

**"THE EMIGRANT: PROBLEMS OF THE IDENTITY AND  
ADAPTATION OF BULGAR-BORN TURKS AFTER THEIR  
EMIGRATION IN TURKEY".**

JOINT RESEARCH AND PROJECT

**BY**

EGE UNIVERSITY                      NEW BULGARIAN UNIVERSITY  
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY      DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY  
IZMIR/ TURKIYE                      SOFIA/ BULGARIA

2002-2003  
IZMIR / TURKIYE

RESEARCH TEAM

TURKISH	BULGARIAN
H.Neşe Özgen, Doç. Dr. Suat Kolukırık, Research Assistants Hasan Şen, Research Assistant Savaş Çağlayan, Research Assistant	Plamen Bochkov, Doç. Dr. • Prof. Dr. Magdalena Elchinova, • Prof. Dr. Ivan Evtimov, • Milena Franova, • Susan Chakar

## SUMMARY

### THE EMIGRANT / THE EXILE

There is not a similar social type to the Turkish emigrant. He was and he remains forever torn apart between two motherlands, neither one recognizing him entirely. He in turn cannot acknowledge them completely too, wandering between them, drawn and repelled from either one or another.

While he was living in Bulgaria, he was an ethnical minority, all the time remaining different with something. He always has been observed with a sort of surveillance, not fully understood, not entirely "own" and not a complete stranger. He felt ordinary only at his home among the close circle of relatives, and to certain extent among the people of his ethnicity. Only in this intimate but limited communication, he had the opportunity to express spontaneously and to get a pleasure from a "natural" unfolding communication, in which the norms, restriction and conventionalities do not reflect but are part of the usual daily-life stream..

As soon as he was walking into the "big" society, he was going wide-awake. Words, gestures, all social, professional and even interpersonal relations were turning into probation test of his ability to conceal or to apologize for being different.

At the end, his presentiments came true. The otherness, though masked or genuinely suppressed and surmounted, toppled over his life. His otherness had become unbearable for those who had not accepted him. His efforts to be like the rest had not been respected. He again was the scapegoat for the social unrest and for the uprising collapse of the system. He was ideal for this role. He had remained different and this was sufficient to be identified with the otherness, with the unidentified disaster that was coming up; with the presentiment for an undisclosed and frightening change, for now on only an intuitive feeling as something bluer but imminent. The otherness has to be abolished, no matter of its form. If the symbol of the otherness is uprooted, maybe the otherness will bypass them and it will not come out in the society again.

The communistic nomenclature not only foreboded the collapse of the "socialistic" system. In their disposal, they had carefully hidden from the rest of the population, data for forthcoming economic crisis, the crisis that was threatening to end up their regime. In order to retain the power, just a little bit more, the dictatorship needed an enemy. The old pre-war bourgeoisie, which was pointed as an enemy at the beginning of the communist autocracy, was gone long time ago. The opposing classes approach as an excuse for the dictatorship could not serve the purpose anymore. Therefore, the ruling circle did not have other options but to avert to nationalism. The socialism turns to National Socialism. As many times in the history, the minority turns to be the best scapegoat. The minority resistance, easily depersonalized, had to be presented as a threat for the existence of the society. Dictators thought that they had found the wonderful means to justify their authority, taking the lead against the nation's enemy. However, they had not quite justified the international situation, neither the internal opposition of the greater part of the Bulgarian population, which again did not succumb to the socialistic propaganda.

The first thing that the exile discovers is that he again lacks the obvious knowledge of how to communicate, how to act and how to adjust in the world he has landed in. Again, he cannot act spontaneously, relying on automatic schemes and recipes, adopted in the process of socialization. Recipes that have been worked out collectively, from the whole community during the course of its historical development, thus having the power of a habit or more precisely of a cultural norm. The emigrant again lacks the cultural exemplars that offer ready-made response models in different social situations as well as a base for interpretation of the relevancy in the other person behavior. The cultural pattern not only allows one to act without thinking, to choose one's actions direction spontaneously, but also allows the community to correctly read and accept as something natural one's goals and deeds. The emigrant again is bereft of the privilege to think ordinary, laying on collective conventions, attained intuitively. He once more is lacking the collectively drawn up arrangements, which are used in typical social situations from each community member and guarantee his recognition as an insider. The exile once again has to exercise efforts (and to certain extent even more vigorously than before) about things that look unproblematic for the society. Yet another time he has to refer to the society as an examiner, to comprehend the cultural norm, to find out how the elements of the behavior recipes are organized - recipes possessed by others out of habit.

