Developing Women's Spaces: Evaluation of the Importance of Sex-segregated Spaces for Gender and Development Goals in Southeastern Turkey

LEILA M. HARRIS
Corresponding Author: lharris@ires.ubc.ca

NURCAN ATALAN

2002/2004

Final version: Harris, L. and N. Atalan (2002/2004) Developing Women's Spaces: Evaluation of the Importance of Sex-segregated Spaces for Gender and Development Goals in Southeastern Turkey. Kadin/Woman 2000 3(2): 17–46.

INSTITUTE FOR RESOURCES, ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY
UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Table of Contents

SUMMARY

As part of Turkey's ambitious Southeastern Anatolia development project (GAP), community centers catering largely to women are being established throughout Turkey's southeast, with aims to teach literacy and entrepreneurial skills, build confidence, and to help overcome considerable gender disparities that characterize the region. This paper interrogates the importance of these centers (CATOM) in relation to experiences of those who participate in the centers, state goals, and in conversation with theoretical understandings of gender and space. In particular, we consider the importance of sex-segregated spaces for the women and girls who participate in center activities. Additionally, we critically evaluate the center model to serve as input into planning processes, with particular attention to the relationship between outcomes of the spaces and stated goals and intent of the community centers. We also conclude with a brief discussion of how this work may contribute to advance theoretical understandings of the connections between gender and space, as well as gender theorizations of states.

Ozet

Cok kapsamli bir bolge kalkinma projesi olan Guneydogu Anadolu Projesi kapsaminda genel olarak kadinlara okuma-yazma ve girisimcilik ogreten, ozguvenlerini gelistiren ve Bolge'deki toplumsal cinsiyet farkliliklarinin ustesinden gelmek icin hizmet veren toplum merkezleri (CATOM), Turkiye'nin guneydogusunda kurulmaya baslandi. Bu makalede, bu merkezlerin onemi, katilimcilarin deneyimleri, devletin bu merkezleri kurmaktaki amaci teorik cercevede toplumsal cinsiyet ve mekan kavramlari uzerinden tartisilmaya calisilacaktir. Burada, ozellikle, bu merkezlerde kurslara katilan genc kiz ve kadinlar acisindan cinsiyete gore ayrilmis mekanlarin oneminden, mekanlarin hizmet ettigi ciktilar ile devletin amaclari arasindaki iliskiden bahsedilmekte ve yakin gelecekte acilmasi planlanan pek cok merkez dusunuldugunde merkez modeli icin girdi olusturabilecek elestirel bir degerlendirme getirilmektedir. Sonuc kisminda ise, bu calismanin toplumsal cinsiyet ve mekan arasindaki iliski konusundaki teorik calismalara ne gibi katkilari olacagina dair kisa bir tartisma yer almaktadir.

I INTRODUCTION

Beginning in 1995, the Turkish government, in cooperation with other development partners, (1) established a network of community centers throughout the Southeastern Anatolia region, a region known for its poverty, hierarchical social relations, and considerable numbers of non-Turkish speaking residents. (2) Identified as a possible mechanism to improve the status of women, (3) these centers became operative as part of the large multi-faceted GAP project, a state-led development program intended to promote economic and social development throughout the southeastern region (GAP stands for the Southeastern Anatolia Project, see Unver, 1997; Saltik, 1994 for details on GAP programs and on the status of women in the region, respectively). As such, CATOM centers constitute a central component of recent state efforts to advance 'human centered development', extending attention of GAP planners beyond hydroelectric generation and economic growth to promotion of education, social equity, and participation of local populations. After decades of criticism and learning from gender and development studies in other contexts, Turkish government attempts to integrate women and gender concerns into development planning have been almost solely focused on CATOM efforts. As such, the centers have become largely synonymous with the 'gender' component of GAP development efforts, and therefore represent a central mechanism through which the state endeavors to transform 'women' and 'gender', making women of the southeast 'targets' of developmental discourse and programs (cf. Abu-Lughod, 1998).

While CATOM spaces were initially referred to as 'women's centers', more recently, they are referred to as 'multipurpose community centers' (Cok Amacli Toplum Merkezi), symbolically signaling a shift from a women-only approach, to a more inclusive approach that addresses needs of disadvantaged populations generally (the majority of CATOM centers are located in poor and underserved urban areas). Despite this broadened focus, the centers still cater largely to women, teaching literacy, (4) entrepreneurial and craft skills, and encouraging social interaction in an effort to bring women more fully into public life. In this paper, we critically evaluate the spaces and outcomes of these centers for three reasons. First, in the Turkish case, and potentially elsewhere, centers such as these serve as an interesting model to address gender components of development programs. As we describe in this paper, efforts of the centers appear to be successful in encouraging social interaction and building skills and confidence among young women, suggesting they may be useful in bringing women more fully into development efforts. Second, we believe that there are significant unexamined assumptions about gender and space that underlie the logic and function of the centers. We intend to provide a critical discussion of the centers that elaborates upon these unexamined assumptions and outcomes, especially to highlight connections between gender and space. Third, we believe that this discussion also contributes to a growing literature on gendered understandings of states and state practices, as well as related work on gender and nationalism. In particular, the CATOM case serves as a very deliberate example whereby states endeavor to rework gender relationships, allowing our critical evaluation of the center model to serve as a response to call to understand gender aspects of state planning and practices, enabling richer theorizations of the 'ways gender regimes are shaped, reinforced, and reworked within the state' (Cravey, 1998). This discussion, therefore, serves broader discussions related to ways that women are ambiguously enrolled in projects of modernity 'with all their unintended consequences' (Abu-Lughod, 1998), ways that differential citizenship is played out in emerging and institutional spaces (Brown, 1997), as well as gendered constructions of nationalism, in which women are simultaneously central and marginal to nationalist projects (Kandiyoti, 1991 ; Yuval-Davis, 1999; Mayer, 2000).

To serve these broader goals, we offer a study of CATOM centers that emphasizes dynamic relationships between gender, development, state practices, and space. We begin with an investigation of the characteristics of the center spaces, highlighting aspects detailed by center participants as being important for their ability to feel welcome and comfortable. As part of this discussion in section II, we provide a general overview of the types of courses and activities offered at CATOM centers, emphasizing factors that were mentioned by center participants as being significant for their continuing interest and participation, such as female-only courses, the role of permission from family members, and socialization

opportunities provided by the centers. With this background, we turn to our critical evaluation of CATOMs in section III, calling attention to questions and critiques raised by the center approach, and noting some important tensions between state approaches to education in the region generally, and how these are negotiated differently through the CATOM model. For example, whereas the state mandates eight-year compulsory education throughout Turkey, there is implicit acknowledgement with the CATOM model that in fact many girls in the region do not attend school and there may be a need for alternative programs and opportunities. This discussion also includes attention to the divide between state intent with respect to the centers, and observable outcomes. It is very deliberate that our evaluation stresses both apparent strengths and weaknesses of the center approach. We do so, first highlighting positive elements before turning to our critiques, in the hope that our evaluation will provide useful and constructive feedback to GAP planners. It is noteworthy, as will be apparent from our discussion, that many center participants demonstrate a markedly positive perception of the centers. We believe that critiques of the center model are important, but do not wish to present them in the first instance in a manner that will overshadow the enthusiasm for center programs conveyed to us by many young women in the region. We conclude in section IV with a discussion of the state's implied goals with respect to gender through the CATOM approach, focusing on the use of these spaces to produce an emerging gendered citizenry. This discussion connects our evaluation of the center model to broader discussions of gender and space, and gendered theorizations of states.

The material used for this paper is based primarily on discussions of a focus group meeting [5] conducted on October 31,2001 at a center in Sanli Urfa, a city of the Southeastern Anatolia region near the border with Syria. This CATOM was one of the first centers to be established in the region, in 1995. There were nine participants in the focus group discussion, with ages varying between 13 and 20 years. One participant had been coming to the center consistently over several years, while others had only been participating for several months. In addition to the focus group discussion, we also draw on observations from several months of fieldwork carried out in the Southeastern Anatolia region during the fall of 2001. [6] Together, we visited seven of the network of 21 CATOMs active at that time. In addition to observations and informal interviews at each of these centers, we also draw on other data collected as part of a larger research project related to gender effects of changing agro-ecological practices associated with irrigation (see Harris, under review), including a survey of households in the Harran plain conducted cooperatively with faculty and students from Harran University. [7]

II WHAT TYPES OF SPACES?[8]

In southeastern Turkey, it is common that girls may not participate in formal education, with approximately two-thirds of females in the GAP region attending primary school (numbers fall drastically for middle school and beyond). [9] Often girls' marriage, or opportunities to work or travel outside the home, may also be subject to decision-making authority of family members, though this undoubtedly varies from family to family. Other trends in the region include high rates of formal illiteracy (44% of women, and 18% of men estimated to be formally illiterate, GAP-RDA, 2002), relatively early marriage age (on average 21.7 years for women) [10] and high rates of fertility (approximately double the national average in Turkey). [11] With the few opportunities for formal employment in the region reserved mostly for men, women and girls often remain at home, engaged in some combination of domestic and/or agricultural work. In urban areas, this balance is weighted towards engagement in domestic reproductive labor. The situation that results in the urban areas is that many young girls have little opportunity for work, learning, or associational opportunities outside of the home, especially after they have reached puberty. At times, work expectations in terms of domestic labor, for example cooking or care of younger siblings, may also be considerable. The vast majority of CATOM centers are sited in relatively impoverished urban neighborhoods, many of which might be populated by families who have recently migrated from rural areas. This siting is deliberate in an attempt to reach young girls who may face considerable economic, social, or cultural hurdles in terms of access to educational and social opportunities.

