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**Abstract**

Using district-level census data for the province of Istanbul, we identify the determinants of the support for the Justice and Development Party (AKP) which has been in power in Turkey since 2002. Socio-demographic indicators such as the gender gap in education and the mean age, that are expected to proxy for social conservatism and the fertility rate, respectively, perform remarkably well as predictors of the party’s vote share. The econometric findings are in line with the hypothesis that the AKP has benefited from the existing living conditions of the urban population, especially in peripheral metropolitan areas, and has been particularly successful in identifying the worldviews and addressing the needs of conservative voters many of whom are first or second generation migrants.

**1. Introduction**

According to 2012 population census figures, Turkey has a population of 75.6 million, just over three-quarters of which lives in urban locations, i.e. province and district centers, while the rest resides in villages and rural municipalities. With an official population of 13.8 million, the Istanbul province is not only Turkey’s most populated province, but it also stands out from the rest of the provinces with an urbanization rate of 99 percent and a population density of 2,666 people per square kilometers. During the past six decades, Istanbul – like many western provinces of Turkey – has received millions of internal migrants from the rest of the country, especially from the north and east where employment opportunities have been more limited. Although up-to-date figures on the share of those born outside the province are unavailable, the share of those whose population registry is in another province gives a rough idea of the predominance of the migrant population. According to 2012 figures, only 16 percent of Istanbul residents are listed in the Istanbul population registry. Due to its unique characteristics, the Istanbul province promises to be an appropriate setting to observe whether political outcomes are dependent on quantifiable socio-demographic characteristics of the different areas that make up the province.

Migration from rural to urban areas in Turkey, particularly to Istanbul, has been the subject of a large body of research in many areas of social sciences. While economists have focused on socio-economic implications from a macro perspective, sociologists have mainly examined the life styles of internal migrants, their patterns of integration, as well as their influence on the cultural structure of the recipient localities. Political scientists, on the other hand, have devoted much of their attention to political implications such as the impact of migrants on election outcomes and the political economy of the urbanization process. A common theme of these studies is that the political assimilation of internal migrants is hardly ever complete since they who hold on to much of the cultural values acquired in their origins, and they differ from the ‘natives’ in terms of their socio-demographic characteristics, economic endowments, and - in many cases - ethnic backgrounds (Inglehart and Baker, 2000). It is this distinction that has made it difficult for political parties to strike a balance between the needs and wishes of the native and migrant populations. In fact, their skillfulness in appealing to the underprivileged and conservative urban masses has been seen as one of the main reasons behind the dramatic rise of the pro-Islamist parties in Turkey during the past two decades.

The main purpose of this study is to carry out simple descriptive and econometric analyses to identify the socio-demographic determinants of the electoral success of the currently-ruling Justice and Development Party (Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi, AKP). The reason for the choice of focusing on the AKP is that it has been the dominant party in the Turkish party system since 2002, and also that it is the latest to come in the line of pro-Islamist parties that are believed to have benefited the most from the existing living conditions of the urban population, especially in the metropolitan areas. While the local administrations led by centrist-parties (mostly until the mid-1990’s) were overwhelmed with, or reluctant to address the needs of the rapidly growing urban populations, pro-Islamist political parties have proven to be much more adept in serving especially the lower class segments of the population. One reason why the rise of political Islam in Turkey is unique and interesting for academics is that the gradual increase in the support for pro-Islamist parties took place within the democratic multi-party system. In addition to their satisfactory performance on the economic front, long-term socio-economic developments, demographic and cultural changes, and interventions to the democratic system by the military and the judiciary have all been cited as key factors in the success of the pro-Islamists. Our main goal, therefore, is to produce empirical findings that might provide some new clues regarding the importance of socio-demographic factors.