Thereby he finds himself in the marginal position of examiner demonstrating to the society members, unintentionally, his marginality, and his otherness. As an examiner, rationally analyzing the cultural pattern he wants to embrace, the emigrant sees the discrepancy in the exemplar and he is not fully persuaded in its perfection. Deprived of the socialization stage when he was likely to internalize the culture of the group, the exile remains an independent observer, lacking the specific collective experience of the society. The collective of his ego is another collective and it is far not what he needs right now. The cultural patterns are not his internal possession but simply an object to be investigated.

Forced by the circumstances to become a part of the new society and to act he inevitably is caught up into the process of juxtaposing. Comparing his collective experience with the one he has to acquire, the first thing the emigrant discovers are the inadequacies of his own picture, of his knowledge, notions, convictions for his new community. However, a picture elaborated in another environment and from distance could not be easily broken or replaced with new one. It becomes a source of constant tensions, inadequate reactions, all underlining the otherness of the emigrant.

The exile acts "as having a role" from the position of a particular status, which he receives in the new community. All the same, no matter the status he had received, he inevitably gets frustrated. No matter how well he carries out his social and operational aspects of his role – medical doctor, teacher, worker, etc. – he is still awkward, in executing the cultural requirements for this character, at least for some time. Thus, the high social status could normally coexist with low cultural status, which inevitably pushes out the exile in the society periphery, marginalizing him, making him not entirely accepted, not so much of an insider. So he is in the same dualistic position another time. The position he thought he would escape from, once ceasing to be a minority. Actually the only difference is that now he is only a cultural minority. In this respect, the emigrant has in his disposal only one perspective. As, if it is true what the practice shows it, it is impossible to change the ethnicity, at least the culture can be adjusted. In reality this can happen fully only for the next generations. The emigrant remains on the border of three cultures, because of other cultural models that he is hereditary burdened with. The first is the one acquired within the ethnic minority group, which is the most archetypal, and in this sense the most powerful in the degree of its internalization hence become unconditional. The second one is the culture of the Bulgarian community, which is also early internalized to a high extent. Big parts of it are unconditionally possessed and only some marginal aspects of the relations between this and the primary culture are problematical. Third is the culture of the new community, which the emigrant has to incorporate through its rationalization and assimilation, but also by using the interpretive instruments from the first two cultures.

The exile appears to be brought into a complicated process, in which not all elements, of the pointed three cultures are not in contradiction and so a forth culture is born – that of the emigrant. In the process of acquiring the new culture, the exile has in its disposal a powerful interpretive system, such as the language.

His Turkish language facilitates him as much as embarrasses him. His Turkish is specific, adjusted to an ethnic minority and has been in use in completely different social context. Its dissimilarity is not as much in the vocabulary and the syntaxes as it is in the idioms and the jargon. It carries different emotions and hides other implications.

The clash of the two languages seemingly identical yet profoundly unlike breaks the speech automations and the half-conscious usage of ready language forms. This, in communication, causes a number of misunderstandings, which underlines the otherness of the emigrant. The Turkish of the majority turns into an area of constant communication's traps, coming always by surprise, in view of the superficial likeness of the two languages. The exile did not have the same problems with the Bulgarian language. He had clearly distinguished it as the language of the majority, apart from the esoteric Turkish of the small ethnic group. He had used both languages adequately crossing the two communities not having problems with the interpretation. It is here where the first nostalgia is born – the one to the Bulgarian language. During the elections for a parliament, emigrants from different places got together to cast their vote in Istanbul: "We gathered- one of the questioners told- and we just chitchatted in Bulgarians. It was very nice". An overturning took place. For the emigrant's community the Bulgarian language had become the esoteric one – means of identification and indication for group's affiliation. It had taken over the function that the Turkish language once had.

