speakers; there is also education about life. Therefore, there is this thing we call total quality. One day a security guard said to me that "Mr İshak, our wives said that we have changed." I asked "Why? What is the matter?" They started to say "please can you do this?" to their wives. Of course, the women became happy. Education is very important.

I argue that in every factory there are different forms of moral and religious control depending on the factory regime and the women workers' profiles. The management's inclination relating moral and religious norms varies. The management (*müdürs, şef, ustas*) controls women workers morally through learning and monitoring every detail of their private lives, like divorce, childcare problems, economic problems, any kind of problems with their husband, and giving advice on overcoming these problems morally. The owner of Neotric, Gökçe (32) answered my question about gossip and personal issues in the factory like this: "When in company in which in which human are present there are always gossip. Because we are like a family, they pay more attention to their private lives now." He indicated that they also teach the workers what is appropriate in familial terms. Relying on their knowledge about the lives of women workers he defines the factory as family in order to prevent the so-called moral problems in the factory. He stated "They have no problems at work; their problem is completely with their husbands." In the factories, the workers call the forewomen as sisters (*abla, aba*) and the headman (*şef*) as brothers (*abi*) but the women workers are aware of the fact that they are not family. However, the operation of the gendered practices, such as familial references, sexual harassment, and gossip around the chastity of women workers operate as a disciplinary mechanism at the workplace. A forewoman in Asylum, Aysu (36) reflects her discomfort in this way as a result of her conversation with the human

resources manager: “I went to ask about the wage increase. He tried to give me a lesson. “You have children, be careful.” He asked “why did you get a divorce?” I said, what is the connection, my life is my business. It is none of your business anyway.” The management assumes that when women and men come together in a place always sexual tension arises: “When a woman comes to the factory, a man thinks ‘I hope she is a beautiful woman. It might be same for women as well. When a new person arrives, it is thought they wish her to be fairly pretty (Orhan, assistant of productive manager Moralist, 34).”

Through learning about their lives the management can control the permission period because the reasons for permission is investigated in a detailed way as I pointed out in the previous part. They also control their social relations in the factory especially between women and men. In this situation, the important point is to provide the order in the factory in favor of production. The day I went to interview with Havva (32, Neotric) several workers “warned” me that her boyfriend makes woman trade in Denizli. Havva has had several psychological problems after divorce because of the gossips in factory about her. Especially, they said that Havva was together with the husband of one of her co-workers, but she revealed everything and proved that she had no relation. In this moral crisis, factory management tried to give suggestions to her about her life, send her to leave and did not discharge. This was in sake of the factory because at that time Neotric had to send workers to unpaid leave and then need to return when they want to. Havva explained the issue in two perspectives:

Nobody talked to me. I went to Nur sister and Ahmet brother. They sent me to leave. When I returned, this time they said that I was working in a hotel. I do not hide anything, I go immediately to superior. They were surprised because of these issues. They said “do not wear such things, it is also a bit your fault.” I changed after that. Everybody began to talk to me slowly and I told them everything. I recorded a video of my home and showed them so that they could see my situation. They think your dressing is very good but it is not the case.

She also explains the same event in a different way in which we also see the sexual harassment issue in the factory:

Anyway they gossiped about me. Then I got over it. I did not go for 4 months. When I returned gossip started again. I went to the manager and said that I wanted to quit. She asked “Why?” I said that I did not want to work with these people. I told everything to her from a to z. Men, women, they are all bad people. Since I am divorced, men said “you are very beautiful today etc.” I used to wear short skirts, this was the problem. I said they are saying that I go and work in a hotel. I explained everything. I said that I wanted to quit but they did not give permission.

This kind of issue in Asylum could be a reason for the discharge of the workers but in Asylum the structural control separates the women and men from the beginning. Therefore, they try to arrange marriages by themselves like a moral coordinator. When I was first in the room of human resources manager he made a phone call which someone asked about a single woman worker in order to arrange a marriage and the manager said “I could not give our daughter to anybody,” so he asked who the boy was, whether he was a religious person etc. Thus, even they call the forewoman and ask to for arranging marriages. Someone has called the forewoman Meral for Ayşen (Asylum, 28) (43) and she began to force Ayşen:

Someone called the sister Meral. He used to work here. The mother of the boy called the sister Meral. He had worked here before, he was a tea seller. She talked in her room, came to me and invited me to her room and even shut the door. Normally in working times they do not talk to the workers as much as I know, but she invited me to her room. She asked “Were you engaged?” then I asked “Why did you ask?” She said “The mother of boy called and said that you were engaged.” I lied to her that I was engaged with another man. Otherwise they would not understand.

Thus, as Yücesan Özdemir (2003) argues that in new labor control there appears “an intensification of discipline and surveillance, controlling not only technical aspects of work but also social relations in the workplace.” This is also much related with the myth about textile workplaces in Turkey being full of flirtatious relationships even in illegitimate ways (Can, 2009, p. 98), therefore they try to control these relations. It is indicated clearly within the statements of the manager of Moralist:

After three days you can hear everything here, we have spies here. We cannot allow such things in the factory. There were two couples. The married man had an affair with the wife of another man. They said this to me, but first I did not believe it. I can't, you know. The husband of this woman also works here and the two brothers-in-laws work here as well. It would be a disaster, it is impossible. I called the woman and it was so difficult to say. So I followed her. She said that there was no such a thing. But it was as it is said. Then we fired all of them because the other woman tried to create a tension (Nilgün, product manager of Moralist, 35).

Any kind of gossip and inappropriate relation in the factory are threats to the reputation. İshak (50) said that:

There is a saying “every horse neighs according to his owner.” When the head of the shop floor, Mr. Sinan, leers at, accosts or seduces the girls, unrest appears among people. Suppose that there are such people. When the manager glowers at, turns away from such things and be cautious about this issue, the place becomes perfect.

In this sense, there appear a lot of cases in which management and also the other workers are criticized by the women workers for their moral perspectives. As Işık (2008, p. 518) argues that there is a relation between ethical religious practice and labor politics. Even if her study is on the informal labor of carpet weaving in a village she shows that “patience (*sabır*)” is produced in a form of disciplined piety which works for both the fulfillment of the worker's spiritual inclination and provides a way of docility in terms of capitalist relationship.

This shows that the workers themselves give consent to some extent to the management but by performing piety they also create their own subjectivities through new moral interpretations and inclinations which are used towards management and other co-workers. Therefore, two forms of moral guardianism are also created by the workers.

First, they criticize the factory management for being unfair⁷ or using Islam⁸ for their profits because they are aware of the connection between moral religious rules and labor control. Especially, in Asylum, where the religious practices are stricter a religious young woman Ayşen (28) stated “I say that they are conscious of the religion. You know I say that they know about it. They are people who pray (*namaz*) and ablute (*abdest*). I ask why they do these things. By asking the question, ‘why?’, all the it grew in me.” She is talking about the unfair and strict rules of the factory especially through forewomen (*ustas*) because she is psychologically affected because of these practices in the factory. Therefore, she performs moral guardianism with her subjectivity as a resisting worker.

Secondly, workers use moral guardianism towards the other co-workers in the factory. Especially, in Neotric divorce is a common issue to speak about and the workers reproduce some of the patriarchal norms by their moral and religious subjectivities even though they themselves as “breadwinners” of their houses, therefore, relatively apart from these rules. To give specific example, in Neotric Sena (28) who is divorced and lives with her two children alone stated that the other workers in the factory do invite her to their houses but for the other divorced women this is not the case because it is very important how they live. Thus, even if she is also divorced she acts as like a moral guardian and morally criticizes the other divorced women:

They came to my place. When they have something to take care of, they just stop by me. They invited me to their houses, for lunch and for overnight visit. But they even

⁷ *Kul hakkı yiyorlar.*

⁸ *Dini kullanıyorlar.*

do not talk to other divorced women except me. They choose people but it is also about the person. It is about paying attention to your private life.

She is also aware that the other workers have gossiped about her since she stopped wearing headscarves after she divorced. She said with her cynical part:

I did not inform my workplace for a long time about my divorce. No one knew about it. Ask why? I was not ready. For a long time, I played a role even to my close friends. I literally acted a role. Otherwise, what you wore and where you went would be a problem (Sena, Neotric, 28).

I conceptualize these practices as moral guardianism, because first of all there are not fixed patriarchal relations or moral norms. They are constantly produced by the subjectivities of the workers and the factory regime. In that sense, they give consent to some patriarchal rules but they are also aware that some of them are strategically used for control.

B. Religious and Moral Codes on the Shop floor: Work as a Spiritual Fulfillment

Another practice is managing the factory by religious rules and awards related to Islam. This strategy could not be separated from the moral guardianism in the sense that both of them try to legitimize a certain way of being moral as a worker and as a woman. Moreover, control including religious codes does not necessarily require a management or owner with pious inclination. In the case of Neotric, even if the management praises itself by being “modern” and has no Islamic inclination, the forewoman Nur (34) with her pious character, tries to control the labor process in her assembly line. For example, she allows the workers who want to go to the masjid to pray during work even if there is not a formal rule on this. In turn the *usta* secures that these workers have a more productive labor performance by fulfilling their religious wishes. However, towards the other workers, there emerges a kind of moral enforcement to become more religious. Pınar (production manager of Neotric, 34)

explains Nur's attempt with an example where Mine (45, Neotric) was praising God by a dhikr tool:

She put a thing, a dhikr tool (*zikirmatik*), I watched her from the other side. She did her job but while working she was pushing the tool twice, so I understood what she was doing. I asked Nur "What is she doing?" She said "she is following her numbers Ms Pınar." I pretended like nothing happened and did not as Nur "why are you lying?" Of course, later on I pointed it out to her with a joke that I knew what she was doing .