**2. Background information on Turkish politics and internal migration**

Turkey is a large country that exhibits a great deal of diversity in terms of demographic, economic, social, ethnic, and cultural characteristics, and consequently, in terms of political tendencies. Commonly referred to as “a bridge between the East and the West” and “a cradle of civilizations”, it borders European Union countries Greece and Bulgaria on one end and Iran, Iraq, and Syria on the other. A recent study by Akarca and Başlevent (2011) deals with the regional patterns in political outcomes in Turkey as well as the association between party choices and the disparities in socio-economic indicators across the country. The authors use cluster analysis to identify the provinces that have similar voting patterns in terms of the vote shares of the main political parties. They find that, for each of the five elections between 1999 and 2009, a 3-way partition of the provinces captures much of the variation in voter behavior across the country and also that many of the provinces remain in the same cluster election after election, in a period of major political turmoil.[[1]](#footnote-1) The cluster of (mostly central and northern) provinces where social conservative right-wing parties including the Justice and Development Party have the highest support is also the one where most internal migrants are originally from.[[2]](#footnote-2) Province level data on socio-demographic indicators further reveal that the three clusters are distinct from each other not only in terms of political outcomes, but also socio-economic characteristics. The observed link between political outcomes and the socio-demographic characteristics suggests that there could be much to learn from a multivariate examination of these factors.

In November 2002, the Justice and Development Party (AKP) won two-thirds of the seats in the Turkish parliament with only 34 percent of the votes, due to the election system that imposes a ten percent national threshold for representation.[[3]](#footnote-3) The rapid rise of the AKP, which was only founded a year earlier following the dissolution of the pro-Islamist Virtue Party (*Fazilet Partisi*) by the Constitutional Court of Turkey, was seen as “another step in the electoral collapse of centrist politics in the country” (Çarkoğlu, 2002a). Nevertheless, the AKP, considered by many as a pro-Islamist party until the elections, was known to have received votes from other sections of the constituency, especially the center-right, at a time when the existing center-right parties were highly unpopular as a result of widely-believed allegations of corruption and poor performances when in power. The AKP has also been the recipient of a substantial amount of protest votes by large masses who have been adversely affected by the dismal economic conditions that prevailed in Turkey after the former ruling coalition led the country into its worst ever economic crisis. The charismatic AKP leader Recep Tayyip Erdoğan’s successful image since his days as the mayor of Istanbul (1994-1998) and his moderate rhetoric also made the AKP attractive to a “diverse array of voters ranging from Islamists to rural nationalists and moderate urban voters” (Çagaptay, 2002). Since 2002, there have been many unprecedented developments in Turkish politics, one of the most remarkable of which is that the ruling party has managed to increase its vote share further in the two subsequent general elections with shares of around 47 and 50 percent in 2007 and 2011, respectively.[[4]](#footnote-4)

In the year 2000, 61 percent of Istanbul’s population was born in another province. In view of this extraordinary figure, it is natural to expect that the urbanization process has been a challenging one in many respects and also that migrants have had a strong influence on the local and national political-economic affairs. In fact, there is a large body of literature which offers a specific and comprehensive description of the web of relations that account for the political behavior of Turkey’s urban population, especially that of internal migrants. These studies provide convincing explanations as to why the political assimilation of migrants is especially unlikely in the Turkish context (Pınarcıoğlu and Işık, 2009; Kurtoğlu, 2005; Hersant and Toumarkine, 2005).

Narlı (2002) argues that the failure of centrist political parties in the past two decades has to with their inability to ‘mobilize’ urban voters while the informal and formal networks among migrants have provided the suitable setting for the grassroots politics that pro-Islamist parties have engaged in to great electoral success during the past two decades. Kalaycıoğlu (2007) claims that the AKP owes its success not only to its ability to appeal to the value systems of conservative masses, but also to “providing for rapid improvement in socio-economic welfare” to those who otherwise would have a much smaller chance of upward social mobility. Öniş (2000) also notes that such informal networks provide a rudimentary form of welfare provision, and that they are crucial to the understanding of the volatile electoral politics in Turkey.

According to Narlı (2002), it is mainly through the above-mentioned links that people are able to make economic gains ranging from finding jobs to obtaining construction permits or title deeds to the pieces of land that they illicitly occupy. Ayata (2008) also argues that the place of origin plays a significant role in community formation and land occupation around the city especially in the early stages of migration. Assuming that the majority of internal migrants lack the financial means to purchase proper housing, it makes sense that their political choices are likely to be affected by their prospects of becoming a part of this redistributive process. In an empirical study of electoral outcomes, Özler (2000) finds that the pro-Islamist Welfare Party fared better in the 1995 national elections in neighborhoods with larger shares of illegally built housing units. Yalçıntan and Erbaş (2003) also carry out an extensive study demonstrating the strong link between the squatter settlementsand election outcomes in İstanbul. Finally, Buğra (1998) points to the economic consequences of squatting and refers to this phenomenon as the “immoral economy of housing in Turkey”.