As it has been already said, the exile is bereft of the opportunity to use spontaneous, internalized cultural models of behavior. Initially he tries to un-puzzle and to generalize them, finding them behind the many and different behaviors and relationships, which he observes. Before finding the norm, he is absorbed by the chaos of single incongruities, the talking at cross-purposes of his behavior, and the actions of the others. The comparisons and analogies help him in this rational extraction of the cultural model. Comparisons and analogies between what he already knows about the society where he had lived before and what he learns for the new one. The coincidences and contrasts he recognizes make him very critical to both cultures and very sensitive to the contradictions found. The emigrant quickly finds that in the modern Turkish society as in the Bulgarian one there are contradicting cultural models, some following the traditional other the modern values.

Within the Bulgarian society, his ethnic group was associated with the forces of the traditionalism. His reluctance to change his ethnical affiliation was regarded as a denial of modernity. Actually, the equator between the modern and the traditional divided the Turkish ethnos, just as the rest of the Bulgarian population. The different social, professional, ethnical and regional groups were located from one to the other end of that equator. In spite of the fact that the Turkish ethnos was viewed as a symbol of the traditional, it was inaccurate and was a part of the interethnic prejudices.

While in emigration, that part of the Turkish minority, which was educated, urbanized and allied to the modern way of life, found in the Turkish culture the same values, which were shared in Bulgaria. It received the chance to be affiliated to the Turkish elite, which recognized it as an ally in its attempt to modernize the society.

To the extent that these exiles were coming from a more advanced society from the point of its modernization (especially as far as the acceptance of secularity, gender equality, individualization and personal success orientation are concern), they began to experience yet another type of nostalgia – nostalgia to the lost degree of modernity.

Completely different faith befell that part of the exiles that came from the rural regions and whose life style preserved a great deal of the traditional rural life and relationships. Most of them had found themselves in the big Turkish urbanized centers such as Istanbul, Ankara, Izmir, Bursa, and others.

They were drastically forced to change their life style and began to suffer from the sudden for them urbanization. Swirled in the hassle of the big city they had to adapt to a milieu utterly unknown to them.

The nostalgia to the former homeland is nourished by the destroyed habits, the altered landscape, and the different climate. This loss of nature uproots the experience and its dimensional tangibility from the memory. In that way the past fades and becomes abstract, like something that has happened in some unrealistic mythical milieu, like a dream the story line of which is difficult to restore when awake. The Ego began to face difficulties in maintaining its integrity. Significant parts of the personality's continuity have lost their values; hence the craving after returning home was born, returning where the integrity of the Ego could be reconfirmed by the repeated amalgamation of the past and the present. The changes in the political environment gave chance to the exile to go back. As we saw he had enough arguments to do so.

Once again, in the new community it turned out that he was "the other". Even more, because of this bitter social experience, he had become judgmental to the cultural standards in general. He refuses to give them credits and he has developed rationality that frightens his new fellow-citizens. If the locals are led by the thinking out of habit, finding security in their intuitive belongings to the cultural requirements, acting according the ready-made recipes, and not challenging their objectivity, the emigrant knows that nothing guarantees this spontaneous and intuitive life, and that each moment this natural way of looking at the things can fall apart under the shock of some natural or social cataclysm.

His incapability to affiliate with the historically and culturally shaped behavioral patterns, which for the locals have the power of natural laws, distant and eaten up by his studiously-reflective attitude to norms and models, which the rest accept as an utter, absolute, ultimate reality, the exile once again is accepted with a certain amount of suspiciousness. He is inexplicably different, he is at the same breath one of us, but also not, close and distant, understandable and incomprehensible, he is an emigrant.

The emigrants make everything to proof their loyalty. They actively involve themselves in the political life; work at the police; go to fight with Kurdish rebels, happy for the chance to give thanks with their lives to the country that has accepted them as a true motherland. However, in the everyday life the suspicion in the loyalty of the emigrant remains. It is not out spoken, but it is tangible through the communication distance and via unconscious gestures of coldness. It is nothing more but a prejudice, but it is so inexorable because it hardens the marginalization of the emigrant-immigrant as not identical to the group, as other.

The circle has closed. The emigrant has not escaped from its destiny to be the other. He sets off to Bulgaria, to his native lands, from which he was banished out. He sets off to his first otherness, which now is perceived as a search for his lost identity, as returning to the roots, as rediscovering himself.

