

WOMAN'S LABOR AND POVERTY:
THE CASE OF ESKISEHIR PROVINCE IN TURKEY

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
THE MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

FATİME GÜNEŞ

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

APRIL 2006

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıođlu
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Prof. Dr. Mehmet C. Ecevit
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Aytül Kasapođlu (AÜ, DTCF, Soc.)

Prof. Dr. Ayşe Gülay Toksöz (AÜ, SBF)

Prof. Dr. Yakın Ertürk (METU, Soc.)

Prof. Dr. Mehmet C. Ecevit (METU, Soc.)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Helga Rittersberger-Tılıç (METU, Soc.)

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last Name: Fatime Güneş

Signature :

ABSTRACT

WOMAN'S LABOR AND POVERTY: THE CASE OF ESKISEHIR PROVINCE IN TURKEY

Güneş, Fatime

Ph. D., Department of Sociology

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Mehmet C. Ecevit

April 2006, 312 pages

This study examines critically how women in poverty use their labor in the production and reproduction processes against poverty and the effects of these processes on women becoming poor referring to women's knowledge. The material foundation of women's poverty is conceptualized as a two-way devaluation of women's labor used in social reproduction. Patriarchal, cultural and ideological structures and relationships are studied as other determinants of women's poverty. In this framework, women's poverty studied based on a field research conducted on 120 women in Eskişehir province, consisting of regular and irregular workers, housewives, married and single mothers. Household is the basic unit of analysis of women's poverty. The scope that women's poverty experiences are questioned are the following: women's labor in production process, women's domestic labor, women participating in social life, violence against women, their perception of poverty and their place in power relations.

Keywords: Woman's Poverty, Woman's Labor, Production, Reproduction, Patriarchy, Turkey.

ÖZ

KADIN EMEĞİ VE YOKSULLUK: TÜRKİYE'DE ESKİŞEHİR İLİ ÖRNEĞİ

Güneş, Fatime

Doktora, Sosyoloji Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Mehmet C. Ecevit

Nisan 2006, 312 sayfa

Bu çalışma yoksul kadınların yoksulluğa karşı mücadelede emeklerini üretim ve yeniden üretim süreçlerinde nasıl kullandıklarını ve bu sürecin kadınların yoksullaşması üzerindeki etkilerini kadınların bilgisine başvurarak eleştirel olarak incelemektedir. Kadın yoksulluğunun maddi temeli, toplumsal yeniden üretim süreçlerinde kullanılan kadın emeğinin çift yönlü değersizleşmesi olarak kavramsallaştırılmaktadır. Bunun yansısı, ataerkil, kültürel ve ideolojik yapı ve ilişkiler kadın yoksulluğunun diğer belirleyenleri olarak ele alınmaktadır. Bu çerçevede kadın yoksulluğu Eskişehir'de düzenli ve düzensiz çalışan, evkadını, evli ve bekar anne olan 120 kadınla gerçekleştirilen bir alan araştırmasına dayanarak incelenmektedir. Yoksulluğun analiz birimi hane halkıdır. Kadınların yoksulluk deneyimleri şu alanlarda sorgulanmaktadır. Üretim sürecinde kadın emeği, kadının ev içi emeği, kadınların toplumsal yaşama katılımı, kadına karşı şiddet, kadınların yoksulluk algısı ve güç ilişkilerindeki konumları.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kadın Yoksulluğu, Kadın Emeği, Üretim, Yeniden Üretim, Ataerkillik, Türkiye.

*To all women who use their labor power to fight against
poverty and oppression*

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Mehmet C. Ecevit, my thesis supervisor, for his guidance, advice and criticism throughout the dissertation process. I owe also thanks to him, for spending time on the weekends in the dissertation meeting in order to support me and other friends who shared the same destiny with me. I also thank my friends for listening, patience and advice in the meeting process. I owe thanks to Prof. Dr. Ayşe Gülay Toksöz, Prof. Dr. Aytül Kasapoğlu, Prof. Dr. Yakın Ertürk and Assoc. Prof. Helga Tılıç-Rittersberger for their advice and criticism. I thank the Assoc. Prof. Sibel Kalycioğlu for her encouragement. I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Yıldız Ecevit and Prof. Dr. Alan Spector for their support and belief in me.

Special thanks go to the women who participated in this research, who shared so generously their time, who invited me to their homes and lives, and whose voices and stories stay with me. Their wisdom, insights, lives, efforts, ideas, knowledge and labor are at the heart of this dissertation. This dissertation would not have been realized without them.

There are many friends, students and family members who have walked this journey with me. I would like to offer my special thank to my student, Zeynep Tecik and her parents, Ayşe and Faruk Tecik for their support and solidarity. I would like to thank my other students, Şehnaz Ardalı, Emrah Özdemir, Erman Özkan, Mehmet Ali Pekmezci and Emre Çapkın for their solidarity.

I would like to thank my friends, Kaan Toker and Ahmet Faruk Keçeli for their contributions and help. I also thank Defne Akıncı for editing and proofreading the

thesis for English with great diligence and dedication. I owe thanks to friends, Semra Akkaya, Hülya Aktuna, Neşe Çakmaklı, Necmi Eraydın, Fatoş Eraydın, Nahide Konak, Noğman Kılıçalp, Berna Kalkay, Aşın Koçak, Aynur Özüğurlu, Şebnem Serpil, Harun Serpil, Elif Uğurlu, and Handan Üstündağ for their encouragement, solidarity and love in this process.

My family members have been watching this process from a far, and I thank my cousins, Serpil and Sıdıka Güneş, my sister, Emine İhtiyaroğlu my brothers, Mutlu and Kemal Güneş, and other members of Güneş's family for their encouragement, prodding, questions and belief in me.

I owe thanks to my mother, Şefika Güneş and my father, S. Ahmet Güneş. Thank you for the tea, meals and the endless hours of keeping Duygusu. My biggest thanks are reserved for Duygusu Güneş, my daughter. I could not spend enough time for you when I was writing. Thank you for your patience and your thoughtfulness.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ix
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. CRITICAL EVALUATION OF POVERTY CONCEPTUALIZATIONS	9
2.1. Introduction	9
2.2. Mainstream Poverty Conceptualization and Its Criticism	10
2.3. Feminist Critiques of Poverty Theories	26
2.4. Conclusion	36
3. WOMEN AND POVERTY IN THE THIRD WORLD	38
3.1. Introduction	38
3.2. Women and Poverty in Development Discourse	38
3.3. Feminist Studies on Women and Poverty	46
3.4. Poverty Studies in Turkey	54
3.5. Conclusion	68
4. FEMINIST FRAMEWORK OF WOMEN AND POVERTY	70
4.1. Introduction	70
4.2. Liberal Feminist Account for Rediscovering Women's Poverty	71
4.2.1. Feminization of Poverty	71
4.2.2. Gender Dimension of Poverty	74

4.3. ‘The System of Patriarchy’ as an Understanding of Women’s Poverty	81
4.4. Marxist-Feminist Class Perspective on Women’s Poverty	85
4.5. Socialist-Feminist Perspective for the Theoretical Analysis of Women’s Poverty	89
4.6. Conclusion	96
5. METHODOLOGY	98
5.1. Introduction	98
5.2. The Methodological Approach	98
5.3. The Research Questions	102
5.4. The Research Methods	106
5.5. Research Site and Sampling	105
5.6. Research Process	109
5.7. Socio-Economic Structure of Eskişehir	114
5.8. Conclusion	119
6. WOMEN AND POVERTY IN ESKISEHIR	121
6.1. Introduction	121
6.2. Socio-Demographic Structure of the Households	123
6.2.1. The Household Size	123
6.2.2. The Age Composition of the Household’s Members	125
6.2.3. Education Levels of Women and Men	127
6.2.4. Women’s Birth Place and Living Duration in the City	129
6.2.5. Living Standards of the Households In Terms of Owning Assets	131
6.2.5.1. Housing	131
6.2.5.2. Property Ownership	131
6.2.5.3. Ownership of Durable Consumption Goods	139
6.3. Women’s Labor in the Production Process Against Poverty	145
6.3.1. Regular Women Laborer	146
6.3.2. Irregular Women Laborer	156
6.3.3. Are Non-Working Women Housewives or Unemployed?	165
6.4. Women’s Labor and Domestic Sphere: Women’s Heavy Burden In Order to Sustain Family Needs in Reproduction Process of the Household	171

6.4.1. Division of Labor in Domestic Sphere	172
6.4.2. Reduction of Living Costs Through Women’s Labor and Deprivation	177
6.5. Social Reproduction and Women’s Deprivation of Social Life	192
6.6. Women’s Position With Respect to Power Relations	195
6.7. Poverty, Deprivation and Women's Perception	201
6.7.1. Women’s Evaluation of Their Situation	201
6.7.2. Women’s Opinion on Explanation of Poverty	209
6.7.3. Respondents’ Attitude to Women’s Poverty	213
7. CONCLUSION	220
REFERENCES	241
APPENDICES	
A. Tables	263
B. Interview Questions	286
C. Turkish Summary	303
VITA	313

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES

Table 1. The age distribution of women	264
Table 2. The age distribution of men	264
Table 3. The education status of women	264
Table 4. The education status of men	265
Table 5. The birthplace of women	265
Table 6. The birthplace of men	265
Table 7. Living duration of women in the city	265
Table 8. The tenant position of the households	266
Table 9. Tenant positions of the households by labor categories	266
Table 10. The rent per a month	266
Table 11. The number of rooms	266
Table 12. The heating system by labor categories	266
Table 13. Infrastructure of the households	267
Table 14. Separate room for children	267
Table 15. The ownership of refrigerator by labor categories	268
Table 16. The ownership of durable consumption goods	268
Table 17. The ownership of bathing stove by labor categories	269
Table 18. The ownership of DVD/VCD by labor categories	269
Table 19. The ownership of mobile phone (men) by labor categories	270
Table 20. The ownership of home phone by labor categories	270
Table 21. The ownership of bedroom by labor categories	271

Table 22. The ownership of children room by labor categories	271
Table 23. The limitation of using electricity / water by labor categories	272
Table 24. The limitation of transportation by labor categories	272
Table 25. Saving of heating by labor categories	273
Table 26. The provisions of heating	273
Table 27. The limitation of cleaning materials by labor categories	273
Table 28. The ratio of the households that meet cloth from weekly local markets by labor categories	274
Table 29. The ratio of the households that meet cloth from exports stores or other places where clothes are cheaper than the other store by labor categories	274
Table 30. The ratio of the household that meet the clothes need from acquaintance/relatives/friends by labor categories	275
Table 31. The ratio of the household that use second hand clothes by labor categories.....	275
Table 32. The ratio of the household that limits food consumption due to economic hardship by labor categories	276
Table 33. The frequency of children drinking milk	276
Table 34. The ratio of using weekly local market for food shopping	276
Table 35. Shopping time in weekly local market	276
Table 36. The shopping ratio of food from gross market by labor categories	277
Table 37. The ratio of production of tomato paste at home by labor categories	277
Table 38. The ratio of production of 'tarhana' at home by labor categories	278
Table 39. The ratio of production of homemade pasta by labor categories	278
Table 40. The ratio of production of pickles at home by labor categories	279
Table 41. The ratio of production of yogurt at home by labor categories	279
Table 42. The ratio of production of jam at home by labor categories	280
Table 43. The ratio of production of preserves at home by labor categories	280

Table 44. Women’s evaluation of their families’ economic level	281
Table 45. Evaluation of family’s economic level by labor categories	281
Table 46. Women’s opinion about the reasons of poverty	281
Table 47. The most important reasons of poverty in women’s view	281
Table 48. The most important reasons of poverty by labor categories	282
Table 49. Women’s opinion about the reasons of women’s poverty	282
Table 50. Women’s opinion about women’s poverty experiences	283
Table 51. Women’s opinion about the sustenance of family and domestic labor	284
Table 52. Women’s opinion on working life	284
Table 53. Women’s opinion about the results of poverty	285
Table 54. Women’s opinion about the poor’ right in Turkey	285

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

New capital accumulation models that have been closely associated with structural adjustment packages promoted by international financial institutions- for example, the IMF and the World Bank- have deeply affected peoples' living conditions in Turkey since the 1980s. The Neo-liberal economic approach and Structural Adjustment Programmes¹ dominated economic policy-making in the 1980s and the early 1990s in Turkey as in other developing countries. The experience of new capital accumulation models has been associated with negative growth and increasing poverty in Turkey.

Liberalization of prices and trade, reduction of government expenditure and deficits, increasing cost of public services (health, education, transportation, and infrastructure), privatization of state-owned enterprises have had enormous impact on people. Unemployment, lower wages and higher prices have led to the impoverishment of working classes in Turkey. This process made an impact on not only the living conditions of the working classes, but also on specifically women's and children' lives in these classes.

The new capital accumulation process has caused women to bear most of the responsibility of coping with increased prices and shrinking income. They are

¹ In 1980, by the January 24 Decisions, a new phase in Turkish economy started. These decisions aimed at the liberalization of economy. Turkish economy adopted export-oriented policies instead of import-substitute industrialization.

responsible for household budgeting and maintenance. Women's participation into paid employment has increased due to the rise of males' unemployment and reduction of males' wages. Thus, women bear a disproportionate burden of the new process. As a result of worsening income distribution and the logic of capital accumulation, women's participation into the labor force has increased in order to maintain themselves and their families. They work mostly in the informal employment that has insecure and the worse conditions. Women use their unpaid labor power immensely due to the decreasing income in the household.

In recent years, the poverty question and discussions have become more popular and have accumulated extensive body of researches for the analysis of poverty in Turkey, as in other developing countries and advanced capitalist societies both at the macro and micro level. The extent of poverty has been shown with respect to income, consumption level, and general welfare indicators such as education, health, material assets, percentage of child death and etc. Poverty studies have started especially after 1990 in Turkey. While some of them have analyzed poverty in order to count the number of the poor at the macro level from viewpoint of economists, other poverty studies have focused on "the new urban poor" or "the new urban poverty". Poverty has mostly been discussed as related with the survival strategies of the households at the micro level in the urban and rural contexts in Turkey. Although there are important poverty researches, women's poverty and their specific position in poverty process are less pronounced in Turkey.

Women's poverty has not been investigated by mainstream poverty studies that usually focus on the household's consumption or income level. 'Malestream' poverty definitions and measures have limitations in itself to reveal women's poverty experiences. Moreover, the explanations of poverty have involved gender-bias. Therefore, it is necessary to explore and question women's poverty from the feminist perspective.

The fundamental aim of this thesis is to reveal the relationship between the ways that women use labor and women's poverty by means of the experiences, knowledge and opinions of women in different labor categories from a socialist-feminist perspective. Within this framework, three fundamental questions are posed: How do poor women fight against poverty with their labor used in production and reproduction processes? How do these processes affect the impoverishment of women? From the point of view of different poverty categories, are there significant differences among women's poverty experiences?

Theoretically, it is argued that the main determinant of women's poverty is a two way devaluation of their labor power in the production and reproduction processes. Moreover, it is also thought that patriarchy affects the impoverishment of women. Both capital and men have utilized women's labor in their interest.

Indeed, the conception of poverty is not a new phenomenon. Its perception has changed throughout history since the construction of modern society. It is related with the question of inequality. Although it is discussed in isolation from the more general question of inequality, the causes of poverty necessarily consist of the causes of inequality. Therefore, poverty is not different from the question of class. Poverty is one of the important manifestations of inequality produced in the social process. Moreover, poverty is the unacceptable form of deprivation and inequality. In other words, poverty involves both inequality and unacceptable deprivation. It can be said that poverty may be understood within the context of inequalities.

Women's poverty is not a new phenomenon. It is related with the question of women's inequality and exploitation in society. Therefore, woman's poverty is not inseparable from their social positions in the class society. Studying women's poverty with a critical perspective will serve the examination of their exploitation positions under capitalist conditions. By doing this, it will highlight how dominant developed institutions distort and assimilate the issue of women within

the context of poverty issue. Although institutions, such as the IMF and the World Bank, have important responsibilities in creating poverty and worsening the living conditions of working classes in developing countries, they also try to solve poverty through women's labor in development process. Women are used as an instrument to reduce poverty (Kabeer, 2003). Their poverty definition and measure also conceal the extent of poverty.

Poverty, in general, includes all conditions and processes, under which individuals/households are unable to reproduce themselves physically and socially in order to maintain a humane and decent life under capitalism. Poverty is "a sum of conditions and tendencies where the reproduction of labor power cannot be provided" (Ecevit and Ecevit, 2002: 272). The needs that are necessary for a humane life have a content that exceeds the limits of poverty simply defined by the classical poverty studies. "If it is considered that a human has the right to live under general and particular conditions that allows him/her to *realize his own potentials*, then the definition of basic needs will be narrow" (Tekeli, 2000:144). The scope of needs includes not only material spheres but also 'social, cultural, and aesthetical spheres developed and established by the humanity' (Ecevit and Ecevit, 2002: 272). All indicators of poverty "can be interpreted as universally operationalized of the right of living as human being" (Tekeli, 2000: 144).

In this sense, "it is always arguable whether the internationally consented bottom-line (or bottom-lines) of poverty is sufficient. The sufficiency of this consented bottom-line" (Tekeli, 2000: 144) is

determined by the standard/level achieved by the political/social struggles of that social stratum. The situations where such struggle is not/cannot be made can be accepted as the stages where living conditions improve (or poverty regresses). Poverty is not simply a level of famine and misery. The struggle to improve living standards means that a person or a household refuses that level. Improvement of this level can be realized through the political struggle of labor classes (Ecevit and Ecevit, 2002: 272-273).

In this respect, the second chapter deals with the conceptualization of poverty. The construction of poverty discourse is examined critically in terms of its weakness in itself and its gender-blind nature. Poverty definitions are reviewed critically from their absolute to the relative sense by examining the income/consumption, basic needs, consensual, capability and social exclusion and participatory poverty approaches. From feminist perspectives, it is argued that poverty consists of male-centered arguments and ignores women's poverty and deprivation experiences. Moreover, views on the explanation of poverty, such as the individualist approaches (genetic, human capital, culture of poverty and underclass conception) and the structural approaches (dualist and radical labor market conception) are questioned with respect to not only their weakness but also ignoring women's poverty.

The third chapter aims to discuss the relationship between women and poverty in the Third World context by drawing upon literature. The construction of development discourse on women's poverty is discussed critically by drawing upon the welfare, equity and anti-poverty approaches. The poverty understanding of development institutions and their response to women's poverty; and feminist framework of women's poverty in relation to the labor market and household are examined. In addition to these, the poverty studies in Turkey are reviewed critically by drawing upon literature. It is discussed critically how poverty research in Turkey have been less concerned with women's poverty.

The fourth chapter aims to review critically the feminist framework of women's poverty by drawing upon women and poverty literature. The liberal feminist trend is discussed with the concepts of the feminization of poverty and of the gender dimension of poverty. In this trend, the empirical dimension of woman's poverty is presented mainly as related to the public (labor market and welfare state) and private spheres (the household). Moreover, three approaches are presented which analyze woman's poverty at the theoretical level. The first approach includes the radical-feminist perspective in which woman's poverty is explained by the

concept of patriarchy. In the second approach, woman's poverty is discussed by the Marxist-feminist perspective based on class analysis. The last approach, which is the standpoint of this thesis, is the social reproduction perspective, which is based on socialist-feminist perspective.

The fifth chapter deals with the methodological dimension of this thesis. The limitations of mainstream poverty studies with respect to explaining women's poverty are discussed by giving the strength of feminist methodology. The questions that the study aims to address are presented as relevant to the aim of the study. Moreover, the qualitative and quantitative research methods that were employed within this study to gain an understanding of women's poverty are explained. The reasons that Eskişehir was selected as the site of the research and the means by which the sampling procedure was determined are presented. Finally, brief information is provided on city of Eskişehir's social and economic structure.

In the sixth chapter, how women use their labor power to struggle against poverty conditions and how these processes affect the impoverishment of women are discussed by drawing upon the data collected through a field study conducted with 120 women, carried out in Eskişehir. In the field study, interviews were conducted with women who had been regular and irregular income earners at least for 5 years, women who were housewives or women who did not work outside the home as income earners and women who were single mothers. It is thought that women's poverty experiences should not be analyzed independently from their social positions in the household, nor from the household's poverty conditions.

Therefore, at first; the socio-demographic structure of the households is presented with respect to the number of persons who live in the household, the age of women, men, and children, housing conditions and property ownership. It is

questioned whether or not there are important differences between labor categories with respect to these indicators.

Second, women and men's positions in the production process are discussed. The reasons of women's participation into the workforce and of obstacles to paid employment are examined in women's own words. In addition, whether women's having income providing jobs has an impact on the welfare of the household and women themselves is discussed.

Third, the relationship between women and poverty is analyzed in the reproduction process. The experiences of women's poverty are examined in their own words, with respect to division of labor, women's perception of their domestic labor, their efforts in order to decrease living costs, the consumption patterns of the households, subsistence production, women's withdrawal from personal needs and social activities.

Fourth, women's poverty is discussed in relation to women's participation into social life. In addition to their participation into the social and cultural activities, their attitudes and opinions about going to the cinema, theatre, acquisition of knowledge, and independent actions are shown.

Fifth, the relationship between women and poverty is discussed in terms of power. Their relation with power is examined with respect to decision-making processes and their reaction concerning children's education, marriage, using money and violence.

Sixth, women's opinions about and evaluation of the reasons of poverty and women's poverty, women's social positions, the results of poverty and the solution to escape from poverty are shown.

In the concluding chapter, the research findings and the issues that are seen as essential necessities to be included in any study of poverty and women's poverty are evaluated and integrated in the form of a summary.

CHAPTER 2

CRITICAL EVALUATION OF POVERTY CONCEPTUALIZATIONS

2.1. Introduction

The main aim of this chapter is to examine the construction of poverty discourse in order to show its weakness in itself and its gender-blind nature. Firstly, how poverty is conceptualized by mainstream poverty studies is shown. Moreover, how poverty theories explain the reasons of poverty is discussed and the roots of it are questioned. Secondly, it is argued that poverty conceptions have consisted of male centered arguments and ignored the poverty of women and their experiences of deprivation.

In the first section, poverty definitions will be reviewed critically from their absolute to the relative sense by examining the income/consumption, basic needs, consensual, capability and social exclusion and participatory poverty approaches. Feminist criticisms of poverty definitions will be presented especially focusing on their weakness, with respect to their not exploring poverty experiences of women.

The second section deals with poverty theories. Poverty theories which are classified as individualist/structural approaches will be explained in terms of their deficiencies. In the individualist approach, the genetic, human capital, and culture of poverty as well as underclass views; and in the structural approach, the dualist and radical labor market views will be questioned with respect to not only their weaknesses but also disregard of women's poverty.

2.2. Mainstream Poverty Conceptualization and Its Criticism

Poverty is a contested concept with respect to its political and ideological dimensions; therefore there is no common definition of poverty. In general, it is “unacceptable hardship” or “deprivation”, so it should be reduced or alleviated. ‘What is deprivation and what is unacceptable?’ constitutes the beginning of any poverty study. The main question of poverty discussions is “Who are the poor?” The answer of this question depends on how poverty is defined or conceptualized. According to the conceptualization of poverty, the extent of poverty or the numbers of the poor have been tried to be measured. The methodological discussion of poverty also consists of two types of question words: who and what. Namely, “what are the indicators of poverty?” and “Who determines those indicators?” The other line of the poverty discussion is to alleviate or reduce poverty. In order to alleviate poverty, the question “What are the reasons of poverty?” is examined. These questions have dominated poverty studies throughout history.

The definition of poverty has served to distinguish the state of poverty and/or the poor from the state of not being in poverty or the non-poor. The state of poverty, in general, means to fail to meet needs or not to have resources to meet those needs. The crucial question in poverty definition is the kind of needs to be taken into consideration in terms of poverty; for example, only economic needs, or such others as cultural, social and political. On the other hand, measures of poverty denote calculating the depth of poverty and the amount of the poor by operationalizing the specified needs.

Income/consumption approach has been used mostly by economists in poverty studies. Poverty is seen in an absolute sense, whereby needs are thought in terms of the individual’s physical survival. “A person is poor in any period if, and only if, her or his access to economic resources is insufficient... (to) acquire enough commodities to meet basic material needs adequately” (Lipton, 1997:127). Namely, poverty is failing to meet basic physical needs, such as food, shelter,

clothing, etc. Individual / households are poor because they do not have enough money to meet these needs or they cannot consume due to lack of income.

With regard to liberal economics argument, welfare is thought as the preference fulfillment to maximize utility. In this frame, poverty is understood as the non-fulfillment of a 'basic preference' (Shaffer, 2001:4). Monetary expenditure as a satisfactory measure of this utility is the justification for a particular poverty line in the logic of this approach (Laderchi et al., 2003: 248). Poverty line represents the adequacy level of reproduction of physical needs.

Both Booth's study in London (1887) and Rowntree's work on poverty (1902) represented the first model for the income/consumption poverty approach in the history of poverty studies. Booth's conception of poverty was related to his definition of poverty line, which separated the poor from the rest of the society. He cut the line of poverty at 18 to 21 shillings a week (Spicer, 1993:29). In Booth's framework, "by very poor those who fall bellow this standard poor whatever the cause, those whose mean prove to be barely sufficient, or quite insufficient, for decent independent life are counted as poor or very poor" (Taylor, 1990:39). Even though he used the term of poverty line as that which depended on income, he classified eight-fold classes according to the employment situation of household heads (Scott, 1994:22). Booth determined poverty line with reference to the lowest level earning among his social groups or in his term 'classes'. He did not take into consideration the contents of needs. There was no explanation about how people spent their income.

Rowntree's poverty line depended on "the nutritionally adequate diet together with needs for clothing and rent" (Laderchi et al., 2003: 248). He calculated the cost of each item and transferred this to the level of income, then determined families who were into or out of poverty. He defined two types of poverty levels, the primary and the secondary poverty. The first one refers to the families that did not have enough money or lack income to buy the basic needs for physical reproduction. The second one was defined based on the use of the income. The

income might be sufficient but it was unwisely spent. The calculation of the subsistence level of poverty depended on the cheapest price of the items. Thus, “unwise spending” or not opting for the cheapest market caused the families to fall below the poverty level (Payne, 1991:19).

Historical origins of poverty studies reflect the understanding of absolute poverty with regard to basic physical subsistence or physical reproduction. The determination of poverty line as the cut-off of the poor from the non-poor is arbitrary and it also includes value judgments. The reproduction of life is understood only in physical terms, such as eating, sleeping, and clothing.

The same fault and contentions can also be seen in most recent poverty studies. One of the illustrative examples is the World Bank’s poverty line, defined as a dollar per a day. According to the estimation of the World Bank, there are 20 billion people living in absolute poverty. One of the important deficiencies of this calculation is that it does not take into account the differentiation of living costs between the countries. The World Bank chooses poverty line arbitrarily and there is no clear and meaningful underlying conception of poverty. It has no specific interpretation in relation to the resources which are needed by the poor in meeting basic necessities (Reddy and Pogg, 2002). Although the World Bank has taken responsibilities in order to reduce poverty, a dollar per day has neither practical significant nor application for poverty policies and programs. Moreover, the World Bank’s poverty understanding consists of ideological and political dimensions in itself. It tries to reflect the number of people who fail to sustain their life under capitalist conditions as minimal a number as possible. In spite of showing a very broad picture of poverty at the macro level, the World Bank’s approach reduces poverty to a social problem applying only to certain groups.