As the literature review above suggests, in the Turkish context, the concept of urbanization is closely related with internal migration which has been a major driving force behind the steep rise in Turkey’s urban population as well as the socio-political developments in those areas. This is why the current study considers internal migration as an indicator of the type of urbanization that poses the greatest challenge for policy makers, and thus, is the most relevant in the political-economic sense.

**3. Methodology, Data, and Regression results**

Our empirical examinations rely on the premise that political preferences reflect the decisions made by utility maximizing individuals. Voters decide to participate in political processes and vote for a given party based on their current socio-economic conditions as well as their expectations for the future. They are also likely to take into account the conditions that affect the general population. Thus, we argue that the support for the ruling AKP is influenced by the urbanization patterns in Turkey’s provinces as these patterns have been a major determinant of the existing social, economic, and cultural conditions prevailing in each province.

In the absence of individual level data from a comprehensive nationwide survey designed specifically for the purpose of examining the relationships in question, the best alternative is to work with official socio-demographic and election data available at the levels of the major administrative units in Turkey. Our empirical work comprises a district level analysis which is restricted to the province of Istanbul.[[5]](#footnote-5) With 39 districts that exhibit a considerable amount of variation with respect to schooling levels and migrant and vote shares, Istanbul appears to be an ideal context for testing hypotheses relating to the relationships between the indicators at hand, considering that a nationwide study would have required a lot more factors to be controlled for before reliable estimates could be obtained.

In preparing our data set, we made use of two databases available at the website of the Turkish Statistical Institute (TurkStat). These databases can be used interactively to generate the district level indicators to be used in the empirical work. One of these databases contains the results of the 2010 census of the Address Based Population Registration System, which allowed us to compute urbanization rates, migrant shares, etc. This database also contains information on the number of people in various age groups as well as those who have completed a given level of education. The other database on the TurkStat website contains the results of 2011 General Elections at the province and district levels. Participation rates as well as party vote shares are available from this database (See Table 1).

The empirical work to be presented in the next section involves the estimation of a multiple regression model where the AKP vote share appears as the dependent variable. As for the explanatory variables, the **population registration rate** of a district is the percentage share of those who are listed in the population registry of Istanbul. In the absence of information on net