He returns to meet new hardship. He returns to find out that he returned not where he wanted. He cannot recognize his homeland, aghast by the Odysseus syndrome, which cannot recognize his own Ithaca, because of the mist with which Athena Palad has embraced him to a complex of . spontaneous relations, habits and unreflected adjustments. He craves for those responses from the relatives that do not have to be clarified, to all this that in its integrity creates the sensation of eternity, of permanency, of feeling for continuity of the I, which again finds itself is in the center of its own world. He craves for the same dimensional organization- buildings, streets, trees, nature, sunrises and sunsets, for the same social and personal environment. Well, he finds another place and other relations. The things have changed, the image kept in mind has rearranged in different picture, even when built with the same building blocks.

Initially the exile forgets that he is also not the same that he has changed too. Foremost he has moved away, he has left and to certain extent has been forgotten. He had his own destiny different from

those of the rest who have continued to live in the spontaneity of their natural relations. As a stranger, the returnee rushes into the society and confuses its usual pace of life. He comes with different status, manners, and identity as a part of another – far-off and not well-known world. He is the same but not quite anymore. He has just become a stranger.

In addition, the ones to whom he returns, anticipating to find them the same, they also have changed. They have went through all kind of things, have been involved in different perspectives, in which the returnee does not have place, have realized goals and intensions, that do not have anything in common with the goals and the intensions of the emigrated. We all are dependent on the unidirectional flow of the time. The past has elapsed and could not be restored in the present. At the beginning, the returnee and the ones who had stayed, are engaged to imitate intimacy, try to recall the past, to rebuild the relations as they were before, but nothing is already the same. The past turns to be different in the memory of the exile and the memory of the rest, as it is interpreted in a different way in the light of different experiences and goals, which the two sides have had. The social conditions have changed, and with them the meaning, the weight, given to certain events from the past. The exile does not understand the new social situation, he does not have the knowledge for it and he makes general statements, running from an engagement and valuations. Imitationing intimacy, the alienation barriers become increasingly tangible.

Time is needed, for the emigrant to become involved into real relations on the base of shared goals, common activities, interests, and to some extent, to infringe its engagements with the other community. This happens. Mutual business erects new dependences, reinstating the emotionality of the relations. The emigrant will never belong fully to his old place, but nostalgias are calmed down and some integrity has been restored. Paradoxically this integrity lies on the otherness, which for the exile had become already existential. He is different everywhere- in the previous and in the new motherland. He is equally accepted and alienated - here and there. But he already has found his specific identity in being always slightly different, always on the road, always somewhere between here and there; living in continual uncompleted relationships, having dual social status, and bearing opposite functions in the different social realities.

\* \* \*

At the end, I would like to suggest a relative classification of the emigrant community.

The first and the sparsest subgroup are those of the emigrants entirely socialized into the new social and cultural milieu. They have utterly erased and suppressed the memories of the “other” life, crossed out their past and have merged into the new society. They have adopted “the culturally formed knowledge” of the community, have learned to act in accordance to the local cultural recipes and actually have ceased to be an emigrant-immigrant. They are already local.

The second, a bit bigger group is the one of the emigrant completely unsuccessful in socializing. He failed in his attempts to adapt into a milieu, totally strange to his previous way of life, he does not have the knowledge and cultural recourses, to interpret, compare and study the new reality. It remains impenetrable for him. This group of people plans their way back. When they find it, they also cease to be emigrants. The third and the biggest group is the group of the partially socialized. They formed the specific exile community, recognizing their affiliation to the new society, but also their difference. They not only recognize this fact, but they also have institutionalized themselves as a community with specific interests and position in their new society. They are the travelers; the ones who try to build bridges across their old and their new identity. They are the ones who find in their difference the mainstay to feel unique, like owners of some richer world, a world that although is not reprieved from the discomfort of bifurcation, combines the advantages of both motherlands and belongs solely to them..

From sociological and anthropological as well from psychological point of view, this subgroup is the most interesting to examine, even from the position of above-Balkan territorial and intercultural

society, as it can be viewed as a model for such community as their number will go up if the European integration continues.

## APP. 1

**"BULGARİSTAN'DAN GÖÇ EDEN TÜRK GÖÇMENLERİN TÜRKİYE'DEKİ UYUM VE ÖZDEŞLİK  
PROBLEMLERİ"  
PROJESİ İLE İLGİLİ ANTROPOLOJİK ARAŞTIRMA ANKETİ  
(İzmir Örneği)**

**1. Türkiye'ye hangi yıl göç ettiniz? Geldiğinizde kaç yaşınızdaydınız?**

.....