In our focus group discussion, many young women who participate in CATOM activities note that for the first time, they feel that they are capable and skilled, have friends, or can imagine making an income of their own. As noted by Sadiman, "I think I can do everything now because of CATOM. I feel as though I

succeeded in something.... Now I am free, I can go everywhere." (12) Berivan similarly demonstrates pride in her accomplishments, "Now my mother and father are proud of me because I can do everything. I went to both sewing and embroidery courses, and also to cloth painting courses. I mean, I learned everything that is offered here." (13) From similar comments made by other girls, and from success stories reported in GAP documents, (14) it is clear that CATOMs serve an important function in allowing these women to pursue education and social interaction in an atmosphere that is supportive and non-threatening. (15) What the reports on the centers seem to understate is the importance of the physical and social space of the centers themselves. What is the value in having women-only spaces of interaction? Why is it important to have a multiple and varied course offerings at the centers, encouraging women to participate over long periods of time, allowing them to return and enroll in further coursework? What type of atmosphere in the centers allows women to feel comfortable and accepted, and how are spaces of the centers interpreted and viewed by women who participate in center programs? Further, what structural or spatial barriers may exist that keep centers from realizing stated goals of promoting education and opportunities for women? We argue that explicit consideration of these types of questions, examining the importance, function, and character of the CATOM spaces themselves, is critical to evaluate the success of CATOM centers, its potential as a model for other development efforts, and in considering possibilities for extension or alteration of CATOM efforts over the coming years. During an interview with one state agent, it was informally mentioned that planners hope to extend the network of CATOM centers to as many as several hundred centers in the coming decades. (16)

CATOMs offer a variety of courses, from diploma equivalency certificates, to sewing and embroidery. It appears to be common that a girl will come to the center and enroll in sewing or crafts, and perhaps after making friends and becoming an active participant in the center, she may decide to enroll in literacy courses, or get a middle school equivalency degree. Government documents note that to date, 60,000 people have participated in center programs, with nearly 2705 women benefiting from literacy courses in 2001 alone. (17) What is lacking from these statistics related to course enrollment is consideration of the characteristics of the centers themselves that allow women and girls to feel a sense of comfort, belonging, and even attachment to the centers. What do they note as being important characteristics of the centers that allow them to feel comfortable participating? What does an appreciation for these characteristics allow us to learn about relationships between gender and development processes, linkages between gender and space, and relations with other important notions of 'difference' (whether religious, linguistic, educational, or otherwise)? From our research, it appears that maintaining sex-segregated spaces is one of several factors especially critical for girls' participation in this context, in terms of access to the activities of the centers (notably gaining permission from family members), their own comfort in participating in the courses, and to foster a sense of belonging among the participants.

In our focus group meeting with participants at the Sanli Urfa center, girls emphasized repeatedly the importance of the CATOMs as female-only spaces for their ability to gain permission to attend from family members. It was clear from many of the girls that if ever the CATOM they attend became a space for both men and women; they likely would be unable to continue attending. As Zara asserted, "parents would not give permission if there were courses for men in the CATOM also." Another teenager, Serap, noted that even speculation that men might attend CATOMs would moan an end to her parents' permission, "Before, my grandfather used to live here, and so one day they told him that men also enter CATOMs. Then my grandfather told my mother and my mother then told me 'if men really come to CATOM then I won't give you permission to go there'." (18) It was only after that she confirmed that the CATOM is only frequented by women that she allowed Serap to continue attending. Nearly every girl in our focus group recounted similar stories about the importance of sex-segregated spaces for their ability to obtain permission to attend, making a strong case that keeping spaces as women-only is vital for girls' access to center programs. In several CATOMs, for example in Adiyaman, it was emphasized in interviews with center staff that women and men participate. In fact, during a visit there three young men were painting in one of the rooms of the center, and pictures of center participants included a number of men in English and computer courses offered on weekends. (19) While this trend is encouraging in that training is being offered to any person interested, it also threatens a fundamental goal of the centers to create opportunities far women and girls if young girls would no longer be able to attend. If CATOMs do continue to accept men and boys more openly in their programs, it would be preferable if mixed courses were offered only at specific times, for example on weekends. Such a clear division may make it possible for girls subject to

restrictive family rules to continue participating in center programs on a regular basis.

It is interesting to note as well that in many statements made by the center participants, the girls recognize, and seemingly accept, social barriers to their participation. As Berivan notes, "Because even (if) your parents give permission then neighbors will see it, relatives will perceive it in a different way" adding "They'll interpret it in a bad way, therefore, parents are not obliged to give permission. They (parents) won't give permission no matter how much you want to come here." (20) Dilsad added "... in these districts, (like ours), even (if) the parents allow their daughters to go out, the neighbors start murmuring and start bothering the girl even if the girl wears a headscarf to go out, just because she goes out." (21) For girls who are allowed in principle to attend CATOM courses, the difficulties associated with traveling to the centers may also present an important obstacle. Several girls commented that they are only able to attend because they have other participants to travel with, for example o sister or close neighbor. These statements suggest questions of access are not limited to personal decisions of other family members, but the families and the girls understand themselves as parts of larger networks of social interaction, and related pressures to conform to generalized expectations for young girls prevalent throughout the region. In short, it is important to contextualize access to center activities in relation to social norms in the region that often result in many girls never being sent to school, or being withdrawn when they roach puberty to avoid perceived impropriety. Therefore, girls' access is contingent on multiple and embedded sets of expectations and possibilities. If a travel companion has too much work at home one day, or if the social pressure from neighbors mounts, access might be withdrawn--it is always tenuous and in question. Difficulties associated with travel to the centers suggest that the location of centers is also critical for questions of participation and access, issues we address later in our evaluation of the center model.

Apart from access, it is also evident from the girls' comments that having female-only spaces, and having all participants being of similar age (participants are generally single girls in their teens) is significant for their ability to feel comfortable and at ease in the space of the center. Azra, who appeared less willing to accept limitations on girl's access and mobility expressed by other participants, added to the conversation, "But if men start coming here then girls won't be as free as they used to be." (22) Another girl elaborated, "For example, they (girls) could not talk freely, they could not do their work in a relaxed way. But since everyone here is a girl, we can do everything freely, we get along well and we do everything accordingly then." (23) Sadiman noted that having female teachers and participants enables participants to be relaxed to the extent that centers have a 'family atmosphere', inferring by her statement that in some cases the girls are even more relaxed then when they are at the CATOM than if they were at their own home, where male members including fathers and brothers, and work requirements, might create a more restrictive and demanding atmosphere. (24)

Work responsibility in the home is a primary factor that keeps girls from being able to attend center activities, and also provides a compelling reason why many girls enjoy and appreciate time spent in the center and away from home. When the discussion turned to these issues during our focus group, several participants noted that they were very sad and disappointed when work keeps them away from the center and their friends. Expressing her enjoyment in spending time with the other women, Sadiman emphatically expressed "I don't want to go home even a little bit. We have become friends with the teachers, we don't want to leave." (25) Others expressed that they would be happier if they could come to the CATOM during the weekend as well, when it is closed, with one girl referring to the difficulty of being at home away from friends those 'two days as if they were like two years'. (26) Gurbet, the only child in her family explained, "When I come here, I'm very happy. I can see all of my friends together ... If I don't come here then I won't be able to see my friends. I wish we had courses at the weekend also." (27) Berivan echoed her preference for spending time with the like-minded girls in her age group, "when you see your friends everyday, you get used to that. If there were courses at the weekend also, it would be better. Because you get used to your friends, even not seeing each other for two days, you miss your friends." (28) Zeliha joined the conversation by saying, "When I don't come here, I feel bored at home." (29) When we asked in response to these comments whether girls could see each other on weekends, by getting together on their own, there was general agreement that they would not be granted permission.