Referring to TQM the new aim of the management is also the satisfaction of the workers in workplaces in all aspects. In this sense, things women workers value become more important and especially the management refers to some kind of spiritual wellbeing. Ishak (50), a factory owner, but not of one of the factories where I conducted fieldwork, says:

The satisfaction of the workers is as important as the satisfaction of the clients. Personally I and my team try to provide this. I meet with all my workers at least twice. I made speeches for them. I have all those speeches. They are very beautiful things, in which the emotions are intensified. We occasionally go for picnics. It is very beautiful. If your workers are fine, your business also goes well. All claim their jobs because it becomes more productive.

And when I asked "how is working with women and men different in terms of productivity or any kind of problem?" he answered:

In my company, there is nearly no problem. Problems in the factories depend on the relationship between the employer and the employee and the rules and principles of the factory. If you paid the salaries on time, talked about these issues at the beginning and kept your promises as much as you could etc. there would be no problem. For example, in my management, let me tell you this, it is the third year now, on Fridays no one works for 1.5 hours. The entire plant stops. For ladies, a *hoca hanım* (a female religious teacher) comes and gives a talk on religious issues (*sohbet yapmak*). We have places upstairs for such talks. The men go to *namaz* if they want to. And

everyone is free on this issue. Nobody asks why you go or why you don't go. There is no such a thing. If something like this happened I immediately would finish it. Everyone is flexible about this topic

This practice is in a formal organization so even if it stems from charity it has a kind of control strategy. In a similar vein, he explains the reason why the workers do not create any tension due to these practices in the factory. This means that knowing the workers' demand even in a spiritual manner can provide a labor control mechanism and create a sphere of moral and spiritual wellbeing. So he adds "here people are relaxing spiritually. I am a believer too, I like this. I think prayers here have a big contribution to me as well." Thus he attributes a kind of spirituality by reference to benevolence even to the factory and the workers within:

You think well, you do not have any bad intentions; that's why our factory is good. There is a cloud floating over our factory and there are angels floating on the clouds. Even a malicious person becomes relaxed. I say this is because of your benevolence. If there was malice then evils would walk around here. Think of this. This is peace and happiness. We cannot do this by going into one person, we just provide opportunities. It is their business whether to use these opportunities or not.

In this sense, there are a lot of regular practices in the factory which are described as charity (*hayır*) like giving *zekat*, giving provisions in Ramadan and religious holiday (*bayram*) and sending to umrah⁹. The workers also praise these practices especially in Asylum in which the regular religious meetings and charity have an important place. Aysu (36, Asylum) expresses her positive feelings about these issues:

So it is very good. Once a month or once every 15 days, there is a private school of uncle haji (owner of the factory). He had a five-floor house. They give lessons to all. They teach how to read Quran. They make people read religious books. It is different

⁹ Which is an important religious activity served by a lot of Muslims recently by going to Mecca and performing some rituals like moving around Kabe seven times and walking between two heels by praying.

for housewives and working women. That day the factory buses take us there. If there is someone who does not want to come, she does not come.

Justice in capitalist relations is emphasized by the rule of not being unfair and against the rights of human beings (*hak yememe, kul hakkına girmeme*). Thus, charity (*hayır*) is called to the attention to maintain a pious community (Benthall 1999, Loeffler 1988). In this sense, even if the women workers praise the religious inclination they also criticize its content in general. Fadime (Asylum, 26) states the importance of being cursed, being unfair, even though she points the positive things in it:

If Asylum is losing, it is losing mostly because of being cursed. You can write this with capital letters. It loses because of being cursed. Wrong management we can call it. There are really positive aspects to it. They have religious meetings, pay our wages on time, and give big rewards in Ramadan. These aspects are good but they did several things to the workers.

As İshak also points out, the workers become spiritually satisfied to a certain point and give consent to these control mechanisms. This way, Islam constitutes everyday life, connecting experience, existence, and practice. It creates a sense of order in this world by being a moral and religious person and a way to imagine the next (Delaney, 1991 cited in Hart 2007, p. 298). Therefore, as Tuğal (2002, p. 99) argues, this could be conceptualized as “moral capitalism” by referring to the importance of justice in Islam.

V. Conclusion

In this chapter, I showed how household structures and gender relations in the household are related to workplace relations and labor control. Especially the physical structure, social inclination and organization in factories lead the characteristic distinctive

mechanisms in factories and thus the creation of subjectivities. Even though the physical aspect of the labor process is structured in a challenging way for the women workers by the basic steps of textile work, labor control could not be realized without the agency of the management. I also sought to show that managerial control intrudes into the households of women, and information about their family life is used as an important data for labor control in the factory. These reciprocal relations are complex and conflicting in terms of creating moral and religious discourses in the factory.

According to the narratives of my respondents the gendered representation of textile work is vital in the workplace in terms of gossip. Labor control turns into a form of moral guardianism on the lives of workers and adjusts the workplace relations with moral and religious codes. This moral and religious tendency also comes from the demands of women workers in the factory who are seeking a spiritual fulfillment in order to prevent the immoral representation of the workplace environment. After discussing technical labor control in the factory I also pointed to the labor control strategies in the factories through morality and religion. These strategies not only clarified the ways of management tactics but also the reproduction of certain social norms by women workers. Nevertheless, this moral guardianism showed itself also as a criticism of the factory management. In this sense, women workers experience their labor at the intersection of household and workplace and thus they create different and contradicting subjectivities upon this reciprocal relation with management.

CHAPTER 3: WOMEN'S SUBJECTIVITIES AT THE INTERSECTION OF THE HOUSEHOLD AND THE WORKPLACE

I. Introduction

In this chapter, I will focus on the subjectivities of women workers that are produced at the intersection of the household and the workplace. In Chapter 2, I discussed the household structures and workplace experiences in which the management penetrates into the workers' private lives and seeks to provide productive workers by using morality and religion. In this chapter, I want to focus on the narratives of the women in order to get an understanding of their subjectivities. In a reciprocal relation between the management and the workers, women workers' subjectivities are formed, but this is a process ridden with contradictions. As Deetz (1998, p. 11) argues "Individuals lose themselves in the regimes of power but paradoxically they are created as subjects by these same regime."

I claim that the paradox in the workplace is related with the experiences of women workers in the factories through which they create their own subjectivities and transform the factory. That is to say, they speak and act through specific discourses like patriarchy, but they also find a place for the construction of their religious and moral subjectivities and transform the factory in this way even if they again speak through discourses of morality and religion. Even though they give consent to the management's strategies, they also resist management control through religious and moral arguments. Thus, they act in contradiction to these patriarchal norms which are reproduced in the factories by themselves. This contradictory position of the subjects cannot be explained by power relations or the interpellation of subjects only. By remaining limited within the discursive structure of experiences in which subjectivities are constituted, the effect of common social and moral norms cannot be explained. The possibility of resistance and active productivity of subjects in these discourses must be considered. Therefore as Ortner (2005) points out subjects must be considered at two

levels, namely the individual and collective levels. This means that subjects have modes in which feelings, desires and perspectives are very dominant but at the same time in a collective manner these feelings, desires and perspectives are produced in a public culture.

To analyze the diverse ways in which women's gender is constructed in the industrial workplace, I want to introduce the various and contradicting subjectivities of workers as breadwinners, responsible mothers, working bodies, moral and religious individuals and resisting workers in this chapter. Moreover, these subjects are never fixed which prevents notions such as patriarchy, exploitation and morality from being defined precisely, since according to their distinctive experiences and subjectivities these notions get different forms and women attribute different meanings to them.

II. Women's Subjectivities in Production

A. Reconstructing "Patriarchal" Relations: Women as Breadwinners

"In the past women used to support their men while men were working but now our men support us while we work." (Nur, Neoteric, 38)

This observation by a worker lends support to the claims of scholars who question the myth of the male breadwinner (Safa, 1995; Dickinson and Schaeffer, 2001). In Denizli many households are composed of divorced women, and even where there is a married couple, the main breadwinner may be the wife. When I went to Sena's (Neoteric, 28) place it was eye-opening to see her family's life. The flat was relatively in good condition with central heating, 3 rooms and a squat toilet. In the kitchen, she has all the domestic appliances and even a dishwasher. The furniture in the house seemed to date back to her marriage because the living room furniture was a set. She had two children with the ages of seven and ten, who stayed

home by themselves when she was at work. They have a computer for the children's homework and educational needs and have a shared room which is also used as living room. We returned to her house after work and cooked meat balls (*köfte*), potatoes and soup (*sarımsaklı tarhana çorbası*) together. It was a special day for children because meat balls were cooked which is uncommon unless they have a guest. She had got a divorce two years ago due to her husband's unemployment and unfaithfulness and was still struggling to get child support from her ex-husband. As I explained in the previous chapter she even sued this man and he was imprisoned. Beside these economic problems she also struggled with the gossip in the factory about her divorce and her decision not to wear the headscarf anymore. She did additional jobs to provide for her children and sustain her life such as selling towels to small shops in Istanbul.

Like Sena, the main household complaint of the women is about their husbands because they never find them capable enough in working, paying debts and fulfilling their responsibilities towards the family. More than half of the women I spoke in Denizli stated that their husbands have no regular jobs and social security. Even if there are not enough job opportunities for men in Denizli, women do not see this argument as valid. Like many others in Denizli, Mine (Neotric, 48) says that "In Denizli men are in coffeehouses and women are in factories." A *şef* in Neotric, Ahmet (48), who has come from Istanbul, also expressed his thoughts about women and men in Denizli:

Women are loyal to their jobs. They like money. They like working, they like doing something on their own. I saw it here for the first time. If there is a phone bill, the woman pays it. If there is an electricity bill, the woman goes to pay. I ask them "Don't you have husbands?" Most of the time there are children problems. Even for a tiny problem the mother wants to get permission from work. Making a living is difficult. Either there are no jobs or the men do not work, I don't understand which is the case.