Basic needs approach as an extended version of income/consumption poverty has accounted for other indicators. In addition to private consumption indicators as food, shelter and clothing, public provided services, safe drinking water, sanitation, public transport, health and education are included in poverty

measurement (ILO, 1976). Basic need estimation has shared the same common problems with income poverty measurement in terms of arbitrary indicators that refer to choosing a limited scope.

In addition to this understanding of poverty in physical reproduction or physical survival, the methodological issue in terms of calculation the poverty line is also problematic. In income/consumption approach, there are different methods, for examples per capita income, food energy methods, food-share method, budget standards, official standards, Headcount Ratio, and one dollar per day are developed and used in order to determine poverty line. It is thought that poverty measurement should be made objectively in a scientific way. Determination of poverty line with either food energy or food share methods do not provide information on minimum energy requirements that may “vary one person to another, from time to time, between people of different ages or different patterns” (Mac Phearson and Silburn, 1998:5). Poverty line also prevents making a comparison between locations or across regions and socio-economic groups. Access to common property resources and state provided commodities (such as health and education) has been ignored and non-traded goods have not been taken into consideration in this conventional approach (Baulch, 1996: 39).

Income/consumption measures serve the technocratic needs of development professionals, rather than emerging from the realities of the poor. ‘Objective’ poverty line is problematic in terms of its epistemological invalidity (Chambers, 1995).

Because it implies a single ‘reality’, merely an attempt to imply scientific rigor about something which is only somebody’s value judgments. In fact, no great claims are actually being made when the term ‘objective’ is used; the purpose is to establish that the line is not locally determined on a subjective basis but reflects a set of needs that are universal (Greeley, 1994: 56).

Individuals have been taken into consideration as biological entities. Their survival has been thought only within the context of physical reproduction in the

absolute poverty understanding. To understand an individual as a social being and as a conceptualization of the reproduction of individual life more than minimum material necessities led to conceptualization of poverty in a more broad sense.

Townsend (1979; 1985; 1987) criticizes absolute poverty understanding with respect to its narrow subsistence notion of the needs that are thought as separate from their social context. He defines poverty relatively. According to him (1979), relative poverty refers to so limited material, cultural and social resources that exclude the persons, families and groups of persons from the minimum acceptable way of life in a given society.

His relative notion of poverty consists of two assumptions. The first assumption is related the needs which are not only physical but also social. That is, needs are encompass a broader meaning than just the physical needs, such as employment, education and social activities (Townsend, 1987). The second assumption is based on rejecting the idea that human needs are absolute or fixed in time. They are socially defined and changed over time (Townsend, 1985). Its implication is that poverty should be thought within the context of comparison in general with existing living standards of a society. According to him, relative poverty means that

Individuals, families and groups in the population can be said to be in poverty when they lack the resources to obtain the types of diet, participate in the activities and have the living conditions and amenities which are customary, or are at least widely encouraged or approved, in the societies below those commanded by the average individual and family that they are, in effect, excluded from ordinary living patterns and activities (Townsend, 1979: 31).

In addition to internal limitations of the income/consumption approach, poverty conceptualization is gender-neutral. “It has often been premised on the concept of a male actor and of male centered notions of well-being and agency, with obvious limitations for addressing the gender dimensions of poverty” (Kabeer, 1996: 11). Poverty statistics have been inadequate in terms of revealing poverty experiences,

specifically the experiences of women's poverty. "They do not tell us enough about the numbers of people living in or the margins of poverty, the depth of their poverty, the related impact of material and social deprivation and how people move in and out of poverty" (Payne, 1991: 16).

Male-centered understandings of poverty do not reflect that women "are less able than men to translate labor into income, income into choice and choice into personal well-being" (Kabeer, 1996: 19). Household income does not indicate how it is distributed within a household. Moreover, it does not say anything about how resources are transferred into the household. Poverty line approach assumes that all members of a poor household are poor and no one is poor in an affluent household. Galbraith (1980 cited in Land, 1983) has called this assumption as 'heroic simplification', which means that "the separate identities of men and women are merged into the concept of the household are not explored".

Poverty line approach is deficient not only in reflecting intra-household income inequality but also in the distribution of resources and it says little about individual access to income. Women generally have low wages than men. They have different kin and conjugal entitlements to transfer. In addition to these, they have different levels and forms of income access and control and different sets of expenditure obligations and responsibilities. "The distinctive features of women's incomes affect, and limit, the degree to which household income can serve as an indicator of well-being" (Jackson, 1998: 52). Razavi points out that the increasing household income had an effect on women's autonomy after the withdrawal of female labor from farm work. When the level of cash income held by men rose, women became more dependent on male income. Mainstream poverty studies that are based on income fail to capture these processes (Razavi, 1997: 61).

The methodological discussion of poverty is based on the necessity of being objective. Different poverty measurements depend on "the question of who decides what necessities is" (Veit-Wilson, 1987: 188). In the poverty measurements discussed above, the 'professional' experts decide what necessities

are heavy under criticisms of ‘democratic’ and ‘participatory’ approaches (Lister, 2004: 45-48). The democratic approach which is called ‘consensual’ to poverty measurement draws on the views of the general population rather than simply professional experts. In consensual conception, poverty is defined from the viewpoint of the public’s perception. Poverty line is established by references to the view of society as a whole. The consensual approach requires the public to estimate an adequate minimum income, and asks people to specify a list of necessary items and what level of benefits the public is prepared to fund (Walker, 1987: 213). According to Mack and Lansley (1985), the consensual approach,

Aims to identify a minimum acceptable way of life not by reference to the views of experts, nor by reference to observed patterns of expenditure or observed living standards, but by references to the views of society as a whole (Lansley, 1985: 42).

Although Mack and Lansley’s consensual definition of poverty has made some important contributions to the poverty research in terms of taking people’s view into account, it also has some limitations. The identification of necessities is the arbitrariness in their studies (Halleröd, 1994). In addition to this, the classification of consumption into necessities and non-necessities are problematic. “Poorer groups were sometimes more likely than the better-off groups to consider certain to be necessities” –carpets and a TV for instance (Gordon et al., 2000, cited in Lister, 2004: 47). Although the consensual approach focuses attention to people’ views, it does not take into consideration the poverty experiences of women. Researches are concerned with the possession of items rather than their quality. In reality, their lack affects women and men differently. This point is taken into consideration. As Payne writes,

Not having a refrigerator means the person responsible for buying and providing food - most often the women - must plan meals accordingly, and will spend more time shopping; not having hot water or a bathroom means different things to the man who uses hot water for washing and shaving in comparison with the woman who is responsible fro childcare, the washing of clothes and cleaning the house (Payne, 1991: 38).

In addition to arbitrary selection the deprivation index, they do not reflect the needs of women and the way that these affect each sex differently. Therefore, neither the selected indicators by population nor those determined by professional experts state anything about the quality of living of women or/and their poverty experiences. In traditional poverty studies, women's labor that is used in the domestic sphere and the production processes have not been accounted under the poverty conditions. In fact, it is impossible to question the quality of living of women using the limited items that have a static nature and measured through quantitative means.

Social exclusion is another concept in the poverty discourse. The term social exclusion has been dominant in European Social Policy since 1980. Like concept of poverty, there is no common understanding or definition of it. In general, it "focuses attention on central aspects of deprivation" which is both 'a multi-dimensional phenomena' and 'part and parcel of social relation" (de Haan, 2000: 22) and enters the poverty discourse and social policy to combat deprivation. European Commission (1985 cited in Gordon and Spicer, 1999) defines the poor in the context of social exclusion concept in this way. "Poor shall be taken to mean persons, families and groups of persons whose resources (material, cultural, and social) are so limited as to exclude them from the minimum acceptable way of life in the Member State in which they live" (1999: 54). It is different from the poverty concept in terms of its multi dimensional, relational, dynamic and process characteristics at the conceptual level (de Haan, 1998; Room, 1995).

The meaning of social exclusion varies among and within European countries. Silver (1994) and Levitas (1998; 1999; 2000) developed two paradigms, which reflect differences among the understanding of social exclusion. According to Silver (1994: 536-539), the term social exclusion consists of three paradigms, which are solidarity, specialization and monopoly. Each will "attribute exclusion to a different cause and is grounded in a different political philosophy: Republicanism, liberalism and social democracy" (Silver, 1994: 536). The solidarity paradigm refers to the French experience as the rupture bonds between

the individual and society and is attributed to the failure of the state. The specialization paradigm is dominant in Anglo-American liberalism based on the under-class discussion. Social exclusion is understood to be a result of market failure, discrimination and unemployment. The monopoly paradigm, which reflects Weber's concept of social closure seen in West Europe; discusses exclusion as the result of group monopoly, that is, some groups monopolize the resources for their interest and exclude others (Silver, 1994).

Levitas (1998; 1999; 2000) discusses the discourse of social exclusion as RED, MUD and SID. The concepts of citizenship, of social rights and of social justice have taken place in the redistributionist discourse (RED). RED sees social exclusion as a consequence of poverty. "It addresses the exclusionary processes in all areas of society which result in inequality itself" (Levitas, 1999: 5). Moralistic discourse (MUD) represents North American language of the 'underclass' and 'dependency' language. The moral underclass discourse of social exclusion focuses on the behavior of the poor not on the structure of the whole society. The underclass or socially excluded as culturally is seen as distinct from the mainstream society. Social integrationist discourse (SID) focuses on the exclusion from paid work. According to this discourse, "who are not employed is consigned to poverty, consequently, imply a reduction of poverty by an increase in benefit levels" (1999: 7).

The social integration approach focuses on its normalizing logic, which leaves "unquestioned the efficacy of capitalist social relation from which people axiomatically excluded if they cannot or do not sustain themselves through paid employment" (Dean and Melrose, 1999, cited in Lister, 2004: 79). Moreover, another problem in the exclusion approach is the dualism at its heart, as exclusion and inclusion that turns upon an insider/outsider distinction. The formulation of exclusion and inclusion suggests a unitary notion of power. It means those included are powerful and those excluded are powerless, but power is dispersed, contingent and unstable (Jackson, 1999: 132). Women domestic labor is ignored within the social exclusion framework (Levitas, 1999). Their unpaid work of

reproduction and voluntary activities are discounted and effectively devalued and marginalized (Lister, 2004: 79). Women are not categorically excluded. They are integrated through reproductive labor. This point is problematic in terms of gender relations from the politics of a dualistic inclusion/exclusion (Jackson, 1999). Jackson says,

Gendered processes such as the definition of wage as work, and the neglect work, are central to the idea that women are socially excluded. The inclusion agenda then suggests that women need to be included i.e. to become wage workers like men, rather than considering the need to revise the way in which inclusion is framed, for example, the importance of including men in more reproductive responsibilities (Jackson, 1999: 133).

Women's inclusion into employment is also problematic. A social exclusion frame does not take into consideration the conditions of employment for females (Jackson, 1999:133). An inclusion in the labor market through marginal, low paid and insecure jobs under poor working conditions does not reflect a genuine poverty-free social inclusion (Atkinson, 1998; Gallie and Paugam, 2002 cited in Lister, 2004).

The social exclusion approach assumes "both the financial power conferred by an income and also the value of being employed as part of being seen as a contributing member of society" (Jackson, 1999: 142) although the gender aspect of intra-household relations have not been accounted in terms of controlling money. As it is assumed, income-generating activities prevent women from poverty. In contrast to this argument, women spend immense labor to meet household needs with low income.

Besides the concept of social exclusion, the capability approach also takes a central role in poverty discourse. Sen (1983) argues that relative poverty has some difficulties in terms of making a comparison between developing and developed countries. It fails to capture the nature of poverty experiences in the South. He has tried to reconcile absolute and relative poverty by focusing

attention to the “irreducible absolute core in the idea of poverty” (Sen, 1983: 159). Starvation and malnutrition are the most obvious manifestations of this absolute core. In his capability framework, being and doing are universal in an absolute sense. However, the things that people need to translate into actual being and doing may change according to cultural and historical context (Sen, 1983). In contrast to income/consumption poverty conception, Sen’s capability frame as a broad normative framework is to evaluate and to assess individual well-being and social arrangement in the society (Robeyns, 2004: 2). It is used as a critical way in order to extend theoretical and methodological arguments of the welfare economics on the inequality, poverty, the well-being of an individual. The main concepts of the capability approach are the capabilities and functioning. Sen (1987a) states the relation and the distinct between them in the following way:

A functioning is an achievement, whereas a capability is the ability to achieve. Functioning is, in a sense, more directly related to living conditions, since they are different aspects of living conditions. Capabilities, in contrast, are notions of freedom, in the positive sense: what real opportunities you have regarding the life you may lead’ (Sen, 1987a: 36).

The standardization of income for the household, in which every individual activity is assumed equal, ignores or does not take into consideration some special position such as illness, disability, age, or gender. The indicators of freedom to live a ‘valued life’ are better than the monetary income measurement of well-being (Sen, 1992). The human diversity, which ‘is a fundamental aspect of our interest in equality’ (ibid: xi), is important to understand an individual’s varying ability to convert the commodities or resources into functioning. The evaluation of well-being takes into consideration an individual’s “actual ability to achieve various valuable functioning as a part of living” (Sen, 1993: 30). He focuses on real freedom (capabilities) of people that “lead the kind of lives they want to lead; to do what they want to do and be the person they want to be” (Robeyns, 2004: 7). In the capability frame, poverty is conceptualized in terms of basic capabilities. “Basic capabilities were intended to separate out the ability to

satisfy certain crucially important functioning up to certain minimally adequate levels” (Sen, 1993: 41). Basic capabilities are “not so much in ranking living standards, but in deciding on a cut-off point for the purpose of assessing poverty and deprivation” (Sen, 1987a: 109).

Although Sen (1987a) defines poverty and deprivation to fail basic capabilities, he does not describe what these basic capabilities are. Moreover, the material and social conditions that affect an individual’s capacity in his theoretical frame are not examined. It consists of a poverty line fault that differentiates the poor and non-poor as in common with other poverty definitions discussed above.

Sen’s ideas deeply affected the evolution of the human development approach in terms of refining and broadening the basic concepts and measurement tools. The purpose of Human Development is “to shift the focus of development economics from national income accounting to people centered policies” (UNDP, 1990). Human development has resulted in the construction of number indices, such as human development index, (1990, 1995), human freedom index (1991), gender-disparity-adjusted (1993), income-distribution-adjusted (1993), gender-related-development index (1995), gender empowerment measure (1995) and human poverty index (1997) (UNDP, 1990, 1991; 1993; 1995; 1997).

The Human Development Index (UNDP, 1990; 1995) has been based on three indicators. The first one is longevity measured by life expectancy at birth. The second indicator is educational attainment measured by a combination of adult literacy and combined primary, secondary and tertiary enrollment. The last one is standard of living, which is measured by adjustment income. The measurements of human development are limited only to these three indicators in terms of realization of capabilities. In fact, there are no differences between the basic needs approach indicators, which do not say anything about women’s poverty experiences.

In addition to HDI, Human Poverty Index (UNDP, 1997) was developed by UNDP (1997). While the first one focuses on the average achievements of a country, the second one concerns the most deprived forms. The selected poverty indicators are based on poverty understanding defined as the denial of the opportunities and choices most basic to human life. The highest deprivation areas are measured by five indicators, which are the percentage of people expected to die before age forty, that of adults who are illiterate that of people with access to health services, that of people with access to safe water, and that of children under five who are malnourished.

Although the HDI and HPI do not concern gender, it is assumed that gender dimension of poverty has been made visible at international levels through the UNDP's Gender-related Development Index (GDI) and the Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM) (Chant, 2003b: 12; Bardhan and Klasen, 1999). Gender-related development index (GDI) is seen as complementary for the human development index (HDI). It was originated in 1995 and it is still subject to revision. Women's well-being has been measured at the national level according to three main indicators: 'Longevity' (female and male life expectancy at birth); 'Knowledge' (female and male literacy rates and female and male combined primary, secondary and tertiary enrolment ratios); and 'Decent standard of living' (estimated female and male earned income, to reflect gender-differentiated command over resources) (UNDP, 2002: 23).

Gender-disaggregated measurement of basic aspects of human capabilities such as life expectancy, education and labor force participation involves many problems. Even if indicators show improvement in women's labor participation, it does not mean that women emancipate from oppression processes in the labor market. Moreover, women's incomes are compared to men's through data that are restricted to formal sector remuneration (Kabeer, 2003: 87). Indicators focus on the formal labor processes; however, most women take place in informal

production processes. Therefore, this does not provide an accurate picture of inequalities between female and male earnings (Baden and Milward, 1997).

Education enrollment in the GDI may show gender inequalities between women and men. Nevertheless, it does not say anything about quality of education and gender bias in educational choices (Chant, 2003b:23). Although life expectancy can be higher for women than men in some situations, it does not mean to reflect the positive well-being of women. However, more detailed analysis revealed that women in the reproductive years were at a particular disadvantage (Kabeer, 2003: 22).

The GEM's purpose is to evaluate gender inequality in economic and political opportunities and decision-making. "While the GDI focuses on the expansion of capabilities, the GEM is concerned with the use of those capabilities to take advantages of the opportunities of life" (Oxaal and Baden, 1997: 20). It comprises four main indicators: The first one is the share of parliamentary seats occupied by women. The second one is the proportion of legislators, senior officials and managers who are women. The third is female share of professional and technical jobs and lastly, the ratio of estimated male earned income (UNDP, 2002).

As in the case of GDI, the GEM has limitations in revealing women's power. Quantitative measures of political participation in formal politics do not say anything about the degree of power women are able to exercise. For example, the indicator that measures the degree of participation of women in professional and managerial roles is concerned with middle-class women. It mainly reflects their advancement (Oxaal and Baden, 1997: 21). Empowerment is thought as individual rather than as collective. The main idea behind GEM is related with a liberal approach democracy that emphasizes individual rights and participation in decision through the electoral process (ibid: 5).

Besides quantitative indicators of poverty and women's poverty, qualitative poverty evaluations have in recent years gained importance among the international development institutions. Participatory Poverty Assessments (PPAs) was originated by the World Bank in the 1990s. The World Bank carried out the 'Voices of the Poor' for the 2000/2001 World Development Report. It represents the convergence of two streams of change in development practice. The first one is Poverty Assessment, and the second is Participatory Research methodologies. The first one is defined as analyzing

The relation between the poverty profile and public policies, expenditure and institution. It also evaluates the effects of economic and social policies on the poor and makes recommendations for the consideration of country policymakers (Brock, 2000 cited in Whitehead and Lockwood, 1999).

Participatory Research methodologies are perceived to produce qualitative research findings from the perspective of the poor and the less powerful (Brock, 2000). Many qualitative methods are used in PPAs, which are focus groups, in-depth discussion with key informants and various techniques such as matrices, mapping, transects and venn diagrams. It is carried out by international development agencies (Kabeer, 2003).

PPAs have criticized traditional poverty conceptualization in terms of not taking into account the voice of the poor. It has considered the definition of poverty from the experiences of the poor. The conceptualization of poverty from the above or from the experts' views does not reveal the true nature of deprivation, which also disempowers the poor.

PPAs... enriching the analysis and understanding of poverty by including the perspectives of the poor; providing a diverse range of valuable information on a cost-effective, rapid and timely basis and creating new relationships between policy-makers, service providers and people in poor communities (Development for International Development, website 2000).

PPAs can improve the understanding of poverty and ensure that poverty reduction strategies reflect the priorities expressed by the poor. However, priorities of the poor can vary from a minimum level to a very high level. Which one is chosen or taken into account is problematic in PPAs (Norton and Stephen, 1995). As Kabeer (2003: 101-102) argues, PPAs are as gender-blind or as gender aware as who conducts them, like other methodologies. “The type of questions asked, the issue explored and the range of information obtained depend on what is considered relevant” (2003: 101). The question of who is selected at the grassroots can affect the picture. The World Bank “determines what aspect will be included and how these will be translated into practical measures” (Kabbeer, 2003: 101). The World Bank’s understanding of poverty is imposed rather than the being the results of the studies. Moreover, the perception of the poor reflects social norms and values. Kabber (2003: 102) writes,

The findings of PPAs may also fail to include gender issues because of ‘poor people’s perceptions’. These perceptions often reflect norms and values that do not attach any weight to gender inequalities or to violations of women’s human rights. Moreover, women frequently subscribe to these value systems and accept that they have lesser worth as human beings. For example, both men and women in Guinea saw women’s heavier workloads as well as male domination in private and public decision-making as ‘natural’ to the organization of gender relations rather than unjust (Kaber, 2003: 102).

Although participatory poverty assessments take into account the ‘voices of the poor’ and consider subjectivity and power relations, the perspective from which the research is conducted is important. The World Bank’s PPAs do not involve a feminist interest. Women are taken into research processes as an added category and as an instrument to reduce poverty.

As a result, it can be said that all of the poverty definitions confuse on both the reasons and the indicators of poverty. While unemployment or low income is seen as indicators of poverty in some viewpoints, they are seen as reasons of poverty in others. It is also the same for women’s poverty and deprivation. In

poverty research, if the main aim is to determine the poverty level, it is possible to choose one poverty line which may be less problematic in its-self but at the sociological level, if the aim is to explore women's poverty experiences, it is necessary to examine the roots of poverty through feminist perspectives.

2.3. Feminist Critiques of Poverty Theories

The explanation of poverty can be taken into consideration within the following two broad classifications. It can be labeled respectively as pathological/individual and structural explanation of poverty (Holman, 1978; Spicer, 1993; Alcock, 1997). The root of this distinction depends on the past, especially in the nineteenth century. As Cheal (1996) points out,

Nineteenth-century opinions about poverty were divided over its ultimate causes. From one point of view, poverty could be seen as an unfortunate result of the inevitable workings of the labor market. Alternatively, poverty might be attributed to the failure of poor people to manage their affairs better. Laziness or addiction to heavy drinking and other wasteful expenditures were considered along with unequal access to financial resources to be possible causes of poverty (Cheal, 1996: 18).

Theories on poverty have two different features. Firstly, most poverty theories do not consist of coherent and efficient conceptual tools in order to explain poverty in general, and specifically women's poverty experiences. Moreover, some theories blamed and saw women as the reason for household poverty. Second, most theories do not take into consideration women's position in the poverty process. Thus, both its pathological/individual and structural explanations fail to take women's poverty experiences in their conceptual arguments. Mainstream poverty theories have gender-blind features.

Poverty is associated with individual features from the individualist perspective. In this perspective, poverty is attributed to a poor individual's traits. These explanations do not necessarily blame the poor but regard them with the

limitations and deficiencies of individuals for explaining poverty (Holman, 1978: 54-55). The genetic explanation of poverty simply as a version of the individualist perspective understands poverty through the inherited capacities of the poor such as inadequacy or pauper syndrome, a mental illness (ibid: 54-56).

The human capital theory is the second version of the individualist explanation for poverty. It rests on the neoclassical (mainstream) economist arguments (Holman, 1978: 67-86; Thomas, 1994: 42-46; Jennings, 1999: 17-18). According to this view, individuals are rational and free to pursue their interest under competitive market conditions. The free market system operates in demand and supply mechanism to use the opportunities for making money (Holman, 1978: 70; Thomas, 1994: 42). The advantages of competitive conditions with respect to workers depend on their personal talent, initiative and efforts. Poverty is caused by lack of employment and low wage. The responsibility for unemployment and low wage is attributed to workers (Albelda, 2002: 31). The reasons of poverty are explained in relation to individuals' weakness, such as lack of such assets as education, training, job skills and language proficiency or laziness. In short, lack of human capital prevents them from the economic mobility (Jennings, 1999: 17).

In general, the individualist explanation of poverty stresses the characteristics of poor individual's attitudes, behaviors, and personal features. According to this explanation, the poor are unable or unwilling to provide adequately for their well-being. Their personality traits cause their achievement or non-achievements. Poor people are taken into consideration with their undeveloped or non-acquired traits without structural factors that cause poverty.

The individualist explanation of poverty includes some deficiencies in understanding women's poverty. The human capital approach fails to explain women's position in the market. Women's participation in the production process is not the same as that of men. These differences were tried to be solved with 'new home economists', developed within the neoclassical economy after the 1960s at the University of Chicago. They thought that women's unpaid economic

activities at home are ignored by the mainstream economics. Thus, it was necessary to discover women's unpaid work. They also discuss women's positions both in paid and unpaid activities through the principles of the classical economics. The main argument is to explore the insufficient competitive conditions for women. According to Becker (1985 cited in Thomas, 1994: 43), women are "not able to compete effectively for higher paying" with their household responsibilities. Indeed, women choose this lower pay, "because they are less physically strenuous and provide more flexible hours" (Becker, 1985 cited in Thomas, 1994: 16). In short, women's lack of employment or employment at the low wages is considered to be determined by women's rational choice (Albelda, 2002: 32).

The 'new home economists' do not account for occupational segregation and discrimination in the market for women's low wages. They dismiss occupational segregation as a factor for women's low wages. On the other hand, they focus on women's primary responsibilities at home. Women's unpaid housework and childcare define their position in the market. It is assumed that women and men behave in a rational way in terms of household interests. Division of labor between a woman and a man are explained according to principles of economics of the 'comparative advantage' (Thomas, 1994: 43-44). In other words, women are better than men at housekeeping. Men's earning is seen sufficient for the family. Division of labor between women and men in the family is seen to be natural. In this perspective, women's positions both in the market and in the home are justified.

The third version of the individualist/pathological explanation of poverty is rooted in Lewis's culture of theory and the underclass discussions. Women are seen as responsible for creating and transmitting poverty from one generation to the next generation, especially by conservatives. Women's position in creating and sustaining poverty is discussed within the context of the culture of single motherhood, the family structure and dependency on welfare (Thomas, 1994; 1994a; 1998; Jennings, 1999).

In Lewis's approach, the culture of poverty is thought as a poor individual's response and adaptation to their marginal position in the larger economic system. The culture of poverty as a way of life, or a poor individual's values, is different from the rest of the society and it is passed down from generation to generation along family lines (Lewis, 1968: 187-188). The culture of poverty as the reaction of the poor develops under the conditions of "a cash economy, wage labor, production for profit"; "a persistently high rate of unemployment and underemployment for unskilled labor"; "low wages"; "the failure to provide social, political and economic organization either on voluntary basis or by government imposition, for the low income population" (Lewis, 1968: 188). In fact, Lewis bases the roots of the culture of poverty culture on the economic system and the culture of poverty is described at the larger society, community level, the family level, the individual level. Later on, a transformed version of his theory has been used to turn into an approach considering poverty within the framework of the individual.

Banfield (1970) developed the culture of poverty thesis as "the lower class culture that was 'pathological'". His work was one of the first poverty studies that took women into analysis. According to him, women cause poverty and play a special role in perpetuating the lower class culture (Thomas, 1994a: 72). Inadequate parenting, lowered aspirations and disadvantaged environments of families and communities are transmitted from the families or communities to their children as children grew up. Women are placed at the center in Banfield's lower-class pathology thesis. Women transmit to their children their lives, the way they live and their values. Women are seen as the main actors in producing poverty through their pathological motherhood. Women displaced men in the discussions of the individual level responsibility and culture of poverty (Thomas, 1994a: 74). Women were integrated into the explanation of poverty as the blame for poverty.