It appears from all of these statements that CATOM spaces provide the girls not only with an opportunity to study and acquire skills, but importantly the centers also provide social spaces in which to interact,

make friends, and benefit from an environment outside of their homes where they might be expected to work, are subject to restrictive family rules, or are monitored closely. Perhaps apart from courses, one of the most beneficial things CATOMs are able to provide is a space where they are no longer a 'daughter' or 'sister', but simply a 'friend' or 'classmate', being able to shed the expectations and restrictions that may go along with their familial roles. Elfida expressed this feeling by noting that when she comes to CATOM girls are able to "forget about their house, their district ... I mean we forget about everything." (30) Thus, the reality that there is a separate physical space far CATOM, apart from the home, appears to have great symbolic and material importance for participants.

Interestingly, being able to attend classes at CATOM also may give the girls an opportunity far greater mobility and freedom outside of class time. Perhaps because they have displayed their maturity in coming to classes, and in some cases, the families are pleased with small sums of money girls are able to earn through their handiwork learned at the centers, girls are sometimes able to travel to purchase materials needed for their CATOM activities. Berivan explained this, "I can go out with my friend. My family would give me permission. We used to go out with neighbor's daughters, for example, far thread for embroidery, or cloth paint (for classes), my parents would allow me to go out to shop for these things. And for those items we could not buy we'd tell to our teacher and she'd buy them for us." (31) Her participation in CATOM painting and embroidery classes therefore opened a legitimate space far her to go out of the house, and see friends, even apart from formal coursework.

In Turkey, where men frequently come together in coffeehouses to play games and meet with friends, the value of similar spaces of interaction for women cannot be understated. CATOMs appear to serve this need by providing opportunities for interaction among young women, integrating both entertainment and educational elements. For girls who may be entering their late teens without literacy skills, beginning their education with non-threatening courses such as embroidery and sewing, with the possibility that they might later join literacy or other courses, is a powerful approach, providing a non-threatening entree for more formal learning opportunities. Some of these girls, lacking a formal education, may otherwise feel intimidated by a more structured educational environment. In contrast to formal educational programs, there are also aspects of CATOM that are more flexible, less strict, and therefore more inviting given common preferences of the girls and families in the region. With the more informal center approach to education that requires the girls' interest and motivation to enroll in coursework, there is also visible evidence of girls being very proud of having completed courses, being able to claim accomplishment in sewing or embroidery even if they cannot read or write, thereby gaining confidence and skills at a self-directed pace. All considered there are obviously many facets of the CATOM model that appear to be successful in the context of Turkey's southeast.

III CRITICAL EVALUATIONS OF CATOMS

i. Flexible state approaches?

Interestingly, when evaluating the CATOM model in relation to other state mandates and programs, there are revealing tensions and contradictions of state approaches that are noteworthy. Calling attention to these tensions is not necessarily to imply weaknesses in the center approach, but in some senses to applaud the compromises suggested by some of the more yielding approaches realized by the CATOM model. For example, although the formal position of the Turkish government is that boys and girls should be educated for a minimum of eight years, CATOM staff and offerings implicitly acknowledge that for many, especially for young girls, this is not the case. Recognizing that education mandates simply do not work for large portions of the population (ie. girls might be kept from school altogether rather than allowing daughters to mingle with boys in classrooms, or to be seen in public without head covering), CATOM centers therefore may provide a vital middle ground that recognizes some of the needs and concerns of families, and constraints placed on the girls in terms of needing to meet family work requirements or other expectations. (32)

At CATOM centers, girls can come and go as they wish; they may miss large amounts of time to work for families in the fields or at home. Girls may also participate in CATOM courses wearing headscarves.

Though it may appear as to be banal, allowing girls to attend CATOM courses wearing a headscarf is remarkable given that debate on the issue still rages in Turkey, often with strict applications of the law. For example, girls who wear headscarves continue to be forbidden from taking university entrance exams, effectively barring them from admission to college. (33) Allowing women to dress as they choose at the centers therefore stands out as an important feature that enables many women and girls to feel comfortable and included. In fact, not only do large numbers of center participants wear headscarves, (34) but instructors are also often covered, a feature that would never be observed in the formal education system. Having state employees who are covered in 'state' sanctioned spaces of the centers underscores the remarkable leniency of the CATOM approach given continued enforcement of headscarf bans in public buildings across the Republic. In a similar fashion, strict requirements that only Turkish should be spoken in public schools are also softened with the CATOM approach. When asked directly about this issue, one CATOM staff recounted that girls are not reprimanded for speaking languages other than Turkish, but undoubtedly, employees will always address participants in Turkish. In sum, the CATOM model in some senses demonstrates a more forgiving and compromising state approach to girls' education, with great potential to advance educational goals over strict approaches that have often exacerbated the situation for girls in the region.

As already emphasized, another important characteristic of CATOMs that is in marked tension with other state approaches to girls' education is the willingness (at least in practice at several centers) to offer single-sex educational opportunities. (35) In a survey of rural households (including both male and female respondents), the majority of respondents (approximately 64%) agreed that if there were separate classrooms for boys and girls in schools, more girls would likely be educated. (36) Gurbet, a CATOM participant, similarly commented on her own situation, "Why did I not go to school? Because there were men, my father did not give permission because of that, I mean because there were boys and girls in the same place." (37) When asked pointedly to GAP planners if offering single-sex classrooms would ever be considered as an approach to encourage girls' education generally (a stated goal of GAP efforts with respect to improving the status of women in the region), the reply indicated that this would not be considered since providing separate spaces for girls and boys would be perceived as countering government gender equity goals. As the examples given have demonstrated, providing women-only spaces serves important functions related to girls' ability to access the centers, contributes to their comfort level, and fosters a sense of belonging among the girls. While provision of similar opportunities to men and boys may be an important step, we argue that there is a continuing need for female-only spaces, at least in the immediate term. Considered together, the more compromising and lenient state approach enlivened by CATOM centers has the potential to create open and welcoming spaces that might also encourage greater female participation in economic and social life in the Southeastern Anatolia region generally. While we have emphasized many positive aspects of the CATOM model, this is not to suggest that there are not other elements that should be critically evaluated and questioned, especially as GAP implementation continues over the coming decades. Below, we critically evaluate CATOM center outcomes with respect to program intent and goals.

ii. State Intent and Outcomes?

The CATOM initiative was first launched in two pilot locations, one in a rural area and the other in a relatively poor section of the city of Sanli Urfa (the site of our focus group discussion), with the support of UNICEF and in partnership with the Sanli Urfa Governorship and the GAP Administration. (38) Primary goals were to encourage local people, particularly women, to define their problems; to motivate them to find solutions; to develop self-confidence; and to elicit active participation and leadership in social and economic life. In short, the center approach constituted a central feature of state efforts to encourage local participation in development efforts, in order to promote 'sustainable human-centered development' suitable to regional conditions. (39) In order to realize these goals, CATOM programs specifically aim to increase literacy among women, as well as to provide basic education on health (including reproductive health, child care, and nutrition), personal hygiene, and environmental issues. Additionally, there are economic components of center efforts, namely to foster skills in income generating activities and to provide employment skills by cultivating team-work and associability, as well as to increase women's

access to public services. [40] While we cannot evaluate CATOM success with respect to each of these varied goals, we do provide a selective discussion of relative merit and accomplishments of different aspects of these center programs.

While the center approach with respect to offering non-threatening and inviting educational opportunities has merit, it can also be criticized for representing a non-serious approach to education. As schools would ordinarily offer courses in math or science, the majority of CATOM coursework involves 'feminine' skills of embroidery, sewing, or painting, with literacy and similar courses standing out as exceptional rather than the norm. That issue aside, CATOMs do offer equivalency degrees. Berivan mentioned that she received her primary school equivalency diploma through the CATOM since she was not able attend primary school. For Azra, who did not graduate from primary school, her main motivation to attend CATOM was to get a diploma; it was only after earning her degree that she registered for sewing and embroidery courses. It is interesting to note that these girls' parents did not allow them to attend school, but are allowing their daughters to get a diploma. There are several possible explanations for this. One is that the parents might have changed their minds over time as the girls aged. More likely, there are qualitatively different characteristics of the centers that are more palatable for them than formal education opportunities. Indeed, one purpose of this paper is to attempt to sort out such characteristics. To reiterate, several characteristics that have been mentioned include flexible timing that allows girls to also meet demands at home, ability to speak native languages, lenience towards attending classes wearing headscarves, and perhaps most notable, the availability of sex-segregated learning opportunities. Given the success of CATOM in reaching girls as a result of these characteristics, the question then becomes whether some of these approaches might be also adopted by more formal educational contexts, specifically in primary or middle schools, especially given that eight years of formal education is intended to be mandatory. CATOMs should be lauded for providing viable possibilities for girls in some respects; however, learning sewing should also not be accepted as an alternative to reading, writing, and other skills that might promote greater equity and participation over the long term.