This shows that even if women workers are seen difficult to work with, they are also permanent in their jobs because unlike men, they do not quit when they encounter difficulties; rather they endure as long as they can. Eda's (Asylum, 39) husband Mahmut (Moralist, 41) was unemployed for three years. He used to work in the yarn factory but he quit immediately. He explained his experience in garment work in packaging part as an unbearable situation:

The foreman said: "you will do as I show you." I made the towels. I packed and put them aside. When it came to the bathrobes he showed me five times but I did not get it somehow. I don't like packing bathrobes. I was irritated by it. I said I could not do it, threw it in his face and came back home. I used to clean the wheels on yarn machines. I cannot figure out bathrobes.

In such cases again women try to overcome difficulties. They remain in their position in the factory by crying or resisting through authentic ways. This does not mean that they are "naturally" akin to these jobs rather through their experiences they find a way to be skillful in these jobs. From a gendered perspective, garment work in ateliers is not seen as a suitable job for men in Denizli, therefore they refuse in a way to work in such positions as Mahmut did.

The main reason women give for divorcing their husbands is unemployment and irresponsibility. Therefore, in many cases, women pay their husbands' debts and are confronted by the unsuccessful work attempts and psychological problems. Husbands do not even want to work as workers but rather prefer to do their own job as a grocer or bus driver on their own cars. According to women mostly they are not patient enough. Gamze (Neotric, 36) talks about her husband's high rate of turnover and her job stability in the following way: "We have been married for 20 years and my husband has his 30th job. It is my third job. He cannot endure. I am patient. Being patient is my biggest treasure." Similarly, Zümürüt (Neotric, 26) said that "He starts a business then he goes under, he starts anew, goes under again. He is not patient." Sema (Neotric, 33) said she divorced her husband because of his suicide attempts

due to unemployment: “He always chooses comfortable jobs. Let’s say he quit the job and came home. I did not ask why he did not work. He would make a bluff immediately. He would get a rope to hang himself. I was so sad. His stomach would be washed, he would say “let me go” and so on.”

In some cases women and men reversed the assumed gender roles such that women earned money and the men looked after the children and did cleaning and cooking when they were at home. “He goes shopping, he cooks, he cleans, he does everything. He just does not work, has no social security. Sometimes money comes from the field (agriculture). I do not say a word. If I say something, I will have to deal with him,” said Gül (Neotric, 45) when I asked her whether her husband helped her at home.

Nevertheless, some women cannot make sense of their husbands’ behaviors and embraced ideas about being a responsible member of the family so they construct their subjectivities in relation to both their home and workplace. Therefore, their workplace experiences lead them to embrace some positive aspect of working and they position themselves as the breadwinner even if they would not prefer this. Fadime (Asylum, 27) said that “The rent gets paid whether my husband works or not. A woman cannot quit her job. She thinks about her future.” Thus, women subjects as responsible, hardworking, patient and frugal person who can control the household economy better than men are constructed. Sabiha (Neotric, 28) says:

If only men also tried hard and were thoughtful like us... If only they spent money carefully and regularly, everything would be better. The men of Denizli are very lazy. Ok, we earn on our own and spend on our own and we are free. But we also know how to spend because it is very hard to earn, we know how to spend. Men are not like this.

Therefore, the women construct their subjectivities in relation to the unemployment and perceived lacks of their husbands. As such, these women think that they would not have to work if their husbands were “ideal.” Nevertheless, they also emphasize the importance of their children in thinking about the future. Nur (Neotric, 38) said that “women think about the future since I cannot think only about today. What will my child do? For example, will he study? I hope he would own a house, I don’t want him to give lot of money as a rent. I hope he would have a job, too.” So, they also become more responsible mothers who think about the future of their children in terms of education, employment and subsistence.

B. Pedagogical Control: Women as Responsible Mothers

As Kağıtçıbaşı and Ataca (2005) also argue there has been an increase in the attributed value of children in recent decades. With a similar observation, I saw that women workers in Denizli pay attention very much to their children in terms of their educational and religious development, job opportunities, psychological wellbeing and future plans. As I discussed in the previous section, women think highly of their working because they can be independent, free and disciplined. Most importantly, they say that they can avoid family problems. They want to live properly and provide a proper life for their children through buying a house and accumulating money. However, when I asked them whether they would work if they did not have to, nearly all of them said that “of course, no.” When I asked them what the most difficult part of working was, their main complaint was not being able to give enough attention to their children, before they mentioned difficult working conditions. As Zümürüt (Neotric, 26) said, if she did not have to work, she would rather stay home and look after her children: “Why would I work? I want to be at home with my child, take care of her.” However, they also have to work to be able to provide a proper future for them so that “their children would not experience what they experience now.”

Nur (38) who is a forewoman in Neotric was the one who mostly talked about her son in terms of education, religious knowledge, and economic possibilities for future. Even when I asked a question about her feelings, she would mention her son. Especially for the divorced women but for the married women as well, children were at the center with all their problems. In their own words, the women try to be more “educated” and “conscious” mothers. In Neotric, the workers are allowed to listen to the radio or music on mp3 players or phones. Interestingly, I noticed that many women listen to a radio program in which a well-known pedagogue, Adem Güneş, who is also known as a religious person, talks about raising children and how to treat them. Women workers, when they described their daily routines, always mentioned helping with their children’s homework, or going shopping with the children and having fun. Moreover, if the children have a serious illness, they search for professors and the best treatment. In Asylum, some of the women asked me for help about their children’s problems such as not studying or lying. And they made me talk to their children. This might be an indication about the contemporary obsession with about the right way of raising a child with the help of pedagogues, doctors and supervisors. In other words, they are taught how to be “good” parents. For family problems they go to school and discuss the issues with the teachers of their children. They even criticize the teachers for being careless towards the children in schools. Nur (Neotric, 38) defined the teacher of her son Hamdi (16) as careless, since she tried to be concerned with all the problems of her son, but she thought that the teachers ignored and marginalized him.

Constant exclusion, constant exclusion... I have to take care of this. She said several times to my face “I go to class, teach the course. Whether he understands or not is not my business.” I said “Let us support this child!” Nothing happened, always exclusion. She has a model in her mind and looks to my son that way. However, Hamdi is now improving but the teacher could not notice this.

Hamdi develops problems at school due to home-related economic problems and the lack of paternal care. Hamdi's father also had no regular job and this was creating tension at home. Nur tried to get psychological support for him and a way to make him better. These attempts and thoughts for the future of children are also related with spiritual wellbeing which is tried to be adjusted by women workers in the factories. Thus she thinks about all the deficiencies of her son:

He yearns for his father; he is searching for a father model. She (a religious teacher) recommends speaking to the child constantly, always acting towards him with care. There is a place where they give religious education to children. They can also relax spiritually. At the same time, he can learn his religion better. I will go there for Hamdi.

C. Psychological Disasters: Women as Working Bodies

The body of woman is always a place for the operation of power. Workplaces that depend on heavy physical labor are good locations to examine the power on the bodies of workers. Foucault (1979) says that the body is subjected to operations of power with the aim of transforming it and that power shapes it in a certain form. In the factories where I conducted fieldwork, the bodies of workers were under pressure due to long working hours and certain modes of work. However, this does not mean that they are docile; rather even if they continue to work they struggle with the psychological challenges. In that sense, beside the physical pains that stem from hard work, their main problem is psychological, since the tension in the shop floor between workers, forewomen and managers compel them mentally. Apart from the workplace stress they are also under the pressure of household economic problems. Therefore, to my question "what kind of health complaints do women workers usually have?" the male doctor of Neotric and also Moralist replied:

Women have more complaints. Women work here and then they work at home too. These diseases depend on psychological conditions. Mostly when there are more production orders or dismissal of workers, the number of health complaints rises. They want to be cared for by someone, only then can they relax.

This gendered explanation by the doctor (Davut, 48) shows the general problems of the women. Almost all the women workers mentioned using antidepressant pills because they argue that if there is any tension between workers and the management the work can be very stressful. If the production is slow, the reactions of the forewoman could be very harsh, but women indicate that these reactions differ depending on the closeness of the forewoman to the worker. This psychological pressure turns into such an emotional violence exerted on the workers that they can immediately cry. However, in *Asylum* this can be seen in the form of nervous breakdown. Because of the fact that the women have begun working in textile workshops at early ages they say that getting used to this environment is not so easy. The stress of finishing an amount of work in a given time, constant yelling and wiggling by the forewomen make the women workers cry all the time especially at the beginning when they learn the job. Hasibe (Neotric, 40) states that “I used to cry all the time, I have cried so much. I did not know anything. I used to work in the night shift back then.”

According to my observations *Asylum* has a depressive atmosphere which might be because of the strict rules concerning relations between workers. Therefore I hesitated to talk or ask questions. In Fazıla’s (*Asylum*, 34) words this factory is “shadowy” (*karartılı*). Even though *Asylum* is a more disciplined and stressful environment compared to others, there are also tensions and such psychological violence which is reflected in workers’ bodies eventually. But at the time of operation of this violence they become subjects. Nermin (Neotric, 27) explains an issue with forewoman Nur (Neotric, 38):

Nur is brutal. I said “My stomach is not good, let me see the doctor.” She gave me bread to relieve my stomach pain. She said “Go to the masjid and sleep!” I went downstairs and was in pain. Anyway, I stayed there, but I could not work. There is the manager, but if I go to her, Nur would ask why I disobey her.

