UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Making the New Turkey

Reconfigurations of state and citizenship in an Istanbul neighbourhood

Idel, C.

Publication date
2026

Link to publication

Citation for published version (APA):
Idel, C. (2026). *Making the New Turkey: Reconfigurations of state and citizenship in an Istanbul neighbourhood*. [Thesis, fully internal, Universiteit van Amsterdam].

General rights
It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations
If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, P.O. Box 19185, 1000 GD Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

UvA-DARE is a service provided by the library of the University of Amsterdam (https://dare.uva.nl)

Download date:14 Nov 2026

References

AA (2013, November, 5). Kızlı - erkekli öğrenci evine yasal düzenleme mesajı. *Anadolu Ajansi*. https://www.aa.com.tr/tr/turkiye/kizli-erkekli-ogrenci-evine-yasal-duzenleme-mesaji/206442

Abdelbary, M., (2022, June 3). Why Turkey changed its name: populism, polls and a bird. *CNN World*. https://edition.cnn.com/2022/06/03/middleeast/turkey-name-change-mime-intl/index.html

Abrams, P. (1988). Notes on the difficulty of studying the state. *Journal of Historical Sociology 1*(1), 58-89.

Adak, S. (2021). Expansion of the Diyanet and the politics of family in Turkey under AKP rule. *Turkish Studies*, *22*(2), 200–221.

Adorno, T. W., & Horkheimer, M. (2002). *Dialectic of enlightenment*. Stanford University Press.

Ahmad, F. (2003 [1993]). *The making of modern Turkey*. Routledge.

Ahmed, S. (2004). *The cultural politics of emotion*. Edinburgh University Press.

Akbulut, M. R., & Başlık, S. (2011). Transformation of perception of the *Gecekondu* phenomenon. *Mimarlık Fakültesi Dergisi*, *28*(2), 1–44.

Akça, İ. (2014). Hegemonic projects in post-1980 Turkey and the changing forms of authoritarianism. In İ. Akça, A. Bekmen, & B.A. Özden (Eds.), *Turkey reframed: Constituting neoliberal hegemony* (pp. 13–46). Pluto Press.

Akçay, Ü. (2020). Authoritarian consolidation dynamics in Turkey. *Contemporary Politics*, *27*(1), 79–104.

Akçay, Ü. (2024). Revisiting the rise and decline of authoritarian neoliberalism: A political economy analysis of Akp's initial decade. *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies*, 26(6), 972–987.

AKP. (2002). *Kasim 2002 genel secimleri secim beyannamesi*. https://www.akparti.org.tr/media/318780/3-kasim-2002-genel-secimleri-secim-beyannamesi-sayfalar.pdf

Aktay, Y. (2006). Islâmcılıktaki muhafazakâr bakiye. In T. Bora & M. Gultekin (Eds.) *Modern Turkiye'de siyasi dusunce, Cilt 5: Muhafazakarlik*. (pp. 346–361). Iletisim.

Allen, D., Lawhon, M., & Pierce, J. (2019). Placing race: On the resonance of place with black geographies. *Progress in Human Geography*, *43*(6), 1001–1019.f

Alpay, S. (2007). Sex and power in Turkey. Today's Zaman. *ESI in the press* https://www.esiweb.org/pdf/esi_women_turkey_reactions_id_4.pdf esiweb.org

Altınordu, A. (2021). Is Turkey a postsecular society? Secular differentiation, committed pluralism, and complementary learning in contemporary Turkey. In K., Barkey, S.,Kaviraj, and V., Naresh (eds.) *Negotiating democracy and religious pluralism: India, Pakistan, and Turkey* (pp. 157–177). Oxford University Press.

Altınordu, A. (2025). "You will be defeated by a tripod and a camera:" Sedat Peker and the antihero narrative in contemporary politics. *American Journal of Cultural Sociology*, *13*(1), 164–188.

Álvarez-Rivadulla, M. J. (2025). The power of critical engagement: What does it mean to do critical urban scholarship from the South? *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *50*, 265-270

Anderson, B. (2009). Affective atmospheres. *Emotion, Space and Society*, *2*(2), 77–81.

Andreetta, S., Enria, L., Jarroux, P., & Verheul, S. (2022). Introduction: States of feeling: Public servants' affective and emotional entanglements in the making of the state. *Cambridge Anthropology*, *40*(2), 1–20.

Arat, Y. (1997). The project of modernity and women in Turkey. In R., Kasaba & S., Bozdogan (Eds.*). Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey* (pp. 95–112). University of Washington Press.

Aretxaga, B. (2003). Maddening states. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *32*(1), 393–410.

Asad, T. (2003). *Formations of the secular: Christianity, Islam, Modernity*. Stanford University Press.

Asad, T. (2011). Anthropology and the analysis of ideology. *Man*, *14*(4), 607–627.

Askins, K. (2016). Emotional citizenry: Everyday geographies of befriending, belonging and intercultural encounter. *Transactions - Institute of British Geographers*, *41*(4), 515–527.

Aslan-Akman, C. (2021). Women officials of the Turkish Diyanet: Gendered transformations and predicaments of empowerment? *Asian Journal of Women's Studies*, *27*(2), 232–257.

Auyero, J. (2007). *Routine politics and violence in Argentina: The gray zone of state power*. Cambridge University Press.

Auyero, J. (2021). Afterword. Going granular. *Qualitative Sociology*, *44*(3), 473–477.

Balaban, U. B. (2025). *Industrial Islamism: How authoritarian movements mobilize workers*. University of California Press.

Bangstad, S. (2017). Doing fieldwork among people we don't (necessarily) like. *Anthropology News*, *58*(4), 238–243.

Barbosa, R., & Casarões, G. (2023). Statecraft under God: Radical right populism meets Christian nationalism in Bolsonaro's Brazil. *Millennium*, *50*(3), 669–699.

Barbosa, S., & Milan, S. (2019). Do not harm in private chat apps: Ethical issues for research on and with WhatsApp. *Westminster Papers in Communication and Culture*, *14*(1), 49–65.

Basaksehir. (2019). Taziye Araci Başakşehirlilerin Yaninda. *Basaksehir Belediyesi*. https://www.basaksehir.bel.tr/taziye-araci-basaksehirlilerin-yaninda

Başer, B. , & Öztürk, A.E. (2017). *Authoritarian politics in Turkey: Elections, resistance and the AKP*. I.B. Tauris.

Bashirov, G., & Lancaster, C. (2018). End of moderation: the radicalization of AKP in Turkey. *Democratization*, *25*(7), 1210–1230.

Batuman, B. (2017). *New Islamist architecture and urbanism negotiating nation and Islam through built environment in Turkey*. Routledge.

Bayat, A. (2010). *Life as politics: How ordinary people change the Middle East*. Stanford University Press.

Bayırbağ, M. K. (2013). Continuity and change in public policy: Redistribution, exclusion and state rescaling in Turkey. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *37*(4), 1123–1146.

BBC. (2016). Turkey's Erdogan says women who reject motherhood 'incomplete'. *BBC*. https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-36456878

Beaumont, J., Eder, K., & Mendieta, E. (2020). Reflexive secularization? Concepts, processes and antagonisms of postsecularity. *European Journal of Social Theory*, *23*(3), 291–309.

Bedirhanoğlu, P. & Yalman, G.L. (2010). Neoliberal transformation in Turkey: State, class and discourse. In A. Saad-Filho & Galip Yalman (Eds.) *Economic transitions to neoliberalism in middle-income countries policy dilemmas, crises, mass resistance* (pp. 107–127). Routledge.

Berman, M. (2010). *All that is solid melts into air: The experience of modernity*. Verso.

Bianet. (2008). Erdoğan: kadınlar doğurun, Türk milletinin kökünü kazıyacaklar. *Bianet*. https://bianet.org/haber/erdogan-kadinlar-dogurun-turk-milletinin-kokunu-kaziyacaklar-105451

Bilgiç, A. (2018). Reclaiming the national will: Resilience of Turkish authoritarian neoliberalism after Gezi. *South European Society & Politics*, *23*(2), 259–280.

BirGün (2025, October 29). Asırlık birikimler 23 yıldır ipotek altında. *BirGün*. https://www.birgun.net/makale/asirlik-birikimler-23-yildir-ipotek-altinda-664503

Blokland, T. (2008). "You got to remember you live in public housing": Place-making in an American housing project. *Housing, Theory and Society*, *25*(1), 31–46.

Bodirsky, K. (2017). Between equal rights force decides? Contested place-making and the right to the city. *City*, *21*(5), 672–681.

Bodirsky, K. (2024). Dispossession as a manifold: Frontlines of authoritarian populist politics in Turkey. In D., Kalb (Ed.). *Insidious capital: Frontlines of value at the end of a global cycle (*pp. 180-210). Berghahn.

Boy, J. D., & Uitermark, J. (2024). *On display: Instagram, the self, and the city*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197629437.001.0001

Bozdoğan, S. (2001). *Modernism and nation building: Turkish architectural culture in the early republic*. University of Washington Press.

Bozkurt-Güngen, S. (2018). Labour and authoritarian neoliberalism: Changes and continuities under the AKP governments in Turkey. *South European Society & Politics*, *23*(2), 219–238.

Bozzini, D. (2015). The Fines and the spies: Fears of state surveillance in Eritrea and in the diaspora. *Social Analysis*, *59*(4), 32–49.

Bracke, S. (2008). Conjugating the modern/ religious, conceptualizing female religious agency: Contours of a `Post-secular' conjuncture. *Theory, Culture & Society*, *25*(6), 51–67.

Brodkin, E. Z. (2017). The ethnographic turn in political science: Reflections on the state of the art. *PS, Political Science & Politics*, *50*(1), 131–134.

Brown-Saracino, J. (2018). *How places make us : Novel LBQ identities in four small cities*. The University of Chicago Press.

Bryant, R. (2021). Sovereignty in the skies: An anthropology of everyday aeropolitics. In R. Bryant & M. Reeves (Eds.), *The everyday lives of sovereignty: Political imagination beyond the state* (pp. 19–43). Cornell University Press.

Buğra, A. (2012). The changing welfare regime of Turkey: Neoliberalism, cultural conservatism and social solidarity redefined. In S., Dedeoğlu, Saniye & A., Elveren (Eds.). *Gender and society in Turkey: The impact of neoliberal policies, political Islam and EU accession*. (pp. 15–31). I.B. Taurus.

Burawoy, M., & Verdery, K. (1999). *Uncertain transition: Ethnographies of change in the postsocialist world*. The Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group.

Butler, J. (2001). What is Critique? An essay on Foucault's Virtue. *Kritik*, 1–13.

Büyüktunca, E. (2024). Diyanet'in Bütçe Payı Son 10 Yılda Rekor Kırdı. *Dogruluk Payi*. https://www.dogrulukpayi.com/bulten/diyanet-in-butce-payi-son-10-yilda-rekor-kirdi

Çakır, R. (1990). *Ayet ve slogan: Türkiye'de İslami oluşumlar.* Metis.

Cambridge Dictionary, (n.d.). cité. In Cambridge Dictionary. Retrieved September 1, 2025, from https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/french-english/cite

Candan, A.B, & Kolluoğlu, B. (2008). Emerging spaces of neoliberalism: A gated town and a public housing project in İstanbul. *New Perspectives on Turkey*, *39*, 5–46.