Like Banfield, Moynihan (1967) makes a link between families, culture of poverty and the poor. In his explanation of poverty, he blames women rather than

men for the transmission of poverty. Children are ‘abnormally’ socialized in female dominated African American families (Thomas, 1994: 27). The dysfunctional family structure is a popular explanation for poverty. It is thought that a breakdown of the family is a major reason for individuals and families to fall into poverty. “ The fundamental problem is that of family structure, so long as this situation persists, the cycle of poverty and disadvantage will continue to repeat itself” (Moynihan, 1965 cited in Jennings,1999: 27).

In addition to the notion of culture of poverty, the underclass debate is also used to explain poverty. There is a shift from the analysis based on the ‘culture’ or ‘cultural’ subheadings of poverty to the analysis of poverty used in the concept of underclass between the 1966 and 1987 (Morris, 1989: 123-125). Both labels are used to refer to the same segment of poor population who are economically deprived, unemployed, or casually and irregularly employed; out-of-wedlock births, female-headed families and the uneducated. In addition to these, there is a high rate of criminal activity and drug abuse among this population.

The concept of the underclass is widely used in poverty studies especially within the context of urban poverty. In general, the concept means to explain the position of some social groups who do not take place in any class in the structured class society. It denotes beyond classes. Myrdal in 1964 firstly used the term as he studied poor black families in New York, to define their social and economic position. To him, the main dimension of the underclass is unemployment (Çam, 1999: 12). Since 1980, the term has been used for people who are permanently poor. As Cheal points out, “there has been much confusion about what an ‘underclass’ really is, and how it differs from other classes in society. There is no single, generally accepted definition” (Cheal, 1996). For example in Murray’s (1984) using the concept of underclass within the context of poverty is to define the poor as a separate social category. Their separation is the cause of poverty. Underclass refers to the increasing levels of illegitimacy and single parenthood, high levels of criminality and uneducated people as well as no participation into the labor market (Murray, 1984). To him, underclass is a type

of poverty, social policies have had an important effect to accentuate it, and they did not relieve it (W. Wilson, 1987: 16-18).

Women's poverty, especially for female-headed families, has been explained in terms of cultural norms and values, family structure and their dependency on welfare in different versions of culture of poverty and underclass discourse. There was a shift from culture and women's poverty to the culture of single motherhood in the mainstream poverty explanation between the 1960s and 1980s (Thomas, 1994a).

Welfare dependency (Duncan and Hoffman, 1991; Novak, 1987), out-of wedlock births and most importantly female-headed families (Mead, 1986) are used as indicators to define the culture of single motherhood (Thomas, 1994a: 78). Dependency as an ideological concept refers to poor women with children who maintain their families without a male breadwinner and adequate wage. They have to support themselves by depending on welfare. In the current discussion, 'welfare mother' is thought as the individual problems, as much moral or psychological as economic. Dependency ideology supports a male-supremacist independent wage-earner/breadwinner and feminizes the notion of dependency (Fraser and Gordon, 1996: 237). On the other hand, children, elderly persons and the able-bodied depend on women's labor. Women are restricted from wage-labor for their carrying work. The nature of carrying out work limits women in accessing resources and power (Deprez, 1998: 28).

Being too lazy, too dependent and too fertile are not the reasons for women's poverty as many conservative and public opinion thought. A single-mother faces a 'triple whammy'. When they take place in labor market, they often earn low wages, like all women. They have to cope with paid and unpaid work together, just as other women. Having to take care of children, women are forced to work in more flexible and part-time jobs. Because of this, they earn less than other women workers. Unlike married women, they must earn income and take care of children without the help of another adult (Albelda and Chris, 1996: 78-81).

The conservative approach emphasizes the strengthening of the male-headed family for the solution of sole-parent's impoverishment. The ultimate goal in this moral discourse about family responsibility is to decrease divorce rates and to reduce number of sole-parent families (Cheal, 1996: 30). Within the family institution, women may not escape from poverty under-capitalist conditions. As Bane (1986) pointed out, single-women were poor before they got divorced or lost their husbands. The assumption that focuses on the inherent inferiority of female-headed household proceeds from the assumption that the conventional male-dominant family is natural and a pre-given structure (Thomas, 1994a: 87).

The politics of single motherhood culture are anti-feminist because they focus on women's behavior. In this perspective, the solution for women's poverty depends on women's aspiration of their behavioral change. They politically ignore the real structural causes of poverty (Thomas, 1994a: 82). Besides the family unit, labor market conditions must be taken into consideration in determining women's chances of avoiding poverty (Fitzgerald, 1991). Occupational segregation, race and gender discrimination and limited availability of affordable childcare prevent most women from participating into full-time labor market. On the other hand, most women resort to welfare after they lose their jobs because they are much less likely to receive unemployment insurance than men (Thomas, 1994a: 85-86). "When care-giving is valued and paid, when dependency is not a dirty word, and interdependence is the norm-only, then will we make a dent in poverty" (Fraser and Gordon, 1996: 261).

Some versions of the culture of poverty, especially Banfield's and underclass discourse can be criticized in terms of their anti-feminist vision, ideological aspects, and ignoring the structural dimension of poverty, patriarchal relations and structures that determine women's poverty experiences.

In contrast to individualist/pathological approach, the structural perspectives on poverty do not pay an attention to the poor individual's traits. They understand poverty as a fact beyond the individual features. Although there are differences

among structural understandings of poverty, they are in common in seeing a poor individual's position to be at the bottom of the society in a stratified society. Structural perspectives on poverty mainly insist on the economic and social institution of society in their explanatory framework. They can also be labeled as 'society blaming' explanation. As Haralambos expresses "questions about the nature and functioning of stratification systems are directly related to the questions about poverty" (Haralambos, 1984). It can be reformulated by the way of the question of poverty as it is related to the questions of class, inequality and power.

The first version of structural explanation of poverty can be named as labor market segmentation theories in a changing economy. Labor market theories are related in explaining poverty with the disadvantage situation of labor force in the labor market. The concept of dual labor market has been used to explain disadvantage features of labor market in understanding of the poor worker's conditions. The dual labor market theory divides the market situation into two parts. The first one is the primary labor market where there are stable employment or job security, relatively high wages, training opportunities, and strong trade unions. The other is the secondary labor market in which employment is unstable or little job security and there are low wages and few possibilities for promotion or training and no unions (Spicer, 1993: 79).

Individuals who take place in the secondary labor market are poorer than the others. In this sphere, some social groups, especially women and ethnic minority groups are more concentrated. Most women fall into the secondary labor market, especially in clerical, sales, and service jobs (Seccombe, 1999: 44). Women's position in the secondary labor market is explained by the lack of attachment to the labor market among the dual labor market theorists. Women's work discontinuity excludes them from job markets offering high wages and career ladders (Thomas, 1994: 50). In addition, the reasons why women are secondary workers are explained by dispensability, clearly visible social differences, and little interest in acquiring training, low economism and lack of solidarity.

According to Walby, focus is only on the description of the characteristics that women bring to labor market and the effects of sexual division of labor on the labor market structure are not taken into account (Walby, 1988: 18).

Research indicates (see Thomas, 1994: 51) that when women stay in the labor market for a long period, their occupational patterns are still very different from men's position. The other problem with labor market theories is its gender blind nature. Gender has an important effect in determining the division of labor between women and men. The explanation of the two sectors without gender specific terms ignores the ways in which the market itself is structured by sexual division. "To treat sexual differentiation as a product of force outside the labor market encourages the further false assumption that the workings of the labor market in no way exacerbate this sexual differentiation" (Thomas, 1994: 52).

The radical dual market theories critique the inadequacies of traditional interpretation of market theory in terms of the explanation of poverty and labor market segmentation by the class perspective. Gordon states that

Class division in society and the relative distribution among classes will affect the distribution of individual income as well. An individual's class will, ultimately, affect both his productivity, through the allocation of social resources to investment in the workers of his class and through the differential access of different classes to different kinds of complementary capital, and his relative share of final product (cited in Townsend, 1979: 78).

In contrast to dual labor market theorists, radicals focus on the functional position of labor market segmentation for capitalism. Radical theorists mostly insist on the usefulness of gender division of labor for the capitalist. On the other hand, their assumptions of a sex neutral economy have some limitations in explaining why women, as a class, always take place at the bottom of the labor market hierarchy. In addition to this, they have an inadequate explanation for women's high levels of poverty (Thomas, 1994: 53).

Second version of structural explanation of poverty focuses on the analysis of capitalism. According to Marx and Engels (1968), poverty is an inherent feature of capitalism. Marx had critiqued the classical political economic understanding in terms of its legalizing the private property and exploitation. He insisted on the essence of the phenomenon. He claimed that classical political economic analysis had not explored the real relationship within the production process in which the main aim was to gain profit. According to him, although capitalism is a dynamic system in its development, capitalist economic system based on the creation of surplus value, which gained from the labor power. Surplus value is created by two ways, which are the technological invention and increasing the working hours. Indeed, working conditions and hours were many times protested by labor power in class struggle in the early of capitalist production system. Labor power had also never had its real wage in the production process. Other struggle sphere of working class was the increasing of the wage level. However, capitalist class easily found cheap labor in the labor market. Labor-power had become as a commodity, which bought and sold. The other feature of capitalist economy was the creation of reserve labor army. This concept had an important strength to understand poverty in his theory.

Relative surplus-population exist in every possible form...the stagnant, forms a part of the active labor army, but with extremely irregular employment. Hence it furnishes to capital an inexhaustible reservoir of disposable labor power. The lowest sediment of the relative surplus-population finally dwells in the sphere of pauperism' (Marx, 1970:33).

Poverty was seen as an outcome of capitalist production system. In Marx's ideas, poverty and inequality were seen not natural phenomenon. They were resulted by the capitalist production system. Poverty was generated and perpetuated by capitalist society. For Marx,

Pauperism is the hospital of the active labor-army and the dead weight of the industrial reserve army. Its production is included in that of the relative surplus-population, its necessity in theirs; along with the surplus-population, pauperism forms a condition of

capitalist production, and of the capitalist development of wealth' (Marx, 1970:35).

His theorizing of capitalism has important insight to explain the poverty around the concept of surplus-population and proletariat that means not having production tools and resources. As a result, as he pointed out that, 'the more extensive, finally, the Lazarus-layers of the working-class and industrial reserve army, the greater are official pauperism. This is the absolute general law of *capitalism*.'(1970: 35). Capitalism establishes an accumulation of misery that is related to accumulation of capital. So, accumulation of wealth is at the same time accumulation of 'misery', 'agony of toil', 'ignorance', 'slavery', 'brutality', and 'mental degradation'. On the other hand, for him to remedy pauperism depend on the end of capitalism as a social system. In his theoretical context, the main power is the class struggle in order to change the class society. His criticisms on capitalist society have many insights to understand the roots of poverty. Due to focusing on relation of production, it fails to conceptualize women's labor without production process, especially women's domestic labor.

According to Seccombe (1999:44) Marx paid little attention to the ways in which capitalism affects women directly. The end of capitalism may not necessarily improve the lives of women. Socialist-feminism suggests that 'a more collective approach to carrying out housework and child care is needed to really eliminate poverty and improve women's lives'

As a result, mainstream poverty explanations of both individual and structural approaches have some limitations in exploring and determining women's specific poverty experiences and their poverty burden under-capitalist conditions.

2.4. Conclusion

All poverty definitions and measurements, income/consumption, basic needs, capability and social exclusion, Human Development and Poverty Index involve deficiencies with respect to arbitrary determination of a poverty line which serves

as a division of the poor from non-poor. They reflect the technocratic needs of experts. Moreover, their premise is the concept of a male actor and male centered notions of well-being and agency. They do not tend to ask questions in the areas concerning women and they are limited in addressing the gender dimension of poverty. Consensual poverty measurement and the Participatory Poverty Assessments, which are assumed to be 'democratic' measurements of the poverty, are also based on the views of population or poor people. However, the identification of necessities is the arbitrariness in the consensual method. It concerns the position of items rather than their quality. It considers it in a sex-affecting nature. Lacking some items affect women and men differently. Participatory Poverty Assessment is gender-blind. The type of questions asked, the issue explored and the range of information obtained do not depend on women's interests. The World Bank's PPAs do not involve a feminist interest. Females are taken into account in the research process as an added category and as an instrument in order to reduce poverty. Women's position under poverty conditions is hidden under these conceptualizations. In the same way, poverty theories stand as male-centered and do not take into consideration women's specific position in society. Individualist approaches in particular, blame women for creating poverty and transmitting it to the next generation by using the culture of poverty theory and underclass concept.

CHAPTER 3

WOMEN AND POVERTY IN THE THIRD WORLD

3.1. Introduction

The main aim of this chapter is to reveal the relations between women and poverty in the Third World context by drawing upon the literature. The development of the discourse on women's poverty will be critically discussed by giving its critiques. In the first part of this chapter, the relationship between women and poverty in the development discourse will be reviewed critically by drawing upon welfare, equity, and anti-poverty approaches. Moreover, in this part the poverty understanding of development institutions and their response to women's poverty will be presented in a critical way. In the third subsection, how feminists frame women's poverty in relation to the labor market and the household will be shown. In the last section, poverty studies in Turkey after 1980 will be presented.

3.2. Women and Poverty in Development Discourse

Development refers to different meanings with regard to theoretical stance. In general and in simple sense, it explains the economic planning processes to modernize less-developed countries. Modernization is equated with development. It is believed that if under-developed countries followed the economic ways of advanced capitalist societies, they would escape poverty and develop. In the development process, there have been several policies aimed at poor women in

the developing world. They are classified as welfare, equity, anti-poverty (Buvinic, 1983), and efficiency and empowerment (Moser, 1993).

The welfare approach was one of the ways in which development policies dealt with poor women in the post World War II era. In these policies, male populations were mainly targeted and women were thought as the welfare sector. Men were seen as productive activities while women were taken into account in their reproductive role only (Buvinic, 1983; Tinker, 1990). The world population problem was tried to be solved by making women the primary targets of family planning, maternity and child health care and nutrition programs (Buvinic, 1983: 24). It was thought that women were primarily responsible for limiting the size of families and it was assumed that limiting fertility could reduce poverty (Moser, 1993: 61).

Welfare programs served to create dependence of women, instead of making them independent. The social position of women was not questioned and there was no approach to examine the gender division of labor and women's exploitation under capitalist conditions. Woman's poverty was reproduced with regard to their labor power used in the reproduction of household process. One of the important aspects of women's poverty was the exploitation of their labor in the household. Liberal development policies transformed women's labor into an instrument of development. The family's physical survival, nutrition, health and population control were some of the important reproduction areas. Women realized their labor in those areas for reproduction of themselves and of the household. Welfare oriented policies were applied to alleviate problems, such as family physical survival, nutrition and women's health through women's labor without questioning their role as a mother and a housewife.

The relationship between women and development with implications for thinking on poverty came with Boserup's influential work (1970) that directed attention to the failure of modernization to benefit women. The new modernization projects,

education, training, and technologies benefited men and negatively affected women. Women had a double burden both within and outside the household. They ignored women's productive role and restricted them to the household. Therefore, women's unpaid work within and outside the household were underestimated by conventional measures of economic activity (Tinker, 1976). In this frame, the equity approach was introduced within the 1976-85 UN Women's Decades. The goal of legal equality of women, such as the right of divorce, of custody of children, property, credit, voting and other citizen rights; were accepted as a minimum basis of consensus in 1976-85 Women's Decades Conference. According to Bunc (1980 cited in Moser, 1993: 65) "feminism to a woman who has no water, no food and no home is to talk nonsense". Despite the importance of the above basic consensus, Third World feminist women criticized Western-exported feminism in terms of irrelevance to the Third World women's vision or priorities.

Women's labor was brought into the development process through liberal feminist concepts such as equal opportunity in the market place. Kabeer (1992) points out that:

The basic paradox in the notion of market equity for women: without effective purchasing power, they cannot acquire support services to alleviate the burden of reproductive work, while without alleviating the burden of reproductive work; they cannot acquire greater purchasing power. Equality of opportunity is meaningless without equality of agency' (Kabeer, 1992: 110).

The equity approach took account of women's poverty according to their subordination position. The conceptualization of women's poverty was made indirectly through their unequal position in relation to men in the development process. Within the liberal feminist framework, women are equal to men. They are rational individuals as men. Absences of equal opportunities exclude them from both the development processes and realizing their full potential.

One of the most important limitations of this perspective is that women are still responsible for the labor necessary to reproduce healthy, active human life on a daily and generational basis. If they were given equal opportunities, they would not emancipate themselves from using their labor power in the reproduction of the household under capitalist conditions. The exploitation of unpaid women's labor sheds powerful insights into understanding women's poverty, which were not taken into consideration in either liberal feminist criticisms of welfare approach or their equity understanding.

Following the end of the unsuccessful First Development Decade and the formulation of alternative models of the Third World, economic and social development caused the shift from the equity base approach to the anti-poverty approach in the development discourse. In this trend, the economic inequality between women and men is linked to poverty (Moser, 1993: 67). The anti-poverty approach is based on these premises:

(1) The ratio of women to men is greater in the poorest income groups than in the population as a whole; (2) the economic performance of households in the lowest income brackets is directly related to the economic activity of women in these households the importance of women's productive role increases with poverty but the extent of their reproductive functions does not diminish, resulting in a dual burden for poor women; and (4) to promote balanced economic growth, a major goal of development policy should be to increase the productivity and income of women in the lowest income households' (Buvinic, 1983: 16).

In that period, international institutions such as ILO and World Bank focused on alleviating poverty besides the economic growth model for the Third World countries. The informal economy was assumed to be an autonomous capacity and seen as a solution for employment against absolute poverty. (Moser, 1984 cited in 1993). The main aim was to meet basic and social needs, such as food, clothing shelter, and fuel, education, human rights and participation in social life through employment and political involvement (Streeton et al, 1981 cited in Moser, 1993: 67).

Thus women's productive role is thought as a way to alleviate poverty especially in low-income households. The main assumption behind this approach is that the origins of women's poverty and inequality with men lie both in their lack of access to private ownership of land and capital and sexual discrimination in the labor market. Therefore, the main aim is to increase employment and income generating options for low-income women through better access to productive resources. Especially women who head their households were the targeted groups. Women were seen as the poorest of the poor (Moser, 1993: 68).

The anti-poverty approach has many limitations with regard to alleviating poverty and women's poverty. It ignores gender roles and patriarchal relationships within the family, in the planning and implementation process of the projects (Schmitz, 1979; Bruce, 1980; Sebsted, 1982; Moser, 1993; Buvinic, 1986). Although anti-poverty programs intended change in the balance of power between women and men, allocation of resources remained in the hands of the male head of the household (Moser, 1993: 67). This approach ignored women's gender role. Cultural constraints restrict women's ability to move freely outside the domestic place. Therefore, it is impossible for women to compete equally with men

The anti-poverty approach ignored women's socially accepted roles in society. These policies did not challenge the gender division of labor and their exploitative position in society. Despite the focus on improving women's access to income through such efforts as small-scale, income-generating projects, they failed to solve poverty problems in general and women's poverty in particular. Liberal development thought, in accordance with its nature, did not question the resources of poverty that are rooted in acquisition of profit in the production process. In anti-poverty approach as one of the liberal development policies, women's labor was only used as an instrumental against the decrease in the quality of household living in poverty conditions.

Liberal development policies, which were imposed to the Third World countries by international institutions during the post-World War II period, failed through the 1970s and the 1980s. Many countries fell into economic crisis. One of the important indicators of this crisis was the chronic payment problem of those countries. Structural Adjustment policies (SAPs), also known as The Washington Consensus, were produced to deal with economic crisis in several African, Latin American, Caribbean and Asian countries by the same institutions such as IMF and the World Bank in the period between 1980 and over the 1990s. Structural Adjustment Policies also named as the Economic Reconstruction Programs, New Economic Policy, and Economic Adjustment Program and so on, consisted of a condition-based loans package, which in appearance served to push countries to economic growth based on efficiency and stability.

The main assumption of the SAPs in relation to neo-liberalism was based on the market being the main dynamic for organizing and allocating resources rather than the state. Government spending was cut down drastically to reduce deficits in the public sector especially in the areas of education, health and social security, which contribute to social wages, particularly to those of low-income groups. This leads to challenging the government's role in the economy in the process of privatization of public economy. Deregulation of labor and capital to increase efficiency constitute other policy areas of the SAPs in the Third World Countries. In addition to this, trade liberalization increases the degree of globalization of economy (Beneria, 1999: 2).

This period is also named as globalization. In general, it refers to the mobilization of goods, capital and labor in the neo-liberal market economy to meet the needs of global capitalism in terms of capital accumulation. It can be said that this process is highly consistent with neo-classical economics and the modernization approach to development. The most important result of the capital accumulation process in the new period has been deterioration of the living standards of people and deep inequalities between the rich and the poor. In contrast to the macro level

aims, there are many negative impacts on social classes at the micro level. Under these conditions, especially women started to use labor force to struggle with poverty conditions that led to worsening of working and living conditions of many women and deepening of women's oppression and exploitation. The decrease in real wages forced women to participate in paid labor force. Women started to take place especially in the informal sector under precarious and low wages. In addition to this, they work in the export sector with low wages, too, which also serves to keep exports competitive. At the household level, decreasing budgets intensified women's domestic and reproductive work. Budget cuts especially in essential services such as health, education and housing affected the poor families and increased women's responsibilities in family care.

The early critique of structural adjustment came from UNICEF's *Adjustment with a Human Face* (1987). The idea was that market-based growth caused human and economic inequality and they stressed the need to protect the vulnerable, especially women (Sadasivam, 1997:1). UNICEF gave attention "to the 'invisible adjustments' being made by women in poor households in their attempts to cope with economic crisis" (Kabeer, 2003: 11).

International institutions began to focus on women's poverty. For example, The 1990 Human Development Report sees women's poverty in terms of the female-headed households and women's labor qualification. Because of having fewer opportunities, women could not provide a decent living to their families. HDR stated that "poverty has a woman's face – of 1.3 billion people in poverty, 70 percent are women". (UNDP, 1995) The most important reason for women's poverty was seen as tragic consequences of women's unequal access to economic opportunities. According to HDR (UNDP, 1995), it was necessary that governments introduce affirmative actions to promote equality and ensure that women have access to productive resources.

Besides UNDP's response to women's poverty, the World Bank's Report (1990, 2000) returned to a more direct concern with poverty reduction (Kabeer, 2003: 16). The World Bank (1990) responded to 'adjustment with human face' through focusing on intensive growth and human capital development. It was believed that increase in human capital investment lead to increase in economic productivity (Wong, 2003: 312). They did not withdraw their primary goal of open economies. The main goal of its new poverty agenda was to promote pro-poor growth through labor-intensive strategies to generate income-earning opportunities for poor women by using their most abundant asset-their labor power. Moreover, the social investment in basic health and education for the productivity of women's labor was the other goal in order to reduce women's poverty and sustain growth. There has been a change in the development thought in the Bank since the 2000s. It is called the post-Washington consensus (Fine, 2001). In contrast to the 1990 Report, the World Development Report (2000) took into consideration women's poverty with the concepts of 'opportunity', 'security' and 'voice'. Kinship rules, community norms and the legal system were thought as obstacles to women's opportunities to reach ownership of resources and domestic autonomy.

Women's labor to poverty analysis was thought in terms of its instrumental social and economic benefits for poverty reduction. There was no analysis about gender-bias in the labor market. The World Bank failed to pay attention to the point that "gender inequality is central to both how poverty is caused and form it takes" (Kabeer, 2003: 13). Development agencies consisted of many paradoxes in their development policies in terms of both growth and poverty. International institutions such as the World Bank and IMF have the major responsibility to create poverty with their imported policies to the less developed countries. They are still interested in alleviating poverty by using women's labor. As it was seen in the anti-poverty approach, they again focus on and use women's labor in an instrumentalist manner to alleviate poverty. When they take feminist critiques into consideration, they reformulate them with regard to their policy orientation.

They distort and assimilate the feminist political aspect in their legal gender equity goal.

3.3. Feminist Studies on Women and Poverty

Labor market is one of the important areas in which women's poverty is conceptualized for the Third World Countries. Especially, feminist studies about SAPs and their impact on women in the production processes had an important effect to create a link between women and poverty. The indicators of women's poverty in the production processes have been mentioned, in general as feminization of labor force, informalization of women's labor, occupational segregation, wage inequalities between females and males, unemployment and underemployment.

Empirical evidences (Standing, 1989; Joeques and Watson, 1994; Joeques, 1995; Çağatay and Özler, 1995) suggest that the growing informalization of the labor force is a major factor which explains the increase in female labor force participation since the 1980s. Standing (1989: 1080) argues that "the international data strongly suggest that women's participation has been rising while male equivalent has been falling". Many jobs and activities which are traditionally undertaken by men have been feminized. Feminization of labor force is strongly connected with the shift to the export-oriented development strategies and structural adjustment processes. Global feminization and flexibility of the work force result from labor regulation. Women participate in flexible labor processes, which are insecure and low paying jobs with few prospects for advancement. Deregulation processes in economy made an important advantage in favor of the employers to improve their competitive position over women's labor (Standing, 1989; Razavi, 1999: 659). Women's income and working conditions compared to men are unequal in the new employment opportunities (Çağatay and Özler, 1995).

Informalization of labor force is an important concept to understand women's poverty in terms of capital accumulation which impacted women's impoverishment. The informalization of employment resulted from two pressure facts. The first fact is that economic competition puts pressure on firms to cut total costs by lowering labor costs. The second is that the government regulates labor standards at the lower level in order to attract foreign direct investment (Carr and et al., 2000: 125).

Moreover, informalization process occurred also in many formal-job sectors. "The informal sector has particular relevance for both poverty and gender concerns because women tend to be concentrated in the informal sector" (Baden and Milward, 1997: 33). A vast majority of women work as subcontract workers or industrial home-workers, which are unrecorded and provide indirect wages in their homes. The subcontracting sector as a highly exploitative content deeply affected women's poverty because women receive lower wages and work longer hours. In addition to these, it does not have legal protection or organized trade unions (Beneria and Feldman, 1992). Women in general earn less than men although they take place in similar occupations. Inequality in wages between women and men is larger in the informal sector than the formal sector (Tokman, 1989). "There is an overlap between being a woman, working in the informal sector, and being poor" (Carr and et. al., 2000: 127).

As Baden and Milward (1997: 34) point out, "there is also strong occupational segregation in the informal sector; women tend to be confined to a narrow range of occupations, mainly in personal services or petty trading, whereas men are more often found in small-scale manufacturing." Women are engaged in selling, dressmaking and personal services whereas men are involved in selling, tailoring, carpentry, personal services and mechanics (Moser, 1992: 97).

The increasing rate of female participation in the production process is explained by the loss of a male's income in the household. In another words, there is an

important relationship between female participation into the productive sector and economic crisis, which causes reduction in the household income (Moser, 1998). Moser (1998) writes that

In deteriorating economic context, household labor portfolios are most effectively managed by increasing the number of workers. When household income decline, the first and most important response is to mobilize additional labor... when households become poorer, the common response was for more women to join the labor force (Moser, 1998: 30).