Interestingly, the girls we interviewed demonstrated a keen awareness of state intent regarding the centers. When asked what they think the goals of the center may be and why the center was established, where it was, Sadiman responded "Most probably the State wants to incorporate us to the society as useful people. Because (we are in) an illiterate district, and many districts here are illiterate, lacking education. I think that's why ... and since some of our friends are illiterate, when they cannot read something on the street, some make fun of them. They call them illiterate. That's why one of my friends cried, and so she told me to register her here, because she said she wanted to learn how to read and write. Right now, she can read and write, that's very good." [41] For Zara, "perhaps the State wants us to be more useful, to be more conscious", and for Zeliha, the center is especially set up in that district because "they know that girls here are not allowed to study." Sadiman noted changes after the establishment of CATOM, "In the past, we were as third class people. But right now, I don't feel like that. We feel the joy of knowing something, doing something ... I could not go to school. I could not get a diploma. I thought life was over for me. But right now, I'll get a diploma ... I'll continue until I have all the opportunities." [42] Whether or not these girls were well versed in the goals of the center, or just inferred these goals is uncertain. Their statements do closely approximate formal state documents of what the centers are meant to achieve, namely increased confidence, literacy, and associability. Especially in terms of self-confidence, many of the girls noted a much better sense of self and accomplishment, as demonstrated in this statement by Berivan, "By coming here, a person feels proud of herself. For example, she knows that she can succeed in everything. For instance, I was at home before and I could not dare to do something. I would say 'I cannot do that', but since I came here, I can dare to do every work right now, I'm even eager to do it and I believe that I can succeed. Now, I have self- confidence, I know I can succeed in everything." [43]

Among critiques of CATOM programs have been concerns raised by Kurdish feminists related to what they view as assimilationist and culturalist aspects of center programs. For instance, some have raised concerns that literacy programs that promote Turkish over native Arabic or Kurdish spoken by many women at home, or family planning efforts that aim to reduce natality among these populations are problematic (e.g. Acik, 2002; Roza 1998; Roza, 999). [44] In contrast to some of these critiques, it is noteworthy that Turkish literacy is not required of center participants languages spoken are not enforced by center staff, though unquestionably, some level of fluency would be required since instruction is

provided solely in Turkish. Among the girls we spoke with, Elfida has only attended embroidery courses to date, suggesting that there is not pressure to enroll in literacy courses from outset, and relatedly, that promotion of Turkish is not a singular or overarching goal of CATOMs. Moreover, many of the girls we met with who attended CATOM courses already knew Turkish, either through several years of primary school, or through television--noted by many as an important vehicle for Turkish education among young girls in recent years. (45)

Apart from literacy and family planning aspects, state planning documents frequently highlight the goal of providing income-generating opportunities for girls. Another critique that emerges when this intent of centers is compared with outcomes, is that state efforts to promote 'income earning opportunities' is overly optimistic, especially given the heavy course concentration on crafts. For some women and girls this is creating false hopes with respect to what economic gains are actually realizable after courses in sewing or painting have been completed. In fact, based on our observations, very few girls are able to earn money. There were several instances of girls having earned enough money to buy their own sewing machine, but it was far more common that girls might only earn enough from sales of their crafts to buy replacement supplies. Berivan clarifies "Our teacher says if we want to sell our work, she can help us to sell it. Then she sells it and we can buy our cloth paint with that money, or embroidery string. I mean we meet our costs that way." Based on conversations in CATOMs throughout the region, most of the participants are in fact earning only small pin money, or are preparing wares for their ceyiz (trouseau). Berivan, comments, "I have kept my work as part of my trousseau until now. But for example, if my aunt wants something, I do it for her. I also do some so for other relatives ... I just do it for my aunts, without money.... For other relatives' work, I ask for some money, whatever they give." (46) There is clear evidence that girls are proud of their achievements and crafts, but very few actually appear to be able to earn any significant income from their work.

In the several CATOMs where income-generating activities have become a major focus of center efforts, for example centers in Batman and Mardin, these 'successes' must also be questioned. At these locations, participants and staff are visibly enthusiastic about the establishment of sewing centers that accept short-term contracts (for example, to sew government uniforms). In reality, women who participate in these contract activities are actually engaging in flexible labor that foils to meet state mandated minimum pay requirements and benefits that would be required of another employer. As such, the desirability of establishing work opportunities whereby women are not guaranteed wages, there is no reliable contract, and where they are paid below the standard minimum payments of $156/month (or 250,000,000TL and 1 $USD=1,600,000TL) must be questioned. In this respect, quite simply, the state is complicit with engaging these women in underpaid flexible labor. As the radical feminist journal Pazartesi contests, "Who other than women will provide the cheap labor for a region that the State is trying to make attractive for capital?" (47) The article clearly places the CATOM network as at the center of attempts to make women's cheap labor available for exploitation, noting "Both CATOMs and other community centers working under governorates are working to meet (the) basic criteria for women to be employed in factories, to be literate and to have a school diploma." As an extension of this observation, the article argues that learning Turkish in CATOMs will not only provide Kurdish women the opportunity to participate in public spaces, but at the same time "the women will attain the opportunity to be exploited by capitalism, with the opportunity, to transition from being unpaid slaves in the home to paid slaves." (48) Indeed in our research, several focus group participants said they would seek employment if a factory were to open that required sewing or other skills they had learned at the center, suggesting that resulting from their experiences at CATOM, the girls are keen to enter the paid labor market if such options were available. Other women remarked that it would be preferable to have such income opportunities at CATOM centers themselves, since otherwise they would anticipate difficulties gaining permission to work from family members if factories employed both men and women. As voiced succinctly by Berivan, "Only if it's all of us (women) working there then they'd give us permission." (49)

Besides the contract production efforts at Mardin and Batman centers, there were also women at the Sanli Urfa Yakubiye center who were very hopeful about the earning potential from production of Christmas stockings for sale in the USA. In fact, a contract for the stockings was eventually arranged through a private partner. (50) Whereas participants generally interpreted these efforts as hopeful, we were again left with the definite impression that the CATOM was raising false hopes for these women. With the stocking deal, hailed as a great success in attempts to find markets for CATOM crafts, women will

produce stockings for approximately $15 a piece, with each piece requiring almost a full week of work (according to one woman engaged in the production). Again, this is not even half the minimum pay requirement for anyone engaged in formal full-time work in Turkey. As many of the CATOM staff at all locations emphasized, a primary need they see for CATOMs is to find markets to sell the craft goods produced. One sales center in Diyarbakir that was explicitly established for this purpose was forced to shut down after only a year of operation. (51) It is possible, as many CATOM staff suggest, that there could be improved efforts to find buyers for the goods. It is also possible, however, that there is not an effective demand for these items. (52) Sadiman, a veteran participant at the center, notes "Right now the sales are very little" (53) Another participant noted when we returned to a CATOM after a several week absence, "you were the last ones to purchase anything from the center." (54) Dilsad similarly lamented, "Only those who visit the center buy our work. People of Urfa don't buy them". (55) For the most part, people who visit the centers do so because they are interested in the center programs, or are on tour with GAP administration officials.

Yet another critique can be waged against the 'sustainability' of CATOM centers. The GAP project as a whole is meant to foster 'sustainable development', understood in part in relation to notions of autonomy of program elements and participation of target populations in project development so that efforts are locally motivated and appropriate. There are several ways that the centers may not be meeting the state's expectations of 'sustainable', 'participatory' development. In part, the centers themselves have not yet been able to generate enough income to sustain themselves, nor have they found significant alternative sources of support apart from the central government in Ankara. (56) Perhaps more important, there is concern that the centers themselves are not models of participatory development given that course offerings and other facets of the programs are determined centrally in Ankara, rather than locally by the participants themselves. The question also remains of how long CATOMs can be sustained, especially given plans to increase the number of centers over time, given that efforts to realize income generation remain elusive.