Çavdar, A. (2016). Building, marketing and living in an islamic gated community: Novel configurations of class and religion in Istanbul. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *40*(3), 507–523.

Çavuşoğlu, E., and Strutz, J. (2014). "We'll come and demolish your house": The role of spatial (re-)production in the neoliberal hegemonic politics of Turkey. In İ. Akça, A. Bekmen, & B.A. Özden, *Turkey reframed: Constituting neoliberal hegemony* (pp. 141–153). PlutoPress.

Çelik, O., Topal, A. & Yalman, G.L. (2016). Finance and system of provision of housing. The case of Istanbul, Turkey (WP-152) [Working Paper]. *Fessud Financialisation, Economy, Society And Sustainable Development*.

Chernysheva, L., & Zaporozhets, O. (2025). (Dis)assembling authoritarianism in everyday digitally mediated neighbouring. *Dialogues on Digital Society*, 0(0). https://doi.org/10.1177/29768640251377166

Çıtak, Z. (2020). The transformation of the state–religion relationship under the AKP: The case of the Diyanet. In P. Bedirhanoğlu, C. Dölek, F. Hülagü, & O. Kaygusuz. *Turkey's new state in the making: Transformations in legality, economy and coercion* (pp. 167–188). Zed Books.

Civelek, C. (2019). "Urban renewal with dancing and music"?: The renewal machine's struggle to organize hegemony in Turkey. *Focaal*, *84*, 1–15.

Cloke, P. (2010). Theo-ethics and radical faith-based praxis in the postsecular city. In A., Molendijk, J., Beaumont, & C., Jedan (eds). *Exploring the postsecular: The religious, the political and the urban* (pp. 223–241). Brill.

Cloke, P., & Beaumont, J. (2013). Geographies of postsecular rapprochement in the city. *Progress in Human Geography*, *37*(1), 27–51.

Cramer, K. (2016). *The politics of resentment: Rural consciousness in Wisconsin and the rise of Scott Walker*. The University of Chicago Press.

Dahlgren, S. & Schielke, S. (2013). Introduction. *Cont Islam, 7*, 1–13.

Danielson, M. N., & Keleş, R. (1985). *The politics of rapid urbanization: Government and growth in modern Turkey*. Holmes and Meier.

de Koning, A., Jaffe, R., & Koster, M. (2015). Citizenship agendas in and beyond the nation-state: (En)countering framings of the good citizen. *Citizenship Studies*, *19*(2), 121–127.

de Koning, M. (2021). "Who are they?" – The ethics and politics of complicity in ethnographic research with Dutch Muslim militant activists. *Zeitschrift Für Ethnologie*, *146*(1/2), 91–107.

de Santos Barbosa, J., & Oosterlynck, S. (2024). Electoral dynamics, the construction of a common sense and national urban policies: The case of the radical right vote in the 2002 French presidential election. *Environment and Planning. C, Politics and Space*, *43*(5), 867–881.

Dedeoğlu , S. (2012). Gender equality policies and female employment: The reforms in the EU accession process. In S., Dedeoğlu, Saniye & A., Elveren (Eds.). *Gender and society in Turkey: the impact of neoliberal policies, political Islam and EUaccession*. (pp. 125–140). I.B. Taurus.

Deeb, L. (2006). *An enchanted modern: Gender and public piety in Shi'i Lebanon*. Princeton University Press.

Dinçer, E., (2022, March 2016). Turkey or Türkiye? The politics of a name change. *The Oxford Middle East Review*. https://omerjournal.com/2022/03/16/turkey-or-turkiye-the-politics-of-a-name-change/

Dirlik, A. (1994). The postcolonial aura: Third world criticism in the age of global capitalism. *Critical Inquiry*, *20*(2), 328–356.

Dixon, D. P., & Marston, S. A. (2011). Introduction: Feminist engagements with geopolitics. *Gender, Place and Culture : A Journal of Feminist Geography*, *18*(4), 445–453.

Doğan, E., & Stupar, A. (2017). The limits of growth: A case study of three mega-projects in Istanbul. *Cities*, *60*, 281–288.

Doğan, S. (2016). *Mahalledeki AKP: Parti işleyişi, taban mobilizasyonu ve siyasal yabancılaşma*. Iletisim.

Doğru, H. E. (2024). 2000'li yıllarda konut sektörünün ekonomi politiği ve devletin dönüşümü. *Mülkiye Dergisi*, 48(2), 313–343.

Dyck, I. (2005). Feminist geography, the "everyday", and local-global relations: Hidden spaces of place-making. *The Canadian Geographer*, *49*(3), 233–243.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (2000). Multiple modernities. *Daedalus*, 129(1), 1–29.

Ekers, M. (2013). *Gramsci: Space, nature, politics*. John Wiley & Sons.

Elias, N. (1994). *The established and the outsiders: A sociological enquiry into community problems*. Sage Publications.

Eligür, B. (2010). *The mobilization of political Islam in Turkey*. Cambridge University Press.

Emirbayer, M. (1997). Manifesto for a relational sociology. *The American Journal of Sociology*, *103*(2), 281–317.

Eraydin, A., & Taşan-Kok, T. (2014). State response to contemporary urban movements in Turkey: A critical overview of state entrepreneurialism and authoritarian interventions. *Antipode*, *46*(1), 110–129.

Erman, T. (1997). Squatter (*gecekondu*) housing versus apartment housing: Turkish rural-to-urban migrant residents' perspectives. *Habitat International*, *21*(1), 91–106. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0197-3975(96)00048-3

Erman, T. (2001). The politics of squatter (*gecekondu*) studies in Turkey: The changing representations of rural migrants in the academic discourse. *Urban Studies*, *38*(7), 983–1002.

Erman, T. (2018). From informal housing to apartment housing: Exploring the 'new social' in a *gecekondu* rehousing project, Turkey. *Housing Studies*, *34*(3), 519–537.

Esen, B., & Gümüşçü, S. (2016). Rising competitive authoritarianism in Turkey. *Third World Quarterly*, *37*(9), 1581–1606.

Esen, B., & Gümüşçü, S. (2021). Why did Turkish democracy collapse? A political economy account of AKP's authoritarianism. *Party Politics*, *27*(6), 1075–1091.

European Stability Initiative. (2005). *Islamic Calvinists: Change and conservatism in central Anatolia, Berlin*.

Faust, L. (2021). Moral challenges in anthropological research among Italian neo-fascists: The significance of the body. *Zeitschrift Für Ethnologie*, *146*(1/2), 173–191.

Faust, L., & Pfeifer, S. (2021). Dark ethnography? Encountering the "uncomfortable" other in anthropological research: Introduction to this special section. *Zeitschrift Für Ethnologie*, *146*(1/2), 81–90.

Fawcett, P., Flinders, M., Hay, C., & Wood, M. (2017). Anti-Politics, depoliticization, and governance. In P. Fawcett, M. Flinders, C. Hay, & M. Wood (Eds.), *Anti-politics, depoliticisation and governance in late-modernity* (pp. 3–27). Oxford University Press.

Feola, G., Goodman, M. K., Suzunaga, J., & Soler, J. (2023). Collective memories, place-framing and the politics of imaginary futures in sustainability transitions and transformation. *Geoforum*, *138*, 1–12.

Fischer, E.F. & Peter Benson, P. (2005). Something better: Hegemony, development, and desire in Guatemalan export agriculture. *Social Analysis*, *49*(1), 3–20.

Fleming, R.L. (2007). *The art of placemaking: Interpreting community through public art and urban design*. Merrell Willcox House.

Flinders, M. & Buller, J. (2006). Depoliticisation: Principles, tactics and tools. *Br Polit, 1*, 293–318.

Fondation Le Corbusier, (n.d). *Cité Frugès* (Workers' Housing Estate). https://www.fondationlecorbusier.fr/en/work-architecture/achievements-cite-fruges-workers-housing-estate-pessac-france-1924-1926/

Förtner, M., Belina, B., & Naumann, M. (2020). The revenge of the village? The geography of right-wing populist electoral success, anti-politics, and austerity in Germany. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space, 39*(3), 574–596.

Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Vintage Books.

Fraser, N. (1990). Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy. *Social Text*, *25/26*, 56–80. https://doi.org/10.2307/466240

Friedmann, J. (2007). Reflections on place and place-making in the cities of China. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *31*(2), 257–279.

Frossard, C. M. (2021). *Policing citizenship: Norms, forms and affects of urban security in Recife, Brazil* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam].

Galam, R. G. (2017). Women "like parched earth in need of rain" and who relax by working: Gossip and the surveillance of Filipino seafarer wives' morality and mobility. *Mobilities*, *12*(6), 861–874.

Gao, Q., Qian, J., & Yuan, Z. (2018). Multi-scaled secularization or postsecular present? Christianity and migrant workers in Shenzhen, China. *Cultural Geographies*, *25*(4), 553–570.

Gerson, J. M., & Peiss, K. (1985). Boundaries, negotiation, consciousness: Reconceptualizing gender relations. *Social Problems, 32*(4), 317–331.

Ghannam, F. (2002). *Remaking the modern: space, relocation, and the politics of identity in a global Cairo.* University of California Press.

Gilbert, D., Dwyer, C., Ahmed, N., Graces, L. C., & Hyacinth, N. (2019). The hidden geographies of religious creativity: Place-making and material culture in West London faith communities. *Cultural Geographies*, *26*(1), 23–42.

Gill, N., Johnstone, P., & Williams, A. (2012). Towards a geography of tolerance: Post-politics and political forms of toleration. *Political Geography*, *31*(8), 509–518.

Gökarıksel, B., & Secor, A. (2014). The veil, desire, and the gaze: Turning the inside out. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 40*(1), 177–200. https://doi.org/10.1086/676897

Gökarıksel, B., & Secor, A. (2015). Post-secular geographies and the problem of pluralism: Religion and everyday life in Istanbul, Turkey. *Political Geography*, *46*, 21–30.

Gökarıksel, B., Hawkins, M., Neubert, C., & Smith, S. (2021). *Feminist geography unbound : discomfort, bodies, and prefigured futures.* West Virginia University Press.

Göle, N. (2000). Snapshots of Islamic modernities. *Daedalus*, *129*(1), 91–117.

Göle, N. (2012). Post-secular Turkey. *New Perspectives Quarterly*, *29*(1), 7–11.

Goodale, M. (2020). God, fatherland, home: Revealing the dark side of our anthropological virtue. *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, *26*(2), 343–364.

Gözaydın, I. (2009). *Diyanet: Türkiye cumhuriyeti'nde dinin tanzimi*. Iletisim.

Gramsci, A. (2000). Prison Writings 1926-1935. In Forgacs (Eds.), *An Antonio Gramsci reader: Selected writings 1916-1935* (pp. 189–402). New York University Press.

Grodzins-Gold, A. (2014). Women's place-making in Santosh Nagar: Gendered constellations. In L., Fernandes (Ed). *Routledge handbook of gender in South Asia* (pp. 173–188). Routledge.

Guardia-Bassols, M., Bañales, J.L.O., Rosselló-Nicolau, M.; Hernández-Falagán, D. (2022). Francoism and the triumph of home ownership, 1939-1975: The case of Nou Barris. In Carola Hein (ed.), *International Planning History Society Proceedings, 19th IPHS Conference, City-Space-Transformation*, TU Delft, 5 - 6 July, 2022. (pp. 559–572)

Guendouzi, J. (2001). "You'll think we're always bitching": The functions of cooperativity and competition in women's gossip. *Discourse Studies*, *3*(1), 29–51.