**Table 1:** District-level data for Istanbul province, 2011 general elections

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| District | Population | Turnout rate | AKP vote share | Population registration rate | Mean age | Mean years of education | Gender gap in education |
| Adalar | 14,221 | 84.1 | 32.1 | 41.4 | 39.1 | 9.1 | 7.2 |
| Bakırköy | 219,145 | 85.2 | 26.2 | 36.9 | 38.5 | 10.5 | 8.0 |
| Beşiktaş | 184,390 | 84.8 | 20.3 | 35.9 | 39.3 | 11.3 | 6.4 |
| Beykoz | 246,136 | 87.5 | 52.3 | 32.6 | 32.2 | 8.2 | 15.0 |
| Beyoğlu | 248,084 | 83.5 | 50.6 | 15.9 | 31.7 | 7.5 | 15.0 |
| Çatalca | 62,001 | 91.4 | 38.3 | 69.2 | 34.3 | 7.3 | 14.9 |
| Eyüp | 338,329 | 87.5 | 48.7 | 21.5 | 31.2 | 8.0 | 13.7 |
| Fatih | 431,147 | 82.7 | 51.8 | 24.5 | 34.4 | 8.1 | 12.3 |
| Gaziosmanpaşa | 474,259 | 86.6 | 57 | 16.7 | 29.7 | 7.3 | 15.9 |
| Kadıköy | 532,835 | 86 | 24.5 | 34.5 | 40.5 | 10.9 | 9.0 |
| Kartal | 432,199 | 87.5 | 45.6 | 15.6 | 32.1 | 8.5 | 15.0 |
| Sarıyer | 280,802 | 86.4 | 40.3 | 21.8 | 33.2 | 9.0 | 9.5 |
| Silivri | 138,797 | 88.2 | 41.1 | 40.3 | 32.4 | 7.6 | 12.3 |
| Şile | 28,119 | 90.1 | 51.6 | 59.9 | 38.4 | 7.2 | 17.7 |
| Şişli | 317,337 | 83.1 | 35.8 | 23.1 | 34.6 | 9.2 | 7.9 |
| Üsküdar | 526,947 | 86.8 | 49.9 | 20.8 | 33.5 | 9.3 | 12.0 |
| Zeytinburnu | 292,430 | 85.5 | 51.4 | 19.4 | 30.1 | 7.4 | 14.4 |
| Büyükçekmece | 182,017 | 85.7 | 45 | 24.9 | 31.5 | 8.6 | 11.9 |
| Kağıthane | 416,515 | 86.4 | 55.1 | 10.5 | 30.1 | 7.7 | 13.2 |
| Küçükçekmece | 695,988 | 86.7 | 45.9 | 12.0 | 29.7 | 7.8 | 14.6 |
| Pendik | 585,196 | 86.9 | 56.4 | 9.7 | 29.3 | 8.0 | 17.5 |
| Ümraniye | 603,431 | 87.2 | 57.8 | 12.5 | 29.5 | 8.2 | 14.9 |
| Bayrampaşa | 269,481 | 88 | 54.3 | 26.5 | 31.8 | 7.7 | 13.8 |
| Avcılar | 364,682 | 85.1 | 42.1 | 16.1 | 30.6 | 8.3 | 12.7 |
| Bağcılar | 738,809 | 86.9 | 60.2 | 6.7 | 27.4 | 7.1 | 18.1 |
| Bahçelievler | 590,063 | 85.7 | 51.7 | 12.4 | 30.8 | 8.2 | 13.7 |
| Güngören | 309,624 | 85.8 | 55.4 | 12.9 | 31.4 | 8.1 | 14.2 |
| Maltepe | 438,257 | 86.2 | 42.1 | 17.5 | 33.8 | 9.1 | 10.8 |
| Sultanbeyli | 291,063 | 88.2 | 68.8 | 3.0 | 25.3 | 6.6 | 25.1 |
| Tuzla | 185,819 | 88.4 | 51.5 | 10.7 | 28.9 | 8.2 | 16.1 |
| Esenler | 461,072 | 87.6 | 64.9 | 6.8 | 27.5 | 6.9 | 19.0 |
| Arnavutköy | 188,011 | 88.4 | 61.8 | 12.0 | 26.5 | 6.4 | 21.3 |
| Ataşehir | 375,208 | 87.5 | 45.6 | 13.2 | 31.3 | 8.8 | 10.9 |
| Başakşehir | 248,467 | 88.3 | 51.9 | 10.5 | 26.9 | 8.5 | 14.0 |
| Beylikdüzü | 204,873 | 86.6 | 43.4 | 22.1 | 31.2 | 9.7 | 11.0 |
| Çekmeköy | 168,438 | 88.8 | 53 | 16.0 | 28.6 | 8.2 | 14.5 |
| Esenyurt | 446,777 | 85.8 | 48.4 | 8.1 | 26.8 | 7.5 | 17.0 |
| Sancaktepe | 256,442 | 88.7 | 51.9 | 5.1 | 27.0 | 7.1 | 19.2 |
| Sultangazi | 468,274 | 88.5 | 59.6 | 6.0 | 26.8 | 6.8 | 19.4 |

migration figures, we expect this variable to serve as a measure of the stock of internal migrants in the districts. Although technically it is possible not to be registered in the province of current residence despite having lived there throughout one’s lifetime, the distribution of this variable in the data suggests that it is a good indicator of long-run migration patterns.

The **mean years of education** measures the average years of schooling received by the 15+ years old population of a district. Since the available information in the population census provides only the number of people who have completed a certain level of education, the average figures were obtained by a scheme that converts this information to years of schooling. The **mean age** in the district is also obtained by using information on the number of people in different age groups. We utilize this variable to capture the variation across districts in the fertility rates under the assumption that the mean age would be lower in districts where families typically have a larger number of children. The reason we expect the fertility rate to be relevant to our analysis is that in a predominantly Muslim society, it reflects the degree of adherence to a traditional life-style where contraception is frowned upon and ‘quality vs. quantity of children’ considerations are largely ignored. Since the relationship between mean age and the outcomes of interest need not be linear, the square of the mean age is also included as a regressor in the regression models.