Apart from these issues, a stronger critique of center programs relates to the fact that while stated goals are to overcome gender disparities in the region, courses offered in fact serve to consolidate and solidify gender norms by teaching women sewing, child care, nutrition, and family planning--having the effect of reifying notions of appropriate femininity rather than providing coursework that might counter traditional notions of femininity. As Dilsad notes (albeit enthusiastically) "Here we learn how to sew, how to do embroidery with the machine and how to paint cloth ... For example, today I did cloth painting, tomorrow I can go to sewing courses or to embroidery courses. Or there can be home-related courses and I can learn how to bake a cake ..." (57) In part, this is an attempt to respond to the needs and interests of girls, but the appropriateness of enforcing and reifying such gender divides over the long term is problematic at best. It would seem worthwhile to consider integrating alternative coursework that might counter, rather than reify, gender norms, for instance, offering coursework related to accounting, farming techniques or other possible skills. Along these lines, it is noteworthy that in Saltik's assessment of the situation of women in the GAP region (1994), agriculture, animal husbandry, and handicrafts are all noted as potential areas for projects related to women, though in practice, CATOMs appear to have only attempted to teach handicrafts to date.

While we do not wish to present a long list of concerns with the centers, given that in some respects they are among the most successful aspects of GAP efforts, there are other critiques that merit attention. During initial conversations with GAP administrators, it was noted that there was some disappointment in terms of activities only reaching young girls. Our research bore this observation out, with many girls elaborating on reasons why married women most often do not participate in center programs, as well as a number of other factors that limit many girls' participation. As noted, the majority of women and girls who participate in center activities are unmarried. It was often noted that once girls marry, they would no longer be able to attend because of considerable work responsibilities in their homes, especially when they themselves have children. For Zeliha's elder sister, with whom Zeliha used to travel to the center, she has no longer been able to attend since her marriage. For many, the mother-in-law may not give permission for brides to attend courses, often because of work expectations. Even if the married girl lives in a separate house, she often feels as though she cannot come to the CATOM for fear of not meeting expectations of her in-laws. As explained by Elfide, "There is also the daughter-in-law of my aunt, she also wants to come, but she says 'my mother-in-law will get angry with me'." (58) Similarly, Zeliha's older

sister would have preferred to continue attending after her marriage, but her husband has determined that the family will leave the city to work as seasonal cotton pickers, and does not permit her to attend even when they are in the city. Zeliha elaborated, "He said 'What will you do there as a woman? As a woman you should sit in your home'. Her mother-in-law also did not allow it, even though she has a separate house. I mean, it does not matter whether she lives together with them or lives separate, they would not allow her." (59) The girls seemed to agree that once married, women are expected to remain home, or as Zeliha summarized, "a married woman shall be the woman of her house." (60) These statements in part illuminate the observable age distribution of participants.

These expectations associated with marriage were also taken as reason for many girls that they should take advantage of their single status to participate in CATOM activities. Berivan expresses this sentiment, "Surely, when a person marries, it cannot be the same. I mean a single and a married person. But a person should do everything when she is single." (61) Dilsad endorsed this statement, "Join everything before you marry, before you become the woman of your home ... to live your life." (62) However, given the fact that girls marry relatively young in this region (in our survey, average age of marriage for women was 18.7 years, compared to 22.3 years for men), (63) the amount of time that a girl/woman can be expected to participate in CATOM activities appears to be limited. Elfide voiced this constraint faced by the girls "If you take the opinion of my parents, they'll get you married at the age of 12. My uncle's daughter got married; she married at the age of 12. She now has a daughter. How can you take care of both, both the house and the baby? She tells me 'Now, we'll see how you do that' and I say 'I won't get married, you'll see." (64) Dilsad expressed contentment about being single that was also echoed by several others, suggesting they are happy because they are "single and to able to know CATOM." (65) Interestingly, even for girls who are not married, the marital situation of others in their family could impinge on their ability to attend. For instance, one participant anticipated that with her sister's marriage in two weeks, she would then be expected to do the housework and no longer able to attend. Similarly, another girl attributed her ability to attend to the fact that she has two mothers, and thus they are able to handle the housework without her (offering the intriguing suggesting that polygamous households may be better able to afford girls' participation in center programs, though one of the implicit goals of the centers is to counter polygamy and other 'traditional' societal practices that are considered gender regressive). Given these expectations and circumstances of many of the girls, these explanations are revealing in terms of central questions of participation and non-participation, core issues for the logic and function of the centers. As program activities are designed and implemented, issues of who participates, and why or why not, are vital. There are considerations related to norms and expectations of the girls (work at home, appropriate femininity in terms of traveling to centers), life cycle and age considerations (for example related to marriage and family), as well as other considerations that all relate to access to social spaces of the centers. While GAP planners oftentimes characterize the constraints on women's ability to attend as mostly 'social' restrictions, it must be acknowledged that there are also significant economic constraints, especially expectations related to contributing to family needs or income. As confirmed by Berivan "There were many students here (earlier), many have been to pick cotton right now. Therefore, the classes are a little bit empty." (66) The prevailing perception (or actuality) that CATOM activities are leisure activities means that girls' participation will inevitably hold secondary or tertiary importance for some.

Through our research, we also noted that other issues had implications for non-access of different women. For example, given that centers are primarily located in urban areas, large segments of the rural population do not have access to CATOM activities, despite the stated intent to provide opportunities to women and girls throughout the region (approximately 44% of the population in the southeast is still rural). (67) Even in urban areas, the constraints on an individual woman's attendance are many, including: location of the center; ease of transport/ travel to the center; work responsibilities at home; expectations of family; social pressures generally, access to networks of others who might introduce them to center activities, and a suite of other factors. Among these, difficulty with travel is noted consistently as an important theme. This suggests that location of centers must be given careful attention. We believe it also implies that in order for CATOMs to be successful in terms of providing educational and associational opportunities to girls and women, simply increasing the number of centers may not be the answer, notably given the impossibility of being able to create accessible permanent centers throughout the region, especially in rural areas. Mobile centers, or traveling classrooms, could be a viable alternative that should be considered. As with the possibility of establishing sex-segregated classrooms at schools, the

option of mobile classrooms in order to reach more women was raised by the authors in a conversation with GAP officials in Ankara. This suggestion was immediately countered with a negative response. The state planner we spoke with insisted that such an option would not be considered, and that permanent centers would continue to be favored (even as permanent centers have generally been understood as a failure in rural contexts, with the one established rural CATOM now having been inactive for several years). There are obvious advantages to permanent centers, for example with ability of teachers to gain trust, or ability of participants to enroll in several courses over time, gaining familiarity with teachers and participants. However, based on extensive interviews with rural residents in the Harran plain southeast of Sanh Urfa, a mobile center model might be more appropriate in rural contexts, especially given heavy seasonal work requirements for young women. Many residents noted course opportunities, particularly in the winter, would be a welcome addition to village life. Mobile or temporary classrooms have the potential to allow participation of women and girls who might otherwise be engaged in seasonal agricultural labor, and would make classes available to the many women who face severe travel restrictions.

As mentioned, the location of CATOM centers is also critical in determining who will be able to attend center programs, and who will be excluded. This is yet another factor that might be more effectively dealt with a mobile classroom model rather than insistence on permanent centers. If a girl has to travel great distances, or to travel alone, she will be unlikely to be able to attend center activities on a regular basis. Even apart from distance concerns, there are other socio-spatial considerations that girls must consider. For instance, girls generally do not walk in front of coffeehouses, or other places where men would be able to gaze at them. Even if centers are relatively nearby, girls may have to travel a circuitous route, often traveling farther to avoid male-dominated spaces. One girl noted, for instance, that she is only able to come to the centers if her brother escorts her. Again, mobile classrooms could possibly address these difficulties, meeting the need for courses in some districts, or making offerings more accessible, rather than limiting courses to the districts where centers have been established. One participant discussed her aunt and cousin's inability to travel to the center, "They came here once or twice but their house is very far away. It's far away, so they get tired. I wish another CATOM was open in Eyyubiye (another nearby shantytown) ... They (her relatives) say that we're very lucky because we have a CATOM nearby." (68) From consideration of all of these issues, it is obvious that some aspects of the CATOM model have been successful, but these successes will remain limited as long as courses do not reach a majority of girls/women, in particular those who may be subject to the tightest of restrictions. Mobile classrooms or other temporary mechanisms may be one of several options that would extend the circle of women reached by programs. Transport options that would pick up women at their homes and deliver them to the centers is another possibility, especially to serve rural areas or women in more distant sections of those cities currently with established centers.