Although women's participation into labor force increased due to decreasing real wages, women's open unemployment level is higher than men's (Baden and Wilward, 1997: 33). "Underemployment is a predominantly female phenomenon, partly associated with the informalization of female labor" (Baden, 1993: 46). In fact, women are over-employed whereby they are forced to combine market work with home-based and expenditure-saving activities (Rodgers, 1989 cited in Baden and Milward, 1997: 33).

In addition to the position of women's labor in the production process, new capital accumulation processes deeply affected women's labor through using it in the reproduction of the family. Decreasing the real wages affected the reproduction of the household as a whole. Women use their labor force to deal with poverty in the household. Women have a double burden with the increasing cost of living. They work longer hours in both the production and reproduction areas in order to decrease the costs of living. Thus, feminists have turned to question women's hidden poverty in the household by means of economists' conceptualization of the household.

Feminists criticize the mainstream poverty studies in terms of thinking of the household as a unitary entity. Many empirical works suggest that for the purpose of measuring poverty, taking the household as a harmonious unit cancels the intra-household inequalities among the family members. This leads feminists to

criticize the earlier approach to the household, called New Household Economics (NHE), which views the household as regarding consumption, the division of labor, and labor market participation without apparent tensions among the household. Moreover, it conceals the intra-household inequalities between family members and women's poverty.

The New Household Economic Model's assumptions rested on the classical economic principles of the firm, which was applied to household behavior by Becker (1965). The household was taken into consideration with the most relevant unity of utility maximization (Katz, 1997; Jefferson and King, 2001). It is thought that the household is a unified unit of both production and consumption. Its utility comes not only from the consumption of goods and services but also from the home-produced goods (Evans, 1989 cited in Moser, 1993). Productive resources and the labor of household members are allocated to different activities according to efficiency principal in order to get the highest return. Arrangements of labor in the productive and reproductive work in the household are based on skills, experiences and education according to the rational principal (Katz, 1997: 27) as in the formal economy. At the same time, it is assumed that benefits are distributed to the members of the household to maximize the joint welfare of the household. Moreover, their preferences are assumed to be equal in the decision.

There are several weaknesses and limitations of conceptualizing the household from the NHE's perspective. Firstly, it ignores the idea that production and consumption units do not necessarily overlap. In informal sector activities, production units can extend beyond the household to include others that are linked by kinship, ethnicity, gender or geographical location. Similarly, a consumption unit can include extended family or neighbors (Moser, 1993: 21). Secondly, the assumption of allocation of production resources and labor in order to maximize efficiency in the NHE has been criticized. According to Wolf (1992: 15), "household.. can neither decide, think nor allocate since analytic construct

are not so empowered. The language used that 'household' allocate or decide-obscures the power relations inherent in household-related decision". It ignores gender as well as age and status, which are critical determinants in differentiating the allocation of family labor to different activities (Moser, 1993: 22). Empirical studies established that "the existence of powerful ideological forces buttressing the existing gender division of labor far beyond any purely efficiency-based rationale, curtailing in particular men's willingness undertake 'female' activities" (Kabeer, 1998: 97). The household division of labor in terms of comparative advantages "obscured the non-economic factors that discriminate between male and female labor in the market place, and values their labor differently in market and non-market sectors" (Evans, 1989 cited in Moser, 1993: 22). Thirdly, the neo-classical model does not explain intra-household welfare inequalities among members, especially male and female, which open a methodological path to explore women's poverty experiences. Wolf argues (1992: 2) that "it is difficult to imagine a patriarch making a decision in the best interest of his daughter, who has secondary status in the household and already receives less food, less health care and fewer goods than her male siblings do".

Most studies from a gender, development and feminist perspective (Harris, 1981; Folbre, 1986; Evans, 1991; Dwyer and Bruce, 1988; Kabeer, 1991) and empirical work on inequalities in income and consumption within the household replaced the idea of unitary entity of the household with the notion that households are arenas of competing claims, rights, power, interests and resources (Chant, 2003b: 14).

The limitations of the NHE with regard to revealing the intra-household inequalities resulted in the development other household models. In contrast to the NHE, Sen (1987, 1990) developed co-operative conflict household model. In this model, the household is seen as the locus and struggles where relations between women and men are manifested (Beneria and Bisnath, 1996:19). It criticized neo-classical economic approach to the family, which views it as a

harmonious unit. In Sen's framework (1990), "the process of bargaining depends upon a series of characteristics that define the relative strengths and/or weakness of different household members" (Beneria and Bisnath, 1996: 19-20). Sen's starting point is that individual members negotiate their interests with a mutual desire to cooperate (Jackson, 1998a: 78). Sen (1990) points out that:

Members of a household face two different problems simultaneously, one involving cooperation (adding to total availabilities) and the other conflict (dividing the total availabilities among the members of the households). Social arrangements regarding who does what, who gets to consume what, and who takes what decisions can be seen as responses to these combined problems of cooperation and conflict (Sen, 1990: 129).

Several feminists use Sen's co-operative conflict household model to make visible the gendered process producing well-being outcomes in the family at the micro level. The question of intra-household with regard to gender and poverty points out two questions. "First, do women and men, in the same household, experiences poverty differently? Secondly, how does household poverty effect distribution within the household?" (Baden and Milward, 1997: 16). Inequality between women and men in terms of access to productive resources (land, capital), in gender division of labor, especially with regard to reproductive responsibilities, in consumption and in responsibility for household expenditure are constructed important related areas (Baden and Milward, 1997: 17) where women's poverty experiences explored.

Another discussion issue with respect to women's poverty within the household context is the concept of female household headship. The orthodox neo-classical approach to household, which constructs 'female altruism' and 'male egoism', is foreign to the existence of a high proportion of female-headed households across countries (Beneria and Bisnath, 1996: 19). The relationship between women's poverty and female-headed household (FHH) was linked in these ways. According to poverty estimation, the women-headed households constitute a

disproportionate number of the poor. They experience greater poverty than the male-headed household (BRIDGE, 2001, Buvinic and Gupta, 1997; Gonzales de la Rocha, 1994 cited in Chant, 2003a). The women-headed household was seen as “the poorest of the poor. Other assertion about FHHs is that they are responsible for ‘an inter-generational transmission of poverty’”, because FHHs cannot “properly support their families or ensure their well-being” (Mehra and et. al, 2000 cited in Chant, 2003a).

In general, the argument that those women are poorer than men is explained in the context of three factors. The first one is women’s disadvantages in respect of poverty-inducing entitlements and capabilities. The other is their heavier work burdens and lower earnings. The third one is the constraints on socio-economic mobility due to cultural, legal and labor market barriers (Moghadam, 1997 cited in Chant, 2003a: 6; Kabeer, 2003). These factors affect FHH more with respect to labor supply, employment and earnings.

One of the factors that make FHHs more vulnerable to poverty is discussed as in lacking a ‘breadwinning’ partner that deprives them from male’s earning and make them dependent on support (Fuwa, 2000: 1535; Safa and Antrobus, 1992: 54). Moreover, most single mothers are placed in the informal sector, which has many disadvantages in respect to earning, fringe benefits, social security coverage and pension. It is thought that the main reason of participation in those sectors is their childcare activities, which they have to do alone (Baden and Milward, 1997; Fuwa, 2000: 1535; Kabeer, 2003). Another factor taken into consideration in terms of FHH’s poverty is the lack of their social networks. “Female heads lack ties with ex-partner’ relatives, or because they ‘keep themselves to themselves’ in the face of hostility or mistrust on the part of their own family networks or others in their communities” (Chant, 2003a: 11).

The construction of FHHs as the poorest of the poor and its equation with women’s poverty, especially in policy; has been questioned by most feminists.

Firstly, it was pointed out that there is little substantive macro-or micro-level evidence to suggest that women-headed households are the poorest of the poor (Chant, 2001; Chant and Craske, 2003). According to Arriagada (1998: 91), “the majority of households with a female head is not poor and is those which have increased most in recent decades”. Women-headed households do not just take place among the poor but also among the middle and upper-income groups (Willis, 2000 cited in Chant, 2003a:16). Moreover, some of them live under the roof of a kin or a friend as ‘embedded-female headed sub-families’ (Chant and McIlwaine, 1995; Marengo et al., 1998; Wartenurg, 1999 cited in Chant, 2003a: 16).

The second critique depends on the argument that FHHs are not homogenous units, but they vary in different social, cultural, demographic and economic contexts and are highly heterogeneous groups in terms of non-marriage, separation, divorce, widowhood and so on (Chant, 1997: 38-39; Çağatay, 1998: 4). Differentiation of the FHH in respect to socio-economic status, age, composition, dependency of the offspring, and access to resources consists of some problems to be labeled under the same categories as the poorest of the poor. “Some of the households that are headed by women as a result of male migration may be relatively affluent if the remittances are high” (Çağatay, 1998: 4). Moreover, some of them can get support from their sons and kinship.

As Jackson and Palmer say (1999: 557), “gender and poverty are distinct forms of disadvantages, which should not be collapsed into a ‘feminization of poverty’ notion of women as the poorest of the poor”. This term that refers to the poor being mostly women does not explain that poverty is a gendered experience (Jackson, 1998: 44). “Poverty should be understood as a condition of experiences and shaped by gendered actors” (Jackson and Palmer, 1999: 557).

The studies conducted in developing countries have made significant contributions to making women poverty visible in the processes of production

and reproduction. Informalization of women's labor, low wages, and occupational differentiation, concentration of women's labor in the informal sector, unemployment, and underemployment are indicators of women's poverty in the production process. Similarly, women's poverty experiences that are concealed in the household have been identified through the criticism towards the understanding of the household in the process of allocation and distribution of sources by classic economics. All these are the visible aspects of women's experiences of inequality and poverty. The theoretical basis of loss of value of women's labor in production and reproduction processes has not been analyzed.

3.4. Poverty Studies in Turkey

Poverty and inequality in Turkey deepened even further after 1980 in the production process as a result of labor and capital reformation and the repeating crises caused by the implementation of the new liberal policies supporting this new structure. Poverty in Turkey was discussed as a structural problem within the framework of the issue of underdevelopment after 1950. The elimination of poverty and the thought that poverty will be resolved within the framework of economic growth and development has endured as a common tendency up to the present time.

The negative impact of the crises created by the process of reformation on the social classes and the decline in the quality of life led to an increase in the interest in the topic of post-1990 poverty in Turkey, leading to a growth in the volume of research in this area. Nevertheless, the studies looking into the effects of the crises on women becoming poor and the relationship between women and poverty from a gender perspective are rather limited.

Studies of poverty undertaken on macro and micro levels in Turkey can be categorized into two basic groups, though they concern the aims and policies towards the reasons of poverty and means of decreasing it. The researches in the

first group constitute the first examples of poverty studies. They generally analyze the extent of poverty in Turkey based on the income/consumption and social indicators. The focal points of the other researches are rather the survival strategies developed in response to poverty, urban poverty and/or “new urban poverty”.

Some studies in the first group (Dansuk, 1997; Dumanlı, 1996; Erdoğan, 1998; Alici, 1998; Uygur and Kasnakoğlu, 1998, Pamuk, 2000) analyzed the dimension of the absolute and relative poverty in Turkey based on the data from the Household Income and Consumption Expenditure Survey (HICES). Dağdemir’s (1992) study on the structural change and income distribution in Turkish economy is among one the first studies looking into the social economic structure. In this study, which analyzed poverty during the period between 1968 and 1987, absolute poverty was determined to be the level that was below average income. According to this study, absolute poverty fell from 51.5% to 22.5%. However, the percentage of wage earners is high (51.71%) among the absolute poor category. In Dağdemir’s view, it is necessary that income distribution be reformed and production capacity be increased for poverty to decline.

Dumanlı (1996), in his study, conducted a poverty analysis on the regional basis by the use of 1987 HICES data. In this work, poverty limit is based on the calculation of the minimum necessary calorie. Absolute poverty is higher in the eastern and southeastern regions compared to the others.

Dansuk (1997), using the same data (1987 HICES data), examined the social bases of poverty. In this study, the poverty line was considered as the lowest/minimum consumption expenditure. Using this line, inter and intra regional poverty percentages were obtained. In this study, the social bases of poverty are presented by considering the income distribution, labor power, gender, education and relationships between some other demographical concepts.

The findings of the study indicate that poverty is a particularly serious problem for the uneducated and undereducated, women, rural area inhabitants, people outside the coverage of social insurance system and people working in the informal sector.

Erdoğan (1996), using the data of 1994 HICES, calculated more than one poverty line and the number of households falling below these lines according to regions. In this work, the poor are classified as the “extremely poor”, the “low level poor”, and the “high level poor”. The extremely poor encompass those who cannot afford minimum food requirements and/or those who cannot get sufficient nourishment. The low level poor have difficulty meeting their needs of housing, clothing, transportation and furniture, besides food. The high level poor category was determined by the use of food proportion approach. In this approach, the households whose food expenses accounted for 40% of all expenses were counted as high level poor. The results of the study show that proportion of the extremely poor is 11%, the proportion of the low level poor is 20% and the proportion of the high level poor is 12% in Turkey.

Erdoğan’s (1998) “Poverty in Turkey: The Scale and Profile”, the level of dietary and non-dietary poverty in Turkey. Dietary poverty covers the minimum dietary expenditure of households. Non-dietary poverty also includes the expenditure made for the other basic necessities besides dietary expenses. This study focuses on the income levels of households instead of their consumption expenses. Based on this, the proportion of households in dietary poverty is 5.66% and the proportion of individuals in this condition is 8.73%. When basic necessities are taken into consideration, 19.31% of the households and 24.30% of the individuals are poor in Turkey.

The poverty line based on minimum food costs and basic necessities has been used in another other study by Dağdemir. Dağdemir (1999) examined the poverty problem between 1987 and 1994 based on macroeconomic effects. According to

this study, poverty increased over time in urban areas. In rural areas, poverty both increased and deepened. According to another study, which employed DİE's 1994 HICES data (Pamuk, 2000), 14.850% of the rural areas and 14.15% of the total households are below poverty line. In Pamuk's study (2000), the poverty line is determined to be half of the middle income in rural households.

The World Bank's report "Economic Reforms, Living Standards and Social Welfare Study" (2000) analyzes the effects of economic reforms on living standards, poverty and welfare in Turkey. The level of poverty in Turkey was determined based on the defined three poverty lines: absolute poverty (local cost of minimum food basket), economic vulnerability (local cost of basic needs basket-including non-food) and relative income poverty (one-half of national median income). According to these descriptions, the proportion of absolute poverty in Turkey is low (7.3%). Economic vulnerability (36.3%) is higher compared to relative income poverty (15.7%). The education level of the household head and labor market status of the household head are claimed to be major determinants of poverty. According to this report, state expenditures need to be reconsidered in order to reduce the problem of poverty and for better living standards. The people who are economically more vulnerable need to be the target population and investments should be made on education.

In all these studies, poverty lines reflect the lowest level of the physical reproduction conditions of the individuals and households. If the necessities list is enlarged for people's social reproduction requirements, the above listed poverty percentages will increase. One of the most significant limitations of these studies which take poverty line as the basis is that the poverty experiences of the poor and particularly of the women are neglected. Although these studies provide information about poverty in Turkey in general, they lack the social and associative dimensions of poverty.

Up until 1980, poverty studies in Turkey were undertaken mainly within urban studies, under such topics as migration, urbanization and shanty housing and within frameworks of living conditions of urban migrants, accommodation, labor power, formal and informal market, and relationship networks. These studies predominantly focused on the social integration problem that people who migrated to the cities (Öğretmen, 1951; Yasa, 1966; Keleş, 1972; Karpat, 1976; Şenyapılı, 1978). However, the state of post-1985 migrants to the cities started to differ. In other words, with the influence of liberal policies, narrowing of job opportunities and decrease in the opportunities for new migrants to find secure jobs in public and private sectors (Kalaycıoğlu and Rittersberger-Tılıç, 2002). New migrants are not as fortunate as the previous migrants as regards access to jobs and accommodation which are necessary for labor reproduction.

The “New urban poverty” became the new concept of poverty studies, which was a result of the mobility of low and unqualified workforce that was fostered by both imperative migration and globalization (Özgen, 2001:89). Poverty studies in Turkey transformed from being macro scale economic analyses to micro studies where social processes are analyzed.

Kaygalak (2001), in his research on poverty in Mersin, concentrates on the effects of migration in the emergence of urban poverty in underdeveloped countries. It is the new migrants who are most influenced by poverty. New migrants do not have such opportunities as housing, jobs and income that the pre-1980 migrants had. Unemployment is worsening the circumstances and living conditions of the new urban poor.

Işık and Pınarcıoğlu (2001) examined welfare and poverty states of the new migrants to the city based on the period that they migrated in their research in İstanbul Sultanbeyli. The welfare and poverty states of the migrants were analyzed mainly in the framework of access to housing and land, possession of durable consumption goods and employment status. The first-comers of

Sultanbeyli are the ones to have high welfare indicators regarding possession of land, housing, durable consumption goods and having a job. Migrants that came after 1990 are not as fortunate as the first-comers. Their conditions are worse concerning possession of housing, durable consumption goods and having jobs. The transmission of sufferers of urban poverty is defined as the concept of “poverty in turns”.

It refers to process in which established squatter residents are able to improve their economic conditions by exploiting the new comers into the neighborhood. Through their involvement in land occupation and gecekondul¹ construction in the early stage of the formation of the gecekondu neighborhood, they find opportunity to own land as and build houses on it, and they make gains on the newcomers in the later years, selling the land they had plotted, renting their houses, and the like. In this way, they hand their poverty over to them (Erman, 2003:48).

Erder (1995, 1996) argues, in his study on İstanbul, that particularly the post-1980 migrants to the city constitute the poor of the city. The new migration processes differ from those before 1980. Terrorism and political reasons led to imperative migration. Previously, traditional relationship ties (relatives, townsmanship) used to have very important functions as regards the migration process and benefiting from facilities in the city. The traditional relationship networks, which used to be a significant support mechanism in accessing accommodation and employment, began to be selective and exclusive. This group, which arrived as a result of imperative migration, is in a more disadvantageous state compared to previous migrants. They arrived in the city unprepared, without networks or sources of support. Their ties with the rural are broken as a natural effect of migration. Males make irregular earnings in the informal sector to make a living for their families.

¹ Gecekondul is the name given to squatter houses in Turkey.

Morçöl and Gitmez (1995) conducted a study with the aim of establishing different poverty typologies in Turkey. The study was undertaken in 1992 in Ankara. A poverty questionnaire was given to 550 people living in neighborhoods where socio-economically different and mainly lower income groups resided. Income, family assets, neighborhood, education and housing conditions were used as living condition indicators while locus of control, life satisfaction and happiness were used as the measure of subjective well-being. As a result of the study, three groups of poverty were determined: doers, losers and accommodators, which are between doers and losers. The length of time that losers spend in the city is shorter than that of accommodators. The new urban poor emerge as the losers in this study as well.

Açıklan (2003) aimed to define urban poverty in Turkey with the study, ‘Working Urban Poor: Istanbul and Gaziantep Cases’. Urban poverty was studied as related to migration, working conditions, problems that women and children face in the family and work life, social values, future expectations and conditions of the young generation through the interviews held with a total of 200 households in both cities. The fundamental characteristics of urban poverty in Turkey are expressed as the following. Poverty mainly encompasses the young. Household income is not sufficient to meet expenses other than basic dietary goods. In fact, households barely manage to meet their basic dietary expenses. The education level of households is basically low. The rate of schooling among children (beyond basic education) is low. Agricultural labor is a significant source of making a living. Children leave education at an early age to start to work. Strong ties based on kinship, townsmanship and ethnic origins are widespread. They live as isolated from urban life. They constitute cheap workforce for the informal economy. The chance of upward social mobility decreased for the young. Traditional gender roles dominate within the households.

All these studies have reached notable results about the sociological states of urban poverty or “the new urban poor” in Turkey; nevertheless, the common point of all is thus: how poverty differentiates from the perspective of social gender and how the women that fall into one of the above cited different poverty categories (e.g., in the poverty-in-turns process, new urban poor, doers, losers, accommodators, working poor) are affected by impoveritization processes, and how they respond to these processes have not been addressed by these studies. Moreover, in most of these researches, men were the interviewees to provide the information on households. The experiences of women, who both work in jobs to supply income and decide every day how the sources of the house will be used under poverty conditions, have been neglected.

Two studies (Ayata and Ayata, 2003; Turak-Feymi, 2004), which contributed significantly with their findings to poverty literature in Turkey, differ from the above studies methodologically. In these studies, both men and women were consulted about household poverty. In other words, half of the participants were composed of women. In the first study (Ayata and Ayata, 2003), the research was conducted on two poverty categories: the benefit dependent and the regular earning poor. The first refers to “the unemployed and causally employed poor who despite having some family income heavily depend on benefits” (Ayata and Ayata, 2003:104). “The second category consists of those families who on average have higher income but more significantly have at least one member regularly employed albeit on the minimum wage” (2003: 104). For both categories, the impoveritization processes were dealt with regarding food, clothing, housing, consumption durables, utilities and services, education, and health. The conditions of poverty differentiate relatively between these categories and the analysis of this differentiation is provided in detail. Yet, the severity of poverty for women is very limited in the study. For example, the amount, quality and cost of consumed foods may differentiate the poverty of households. However, women labor makes an important impact in decreasing the costs of living. In this study, one of the findings concerning women’s poverty is thus:

“The female-headed households are among the poorest and the most desperate in that women have the greatest difficulty in finding jobs and they therefore suffer from shortage of cash” (2003: 107). In the study, interviews were held only with widowed women. Yet, a female-headed household is a category that differentiates into more sub-categories in itself.

The same limitation exists in Turak-Feymi’s (2004) study. In the study, where the sociological analysis was undertaken on the case of Bursa, half of the interviews were held with women (50 women). The interviews were done with people who were in various risk groups. These risk groups include the unemployed, housewives, common civil servants and common laborers. The basic aim of holding half of the interviews with women is stated to be in order to reveal women’s differences within the poverty framework. Besides the sociological dimension of poverty and the demographical characteristics of the households, the study examined life style, participation in social life in the city and self-evaluation, work life, income, consumption habits, means of survival, political participation and power.

In Turak-Feymi’s (2004) work, the issues that are necessary for consideration from the perspective of women’s poverty were stated to be women’s evaluations on the working conditions and working lives, their views on poverty, their life standards and their positions on reproduction of life. However, although the study states important findings on the life style and survival of the household (e.g. subsistence production), the labor that women use in the preproduction process and the effect of this labor on women’s impoverishment were not mentioned. How the household survives on low income is an important question for the study; nevertheless, the effort and time that women spend for economic use of this income were not examined. The battle that women fight against poverty is strengthened by the patriarchal structure and relationships. The revelation of gender differences in poverty necessitates that the position of women in poor households be questioned from the feminist perspective. Without sensitivity

towards the social perspective on gender, a methodological addition of women to research will be insufficient in bringing out women's experiences of poverty.

Another topic that poverty studies in Turkey focus on (Demir, 1993; 2002; METU; 1999, Ardiç, 2003; Kalaycıoğlu and Rittersberger-Tılıç, 2002) is the strategies of surviving poverty. In these studies, women's poverty is not questioned directly, though, it is possible to encounter analyses regarding women's positions in struggling against poverty in households. Demir (1993) researched the effects of the new conditions that emerged after 1980 in Turkey on low income classes and how these classes survived poverty conditions. In this research conducted in 1990, interviews were held with 111 households by the researcher in the Mamak district in Ankara. According to the findings of the studies, women's labor makes up an important place in dealing with poverty. Two thirds of the women started to work in income providing jobs sometimes outside and sometimes inside the house after 1980, and particularly after 1985. The income providing activities that women worked at included primarily child care, house cleaning, knitting and sewing.

The role of women in strategies in keeping the livelihood in urban areas was studied within the framework of production and reproduction processes in another study (METÜ; 2000). In 1999, interviews were conducted with the men and women of 300 households in Ankara. In this study, which researched poverty and survival strategies of households, a relationship was established between women's poverty and the intense labor that women exert. Women's participation in workforce is rather low among the interviewed households (11.9%). One of the reasons that women's participation in the workforce is limited is that women lack the qualifications that labor market demands. However, the actual reason is explained as the obstacles set by the traditional patriarchal ideology and cultural structure. Most of the women who work in income providing jobs take place in informal jobs outside the house. Women supply a significant contribution to the livelihood of the household with their domestic labor, child care, house work and

home-made food production against the hard conditions of economy. In the study, women are stated to establish the relationships with close relatives to solve the family's financial problems.

The traditional family ties are a vital source of survival for the household in Turkey. As Buğra (2001:23) states, at the center of Turkey's traditional welfare regime lies the family cooperation model. Such relationships as family of personal and informal characteristics, community and neighbors have an important function in people's various conditions such as unemployment, illness or old age in their survival. Kalaycıoğlu and Rittersber (2002) discuss the importance of social solidarity networks in the process of surviving poverty with reference to the findings of field research. In the model that they developed concerning the strategies of surviving poverty, the "Family Pool" is placed at the center. The "Family Pool is a system created on broad family-relatives-lineage relationships and based on the principle of reciprocity" (2002:7). The relationships of the research with women and poverty are the following. The family's contributions to the family pool against poverty are of vital importance and of diverse nature. The most significant contribution of women into the family pool is when they start working outside the house in income providing jobs. Women generally start to work when the financial conditions of the family hit the worst state. Women play an important role in approaching their neighbors, relatives or acquaintances of the same ethnic origin at hard times of the family. Women are the actors to establish associations with foundations, local headman and local administration. They support the family significantly in the provision of aids like education, food and fuel. This last point is supported by a research conducted in Eskişehir (Güneş, 2004).

In this research, whereby poverty conditions of families who receive aid from the municipality in Eskişehir and the role of women in the strategies to manage their lives in poverty are questioned, interviews were held with 300 women who received aid in 2003 (Güneş, 2004). A large majority of those who sign up to be

supplied with the municipality aids such as food, clothing, fuel, and educational support were made by women (% 80). The men who do the registration to receive aid are generally those who are old, ill or handicapped. Men who have difficulty in making a living for the family for financial reasons feel unsuccessful and inadequate. Likewise, receiving help from formal institutions is a matter of honor and pride for them. It is the women and young girls who wait in the queues at the soup houses every day. The fundamental findings of the research from the perspective of women's poverty are the following. The education level of women is low. The sharing and distribution of household sources are based on the basis of social gender inequality. Women are the ones who exert labor in the fight against poverty. Women labor has an important role in the decreasing of living costs. A large majority of women outside the house work in temporary jobs as they are able to find them for low wages with no security of insurance.

Bora (2002) conducted interviews with many women living on the aid that they receive from various institutions, in the research on women's poverty conditions in Ankara, Erzurum, Istanbul, Konya and Urfa. It was found in this study, too, that women were mainly the ones to sign up to be considered for support in such institutions as the municipality and governor's office. The reason that applications to be receive aid are made by women is that they can express their own poverty with more ease. Women culturally perceive themselves as responsible for the livelihood of the home. This is not seen as failure to women. Those who receive help in general constitute those households which fall beyond the solitude network and which suffer from poverty to the limit of hunger. According to the author, applying for aid is one of the significant strategic duties that women have developed against poverty. It was reported that the number of women working for wages was low. In the study, among the most severe experiences that women living in poverty conditions were failure of sending children to school, inability to provide them with good prospects for their future, and failure to provide them with good diet. These make life difficult even further for women.