However, in any case the workers in the Asylum are faced with psychological violence therefore, their common problem becomes their psychological wellbeing and the subjectivities are structured in this way. Ayşen told me in tears about the psychological attacks she had at the factory during working hours because of the pressures of the forewoman Meral (43). She also talked about the psychological state of the other workers in the factory.

Two other people see the psychiatrist along with me. One of them was seeing him/ her before me actually. She said to her face “you are unfair.” She said she cannot sleep, “if I do not take the night pill, it would be the same for me,” she said. Therefore, the effect of the *usta* are great. When you ask something or want something, she denies you right away and gives negative answer. We would be relaxed if she listened at first. She does not. When you speak, she looks at you with prejudice, looking down on you. She turns her head away and does not deal with you. Or she looks at you negatively (Ayşen, Asylum, 28).

The behaviors in the case of Ayşen’s attack show again the fact that religious beliefs of workers can be manipulated in the sake of production. That is to say, even if the main rule is working and living in workplace according to religious rules, these very religious rules can be flexible at the case of factory’s sake. So, in Ayşen’s first attack the forewoman managed the issue by recommending prayer, so that Ayşen (Asylum, 28) could continue to work.

I experienced another depression before that. On that, she immediately took me to the doctor’s room and said “Pray.” There was a nurse who said “Sister, shall I inject a tranquilizer?” She said “No need for this. If she prays, she will be fine.” It was that. In the second one my body could not handle it. That time it was like machine coming on me.

The second time, she fainted in the factory and was treated very inappropriately in such a vulnerable situation for the worker. The conditions were also incompatible with the rules they apply in factory:

Sister Meral cried because men were walking all around. Is there anything to cry about? I lost my consciousness, on whom can it be blamed? If it was a shame why did they send me to hospital by the bus of men? They did not care at all; they left me just there at the hospital like a kitten. When you work you were good but when you are ill why they didn't care?

Her family was also shocked by her situation. Ayşen related her mother's comments to me: "She said 'I thought you lost your mind', since when they first see me with close eyes I said 'don't come.' She said 'you just refused us.' My consciousness was not open, I don't remember." When she turned to factory after three days the behaviors towards her were not so different:

I went on the 3rd day because I felt well. In the car, my head bloated and I felt dizzy. Without clocking in I went and sit. They said "Go inside you could sit comfortably." Meral came and said "Why are you sick, didn't you go and see a doctor, didn't you say he/she should draw up a report?" When she talked this way, I was done there. I was saying like a machine "What will I do, what will I do, what will I do, where will I go, what will I do, what will I do?" When I asked for permission she said "What's in it to me, if you are sick go and see the doctor, it is none of my business." With these words I am done. Then I could not open my eyes. They constantly gave me water. Until Mr. Şaban arrived they kept me waiting. He said "Ok, send her to the hospital!"

Şaban (Asylum, 54), who is the human resources manager of Asylum tries to control the situation and at the same time he tries to keep Ayşen working, since after these issues she hardly wants to quit the work but in a way they don't let her go. Therefore, after several days Mr Şaban invited Ayşen to his office:

He invited me to his office after several days. We were talking but I was crying and could not speak. He said "I wanted to speak to make you relax but you were not relaxed." I said "Actually, I do not want to speak." I was crying all the time, I was crying. He was speaking and I was crying. I said that I wanted to quit but he constantly

said something. He asked “what can we do as a solution?” He asked “how can we help you?” So, after all the things, they want to do something. While I was crying I said that I wanted to quit. He asked “what shall we do?” “Why are you crying, what is the reason for crying?”

In this case of psychological violence which depends on the hard physical working conditions workers fall into depression but in this situation they become also reacting subjects criticized the management. As I will show in the next section, they also become resisting workers. In this sense, the physical and psychological processes they go through in the workplace depend on the approach of the management and their subjectivities emerge through the resistances they display towards the management and through the meanings attributed to these processes.

D. Performing Piety: Women as Religious and Moral Individuals

The women workers are under pressure in these workplaces and also have problems at home; therefore, they are searching for a spiritual relaxation and confirmation of working. The management resorts to this moral control to meet their spiritual and moral expectations, but the workers themselves give consent as well. From this point on they began to create their own religious outlook and subjectivities and use them in order to resist and morally judge the management and even the other workers within this relation. In the previous section, I conceptualized this relation as a dual moral guardianism, because both the management and workers act as moral guardians in the workplace. In this process, these relations create pious and moral women subjects. As I conceptualized “moral guardianism” which is a daily control mechanism within workplace relations in the way of structuring the appropriate and proper way of living a moral and religious life, the concepts of morality and being pious are constructed also within this process according to the subjects of the workers.

I want to focus on Mine's (Neotric, 45) narrative to analyze the religious and moral construction of subjects. When I was speaking to her, she said that she was only 10 years old, since she felt like she was reborn after getting a divorce. She had very hard times with no furniture or electricity when she lived with her two kids. She said that she only turned to God and committed her children just to God. After this commitment, she explained to me that she began to read religious books and developed herself about religious topics. One of her sons graduated from the university and found a good job whereas her younger son started going to university the year before my fieldwork. Most importantly for her she achieved to buy a house by herself because she believes that these possibilities came from God thanks to her current religious inclination. Accordingly she said that "*Allah* Almighty blessed me. My Lord, I hope, blesses me on the other side too. Look, my God granted this house to me. I mean, I got divorced, I got my house...He rewarded my patience." She had a house now with an old kitchen in city center where the houses are like squatters and she still has to carry coal into the house every day to heat only one room and open its door with the hope that the other parts of the house will get warm as well. Nevertheless, she owns a house and this is God blessing for her no matter how bad conditions the house is in. Thus, she found a moral way to overcome the troubles in her life by religious means by which she constructe her subjectivity as a moral and religious woman.

In the workplace women workers have the opportunity to focus on religious issues as a collective group. In addition to praying together and sharing religious knowledge, they also conduct religious meetings to speak on specific issues each time. Many women in these factories wear headscarves and are divorced. In this sense, one can likely hear about praying activities and gossip events in the factory. Morality and religious rules are intrinsic to the labor control rules within the shop floor because the manager and the foremen play a role of

keeping the moral and religious atmosphere in the factory. Therefore, for the women also being suitable to moral and religious rules defined within the factory has quite importance.

Religious rules are vital for the women and for the management for controlling workers in the factories. Especially in *Moralist* we see that the manager, her assistant and foremen work as moral guardians on the grounds that there were issues such as illegitimate relationships, taking photographs of women workers in the dressing room and sending it to male workers, etc. They even criticized the other departments of the factory like yarn dying or the shop floor for not being so careful about these issues. When I asked whether they had any kind of gossip or moral problems in the factory, Kübra (*Moralist*, 45) responded at: “I work 8 hours there. I mean, when you do not get too familiar with men, when you know your limits, there will be no any gossip. When they see that you put a distance, they cannot say anything but if you treat them a bit softly, then they take you up on that.” She indicated that the moral control is a responsibility of the women so they must be able to manage to put a distance with men. Miray (*Moralist*, 28) also had a similar approach: “As long as you put a distance, no problem arises; no one says anything to you. You know, for example, if you treat a man softly, he also...you know. Since they have it in their minds, so it doesn't matter how careful you are.” *Moralist* has a distinctive structure that there not necessarily religion but mainly the moral control between men and women is emphasized because in factory the men and women are working together unlike the garment ateliers.

In *Neotric* the life stories of the women also modify the gossip mechanisms in the factory but they mostly refer to the household lives of women workers. *Usta* and *müdiir* are never unaware of these stories. If there is a divorce, there is an ongoing gossip about what the woman wears, where she goes to and with whom she goes. Even if women are much more encouraged to divorce by their families and they are independent to do this, some women stated that “I thought several times to divorce but I was afraid being seen as a bad woman

without a man.” In this sense, they also see their men as security guards against the others’ reactions in the form of gossip, but controversially gossip is rarely seen as an unethical behavior, especially when they are doing it. As in Havva’s narrative, even if she was depressed by the gossip of her co-workers, she also spoke about other women: “I know she has done even when she was married. I do not want to speak. She was speaking and accepting gifts from her recent husband when she was married with her ex-husband.” However, she also finds a way to live more “moral” and apart from all these issues, therefore, she has hopes for her new relationship with Hüseyin:

I have been with Hüseyin for eight months. He restricts my life. I do not go out. I get out of the factory bus and he picks me up... After him I did not use telephone. I want a different person. I did, managed everything until now but I want to someone to make everything for me (Havva, Neotric, 32).”

With her search for peace in her life she also confront with her neglects. Even if she is an independent woman she gives advices to others about the disadvantages of divorce. She wants to warn her friend who has also an inclination for divorce:

Her mind also leans towards ours. Divorce anyway, why would you deal with him, look at Hatice, look how she can stay here. I said “why would you divorce and ruin your life, do you think it is better that way, don’t look up on anybody.” I said “look I can’t even see my child. They will fill your child’s mind against you. You will have to see your child outside, it will be worse.”

Fazıla (Asylum, 34) who was married twice said that she is against divorces by using religious references: “I got a divorce but I am against divorce, especially after 40 years of age. I am saying this in terms of religion. I want people to compromise; that is why I am saying this.” However, there is still a tendency to morally criticize others in order to take a moral

position. For example, when I asked Damla (Neotric, 35) whether there are any kinds of inconvenience in her life because of divorce she said if you had no relation someone there could not be gossip or other things. However in further conversation she mentions a man who assaults her and immediately after that she talks about other divorced women.