Abstracting from the CATOM experience, we argue that the CATOM model raises a number of issues and opportunities that could be incorporated into other state programs and educational efforts (including formal schooling). CATOMs have been partially successful at addressing the reality of heavy work expectations for girls, difficulty in traveling to school, and inability or unwillingness of many girls to attend schools with boys or without headcovering. In these respects, CATOMs offer many lessons to other governmental educational efforts that could be taken as alternative models to achieve greater literacy and educational attainment among girls in the Southeastern Anatolia region. Especially given realities of rural life, courses in the winter when there is less agricultural work or for several hours a week, could be viable alternatives for girls whose parents feel they cannot afford to send their girls to school full-time, or risk the dangers (social or physical) of having them travel outside of the village. In the same vein, CATOMs have also been successful in offering courses free of charge, surprisingly not a feature of the formal school system. Many families complain of school fees (especially for books and uniforms) as representing major barriers for girls' education regionally. Though the fees are minimal, they are frequently noted as significant for rural and poor families, often given as justification for why it is preferred to educate boys over girls. As one father of five children stated, if he send the kids to school, he estimated it would cost him about 1 Billion TL (approximately $600 at the time, most likely an overestimate of expenses that would be required), for all the books and uniforms, not to mention the fact that they won't work and earn additional income. He says because of the expense, he prefers to send his sons, and keep his daughters at home. (69) Taken together, the issues that end up being important for the ability of girls to access spaces and opportunities of education generally, or the CATOM spaces in particular, are complex, and

interrelated, involving a mix of social, economic, spatial, and relational considerations between women, their families, their work, and their physical and social location. By comparing the CATOM experience with other aspects of state efforts in the region, it is clear that at times, the state has been implicated in marginalizing certain women from access to educational opportunities, at times through strict adherence to laws such as those related to language, headcovering, or provision of schooling. The successes of the CATOM model in these respects also suggests that GAP planners may be able to work more closely with other education staff in the future to encourage learning across these perspectives, and possibly to improve girls' education and attendance generally.

IV. CONCLUSION

Understanding associations between gender and space is paramount in the work of feminist geographers. Through our analysis of CATOM spaces in the GAP region of southeastern Turkey, we have attempted to explicate the importance of spaces that focus on women for gender equity, participatory development, and other state goals in this relatively impoverished region. Much work by feminist geographers deals with gender differentiated access to, and experiences of, public spaces. For example, studying ways that men and women might experience different levels of comfort or safely in urban areas. (70) Much of the discussion indicates that spaces such as CATOM centers that target women and girls may also be significant for conditioning experiences, identities, and confidence of women. Our critical evaluation of the center model is in part an attempt to understand how the spaces, and features of the centers, serve or constrain possibilities for altered gender dynamics in the GAP region. After less than a decade since initial implementation, there is evidence that CATOM spaces have been important in altering the situation and life experiences of some girls. This analysis contributes to the large body of work in feminist geography that similarly elaborates men's and women's differential experiences of certain spaces. Through the examples we provide, there is also support for claims by theorists that individuals are not only affected differently with respect to certain spaces, but those spaces can also be central to the constitution of that individual's sense of self, or subjectivity, as a feminine, masculine, or laboring subject. (71) In short, CATOM spaces are not only significant for many women in the region, but are also in part serving to define and consolidate the very associations of what it means to be female. While this also happens in other social realms (such as work or home life), it is particularly revealing in this instance since the spaces are state sanctioned, and state operated, suggesting particular relationships between states, state practices, and gender dynamics. To illustrate this, the earlier discussion on the ways that providing sewing, baking, and embroidery coursework at CATOM centers demonstrates that, in part, CATOM centers are implicitly affirming that these activities are appropriately 'feminine', and thus defining what should be taught to young girls. In some senses, such activities reify rather than upset predominant gender associations that the state is purportedly intent on overcoming.

There are also other implicit associations between gender and space that can be explicated through a discussion of CATOM centers in the GAP region. Government documents list the goals of these centers as enabling girls to 'improve knowledge of health, increase literacy, develop skills and income, improve self expression, communication, and raise awareness of problems, team work, associability, and access to public services.' (72) It is evident from this list that apart from educational opportunities, there is the implicit assumption that with greater ability of girls to associate with each other socially, and with improved ability and confidence, girls may eventually be able to alter their relative situation and status with respect to male counterparts. This can be read as an implicit theory of gender and space, whereby state officials assume that creating associational spaces may encourage girls to jointly realize their problems, and work together to overcome them. In other words, there is an implicit goal of creating, encouraging, or promoting spaces for oppositional gender politics. If girls become literate, gain confidence, and network, perhaps they will be better able to demand their rights, oppose efforts to limit them, and support each other towards overcoming problems and restrictions.

There was little evidence for this notion of an 'oppositional' or 'supportive space' to overcome gender disparities, with a few notable exceptions. One such instance was a woman who recounted to us with a mixture of pride and tears that she was able to use the resources and friendships of the CATOM center to leave an abusive relationship with her husband. In fact, she was able to stay at the center for several

months, and eventually was employed by the center and able to earn her own income. Apart from this example, perhaps surprisingly, very little of the girls' conversations can be read as 'resistant' or 'oppositional'. Another example worth mentioning is that in our focus group, the girls jested that perhaps if the spaces became mixed-sex spaces, they might hide this from their families so they could continue attending. One girl's insistence that if men started coming 'then we would not tell our families that men come to the classes' was met with laughter from all other participants, another continued (smiling), 'if they came here to check for themselves, then we would definitely be in great trouble.' (73) In a similar vein, several girls did in fact keep their new knowledge of family planning techniques secret from their families, though some also actively discuss techniques with family and neighbors despite being told 'you are a young girl. It is not your duty to talk about these issues.' (74) Apart from these few examples, there was not much evidence of resistance, or oppositional politics stemming from the girls participation at CATOMs, their newfound skills, or from their novel ability to associate with each other.

In terms of gender resistance generally, it is also be noteworthy that while the girls recounted their difficulties in gaining permission to attend the centers, a number of the girls commented that other females (for example their mothers) were more opposed to their attendance than fathers or brothers. As already noted, in some cases, this may directly result from work pressures in the home, as allowing a daughter to attend center activities might translate into increased work responsibilities for a sister or mother. In these ways, the situation of the women, even with some notable progress among certain center participants, in many ways cannot be disassociated from the situation and position of other women, either in their families, or more generally. Along these lines, when the group of girls at the urban center were asked about 'do you think there are other problems that make life more difficult for girls and women of this district?' the response given by one girl was "Yes, it is cotton." (75) Several girls giggled at this answer, but nonetheless this demonstrates the intimate connections between rural livelihoods and situations of urban women, the interconnections between different women, and the relevance for women of changing agricultural practices associated with GAP implementation more generally. While many of the girls who participate in center activities are often relatively impoverished, the fact that these women live in urban areas also points to a significant difference between urban and rural women in the region, for example in terms of opportunities to attend center programs. The comment made regarding cotton also suggests that the situation of women in the region cannot be improved by efforts that focus solely on urban areas, some women, or in ways that are disassociated with other socio-environmental trends in the region (also Harris, under review).

A related linkage that was revealed during the research is the changing relationship of female subjects to the State apparatus itself. Perhaps more notable than altering the girls' relationship and situation with respect to men in their own families (whether fathers, brothers, or husbands), is the changing nature of the relationship of these girls to the State institutions and goals (for instance, girls changing relationship to Turkish as the language of the State, taking on family planning goals, or portraying themselves relative to state discourses about education, literacy, and working as a 'productive citizens'). In our analysis, we provide some evidence that girls have an understanding of themselves, as 'targets' of development efforts, and situate themselves as in need of reform and attention in relation to state institutions and goals. In response to the quote cited earlier by Sadiman, "most probably the State wants to incorporate into society as useful people", the follow up question was asked, "you mean to benefit from you?" Sadiman: "Yes." (76) This exchange exposes the complex and conflicting understanding of the girls, viewing themselves both as beneficiaries of state programs, and also as being in a situation to better serve the State as productive citizens. The girls not only understand themselves as girls/women, but they also appear to be situating themselves vis a vis the State, as 'targets', 'constituents', and 'citizens'. These sorts of statements are interesting not only to better understand the effects of state-led programs, but are also revealing to situate how the State itself is understood, and lived, especially with respect to historically and geographically marginalized citizen-subjects such as women in the Southeastern Anatolia region. This reading situates gender as not only significant in the GAP region, but as significant in conditioning state-society relations, and the ways that individual state subjects are constituted and situated with respect to State goals and programs. The explicit role of center spaces in the consolidation of a 'new gendered citizenry' is also interesting when considering the alternative and changing spaces of citizenship, specifically how relationships between people and states may be reshaped in relation to changing spatial politics, and how debates and practices related to citizenship play out in these emerging

political and institutional spaces (cf. Brown, 1997). As such, the analysis of CATOMs also specifically offers insights for gendered analysis of states, understanding how state efforts, and state sanctioned spaces are experienced and accessed differently by masculine and feminine subjects. Even the basic question of how 'women' or 'gender' comes to be a legitimate object/target of state efforts is critical. As discussed at length by Abu-Lughod (1998), women are often ambiguously situated with respect to modernization projects. As she explains, often projects that target women's emancipation also may serve to exacerbate inequalities among women, and may condition new forms of control and discipline (for example, new identities, experiences and constraints associated with new subjectivities of women as workers, or consolidated notions of gender appropriate behavior). The particular role of space in such attempts is of particular interest for our project, and could be considered more fully in ongoing work by state and development theorists alike.