Similar to the other studies, Baysu (2002) examined the relationship between women and poverty, based on women's strategies against poverty. Women's poverty is conceptualized as unequal access to sources in the household, responsibilities and power. The four dimensions that affect women's poverty are explained to be in the following way: sect differences, employment, support system, and family structure. As a result of the interviews with 24 women in Ankara, the researcher reached the following findings: A women who is poor financially may not be poor from the perspectives of power and responsibility. In fact, poverty may be a reason for women to become strong in certain conditions. All of the women started to work for wages as result of financial difficulties. This enabled some women to become strong, which weakened women's power over the wages. In both cases, poverty causes the patriarchal system to enter a crisis. This crisis bears two results for women. Some women work to increase their power over men while others accept the existing system.

In another study, women's positions in poor families are questioned by Erman, Kalaycıoğlu and Rittersberger-Tılıç (2002). It was conducted in squatter settlement of Ankara, Istanbul, İzmir and Mersin including 100 in-dept interview with women. This research focuses on rural migrant women's participation into labor force, "what kept them from seeking employment, what types of jobs they had, their economic contribution to their families" (2002:397). Moreover, it is questioned whether their contribution affect their positions in their families. In addition to them, it is questioned that how women's money earning-activities affect their power in terms of decision making in the family. It is pointed out that women have very limited power in decision making. Moreover, according to research findings, migrant women tend to marry younger. They have more children and less educated. Low or no education limits their employability outside the home. Most of them work in domestic services or cleaning services and in home or piece work. Although women's works are essential to the survival of the family they do not consider what they do as work. Both women's irregular

work and cultural attitudes perceive men as the only breadwinner also affect their attitudes (World Bank, 2000).

Türkyılmaz (2004) questioned the poverty experiences of the women of two generations based on the interviews held with the women and their eldest daughters in Altındağ and Çandarlı districts in Ankara. Social values, domestic relationships, and characteristics of the environment are important factors on the poverty experiences of generations. Women transmit their poverty experiences to their daughters. The conditions of the daughters are better than their mothers' as relevant to their social environment and changing expectations. Patriarchy is reproduced by society and the daughters themselves in their lives.

There are limitations in discussing the relationship between women and poverty based on survival strategies against poverty in Turkey. The concept of survival strategies has such a content in poverty studies that emphasizes that individuals are not passive against structural processes. Strategy expresses the rational path taken to reach a particular aim. Household strategies denote that the sources that the family possesses and the use and management of these sources are highlighted (METU, 114). It is known that women's labor has a crucial role in this matter. However, since the use of non-existent and/or insufficient sources requires enormous labor and effort, it increases women's poverty and exploitation. The strategy concept falls insufficient in gaining an understanding of women's poverty in this respect. .

As a result, there are rather few studies on women's poverty in Turkey. Nevertheless, the empirical findings describing the poverty experiences of women are discussed in poverty research, however limited they may be. Since women's poverty is not independent from the state of inequality and exploitation in women in society, it requires that the feminist theory and discussions be reconsidered. Meanwhile, topic of women's poverty is an important platform for the feminist politics in the process of women's fight for salvation.

In Turkey, though, the works examining both the empirical and theoretical levels of women's poverty are rather limited. Particularly, post 1990 studies on poverty dealt with women's poverty around the strategies of household livelihood. In some of the poverty studies, women have been added as a mere category to the research. Although women were consulted for information as well, the conceptualization of unique and special conditions and processes of women's poverty as sensitive to gender was weak.

3.5. Conclusion

Since the 1980s, neo-liberal policies have deeply affected the working classes and especially women's labor in the social reproduction process. The decrease in real wages forced women to use their labor power in both the production and reproduction processes in order to minimize living costs. Development agendas respond to women's poverty through women's labor power, social investment in basic health and education to improve labor productivity. Women's labor is used as an instrument against poverty.

Most feminist researches have revealed the relationships between labor market, household and women's poverty in the Third World context. Informalization of women's labor, occupational segregation, wage inequalities between females and males, unemployment and underemployment are empirically indicated in order to understand women's impoverishment. Moreover, in contrast to the neo household economic model, which is based on the classical economic principles of a firm, feminists conceptualize the household as a cooperative-conflict in order to reveal women's poverty experiences. The household is seen as arenas of competing claims, rights to power, interests and resources. Thus, women's poverty has mostly been discussed by a majority of the feminists around the empirical indicators of women's impoverishment. Although empirical indicators reflect women's poverty, they have limitations with respect to the theoretical basis that explains why women experience poverty different from how men experience it.

The negative impact of the crises created by the process of reformation on the social classes and the decline in the quality of life led to an increase in the interest in the topic of post-1990 poverty in Turkey, leading to a growth in the volume of research in this area. Nevertheless, the studies looking into the effects of the crises on women becoming poor and the relationship between women and poverty from a gender perspective are rather limited. Particularly, post 1990 studies on poverty dealt with women's poverty around the strategies of household livelihood. In some of the poverty studies, women have been added as a mere category to the research.

CHAPTER 4

FEMINIST FRAMEWORK OF WOMEN'S POVERTY

4.1. Introduction

The main purpose of this chapter is to present the debates on women and poverty through feminist perspectives. Mainstream poverty studies have included two problems, which are related with each other. While the first problem is associated with its definition, measurement and determination of poverty resources, in this process, the other problem is the relationship between women and poverty being made invisible.

The majority of feminist studies that make an effort to make women's poverty visible have involved some problems at the theoretical and methodological levels. Generally, feminist studies have problems in terms of the determination of sources of poverty and establishing a weak relationship between these determinants and women's poverty experiences at the theoretical and methodological level.

Over the last two decades, studies on women and poverty caused an important rich literature to be brought into existence. However, they mainly focus on the empirical dimension of women's poverty. One of the important deficiencies of the woman and poverty literature is its theoretical weakness.

In the first part of this chapter, the liberal feminist trend under the concept of feminization of poverty and of the gender dimension of poverty will be discussed. In the liberal feminist trend, the empirical dimension of woman's poverty is discussed mainly in relation to the public (labor market and welfare state) and private spheres (the household). Although these empirical studies do not have theoretical integrity in itself, their main contribution is to criticize mainstream poverty studies with respect to their gender-blind nature and their making women's poverty experiences visible at the empirical level.

In the second part of this chapter, three approaches will be presented, which analyze women's poverty at the theoretical level. The first approach includes the radical-feminist perspective in which women's poverty is explained by the concept of patriarchy. In the second approach, women's poverty is discussed through the Marxist-feminist perspective based on class analysis. The last approach, the standpoint of this thesis, is the social reproduction perspective, which depends on the socialist-feminist perspective.

4.2. Liberal Feminist Account to Rediscovering Women's Poverty

4.2.1. Feminization of Poverty

Women's poverty is not a new phenomenon (Lewis and Piachaud, 1992: 27). However, its rediscovery has been included in poverty discussions by the concept of the feminization of poverty, which refers to the female-headed household. Pearce (1978) used the term of 'the feminization of poverty' in order to attract attention to the idea that poverty was becoming 'feminized' in the USA. "Poverty is rapidly becoming a female problem" (ibid: 28). According to her, the percentage of female-headed households was larger among the poor (Pearce, 1993). Women's poverty is equated with the household structure and the number of households maintained by women in the poor population has been discussed in her framework.

The increasing ratio of female-maintained households is explained by the rising number of divorce /separation and out-of-wedlock births in the last thirty years in the USA (Rodgers, 1990: 52-53). One of the reasons of the separation /divorce is a result of the decreasing job opportunities for men with low skills. Men do not earn enough income and not compensated their family expenses. They could not take the responsibility of marriage (Wilson and Neckerman, 1986 cited in Rodgers, 1990: 57). Male earnings and unemployment are thought to contribute to the divorce process and increase the number of single parent families. The gain of independence by women through employment or other sources of income also affected divorce rates and births to unmarried women. Women who gain power from earning income can easily break their bad marriages and marry again (Garfinkel & McLanahan, 1994 cited in Rodgers, 1990: 61). Feminist movement has affected public attitudes of single parenthood and divorce (Magnet, 1993).

Factors contributing to women's poverty, especially single parent families, are explained by the lack of husband's wage (Ehrenreich, 1983; Ehrenreich and Piven, 1984; Weitzman, 1985), the inadequacy of child support payments (Kemp, 1995), women's lower wages (J.B. Wilson, 1987; Zopf, 1989; Kemp, 1995) and inadequate social welfare programs (Kemp, 1995).

Discussions on women's poverty with the factor of family structure have been extended by later researchers, for example Goldberg and Kremen (1990); to indicate that this fact is not only seen in the USA but in other developed capitalist countries, especially like in Canada and European Countries. Goldberg and Kremen (1990) point out that the households maintained by women have become the majority of the poor. Women comprise about three-fifths of all poor families with children in the United States (1990: 2). They discuss labor market factors, policies to promote labor market equality of women, social welfare benefits or government income transfers and demographic factors as common features affecting women impoverishment (ibid: 7).

Economists and sociologists more generally discuss the relationship between women and poverty with reference to single women or ‘the feminization of poverty’ issue in the USA. These discussions cover theoretical and methodological limitations. The first critique of the focus on the feminization of poverty concerns its theoretical inadequacy. Theoretically, it does not take the class position of women into consideration. The discussion focuses on the middle class women who are divorced or separated. Before the beginning of the discussion on this theme, women were also represented among the poor population. The term of impoverishment of women is better than the feminization of poverty because it captures the long history of women’s economic impoverishment (Abramovitz, 1991: 380). To attribute the increasing ratio of poverty to the increasing rate of the number of single parents causes the wrong relationship between poverty and gender. To understand poverty based on gender or blaming poverty on gender is to ignore economic factors such as decisions of business and governments regarding low wages, plant closure and low level of minimum wages (Abramovitz, 1991: 380). “It can obscure the larger economic and political roots of poverty, since the feminization of poverty tended to be less pronounced in periods when the poverty rate was rising” (Sheak, 1988 cited in Nolan and Watson, 1999:4).

According to Burnham (1985: 14), feminization of poverty consists of four “grave pitfalls and blind spots inherent in its analysis”. These are the “misidentification of gender, rather than class, as the primary determinant of poverty; the obscure of class differentiation among women; the obscure of racial stratification by classes; the exclusion of poverty among men of color” (cited in Gonyea, 1994: 38). It is seen as a tendency to overlook broader issues (Nolan and Watson, 1999: 3).

The feminization of poverty as a model not only distorts and simplifies the phenomenon of poverty but it also is politically divisive (Dressel, 1988 cited in Gonyea, 1994: 38). It offers an inaccurate empirical and political analysis of the

situation because it ignores classes as well as racial and ethnic differences among women. Moreover, with political purposes, it also ignores the common basis for class, racial and ethnic solidarity between men and women (AAWO, 1983; cited in Gimenez, 1999: 341).

Other criticism of the focus on the feminization of poverty is related to its methodological dimensions. While the notion of the feminization of poverty has opened a very useful window to research women's poverty, it has not questioned the gender biased notion in the household which contains a couple and the man is taken as the head (Nolan and Watson, 1999: 3). "The increase in the number of poor people living in families with married parents has exceeded the increase in the number of poor people living in mother-only families" (Greenstein, 1989 cited in Abramovitz, 1991:380).

Although women's poverty has become more visible with the concept of the feminization of poverty through the growing numbers of women living without men as single parents and through women's low wages, it is still an ambiguous term. It still does not have the force to reveal the true nature of women's poverty (Ruspini, 1999: 324). For this reason, focusing on the social gender aspect of poverty served to reveal the poverty experiences of women in more detail, going beyond calculation of statistical number of poor women.

4.2.2. Gender Dimension of Poverty

The analysis of the gender dimension of poverty focuses on the argument that women are much poorer than men in families. This discussion can be thought as a methodological extension of the issue of feminization of poverty in terms of making women's poverty more visible in the households where women and men live together. In this discussion, the manifestations of women's poverty are thought in relation to women's position in the labor market as well as the family and in relation to the ideology of economic dependency. Women's poverty is

seen as the result of an accumulation of deprivation within the systems of three sources, the labor market, welfare system, and the household.

Labor market participation is taken into consideration as an important determinant of the economic positions of single parents and of women generally. Women's poverty is discussed related with low wages. The low wages of women are associated with short-term work, occupational segregation and informalization of women's labor.

The reason why women continue to earn less than men is working in part-time jobs (Payne, 1991: 62). Moreover, a further reduction in women's earning is part-time work as it prevents women from such earnings as pension. The largest group of women as part-time workers is excluded from occupational pension schemes (Lonsdale, 1992: 105), non-cash benefits-in-kind and welfare services as counseling (Payne, 1991: 62). In the discourse of women and poverty, part-time work as related to low wages is seen to be a crucial factor to understand gender differences in poverty.

In addition to part-time work, women's poverty is discussed as related with the kinds of jobs in which women take place in the labor market as low paid workers. Women dominate the sectors where wages are not only the lowest but also are certain types of jobs and poorer conditions (Daly, 1989: 44). They concentrate in certain industries and occupations, especially employment in the service sector. These are also low-status occupations, such as catering, cleaning, hairdressing, selling and clerical work, and in health and education (Payne, 1991: 67). Women's work in the labor process is similar to the unpaid jobs that they do at home such as cooking, sewing, cleaning and washing (Lonsdale, 1992: 97). Their caring responsibilities form their participation into the labor market (Payne, 1991:69) and especially affect their participation and hours of paid work as part time workers (Joshi, 1992: 112-113). Moreover, because of childcare

responsibilities and difficulties of finding affordable childcare, women usually have to do work from home (Payne, 1991: 67).

The main feature of home-based work is greater flexibility and illegal underpayment. It can be seen as a part of the productive process rather than simply defining it by its location because working from home is done at home for a wage, especially at piece work rates and for a single employer (Lonsdale, 1992: 106-107). It is associated not only with low wages but also being a boring and repetitive work. It also consists of other forms of deprivation, such as isolation, inability to control the flow of work and the lack of benefits, such as holiday pay and travel costs delivering the finished work, and the cost of production, for example heating and lighting.

In relation to poverty, women's position in the labor market is explained in terms of the gender division of labor. Women's poverty is explained according to their domestic circumstances, which have a profound effect on their ability to take paid employment. The sexual division of labor plays an important role in characterizing women's work as significant inside the home and unvalued outside of it (Daly, 1989; Payne, 1991; Glenndinng and Millar, 1992, Millar and Glenndinng, 1989; Lonsdale, 1992; Ruspini, 1999). Women are more excluded than men from independent income because they bear children and disproportionately spend more time in caring work that is done at home (Cropmton, 1997). Married women have entered the labor market after their youngest children has reached school age. They cease their work after bearing a child. In contrast to women, men's participation into the labor market is seen continuous and full-time labor market attachment, after leaving full-time education until retirement (Hakim, 1996 cited in Bradshaw and et. all, 2003: 14).

The ideology that women's primary attachment is to the home affects women's evaluation of their participation in the labor process. They often see their earnings only as contributions for family subsistence. Women can describe themselves "as

working for 'luxuries', even where the majority of their earnings were spent on essentials" (Payne, 1991: 70).

Women's labor market position has affected their relationship with the welfare system. The state benefit system does not consist of all working patterns. The particular patterns of participation in the labor market are taken into consideration for benefits such as a short-term absence from a paid employment as results of unemployment and temporary sickness. A work pattern is related to full-time and a permanent attachment to the labor market, which reflects men's position in the labor market, not women's (Land, 1986). Women's experiences have greater risks that are not compensated for sufficiently by a social security protection (Millar, 1992). The majority of women live in poverty because benefit levels are too low to provide a sufficient standard of nutrition or enough warm clothing (Payne, 1991: 78). Especially single-parents can rarely access the types of services such as affordable child care provision. All of these are necessary to support themselves and their children (Millar, 1992).

In general, married women, single-mothers and aged women are more likely to be dependant on a social welfare system than men. They are dependent on the poorest benefits. The operation of state benefits affects the impoverishment of women (Payne, 1991: 71). The relationship between women, poverty and the welfare system depend on these factors: A large number of women are supported by low payments of the system and dependence on social welfare contributes to their long-term poverty (Daly, 1989: 52). State benefits reflect the assumption of women's primary domestic role. The social welfare system also reproduces ideologies of gender (Alcock, 1997; Daly, 1989: 65). The operation of state benefits as a mechanism keeps women poor and reinforces the discourse of women as economic dependants (Payne, 1991:71)

A minimum wage for full- and part-time workers and improved equal pay laws are only some of the policies to prevent the poverty faced by women. Other

policies produced as the solution for women's poverty by liberal perspective are the following:

Including part-time employees in sickness and maternity insurance schemes, developing training schemes which encourage young women to enter in occupations that are defined for men, and increasing subsidized childcare including school holiday care and care after school hours (Oppenheim and Harker, 1996: 111).

Although these policies have kept their importance with respect to women's participation in the production process, they have not taken into consideration their position in the domestic sphere. Although women work as waged workers, they have not emancipated from the domestic responsibilities. The household is an important area in order to see the manifestations of their poverty experiences.

Poverty affects all members of families but the women's poverty experiences are different from men's in many aspects such as coping with poverty, its burden, its management and other deprivation forms in the household. In order to understand women's poverty, the amount of the resources gained by families is not examined but it focuses on how resources are shared within the members of the family (Daly, 1989: 27). One of the important dimensions of women's' hidden poverty experiences is discussed under the money allocation process within the household (Pahl, 1980, 1983, 1989; Piachaud, 1982; Vogler and Pahl, 1994; Vogler, 1998). Married men and women experience the financial control and management in different and unequal ways.

Pahl (1983) distinguishes between control, management and budgeting in relation to the allocation and use of financial resources in the family. The distinction between control and management is gender-based. Men usually control and women manage the money (Daly, 1989: 27). Especially, women have to manage household finance resources in the low income households as it is a burden where there is not enough money to meet the basic necessities; on the other hand, men

are more likely to manage money when family income is high. To have the control over higher earnings is the source of power (Payne, 1991: 35, Pahl, 1980: 319).

On the other hand, when women earn income, it is thought that there is an important relationship between women's participation in the labor market and relative power in decision making in the family within the frame of resource theory of power, which conceptualizes "marriage as a set of exchange relations in the balance of power rests on the partner who contributes most resources to the marriage" (Ferree, 1990 cited in Vogler, 1998: 688). In contrast to the resources theory, the allocation of financial resources is more strongly related to gender inequality in access particularly to jobs and pay, the income level of the couple, the sources of income of the couple; normative expectations about the allocation of money and the ideological and cultural factors. Women's income is seen as a supplementary income or 'pin money'. Therefore, it is treated as less important than men's earning (Pahl, 1983; Vogler, 1998: 689-695).

These factors mostly affect not only the allocation system but also spending of incomes earned by wives and husbands. The patterns of spending are based on the gender inequality. Women do not spend their money for their personal consumption but on food, clothing, their children, school expenses and consumer durables (Piachaud, 1982). In addition to these, "husbands were more likely to have money for personal spending and for leisure than were wives" (Pahl, 1989: 148). Women's poverty experiences in relation to the consumption of food have been investigated in most qualitative studies (Land, 1983; Charles and Kerr, 1987; Brannen and Wilson, 1987; Graham, 1987).

Women's responsibility of managing low income to make ends meet in the household becomes stressful under difficult conditions (Cropmton, 1997). Women spend immense labor and energy both mentally and physically to struggle with poverty in low-income households. They have to buy from the

cheapest shops and search for or travel distances to find cheaper food or such other items as clothing and domestic goods. Because of managing low income, they prefer walking to getting on public transportation or private cars. In addition to physical stress, they also have emotional troubles such as guilt, worry and fear. Poor women feel guilty in relation to their children: poor diet, lack of warm clothes, and inability to afford healthy, leisurely activities for them. They are also worried not only about meeting the necessities the next day, but also about the future of their children (Daly, 1989: 25-26).

Women are more deprived not only in terms of money allocation, spending patterns or unequally sharing of material resources in the households, but also in terms of other non-material items (Cantillon and Nolan, 1998; Nolan and Watson, 1999; Cantillon and Nolan, 2001). Nolan and Watson (1999) and Cantillon and Nolan (2001) have used a set of non-monetary items to indicate differences and inequality in individual living standards within the household. For them, women are more deprived than men in the consumption of food, heating and use of cars, at the household and individual level; in the control over resources and the burden of coping; and in the access to, and expenditure on, leisure activities (ibid: 2001).

Although studies on women and poverty, the feminization of poverty and its gender dimension have focused attention on the importance of the issues, they have theoretical weaknesses in explaining women's poverty under capitalist conditions. They primarily focus on the empirical indicators of the women's poverty experiences in relation to the labor market, the welfare status and the household. In the women and poverty literature, the arguments of the feminization of poverty are criticized from the Radical, Marxist and Socialist Feminist frames with respect to theoretical weaknesses.

4.3. 'The System of Patriarchy' as an Understanding of Women's Poverty

This part is constructed using Susan Thomas's (1994) approach, which is based on patriarchy and gender class to explain women's poverty. According to her, the feminization of poverty framework views the main reasons of women's impoverishment as the relationship between women's working in low-paying jobs and their responsibility for child rearing. The feminization of poverty analysis has served a useful purpose in terms of focusing attention to the public awareness of the problem. On the other hand, it has a number of limitations inherent in this framework (Thomas, 1994: 14).

Liberal feminists have failed not only to clearly conceptualize women's position in the family and women's right and responsibilities, but also to resolve the inconsistency of women as wage earners and mothers. Liberal poverty scholars discussed the relationships between women's poverty and their labor market positions. However, they have seen one of the reasons of women's poverty "as the product of individual man's failure to provide for women and their dependent children rather than patriarchal structure of society and women's secondary status within it" (Thomas, 1994: 6).

Although men's failure to support women and his children makes an important contribution to women's and children impoverishment, the view of women as innocent victims of men's irresponsibility overtly clarifies some problems at least for two reasons.

First, while the strategy may win sympathy for the plight of poor women, it also fails to challenge deeply rooted ideas about dependence on male breadwinners. Second, by seeing the problems as one caused by the irresponsibility of ex-husbands, women's poverty is passed off as a sad consequence of individual men's irresponsibility rather than a condition of life for women living in a patriarchal society. The notion that divorce is somehow the cause of women's poverty permits feminization of poverty writers to ignore the systemic influence of patriarchy and the oppressive aspects of the traditional family (Thomas, 1994: 69-70).

The feminization of poverty approach has some limitations in relation to the economic determinants of women's poverty. It stresses the call for an end to occupational segregation, enactment of pay equity and comparable worth policies, demanding for day caring funding. Thus, they demand an equal opportunity for women as men have in the labor market. While all of these are very important policies for women's position, they ignore "the political causes of women's poverty" (Thomas, 1994: 70).

Thomas (1994) stresses the two reasons why to call for an end to discriminatory economic practices and policies are problematic: First, the position of women's career is envisioned in male dominated occupations and it is assumed that "if only working women would become more like working men". Secondly, Thomas discusses the problems of calling for an end to labor market sex discrimination in terms of denying the importance of the politics of women's poverty.

From the radical feminist standpoint, she mentions that the relationship between women and men is political both in the public and in the private sphere. Most writers on feminization of poverty have missed this basic understanding of the political nature of the relationship between women and men. The writers of the feminization of poverty focus exclusively on the need for economic equality (Thomas, 1994: 71). They see sexism as an important reason of women's poverty. It is harmful because "it deprives women of their equal rights to pursue their own freedom of choice". Thus, they limit the feminist vision into the world

of work and market place. It was thought that if women were to achieve political and economic equality with men, their poverty would be abolished (Thomas, 1994: 72).

Women's poverty is seen as a product of sexism primarily in the private realm rather than the public realm. This is problematic because it says nothing about causalities (why) or mechanisms (how). It refers to inequality but does not indicate why and how inequality develops. Women are seen as victims of individual men rather than of the system of patriarchy within the sexist explanation of women's poverty by feminization by the authors of poverty (Thomas, 1994: 71-72).

The feminization of poverty frame does not take the political dimension of gender into consideration. It focuses on the removal of sexist laws and practices. It is thought that if women are given 'freedom of choice', women's poverty will be abolished under the present conditions. She discusses the 'freedom of choice' as an inherently inadequate model for women because women do not have power. Thus, assumptions that women's poverty is mainly a product of unfairness of legal and economic practices and that "the reformation of these mechanisms of economic and sex discrimination will make the problem of women's poverty go away are unrealistic" under patriarchy (Thomas, 1994: 72).

In contrast to sexism and notions of sex discrimination, she explains the nature and causes of women's poverty with the concept of gender and gender relations as they are constructed and maintained under the system of patriarchy. Thomas (1994: 73) writes that "only when these relations are factored into the poverty equation can a thorough understanding of women's impoverishment is gained" She uses the concept of patriarchy as

Refer to the hierarchal relation between men and women in which men are women dominant and women are subordinate. Patriarchy is thus the system of male oppression of women. This consolidation of male hegemony is accomplished by means of a least three primary mechanism: 1) the creation of a gender class, 2) the ideology of male supremacy, and 3) creation and control of institutions and policies such as traditional marriage and the marriage contract which maintain this power (Thomas, 1994: 74).

She focuses on how and why these mechanisms operate and how they are connected with women's impoverishment. According to her, feminization of the poverty framework ignores an analysis of the system of patriarchy. Therefore, they also reject its argument that women are oppressed by men as a gender class. When they point out that women's impoverishment is related with the home, domestic labor and motherhood, they do not take into consideration "this as fundamental component of the sexual privilege men have in patriarchy". They ignore the reality of gender-class conflict and do not focus on the difficult questions of patriarchal society "as it structures the political life of society" (Thomas, 1994: 77).

She uses Zillah Eisenstein's concept of gender class in determining of the women's poverty. For her, Eisenstein's work is useful to begin the development of a single political economy of women's oppression and impoverishment (ibid: 81). According to Eisenstein (1984: 146),

Women constitute a gender class, because of the particular activities which they perform, activities which, done as they are by women, are necessary to the functioning of society as it currently exists. Women as women, reproduce rear and nurture children, consume, engage in housework and earn wages. Thus, to identify women as a gender class means.. that women are a class by virtue of the specific work they engage in as women (womanhood, wifehood, motherhood). Women as a gender class do more than the working class because they not only engage in wage labor; they perform the duties of 'womanhood' as well' (Thomas, 1994: 86).

According to Thomas (1994), Eisenstein's gender-class model explores the distinctions among women in terms of the work they do within the economy as a whole. It also shows how these women in various economic class categories share similarities with other categories of women in the activities they perform in the gender-class model (ibid: 88). Pauperization of women is as a result of a product of the complex interaction of forces, both public and private in nature.

As a result, according to Thomas (1994), it is necessary to see women's poverty as a function of the social processes of gender stratification. Their poverty is not "only endogenous to our society but it is a logical consequence of the present structure of the basic institutions of our society-gender class, marriage, labor markets, and policies of the state" (1994: 15). In contrast to the feminization of poverty model, her explanatory framework on women's poverty consists of important conceptual issues. While the system of patriarchy is not sufficient itself to explain women's impoverishment as women gender class under the capitalist conditions, she has made an important contribution to take the issue of women and poverty as theoretical.