Gümüşçü, S. (2024). The AKP and stealth Islamization in Turkey. *Turkish Studies*, *25*(3), 371–397.

Günay, O., & Yörük, E. (2019). Governing ethnic unrest: Political Islam and the Kurdish conflict in Turkey. *New Perspectives on Turkey*, *61*, 9–43. doi:10.1017/npt.2019.17

Gündoğan, A. Z. (2021). Rethinking centrality: Extended urbanization in Istanbul. *City, 25*(1–2), 46–66.

Güney, K. M. (2019). Building northern Istanbul: Mega-projects, speculation, and new suburbs. In K.M. Güney, R. Keil, & M. Üçoğlu (Eds). *Massive suburbanization* (pp. 181–200). University of Toronto Press.

Gupta, A. & Ferguson, J. (1997). *Anthropological locations boundaries and grounds of a field science*. University of California Press.

Gupta, A. (1995). Blurred boundaries: The discourse of corruption, the culture of politics, and the imagined state. *American Ethnologist*, *22*(2), 375–402.

Habermas, J. (2006). On the relations between the secular liberal state and religion. In H. de Vries and L.E. Sullivan (Eds.). *Political theologies, public religions in a post-secular world* (pp. 251–260). Fordham University Press.

Hall, S. (1988). *The hard road to renewal: Thatcherism and the crisis of the left*. Verso.

Hall, S. (1992). Introduction in S. Hall & B. Gieben (Eds.). *Formations of Modernity*. (pp. 1–17). Polity.

Halvorsen, S. (2021). The role of territory in grassroots party-building: Insights from Argentina. *Territory, Politics, Governance*, *11*(7), 1303–1323.

Haraway, D. (1988). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies*, *14*(3), 575–599.

Haugen, M. S., & Brandth, B. (2015). When farm couples break up: Gendered moralities, gossip and the fear of stigmatisation in rural communities. *Sociologia Ruralis*, *55*(2), 227–242.

Hay, C. (2007). *Why we hate politics*. Polity Press.

Hochschild, A. R. (2016). *Strangers in their own land: Anger and mourning on the American right*. The New Press.

Holston, J. & Appadurai, A. (1999). Introduction: Cities and Citizenship. In J. Holston (Ed.). *Cities and Citizenship* (pp. 1–21). Duke University Press.

Holston, J. (2008). *Insurgent citizenship: disjunctions of democracy and modernity in Brazil*. Princeton University Press.

Hoşgör, A.E., (2015). The question of AKP hegemony: Consent without consensus. In N. Balkan, E. Balkan, & A. Öncü (Eds.). *The neoliberal landscape and the rise of Islamist capital in Turkey* (pp. 201–235). Berghahn Books.

Işın, E. F., & Nielsen, G. M. (2008). *Acts of citizenship*. Zed Books.

Işın, E.F. (2008). Theorizing acts of citizenship. In E.F. Isin and G.M. Nielsen (Eds.). *Acts of citizenship* (pp. 15–44). Zed Books.

Jaffe, R. (2015). Between ballots and bullets: Elections and citizenship in and beyond the nation-state. *Citizenship Studies*, *19*(2), 128–140.

Jenkins, D., & Ram, L. (2021). 'Party in the street': The partisan politics of space. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space*, *40*(3), 724–743.

Jessop, B. (2005). Gramsci as a spatial theorist. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, *8*(4), 421–437.

Jones, R. (2012). State encounters. *Environment and Planning. D, Society & Space*, *30*(5), 805–821.

Kallio, K. P., Wood, B. E., & Häkli, J. (2020). Lived citizenship: Conceptualising an emerging field. *Citizenship Studies*, *24*(6), 713–729.

Kandiyoti, D. (1997). Gendering the modern: On missing dimensions in the study of Turkish modernity. In R., Kasaba & S., Bozdogan (Eds.). *Rethinking modernity and national identity in Turkey* (pp. 113–132). University of Washington Press.

Kandiyoti, D. (2019). Against all odds: The resilience and fragility of women's gender activism in Turkey. In D., Kandiyoti, N.S., Al-Ali & Spellman-Poots, K . (Eds.). *Gender, governance and Islam* (pp. 80–100). Edinburgh University Press.

Karaman, O. (2008). Urban pulse-(re)making space for globalization in Istanbul. *Urban Geography*, *29*(6), 518–525.

Karaman, O. (2013). Urban renewal in İstanbul: Reconfigured spaces, robotic lives. *International Journal Of Urban And Regional Research*, 37(2), 715–733.

Karatepe, I. D. (2020). *The cultural political economy of the construction industry in Turkey: The case of public housing*. Brill.

Karpat, K. H. (1959). *Turkey's politics: The transition to a multi-party system*. Princeton University Press.

Kaya, A. (2015). Islamisation of Turkey under the AKP rule: Empowering family, faith and charity. *South European Society and Politics*, 20(1), 47–69.

Kaygusuz, Ö. (2018). Authoritarian neoliberalism and regime security in Turkey: Moving to an 'exceptional state' under AKP. *South European Society and Politics*, *23*(2), 281–302.

Keenan, K. (2025). The urban realm and the municipal bureaucracy: Recognizing the role of place as disruptor to organizational traps. *Environment and Planning. C, Politics and Space, 43*(8), 1696–1713.

Kemahlıoğlu, Ö. (2012) *Agents or bosses?: Patronage and intra-party politics in Argentina and Turkey*. ECPR Press Monographs.

Keyder, C. (1987). *State and class in Turkey: A study in capitalist development*. Verso.

Keyman, E. F. (2010). Modernization, globalization and democratization in Turkey: The AKP experience and its limits. *Constellations, 17*(2), 312–327.

Kipfer, S. (2002). Urbanization, everyday life and the survival of capitalism: Lefebvre, Gramsci and the problematic of hegemony. *Capitalism Nature Socialism*, *13*(2), 117–149.

Koch, N. (2022). *Spatializing authoritarianism*. Syracuse University Press.

Konda. (2017). Türkiye 100 Kişi Olsaydı. *Konda.* https://konda.com.tr/rapor/56/turkiye-100-kisi-olsaydi

Koster, M., & van Leynseele, Y. (2018). Brokers as assemblers: Studying development through the lens of brokerage. *Ethnos*, 83(5), 803–813.

Kuran, İ. (2024). The AKP's clientelist–machine politics and the role of Kurdish brokers: The case of Bağcılar. *New Perspectives on Turkey*, *71*, 121–142. https://doi.org/10.1017/npt.2023.32

Kusenbach, M. (2003). Street phenomenology: The go-along as ethnographic research tool. *Ethnography*, *4*(3), 455–485.

Kütük-Kuriş, M. (2021). Moral ambivalence, religious doubt and non-belief among ex-hijabi women in Turkey. *Religions*, *12*(1), 33.

Kuyucu, T. (2014). Law, property and ambiguity: The uses and abuses of legal ambiguity in remaking Istanbul's informal settlements. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *38*(2), 609–627.

Kuyucu, T., & Ünsal, Ö. (2010). "Urban Transformation" as state-led property transfer: An analysis of two cases of urban renewal in Istanbul. *Urban Studies*, *47*(7), 1479–1499.

Laliberté, N., & Schurr, C. (2015). Introduction. *Gender, Place & Culture*, *23*(1), 72–78.

Lamont, M., & Molnár, V. (2002). The study of boundaries in the social sciences. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *28*(1), 167–195.

Laszczkowski, M. (2016). "Demo version of a city": buildings, affects, and the state in Astana. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, *22*(1), 148–165.

Laszczkowski, M., & Reeves, M. (2015). Introduction: Affective states: Entanglements, suspensions, suspicions. *Social Analysis*, *59*(4), 1–14.

Lazar, S. (2013). Citizenship, political agency and technologies of the self in Argentinean trade unions. *Critique of Anthropology*, *33*(1), 110–128.

Leitner, H., Sheppard, E., & Sziarto, K. M. (2008). The spatialities of contentious politics. *Transactions - Institute of British Geographers*, *33*(2), 157–172.

Letsch, C. (2014). Leaked tapes prompt calls for Turkish PM to resign. *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/feb/25/leaked-tapes-calls-erdogan-resign-turkish-pm

Liebmann, L. L., & Galal, L. P. (2020). Classing religion, resourcing women: Muslim women negotiating space for action. *Cultural Dynamics*, *32*(4), 261–281.

Lipsky, M. (2010 [1980]). *Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services*. Russell Sage Foundation.

Loftus, A., & Lumsden, F. (2008). Reworking hegemony in the urban waterscape. *Transactions - Institute of British Geographers*, *33*(1), 109–126.

Loopmans, M. (2008). Relevance, gentrification and the development of a new hegemony on urban policies in Antwerp, Belgium. *Urban Studies*, *45*(12), 2499–2519.

Lord, C. (2018). *Religious politics in Turkey: From the birth of the Republic to the AKP*. Cambridge University Press.

Lovering, J. & Türkmen, H. (2011). Bulldozer neo-liberalism in Istanbul: The state-led construction of property markets, and the displacement of the urban poor. *International Planning Studies*, *16*(1), 73–96.

Löw, M. (2006). The social construction of space and gender. *The European Journal of Women's Studies*, *13*(2), 119–133.

Lüküslü, D. (2016). Creating a pious generation: youth and education policies of the AKP in Turkey. *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, *16*(4), 637–649.

Mahmood, S. (2005). *Politics of piety: The Islamic revival and the feminist subject*. Princeton University Press.

Mardin, S. (2005). Turkish Islamic exceptionalism yesterday and today: Continuity, rupture and reconstruction in operational codes. *Turkish Studies*, *6*(2), 145–165.

Mardin, S., (1977). *Religion in modern Turkey*, UNESCO: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation. Retrieved from https://coilink.org/20.500.12592/2280kj4

Maritato, C. (2016). Reassessing women, religion and the Turkish secular state in the light of the professionalisation of female preachers (vaizeler) in Istanbul. *Religion, State & Society*, *44*(3), 258–275.

Marschall, M., Aydoğan, A., & Bulut, A. (2016). Does housing create votes? Explaining the electoral success of the AKP in Turkey. *Electoral Studies*, *42*, 201–212.

Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2015 [1848]). *The Communist Manifesto*. Penguin.

Massey, D. (2005). *For Space*. Sage.

McGregor, J., & Chatiza, K. (2020). Partisan citizenship and its discontents: Precarious possession and political agency on Harare City's expanding margins. *Citizenship Studies*, *24*(1), 17–39.

Militz, E., & Schurr, C. (2016). Affective nationalism: Banalities of belonging in Azerbaijan. *Political Geography*, *54*, 54–63.

Mills, A. (2007). Gender and mahalle (neighborhood) space in Istanbul. *Gender, Place & Culture*, *14*(3), 335–354.

Mitchell, T. (1988). *Colonising Egypt*. Cambridge University Press.

Mitchell, T. (2000). *Questions of modernity*. University of Minnesota Press.

Mitchell, T. (2018). Society, economy, and the state effect. In G., Steinmetz (Ed.). *State/Culture state-formation after the cultural turn* (pp. 76–97). Cornell University Press.