The availability of educational attainment figures by gender allows us to construct a variable that is expected to serve as a measure of gender inequality not only in education, but also in other domains of social life.[[6]](#footnote-6) This variable, which we call the **gender gap in education**, is computed as the difference between the mean years of education for males and females expressed as a percentage of the overall mean years of education in the district. We expect this variable to proxy for the ‘conservativeness’ of the cultural environment.

Across Istanbul’s 39 districts, the AKP vote share ranges between 20 and 70 percent which means that there is a lot of variation that can be explained provided that the right set of variables are put together. The binary relationships between the AKP vote share and the potential explanatory variables are presented in Figures 1a through 1d. The scatter diagrams reveal clear associations between the AKP vote share and the variables in hand such that the vote share is negatively related with the population registration rate, the mean age, and the mean years of education while it is positively associated with the gender gap in education.

The district-level regression results are summarized in Table 2. With an R-square figure of 0.87, the estimated model yields a very good fit. In line with the binary relationships observed above, we find that the population registration rate and the years of education are inversely related with the vote share, while the gender gap in education has the opposite effect. The coefficients on age and its square imply that the vote share of AKP is maximized when the mean age in the district is around 34. According to our estimates, a one-percentage point increase in the population registration rate leads to a 0.25 percentage point decrease in the AKP vote share. This finding is in accordance with the hypothesis that the AKP is stronger in areas with large migrant populations. The coefficient on the gender gap in education also has the expected positive sign meaning that the AKP has stronger support in conservative districts where men typically receive more education than women. A one unit increase in the value of this variable increases the vote share of the AKP by 1.6 percentage points. This estimate implies that the AKP vote share in a district where men have 10 percent more years of education than women is expected to be 16 percentage points more than a district where men and women have equal schooling levels.[[7]](#footnote-7)

**Table 2:** Regression results

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | AKP vote share |
| Population registration rate | -0.247  (0.008) |
| Mean age | 8.762 |
| (0.012) |
| Mean age^2/100 | -12.883  (0.012) |
| Mean years of education | -2.867  (0.060) |
| Gender gap in education | 1.581  (0.001) |
| Constant | -91.627  (0.172) |
| No. of observations | 39 |
| R-squared | 0.869 |

Note: The p-values of two-sided tests of significance are in parentheses.

**4. Conclusion**

The purpose of this study was to identify the socio-demographic determinants of the vote share of the Justice and Development Party (AKP) which has been in power in Turkey since 2002. Making use of data available at the district level, we were able to observe the patterns that apply in the province of Istanbul. Our findings were in line with the hypothesis that the AKP has benefited the most from the existing living conditions of the urban population, especially the lower and middle classes residing in metropolitan areas. Apparently, the party has been particularly successful in identifying the worldviews and addressing the needs of conservative and generally-underprivileged masses of voters many of whom are first or second generation migrants. The high level of support for the party in parts of the province where lower-class migrant populations are concentrated was among the key findings of the econometric work. Alongside ideological and cultural factors, we attribute this success to the party’s prioritization of the provision of public services to the lower-class neighborhoods.

One example of such services are housing projects undertaken by the Housing Development Administration of Turkey (“Toplu Konut İdaresi Başkanlığı” or TOKI for short in Turkish) that have allowed many families to purchase their own homes and saved them from having to pay monthly rents. In addition to gaining access to affordable housing units, many lower-income families have also had the opportunity to sign contracts with construction companies and build larger and more modern housing units on the property that they have been occupying. Such projects initiated within the framework of what is known as the “urban transformation” of many districts and neighborhoods of Istanbul are among the prime examples of how local administrations provide the underprivileged masses with social mobility opportunities that they have been pursuing for a long time, even though much of the profits are nowadays taken in by construction companies.[[8]](#footnote-8) The extension of public transportation services to the suburbs and improvements in access to health services have also made life easier for the residents of peripheral districts.