4.4. Marxist-Feminist Class Perspective on Women's Poverty

The feminization of poverty framework has been criticized from the class perspective in terms of focusing on the factors of poverty and not taking into account the determinants of poverty in general and in particular women's poverty. Gimenez's framework of poverty depends on Marxist class analysis. She explains women's poverty from the standpoint of Marxist-feminist theory.

According to Gimenez (1993: 193-194), poverty and poor are ideological concepts. Poverty as a concept has been mystifying the broader process of impoveritization. It obscures its structural roots in the economic organization of society, and especially its class dimensions. Poverty is thought as a problem that affects primarily women, the elderly as well as the racial and ethnic minorities.

The economic determinants of poverty are related with the decline in family wages. Poor families are often identified as the 'working poor'. The terminology of working poor reflects the relative power of different strata within the working class according to their wages. Their class location is ignored. For Gimenez (1993: 194), "if social class is taken into account, the phenomena called 'poverty' can be best understood as the fate of the most vulnerable sectors within working class".

She focuses on the class location that makes people vulnerable to poverty. On the other hand, she thinks that age, gender, race and ethnicity are relevant correlates of poverty, not determinants of it. The concept of class is necessary to explore its implications for the life chances of people in different social classes. Gimenez (1993) writes that

From the standpoint of Marxist theory, class is a relation between people mediated by their relationship to the means of production. Ownership of means of production, even in a modest scale, gives political and economic control over others and secures economic independence. Lack of ownership of means of production places workers-male and female- in a dependent situation, vulnerable to the decisions taken by those who, by controlling capital, control their access to the conditions indispensable for their physical and social daily and generational reproduction: employment (Gimenez, 1993: 196).

Most social scientists construct socioeconomic status categories according to occupation, income, and education. The differences among social classes at the level of socioeconomic stratification are labeled as the 'poor', the 'underclass', or the 'lower class' at the bottom and the 'upper class' or the 'rich' at the top, with the 'middle' and 'upper-middle class' in between. This kind of understanding of social classes reflects a simple ranking that focuses on the different power and resources that an individual brings to the market. All of these are empiricist understandings of social classes that obscure 'the sources of poverty'. Gimenez (1993: 196) writes that "if the social class location of people (not their

socioeconomic status) is taken into account, it becomes obvious that it is class location that propels some people into poverty”.

According to Gimenez (1999: 333-339), the feminization of the poverty framework focuses on factors that are specific to the situation of women in modern society. In this frame, women as a group and regardless of class are more vulnerable to poverty than men. The poverty of women has different causes than that of men. The determinants of women’s poverty are thought as changes in mortality and marriage rates, divorce, separation, out of wedlock births, and decision to live alone. Therefore, all these factors contribute to the increase in female-headed households. Moreover, women’s longer life expectancy also contributes to the increasing number of women over 65 years of age. In addition to these, male-unemployment, being laid-off, the decline in wages and women’s unpaid domestic labor is thought as important correlations with women’s poverty.

According to her, literature on women and poverty has made a detailed description and obvious explanations of the feminization of poverty. In fact, “it is not as self-evident as it may seem”. The identification of the determinants of the feminization of poverty as sexism, racism and the operations of the economy explain the only obvious and observable facts of women’s poverty (Gimenez, 1999: 339).

Poverty does not affect primarily women but is also affects men, children, and the elderly in different degrees. On the other hand, feminization of poverty reflects only one dimension of a broader process (Gimenez, 1999:341). Poverty is a structural component of the capitalist economy that affects people regardless of age, and sex and falls disproportionately upon minority (ibid: 342). She points out that

This critique of the feminization of poverty interpretation of current trends identifies important issues for further theoretical and empirical investigation. These insights.. have to be connected to their underlying capitalist structural determinants in production and reproduction, to more clearly understand the significance of these empirically observable phenomena. This process entails the examination of the relationship between capitalist structures, processes, and contradiction, which are not readily observable and empirically observable changes in the size and composition of the poverty population (Gimenez, 1999: 342).

She has criticized the feminization of poverty framework, which does not take into account why some women are poor while others are not. She argues that gender related factors are only relevant correlates of poverty, not determinants thereof. Women's class locations are determinants of that which already makes them vulnerable to poverty (Gimenez, 1999: 342).

According to her, capitalist women and petty bourgeois women are not at the risk of becoming poor. Theoretically, they have a source of income independent of marriage or paid employment. If they own wealth, they are unlikely to become poor for gender related factors. On the other hand, if they lose the independent source of income or wealth ownership, "they will experience downward social mobility and might even become poor" (Gimenez, 1999: 343-344).

From another viewpoint, for her, propertyless women are always at the risk of becoming poor. The capitalist organization of production and reproduction make them dependent on marriage and employment for economic survival. Women who take place above the working class are at the risk of becoming poor in case of separation, divorce, or widowhood. They experience upward mobility through marriage. Her main argument is that "the ultimate determinant of individuals' relative vulnerability to poverty is their class location" (Gimenez, 1999: 345).

Her framework involves strong arguments about the material condition of poverty but a detail analysis of material conditions of women's labor should be made in order to understand the roots of women's poverty.

4.5. Socialist-Feminist Perspective for the Theoretical Analysis of Woman's Poverty

Woman's poverty generally is not independent from their unequal and exploitative positions and relations in the society. At the same time, to think on women's poverty will serve to re-examination the exploitative and oppressive positions of women in the society. In this sense, it is necessarily caused to revise socialist-feminist theory. Women have spent intensive labor for physical and social reproduction of herself and her family under the capitalist conditions.

It is possible to indicate following for commoditized and non-commoditized labor of women in the social reproduction process in order to make an analysis the relation between women and poverty under the socialist feminist perspective:

1. In the capitalist production process, commoditized woman labor power is devaluated like man's labor power. Paid wage is below the costs of subsistence goods necessary for the reproduction of herself and her family.
2. Patriarchal, cultural, and ideological structure and relations strengthen domestic positions of women and gender-based division of labor of the society. This also affects the positions and wages of the women in the production process. Women are mostly employed in casual, part-time, and home-based jobs.
3. Income of women in the production process is ideologically and culturally regarded as only a supplementary income or contribution to the reproduction of the family. Woman labor is considered by the capital as an element of reserve army of labor power.

4. There is a significant relation between the participation of women into the production process, drawing down of the costs of subsistence goods necessary for the reproduction of the family, and relative increase of family welfare.

5. Women's participation into the production process does not change their domestic roles and responsibilities. Earnings of woman and man's labor are not sufficient to meet subsistence products and services necessary for the reproduction of their family. Women try hard to decrease costs of living in order to meet these needs.

6. Women who do not work in non-domestic works live dependent to the man's wage for their own reproduction. Woman's domestic labor, woman's labor in the production process, and conditions of realization of their labor create an important obstacle before the realization of their potentials as a human.

7. Consequently, in addition to the capital, patriarchal structure and relations create an intensive pressure on woman labor. These are the basic determinants of the impoverishment of women and their social exclusion.

Poverty as structural problem takes its roots from the operations of capitalism. Owing to this fact, it is necessary to take into consideration the production relations of capitalism in order to understand material conditions of poverty. The basic distinctive feature of the capitalist mode of production is to be a commodity producing system. Commodities have use values for meeting human needs. Use values obtain a meaning through exchange values while use value is exchanged within the market relations. In the capitalist mode of production, value-creating labor becomes commodity since the commodity production is fulfilled by human labor. The capitalist mode of production is an extended commodity production system to this extent (Tekeli, 1982).

A wage is paid for the commoditized labor power for a definite period of time of working day for the sustenance of himself/herself and his/her family. The wage paid corresponds to the subsistence products that will provide him/her to be able to reuse own labor power in the production process. What differs labor power from other commodities as a commodity is that he/she creates a value more than his/her wage, namely the value necessary to reproduce himself/herself. This value creates surplus value, which is important for the capital and required for the maintenance and reproduction of capitalist relations of production (Tekeli, 1982).

Enhancement of surplus value depends on the productivity of labor. This means that it should have the laborer to work longer than the period or to shorten the working time necessary to reproduce himself / herself. Increase of productivity causes value increment of the capital while it causes the devaluation of labor. Decrease in the wage corresponding to the value of labor will result in impoverishment of the laborer and his/her family, as this will cause reduction in the acquisition of subsistence products necessary for the reproduction of labor (Tekeli, 1982).

It can be assumed that women are supposedly in the same status with other male laborers when they enter into the capitalist production process. However, it is insufficient to analyze only commoditized woman labor in the production process with regard to the woman poverty. Women laborers endeavor for housework as well their commoditized labor, during the reproduction process. Domestic labor debates have made an important contribution to understand unpaid women's labor in the capitalist society. It is thought that Marxism as a social theory focuses on the class relations in the production process and explain inequality and exploitation with respect to production relations. In terms of labor, Marxist analysis focuses on the commodification labor that creates surplus value that is stressed on above. Socialist feminist have focused on women's work-related concern. In doing so, they have opened a new door to understand the relationship between capitalism and women's domestic work.

According to Benston (1969:16), Women are primarily producers and only secondary consumers in domestic sphere under the capitalism. Women as a social group are “responsible for the production of simple use-values in those activities associated with the home and family” (cited in Tong, 1989:53). Although, Benston takes into consideration women’s labor in terms of producing use-value, according to Dalla Costa and James (1972), women’s labor is seen not outside the production process. For them, “women’s domestic work is productive not in the colloquial sense of being ‘useful’ but in the strict Marxist sense of creating surplus value” (cited in Tong, 1989:54).

According to Secombe (1973) housewife does not produce surplus value as she is not in the capitalist production process, but has a value as she creates one of the elements that consist of the value of labor power. For her, a housewife contributes to the value of her husband’s labor power to be realized in the labor market through her labor spent for preparing subsistence goods to be ready for consumption, which are purchased by his wage. Consequently her labor finds its value when her husband’s labor power is sold in the market (cited in Tekeli, 1982:42). Although domestic labor debates are criticized explaining women’s oppression in terms of the functional requisites of capital’s drive for profit, they include important conceptual insights in order to understand the material bases of women’s poverty.

In addition to domestic labor, women’s labor in the production process has also devaluated. When women enter the labor market, their employment conditions are unequal. Their wage level is low. The main starting point is that women’s dependency on a male breadwinner depresses their wages relative to men’s. This also reinforces both their economic dependency within marriage. It also means that “women can more easily than men be made unemployed at a time of recession” (Bryson, 1992:240). Woman labor is considered by the capital as an element of reserve army of labor power. Women are also a pool of cheap labor. Because of their levels of pay and conditions of work, women’s work is

oppressive. Although women participate into labor force, they do not relieve from their responsibility for domestic labor. They are full-time workers.

The separation between production and reproduction prevent to explain a total analysis of women's labor in the capitalist society. As Nicholsan points (1987 cited in Ramazanoğlu1, 1989:80) out that "the separation of production and reproduction should be seen not as a characteristic of all societies, but as an historical development 'which led liberals to differentiate the family and the state'".

It requires a theoretical perspective including a total analysis of forms of labor realized in the production and reproduction processes in order to understand women poverty. At the theoretical level, both analysis of capitalism and domestic labor debates constitute an important starting point in order to go further to holistic analysis for the material basis of women's poverty.

By conceiving the material foundation of social life as the productive activities of everyday life, social reproductionists offer a materialist understanding of social relations that is better able to take account of contradictions and complexity than one based on the market alone (Ferguson, 1999:1).

There is an inevitable connection between households and formal economy, which manifests itself in two fundamental ways: "capitalist requirement for a healthy renewed workforce each day and over the long term; and the household's dependence on wages as the crucial" (Ferguson, 1999:5). Reproduction of life does not only depend on the imperatives of the market. Although, market is an important sphere to meet human needs; individuals also meet their needs through households and communities. Ferguson points out that "these social activities together form the material basis of life" (1999:5).

In this thesis, woman's poverty is analyzed within the context of using forms of woman's labor that is realized in the social reproduction processes.

Social reproduction is defined as the social processes and human relations associated with the creation and maintenance of the communities upon which all production and exchange rest. This involves not only the social wages, that is, state provisions associated with health and welfare and socialization of risk (pension, unemployment insurance, social safety nets, kinship networks), but also structures associated with the long-term reproduction of the socioeconomic system such as education. These processes, institution and ideas shape the way that individuals, families and communities view the social, political and indeed moral order (Bakker, 2003:67).

The biological reproduction, reproduction of the labor force and reproduction of provisioning and caring needs constitute the important components of social reproduction. Biological reproduction of procreation refers to childbearing. Women's labor are consumed and used up like other commodities in the childbearing process. "Enforced childbearing consumes women physically and the leading cause of death for women globally remains pregnancy and complications from childbearing" (Bakker, 2003:77).

The reproduction of labor force means the daily maintenance of worker and potential labor and the process by which they become workers. Domestic debates focused on this aspect of social reproduction in terms of women's contributions to the functioning of capitalism and the perpetuation of patriarchy within the context of the family (Bakker, 2003:77). Reproduction of labor refers to not only to the sustenance of (male) workers but also the maintenance of women and children's labor power either in the formal, informal or subsistence economies (Young, 2003:110).

The third component of the social reproduction is the care economy that "includes aspects such as cooking meals, caring for children, the elderly,

community work, volunteering in NGOs and providing a psychological “cushion” for family members as a result of economic insecurity” (Troung, 2000, cited in Young, 2003:110).

The specific dimension of woman’s poverty is a two way devaluation of her labor power that is used in the social reproduction process. Sarvasy and Van Allen (1984:92-94) define woman’s labor as unjust dual role in this process. To them, “the concept of unjust dual role captures the condition whereby many women combine unpaid domestic labor with under wage labor” (1984:92). Their main argument is that “dual role does not determine that all women will be poor, but we call the unjust dual role does make women vulnerable to poverty” from socialist feminist perspective.

In this study, instead of unjust dual labor, it is used a two way devaluation of women’s labor in the social reproduction process with respect to women’s poverty. In addition to the material basis of the women’s labor (double-exploitation of women), patriarchy make deeper and continue women’s poverty at the second level. Hartman’s definition of patriarchy and her connection that she makes between patriarchy and capitalism is useful to interpret the women’s poverty experiences. Patriarchy is:

A set of social relations which has a material base in which there are hierarchical relations between men and solidarity among them which enable them in turn to dominate women. The material basis of patriarchy is man’s control over women’s labor power. The control is maintained by excluding women from access to necessary economically productive resources and by restricting women’s sexuality. Man exercises their control in receiving personal service work from women, in not having to do housework or rear children, in having access to women’s bodies for sex, and in feeling powerful and being powerful (Hartman, 1992:146).

The capitalist and patriarchal structure creates important obstacles for the realization of their potentials as a human. Women's alienation is experienced in both paid and unpaid employment.

4.6. Conclusion

In their studies, feminists, especially in the developed countries, both make woman poverty visible and criticize man-centered poverty discourse for ignoring woman experience. However feminist studies are insufficient in theoretical analysis of poverty while they criticize classical poverty studies in the methodological basis. Most of the feminist studies discuss woman poverty according to the empirical indicators. Woman poverty is regarded as equivalent of the single woman households, and woman poverty is explained by the factors like household structure, divorce, and man's irresponsibility. Feminist studies develop this approach by including the households where woman live together with her husband in their analysis. Empirical dimensions of woman poverty, with regard to the acquisition, use and division of resources are explained through gender-based division of labor.

The system of patriarchy is an important attempt to explain woman poverty theoretically, other than the empirical indicators. But, patriarchy is not an appropriate concept for understanding poverty derived from the capital accumulation process of the capitalism. To explain woman poverty only depending on the patriarchy will result in neglecting the importance of the capital that profits from the woman labor.

Marxist class analysis is an important approach for explaining poverty. However, it requires including reproduction processes into analysis in addition to the production process for a total understanding of poverty and woman poverty.

The social reproduction approach has a conceptual integrity to understand the role of woman labor in the reproduction of social life, serving both for the benefit of capital and patriarchy.

CHAPTER 5

METHODOLOGY

5.1. Introduction

The main purpose of this chapter is to discuss the methodological stance of this study and research process. First, the strength of feminist methodology will be discussed in order to explore women's poverty experiences. Second, the research questions and techniques used in this study will be focused on. Third, the research site and sample will be shown. Fourth, the research process will be described. Finally, the economic and social structure of the city, Eskişehir, where the research was conducted will be presented.

5.2. The Methodological Approach

Mainstream poverty studies have tended to ignore, distort or marginalize women and their poverty experiences. This is a result of the systematic biases and inadequacies in mainstream poverty theories and also an omission of women from empirical research. As a trend, they have tended not to ask questions or do research in the areas of concern to explore women's poverty. This is why women have frequently been excluded as a research subject. In the case of inclusion, they have been viewed from traditional scientific perspectives. Therefore, it is necessary to understand women's poverty from feminist research rather than adopting and adding gender into mainstream poverty theories.

One of the main objections of feminists to traditional methods of inquiry is the focus of research that frequently overlooks issues regarding women and to research outcomes that justify the status quo and myths about women (Seiz, 1992; Harding, 1986). In mainstream poverty studies, women frequently are tended to ignore. As Seiz (1992) points out that, the lower earnings and greater home responsibilities of women have been explained according to greater productivity at home within the context of neoclassical theories of home production. These explanations have justified women's labor in domestic sphere and have hidden women's poverty's experiences. Moreover, as it is discussed in the chapter two, 'the culture of single motherhood' as a myth has been reproduced within the context of dependency approach in mainstream social science to explain women's poverty.

Many feminists have also rejected the assumption of traditional scientific inquiry that research is value-free (Strassmann, 1993; Harding, 1986, 1991; Stacey, 1988, 1990). One of the main assumptions of traditional poverty inquiry is that poverty research is value-free. The determination of poverty line has been assumed as scientific. As Harding (1991: 11) argues, "scientific knowledge is always, in every respect, socially situated. Neither knower nor the knowledge they produce are or could be impartial, disinterested, value-neutral". It is impossible for researchers to be completely objective in their work. "Emotional involvement cannot be controlled by mere effort of will and this subjective element in research should be acknowledged, even welcomed" (Letherby, 2003: 68). The reason is that women researchers have inherent values, experiences and perspectives that guide our research (Strassmann, 1993).

Moreover, power relations highly influence scientific process. Researches more often reflect and verify the dominant social and scientific framework (Seiz, 1992). As in the case of development discourse, researches about women's poverty reflect the perspectives of international development institutions such as the World Bank. The theories and methods that have been used in this literature

are consistent with these development agencies' ideology. Therefore, any research by women, for women and with women should be undertaken by inclusion of the viewpoints of women, which is ignored. Thus, it is necessary to include women in the processes of knowledge production in order to "suggest new explanations and uncover and correct the flaws produced by a andocentric bias" (Seiz, 1992: 277). The power relations are also seen in the process of traditional research. Knowledge production frequently generates and perpetuates power. In traditional research, researchers who create knowledge perpetuate the existing power hierarchies (Mies, 1983; Reinhartz, 1992).

Feminist critiques of hegemonic malestream science opened a door to develop an alternative methodology in order to understand women's life experiences. However, there are different feminist epistemologies that are concerned with what counts as legitimate knowledge and what can be known. Skeggs (1994 cited in Letherby, 2003: 3) argues that "the ways in which method, methodology and epistemology are identified in the research process demonstrate the different theoretical position held" by feminist researchers.

This study rests on the feminist standpoint epistemology. As a position, it is associated with socialist feminist theory, which is used to explore women's poverty experiences in this study. The feminist standpoint explains the social world from the vantage point of women's lives.

The situated knowledge of women, informed by women's lived experiences, comprises a more holistic understanding of the world, less distorted by the abstract and ideological conceptual frameworks of masculinity science (Ho and Schraner, 2004: 9).

Women, as the oppressed group, "provide a more objective view than the perspective from the lives of the more powerful" (Harding, 1991: 26). Methodologically, this study shares the idea of the truth of the oppressed. In this research, poor women have more power to reflect on their lives under poverty

conditions than experts who use mainstream poverty methodology that ignore and distort the experiences of their poverty.

Moreover, this study also shares the idea of truth from the lived experiences of women's labor, which is focused using the feminist standpoint epistemology. Hartsock (2004) and Rose (2004) argue that women's productive and reproductive work gives them a strong epistemic vantage point for a deep and holistic understanding of human life. In this study, the relationship between women and poverty are understood according to the use of forms of women's labor power in both production and reproduction processes. It is thought that this epistemic point will give us a deep and holistic understanding of women's relationship with poverty. From such an epistemological point of view, the research is structured around the feminist standpoint.

As Harding (1987) argues, feminist research is not a method of research, which makes feminist research significantly different from malestream research. It has involved the alternative origin of problems concerning women rather than men. The alternative explanatory hypotheses are developed and evidence is used in feminist research. The purpose of enquiry is to focus on understanding women's worldview and to play a role in female emancipation. Lastly, the nature of the relationship between the researcher and the 'subjects' of her enquiry is different from the malestream science. Its nature should be free of hierarchy. .

What makes this research feminist depends on the origin of the problem that are concerned with poor women, who are oppressed and exploited in the capitalist society. The selected topic or concern with women in poverty on a different basis from non-feminists does not make this study a feminist. Moreover, in this research, evidence and data are based on the experiences of poor women and their view. Lastly, the nature of the relationship between myself as the researcher and the women participants is different from the mainstream poverty research. It is aimed to be an interactional research process. As a researcher, I and women

participants take place as subject positions. Free of hierarchy, interactional relationship and the sharing of experiences, which are important principles of feminist methodology, are tried to be applied.

5.3. The Research Questions

The basic aim of this thesis is to reveal the ways that women use their labor and women's poverty by making use of the experiences, knowledge and experiences of the women who are in different labor categories. Within this framework, three fundamental questions are posed: How do poor women fight against poverty with their labor used in production and reproduction processes? How does this process affect the impoverishment of women? From the point of view different poverty categories, are there significant differences among women's poverty experiences?

The following questions have been developed as related to these fundamental questions:

What are the socio-demographic characteristics of households? How do these affect women's quality of life?

What is the relationship between the increase in hardship in making a living and commoditization of women labor power?

How and under what conditions do women use their labor power in the production process? In what ways does women's working in money-making jobs influence the welfare of the family and the women?

How do women use their labor power to decrease living product costs to meet the family needs against hardship of making a living?

What is the position of poor women in the processes of decision making?

How do women view poverty and women's poverty?

5.4. The Research Methods

This part examines multiple methods used, which are the survey, interview and in-depth interview and observation and explains how they will be used and why they are appropriate methods to use in this research. Both qualitative and quantitative research methods are applied in this research. The research form that is applied in the research process consists of both structured, semi structured and open-ended questions.

The survey method is not sufficient to reveal women's poverty by itself. In this study, mainstream poverty studies are also criticized due to their choice of the quantitative method at the methodological level. In this research, the main reasons of using the survey method are the following: first, it helps to show the static poverty situation of the households where women live, which is generally made by mainstream poverty studies. At the same time, by doing this, it is also presented why classical poverty research is insufficient in revealing women's experiences. Second, statically, it gives a possibility to make a comparison to see the differences and similarities between the different labor categories in which women take place. Especially, it has power to conduct analysis on the women's attitude to poverty, woman's poverty and woman's social position.

“Feminist survey research reports on attitudes as well as behaviors” (Reinharz, 1992: 84) and “behavioral statistics tell only half the story. We can not understand the meaning of behavior without the attitudes behind this” (ibid: 85). It is known that survey and other statistical research formats have many limitations in exploring women's experiences, especially poverty experiences. As Verba et. al. (1983 cited in Reinharz, 1992) say,

One limitation is the fact that they oversimplify complex issues by reducing them to the responses to a limited number of questions. The relationships involved in events that are perceived as sexual harassment are often subtle and complex. These cannot be adequately captured in a questionnaire. We tried to deal with this

problem by asking many questions that attempt to get some of the details of events. We sought concrete information rather than abstract statements of opinion. We also presented our respondents with opportunities to comment at length on their experiences, and, many did (Verba and et al.1983 cited in Reinharz, 1992: 90).

What Verba and others say are in common with this research. Therefore, besides the survey method, qualitative methods are used in the research. While interviewing women, questions are asked to understand their lives in their own words. “The use of semi-structured interviews has become the principal means by which feminists have sought to achieve the active involvement of their respondents in the construction of data about their lives” (Graham, 1984: 112).

Semi-structured or unstructured interviewing is a qualitative data-gathering technique. It differs from the survey research, or structured interviewing in that it includes free interaction between the researcher and interviewee. The open-ended research questions explore woman’s views of reality and let the researcher generate theory. Respondents answering in their own words complement quantitatively oriented research (Reinharz, 1992: 18).

The versatility of feminist interview is presented in the vast array of topics in studies, including housework, mothering, experiences of violence, decisions about abortion and childcare (Reinharz, 1992: 22). The application forms of interviewing are also important. From the feminist perspective, interviewing should be conducted face-to-face with the participants in order to understand women’s experiences.

The relationship between the interviewer and the interviewee is important with respect to the characteristics of feminist research. Multiple in-depth interviews strengthen the bonds between the interviewer and the interviewee. “In addition to the potential for developing trust, the asset of this method is the opportunity to share interview transcripts or notes with the interviewee and then invite the interviewees analysis” (Reinharz, 1992: 36).

Moreover, as Reinharz (1992) pointed out

Multiple interviews are likely to be more accurate than the single interviews because of the opportunity to ask additional questions and to get corrective feedback on previously obtained information. As times passes, the researcher also can see how thoughts are situated in particular circumstances (ibid: 37).

Some feminist researchers argue that qualitative methods fit especially well with feminist goals. Some feminist researchers (Mies, 1991; Cancian, 1993 cited in Devault, 1996: 35) who work with qualitative methods claim that qualitative methods are more feminist than others. On the other hand, some feminists (Oppong, 1982; Smith, 1994) choose such quantitative methods as survey techniques, secondary analysis of large data sets in the research process and they label their projects as feminist (Devault, 1996: 36). Instead of this division, it is helpful to discuss or show in what cases and for what aim the research tools have been chosen. According to feminist research goals, any one more appropriate over the other may be chosen.

The collected data was analyzed using SPSS 12.0 Statistics Program with appropriate statistical techniques. Categorical nature of the sample did not permit the application of simple linear regression. A comparative analysis was conducted to understand whether there existed a difference among effort/workforce categories depending on poverty variables. The Chi-square test was administered and the analyses were presented in the form of comparative tables. The value of 0.05 was used as probability of error. In addition, comments on the frequency distribution were made. The lack of statistical analyses was attempted to be overcome by using qualitative analysis method. The results are limited to the sample.

5.5. Research Site and Sampling

This part focuses on the research site and sampling, explaining why this research was conducted in Eskişehir / Turkey and how the sample was determined in order to explore women's poverty.

The research was undertaken in Eskişehir. The reasons for choosing Eskişehir are that, first, although Eskişehir is not a metropolitan city; it is industrialized and developed as a middle-scale city. Second, in order to explore the experiences of women's poverty in the urban context, it is necessary to search in detail the daily lives of women. Because I, the researcher, live in Eskişehir, it was practical to reach them and to apply the research in proper conditions. In addition to this, it was productive in terms of the use time.