Molendijk, A. L., Beaumont, J., & Jedan, C. (2010). *Exploring the postsecular: The religious, the political, and the urban*. Brill.

Moss, P. & Dyck, I. (2003). Embodying Social Geography. In K., Anderson, M., Domosh, S., Pile & N., Thrift (Eds). *Handbook of Cultural Geography* (pp. 58–73). Sage Publications.

Mutluer, N. (2019). Diyanet's role in building the 'yeni (new) milli' in the AKP Era. *European Journal of Turkish Studies*, *27*.

Muwwakkil, J. (2023). You have never lived a day outside of your body: Engaging racialized and gendered positionality in ethnographic research. *Transforming Anthropology*, *31*(2), 125–136.

Nagar, R. (1998). Communal discourses, marriage, and the politics of gendered social boundaries among South Asian immigrants in Tanzania. *Gender, Place and Culture : A Journal of Feminist Geography*, *5*(2), 117–139.

Navaro-Yashin, Y. (2002). *Faces of the state: Secularism and public life in Turkey*. Princeton University Press.

Nuijten, M. (2004). Between fear and fantasy: Governmentality and the working of power in Mexico. *Critique of Anthropology*, *24*(2), 209–230.

Öncü, A. (1988). The politics of the urban land market in Turkey. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *12*(1), 38–63.

Ong, A. (1999). *Flexible citizenship: The cultural logics of transnationality*. Duke University Press.

Öniş, Z. (2012). The triumph of conservative globalism: The political economy of the AKP Era. *Turkish Studies*, *13*(2), 135–152.

Öniş, Z. (2013). Sharing power: Turkey's democratization challenge in the age of the AKP hegemony. *Insight Turkey*, *15*(2), 103–122.

Oomen, E. (2024). Informed consent. *AISSR wiki*. file:///C:/Users/cidel/Zotero/storage/X6W8UUQW/Informed-Consent.html

Ortner, S. B. (2016). Dark anthropology and its others: Theory since the eighties. *HAU Journal of Ethnographic Theory*, *6*(1), 47–73.

Owen, J., Walker, A., & Ince, A. (2022). Editorial: Uncomfortable geographies. *Emotion, Space and Society*, *42*, Article 100871.

Özdemir, D. (2011). The role of the public sector in the provision of housing supply in Turkey, 1950-2009. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *35*(6), 1099–1117.

Özen, H. (2020). Reproducing "hegemony" thereafter? The long-term political effects of the Gezi protests in Turkey. *Journal of Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, *20*(2), 245–264.

Özen, H. (2022). Interpellating 'the people' against environmentalists: The authoritarian populist response to environmental mobilizations in Turkey. *Political Geography*, *97*, Article 102695.

Özet, I. (2019). *Fatih-Başakşehir: Muhafazakâr mahallede iktidar ve dönüşen habitus*. İletişim Yayınları.

Öztürk, A. E. (2016). Turkey's Diyanet under AKP rule: From protector to imposer of state ideology? *Journal of Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, *16*(4), 619–635.

Pain, R. (2009). Globalized fear? Towards an emotional geopolitics. *Progress in Human Geography*, *33*(4), 466–486.

Painter, J. (2006). Prosaic geographies of stateness. *Political Geography*, *25*(7), 752–774.

Pasieka, A. (2017). taking far-right claims seriously and literally: Anthropology and the study of right-wing radicalism. *Slavic Review*, *76*(S1), S19–S29.

Pasieka, A. (2019). Anthropology of the far right: What if we like the "unlikeable" others? *Anthropology Today*, *35*(1), 3–6.

Pearse, R., & Connell, R. (2016). Gender norms and the economy: Insights from social research. *Feminist Economics*, *22*(1), 30–53.

Peyrefitte, M., & Sanders-McDonagh, E. (2018). Space, power and sexuality: Transgressive and transformative possibilities at the interstices of spatial boundaries. *Gender, Place and Culture : A Journal of Feminist Geography*, *25*(3), 325–333.

Pinkster, F. M. (2016). Narratives of neighbourhood change and loss of belonging in an urban garden village. *Social & Cultural Geography*, *17*(7), 871–891. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2016.1139169

Platt, L. C. (2019). Crafting place: Women's everyday creativity in placemaking processes. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, *22*(3), 362–377.

Poblocki, K. (2021). Suburbanization of the self: Religious revival and socio-spatial fragmentation in contemporary Poland. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *45*(1), 39–60.

Poppe, W., & Young, D. (2015). The politics of place: Place-making versus densification in Toronto's tower neighbourhoods. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *39*(3), 613–621.

PPS (2007). "What Is Placemaking?" *Project for Public Spaces*, 2007, https://www.pps.org/article/what-is-placemaking

Prickett, P. J. (2015). Negotiating gendered religious space: The particularities of patriarchy in an African American mosque. *Gender & Society*, *29*(1), 51–72.

Pykett, J. (2009). Pedagogical power: Lessons from school spaces. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, *4*(2), 102–116.

Pykett, J., Saward, M., & Schaefer, A. (2010). Framing the good citizen. *British Journal of Politics & International Relations*, *12*(4), 523–538.

Qian, J., & Kong, L. (2018). When secular universalism meets pluralism: Religious schools and the politics of school-based management in Hong Kong. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, *108*(3), 794–810.

Rana, J. (2022). Secular-religious self-improvement: Muslim women's kick-boxing in the Netherlands. *American Ethnologist*, *49*(2), 191–203.

Ranade, S. (2007). The way she moves: Mapping the everyday production of gender-space. *Economic and Political Weekly*, *42*(17), 1519–1526.

Ridgeway, C. L. (2011). *Framed by gender: How gender inequality persists in the modern world*. Oxford University Press.

Risman, B. J. (2004). Gender as a social structure: Theory wrestling with activism. *Gender & Society*, *18*(4), 429–450.

Rosati, M. & Stoeckl, K. (2012). Introduction. In M. Rosati & K. Stoeckl (eds.). *Multiple modernities and postsecular societies* (pp. 1-17). Routledge.

Rosati, M. (2012). The Turkish laboratory: Local modernity and the postsecular. In Turkey. M. Rosati and & K. Stoeckl (eds.). *Multiple modernities and postsecular societies* (pp.61-79). Routledge.

Rosati, M. (2015). *The Making of a postsecular society a Durkheimian approach to memory, pluralism and religion in Turkey*. Ashgate.

Roseberry, W. (1994). Hegemony and the language of contention. In G. M. Joseph & D. Nugent (Eds.). *Everyday Forms of State Formation: Revolution and the negotiation of rule in modern Mexico* (pp. 355–366). Duke University Press.

Rudaw. (2024). Erdoğan'dan İsmailağa *cemaat*ine ziyaret. *Rudaw.* https://www.rudaw.net/turkish/middleeast/turkey/3003202422

Saglam, E. (2021). Darkness Unbound. Insights from ethnographic research with nationalist groups in contemporary Turkey. *Zeitschrift Für Ethnologie*, *146*(1/2), 129–153.

Sakizlioglu, B. (2014). Inserting temporality into the analysis of displacement: Living under the threat of displacement. *Tijdschrift Voor Economische En Sociale Geografie*, *105*(2), 206–220.

Sampson, R. J. (2012). *Great American city: Chicago and the enduring neighborhood effect*. The University of Chicago Press.

SCF. (2021). Turkey investigates social media users calling for int'l help to combat wildfires. *Stockholm center for freedom*. https://stockholmcf.org/turkey-investigates-social-media-users-calling-for-intl-help-to-combat-wildfires/

Schielke, S. (2009). Ambivalent commitments: Troubles of morality, religiosity and aspiration among young Egyptians. *Journal of Religion in Africa*, *39*(2), 158–185.

Scott, J. C. (1990). *Domination and the arts of resistance: Hidden transcripts*. Yale University Press.

Scott, J. C. (1998). *Seeing like a state: How certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed*. Yale University Press.

Selvi, A. F. (2024). "Türkiye," not "Turkey": Nation branding in the age of populism and nationalism. *Journal of Language and Politics, 23*(4), 496–519. https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.22104.sel

Sert, E. (2024). Urban green spaces of İstanbul: From "beautifying" efforts to "mega-projects." *Planning Perspectives*, *39*(6), 1359–1380.

Sevilla-Buitrago, A. (2017). Gramsci and Foucault in Central Park: Environmental hegemonies, pedagogical spaces and integral state formations. *Environment and Planning. D, Society & Space*, *35*(1), 165–183.

Shaikh, S. (2009). In search of al-Insa ¯n: Sufism, Islamic Law, and gender." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion, 77*(4), 781–822.

Shaker, R., van Lanen, S., & van Hoven, B. (2021). "No one likes that judgmental look like you are a terrorist." Sensorial encounters with the Muslim Other in Amsterdam. *Geoforum*, *120,* 14–21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2021.01.014

Shakthi, S. (2020). Confronting my many-hued self: An autoethnographic analysis of skin colour across multiple geographies. *Emotion, Space and Society*, *37*, Article 100732.

Sharma, A., & Gupta, A. (2006). *The anthropology of the state: A reader*. Blackwell Pub.

Shoshan, N. (2021). Under a different name: Secrecy, complicity, ethnography. *Zeitschrift Für Ethnologie*, *146*(1/2), 109–128.

Silver, D. A. & Clark, T. N. (2016). *Scenescapes: How qualities of place shape social life*. University of Chicago Press.

Silvey, R. (2004). Power, difference and mobility: Feminist advances in migration studies. *Progress in Human Geography*, *28*(4), 490–506.

Singer, R., & Bickel, R. (2015). Which way to go? Women's walking decisions and Ultra-Orthodox enclaves in Jerusalem. *Gender, Place and Culture : A Journal of Feminist Geography*, *22*(7), 987–1006.

Sol. (2024). Erdoğan Adıyaman'da Menzil *tarikat*ıyla görüştü. *Sol Haber*. https://haber.sol.org.tr/haber/erdogan-adiyamanda-menzil-*tarikat*iyla-gorustu-390313

Sozcu, (2023). TOKİ İstanbul kura sonuçları belli oluyor: TOKİ İstanbul Tuzla 20 bin konut kura sonuçları. *Sozcu*. https://www.sozcu.com.tr/toki-istanbul-kura-sonuclari-belli-oluyor-toki-istanbul-tuzla-20-bin-konut-kura-sonuclari-wp7623553

Spierings, B., van Melik, R., & van Aalst, I. (2016). Parallel lives on the plaza: Young dutch women of Turkish and Moroccan descent and their feelings of comfort and control on Rotterdam's Schouwburgplein. *Space and Culture*, *19*(2), 150–163.

Spivak, G. C. (2010). Can the subaltern speak? In R.C., Morris (Ed.). *Can the subaltern speak?: Reflections on the history of an idea*. Columbia University Press, 21–81.

Staeheli, L. A. (2011). Political geography: Where's citizenship? *Progress in Human Geography*, *35*(3), 393–400.

Staeheli, L. A., Ehrkamp, P., Leitner, H., & Nagel, C. R. (2012). Dreaming the ordinary: Daily life and the complex geographies of citizenship. *Progress in Human Geography*, *36*(5), 628–644.

Staeheli, L. A., Marshall, D. J., & Maynard, N. (2016). Circulations and the entanglements of citizenship formation. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, *106*(2), 377–384.