The discussion presented so far may not have given many clues as to whether or how the AKP’s success has to do with its pro-Islamist roots. We must, therefore, point out that many services provided by local AKP officials continue to have a religious aspect to them, and since Islamic conservatism is much more common among low-income families living in poorer districts, such actions have repeatedly paid off at the ballot box. Among the many ways of catering to the religious sentiments of the people are the provision of food stamps and free meals in Ramadan, social activities and free public transportation during religious holidays, and mass circumcision ceremonies for male children. Local politicians also take the initiative in the construction and restoration of mosques which they themselves visit every week for Friday noon prayers. Funeral and burial services are provided for free to all residents, and if the family of the deceased wishes the burial to take place in their original hometown, the transportation of the body is also done free of charge. Thus, over the years, party officials have become experts in not only providing basic services, but also in using them as public relations activities that aim to reinforce the positive images of the party leaders in the eyes of their constituencies. In a country where ethnic and religious identities play important roles in shaping people’s political preferences, these parties have also portrayed themselves organizations that bring together “good Muslims” who will do only what is in the best interest of the people. Barring any substantial socio-economic changes, it seems that they will continue to dominate Turkish politics in the years to come.

One aspect of the current study that deserves reiteration here is that basic information drawn from district-level census data proved to be highly instrumental in providing empirical evidence in favor of hypotheses regarding factors behind the success of a certain political party. The gender gap in education, in particular, turned out to have a sizeable impact on the party choice, in the presence of a control for the mean years of schooling in the district. In fact, this variable has a similar effect in a province-level regression across Turkey’s 81 provinces. Thus, it promises to be applicable in different contexts where social conservatism appears to be of relevance. Future empirical work that makes use of this variable which can be calculated using both census and survey data will reveal whether or not its usefulness extends to areas other than voting behavior.

**References**

Açıkel, F. (2003) “Mapping the Turkish Political Landscape Through November 2002 Elections”, *Journal of Southern Europe and Balkans*, 5, 185-203.

Akarca, A. T. (2008) “Inter-Party Vote Movements in Turkey Between 1999 and 2002: A Statistical Analysis using Cross-provincial Election Data”, Munich Personal RePec Archive paper number 9627 (http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/9627/).

Akarca, A. T. and C. Başlevent (2010) “The Region-of-Origin Effect on Voting Behavior: The Case of Turkey’s Internal Migrants”, *İktisat İsletme ve Finans*, 25 (297), pp. 9-36.

Akarca, A. T. and C. Başlevent (2011) “Persistence in Regional Voting Patterns in Turkey during a Period of Major Political Realignment”, *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 18 (2), pp. 184-202.

Atacan, F. (2005), “Explaining Religious Politics at the Crossroad: AKP-SP”, in ***Religion and Politics in Turkey***, Eds. B. Rubin, A. Çarkoğlu, Routledge Curzon, London, pp. 45-59.

Ayata, S. (2008) “Migrants and Changing Urban Periphery: Social Relations, Cultural Diversity and the Public Space in Istanbul's New Neighborhoods”, *International Migration*, 46 (3), pp. 27–64.

Bacik, G. (2004) “The Parliamentary Election in Turkey, November 2002”, Electoral Studies 23, pp. 821-845.

Başlevent, C. and A. T. Akarca (2009), “Micro Evidence on Inter-Party Vote Movements in Turkey: Who Voted for AKP in 2002?”, Paper presented at the 5th ECPR General Conference, Potsdam, Germany, 10-12 September 2009.

Başlevent, C., H. Kirmanoğlu, and B. Şenatalar (2005), “Empirical Investigation of Party Preferences and Economic Voting in Turkey”, *European Journal of Political Research*, 44 (4), pp. 547-62.

Buğra, A. (1998) “The Immoral Economy of Housing in Turkey”, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 22 (2), pp. 303–317.

Çagaptay, S. (2002) “The November 2002 Elections and Turkey's New Political Era” *Middle East Review of International Affairs (MERIA) Journal*, 6 (4), pp. 42-48.

Çarkoğlu, A. (2002a) “Turkey's November 2002 Elections: A New Beginning?” *Middle East Review of International Affairs (MERIA) Journal*, 6 (4), pp. 30-41.

Çarkoğlu, A. (2002b),“[The Rise of the New Generation Pro-Islamists in Turkey: The Justice and Development Party Phenomenon in the November 2002 Elections in Turkey”](http://research.sabanciuniv.edu/380/), *South European Society & Politics*, 7 (3), pp. 123–156.

Çarkoğlu, A. (2008) “Ideology or Economic Pragmatism? Profiling Turkish Voters in 2007”, *Turkish Studies*, 9, pp. 317-344.