Purposive sampling was used for this research. Since women's poverty is analyzed as related to the patterns that they use labor, whether women worked for income provided jobs were examined in the choice of women. Based on this criterion, the women who did not work for income and housewives comprised the first group, and the women who worked in income providing jobs comprised the second group. Following this, the women working in an income providing job were categorized into two sub-groups as working regularly and working irregularly. Women have been grouped into three based on the manner that they use labor: housewives or unemployed women, regular and irregular income earning women. It was made sure than the income earning working women had been in the production process for at least three years. The marital status of the women was also used as a criterion in the sampling selection, besides the use of labor of women. In the selection of single women, their labor use was considered. Effort was made to keep the numbers of women who worked for income and those who did not work within the single women category. Together with single women, four fundamental risk groups were determined for the research sampling. In this study, the analysis unit of the research is the household. It is thought that

those women's poverty is not an individual problem. Because of this, women should not be taken into consideration independently from the family. Therefore, while women are chosen to for interview, the husband's working position is also taken into account. Men's working positions for income were similarly tried to be considered. As a result of this, a total of eight risk categories for the point of poverty were formed.

Various risk categories were formed based on work positions in Turak-Feymi's (2004: 96) poverty study as well. These formed risk groups include housewives, the unemployed, and workers in the informal sector, common civil servants, and common laborers. However, the last three of the risk groups have some limitations to comprehend the place of labor in the production process. In some cases, the informal sector may indicate by itself both regularity and irregularity. This is valid for the common laborer as well. Therefore, this limitation is attempted to overcome by distinguishing income providers based on their regularity and irregularity.

The research is only limited to the women who have the potential for using their labor power. The elderly and disabled women are not included in the research sampling. As these groups are dependent, their poverty experiences should be studied within a different context. It is necessary to clarify concepts in order to avoid conceptual confusion. As mentioned above, working positions refer to earning regular and irregular income and not earning income (housewife) or being employed. The terms formal and informal sector do not reflect the real position of either female or male working status in the production process. A woman may work as a cleaning worker in the informal sector for many years but she may earn income in a regular way. In the same way, a man may work in the formal sector as subcontracted worker but his wage may not be regular.

For this research, unemployment is defined in this way: a person who is at the working age and working position with previous work experience and who has not worked as a wage laborer for at least one year.

The housewife is defined in this way: a woman who is at the working age and position, and who does not participate in the working life, and who does not have any material gain with respect to economy, and who works in the home as unpaid labor laborer.

As result, eight poverty categories were purposively determined for this research. These labor categories lead their lives under risk conditions with respect to using labor power and earning income. Both women and men have the potential to use their labor power in both the production and reproduction processes. This research was realized with women who take place in those risk groups.

In the first category, both women and men are regular income earners (labor category A).

In the second category, women are irregular and men are regular income earners (labor category B).

In the third category, women are housewives but men are regular income earners (labor category C).

In the fourth category, women are regular income earners but men are irregular income earners (labor category D).

In the fifth category, women and men are irregular income earners (labor category E).

In the sixth category, women are housewives and men are irregular income earners (labor category F).

In the seventh category, women are housewives and men are unemployed (labor category G).

In the eighth category, single-mothers take place. Women are regular and irregular income earners and housewives (labor category H).

The labor categories are put into order from relatively the best position to the worst position according to women and men work forms outside the home. The interview is realized with fifteen women in each category. The number of women with whom interviews were held is 120. It is thought that these labor categories are risk groups according to their working positions. Regular and irregular laborers included workers who are mostly unskilled and unqualified and earn mostly around the minimum subsistence level. In addition to the working position, being a single-mother is also a risk factor for a woman with respect to poverty and deprivation.

5.6. Research Process

The field research took place between April and June, 2005. Prior to the research, a pilot study was conducted by interviewing 10 women and the possible problems in the interview form were eliminated. The research was done mostly with women living in Gültepe, Yıldıztepe, Büyükdere, Emek, Fevzi Çakmak, Şarhöyük, Tunalı ve Yeşiltepe districts. I reached the first woman that I interviewed through my students who live in Gültepe district, which I know very well. I used the snowball sampling method to reach the women. Each participant introduced me to another. This was vital to create a trusting atmosphere. The participant gave information both about my research and about me to the other woman, enabling to save the time for introduction. Since the number of women that I approached was high, I consulted the district headman for information. The headman (*Muhtar*) introduced me to some women as well, which made it possible for me to be a guest in the participant's home comfortably.

The women mostly determined the time, place and hour of the interviews. I had a chat with the women mainly in their homes. However, I had to hold the interview at the workplaces where the women were employed. As those who worked as seasonal laborers worked 7 days a week, the interviews were held in the fields while they were working. The interrupted talks in the fields were completed in the women's homes. I did not use a recorder at the first meetings. My initial plan was to complete the interview protocol with 120 women and then to conduct in-depth interviews with 3-4 women that I would randomly select from the laborer category. However, most of the interviews took longer than I had expected. The shortest time period for an interview was one hour. I did not use a recorder during the first interviews. I used it while interviewing 25 women without disrupting the research plan and without delaying any further. With most of the women, long interviews were held which went beyond the boundaries of the survey form and turned into in-depth interviews. For instance, none of the women responded with short answers in the section where the frequency that they have to economize due to hardship of living. Since this had occurred in the pilot study as well, this question was altered and posed directly as from what and how they economize. All the way the questions in the survey form were asked was changed in this way.

Some women asked me to visit them later too. I had the opportunity to familiarize with the women I visited following the study. Although the research was completed in June, my interactions with the women I met in Gültepe district continued in the summer months of July and August. These meetings made it possible to get to know some of the participants more closely.

In spring 2003, I had conducted another research on 300 women, living on and making their families survive with the help that they receive from the municipality. It was nearly always the women who made the application to the municipality to receive help and getting food from soup houses every day in the summer and winter. The labor that women made in this work was the most striking indicator of the personal struggle against poverty. The question "Why it

is women and not men that struggle to get aid?” was the fundamental problem of that research. Most of the women in the research asked whether these interviews would benefit them. It was difficult to explain the answers to these questions for me.

Despite the previous experience I had with researching women who received aid on poverty, it was still rather hard to answer the questions that were posed to me in this instance too. In other words, it was very difficult for me to explain why I wanted to do this research and what I wanted to talk to them about before the interviews. The reason is that poverty and hardships of living were one of the most serious problems that affected these women’s lives. The often asked what use these interviews be for poverty and hardship. The question “What is the use?” was both correct and meaningful from the viewpoint of the issue of poverty. Even so, I chose to use hardship of living and financial hardships instead of the concept of poverty as a way to ease this tension in this study. Most women did not perceive themselves as poor but they definitely admitted that they were suffering from making a living.

Each woman had a different life story and all of these stories constituted different experiences going beyond the academic boundaries and abstract phenomena. The hardest position I fell into, as a human being, was the feeling of helplessness at the stories that were imparted to me. Poverty was a visible and lived reality and it was impossible to do anything but share this reality. For the really destitute, the only thing that was done was to contact the municipality and governor to provide some support for the education of children.

The interview protocol consisted of six main parts.

1. Socio-economic information of the home: education, age, residence, possession, and property information.

2. Production process: the experience of the man and woman about the last 10 years.
3. Reproduction process: decreasing of living costs, ways of consumption, debts, savings, women's domestic labor.
4. Social reproduction process and women.
5. Power: decision-making process, violence, health.
6. Poverty perception: poverty and in particular women's poverty.

The interview was in general held as much as possible in the structure in the questionnaire form. However, the length of the form caused the interviews to be interrupted from time to time. In these interruptions, women expressed the difficulties that they experienced freely in their own words. This turned out to be an advantage for the study. Women made additional explanations for the answers they provided although the responses for the closed questions were short. They explained why they did not agree with a certain idea in the attitude questions at the end in particular.

I explained that the participants could ask questions to me in their accord during the interview. They asked such questions as where I lived, whether I was a tenant, how much salary I made, whether I was married and where I was from? I had more than one position (academician, student, mother, a single woman) and this actually surprised them. Because I was living on one income with my daughter, most of the women felt close to me. I was a woman with a regular salary working as an academician at a university, and yet this condition did not prevent me from suffering from hardships of living. Exchanging our experiences eliminated the possible hierarchic structure that could have occurred. We had, as women, mutual experiences in hardship of making a living and making efforts against poverty.

The actually number of interviews that were held amounted to 120 during the research period. Some women who knew beforehand that I was going to visit had

invited their neighbors as well. In such cases, focus interview groups were formed naturally. In these instances, I quit interviewing the particular woman to continue with the whole group. We talked with the women about what they did against hardships of making a living, how they used their labor and the effects that these efforts had on them. Differences of opinions among the women about the reasons of poverty led interesting discussions to emerge.

As Reinharz points out, “the ethic of commitment exposes feminist interviewed to stress in studies of traumatized women” (1992: 34). My experience was similar with sociologist Beck Thompson (1990 cited in Reinharz, 1992: 34) who says that “stress can occur in numerous phases of the research process including the interview process itself”:

I sometimes found myself trying to escape from the pain of their stories as they spoke. Many of women have been multiply victimized including enduring poverty, sexual abuse, exposure to high level of violence, and emotional and physical torture. One way I tried to escape the pain of their stories was by interrupting them with comments such as: “I know what you mean” or “I went through a similar thing.” ... recognizing psychological consequences of interviewing techniques... (I had to sort out) when making a comment during an interview is actual support and when it is dysfunctional rescuing...sitting with the pain may be the only response that doesn't cheapen the power of its recounting. But sitting with the intimacy of such silence is intense and often left me completely drained after the interview. I also noticed that my immediate desire to comfort them was my wanting to escape the pain myself that the women's ability to retell a traumatic story meant she had already survived the 'worst of the pain' (Thomas, 1990 cited in Reinharz 1992: 34-35).

Research practice involved some difficulty in terms of feeling stress. Moreover, in some cases, I had no alternative to solve women's traumatic and problems but give emotional support.

5.7. Socio-Economic Structure of Eskişehir

In this section, the research setting the city of Eskişehir, will be explained through such indicators as its financial and social structure, population, migration, settlement, education, production, income distribution, consumption, saving and life quality.

According to 1990 census, 641,301 people resided in Eskişehir and this figure reached 706, 009 in the 2000 census. The annual population increase in Eskişehir is 1.01%. In these periods, the population in Turkey rose from 56.473.03 to 67.803.927. Between 1999 and 2000, when the population increase rate was 3.07% in Turkey, it was 1.66% in Eskişehir. In the year 2000, women constituted 50.1% of the total population in Turkey. Of this population, 44.13% are age-related dependents. Those who are 65 and above amount to 10.66% while the dependent population between the ages of 0 and 14 reach 33.47%. The size of households in 2000 reveal that the percentage of households with 4 residents is 28.3 and that with 10+ residents 1.0% (ETO; 2003: 4-13).

According to the data of 2000, the percentage of those who were born in Eskişehir amounts to 69.34% in the total population. Those who were born in other cities of abroad make up 30.66%. The population that settled in Eskişehir mainly come from Afyon, Bilecik, Ankara, Konya, Kütahya, İstanbul, Erzurum, Ağrı, Bursa, İzmir, Kars and Balıkesir. The people who moved to Eskişehir from abroad previously lived in Bulgaria, Romania and Germany.

The rate of population increase in Eskişehir parallels the post-1945 urban population increase rate in Turkey. For instance, the population increase rate in Eskişehir between 1950 and 1955 was 33.6%. This rate is close to the urban population increase rate in Turkey (32.9%). Post-1950 population increase rate in the city indicate the movement of the population towards the urban areas. Eskişehir receives migration from its districts and nearby provinces as well as

from abroad. Bilecik takes the first place to be migrated from this city in 1960. This is followed by Afyon, Istanbul, Bursa, Ankara, Kütahya, Konya, Balıkesir, İzmir, Adana, ve Sivas. Most migrants from abroad, primarily from Bulgaria and the other countries in the Balkan countries moved to Eskişehir was based on their own wishes. One of the primary reasons of this is that in this city there is a potential for workshops and small scale industrial manufacture.

In 1960, Eskişehir ranked in the 6th place in volume of urban population, following Istanbul, Ankara, İzmir, Adana ve Bursa. In this period too, migration continued and Eskişehir attracted a significant amount of population from its various provinces. The notable point about the structure of Eskişehir population is that it falls further behind in the ranking of size of population although some amount of population enters it in certain periods. The city fell down to the 10th rank in 1990 for its 6th place in 1965 in Turkey (Ertin, 1994: 105-113). This can be attributed to the low reproduction rate (1.74%), industrial progress in other provinces (Gaziantep, Konya, Mersin, Kayseri) and its own population attracting characteristics.

The districts where the research was conducted were Gültepe, Yıldıztepe, Büyükdere, Emek, Fevzi Çakmak, Şarhöyük, Tunalı ve Yeşiltepe, which were established by migrant population. Gültepe district was set up by migrants who came in 1950-52. The districts of Yeşiltepe and Tunalı are residential areas where the number of migrants increased between 1978 and 1989. In the years between 1955-60, one of the first shanty regions of the city, Şarhöyük, was mostly originated from Sarıcakaya and Afyon. In the period between 1960-80, Büyükdere, Gültepe, ve Yıldıztepe districts, which are the prominent shanty regions of the city still showing the characteristics of a shanty area today, were set up by migrants from Seyitgazi town, neighboring villages, and provinces of Erzurum, Diyarbakır and Malatya. The Fevzi Çakmak district was set up by migrants from Afyon province and the Emek district was set up by migrants from Afyon province and the neighboring villages and towns of Eskişehir (Ertin, 1994:

114-116). The districts sociologically reflect gathering based on fellow townsmanship. The provinces that Eskişehir receives migration from have not historically changed in general. However, after 1980, Erzurum and Diyarbakir also became one of the provinces where migrants flowed into Eskişehir.

Undoubtedly, one of the most important reasons of migration is that Eskişehir is an industrial city. The industrialization of the city dates back to the time of first Republic era. The overall economic structure is based on agriculture and industry. However, this balance is growing towards industry. The close vicinity of the city geographically to markets and ease of transportation accelerate the regional industry growth. Some noteworthy developments in industry were made with state support were the Sugar Plantation set up in 1923, Aeronautics Maintenance Plantation, Sumerbank Cloth Printing Plantation and Machinery Factory (ETO; 1973). Eskişehir ranks 9th with its contribution to production, while Istanbul coming first, followed by Ankara, İzmir, Kocaeli ve Bursa all account for half of the production in Turkey. Of the gross national product, Eskişehir creates 12.3% of the agriculture sector, 21.5% of the industry sector and 66.2% of the services sector (ETO; 2004: 20-21).

In the year 2000, of the total of 86, 277 people, 35.3% worked in agriculture, 18.9% in industry, 4.5% in construction and 41.0% in service sector. In these, the participation of males in Eskişehir in the workforce is 64.6% while for women this percentage is 28. The rate of unemployed women (10.1%) compared to men (7.7%) is a little higher. Women mainly work in the agriculture sector (60.8%) and service sector (30.0%). The percentage of women working in the industry (8.7%) and construction sectors (0.4%) is low. The percentages of male workforce in service sector (45.7%) and industry sector (23%) are higher than their participation in construction sector (6.3%). In 2002, the number of public (233) and private businesses (5.092) were found to be 5,325. A total of 13, 926 laborers work in the public enterprises. The number of workers in private workplaces amounts to 48,732' dir (ETO, 2003).

A general study of employment patterns reveals that the number of workers with wages/salaries and daily wages is high (77.27%). The reason that this percentage is high in Eskişehir is that a large portion of the population is employed in such public sector establishments as defense, service, transportation and education. Self-employed workers amount to 14.07% (ETO, 2004: 41). In the year 2000, the distribution of the working population into the state of employment based on gender is the following: of the total of 138, 349 people working for wages, salary or daily wage 21% constitutes women. Among the employers (9%) and self-employed workers (9.7%), the percentage of women is low. Most women work as unpaid family workers (73%) (ETO, 2003:12).

The percentage of housewives in the total population in 1980 fell from 62.9% to 50.8% in the year 2000. In the non-working population, the retired persons comprised 7.8% in 1980 while this rate rose to 15.4%. There is no significant change in the percentage of students (23.4% for 1980, 24.6% for the year 2000) (ETO, 2003:12). The working population in general in Eskişehir is 28.86%. This proportion shows that nearly 29 persons out of 100 work in Eskişehir. The percentage of unemployment in the city center of Eskişehir is 10.74 (ETO, 2004:15-17).

Another significant indicator which depicts Eskişehir's economic and social structure is the amount of total income and their distribution. Labor income constitutes 47.49% of the Eskişehir province's income, and retirement payments and all types of state aid as well as complimentary income from the foreign transfers make up 18.63% of the total income of the province. The income from entrepreneurship in Eskişehir amounts to 18.58%. In comparison with the other provinces (İstanbul, Ankara, İzmir, Bursa, Kocaeli, Denizli, Kayseri, Gaziantep), this indicates a very small portion. When the portion relationships of the income are examined, it can be seen that the 20% portion of the population with the lowest income in Eskişehir gets 63.31% share from the province income and that

20% portion of the population with the highest income gets 44.95% share of the province income. (ETO, 2004: 27-28).

The households in Eskişehir save 26.08% of their income and spend 73.92% of it. An examination of the distribution of household expenditure based on their types shows that income is generally spend on food and housing (26.07%). The expenditure proportions from the household budget for clothing, transportation and education are lower (ETO, 2004: 30). 58.93% of the households living in Eskişehir central province own the residence they live in. 10.03% of the households stay in one of their relative's residence and 4.33% stay in state provided lodgings. 26.71% of the households living in Eskişehir pay rent for their residence (ETO, 2004: 34).

According to UNDP 2004 Human Development Report in Turkey, 9 provinces have made high and all other provinces achieved medium human development in Turkey based on HDR values. Eskişehir ranked 14th in Turkey after Kocaeli, Yalova, İstanbul, Bursa, İzmir, Muğla, Sakarya, Bolu, Tekirdağ, Balıkesir, Ankara, and Bilecik. Among the provinces which showed medium human development, Eskişehir ranked 5th place (<http://www.undp.org.tr>). Eskişehir takes the 8th place among the 78 provinces where evaluations were made in Turkey in the ranking of Human Poverty Index. That Eskişehir is a habitable place with relatively high living standards is related with the portion of the education sector. Education is an important factor affecting income level and life style (<http://www.ogu.tekam.sitemynet.com>).

Eskişehir is a province where the rate of literacy is high in Turkey (91.5%). Among İstanbul, Ankara, İzmir, Bursa, Kocaeli, Denizli, Kayseri ve Gaziantep, it ranks 3rd, just after Ankara and İstanbul (ETO, 2004: 32). In the year 2000, the percentage of illiterate women (15.14%) is higher compared to the percentage of illiterate men (3.25%). 56.37% of the women finished primary school, 6.29% finished secondary school, 9.62% finished high school, and 6.19% are higher

education graduates. Among the men, the percentages of those who finished secondary school (13.75%), high school (19.77%) and higher education (10.99%) are higher (ETO, 2003:9). In Eskişehir, 20.81% of the income providing population is graduates of high school or equivalent vocational high schools and they get 24.11% of the total income of the province. In Eskişehir, 11.1% of the income providing population are graduates of faculties and college and get 18.69% of the total income of the province (ETO, 2004: 32).

Poverty is an important reality in Eskişehir just as it is for other provinces. The portion that Eskişehir gets from the Social Cooperation and Collaboration Promotion Fund which is transferred within the Province Social Cooperation and Collaboration Foundation is about 17%. The transferred money are used for health aids, projects, schooling aids, food, clothing and fuel aids (SSE, 1998: 324).

The proportion of people that receive food from the soup houses registered to Tepebaşı and Greater Municipality is high in Eskişehir. Besides food aid, education, fuel and health aids are provided as well. The seminars aimed at women such as reading-writing and skills courses, education support programs, health and family planning, women's rights and children's rights are benefited by those in society who do and do not receive aid, particularly women, for free.

5.8. Conclusion

Mainstream poverty studies have tended to ignore, distort or marginalize women and their poverty experiences. This is a result of the systematic biases and inadequacies in mainstream poverty theories and also an omission of women from empirical research. In contrast to mainstream poverty measurements, feminist methodology has important power in order to understand women's poverty. Feminist research is significantly different from malestream research. It involves the alternative origin of problems that are concern of women rather than

men. There is no power relation in the feminist research process. Feminist critiques of hegemonic malestream science (feminist criticism of hegemonic science) open a door to develop an alternative in order to understand women's living experiences, in particular their poverty experiences. Therefore, in order to reveal women's poverty experiences from in their own view and words, in this research, feminist methodology has been applied.

CHAPTER 6

WOMEN AND POVERTY IN ESKİSEHIR

6.1. Introduction

In this chapter, women's poverty is analyzed and discussed under the light of data that are collected from the field research that have been applied in Eskişehir. In the thesis, women's poverty is examined based on the use of forms of women's labor use forms in the social reproduction process. Contrary to men, women are highly aware of their labor in domestic and production spheres both for reproduction of themselves and their families. Therefore, women's poverty is related with her material conditions in which they sustain their lives. Moreover, women do not consider themselves independent from their social positions in the family. In this research, the standpoint of analysis unit of women's poverty is the household in which they live because there is an important relationship between women's experience of poverty and the social position of household.

At first, the relationship between the social-demographic structure of the households and poverty will be shown. Because, it is thought that women's poverty experiences should not be analyzed independently both from their social positions in households and households' poverty conditions. In this subsection, the size of household, individual numbers who live in the households, their age, education position, birth of place, and women's duration in urban areas are taken into consideration to make correlation between family and poverty. Moreover, the physical conditions of housing and infrastructure, property ownership and having

durable consumption goods will be shown as indicators in order to understand the living standard of families and under what conditions women experiences poverty.

In the second subsection, women and men's position in the production process will be discussed. Although need to survive under the poverty conditions is one of the most important reasons that affect women's participation into work force, other determinations such as household type and composition, life-cycle, women's age, marital status, and support structure will be presented in women's own words. Moreover, the factors such as patriarchal authority, having children, age; educations that prevent the housewives from paid employment will be examined.

In the third, subsection, the relation between women and poverty will be analyzed in relation to reproduction process. Division of labor, women's perception of their domestic labor, their efforts in order to decrease living costs, the consumption patterns of the households, subsistence production, and women's withdrawal from their own needs will be presented in order to understand the experiences of women's poverty.

The exclusion from the social life is one of the important deprivations of women. In the fourth subsection, the women's participation into the social and cultural, their attitude and opinion to them, will be shown under the title of the social reproduction and women's deprivation of social life.

In the fifth subsection, the relation between women will be discussed in terms of power. Their relation with power will be examined with respect to decision-making processes and their reaction concerning children's education, marriage, using money and violence.

Lastly, women's opinions and appreciation about poverty and women's poverty will be presented. Women's evaluation of their life related to their husbands,

single-parents, married women, non-working women outside the home, and women in paid employment will be examined in their own view.

6.2. Socio-Demographic Structure of the Households

Since women are not thought independent from household social position in which they live, it is important to show the general socio-demographic pictures of households in order to understand their poverty experiences. In this research, the total numbers of interviewed women are 120. The socio-demographic profile of households are shown in relation with the number of persons live in the household, the ages of women, men and children, place of their birth, their staying process in the urban, and their education status, housing conditions and property ownership. All of them as status indicators reflect the income earning and reproduction opportunities and conditions of households. At the same time, it is examined whether or not there are important differences between labor categories with respect to the above indicators.

6.2.1. The Household Size

There is an important correlation between the number of persons in the household and the poverty. The size of the household direct affects the income share of the persons in the household. Generally, increase in the number of person living in the household, which result in the decrease of income, has a negative effect on impoverishment. However, this relation changes according to the number of the employed persons in the household.

According to the general labor categories of the research performed, average size of the household is 4.25 persons where the smallest household of the sampling group consists 2 persons (single mother category), and the biggest household consists of 10 persons. According to the labor categories, the biggest average household size (5.13) is included in the non-working woman and man labor category (G). In addition, there is no other working person in these households.

An important relationship can be established between average size of the household and the impoverishment in this non-working woman and man category. Among the married labor categories, the lowest average size of the household (4) is included in the group E. In this category, woman and man are irregularly employed. Although the household includes two income earners, the rate of the income is low and unstable. Therefore, poverty may not be relieved due to the unsteadiness and insufficiency of income even the average size of the household is lower. Among 120 households, the number of income earning persons other than the women and the man is quite low (17 persons).

The household size of single mother category is smaller than other categories. Of the single women's households, the rates of for three (33 %) and four (33 %) person's families are the same. The 13 percent single parent families involve five persons. There are two persons live in the 20 percent of single mother household. Twelve single women live only with their children. There are only three single parents who stay with their mother and children. Income resources that are transferred to the single mother's households are sustained through women's work (9 women), their husband's and father's wages (5). Moreover, without these resources; there are four families in which youth children have supported the household with their wages in five families.

Researched categories generally are nuclear family with respect to household type (98 percent). In contrast, to extended family type that is seen in rural, this reflects that these families have become urbanize in terms of family type. Most of the families consist of 4-5 members (70 %) in the labor categories other than the single woman household. Of 120 households, the ratio of the crowded households with 6-10 persons is lower (10 %).

When it is discussed with respect to labor categories without single women, it is seen that for three persons' family intensify in the households where woman and man work irregularly (31 %) and, where woman work regular and men work

irregular (27 %). While for four person's families take place among non-working women and regular working men category (73 %), for five persons families intensify in non-working women and irregular working men category (33 %). On the other hand, the rate of crowded families is high in non-working woman and non-working man category (23 %). In this category, there are two families in which nine and ten persons live. Moreover, other crowded family that has got 10 persons takes place in the non-working woman and irregular working man labor category.

Both unemployment and the increasing of the number of persons in the household have deeply affected women's position in the poor families. Women have spent more time and efforts for caring of child and daily activities of family under the worst conditions. Women's position is relatively worse in the crowded families than women who take place in other labor categories. These families have got between 4 and 8 children. Due to the fact of men's unemployment and irregular work, they sustain their lives depending on municipality aid.

6.2.2. The Age Composition of the Household's Members

In this subsection the age composition of the household members are analyzed. The age composition of the household members has two important aspects. First, it reflects the potential active labor-force of the household. Secondly, it shows the ratio of dependant children and adults of the family. Both of them are important for the woman labor because women bear the maintenance, care, and raising responsibilities within the household. This is already a burden for women whether they take part in the production process or not. This responsibility becomes more serious under the poverty circumstances.

Of the 120 women, the 55 percent of women take place between 30 and 39 age segment. The rates of women that take place the 40 and 49 age segment are 29.2 percent while the rate of younger women whose ages are between 18 and 29 is 13

percent. There are only four women whose ages are between 51 and 53 (Table 1, see Appendix A). If the age composition is taken into account with respect to labor categories, there are no any important differences among them. It can be easily seen that all women have potential to use their labor power actively.

When it is looked at the age composition of men, it is seen that while 50 percent of men takes place the 30 and 39 age segment, 40 percent of men takes place between 40 and 49 age segments. On the other hand, there are only three men whose ages are between 25 and 29 interval. Moreover, eight men take place between 50 and 57 age category (Table 2, see Appendix A). As in the case of women, there are no any important differences among men according to their working positions. All men have potential to use their labor capacity as women. It is also taken account of their labor potential when sample is chosen.

Of the 105 married households, while the 59 percent of married households have got two children, the 22 percent has got three children. While the 13 percent have got one child, the 6 percent have got between 4 and 8 children. Of the total sample, the numbers of children are 267.