Perhaps the most oppositional statement made by any of the girls, rather than attempting to combat gender gaps in the region (the explicit target of GAP gender development efforts), was to combat state policies towards the girls themselves. In general, many of the girls appear to have adopted the official state position on some issues, for example the need far women in the region to have fewer children. Other aspects of the State approach appear to not be accepted so readily. As Zeynep protested in a discussion about girls' exclusion from formal schooling "should the headscarf be forbidden? Cannot it also be with a headscarf?" As the State endeavors to promote greater awareness, confidence, and associations among women to counter gender inequities, there is also the real possibility that girls may also gain awareness and confidence to oppose state practices as well, voicing opposition and confidence in the face of ongoing policies that effectively position male and female subjects differently, both in the southeastern region and throughout the country.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to especially thank the young women of the CATOMs who generously gave of their time and thoughts to participate in our focus group discussions and interviews. Staff at the GAP administration in Ankara and Sanli Urfa, and at the centers, have also been very supportive and open to this research. Their contributions have been essential and are very much appreciated. Nurten Canbeyoglu also deserves thanks for her great enthusiasm far this project, especially her contributions towards making the focus group discussion successful. The American Research Institute in Turkey, and the MacArthur program on Global Change, Sustainability and Justice at the University of Minnesota have generously provided funding for the research. We would also like to thank Richa Nagar, Eric Sheppard, and two anonymous reviewers for comments on earlier versions of this essay.

NOTES

(1) Including the International Labor Organization (ILO), UNICEF, Ana-Kultur Cooperative (Turkish Children's Rights Coalition for General Coordination), Izmir Turkish Women's Council, Mother Child Education Foundation (ACEV), and Turkish Family Health and Planning Foundation (TAP).

(2) In particular, there are significant numbers of Arabic and Kurdish speakers in the region, some of whom speak Turkish as a second language, while others, especially women, may not speak Turkish at all.

(3) A report on possibilities to improve the status of women in the region was developed by Turkiye Kalkinma Vakfi (Turkey Development Foundation) between 1992-1994. Findings from the report, 'The Search to Improve the Status of Women in the GAP Region and the Integration of Women in the Development Process' were then incorporated into the GAP Regional Development Administration's 'Social Action Plan' to foster social and economic development in the GAP region.

(4) Formal rates of literacy for the region in the year 2000 were estimated as 56% of women, and 82% of men (or 69% literacy generally), compared to national estimates of aggregate literacy of 86% (75% for women and 90.8% for men). These figures point to reasons why literacy efforts specifically target the Southeastern Anatolia region (GAP-RDA, 2002).

(5) To ensure confidentiality, all the names used in this paper have been changed by the authors.

(6) This fieldwork was conducted for the purposes of Harris's doctoral dissertation on gender, irrigation, and changing agricultural practices in the Southeastern Anatolia Region. Atalan served as assistant for much of the field work.

(7) Harris and Karahan Kara, 2001. Survey of 125 rural households in the Harran plain, carried out in November.

(8) The theorization of space we draw on here is a relational view of social space, whereby specific places provide opportunities for social interaction, and the importance of these interactions is relational in that the significance of interactions in a particular place varies with respect to opportunities that may or may not be available elsewhere. For example, in the case of the centers, 'space' is understood as the physical and social characteristics of the centers, including the types of interactions that occur there, the types of courses, and the general mood or tenor of those places as viewed and perceived by the participants. In a relational sense, these centers perhaps take on greater importance as similar social spaces are not commonly available to women elsewhere in the southeast region. This notion of space has significant overlap with common conceptions of 'place', including the idea of "location, the geographical area encompassing the settings for social interaction as defined by social and economic processes operating at a wider scale, and sense of place (two of the three notions of place identified by Agnew, as detailed J. Duncan, 1994).

(9) This is due to a combination of reasons, from financial reasons, to work requirements, to notions of propriety. Formal estimates are that 66% of girls in the GAP region attend elementary school, compared with 76% of boys in the region. It is most likely that the numbers are higher for urban areas, and lower still for rural areas of the region. Only 10% of girls might attend high school, compared to nearly a 25% of boys (GAP-RDA, 1997).

(10) GAP-RDA, 1997, p. 29. 1991 estimate.

(11) 4.35 total fertility rate for the GAP region verses 2.65 for all of Turkey in 1990 (GAP-RDA, 1997, p.32).

(12) Focus Group with CATOM participants, 2001, p.6.

(13) Focus Group with CATOM participants, 2001, p.7.

(14) For example, GAP-RDA, 1997.

(15) In this paper, we do not evaluate Halk Egitim Merkezleri (public education centers), that provide courses for men and women in other parts of Turkey. There are similarities and differences between CATOM and Halk Egitim Merkezleri that would provide an interesting comparison for the subject of another paper (ie. both aim to provide public education opportunities, especially for women). Generally, Halk Egitim merkezleri are not considered to be female-only spaces-though the majority of courses offered there also enroll women. There are a number of peculiarities to the southeast Anatolia region that make the CATOM model function differently, some of which are discussed in this paper.

(16) Harris, 2001. Interview November 13.

(17) GAP-RDA, 2002.

(18) Focus Group with CATOM participants, 2001, p. 14.

(19) Harris, 2001. Interview, September 12.

(20) Focus Group with CATOM participants, 2001, p. 13.

(21) Focus Group with CATOM participants, 2001, p.21.

(22) Focus Group with CATOM participants, 2001, p. 12.

(23) Focus Group with CATOM participants, 2001, p.12.

(24) Consistent with this claim, Sadiman commented on her mother's jealousy about her closeness to others at the center. Despite her mother's warnings that she wouldn't be treated well at the center, she was well received, and told her mother, "they like me there even more than you like me, they are more interested in me than you are" (Focus Group with CATOM participants, p. 14). These comments indicate that there is great significance for the girls of having a space of interaction apart from their home environment. Since many of the girls were never able to go to school, for some CATOMs represent the first time they were able to forge an individual identity, or independent interaction, apart from their familial roles.

(25) Focus Group with CATOM participants, 2001, p.7.

(26) Focus Group with CATOM participants, 2001, p.9.

(27) Focus Group with CATOM participants, 2001, p.8.

(28) Focus Group with CATOM participants, 2001, p.8.

(29) Focus Group with CATOM participants, 2001, p.8.

(30) Focus Group with CATOM participants, 2001, p.16.

(31) Focus Group with CATOM participants, 2001, p.22.

(32) It was interesting that a teacher at a CATOM encouraged girls to be attentive to their responsibilities at home as well engaging in center programs, advising girls to handle both requirements together and not

to neglect their duties at home, most probably so that girls would be able to continue attending (Focus Group with CATOM participants, 2001, p.24)

(33) This issue is frequently in the Turkish press. Additionally, we met with several girls who have encountered difficulties related to this issue. One woman, for example, had already tried to enter the college entrance exams two years in a row and had been denied because she refused to take off her headcovering. Other women choose to wear wigs or other compromises, and some feel compelled to come to school without headcovering to avoid problems.

(34) Girls emphasized their preference for wearing headcovering in interviews. Zeliha voiced, "Neither my mother nor my father pressured me to wear a headscarf, it was my own choice. I looked around and saw that everyone had a headscarf, and so I decided to cover my head, and wear a headscarf. Then my mother got very happy. I mean she did not tell me to do so but when I did it she was very happy" (Focus Group with CATOM participants, 2001, p. 19). The headscarf is considered by many as a means of protection from the gaze of outsiders, particularly men, symbolic for protection of a girl's honor, and thus that of her family. In discussions with families concerning why girls are pulled from school by the 5th grade, the inability to wear headscarves in public school is noted as a primary reason why girls are either forbidden to continue, or themselves prefer to withdraw. In these senses, there are interesting parallels between the notion of protection offered by the headscarf, and that afforded by the sex-segregated space of the centers, where girls are similarly protected from public (men's) gaze.