Steinmüller, H. (2015) Father Mao and the country-family: Mixed emotions for fathers, officials, and leaders in China. *Social Analysis: The International Journal of Social and Cultural Practice*, *59*(4), 1–19.

Teitelbaum, B. R. (2019). Collaborating with the radical right: Scholar-informant solidarity and the case for an immoral anthropology. *Current Anthropology*, *60*(3), 414–435.

Tekeli, I. (1996). *Türkiye'de yaşamda ve yazında konut sorununun gelişimi*. TC Başbakanlık Toplu Konut İdaresi Başkanlığı.

Ternullo, S. (2024). *How the heartland went red: Why local forces matter in an age of nationalized politics*. Princeton University Press.

Thomas, P. (2016). *Placemaking an urban design methodology*. Routledge.

TOKİ. (2018) *Toki konut üretim raporu*. Retrieved from https://www.toki.gov.tr/AppResources/UserFiles/files/FaaliyetOzeti/ozet.pdf.

Toprak, B. (2005). Islam and Democracy in Turkey. *Turkish Studies*, *6*(2), 167–186.

Törnberg, P., & Uitermark, J. (2025). *Seeing Like a Platform: An Inquiry into the Condition of Digital Modernity*. Taylor & Francis Group.

Trantas, G. E. (2025). The third conquest of Constantinople: The symbolism of Hagia Sophia's reconversion to a mosque. *Religions*, *16*(4), Article 429. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel16040429

TRT1. (2023, February 21). *Dr.Salih Selman, Görüntüsünü Değiştirip İslam'a Sarılmasını Anlattı*. [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=06B6zmFt9TU

Tuğal, C. (2009). *Passive revolution: Absorbing the Islamic challenge to capitalism*. Stanford University Press.

Tuğal, C. (2023). Politicized megaprojects and public sector interventions: Mass consent under neoliberal statism. *Critical Sociology*, *49*(3), 457–473.

Turam, B. (2007). *Between Islam and the state: The politics of engagement*. Stanford University Press.

Türkün, A. (2011). Urban regeneration and hegemonic power relationships. *International Planning Studies*, *16*(1), 61–72.

Üçoğlu, M. (2021). Financialization and suburbanization: The predatory hegemony of suburban-financial nexus in Istanbul. *Globalizations*, *18*(6), 981–994.

Van Eck, E. (2022). "That market has no quality": Performative place frames, racialisation, and affective re-inscriptions in an outdoor retail market in Amsterdam. *Transactions - Institute of British Geographers, 47*(2), 547–561.

Van Gent, W., Brugman, G., & De Craene, V. (2023). Navigating (homo) nationalism and heteronormativity; How Turkish-Dutch and Moroccan-Dutch gay/bi men negotiate belonging in Amsterdam. *Geoforum*, *141*, Article 103743. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2023.103743

Van Haperen, S., Nicholls, W., & Uitermark, J. (2018). Building protest online: Engagement with the digitally networked #not1more protest campaign on Twitter. *Social Movement Studies*, *17*(4), 408–423.

Van Neste, S. L., & Martin, D. G. (2018). Place-framing against automobility in Montreal. *Transactions - Institute of British Geographers*, *43*(1), 47–60.

Vásquez, M. A., & Knott, K. (2014). Three dimensions of religious place making in diaspora. *Global Networks*, *14*(3), 326–347.

Vollebergh, A., de Koning, A., & Marchesi, M. (2021). Intimate states: Techniques and entanglements of governing through community in Europe. *Current Anthropology*, *62*(6), 741–770.

Wacquant, L. (2003). Ethnografeast: A progress report on the practice and promise of ethnography. *Ethnography*, *4*(1), 5–14.

Wertheimer, T., (2022, June 2). Turkey wants to be called Türkiye in rebranding move. *BBC News.* https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-61671913

White, J. B. (2002). *Islamist mobilization in Turkey: A study in vernacular politics*. University of Washington Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780295802275

Wijntuin, P., & Koster, M. (2019). Dutch-Moroccan girls navigating public space: Wandering as an everyday spatial practice. *Space and Culture*, *22*(3), 280–293.

Williams, A. (2015). Postsecular geographies: theo-ethics, rapprochement and neoliberal governance in a faith-based drug programme. *Transactions - Institute of British Geographers*, *40*(2), 192–208.

Wilson, H. F. (2020). Discomfort: Transformative encounters and social change. *Emotion, Space and Society*, *37*, Article 100681.

Yalçıntan, M. C., & Erbaş, A. E. (2003). Impacts of "*Gecekondu*" on the electoral geography of Istanbul. *International Labor and Working Class History*, *64*(64), 91–111.

Yalman, G. L. (2009). *Transition to neo-liberalism: The case of Turkey in the 1980s.* (1st ed.). İstanbul Bilgi University.

Yenen, A.A., & Zürcher, E. J. (2023). That's nobody's business but the Turks': rebranding "New Türkiye" for the new century. In A.A. Yenen & E.J. Zürcher (Eds.), *A hundred years of republican Turkey: A history in a hundred fragments* (pp. 537–542). Leiden University Press.

Yeni Şafak. (2005). Kaçak Kur'an kursuna operasyon. *Yeni Safak*. https://www.yenisafak.com/gundem/kacak-kuran-kursuna-operasyon-2695730

Yeşilbağ, M. (2022). Statecraft on cement: The politics of land-based accumulation in Erdoğan's Turkey. *Urban Studies*, *59*(13), 2679–2694.

Yılmaz, I. (2018). Islamic populism and creating desirable citizens in Erdogan's new Turkey. *Mediterranean Quarterly*, *29*(4), 52–76.

Yılmaz, I. (2021). *Creating the desired citizen: ideology, state and Islam in Turkey*. Cambridge University Press.

Yılmaz, I. (2022). Islamist populist nation-building: Gradual, ad hoc Islamisation of the secular education system in Turkey. *Religions*, *13*(9), 814.

Yılmaz, I., & Ertürk, O. (2023). Religious necropolitical propaganda in educational materials for children. *Religions*, *14*(1), 67.

Yılmaz, I., & Ertürk, O. F. (2021). Populism, violence and authoritarian stability: Necropolitics in Turkey. *Third World Quarterly*, *42*(7), 1524–1543.

Yörük, E. (2022). *The politics of the welfare state in Turkey: How social movements and elite competition created a welfare state*. University of Michigan Press. https://doi.org/10.1353/book.101375

YSK. (n.d.) *Milletvekili Genel Seçim Arşivi*. https://www.ysk.gov.tr/tr/milletvekili-genel-secim-arsivi/2644

Zayim, A. (2014). Differentiated urban citizenship and housing rights: Analysing the social impacts of urban redevelopment in globalizing Istanbul. *International Planning Studies*, *19*(3–4), 268–291.

Zuntz, A.C., & Columbu, A. (2024). Right to mobility, right to belong: Bottom-up citizenship practices of Syrian refugees in Europe. *Migration Studies*, *12*(4), Article 047. https://doi.org/10.1093/migration/mnae047

Zürcher, E. J. (2004). *Turkey : A modern history.* Tauris.

Summary

Since its establishment in the early 1920s, Turkey was constituted as a secular modern republic. However, following the rise to power of the Justice and Development Party (AKP) in 2002, the country has undergone a profound transformation often framed as the making of a New Turkey. Through large-scale urban development projects, welfare expansion, and the reintroduction of religion into the public sphere, the AKP has advanced a post-secular vision of modernity that challenges the secular-modernist paradigm of the Kemalist era. While a substantial body of scholarship has examined the authoritarian, illiberal, and undemocratic dimensions of AKP rule, less attention has been paid to how pious popular classes experience, negotiate, and affirm this political project in everyday life. This dissertation addresses this gap by asking: *How are state and citizenship reconfigured in everyday spaces under AKP governments*?

To answer this question, I develop a place-based approach grounded in a Gramscian understanding of hegemony. Rather than focusing solely on coercion or institutional transformation, I examine the generative dimensions of the AKP's project – how it cultivates consent and establishes new forms of common sense regarding the state and citizenship. Drawing on the concept of place-making, understood as a relational and processual practice through which people shape spaces and are simultaneously shaped by them, I demonstrate how political ideals become embodied, negotiated, and contested in everyday life. Empirically, the dissertation focuses on the neighbourhood of Kayaşehir and examines how party activists, religious institutions, Islamic civil society groups (*cemaat*s), and residents participate in the making of a post-secular modernity. These themes and questions are introduced and elaborated in Chapter 1 – Introduction, which outlines the conceptual framework, research questions, and overall structure of the dissertation.

In Chapter 2 – Reconfiguring Modernity, Secularism, and Citizenship through Place-Making – I outline the theoretical framework that underpins this study, drawing on debates on modernity and citizenship to show how place-making enables us to observe post-secular modernity as it is lived, negotiated, and contested in everyday spaces. The literature on modernity is marked by a clear ontological divide. Critical approaches conceptualise modernity as a capitalist political project, emphasising its exploitative effects and the inequalities it produces along lines of race, gender, and class (Asad, 2003; Mitchell, 2000). In contrast, alternative approaches argue for multiple modernities, suggesting that Western secular modernity is only one form among many and that other articulations can be empowering and contextually grounded (Eisenstadt, 2000; Deeb, 2006; Bracke, 2008).

My conceptualisation of post-secular modernity draws selectively on both perspectives. I approach it as a political project that promises material development without requiring adherence to secular norms. Rather than framing it solely as an extension of capitalist inequality or as liberation from secular imposition, I focus on its generative dimensions: the new imaginaries of statehood, citizenship, and moral order it enables, as well as the contestations it produces. In doing so, I highlight what it means to embody and negotiate post-secular modernity in everyday life.

My discussion of state and citizenship under a post-secular modernity project builds on two strands of scholarship: anthropological debates on statehood (Sharma & Gupta, 2006; Koster & Van Leynseele, 2018; Lazar, 2013) and theories of substantive citizenship (Holston & Appadurai, 1999; De Koning et al., 2015). Drawing on these literatures, I foreground the emotional, affective, and performative dimensions through which both the state and the citizen are produced in everyday life. Rather than treating statehood and citizenship as fixed institutional or legal categories, I approach them as relational and processual formations that take shape through daily practices, interactions, and spatial arrangements. Conceptually, I extend these debates by mobilising place-making as an analytical lens to show how such formations are

materially and socially embedded in lived environments. Empirically, I focus on actors and sites that have remained marginal within these discussions, demonstrating how their place-based practices articulate specific understandings of the state and of what it means to be a "good" citizen under a post-secular modernity project.

In Chapter 3 – Case Study and Methods – I provide a detailed account of why Kayaşehir was chosen as a case study. The main reasons are that Kayaşehir exemplifies the AKP's modernist aspirations, supports Islamic ways of life through its religious infrastructure, and has consistently been a strong electoral base, making it ideal for observing how statehood and citizenship are enacted in everyday life. Methodologically, the research draws on political ethnography and feminist geography, using a gender-sensitive lens to explore three interconnected domains: party politics, religious education, and neighbourly relations. I examine how the AKP's project materialises through place-based practices by local party organisations, religious institutions (Diyanet and *cemaat*s), and residents. Through participant observation in rallies, religious courses, and neighbourhood gatherings, I traced how political authority, religious morality, and gendered social norms are enacted, negotiated, and contested in daily life.