Çarkoğlu, A. (2010), “The March 2009 Local Elections in Turkey: A Signal for Takers or the Inevitable Beginning of the End for AKP?”, *South European Society and Politics*, 14 (3), pp. 295–316.

Çarkoğlu, A. and G. Avcı (2002), “An Analysis of the Turkish Electorate from a. Geographical Perspective”, in Y. Esmer and S. Sayari (Eds.), *Political Parties and Elections in Turkey*, Boulder, Co: Lynne Rienner, pp. 115–135.

Çarkoğlu, A. and B. Toprak (2000). Türkiye’de Din, Toplum ve Siyaset (Religion, Society and Politics in Turkey), in Turkish. Turkish Economic and Social Studies Foundation (TESEV) Publications. Istanbul.

Dulupçu, M. A. (2005) “Regionalization for Turkey: An Illusion or a Cure?”, *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 12 (2), pp. 99-115.

Esmer, Y. (1995) “Parties and the Electorate: A Comparative Analysis of Voter Profiles of Turkish Political Parties”, in Ç. Balım, E. Kalaycıoğlu, C. Karataş, G. Winrow, and F. Yasamee (Eds.) *Turkey: Political, Social and Economic Challenges in the 1990s*. Leiden, New York, Köln: E. J. Brill.

Esmer, Y. (2002) “At the Ballot Box: Determinants of Voting Behaviour in Turkey”, in Y. Esmer and Sabri Sayarı (Eds.) *Politics, Parties and Elections in Turkey*. Lynn Rienner.

Gülalp, H. (2004) “AKP’s Conservative Democracy: A Post-Kemalist Liberalism?”, Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco, USA.

Güneş-Ayata, A. and S. Ayata (2002) “Ethnic and Religious Bases of Voting“, in Y. Esmer and Sabri Sayarı (Eds.) *Politics, Parties and Elections in Turkey*. Lynn Rienner.

Güvenç, M. and H. Kirmanoğlu (2009) Electoral Atlas of Turkey 1950-2009: Continuities and Changes in Turkey's Politics, Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi University Press.

Hersant, J. and A. Toumarkine (2005) “Hometown Organisations in Turkey: An Overview”, *European Journal* of Turkish Studies, Thematic Issue, No. 2 | Hometown Organisations in Turkey, Document #397.

Inglehart R. and W. E. Baker (2000) “Modernization, cultural change, and the persistence of traditional values”, *American Sociological Review*, 65 (1), pp. 19-51.

Kalaycıoğlu, E. (2007) “Politics of Conservatism in Turkey”, *Turkish Studies*, 8 (2), pp. 233–252.

Kurtoğlu, A. (2005) “Mekansal Bir Olgu Olarak Hemşehrilik ve Bir Hemşehrilik Mekanı Olarak Dernekler” (in Turkish), *European Journal* of Turkish Studies, Thematic Issue, No. 2 | Hometown Organisations in Turkey, Document #375.

Narlı, N. (2002) “İlksel Bağlar, Hemşehrilik, Gettolaşma” (in Turkish), Document available at http://www.bianet.org.

Öniş, Z. (2000) “Neoliberal Globalization and the Democracy Paradox: The Turkish General Elections of 1999”, *Journal of International Affairs*, 54 (1), pp. 291–306.

Öniş, Z. (2006) “Globalization and Party Transformation: Turkey’s Justice and Development Party in Perspective”, in: Burnell, P. (Ed.), *Globalizing Democracy: Party Politics in Emerging Democracies*. Routledge, London.

Özbudun, E. (2006) “From Political Islam to Conservative Democracy: The Case of the Justice and Development Party in Turkey”, *Southern European Society and & Politics,* 11 (3-4), pp. 543-557.

Özcan, Y. Z. (2000) “Determinants of Political Behavior in Istanbul, Turkey”, *Party Politics*, 6 (4), pp. 505-18.

Özel, S. (2003), “Turkey at the Polls: After the Tsunami”, *Journal of Democracy*, 14, pp. 80-94.

Özler, Ş. İ. (2000) “Politics of the Gecekondu in Turkey: The Political Choices of Urban Squatters in National Elections”, Turkish Studies, 1 (2), pp. 39–58.