The men are so...One of them said “what is the deal, I always see you with your children, don’t you have a husband?” I said that I had one. He said “no you don’t, I know.” He said I offer you friendship.” It was 2 or 3 years ago. He asked me “where are the children? They don’t come to the bus stop.” I blurted out that they went to the village. Then he said “let’s go for a dinner.” He is an old man. Then he kept staring at me and walking before me. I said “aren’t you ashamed of your age, I am the same age as your daughter.” He got me followed. He said “I know who you are.” I said this to the uncle. He said “if I see him again I will beat him.”

And she continues this story of another woman by morally pointing her. She declares implicitly that she is a moral person different from this woman.

There’s a woman over there, she pays 350 TL of rent. She leaves at 10 at night. People say a taxi comes and picks her up. Brother Ali said “she works in a night club, she doesn’t work in the textile at night, she works in a night club, and she goes there at night.” He said that she always got back by taxi with different men. She has 2 children, no husband. Her landlord doesn’t say anything to her.

In Neotric, there are also women who quit wearing headscarves after getting a divorce which is seen as morally inappropriate. In a friendly tone, the forewoman warns the woman to be more careful religiously and about praying. In the factory praying is allowed as long as it does not affect the production process. For example, the new manager of the factory finds these activities unfavorable during production times, but the workers and forewoman criticize her for not being respectful and ethical enough. Likely, if there are women who are not veiled

they also could be the target of criticism. For example, Mine (Neotric, 45) made a joke to Zümrüt whose arm was burned with boiling water; “God burned you before hell since your arms were bare but it is a sign for you.” However she also adds that no one can know who is moral and religious enough since God decides this. Sena (Neotric, 28) also refers to such kind of approach of the co-workers in the factory.

Depart from Neotric in Asylum, religious activities are planned as part of the production process, so that the tea and meal breaks are arranged according to prayer times. At the same time, they have Friday praying for all the factory, religious meetings and Quran reading meetings in Ramadan with gifts. Most importantly the women have to wear headscarves even if they are not veiled in their social lives. That is to say, religious practices are a part of structural management therefore they have to wear headscarves and even if they are not forced to pray there is a social pressure because the majority of the workers pray. However, still the women say that there is no pressure for religious activities and that the rules in the factory such as separate breaks for men and women, separate buses for transportation and the talking ban with men are very good for them, since they feel comfortable in this way compared to other mixed-gender factories. Even if not all of them veiled out of factory they begin to show a kind of tendency especially in the case of stating themselves as moral and religious people because they argue that Asylum is a relatively secure environment for them due to its religious image. Thus, some of the workers see this place as an opportunity to become a more religious person in relation and even with comparison to their lives.

As previous examples suggest they in a way relate their piety or moral principles with the workplace mechanisms. In Neotric, Sabiha (28) says that; “It is a very good thing for me to work. My life becomes very regular because I have worked since my childhood and I'm not used to staying home. I get bored at home when I stay for a month. I worship regularly. For

example, if I were home, I wouldn't perform the Morning Prayer" Hasibe (Neotric, 40) complains about her husband because he works as a religious teacher and earns money by praying, writing some Arabic prayers and voodoo. And she finds cheating people with religion as a shameful and ill-gotten (*haram*) activity.

Easy come, easy go. This is why I want to work until retirement because I want to have *halal* food down our throat. I won't give him any money, I have done it a couple of times; there were installments to pay. He did not pay them either so I did not give them ever since. He does not have social security. Since I have it, I take care of the children.

As a more explicit example Aynur saw workplace an opportunity to be veiled and pious woman in terms of experiencing and learning piety:

My husband forced me to cover my hair the first year we married. The workplace also wanted to this way. I never thought it suited me well. He made me wear it. He bought me a topcoat which was like a sack. I covered my hair for a couple of years. He went to Russia then I stopped covering my hair. When he got back he saw me but didn't ask why I stopped covering my hair. Later he went to a couple of talks. I was uncovered but I was still performing *namaz*. I used to sit in my room and read this kind of stuff when I was a child. I had it in me. I used to say to my mother (for her sister) "look she will burn in hell and you will be responsible." I was performing *namaz* when I started working in the textile then I covered my hair of my own accord." I get accustomed to prayer and wearing headscarves here. This was an opportunity for me (Aynur, Asylum, 37).

Regarding veiling issue that is to say performing piety Kandiyoti (1996) argues that they are obliged to provide some norms such as veiling in order to be able to work because they want to show a secure existence in a way. I agree with this approach that they traditionally give meaning to veiling and see it as a form of security. However, at the same time there are different forms of reflection in different factories and in different subjectivities.

Also, Hoodfar (1996) argues that veiling could be shaped as a negotiation and protest at the same time. For example, in Aylsum the workers state that working there means to wear headscarf for them, so it constitutes a form of religious subject. But in Neotric some women quit veiling after divorce. In that sense, the women workers are not passive objects of these norms but they give meaning to all of these practices according to their own subjectivities and inclinations.

E. Resisting through unique ways: Women as Workers

Denizli is a small city where you can run into women workers in every corner. Several times, I speak with women workers from other factories on the minibus who were very keen to resist and do something for their physical and psychological exploitation in factories. As it is certain in previous examples women workers in the factories where I conducted fieldwork, are very critical about the management but there is no collective resistance there. I argue that this is due to new forms of class subjectivities that are individualized and depoliticized with the effect of global capitalism to a certain level (Ferguson, 1994, 155). Thus, it became hard to mention an entire class with similar interests because their interests are differentiated (Yücesan Özdemir, 2003). As Yücesan-Özdemir (2003) also argues the flexible resistance mechanisms prevent workers from resisting actively by strikes and demonstrations for example. And even though they resist they give consent to managerial strategies, but I agree with Yücesan Özdemir (2003) that this does not necessarily lead to hegemonic control as Burawoy (1979) argues. The apparent consent in the factory realized as a hegemonic control through ideological attributions but this view underestimates workers' capacity to form a critical consciousness of the employment relationship. However, in my case this consent opens a space in order for the women workers to create their own subjectivities.

In all of factories, when I asked my respondents whether they get their labor's worth, they said "not at all". Therefore, I asked why they did not go on strike or stop the production

for these problems and for increasing their wages, as it was done by the male workers in the yarn dyeing factory. Many of them said that they could not because there was no solidarity among women: “You said ok and go to a door, but if you turn and look back, you realized that nobody is behind you” (Fazıla, *Asylum*, 34). Or “They provoke you but on the way nobody remains behind you. All gets lost one by one.” Moreover, they say that nothing would change and the employer will say “the door is there we can easily find a worker instead of you.” Thus, they cannot run the risk of losing their jobs because they have children, they loans to pay for their houses, credit card debt and they want to be retired. Similarly, Sena (Neotric, 28) answered my question about striking by saying that in a different department of the same company workers had gone on strike, but women workers could not. She said; “There is no unity here. We have the fear of being left alone. If I said ‘friends, let’s go on strike today, let’s not work...’ It is not even that, they say ‘let’s do it’ and then you are left alone.”

I also asked questions about labor unions to workers and to the factory owners. All the workers I talked to said that labor unions would not be allowed in these factories. As Sena said, “This factory does not employ workers who are the members of unions. I once invited someone to the workplace. She had a couple of years left for retirement. Sister Elif came to me and said that she was very unhappy and she was leaving. They fired her because she was member of a union previously.” Therefore, the workers who used to be labor union members are marginalized in such a way that they cannot find any job anymore. As Mahmut (Moralist, 41) explains “my brother’s son was like that, but nothing happened. On top of it, he got unemployed. Workplaces did not hire him because he was unionized. You did this in the workplace, I mean, you went on strike, there is no way another textile will hire you. They cross you out and inform everybody. No one hires him.”

Whereas the owner of the factory Gökçe (Neotric, 32) did not hesitate to say explicitly that they do not allow labor unions. He said “A union tried to enter here by talking to the

workers outside. We asked those workers ‘is there something we didn’t give you?’ We gathered the workers and explained to them. Some understood it, some didn’t. So we let them go. Unionized workers cannot work in this workplace.” Also their ignorance of labor unions also depends on their disbelief of their activities because of the corrupted systems. They are also aware that the labor unions have tended to become hierarchical and corrupt places especially recently. Mahmut says that “unions are empty business. Trade unions were the supporters of the workers. It is the case now, too. The union receives fees from everybody. But when you want to go on strike, it supports you for two days, but the third day it gets what it wants to get from the boss. So it backs out.”

The women workers are very interested and active about what is going on in the factory, what the manager and foremen talk about, what kind of problems occurs in the factory because they are ready to react in their own ways. However, the factories differ due to their intrinsic mechanisms. The workers in Asylum have a main problem with their foremen. Some workers have psychological problems and try to quit because of the stress and pressure during the production process. Some of them tried to complain about the behaviors of the forewomen to the manager but the manager and forewomen have in some cases cooperated in order to justify labor control. As Edwards argued, the role of *ustas* is also the maintenance of the simple control in the workplace so that the control mechanisms could be personalized and thus the conflict between capital and labor is concealed.

The forewomen do not support us much to fight for our rights. To be honest, everyone is after their interest and money. If an *usta* says I will lead you, let us shut down the machines and ask for salary increase, the *usta* would be the first to get fired. Either you would be laid off without compensation, or they might not forget this and make you feel ashamed and send you away. *Ustas* already ask for increase in their wages and get it anyways (Sena, Neoteric, 28).