In Chapter 4 – Making a Party/State – Everyday Engagements with the AKP as the State – I address the sub-question of how the AKP claims and maintains political authority in everyday life. Focusing on the place-based practices of party activists, members of the Muhammedi Cemaat, and residents, the chapter demonstrates how authority is embedded, felt, and reproduced within the neighbourhood.

Party activists and the Muhammedi Cemaat operate along a continuum from the profane to the sacred, reflecting the post-secular modernity project. Activists humanise the party by emphasising its caring, everyday presence – visiting homes and guiding residents to municipal or state services – making the AKP akin to a supportive neighbour. The Muhammedi Cemaat, in

contrast, cultivates an affective atmosphere during Quran recitations and religious courses, presenting the AKP as the protector of Islam and the nation, which evokes both pride and fear and contributes to its near-sacred status.

Residents' interactions with these actors socialise them into the party/state, shaping understandings of politics and citizenship. Even dissenting voices, such as those on WhatsApp groups, largely operate within pro-AKP definitions of politics, showing that consent is produced not only through agreement but also through widespread acceptance of the party/state's ethico-political framework. Through these everyday, place-based practices, the chapter shows how the AKP's post-secular modernity is enacted, internalised, and reproduced.

In Chapter 5 – Making the Pious Citizen: Everyday Engagements with Religious Morality – I address the sub-question of how Kayaşehir has become a site for Islamic living, where diverse Islamic lifestyles and ideas take shape within the AKP's political project. The chapter shows that the neighbourhood emerges as a terrain for cultivating pious citizens through the combined, place-based practices of the Muhammedi Cemaat and the Diyanet, which animate religious spaces, promote moral sensibilities, and engage residents in the internalisation of pious conduct.

The two institutions operate in complementary yet distinct ways: the Muhammedi Cemaat primarily occupies semi-private spaces, such as TOKİ flats and basements, promoting a strict, Prophet-inspired Islamic lifestyle, while the Diyanet uses semi-public venues, including mosques and seminar halls, addressing a more heterogeneous audience. This spatial and pedagogical complementarity allows them to saturate the neighbourhood with religious practices and education, creating pervasive affective atmospheres that shape everyday life.

Tensions between the state and *cemaat*s, however, reveal the limits of this cooperation. The state maintains authority through both coercion and consent – encouraging discreet *cemaat*s' activities while enhancing the

appeal of Diyanet spaces like kindergartens. Through these intertwined and sometimes contested practices, Kayaşehir exemplifies the fusion of Islamic tradition and Islamic modernity central to Turkey's post-secular modernity. The chapter demonstrates that the production of pious citizens relies on the interplay between the state and religious actors, where the roles of believer and citizen are fused in everyday life.

In Chapter 6 – Making Pious Womanhood: Everyday Engagements with Gender Norms – I examine the sub-question of how pious women in Kayaşehir experience, negotiate, and, at times, transgress the conservative gender norms central to the AKP's hegemonic project. The chapter shows that while the neighbourhood is widely recognised as pious, women interpret and enact these norms in diverse ways, reflecting both adherence to and subtle contestation of the party's model of conservative womanhood.

Everyday place-based practices – such as Quran study meetings, neighbourhood gatherings, and the use of shared spaces – enable women to develop social networks, enforce and negotiate gendered expectations, and 'en-gender' the physical and social environment. Differences emerge across women's circumstances and aspirations: single mothers like Hayriye and Zerrin subtly challenge dominant norms through quiet negotiations, while platforms such as KayaLadies explicitly explore alternatives, fostering varied expressions of piety.

The chapter highlights that women's engagement with gender norms does not necessarily oppose the AKP. Many women remain party supporters, yet their everyday practices often diverge from the party's expectations, revealing religious subjectivities that navigate between secular-liberal and conservative Islamic ideals. The newness of Kayaşehir, lacking entrenched gender traditions, allows women to articulate their aspirations through flexible, place-based practices, reshaping post-secular modernity in ways that both align with and exceed the AKP's vision, enabling multiple ways of living piously to coexist.

Chapter 7 – Conclusion – synthesises how each preceding chapter addresses different dimensions of the research question and highlights the dissertation's theoretical and empirical contributions. As a political project, post-secular modernity emerged in reaction to secular modernity, seeking to displace it rather than reconcile with it. Contrary to theoretical expectations of reflexive engagement, this has produced 'in-between' ways of living, where residents may embrace piety without fully aligning with the AKP's political agenda. Examples include Diyanet kindergartens offering secular classes to attract residents, and pious women enacting unorthodox Islamic practices that diverge from the party's gender norms. These cases are not mere exceptions but reflect the dialectical interplay between secular and post-secular modernity, enabling new forms of citizenship that are distinct from the AKP's vision.

Place-based practices demonstrate that particular ideas of the state and specific understandings of the "good citizen" are formed in tandem with the construction of the neighbourhood – encompassing both the built environment and everyday social relations. The reconfiguration of the state as the party/state does not end with the erection of apartment blocks, public declarations, or party programmes; it is continuously produced through daily practices. This reflects what Gramsci describes as the unfinished character of hegemonic projects and his emphasis on the mundane spaces where political ideals are enacted (Gramsci, 2000). Likewise, the state's citizenship agenda is not confined to formal rights or policies but is enacted through neighbourhood spaces. Through the place-based practices of party activists, religious institutions, and residents, the state and the good citizen take embodied and affective forms that circulate – and at times are contested – locally.

Understanding place-making as a relational and processual dynamic allows me to contribute to debates on statehood and citizenship by showing not only how actors create places that reflect broader political ideals, but also how new ideas and practices of statehood and citizenship emerge through everyday life within those places. In this sense, Kayaşehir becomes a generative site where evolving forms of statehood and citizenship are actively made.

Samenvatting

Sinds haar oprichting begin jaren twintig werd Turkije vormgegeven als een seculiere moderne republiek. Met de machtsovername door de Partij voor Rechtvaardigheid en Ontwikkeling (AKP) in 2002 heeft het land echter een ingrijpende transformatie doorgemaakt die vaak wordt omschreven als de totstandkoming van een Nieuw Turkije. Door middel van grootschalige stedelijke ontwikkelingsprojecten, de uitbreiding van sociale voorzieningen en de herintroductie van religie in de publieke sfeer heeft de AKP een post-seculiere visie op moderniteit bevorderd die het seculier-modernistische paradigma van het Kemalistische tijdperk uitdaagt. Hoewel een omvangrijke hoeveelheid wetenschappelijke literatuur zich heeft gericht op de autoritaire, illiberale en ondemocratische dimensies van het AKP-bewind, is er minder aandacht besteed aan de manier waarop vrome volksklassen dit politieke project in het dagelijks leven ervaren, laveren en bevestigen. Dit proefschrift vult deze leemte door te vragen: *hoe worden staat en burgerschap opnieuw vormgegeven in alledaagse ruimtes onder AKP-regeringen*?

Om deze vraag te beantwoorden ontwikkel ik een plaatsgebonden benadering die is gefundeerd op een Gramsciaans begrip van hegemonie. In plaats van uitsluitend te focussen op dwang of institutionele transformaties, onderzoek ik de productieve dimensies van het AKP-project: de manieren waarop het instemming cultiveert en nieuwe vormen van vanzelfsprekendheid creëert met betrekking tot de staat en burgerschap. Uitgaande van het concept place-making, opgevat als een relationele en procesmatige praktijk waardoor mensen ruimtes vormgeven en tegelijkertijd zelf door deze ruimtes worden gevormd, laat ik zien hoe politieke idealen worden belichaamd, onderhandeld en betwist in het dagelijks leven. Empirisch richt dit proefschrift zich op de wijk Kayaşehir en onderzoekt het hoe partijactivisten, religieuze instellingen, islamitische maatschappelijke organisaties (*cemaat*s) en

bewoners deelnemen aan de vormgeving van een post-seculiere moderniteit. Deze thema's en onderzoeksvragen worden geïntroduceerd en uitgewerkt in Hoofdstuk 1 – Inleiding, waarin het conceptuele kader, de onderzoeksvragen en de gehele structuur van het proefschrift worden uiteengezet.

In Hoofdstuk 2 – Het herconfigureren van moderniteit, secularisme en burgerschap door place-making – presenteer ik het theoretische kader van deze studie, puttend ik uit debatten over moderniteit en burgerschap om te laten zien hoe place-making ons in staat stelt post-seculiere moderniteit te observeren zoals deze wordt geleefd, onderhandeld en betwist in alledaagse ruimtes. De literatuur over moderniteit wordt gekenmerkt door een duidelijke ontologische scheidslijn. Kritische benaderingen conceptualiseren moderniteit als een kapitalistisch politiek project en benadrukken de uitbuitende effecten ervan en de ongelijkheden die het produceert langs lijnen van ras, gender en klasse (Asad, 2003; Mitchell, 2000). Alternatieve benaderingen daarentegen pleiten voor het bestaan van meervoudige moderniteiten, door te suggereren dat Westerse seculiere moderniteit slechts één vorm is van velen, terwijl andere vormen empowering kunnen zijn en contextueel geworteld (Eisenstadt, 2000; Deeb, 2006; Bracke, 2008).

Mijn conceptualisering van post-seculiere moderniteit put selectief uit beide perspectieven. Ik benader haar als een politiek project dat materiële ontwikkeling belooft zonder conformiteit aan seculiere normen te eisen. In plaats van post-seculiere moderniteit uitsluitend te beschouwen als een uitbreiding van kapitalistische ongelijkheid of als een bevrijding van opgelegde seculariteit, richt ik mij op haar generatieve dimensies: de nieuwe verbeeldingen van staatsschap, burgerschap en morele orde die zij mogelijk maakt, evenals de vormen van protest die zij voortbrengt. Op die manier onderstreep ik wat het betekent om post-seculiere moderniteit in het dagelijks leven te belichamen en te laveren.

Mijn bespreking van staat en burgerschap binnen een post-seculier moderniteitsproject bouwt voort op twee wetenschappelijke tradities: antropologische

debatten over staatsschap (Sharma & Gupta, 2006; Koster & Van Leynseele, 2018; Lazar, 2013) en theorieën over substantieel burgerschap (Holston & Appadurai, 1999; De Koning et al., 2015). Voortbouwend op deze literatuur benadruk ik de emotionele, affectieve en performatieve dimensies waarmee zowel de staat als de burger in het dagelijks leven worden geproduceerd. In plaats van staatsschap en burgerschap te beschouwen als vaste institutionele of juridische categorieën, benader ik ze als relationele en procesmatige formaties die vorm krijgen door dagelijkse praktijken, interacties en ruimtelijke arrangementen. Conceptueel breid ik deze debatten uit door place-making als analytische lens te mobiliseren om te laten zien hoe dergelijke formaties materieel en sociaal verankerd zijn in geleefde omgevingen. Empirisch richt ik mij op actoren en locaties die binnen deze discussies grotendeels marginaal zijn gebleven, waarbij ik laat zien hoe hun plaatsgebonden praktijken specifieke opvattingen articuleren over de staat en over wat het betekent om een 'goede' burger te zijn binnen een post-seculier moderniteitsproject.