(35) There is a great deal of literature that deals with the role and function of offering single-sex educational opportunities, particularly to build confidence among young girls or to provide non-competitive learning environments. This obviously has relevance for some of the arguments we build here, though a review of this literature and some of its premises is beyond the scope of this paper.

(36) Harris and Karahan Kara, 2001.

(37) Focus Group with CATOM participants, 2001, p.12.

(38) GAP-RDA, 2002.

(39) GAP-RDA, 1997, p.3.

(40) GAP-RDA, 2002.

(41) Focus Group with CATOM participants, 2001, pp. 20-21.

(42) Focus Group with CATOM participants, 2001, p. 17.

(43) Focus Group with CATOM participants, 2001, p. 17.

(44) "As one example of such strong critiques, Acik (2002, 296) quotes the editor of Roza magazine, Fatma Kayhan, "Sterilization is not a process which has recently started ... Another name for this is that genocide starting in the wombs of women, or an 'ethnic cleansing' movement. It's the policy of destroying those whom you cannot get rid of by weapons in the wombs.... The State has been interested in the wombs of Kurdish women for a long time." Acik situates this argument by citing a National Security Council report published in December 1996 which states that the Kurdish population may reach 40% of Turkey's total population by the year 2010, and is expected to reach 50% by 2025.

(45) During interviews throughout the Harran plain, it was in fact rare to encounter young women who did not speak some Turkish. Many indicated to us that they had learned by watching television. There were some exceptions to this, but as a rule, younger generations are increasingly bilingual (Harris, 2001).

(46) Focus Group with CATOM participants, 2001, 2001. p.39.

(47) "Sermaye icin cazip hale getirilmeye calisilan, muhtemel ki cazip hale gelecek olan bolgede ucuz isgucu kadinlardan baska kim olacak? O kadinlara fabrikada calismaya girmek icin gerekli olan okuma yazmayi, ilkokul diplomasini temin etmek gerekiyor ki bu gerekliligi hem CATOMlar hem valiliklere bagli calisan toplum merkezleri yerine getirecek" (Pazartesi, 1998a, p.3).

(48) "Turkce ogrenmek kadinlarin erkeklerle aralarindaki ucurumu biraz olsun kapatacak belli ki. Ote yandan, kapitalizmin somurusune maruz kalacak donanima erisen kadinlar, ucretsiz ev koleliginden ucretli somuruye gecme sansini elde edecekler" (Pazartesi, 1998a).

(49) Focus Group with CATOM participants, 2001, p.38.

(50) More about the contract arrangement can be read in the Turkish magazine Tempo, 2002. pp.62-63.

(51) We interviewed a woman working in the CATOM sales office. She said she believed the market was forced to close because it was in a poorer section of town, and had been selected on the basis of reduced rent. She believed that if it were relocated to a shopping area in the city center, there would be better opportunities to sell goods. On this issue, one GAP planner attributed the poor sales of carpets and other handicrafts to the fact that women are not properly trained with respect to quality, and often do not know what sorts of colors and patterns will be most marketable.

(52) The suggestion has been made on several fronts that in order to be effective, CATOM needs to include skills training that is more marketable, including the possibility of greater market research with respect to crafts, carpet and other items produced at the centers, so that income earning might be more possible.

(53) Focus Group with CATOM participants, 2001, p.39.

(54) Focus Group with CATOM participants, 2001, p.39.

(55) Focus Group with CATOM participants, 2001, p.3.

(56) Since their establishment in 1995, over $2 million of government funds have been spent on CATOM activities

(57) Focus Group with CATOM participants, 2001, p.31.

(58) Focus Group with CATOM participants, 2001, p.9.

(59) Focus Group with CATOM participants, 2001, p.23.

(60) Focus Group with CATOM participants, 2001, p.24.

(61) Focus Group with CATOM participants, 2001, p.24.

(62) Focus Group with CATOM participants, 2001, p.24.

(63) Harris and Karahan Kara, 2001.

(64) Focus Group with CATOM participants, p.2.

(65) Focus Group with CATOM participants, p.25.

(66) Focus Group with CATOM participants, p.4.

(67) GAP, 1999b. p.73.

(68) Focus Group with CATOM participants, p. 10.

(69) Harris, 2001. Interview, October 12.

(70) McDowell, 1999, for review of work on similar themes in feminist geography.

(71) Rose, 1993.

(62) GAP-RDA, 2002.

(63) Focus Group with CATOM participants, p.13.

(64) Focus Group with CATOM participants, p.29.

(75) Focus Group with CATOM participants, p.21.

(76) Focus Group with CATOM participants, p.20.

(77) Focus Group with CATOM participants, p.19.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abu-Lughod, L., Ed. (1998). Remaking Women: Feminism and Modernity in the Middle East. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Acik, Necla (2002). Ulusal Mucadelede Kadin Mitosu ve Kadinlarin Harekete Gecirilmesi: Turkiye'deki Cagdas Kurt Kadin Dergilerinin bir Analizi. In 90'larda Turkiye'de Feminizm, ed. by A. Bora and A. Gunal (Istanbul: Iletisim, 2002), pp.279-306 (originally published in German, translated by Tanil Bora).

Brown, M. (1997). New Spaces of Radical Citizenship. Replacing Citizenship. New York, NY: Guilford Press, 1-26.

Cravey, A. (1998). Engendering the Latin American State. Progress, in Human Geography, 22(4): 523-542.

Duncan, J. (1994). Place, in R.J. Johnston, D. Gregory and D. Smith, The Dictionary of Human Geography, Blackwell, Oxford.

Focus Group with CATOM participants (2001. Sanhurfa. Conducted by Nurcan Atalan, Leila Harris, and Nurten Canbeyoglu. October 31.

GAP-RDA. (2002). Multipurpose Community Centers (CATOM). Best Practices Document Presented to Johannesburg Summit Ubuntu Fair. Unpublished paper.

GAP-RDA (1999a). Speeches and Presentations on Southeastern Anatolia Project (GAP) delivered by I.H. Okay Unver, President, GAP Regional Development Administration. Innovations in Water Resources Development in the Southeastern Anatolia Project (GAP) of Turkey (speech delivered at conference: Water as an element and development in the Middle East jointly organized by Hacettepe University and Friedrich Naumann Foundation, 4-8 October 1993, Ankara, Turkey. pp. 1-7.

GAP-RDA (1999b). Speeches and Presentations on Southeastern Anatolia Project (GAP) delivered by I.H. Olcay Unver, President, GAP Regional Development Administration. Integrated Regional Socioeconomic Development in the Southeastern Anatolia: GAP, Paper delivered at the Economist Conferences 13th Roundtable with the Government of Turkey, 8-9 November 1995, Ankara, Turkey, pp.73-85.

GAP-RDA (1997). Women and GAP Towards 21st Century, September.

Harris, L. (under review). Irrigation, Gender, and the Social Geographies of the Changing Waterscapes of Southeastern Anatolia. Environment and Planning D: Society and Space.

Harris, L. (2001). Field notes taken during seven months of field-work in Turkey, May to November, 2001.

Harris, L. and Karahan Kara (2001). Survey of rural households in the Harran plain, focusing on gender and effects of irrigation in newly irrigated villages. November, 2001.

Kandiyoti, D. (1991). Identity and Its Discontents: Women and the Nation. Journal of International Studies 20(3): 429-43.

Mayer, T., Ed. (2000). Gender Ironies of Nationalism: Sexing the Nation,. London and New York, Routledge.

McDowell, L. (1999). Gender, Identify, and Place: Understanding Feminist Geographies, Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Pazartesi (1998a). Devletin Eli Uzaniyor mu Kalkiyor mu? (Ayse Duzkan), Istanbul, April 1998, No.37, pp.2-5.

Pazartesi (1998b). Biz Kadinlar Diyememek bir Turlu ... (Ayse Gul Karayazgan), Istanbul, May 1998, No.38, pp. 8-10.

Rose, G. (1993). Progress in Geography and Gender. Or Something Else. Progress in Human Geography 17(4): pp. 531-537.

Roza (1998). Kadina ve Kurt Kadinlarina Dair, Istanbul, Nov-Dec 1998, No.14, pp. 12-13.

Roza (1999). CHP Kadin Kollarinin Kurt Kadinina Iliskin Raporu Uzerine Birkac Sozu, Istanbul, Feb-Mart 1999, No. 15, pp. 16-17.

Saltik, Ahmet (1994). Women's Status in the GAP Region and Their Integration into the Process of Development. Development Foundation of Turkey, September 1994.

Tempo, 2002. July 1-7, 2002) Vol. 31, Issue 764, pp 62-63.

Yuval-Davis, N. and P. Werbner, Eds. (1999). Woman, Citizenship, and Difference. London, Zed Books.