**2. Kendinizi nasıl tanımlıyorsunuz?**

-Siyasi mülteci

-Ekonomik mülteci

-Hem siyasi hem ekonomik mülteci

**3. Şu andaki ekonomik durumunuz nedir?**

-Aynen Bulgaristan'da olduğu gibi

-Bulgaristan'daki durumumdan daha iyi

-Bulgaristan'daki durumumdan daha kötü

**4. Sosyal statünüzü nasıl değerlendiriyorsunuz?**

-Aynen Bulgaristan'da olduğu gibi

-Bulgaristan'daki durumumdan daha iyi

-Bulgaristan'daki durumumdan daha kötü

**5. Bulgaristan'a karşı özleminiz var mı?**

-Evet

-Çok seyrek

**-Hayır**

**6. Yerli Türk vatandaşları sizleri nasıl kabullenmektedir?**

-Kendilerinden çok farklı kimseler olarak

-Kendilerinden biraz farklı kimseler olarak

-Kendilerinden bir kişi olarak

**7. Siz kendinizi nasıl değerlendiriyorsunuz?**

-Onlardan çok farklı kimseler olarak

-Onlardan biraz farklı kimseler olarak

-Onlardan bir kişi olarak

**8. Yerli vatandaşların sizleri kendilerinden çok farklı bulduklarını niteliklerden üç unsur belirtiniz.**

.....

.....

.....

-Öyle unsurlar yoktur

**9. Kendinizi onlardan farklı bulduğunuz niteliklerden üç unsur belirtiniz**

.....

.....

.....

-Öyle unsurlar yoktur

**10. Bulgaristan'a geliyor musunuz?**

-Sadece bir kez geldim

-Şimdiye dek hiç gelmedim

-Birkaç kez geldim

-Bulgaristan'a sürekli yolculuk ediyorum

**11. Bulgaristan'a yolculuğunuzun nedenleri nelerdir? (Birden fazla seçenek işaretleyebilirsiniz)**

-Dini bayramlar

-Aile ile ilişkili kutlama ve taziyeler vb.

-Akraba görüşmeleri

-Dost görüşmeleri

-Eğitim evrakları düzenlemesi



- Emekli maaşı, tazminat, sigorta ile ilgili işlemler
- Çalışma ile ilgili işler
- Sağlık ve tedavi işleri
- İstirahat için
- Öğrenime devam etmek için ilgili işler için
- Başka işler/Lütfen ayrıntılı belirtiniz.....

**12. Bulgaristan'da oturan Türkler sizleri nasıl kabulleniyorlar?**

- Kendilerinden çok farklı kimseler olarak
- Kendilerinden biraz farklı kimseler olarak
- Kendilerinden bir kişi olarak

**13. Sizler kendinizi nasıl kabulleniyorsunuz?**

- Onlardan çok farklı kimseler olarak
- Onlardan biraz farklı kimseler olarak
- Onlardan bir kişi olarak

**14. Bulgaristan Türklerinin sizleri kendilerinden farklı kişiler olarak değerlendirdikleri niteliklerden üç tanesini yazınız.**

- .....
- .....
- .....

**-Öyle unsurlar yoktur**

**15. Kendinizi onlardan farklı bulduğunuz niteliklerden üç tanesini yazınız**

- .....
- .....
- .....

**-Öyle unsurlar yoktur**

**16. Kendinizi nerede daha iyi hissediyorsunuz?**

- Türkiye'de
- Bulgaristan'da-
- Türkiye'de ve Bulgaristan'da kendimi aynı miktarda iyi hissediyorum
- Türkiye'de ve Bulgaristan'da kendimi aynı miktarda kötü hissediyorum

**17. Bulgaristan'a dönmenize ne engel oluyor?**

- "Soya Dönüş"/"Bulgarlaştırma" sürecinden kalan kötü anılar
- Bulgar milliyetçiliği
- Bulgaristan'da yaşayanların çoğunun ateistliği/dinsizliği
- Ahlaksızlık
- Son derece fazla cinayet ve yolsuzluk olayları
- Bulgaristanın ekonomik durumu
- Azınlıklara yeniden işkence yapılacağı korkusu
- Hayatımda yeni değişiklikler yapma isteksizliği
- Başka/lütfen belirtiniz.....