In Hoofdstuk 3 – Casestudy en methoden – geef ik een gedetailleerde toelichting op waarom Kayaşehir als casestudy gekozen is. De belangrijkste redenen hiervoor zijn dat Kayaşehir model staat voor de modernistische ambities van de AKP, islamitische leefwijzen ondersteunt via haar religieuze infrastructuur, en consequent een sterk electoraal bolwerk vormt, waardoor de wijk uitermate geschikt is om te observeren hoe staatsschap en burgerschap in het dagelijks leven worden gepraktiseerd. Methodologisch put het onderzoek uit politieke etnografie en feministische geografie, waarbij een gendersensitief perspectief wordt gehanteerd om drie onderling verbonden domeinen te onderzoeken: partijpolitiek, religieus onderwijs en burenrelaties. Ik analyseer hoe het AKP-project zich materialiseert via plaatsgebonden praktijken van lokale partijorganisaties, religieuze instellingen (Diyanet en *cemaat*s) en bewoners. Door participerende observatie bij bijeenkomsten, religieuze cursussen en buurtsamenkomsten heb ik getraceerd hoe politieke autoriteit, religieuze moraliteit en gegenderde sociale normen in het dagelijks leven worden vertolkt, onderhandeld en betwist.

In Hoofdstuk 4 – Het maken van een partij/staat: alledaagse betrokkenheden met de AKP als staat – behandel ik de deelvraag hoe de AKP politieke autoriteit in het dagelijks leven claimt en behoudt. Met een focus op de plaatsgebonden praktijken van partijactivisten, leden van de Muhammedi Cemaat en bewoners laat dit hoofdstuk zien hoe autoriteit in de wijk is ingebed, gevoeld en gereproduceerd.

Partijactivisten en de Muhammedi Cemaat opereren op een continuüm van het profane naar het sacrale, wat de post-seculiere moderniteit weerspiegelt. Activisten vermenselijken de partij door haar zorgzame, alledaagse aanwezigheid te benadrukken – het bezoeken van mensen thuis en het gidsen van bewoners naar gemeentelijke of staatsdiensten – waardoor de AKP lijkt op een ondersteunende buur. De Muhammedi Cemaat daarentegen cultiveert een affectieve sfeer tijdens Koranrecitaties en religieuze cursussen, waarbij de AKP wordt gepresenteerd als beschermer van islam en natie, wat zowel trots als angst oproept en bijdraagt aan haar bijna sacrale status.

De interacties van bewoners met deze actoren socialiseren hen in de partij/staat en vormen hun begrip van politiek en burgerschap. Zelfs kritische stemmen, bijvoorbeeld in WhatsApp-groepen, opereren grotendeels binnen pro-AKP definities van politiek, wat laat zien dat instemming niet alleen via overeenstemming wordt geproduceerd, maar ook via wijdverspreide acceptatie van het ethisch-politieke kader van de partij/staat. Door deze alledaagse, plaatsgebonden praktijken laat het hoofdstuk zien hoe de post-seculiere moderniteit van de AKP wordt vertolkt, geïnternaliseerd en gereproduceerd.

In Hoofdstuk 5 – Het maken van de vrome burger: alledaagse betrokkenheden met religieuze moraliteit – behandel ik de deelvraag hoe Kayaşehir is uitgegroeid tot een ruimte voor islamitisch leven, waarin verschillende islamitische leefstijlen en ideeën vorm krijgen binnen het politieke project van de AKP. Het hoofdstuk laat zien dat de wijk opkomt als een terrein voor de cultivering van vrome burgers door de gecombineerde, plaatsgebonden praktijken van de Muhammedi Cemaat en de Diyanet, die religieuze ruimtes

tot leven brengen, morele gevoeligheden bevorderen en bewoners meetrekken in de internalisering van vroom gedrag.

De twee instellingen opereren op complementaire maar duidelijk verschillende manieren: de Muhammedi Cemaat beslaat voornamelijk semi-private ruimtes, zoals TOKİ-flats en kelders, en bevordert een strikte, op de Profeet geïnspireerde islamitische levensstijl, terwijl de Diyanet gebruik maakt van semi-publieke locaties, zoals moskeeën en seminarzalen, en een meer heterogeen publiek aanspreekt. Deze ruimtelijke en pedagogische complementariteit maakt het mogelijk om de wijk te doordrenken met religieuze praktijken en onderwijs, waardoor doordringende affectieve sferen gecreëerd worden die het dagelijks leven vormt.

Spanningen tussen de staat en de *cemaat*s onthullen echter de grenzen van deze samenwerking. De staat behoudt autoriteit via zowel dwang als instemming – door discrete activiteiten van *cemaat*s aan te moedigen en terwijl de aantrekkelijkheid van Diyanet-ruimtes, zoals kinderdagverblijven, te versterken. Door deze verweven en soms betwiste praktijken belichaamt Kayaşehir de samensmelting van islamitische traditie en islamitische moderniteit die centraal staat in de post-seculiere moderniteit van Turkije. Het hoofdstuk laat zien dat de productie van vrome burgers berust op de wisselwerking tussen staat en religieuze actoren, waarin de rollen van gelovige en burger in het dagelijks leven samensmelten.

In Hoofdstuk 6 – Het maken van vrome vrouwelijkheid: alledaagse betrokkenheden met gendernormen – onderzoek ik de deelvraag hoe vrome vrouwen in Kayaşehir conservatieve gendernormen die centraal staan binnen het hegemoniale project van de AKP, ervaren, onderhandelen en soms doorbreken. Het hoofdstuk laat zien dat hoewel de wijk overal als vroom wordt gezien, vrouwen deze normen op uiteenlopende manieren interpreteren en vertolken, wat zowel bevestiging als subtiele contestatie van het model van de partij van conservatieve vrouwelijkheid weerspiegelt.

Alledaagse plaatsgebonden praktijken – zoals Koranstudiegroepen, buurtbijeenkomsten en het gebruik van gedeelde ruimtes – stellen vrouwen in staat sociale netwerken te ontwikkelen, genderverwachtingen af te dwingen en te onderhandelen, en de fysieke en sociale omgeving te 'en-genderen'. Verschillen komen op tussen de omstandigheden en aspiraties van vrouwen: alleenstaande moeders zoals Hayriye en Zerrin dagen dominante normen op subtiele wijze uit via stille onderhandelingen, terwijl platforms zoals KayaLadies expliciet alternatieven verkennen en uiteenlopende uitdrukkingen van vroomheid bevorderen.

Het hoofdstuk benadrukt dat de omgang van vrouwen met gendernormen niet noodzakelijkerwijs in oppositie staat tot de AKP. Veel vrouwen blijven partijaanhangers, maar hun alledaagse praktijken wijken vaak af van de verwachtingen van de partij, wat religieuze subjectiviteiten zichtbaar maakt die zich bewegen tussen seculier-liberale en conservatief-islamitische idealen. De nieuwheid van Kayaşehir, waar nog geen diepgewortelde gendertradities bestaan, maakt het mogelijk dat vrouwen hun aspiraties via flexibele, plaatsgebonden praktijken articuleren en zo de post-seculiere moderniteit hervormen op manieren die zowel aansluiten bij als verder gaan dan de visie van de AKP, waardoor meerdere vormen van vroom leven naast elkaar kunnen bestaan.

Hoofdstuk 7 – Conclusie – synthethiseert hoe elk voorafgaand hoofdstuk verschillende dimensies van de onderzoeksvraag behandelt en benadrukt de theoretische en empirische bijdragen van het proefschrift. Als politiek project kwam post-seculiere moderniteit op in reactie op seculiere moderniteit, met als doel deze te verdringen in plaats van zich ermee te verzoenen. In tegenstelling tot theoretische verwachtingen van reflexieve betrokkenheid heeft dit 'tussenliggende' manieren van leven geproduceerd, waarin bewoners vroomheid kunnen omarmen zonder zich volledig op een lijn te stellen met de politieke agenda van de AKP. Voorbeelden hiervan zijn Diyanet-kinderdagverblijven die seculiere lessen aanbieden om bewoners aan te trekken, en vrome vrouwen die onorthodoxe islamitische praktijken ontwikkelen die

afwijken van de gendernormen van de partij. Deze gevallen zijn niet slechts uitzonderingen, maar weerspiegelen de dialectische wisselwerking tussen seculiere en post-seculiere moderniteit, die nieuwe vormen van burgerschap mogelijk maakt die verschillen van de visie van de AKP.

Plaatsgebonden praktijken laten zien dat specifieke ideeën over de staat en specifieke manieren om 'goede burgerschap' te begrijpen worden gevormd parallel met de opbouw van de wijk – zowel van de gebouwde omgeving als van de dagelijkse sociale relaties. De herconfiguratie van de staat als partij/staat eindigt niet bij met het oprichten appartementencomplexen, publieke verklaringen of partijprogramma's; zij wordt voortdurend geproduceerd in alledaagse praktijken. Dit weerspiegelt wat Gramsci de onafgemaakte aard van hegemoniale projecten noemt en zijn nadruk op de gewone ruimtes waarin politieke idealen worden vertolkt (Gramsci, 2000). Evenzo is de burgerschapsagenda van de staat niet beperkt tot formele rechten of beleid, maar wordt vertolkt in buurtruimtes. Via de plaatsgebonden praktijken van partijactivisten, religieuze instellingen en bewoners krijgen de staat en de goede burger belichaamde en affectieve vormen die lokaal circuleren – en soms worden betwist.

Het begrijpen van place-making als een relationele en procesmatige dynamiek stelt mij in staat bij te dragen aan debatten over staatsschap en burgerschap door niet alleen te laten zien hoe actoren plaatsen creëren die bredere politieke idealen weerspiegelen, maar ook hoe nieuwe ideeën en praktijken van staatsschap en burgerschap ontstaan in het alledaagse leven in die plaatsen. In die zin wordt Kayaşehir een generatieve ruimte waar evoluerende vormen van staatsschap en burgerschap actief gemaakt worden.

Appendix

This appendix provides a detailed overview of the interviews and participant observations conducted during fieldwork in Kayaşehir between 2021 and 2022. The table below summarises the data collected across different groups, institutions, and political organisations.

Interviewees	Specific Groups / Institutions	Interviews	Participant Observations
TOKİ Residents	TOKİ residents	25 interviews (9 men, 16 women)	• Breakfast and dinners with residents • Participation in KayaLadies activities (picnics, trip to women-only beach, boat tour) • Following residents' everyday routines
Religious Organisations	Diyanet	• Local director • Woman preacher 1 • Woman preacher 2 • Head teacher of ages 4–6 Quran school	• Mukabele (4x) • *Sohbet* (5x) • Trip to Çamlıca Mosque
Religious Organisations	The Muhammedi Cemaat	No formal interviews	• *Mukabele* (11x) • *Sohbet* in three locations • Night-time conversation • Iftar

Interviewees	Specific Groups / Institutions	Interviews	Participant Observations
Political Parties	AKP, CHP, YRP, DEVA	• District vice president • Former neighbourhood president • Women's branch presidents, branch workers • Councilman of Başakşehir • Former women's branch president • Presidents of youth branch	• Two picnics with branch workers • AKP rally (Atatürk Airport) • Ramadan campaign in city square • Campaign in Old Kayaşehir (2021)
TOKİ		• Head of planning • Planners in Kayaşehir project	None
Başakşehir Municipality		• BAKMER HR officer • Director of planning • Director of civil works	• Social events in TOKİ districts
Real Estate Agents		2 interviews	None
Muhtarlık		• Muhtar • 2 officers	None

Acknowledgements

I am writing this part in July 2026, after allowing myself some time to step away from the thesis and gain the distance needed to reflect on the entire journey without the immediate exhaustion of finishing it. I was 28 years old when I began this PhD and I am now 35. Looking back, I realize that these seven years changed me in ways I could never have anticipated.