Pınarcıoğlu, M. M. and O. Işık (2009) “[Segregation in Istanbul: Patterns and Processes](http://www.citeulike.org/article/6007005)”, [[My Copy]](http://www.citeulike.org/journal/bpl-tesg)Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie, 100 (4), pp. 469–484.

Sayarı, S. (2007) Towards a New Turkish Party System?, *Turkish Studies*, 8, pp. 197-210.

Scott, J. (2006) Sociology: The Key Concepts, London: Routledge, p.122.

Tepe, S. (2005) “Turkey’s AKP: A Model ‘Muslim-Democratic’ Party?”, *Journal of Democracy*, 16, pp. 69-82.

Tezcür, G. M. (2012) “Trends and Characteristics of the Turkish Party System in Light of the 2011 Elections”, Turkish Studies, 13 (2), pp. 117-134.

Tüzün, S. (2007) “Seçmen Haritası” (The Voter Map), Radikal, 29 July – 1 August 2007.

Tosun, T. (2003) Siyasette Yeniden Mevzilenmeler: Liberal Sosyal Sentez Muhafazakar Demokrat Sentez Ekseninde 3 Kasım 2002 Seçimleri (New Alignments in Politics: 3 November 2002 Election along the Axis of Liberal Social Synthesis and Conservative Democrat Synthesis). Büke Publishing, Istanbul.

Turan, A. E. (2004) Türkiye’de Seçmen Davranışı: Önceki Kırılmalar ve 2002 Seçimi (The Voter Behavior in Turkey: Previous Breaks and the 2002 Election). Istanbul Bilgi University Publications, İstanbul.

West, W. J. (2005) “Regional Cleavages in Turkish Politics: An electoral Geography of the 1999 and 2002 National Elections”, Political Geography, 24 (4), pp. 499–523.

Yalçıntan, M. C. and A. E. Erbaş (2003) “Impacts of ‘Gecekondu’ on the Electoral Geography of Istanbul”, *International Labor and Working-Class History*, 64 (October), pp. 91–111.

Yıldırım, E, H. İnaç., and H. Özler (2007) “A Sociological Representation of the Justice and Development Party: Is It a Political Design or a Political Becoming?”, *Turkish Studies*, 8 (1), pp. 5-24.

**Figure 1a:** AKP vote share vs. the population registration rate in 39 districts



**Figure 1b:** AKP vote share vs. the mean age in 39 districts



**Figure 1c:** AKP vote share vs. the mean years of education in 39 districts



**Figure 1d:** AKP vote share vs. the gender gap in education in 39 districts



1. Çarkoğlu and Avcı (2002), Dulupçu (2005), West (2005), Tüzün (2007), Güvenç and Kirmanoğlu (2009), and Tezcür (2012) are some of the other studies that deal with the geographical patterns observed in election outcomes in Turkey. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Akarca and Başlevent (2010) have found a strong region-of-origin effect on the party choices of internal migrants in Turkey. This finding implies that the migrants are more likely to support conservative parties at their destinations as well. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. For detailed analyses of the 2002 elections, see also Açıkel (2003), Özel (2003), Tosun (2003), Bacik (2004), Turan (2004), Akarca (2008), and Başlevent and Akarca (2009). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Among the many papers focusing on the various aspects of the rise, ideology, and the key policies of the AKP are Çarkoğlu (2002b, 2010), Gülalp (2004), Atacan (2005), Tepe (2005), Öniş (2006), Özbudun (2006), Sayarı (2007), and Yıldırım *et al.* (2007). For discussions on the role of religion in Turkish politics, see Çarkoğlu and Toprak (2000), Güneş-Ayata and Ayata (2002), and Kalaycıoğlu (2007). More general discussions and empirical results on the determinants of voting behavior in Turkey can be found in Esmer (1995, 2002), Özcan (2000), Başlevent *et al.* (2005), and Çarkoğlu (2008). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Districts are small administrative units that make up provinces. They have municipalities run by elected mayors. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. As discussed in Scott (2006), there are connections between gender inequality in one domain and that in another, such as the link between political representation and laws that aim to narrow the gender pay gap. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Since the dependent variable in our regressions is restricted to the zero-one interval, an alternative to OLS regressions would be estimating Grouped Logit models with correction for heterescadasticity. These estimates, which yield patterns that are mainly in line with those presented here, are available from the authors upon request. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. At this time, there is no district level data that can be used to quantify the impact of this process. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)