**18. Bulgaristan ile ilgileniyor musunuz?**

- Bulgaristan'da tüm olup biten ile ilgileniyorum
- Politika ile ilgileniyorum
- Ekonomi ile ilgileniyorum
- Kültür ile ilgileniyorum
- Bilim ile ilgileniyorum
- Sadece yakınlarımla hayattı ile ilgileniyorum
- Bulgaristan ile çok fazla ilgilenmiyorum.

**19. Bulgaristan ile ilgili bilgileri genellikle nereden alıyorsunuz?**

- Bulgaristan ile ilgilenmiyorum
- Türk basını ve medyasından
- Bulgar basını ve medyasından
- Batı basını ve medyasından
- Başka göçmenlerle yaptığımız konuşmalardan, sohbetlerden
- Bulgaristan'da bulunduğum sürelerde yaptığımız sohbetlerden,

-Başka/lütfen belirtiniz.....

**20. Bulgaristan ile ilgileniyorsanız, lütfen ilginizin derecesini belirtir misiniz?**

- İlgilenmiyorum
- Çok az ilgileniyorum
- Orta derecede ilgileniyorum
- Çok ilgileniyorum

**21. KIYASLAYABİLİR MİSİNİZ?**

	Türkiye'de daha iyi	Bulgaristan'da daha iyi	Bilemiyorum
Çalışma Koşulları			
Emek İlişkileri			
Eğitim Durumu			
Sosyal Güvenlik			
Ahlak			
Dine İnanç/Dindarlık			
Medeni Serbestlikler			
Azınlıklara Karşı Münasebetler/ Davranışlar			
Kadınlara Karşı Münasebetler /Davranışlar			

**22. Son Bulgar parlamentosu seçimlerine katıldınız mı?**

- Evet, Oyumu HÖH'ne verdim
- Evet, Oyumu DGB'ye verdim
- Evet, Oyumu BSP'ye verdim
- Evet, Oyumu başka bir partiye verdim
- Hayır, katılmadım

**23. Sizin tahmininize göre gelecek on yıl içinde Türkiye ile Bulgaristan'ın ilişkileri nasıl gelişecektir?**

- Değerlendiremiyorum
- İki ülke arasındaki ilişkiler daha da gerginleşecek
- Çelişkiler olacak, fakat çok hafif olacaktır
- Her tür çelişkiler kalkacak ve iki ülke bir devlet olarak birleşecektir
- Başka/lütfen belirtiniz.....

**24. Göçmenlerin bir örgütüne katılıyor musunuz? Üye misiniz?**

- Evet, yönetimde görevliyim
- Evet, aktif üyeyim
- Evet, üyeyim
- Hayır, katılmıyorum

**25. Türkiye'de bir siyasi partiye üye misiniz?**

- Evet, yönetimde görevliyim
- Evet, aktif üyeyim
- Evet, üyeyim
- Hayır, üye değilim

**26. Türkiye ile ilgileniyor musunuz?**

- Türkiye'de tüm olup biten ile ilgileniyorum
- Politika ile ilgileniyorum
- Ekonomi ile ilgileniyorum

- Kültür ile ilgileniyorum
- Bilim ile ilgileniyorum
- Sadece yakınlarımda hayatı ile ilgileniyorum
- Fazla ilgilenmiyorum

**27. Türkiye ile ilgili bilgileri nereden alıyorsunuz?**

- Türkiye ile ilgilenmiyorum
- Türk basını ve medyasından
- Bulgar basını ve medyasından
- Batı basını ve medyasından
- Başka göçmenlerle yaptığımız konuşmalardan, sohbetlerden
- Başka/lütfen belirtiniz.....

**28. Türkiye ile ilgileniyorsanız, lütfen ilginizin derecesini belirtir misiniz?**

- İlgilenmiyorum
- Çok az ilgileniyorum
- Orta derecede ilgileniyorum
- Çok ilgileniyorum

**29. Şu anda oturduğunuz yeri/semi nasıl ve neden seçtiniz? Hangi faktörler etkili oldu?**  
.....

**30. GÖÇ EDİLEN YER.....**

**31. BULGARİSTAN'DAYKEN İŞİNİZ NE İDİ?.....**

**32. BURADA İŞİNİZ NEDİR?.....**

**33. EĞİTİM DURUMUNUZ?.....**

**34. YAŞINIZ?.....**

**35. DOĞUM YERİNİZ?.....**

**36. CİNSİYETİ?.....**