Neotric is still in a struggle to prevent the global and national crises regarding the textile sector such as the rise in cotton prices, shrinking exports and the discouragement of the government. Even if they discharge more than half of their workers sometimes they close the factory and send their workers to annual leave or non-paid leave. Therefore, the workers could not get permission for their annual leave when they want to, and they do not work even some weeks of the month. For this issue, they talked to the manager and owner, they collected signatures but nothing changed. When I was there one of the workers wrote a letter, which told what happens when they have to take annual leave, how their children and their family struggle. However the forewoman of this worker did not give the letter to the manager, saying that she and the workers could also get into trouble. Hasibe explains a similar situation she experienced in the factory; “Sema, a friend led the others and asked ‘what about our allowances? We heard than people will be laid off. People have debts etc., why are you acting like this?’ People gathered as they found support. Mr. Cem will make announcement. However *usta* told him to talk to his father first, and then to make announcement and saved the boss, while we stood our mouths open.” (Hasibe, Neotric, 40) Thus the women workers actively react and criticize the practices in their workplaces through their own ways and own subjectivities. Interestingly, this process also reproduces their new subjectivities especially as a worker. And they achieve to make important changes in these factories by their unique ways which could be a letter, a word, a nickname, a fight with the forewoman or even a religious statement to owner of the factory.

III. Conclusion

In this chapter, I discussed the subject positions I came accross in my fieldwork, in the statements of my respondents and in the process of participant observation. As I argued before, subjectivity is not a fixed or permanent stage rather it is a discontinuous, changeable

and controversial category. Women experience the relations between the workplace and the household within the interactions of these two spheres and attribute meanings to these specific experiences. Referring to Butler, subjectivities exist as long as they are realized in performances. Thus experiences, practices, meanings, language and all the other signs reproduce these individuals as breadwinners, mothers, working bodies, religious and moral persons and workers.

CONCLUSION

“In your company, the rightful share of [God’s] subjects are violated.”

(“*Senin işyerinde hak yeniyor, kul hakkına giriliyor.*”)

These are Fadime's (Asylum, 27) words addressed to the owner of the factory where she worked. She was a shy person when I interviewed her, but she also shared with me that she had been divorced for a long time but tried to hide it from her co-workers. When I was in Asylum between her and the *usta* there was a tremendous tension and she was very aggressive towards the *usta* if she acted unfairly. On my last visit to Denizli, I learned that Fadime had found the phone number of the factory owner who is said to be a member of the *Nur Cemaati*¹⁰ and who supported religious education activities in Denizli. She called him and told him the sentence quoted above. And the next day the *usta* who was working there for 25 years was fired. The effect of such an individual attempt by referring to Islamic faith of factory owner exemplifies my main point in the thesis so that all the activities and even concepts are defined within the process in which the workplace and the household is in relation. There might be various types of resistance strategized by women workers and in the case of Denizli referring to the moral and religious order on the shop floor is very effective. Thus, like the managerial part which positions itself according to the worker profiles in the factory, the workers also learned the intrinsic mechanisms of management and resist through these ways. Upon these experiences they produce their meanings and subjects.

Taken into account these specific examples and narratives of workers, I argue in this thesis that labor control and labor process are not merely structural or physical constructions rather they are shaped regularly according to the workers inclination and management's need. That is to say, in order to provide productivity and create productive workers managerial members try the ways in which workers possibly give consent. At the same time, these ways gain a moral and religious dimension by reference to women's private lives. In that sense, I argued that management apply labor control in the way of moral guardianism, which means that in a collective manner moral and appropriate things are defined and represented as a way

¹⁰ This is a religious brotherhood, called *Nur Cemaati*, *Nurcular* or *Hizmet* but I prefer to use the term that the women workers use.

of order. Moreover, women workers also have a part from this moral guardianism and act as moral guardians in shop floor about the private lives of co-workers, religious and moral inclinations of management and even about their own lives.

I also argue that this whole process creates women workers' subjectivities at the intersection of the household and the workplace so that they resist, work and act through their specific ways in the factories. As a result the discontinuous subjectivities like breadwinner, mother, and working body, religious and moral person and most importantly worker emerged. So, that despite their dependencies related with their needs and survival they also become active resisting workers in this process as Fadime, who changed the lives of other workers and her own life by her local strategies. Even if this can be seen a tiny thing, based on my observations of their experiences I maintained that in the short term the nonexistence of *usta* Meral in Asylum provide a relatively healthy and peaceful environment in the workplace.

However, there is also the risk of falling into the trap of romanticizing resistance which can prevent one to see the power structure behind it. As Abu-Lughod (1990, cited in Mahmood, 2005, p. 8) states:

[...] there is perhaps a tendency to romanticize resistance, to read all forms of resistance as signs of ineffectiveness of systems of power and of the resilience and creativity of the human spirit in its refusal to be dominated. By reading resistance in this way, we collapse distinctions between forms of resistance and foreclose certain questions about the working of power.

Thus Abu-Lughod (1990, cited in Mahmood, 2005, p. 9) points resistance as a “diagnostic of power” so that we can learn about the complex interworkings of historically changing structures of power namely systems of oppressions by the everyday practices. I agree that this structure must be also considered since there is no way out of these power relations. In this sense, Fadime's resistance reproduces the system of global capitalism in

which *usta* is seen as the responsible actor as a resistance point and lost her job even if she is also a worker within the exploitative system of global capitalism as Fadime. Moreover, the owner of the factory, the capitalist reinforces his position and the systematic existence of factory working for the global production would not change.

However, still in these local resistances there are more than the power relations since as I stated in chapter 1 globalization is produced in these local practices and in this way they change their local globalization structure by firing one actor, *usta*, in the case of Fadime. Thus, one could not say that *usta* was not the face of global economic violence in the local level that Fadime changed the application of globalization in this factory for a while by her authentic ways. At this point, it is also very important that as Mahmood (2005, p. 13) argues the conceptualization of the words by a Western-based academic background would be also very problematic. In this way, she problematizes liberal presuppositions of the scholarship on gender which define freedom in a certain form and exclude the local meanings and definitions of the subject (*ibid*). In this sense, in Denizli women workers have a different understanding of their experience of globalization, exploitation and domination, which does not mean that they are not exploited by the global structures, even in daily practices by consumerism for example.

The power of global capitalism and its effects on the local are not so difficult to describe, but the essential issue is women worker's own experiences, meaning attributions and conceptualization of these notions. One can say for any case that global capitalism and power relations are exploitative but this would not show us in Denizli women workers understands this exploitation in a different sense which is related with their spiritual and private interpretations depending on the experiences in household and workplace. And most importantly this would not show us the construction of moral guardianism as a productive,

strategical and resisting tool against global power relations despite it is also used by managerial actors against them.

I. Limitations of this Study and Suggestions for further Research

This study can present a theoretical and an empirical background regarding women garment factory workers in Turkey in connection with nationalist and religious discourses in Denizli. However, I cannot argue that this study can reveal the same results for other factories or groups. Therefore, this study does not claim to be a representative one, rather it is a modest attempt and an exploratory study to understand how women workers in Denizli experience their labor and give meaning to it at the intersection of workplace and household. My informants are only one part of the working class in Denizli and their experiences and subjectivities are peculiar to the factories and individuals I chose. There are other factories in Denizli in which working conditions are relatively harsher than those of these factories in terms of gender discrimination, social security and working conditions. I believe that it is also important to study those factories. While these limitations should be taken into consideration, this study should be seen as a distinct methodological approach in order to understand the experiences of women workers in a profound way.

With this outlook, there are areas for expanding this research. . First of all, even if this study is on the manufacturing industry, this could be broadened to other sectors such as services, which has been on the rise in recent decades. The 2011 TURKSTAT reports show that LFP in the service sector in Turkey (48.1%) is higher than in the manufacturing industry (26.5%). Even when we look at statistics in terms of the distribution among men and women it becomes more interesting since in 2011 female LFP in the manufacturing industry was just 15.2 % whereas in the service sector the rate was 42.6 %. And among men the rate in the manufacturing industry was 31.1 % whereas it was 50.3 % in the service sector.

Moreover, although it was my aim to study the working class women in factories, I also had a chance to speak to the women managers who could be considered as middle class and I saw that their subjectivities are also reproduced within their own context but again at the intersection of the workplace and the household. And even if the workplace is a factory, the working and middle class women experience it differently. Moreover, studying middle class women through the lenses of experiencing Islam would be also very interesting. Thus, I also find it crucial to expand this research to different classes for two reasons. Firstly, it gives the possibility to reexamine the “classless” representation of women and secondly it would challenge the tendency of studying “Muslim women” as a “homogenous” category.

This study focused on working women’s subjectivities. I believe that it is also necessary to study the production of masculinities in factories or other workplaces. An analysis of the formation of masculine subjects at the intersection of the workplace and the household would be an important contribution to the sociological literature on Turkey, in which there is a shortage of studies on men and masculinities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abadan Unat, N., Kandiyoti, D. & Kiray, M. B. (1981). (eds.) *Women in Turkish Society*. Leiden: Brill.
- Abu-Lughod, L. (1990). The Romance of Resistance: Tracing Transformations of Power through Bedouin Women. *American Ethnologist*, 17(1), 41-55.

- Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations. *Gender and Society* 4 (2), 139-158.
- (2004). Gender, Capitalism and Globalization. *Critical Sociology* 30, 1; 11-41.
- Ahmed, L. (1992). *Women and Gender in Islam: Historical Roots of a Modern Debate*. New Haven: Yale University Press, (1992)
- Althusser, L. (2008). Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses, In L. Althusser, *On Ideology*.
- Aydoğanoğlu, E. (1991). *Fabrikada Emek Denetimi*. İstanbul: Evrensel Basım Yayın
- Beneria, L. & Roldan, M. (1987). *The Crossroads of Class and Gender: Industrial Homework, Subcontracting & Household Dynamics in Mexico City*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Beneria, L. (1995). Toward a Greater Integration of Gender in Economics. *World Development*, 23(11), pp. 1839-1850.
- Beyhan, B. and Armatlı-Köroğlu, B. (2002) Collaborative Relations as the Basis of Economic Development: The Tale of Denizli, paper presented at 6. *ERC/METU International Economics Congress*, Ankara
- Bora, A. (2008). *Kadınların Sınıfı*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Boserup E. (1970). (reprinted 1997). *Women's Role in Economic Development*. London: Earthscan.
- Braverman, H. (1974). The Real Meaning of Taylorism. In *Critical studies in organization and bureaucracy*, edited by Fischer, F. & Sirianni, C. (1994). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Burawoy, M. (2001). Manufacturing the Global. Introduction to a Special Issue of *Ethnography* II:2, pp.147-159
- (1985). *The Politics of Production: Factory Regimes Under Capitalism and Socialism*. London: Verso.
- (1979). *Manufacturing Consent: Changes in the Labor Process Under Monopoly Capitalism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press,
- Butler, J. (2009). Performativity, Precarity and Sexual Politics. *AIBR*, 4(3), i-xiii.
- (1997). *The psychic life of power: theories in subjection*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- (1993). *Bodies that matter: on the discursive limits of 'sex'*. London: Routledge.

- Çağatay, N. & Berik, G. (1990). Transition to Export-Led Growth in Turkey: Is There a Feminization of Employment?. *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 22 (1), 115-134.
- Çağatay, N. & Özler, Ş. (1995). Feminization of the Labor Force: The Effects of Long-Term Development and Structural Adjustment. *World Development*, 23, 1883-1894.
- Cairolı, M. L. (1998). Factory as Home and Family: Female Workers in the Moroccan Garment Industry. *Human Organization*, 57(1), 28-43.
- Can, B. (2009). *Subjectivities of women garment workers in the Gazi neighborhood* (Unpublished M.A. Thesis). Bogazici University, Institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences, Istanbul.
- Dayıođlu, M. (2000). Labor Force Participation of Women in Turkey. in Feride Acar and Ayşe Günes-Ayata (eds.), *Gender and identity construction : women of Central Asia, the Caucasus and Turkey*. Leiden: Brill.
- Dedeođlu, S. (2008). *Women Workers in Turkey: Global Industrial Production in Istanbul*. New York: Tauris Academiz Studies.
- Demiriz, G. (2002). The Unfinished Story: A Case Study of Home-Workers in Denizli (Turkey) Textile and Clothing Industries. *Sosyoloji Arařtırmaları Dergisi*, 5(1), 5-27.
- Dickinson, T. D. & Schaeffer, R. K. (2001). *Fast Forward: Work, Gender, and Protest in a Changing World*. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.
- DSO (2012). E.U. and U.S.A Exportation Of Denizli And Turkey (2006-2012). (<http://www.dso.org.tr/images/file/istatistik/2009/d06.pdf> last accessed November, 2012)
- DSO (2011) Export-Import Values And Number Of Exporter-Importer Firms Of Denizli And Turkey (2001-2012-Data of Ministry of Economy) (<http://www.dso.org.tr/images/file/istatistik/2009/d08.pdf> last accessed November, 2012)
- DSO (2010). Distribution of Female-Male Employment in Denizli & Turkey-E.U.S.C. (December 2005-September 2010). (<http://www.dso.org.tr/images/file/istatistik/2009/i11.pdf> last accessed November, 2012)
- DSO (2006). Denizli Sanayisi Genel Görünüm Anketi Sonuçları

- (<http://www.denizliso.tobb.org.tr/anket2006.pdf> last accessed on November, 2012)
- Durak, Y. (2011). *Emeğin Tevekkülü: Konya'da İşçi-İşveren İlişkileri ve Dindarlık*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Duruoğlu, T. (2007). Emek Piyasasında Cinsiyetçi Ücret Ayrımı: Bursa Organize Sanayi Bölgesinde Bir Araştırma. *İletişim Kuram ve Araştırma Dergisi*, 24, 61-76.
- Ecevit, Y. (1991). Shop Floor Control: The Ideological Construction of Turkish Women Factory Workers. In N. Redclift & M. T. Sinclair, *Working Women, International Perspectives on Labour and Gender Ideology*. London: Routledge.
- (1995). The Status and Changing Forms of Women's Labour in the Urban Economy. in Şirin Tekeli (eds) *Women in Modern Turkish Society: A Reader*. London, Zed Books.
- Edwards, R., C. (1978). Forms of Control in the Labor Process: A historical Analysis. in *Critical studies in organization and bureaucracy*. (ed) Fischer, F. & Sirianni, C. (1994). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Ehrenreich, B. & Hochschild, A.R. (2004). *Global Woman: Nannies, Maids, And Sex Workers In The New Economy*. New York : Metropolitan/Owl Books
- Elson, D. & Pearson, R. (1981) 'Nimble Fingers Make Cheap Workers': An Analysis of Women's Employment in Third World Export Manufacturing. *Feminist Review* 7, 87–107.
- Ergün, E. (2002). Understanding the Integration of Istanbul's Peripheral Neighborhoods into the World Market: A Disclosure of Women's Labor in "Secure" Places. *Boğaziçi Journal: Review of Social, Economic and Administrative Studies*, 16(1).
- Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. In H. Dreyfus and P. Rabinow (eds.) *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Freeman, Carla 2001. Is Local: Global as Feminine: Masculine? Rethinking the Gender of Globalization. *Signs*, 26 (4), 1007-1037.
- Friedman, A., L. (1977). *Industry and Labour: Class Struggle at work and Monopoly Capitalism*. London: Macmillan.

- Fuentes, A. & Ehrenreich, B. (1983). *Women in the Global Factory*. New York: Institute for New Communications.
- Gibson-Graham, 1996, *The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It): A Feminist Critique of Political Economy*, Oxford UK and Cambridge USA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Gottfried (2010)
- Hart, K. (2009). Conflicts and conundrums in a women's cooperative in western Turkey. *HAGAR Studies in Culture, Polity and Identities*, 9 (1), 25-42.
- (2007) Performing Piety and Islamic Modernity in a Turkish Village. *Ethnology*, 46 (4), 289-304
- Hartmann, H. (1979). The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism. In L. Sargent (ed.), *Women and Revolution* (pp. 1-41). Boston: South End Press.
- Hoodfar, H. (1997). *Between Marriage and the Market: Intimate Politics and Survival in Cairo*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- (1996). Egyptian Male Migration and Urban Families Left Behind: "Feminization of the Egyptian Family" or a Reaffirmation of Traditional Gender Roles?, in Singerman, D. & Hoodfar, H. eds. *Development, Change, and Gender in Cairo* (Chapters 1&2). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Işık, D. (2008). On Sabır and Agency. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 10 (4), 518-541.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. & Ataca, B. (2005). Value of Children and Family Change: A Three-Decade Portrait From Turkey. *Applied Psychology*, 54 (3), 317-337.
- Kandiyoti, D. (1988). "Bargaining with patriarchy" *Gender and Society* 2,3:274-290.
- (1996). "Contemporary Feminist Scholarship and Middle East Studies" *Gendering the Middle East: Emerging Perspectives*, 1-29.
- Keyman, F. & Koyuncu Lorasdağı, B. (2010). Denizli/ Kendi dinamikleriyle kalkınan "Anadolu Kaplıanı". In F. Keyman & B. Koyuncu Lorasdağı, *Kentler: Anadolu'nun Dönüşümü, Türkiye'nin Geleceği*. İstanbul: Doğan Kitap.
- Kibria, N. (1998). Becoming a Garment Worker: The Mobilization of Women into the Garment Factories of Bangladesh. In R. Sobhan and N. Khundker (eds.), *Globalization and Gender: Changing Patterns of Women's Employment in Bangladesh*. Dhaka: UPL/CPD.
- Kim, S. K. (1997). *Class struggle or family struggle?: the lives of women factory workers in South Korea*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, C. K., (1995). *Engendering the Worlds of Labor: Women Workers, Labor*

- Markets and Production Politics in the South China Economic Miracle.
American Sociological Review, 60(3): 378-397.
- Lynch, C. (2007). *Juki Girls, Good Girls; Gender and Cultural Politics in Sri Lanka's Global Garment Industry*, London; Cornell University Press.
- Macleod, A. E. (1999). Transforming Women's Identity: The Intersection of Household and Workplace in Cairo, in Singerman, D. & Hoodfar, H. eds. *Development, Change, and Gender in Cairo* (Chapters 1&2). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Mahmood, S. (2005). *Politics of Piety: The Islamic Revival and the Feminist Subject*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005
- (2001) Feminist theory, embodiment, and the docile agent: Some reflections on the Egyptian Islamic revival. *Cultural Anthropology*, 16(2), 202-236.
- Lim, L. (1981). Women's Work in Multinational Electronics Factories. Pp. 181-90 in *Women and Technological Change in Developing Countries*, edited by R. Dauber and M. Cain. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- (1983). Capitalism, Imperialism and Pa-triarchy: The Dilemma of Third World Women Workers in Multinational Factories. Pp. 70- 91 in *Women, Men, and the International Division of Labor*, edited by J. Nash and M. P. Fernandez-Kelly. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Najmabadi, A. (1998). Crafting an Educated Housewife in Iran. Lila Abu-Lughod & Afsaneh Najmabadi (eds). in *Remaking Women: Feminism and Modernity in the Middle East*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 91-125.
- Nash, J. and Fernandez-Kelly, M. (eds.) (1983), *Women, Men, and International Division of Labor*, Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Navaro-Yashin, Y. (2000). Evde Taylorizm: Cumhuriyet'in ilk Yillarinda Evisinin Rasyonellesmesi." ("Taylorism in the House: The Rationalization of Housewifery in the Early Republic"). *Toplum ve Bilim*, 84, 51-74.
- Ngai, P. (2005). *Made In China: Women Factory Workers in a Global Workplace*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Ong, A. (1987). *Spirits of Resistance and Capitalist Discipline: Factory Women in Malaysia*, State University Of New York Press, Albany.
- Ortner, S. (2006). *Anthropology and Social Theory: Culture, Power, and the Acting Subject*. Duke University Press.
- (2005). Subjectivity and cultural critique, *Anthropological Theory*, 5(1), 33-4.