I am deeply grateful for that transformation. It unfolded while I was building a life in Amsterdam, sharing everyday moments with my colleagues at the UvA, and working on a project that, in many ways, became much bigger than the thesis itself. It reshaped the way I think, work, and relate to the people around me. Perhaps for the first time in my life, I feel genuinely content with who I have become.

Whether this thesis turned out as well as I once hoped almost feels secondary now. What I value most is the journey itself and the privilege of sharing different chapters of my life with my supervisors, colleagues, friends, family, and the many people I met during my fieldwork in Istanbul. Each of you has left a mark on this process and, in one way or another, on the person I have become. The following pages are my attempt to thank you for that.

Justus Uitermark, my dear supervisor and the PI of the NWO project, you have been one of the most influential people in my life. Not only because of your brilliant academic work, but even more because of the person you are. Your commitment to equality, your trust in people, and your willingness to create opportunities for others shaped me as much as any academic advice you gave me. Beyond research and writing, you taught me what it means to be generous, principled, and kind. Looking back, I think those are the lessons I will carry with me the longest. I feel incredibly fortunate that you were my mentor.

Wouter van Gent, my dear co-supervisor, I still find it remarkable that someone whose work I cited in my master's thesis eventually became my supervisor. Your sharp analytical mind and extraordinary attention to detail constantly challenged me to become a better researcher. Through countless small interactions, you introduced me to a distinctly Dutch way of thinking, communicating, and approaching everyday life. Those lessons made my inburgering process not only easier, but also much richer and more enjoyable.

Rivke Jaffe, I have always looked up to you—not only because of your remarkable academic achievements, but because of the generosity and humility with which you share your knowledge. As the leader of Urban Geographies, you always made time for people, listened carefully, and treated everyone with respect. Watching your quiet and thoughtful way of leading taught me that kindness and academic excellence are not separate qualities but can reinforce one another. You have been an inspiring example of the kind of academic community I hope we can all contribute to.

Fenne Pinkster, I still remember how excited I was when you suggested our walk-and-discuss meetings during the summer of 2023. Those conversations stayed with me far beyond the walks themselves. Your attentiveness to the textures of everyday urban life fundamentally shaped the way I look at cities. Coming from a background that had always pulled me more towards sociology than urban studies, I learned from you how to slow down, observe carefully, and see the city itself as an active participant in everyday life. That perspective has profoundly influenced the way I approach my own research.

My thesis committee—Banu Gökarıksel, Tuna Taşan-Kok, Ward Berenschot, Rivke Jaffe, and Fenne Pinkster—it has been a great honor to have you accompany this final stage of my PhD. Thank you for the time, care, and thoughtful engagement you devoted to reading my work.

I would like to thank Tuna Taşan-Kok separately. In 2010, when I was a first-year student at ODTÜ, I took one of your courses. Looking back now, I

realize that it was through your inspiring teaching that my academic curiosity was first awakened. It feels particularly meaningful that, sixteen years later, you became part of the committee evaluating the thesis that grew out of that curiosity.

Although I have not been in close contact with ODTÜ since leaving, the professors I had the privilege of learning from continue to shape the way I think as a researcher. I still remember the hours-long discussions that left us feeling as though our brains were about to explode, often followed by drinks that became just as important as the seminars themselves. Those conversations captured everything I have always loved about academia: intellectual curiosity, disagreement, friendship, and the joy of thinking together. Helga Rittersberger Tılıç, Sibel Kalaycıoğlu, Çağatay Topal, Barış Mücen, Erdoğan Yıldırım, and Katharina Bodirsky, I feel incredibly fortunate to have been your student.

İrfan Özet, Ayşe Çavdar, and Berna Zengin Arslan, thank you for your generosity during my fieldwork in Istanbul. Because each of you had worked on closely related topics, your insights, advice, and the people you introduced me to were invaluable. Your support made navigating the field much easier than it otherwise would have been.

Speaking of fieldwork, I want to thank everyone who became part of this research, whether as interviewees or simply as companions during my time in Kayaşehir. Quite literally, this research would not have been possible without your willingness to open your homes and your lives to me. Although I cannot mention your names because of research ethics, I hope you know how grateful I am. You welcomed me with extraordinary warmth, endless hospitality, and an openness that I will never forget. The late-night gatherings filled with tea, cigarettes, laughter, and long conversations remain some of my happiest memories from Kayaşehir. More than a field site, it became a place where I felt genuinely at home.

During the first month of my fieldwork in 2021, I lived with Fatos, Başak, and Melis. Although we had never met before, you generously opened your home to me and made those first weeks in Istanbul feel warm, welcoming, and safe. I am deeply grateful for your generosity. What makes this story even more special is that it was only possible because, decades earlier, you had been my grandmother's neighbors. I could never have imagined that a connection formed so many years ago would one day make my fieldwork possible. Ananem, this is yet another reminder of how the relationships you built throughout your life continue to shape mine. I am deeply grateful for the generosity, trust, and sense of community you have always created around you.

Returning to Amsterdam, our project began in Sociology before eventually moving to the Geography department at the UvA. Looking back, I realize how fortunate I was to be surrounded by such an inspiring community throughout these years.

Afra Foli, we walked this journey together as the two PhD candidates of the project (well, until you finished a year before me and left me to survive the final stretch on my own). I am so grateful to have had you by my side, both as a colleague and as a dear friend. Your kindness, your sharp sense of humor, and your ability to laugh at the absurdities of academia made this journey so much lighter.

Dolly Loomans, your compassion has left a lasting impression on me. You have an extraordinary way of making people feel cared for, simply by taking a genuine interest in how they are doing. Through you, I learned that compassion is often expressed through the smallest everyday gestures. I now find myself asking people how they are feeling much more often, and I suspect I learned that from you. Solène Le Borgne, your discipline has always amazed me. You somehow manage to work incredibly hard while making time for sports, friends, and life outside academia. You showed me that dedication does not have to come at the expense of balance, and I hope to carry some

of that discipline with me. Maria Hagan, I have always admired how you combine an exceptionally critical academic mind with such warmth and grace. Being around you taught me that intellectual rigor does not require emotional distance, and that we can remain thoughtful, generous, and attentive to others even in difficult moments. It is always a joy to wander through the city with you, where our conversations effortlessly move between everyday life and academic debates.

Carla Huisman, you are one of the most engaged academics I have ever met, and I am so grateful that our paths crossed during these years. I deeply admire how seriously you take the question of how to live an ethical and just life. Your commitment to aligning your everyday choices with your values has profoundly influenced my own way of thinking, and continues to shape my ethical compass. Harry Pettit, I have always admired your courage. Even though you have personally faced so much injustice, you have never lost your determination to stand up for what you believe in or your commitment to supporting others. You remind me that courage is not something we are born with, but something we choose, again and again. Tara Asgarilaleh, I still love telling people the story of how we met—simply because I mistakenly thought you were from Turkey. I could not be happier that my mistake turned into such a wonderful friendship. Looking back, I think our friendship is one of those beautiful reminders that some of the best things in life happen completely by chance.

During my time in Sociology, I was welcomed with extraordinary warmth, something I will never forget. Gabriel Otero, Christoph Janietz, Fenna Smits, Anastasiya Halauniova, Bram Hoogendoorn, Dragana Stojmenovska, Michiel Stapper, Minke Hajer, Laura Vonk, and Marina Tulin, thank you for making me feel at home from the very beginning.

To my dear office mates in Urban Geographies —Sebastián Argüelles Delgado, Vera Sales, Eline van Oosten, Tullio da Silva Maia, Ricardo Díaz García Frade, Herre de Bondt, Raina Ghosh, Qiong He, Jakub Crcha, Melchior

Deekman, Anke van den Dries, Natalia Hussein, Joeke Kuyvenhoven, Éloïse Ly Van Tu, Laure Michon, Marije Peute, Sharifah Redan, Julie Solevad, Bram van Vulpen, Amber Howard, Jelke Bosma, and João Fernandez Pereira—thank you for all the coffees, spontaneous conversations, shared lunches, celebrations, frustrations, and countless everyday moments that turned our office into a place I genuinely loved coming to.

I also want to thank my wonderful colleagues in GPIO, where I always felt equally at home. Marco Bontje, Willem Boterman, Melchior Deekman, Emil van Eck, Cody Hochstenbach, Julie Ren, Aslan Zorlu, Rowan Arundel, Valentina Carraro, Amber Howard, Carolina Maurity Frossard, Emanuele Sessa, Dominic Teodorescu, Debra Solomon, Ying Tzu Lin, Miguel A. Martínez, Letizia Chiappini, Aroosha Zahid, and Frederico Roman Ramos, I am grateful to have shared this journey with you.

Among my colleagues, I would especially like to mention Carolina Maurity. Carolina, I look up to you immensely, and I am sure your influence can be found throughout this thesis. From the way you write to the way you think about and design your book, I have learned so much from you. I am probably one of your biggest fans. Thank you for being such an inspiring scholar and person.

My Turkish crew at the UvA—Ebru Kurt-Özman, Özge Yüksekkaya, Merve Aygün, Mert Cangönül, Ezgi Evrim Özkol, and Pınar Şefkatli—you always felt like a little piece of home. Especially during the countless conversations when we all needed to rant about Turkish politics, you reminded me that some things are simply easier to carry together.

Deniz Kınay, you have been my oldest friend and my anchor throughout all these years. We first met in high school, then found ourselves at the same university, and after years of living apart, life somehow brought us back together in the same city. I have always admired your fighting spirit and the passion with which you stand by the people you love. Thank you for

standing beside me through every chapter of my life. Sarper Erinç Aktürk, Damla Göre, Hüseyincan Eryılmaz, Burcu Uysal, Burçin Türkmenoğlu, Gülper Alp, Dilge Terbaş, Yankı Çobanoğlu, and Yunus Can Gültekin, your friendship has been one of the greatest constants in my life. Thank you for filling it with laughter, warmth, and countless memories.

My dear family, annem Pınar and babam Efe, thank you for giving me the freedom to find my own path while never letting me doubt that you would always stand behind me. You never questioned my decisions, even when they meant moving far away from home, and I always felt your trust and unconditional support. Whatever I have achieved rests on the confidence you gave me to become my own person.

Zeynep, Murat, Ahmet, Ece, Nafiz, Meliz, Deniz, Sernur, Eda, Cezmi, Derin, Defne, Eli, Maia, and Richard, I feel incredibly lucky to call you my family. Knowing that there are so many wonderful people waiting for me, wherever life takes me, has always been one of my greatest sources of happiness.

Ananem, babanem, and dedelerim, I will always be proud to be your granddaughter. Everything you built, endured, and passed on has become part of who I am today. Dedem Sadettin, thank you for everything you did to build a better life for our family. The opportunities I have had—including the chance to write this thesis—rest on the foundations you helped create. You will always be remembered with deep gratitude. Ananem Cevo, I miss you every single day. I wish you could have been here to see this moment, but I know, in my own way, that you have never really left me. I still carry you with me every day.

Every conversation, every friendship, every disagreement, every act of kindness, and every lesson I learned from the people around me found its way into these pages. If this journey changed me, it is because of all of you. Thank you for becoming part of it.