- Özbay, F. (1981). The Impact of Education on Women in Rural and Urban Turkey. Pp. 160-180 in *Women in Turkish Society*, edited by N. Abadan-Unat.
- Özdemir, Ş. (2012). İki Alan Çalışmasının Bulguları Arasındaki Farka Dair Açıklamalar: Emeğin Farklı Halleri? *Birikim*, Güncel makaleler, 16.03.2012. (<http://www.birikimdergisi.com/birikim/kisi.aspx?kid=2220&isim=%DEennur%20%D6zdemir> last accessed 28.11.2012)
- (2010) İslami Sermaye Ve Sınıf: Türkiye/Konya Müsiad Örneği. *Çalışma İlişkileri Dergisi*. (http://www.calismailiskileridergisi.org/download_pdf.php?id=2&f=2 last accessed 28.112012)
- Özyeğin, G. (2002). The Doorkeeper, the Maid, and the Tenant: Troubling Encounters in the Turkish Urban Landscape. in Deniz Kandiyoti and Ayşe Saktanber (eds.) *Fragments of Culture: The Everyday of Modern Turkey*, 43-72.
- Penpecioglu, M. (2007). *A Critical Interpretation on Industrial Restructuring of the Region, the Case of Denizli Textile and Garment Sector*. (Unpublished M.A. Thesis). Middle East Technical University, The Graduate School Of Natural And Applied Sciences, Ankara.
- Pınarcıoğlu, M. (2000). *Development of Industry and Local Change*. METU, Ankara: Faculty of Architecture Press.
- Pyle, J. (1999). Third World Women and Global Restructuring. in Janet Saltzman Chafetz (eds), *Handbook of the Sociology of Gender*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Pyle, J. L. & Ward, K. B. (2003). Recasting Our Understanding of Gender and Work During Global Restructuring, *International Sociology*, 18, 461-489.
- Rose, N. (1996). *Inventing Our Selves: Psychology, Power and Personhood*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rudnykyj, D. (2009). Spiritual Economies: Islam and Neoliberalism in Contemporary Indonesia. *Cultural Anthropology*, 24 (1), 104-141.
- Salaff, J. (1981). *Working Daughters of Hong Kong*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Safa, H. (1995). *The Myth of the Male Breadwinner: Women and Industrialisation in the Caribbean*. Boulder: Westview.
- Salzinger, L. (2004). From Gender as Object to Gender as Verb: Rethinking how Global Restructuring Happens. *Critical Sociology*, 30 (1), 43-62.

- (2003). *Genders in Production. Making Workers in Mexico's Global Factories*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Savran, G. A. (2004). *Beden Emek Tarih: Dialektik Bir Feminizm İçin*. İstanbul: Kanat Kitap.
- Selim R. & İlkaracan İ. (2008). Gender Inequalities in the Labor Market in Turkey: Differentials in Wages, *Industrial and Occupational Distribution of Men and Women*. (<http://www.econ.utah.edu/~ehrbar/erc2002/pdf/P405.pdf> accessed 03.29.2010)
- Sen, Aç (2003). Gender Inequality in Human Development: Theories and Measurement,” in *Background Papers: Human Development Report 1995*, United Nations Development Programme (New York, 1996), 1-20.
- (1990). Gender and Cooperative Conflicts. In *Persistent Inequalities* edited by Irene Tinker. New York: Oxford University Press
- Singerman, D. & Hoodfar, H. (eds). (1996) *Development, Change, and Gender in Cairo*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Suğur, N. & Suğur, S. (2005). Gender and Work in Turkey: Case Study on Women Workers in the Textile Industry in Bursa. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 41(2), 269-279.
- Suğur, S. (2005). Türkiye'de Tekstil Sektöründe Kadın Emegi ve Değişen Toplumsal Cinsiyet İlişkileri. *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, 38 (1).
- Tekeli, Ş. (eds). (1994). *Women in Modern Turkish Society: A Reader*. London: Zed Books.
- Taylor, Frederick Winslow (1911), The Principles of Scientific Management. In *Critical studies in organization and bureaucracy*, edited by Fischer, F. & Sirianni, C. (1994). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Tokatlı, N. & Kızılgün Ö. (2009) Coping with the changing rules of the game in the global textiles and apparel industries: evidence from Turkey and Morocco, *Journal of Economic Geography*, 10; 209-229.
- Tsing, A. (2000). The Global Situation. *Cultural Anthropology*, 15, 3; 327-360.
- TURKSTAT (2012). Divorces by Statistical Regions and age group, 1st & 2nd Quarter.
- TURKSTAT (2011). Crude divorce rate by Statistical Regions (2007-2011).
- TURKSTAT (2011). Divorces by Statistical Regions (2001-2011).
- TURKSTAT (2011). Regional Results Of Household Labour Force Survey- Economic Activity By Years And Sex (2004-2011).

- Türkün-Erendil, A. (2000). Mit ve Gerçeklik Olarak Denizli Üretim ve İşgücünün Değişen Yapısı: Eleştirel Kuram açısından Bir Değerlendirme. *Toplum ve Bilim*, 86, 91-117
- Wallerstein, I. M. (1984). *The Politics of the World-Economy. The States, the Movements and the Civilizations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- White, J. B. (1994). *Money Makes Us Relatives: Women's labor in Urban Turkey*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Wolf, D. (1992). *Factory Daughters: Gender, Household Dynamics, and Rural Industrialization in Java*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- (1990). Daughters, Decisions and Domination: An Empirical and Conceptual Critique of Household Strategies. *Development and Change*, 21, p. 43-62.
- Yıldırım, E. (1999) Modern Management Techniques in the Developing World: the Case of TQM and its Impact on Workers in Turkey. *Work, Employment and Society*, 13, 603-709.
- Young, I. M. (1997). *Intersecting Voices: Dilemmas of Gender, Political Philosophy, and Policy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Yücesan-Özdemir, G. (2003). Hidden Forms of Resistance Among the Turkish Workers: Hegemonic Incorporation or Building Blocks for the Working Class Struggle? *Capital and Class*, 81, Autumn, 31-61.

APPENDIX: List of Respondents

Factory 1: Neotric*

Name	Age	Position	Marital Status	Children	Sex
Mine	45	worker	divorced	2	female
Nur	38	forewoman of machine	married	1	female
Sema	33	worker	divorced	1	female
Azize	48	worker	married	2	female
Sena	28	worker	divorced	2	female
Havva	32	worker	divorced	1	female
Gamze	36	forewoman of sample	married	no	female
Nermin	27	worker	married	2	female
Fahriye	43	worker	Single	2	female
Damla	35	worker	divorced	2	female
Ahu	29	worker	married (x3)	1	female
Sabiha	28	worker	married	2	female
Hasibe	40	worker	married	1	female
Umut	29	worker	married	1	male
Can	34	worker	married	2	male
Zümrüt	26	worker	married	1	female
Gül	45	worker	married	2	female
Fikriye	39	worker	divorced	3	female
Duru	27	worker	married (x2)		female
Pınar	34	product manager	married	2	female
Gökçe	32	owner of the factory	married		male
Ahmet	48	headman of shoop floor	married	3	male
Davut	48	doctor of factory	married	-	male

*I conducted interviews lasting between three to five hours with the first ten workers in the list. The rest of the interviews took place in the factory and can be described as conversations of one to two hours.

Factory 2: Asylum*

Name	Age	Position	Marital Status	Children	Sex
Aysu	36	worker	divorced	2	female
Fazıla	34	worker	married (x2)	2	female
Ayşen	28	worker	single	None	female
Münire	38	worker	married	2	female
Eda	39	worker	married	1	female
Deniz	33	worker	married	1	female

Aynur	37	forewoman of barthrope	divorced	3	female
Mahmut	41	husband of Eda	married	1	male
Emine	29	worker	married	2	female
Fadime	27	worker	divorced	2	female
Meral	43	forewoman of duvet cover	single	None	female
Nuran	25	worker	married	None	female
Müğe	26	Worker	married	1	female
Şaban	54	human resources manager	married	2	male
Murat	50	partner of ownership	married	3	male

* I conducted interviews lasting between three to five hours with the first eight workers in the list. The rest of the interviews took place in the factory and can be described as conversations of one to two hours.

Factory 3: Moralist*

Name	Age	Position	Marital Status	Children	Sex
Kübra	45	worker	married	3	female
Mehmet (husband of Kübra)	48	worker	married	3	male
Emel	32	worker	married	1	female
Bilal (husband of Ece)	34	worker	married	1	male
Miray	28	worker	married	none	female
Bülent (Husband of Miray)	29	worker	married	none	male
Fadime	30	worker	married	1	female
Hüma	26	worker	single	none	female
Hami	30	assistant of production manager	married	2	female
Orhan	34	assistant of production manager	married	2	male
Nilgün	35	production manager	married	2	female

*The first seven persons in the list were my main respondents.

Denizli Association of Manufacturers (DSO)

Name	Age	Position	Marital Status	Children	Sex
İsmail Yılmaz	50	chairman	Married	3	male