The number of the children who are available for active employment according to age is not high, excluding adult women and men. When the total number of the children (267) in the households are considered, there is only 37 children who are available for working, do not attend to higher education, and 19 years old and above. When this is considered according to labor categories, more than half of these children are included in the single households (11) and where women are irregularly employed (11). About 47 percent of the children are between 7 and 14 ages old. The percentage of the children between 15 and 18 is 19. The percentage of the children between 0 and 6 is about 17. Consequently, most of the children are dependant to the family (83 %).

Excluding 42 children that are under the age of six, there are 225 children who get education. Only about 13% of them attend to high school (31 children) while about 57 percent of them attend to compulsory education of eight years. Only 8 children attend to university. There are 3 children who cannot attend to compulsory education due to economical conditions although they are within the compulsory education ages. In this household where woman and man do not work, 2 children have not enrolled in the primary school although they are within the compulsory education ages. The eldest girl, 13 ages, takes care of some her brothers and sisters. The other child, 8 years old, could not be enrolled to the school since the parents have not made her birth registration. The other child is mentally disabled and requires a special education. However, the most important obstacle for these children to go school is their parents' unemployment.

Educational background of the children 19 and above ages that are capable to use their labor power is generally lower. It becomes harder to find a job as they are primary, secondary, and at best, high school graduates. Most of these young persons work at irregularly without social security. Women rather worry about the future of their children. Lack of sufficient education makes harder to find job in the labor market for these children who are capable to work.

It makes the children more dependent to the family since their active participation to labor-force is low and they are in the school age. It affects women negatively to take place in the production process, as most of the children are dependant. Furthermore, it makes the burden of the women who work regularly and irregularly heavier both to work and take care of the children under poverty.

6.2.3. Education Levels of Women and Men

Education level is an important variable for the relation between the women and the poverty. Education is not only a factor effective on the participation of the women in the labor force but also important for the woman health and the

education of the children. However, in the discourse of the poverty, education is indicated as a reason for the poverty according to the human capital approach. Mostly, there is a tendency to confuse the reasons and results of poverty in these debates. In the developing countries, many women are deprived of the opportunities to be educated due to both economical reasons and cultural attitudes and behaviors.

Of the 120 women, 76 percent of women graduated from primary school. There are only four women who graduated from secondary school. Moreover, there are only sixteen women who have a high school degree. The number of women who did not complete primary school education but are literate is seven. There are two illiterate women among 120 women (Table 3, see appendix A).

There is no significant difference between the labor categories according to the education of women. There are women having primary school degree who have regular works while there are women having high school degree who work in irregular works. Concentration of women's education level in the primary school makes their position in the production process. The works made by regularly and irregularly employed women do not require higher educational levels. Almost all of women indicated that they could not have educational opportunities due to economical insufficiency of their families. Additionally, some of the women told that educational priorities were reserved to their brothers in their families. The greatest wish of the women who suffer to deprive of education is to have their children to be educated. Education which is an important effect on the work and wages is only an indication being deprived, not its reason. It is the point that must be discussed is to discover under which conditions what kind of structures creates obstacles before women to be educated.

When education level of men is looked over, it is seen that of the 105 men, the rate of men who graduated from the primary school is 58 percent. While 23 percent of men graduated from the secondary school, the rate of having a high

school degree is only 14 percent among men. There are only two men who graduated from Open University. The numbers of men who have not graduated from the primary school are three (Table 4, see Appendix A). It is considerable that the educational level of the men employed in jobs with regular income is at least high school (71 %) and junior high school (54%). Likewise, the ratio of the primary school graduates is higher in the unemployed and irregularly employed men (69 %).

Although, both women and men's education levels are not so high, men's position relative to women is better when it is looked at with respect to their education. At least, there is no any man who is illiterate. The rate of having license from secondary and high school is higher for men than women.

6.2.4. Women's Birth Place and Living Duration in the City

Migration, an important phenomenon during the process of social change of Turkey, essentially expresses the spatial mobility of the expropriated (impoverished) social classes in the rural areas in order to create new work and survival opportunities. Following mechanization in agriculture in 1950 and new technological advances negatively affect the reproduction of labor-force that emerges in the rural areas. New fields of work created by the industrialization process, new educational and health opportunities makes urban attractive for the reproduction of the labor-force.

Women's birthplace and duration of their stay in the city provide information about the migration process. There is a significant relationship between being a migrant and poverty. The relationship can be discussed in two aspects. First, migration has an important effect on the emergence of urban poverty in underdeveloped countries. Second, migrants are in the stratum which is most affected by poverty.

It is seen that the majority of women were born in town and village at the distribution made according to the positions of birthplaces (62 %). Of the 120 women, only 37 percent were born in the urban. There is only one woman who was born out of Turkey (Table 5, see Appendix A). On the other side, of the 105 men, the rate of men who were born in the urban is 25. Almost 73 percent of men were born in town and village (Table 6, see Appendix A).

When women's duration of stay in the urban is examined, this is less than 10 years and the ratio of the women who live in city areas more than 50 years is the lowest. The ratio of the women who live in the city areas between 11-20 years is 29 per cent. The ratio of the women who live in the urban areas between 31-40 years is 28 per cent. While the women between 21-30 years is 23 per cent (Table 7, see Appendix A). There is a parallelism between staying in the urban areas and staying in Eskişehir. Duration of stay in urban areas does not include a significant difference for labor categories.

Migration to Eskişehir is commonly from neighbor provinces, and its counties and villages. The migration routes in this study highly reflect this peculiarity of Eskişehir. 77 % of the women migrate to Eskişehir from neighbor provinces, counties and villages. Remaining 23 % lived in Kars, Urfa, Tunceli, Erzurum, Sivas, and İzmit before migrating to Eskişehir. Most of the women settle in this city with their families before marriage, and some of them migrate to Eskişehir due to reasons like new job opportunities and marriage. Likewise, 82 percent of the men migrate to Eskişehir from neighbor provinces, counties and villages. Remaining lived in Edirne, Rize, Diyarbakır, Kırıkkale, Batman, Trakya, Erzurum, Tunceli, Kars and Sivas provinces before migrating to Eskişehir (17 percent). Approximately 57 percent of the women have begun to live in Eskişehir after 1980.

Migration is a way selected to find better jobs for the reproduction of labor. While the migrants who migrate after 1950 have relatively available conditions

(jobs, dwelling places, a web of contacts) to survive in the city, the conditions of the migrants who migrate after 1980 become more inconvenient than the past period.

During and after migration the strength of the traditional web of contacts developed in the basis of cooperation and solidarity has weakened. Progresses since 1980 make living conditions of the working class harder and constricted the conditions to use their labor in the production process. The individuals in the households are either unemployed or generally employed in unorganized, casual, irregular and low-wage jobs without social securities. As the educational level of the households is low, most of them are causally employed in unqualified jobs without social securities.

Since 1980, the phenomena like global implementation of new liberal policies, unemployment increasing as a result of the new capital accumulation models, decreasing level of wages, constrictions in the public service, unsecured, unorganized, casual working forms in the labor process have caused sustenance straits on the social strata, and accelerated impoverishment processes.

6.2.5. Living Standard of the Households In Terms of Owning Assets

6.2.5.1. Housing

In the poverty studies, dwelling house is a significant material source for the physical and social reproduction of the individual and the household. The relationship between the dwelling house and the poverty is generally established through slum regions in the underdeveloped countries. It is generally focused on the ownership and the physical conditions of the dwelling houses as the basic issues.

The mechanisms of acquiring dwelling house are also important for this relationship established between the dwelling house and the poverty in the

developing countries. As the dwelling house acquisition mechanisms are dependent to the market, the poor of such countries either can not have any access to the means housing market or acquire houses through informal means (slum) (Aldrich and Sandhu, 1995)

Poor who do not have access to dwelling house either becomes homeless or the physical conditions and substructure of the houses are far from meeting human living conditions. There is a significant relationship between low quality houses and the physical environment surrounding these dwelling units. One of the poverty indicators of human poverty index is access to clean and stable water resources (United Nations, 1997). Sufficiency level and quality of public services in the housing environment establish the basic indicators of the poverty and deprivation as well as the physical conditions of the house (utilization area, electricity, water, etc.). Moreover, housing conditions directly have affected on the individuals' health.

However, although these general indicators reflect the general conditions of the house, they are insufficient to express the poverty experience of the women under these conditions. Women spend most of their time within the house. They intensively strive for daily works under such inadequate physical and substructure conditions. The endeavor and effort exerted by women keeps them deprived of human living conditions.

Of the 120 households, 43 percent are tenants. The ratio of the occupants who do not pay rent is 33 percent while the ratio of householders is 23 percent (table.8). The ownership of the houses of which their occupants do not pay rent generally belongs to their relatives (their parents, sisters and brothers). Only 3 occupants do not pay rent due to their jobs, the superintendents (*kapıcı*). The ratio of ownership of the houses is low. Most of the households decrease their cost of sustenance by residing in the properties of their relatives. Generally, they reside in the inherited

properties of men's parents. The traditional networks are so important to fight against poverty.

A statistically significant relation is found between the labor categories and tenancy. In the labor categories, the numbers of the households that do not pay rent to their dwelling houses are more than other household for regularly employed men (women are regularly and irregularly employed and unemployed). The number of the tenancy increases more in the households where men are irregularly employed and unemployed (women are irregularly employed and unemployed) and single women reside (Table 9, see Appendix A).

The rent level is relatively higher in Eskişehir. When the rents paid by the households are considered the ratio of rent 85 YTL. And below are approximately 46 percent; the ratio of the rent between 100 and 199 YTL. is 46 percent. There are only four households that pay rent for their housing between 200 and 350 YTL. (Table 10, see Appendix A). When the relationship between the rent ratios and labor categories is considered the households that pay relatively low are in the labor groups G (73 %) and F (56 %) Another group with lower rent rates is the single mothers (H category, 83 %) These households are obliged to draw their subsistence costs down by residing at houses that have physical conditions unavailable for health, as their average income is low. It is noteworthy that the lowest amount of rent is 15 YTL.

When number of rooms of the households is considered, the ratio of the households with 2 rooms is 38 percent. The ratio of the households with 3 rooms is about 42 percent. The rate of households in which there are four rooms in the house is 18 per cent. On the other hand, there are three families that sustain their lives only in one room (Table 11, see Appendix A).

The physical conditions of the houses are directly observed as the interviews with most of the women are made in their houses. Rooms are generally small.

Negative physical conditions of the house and heating problems force the household members mostly to live in one room. The proportion of the houses that have central heating is low (17 percent). Most of the households utilize stove for heating (83 %). All households under the labor categories G and F heat their houses with stoves. The rate of the households heated with stove under the single mother category is significantly high (93 %) (Table 12, see Appendix A). A significant proportion of the households have their toilets outside the house (43 %). The percent of the households that utilize toilet as bathroom is 12. 45 percent of the households have separate bathrooms and toilets (Table 13, see Appendix A).

As 67 percent of the households indicate that they can be able to allocate a separate room for their children, children do not have a separate room are 33 percent (table.14). The households who do not have a separate room for children are intensified in the households G, F, and single mothers categories. Basically it is possible to indicate following depending on the observations. It does have a minor difference for the children to have separate room in the houses heated by stove. The members of the family spend almost all of their time in room with stove, as they have to stay in that room for heating. Separate room only has a physical existence and most of the children feel lack of a room of their own which is heated while they study in winters.

It was asked that according to you, what is the insufficiency of your house in terms of physical conditions or other. Alternatively, what kinds of problems do you have with your house? Of the 120 women, 22 percent women are satisfied with their house. However, most of women have many problems with their houses. The responses of the women to this question according to labor categories classification are as follows:

The responses of the women under the labor category A are as follows:

'There are a lot of deficiencies, it is not orderly, a corrupt house', 'it is problem to be heated by stove, I wish if there is a central heating system, it is burdensome to fire the stove, it dirt never cleans', 'not my own house, it is so-so, it cannot be helped if I say it is bad, the rents are high', 'it would be better if I have a room, and it is bad to be heated by stove, to live in a house with stove is difficult very for working women', 'it is small', sunless', its toilet is on the balcony', 'bad furnished, its cleanness cannot be perceivable'.

The responses of the women under the labor category B are as follows:

'I want more rooms and central heating', 'it is sunless, I would like to live in upper floors since we live in the basement floor', 'it is unplumbed, it has no kitchen, we use same place both for kitchen and bathroom', 'I wish if there is one more room, and a better kitchen', 'old house', 'too much moist', 'no bathing stove in the bathroom, you cannot take a bath anytime you want, there is too much noise in the landowner apartment, there is also noise of the adjacent bake house and road. There are always insects as it is in the garden', 'it is small and insufficient number of rooms, I want a separate bedroom, a separate living room, and a separate children's room. This house is not suitable for me', 'we live together my mother in-law, it is dark, basement', 'the road to home is steep, not flat, this is tiring, small, dark', 'basement, it is dark but my spouse's job, what can we do'.

The responses of the women under the labor category C are as follows:

'Its toilet is outside, it is cracked, it is reported "unavailable to reside" following the earthquake, it has only two rooms, hard to have warm,' 'it would be better if there is a room more', 'the house is very small, I wish if there is an extra room for the children; it becomes difficult to host guests', 'it is cold, it is unplanned, old, and insufficient number of rooms', 'it has a lot of deficiencies, I wish it would be a new house. It is hard to have warm, the kitchen does not look like a kitchen',

‘the house is heated with stove, we want one more room’, ‘small and dark’, ‘it is difficult to heat the house, waste water of the toilet overflows to the hall’.

The responses of the women under the labor category D are as follows:

‘There too much moist, dye does not adhere’, ‘the house is not livable, very small, a very old house’, ‘it is cold, its roof is leaking’, ‘it would be better if there is an extra room’, ‘we could not have warm, first floor is cold, and cannot be heated by stove but still sufficient’, ‘not being heated by a central heating system is a problem, it is hard to have warm’, ‘the house is ruined, then ceiling will fall on us, no bathroom, it is trouble to take a bath’, ‘it is basement, it is gloomy, I look for a house to move’.

The responses of the women under the labor category E are as follows:

‘It is not like a house, I wish to live in an apartment flat’, ‘rooms are few, small toilet, it is leaking’, ‘it is very old, have many problems, which of them I might tell you’, ‘no cupboard in the kitchen, everywhere becomes messy’, ‘there is no separate bathroom, we have a lot of problems with the bathroom, insufficient number of rooms, it is unplanned’, ‘it does not have a garden’, ‘firstly, there must a study room for the children, children cannot study in crowd, and dark’, ‘not a furnished house, ho curtain in the kitchen, we need a couch in the room, we feel humiliated when a guest visits’, ‘house is on the ground level, its garden is dirty, only one room, small’, ‘very small, children cannot be able to study’.

The responses of the women under the labor category F are as follows:

‘There is moist, it is narrow, not sufficient, we are crowded’, ‘there is a shortage of room, insufficient’, ‘the house is very small, very old house’, ‘The house is under bad condition, it is sunless, the roof leaks’, ‘insufficient number of rooms’, ‘a very old house’, ‘not my own house in the first place, we’re ten persons, the

greatest problem is being very crowded and living in this small house', 'the house is not regularly designed', 'it would be better if there is one room more', 'rooms are very small', 'the bathroom and toilet are in the same place, where could you take a bath, it is small', 'the house is in bad condition, there is moist, the kitchen leaks'.

The responses of the women under the labor category G are as follows:

'This is not a place to live. There is no place that you may call a kitchen; there is moist, it is narrow; this makes the child always ill; look, she is coughing, 'what can I tell! See, it does not have even a tap', 'the house is too old, no bathroom, kitchen, the toilet is outside, an old house', 'we only live in a room', 'There is no kitchen, this is supposed to be a bathroom, rooms are very small', 'the ceiling will fall on us, not plastered, ground house, this house needs repair, but cannot bear a repair'.

The responses of the women under the single mother category in relation to their houses are as follows:

'It needs maintenance, no balcony', 'very dark and there is moist', a very cold, old house', 'I am not contented with the neighbors and neighborhood', 'there no sewage system, fountain, an old house', 'there is moist, sewage leaks to the garden', 'no furniture in the house', 'it is not proper, everything creates difficulty, I live in a room and my daughter in law live in the other room', it is a corrupt house, dark, and small'.

In fact, the problems experienced by the women in relation to their houses do not differentiate much in all of labor categories. Especially, number of rooms and heating problems takes first place among other troubles. Number of the rooms, form of the ownership, quantitative measurement of other physical properties which are used in the classical poverty studies are not sufficient enough to set

forth the poverty experience of the houses and especially, of the women. Women face with these problems more during the reproduction of daily life, and the classical poverty studies are insufficient to search out the poverty experience of women. It creates incredible strains on the women's labor to wash in an unplumbed house, to take care of children in a house without bathroom, to help education of children without a study room.

6.2.5.2. Property Ownership

As poverty is commonly analyzed depending on the wage and consumption in the classical poverty studies, other resources (e.g. real estate) of the household are not included in the analysis. These resources are among the important supportive elements for the reproduction of the household. When these resources are considered in the poverty studies, it is generally quantitatively measured whether exist or not. However, the process and quality of acquisition of these resources are important to determine the living standards of the household. Women endeavor an invisible labor especially during the acquisition or building of houses. In addition to this, only few women have title on these resources.

The ratio of the households that do not possess immovable like house, land, store in the city, or car is considerably high (71 %). It is low in ratio of which has a field or house in the village (4 %). The households that possess a field or house in the village indicate that these assets do not provide any revenue. There are only three households that have a second house other than they reside. Three of them are cooperative houses, and these households undergo to pay monthly installments of the houses. The ratio of the households that have a land in the city is also considerably low (3 %). The ratio of the households that own a car is also low (15 %).

In the classical poverty studies, when possessed real properties are considered, it is regarded whether they quantitatively exist. These assets are regarded as welfare

indicators. Nevertheless, when the quality and acquisition process of these assets are considered, we encounter with a relation inversely proportional with the welfare of the households. The debts of 3 households possess a second house due to the cooperative results in restriction in other needs of these households.

Car ownership is not a welfare indicator by itself. Likewise, the quality and acquisition of the car can be carried out in the expense of decreasing cost of living of the households. The value and model of the cars vary between 1500 YTL and 7500 YTL. Car ownership is a status indicator for these households even the model and value of these are lower. Men drive the cars in all of the households.

Gold becomes the most disposed of assets of the household due to economic constraints within last five years (29 %). Women generally make gold saving. Gold possession is an indicator of social status of women. However most of the women save gold to correspond family requirements in bad times. All of the women who employed in seasonal works in fields in summer indicate that they certainly purchase gold by some of their earnings. Gold, generally spend in winter for compensating fuel and educational costs of the children. The ratio of the households that sell their cars is low (15 %). On the other hand, the ratio of car ownership is also low in general. The households disposed of their cars due to different reasons such as marriage costs of their children (4 households), to replace outdated model cars (6 households), to clear outstanding insurance (Bağ – KUR) debts to be paid by them (5 households). There are also households that sold their furniture and house appliances.

6.2.5.3. Ownership of Durable Consumption Goods

Durable consumer goods are an indicator of living standards on the one hand and important and necessary tools for the reproduction of living on the other hand. There may be an inversely proportional relation between the quality and

acquisition of them and general welfare indicators like in the ownership of other assets (immovable) quality. Lack and/or low quality of necessary house ware negatively affect the labor and time spend by the women especially according to their domestic position. Lack and/or low quality of necessary house ware negatively affect women's psychology, and feel themselves destitute and disadvantageous compared to wealthier women.

Most of the appliances inquired in the research include widely used and necessary consumer foods. Refrigerators, vacuum cleaners, washing machines, dishwashers, ovens are appliances that promote housework like cooking and cleaning, which are necessary for daily reproduction of labor. There is an important relationship between the quality and ownership of these appliances and the intensity of women labor as these work are still under the charge of women. In other words, to own such appliances does not necessarily mean that the family and woman have higher living standards. Contrary to this, women endeavor more to reduce operational expenses (electricity, detergent, gas, etc.) necessary for these appliances.

The majority of households have got first hand refrigerator (73 %). There are also families that use second hand refrigerator (22 %). There are 6 households that do not have a refrigerator. In the labor categories, also a statistically important relation is determined between the employment and refrigerator ownership and way of its acquisition. Most of the households that do not own refrigerator concentrate in the labor categories that both man and woman do not work (G) and only man is irregularly employed (F). Likewise, ownership of secondhand refrigerator is higher in these labor categories (Table 15, see Appendix A).

Other households that do not own a refrigerator are included in the single mother category (H). In this category, use of secondhand refrigerators is higher than other categories (26 %). For example, Güler separated from his husband due to irretrievable breakdown of marriage 3 years ago. As her husband did not want to

separate from her, he did not allow her to take any furniture or goods while she left in order to punish her. Güler, a cleaning servant in the university employed by a private company for 3 years, has to set up her life from the beginning. Güler told that she has sustenance troubles, and be able to manage without refrigerator as she buys food daily.

Vacuum cleaners are widely used household appliances. The ratio of the households that do not have a vacuum cleaner is 14 per cent while most of the households have a vacuum cleaner (85.8 percent) (Table 16, see Appendix A). 11 households of a total of 17 households that do not have this appliance are included in the labor categories of G, F, and E. These are relatively poorer households among the research categories. The numbers of households that own a secondhand vacuum cleaner are low (7 families). Most of the women try to decrease living costs by managing electricity good. Some women stated that they rarely use vacuum cleaner. This effort makes them more tired of house cleaning, and also threatens health of the women who clean their houses under inappropriate conditions.

Now, there is a television in every house and it becomes an indicator of welfare to have more than one television. Almost all of the households own a television (97.5 percent). The ratios of the households that do not have a television (3 %) and have a secondhand television (6 %) are low (Table 16, see Appendix A). The ratios of the households that have more than one television (2-3) are not such low (38 %). Some of televisions in these households are not operated as they are bought for the dowry of the children. 3 households that do not own a television are included in the labor category A where both woman and man are unemployed and single mother category (H).

Washing machines are appliances that are not luxury consumption goods anymore and widely used in the houses. Most of the households have a washing machine (90 %). While the ratio to have an automatic washing machine is high

(80 %), there are thirteen households that do not have an automatic washing machine but only have washing machines (10 %). Five of eight households have secondhand washing machines. It is very low to have a secondhand washing machine among the automatic washing machine owners (4 households) (table.16). The ratio of the household that do not have washing machine is low (9 %) but this increases the labor intensity of the women in these households. Most of the households that do not have a washing machine are included in the households that woman and man do not work (G). In addition to this, there are households that do not have a washing machine in the labor categories F, E, and D and single mother category (H). These labor categories included households that have irregular and unstable income compared to other categories. Income is more irregular in these labor categories compared to other households. There is a washing machine in all households where man has a regular income. More than half of the women stated that they do not operate their washing machines frequently in order to save from electricity and detergent costs.

Dishwasher is not a widely used product like above appliances. Yet, the ratio of dishwasher owners is too low in this research (10 %) (Table 16, see Appendix A). Most of the households that have a dishwasher are included in the labor categories that man regularly works. According to women, dishwasher is luxury consumption good. In fact, all women want to have a dishwasher. It is regarded as luxury consumption good as it does not have primary priority among the needs of the households. Most of the woman stated that it is a torture to wash dishes in winter. The phrase, 'You get used to it, it cannot be helped' is frequently told by the women.

The ratio of the households that do not have a sewing machine is high (62 %) (Table 16, see Appendix A). They are concentrated in the labor categories with irregular and unstable income (G, F, E, and D) and single mother group (H). Most women do not use sewing machine. Women state that they usually purchase clothes in the market as it costs much to sew them.

Most of the households (G, F, E, and H labor categories) do not have a bathing stove (59 %) (Table 17, see Appendix A). The most important difficulty is to bath the children for the households that do not have a bathroom and a bathing stove most women have to have their children to take a bath within the house with water heated on the stove.

Little bottle gas ownership is asked in the household appliances. The price of little bottle gas is lower compared to big bottle gas, and its use is highly common in the households (93 %) (Table 17, see Appendix A). The most important reason to use little bottle gas (more than one) is lack of money. When big bottle gas expired, if there is no money to replace it, then they use previously purchased little bottle gas. Also little bottle gas is an appliance available to borrow it from neighbors to cook. Little bottle gas has an important strategic position for the households with low, unstable, and irregular income. The women suffer most, of cooking in the little bottle gas. While using little bottle gas, women spend more time and effort than spent during normal stove.

Using DVD/VCD player takes place in the widely used consumption goods. It is also a status indicator for many families. More than half of the households have a DVD/VCD player (61 %). DVD/VCD player ownership is concentrated in the households that have regular income (C, B, and A labor categories). DVD/VCD player ownership is low in unemployed labor category and single mothers group (20 %) (Table 18, see Appendix A). The households that own computers are very low (13 %). Computer is necessary for most of the households. It is especially included in the children's needs that are not met. The lack of computer which is used in all spheres of life is felt more by the children.

Usage of mobile phone, another technological device, becomes common along with the DVD/VCD player and computer. Mobile ownership of women (32 %) is lower than men (68 %). The ratio of secondhand mobile phone ownership is low both for women (9 %) and men (14 %). The ratio of mobile phone ownership by

men is higher in the labor categories of regular income of men (Table 19, see Appendix A). The ratio of non-ownership of home phone is 26 per cent among the research categories. These households that do not own a phone are concentrated in the households with relatively poor income (G, F, E, D, and H). The ratio of non-ownership of phone is very high in the households where man is regularly employed (Table 20, see Appendix A).

The ratio of the households that do not have hall suite (70 %), bedroom (65 %), and children room (79 %) is high. All of these are necessary house furniture for women. Hall suite is an important status indicator for women. To have a separate room as to have a computer takes a primary place among the demands of children. The ratio of non-ownership of bedroom and children room is high especially among G and H categories (Table 21 and Table 22, see Appendix A).

Among the labor categories, G, F, and E groups are in relatively worse condition according the socio-demographical properties. Especially the living condition of the labor category G where both man and woman are unemployed is too low according to the number of household members, education, physical conditions of household and owned goods. Lack or irregularity of income presses the minimum living standard too down in these categories.

Relative inequalities in the socio-demographic condition of the households create significant differences in the domestic labor and status of the women. Most of the women are deprived of education. Even the number of household members, education, physical conditions of household and owned goods vary according to the labor categories, this does not differ domestic labor intensities of women. Most of the women are not content with the houses they live. Poor quality and insufficiency of houses create a pressure on the labor of the women. All works necessary for the reproduction of labor (cooking, laundry, washing dishes, child care, etc.) are carried out by unending efforts of women under conditions of deprivation.

6.3. Women's Labor in the Production Processes Against Poverty

In this part, the form and processes of commoditization of women's labor against poverty conditions will be analyzed with respect to labor categories. Women's position in the labor market will be examined under the title of regular and irregular women laborer. In some cases, the dualist conception as formal and informal is insufficient to reveal labor position in the production sphere. New labor processes have changed this kind of dichotomy. Informalization processes have occurred in all sectors of economy. New terms and an expanded definition of labor position are needed in the production processes.

Labor's position in formal sector has been thought to be full-time work, regulated, protected, stable, and organized. On the other hand, informal economy has been characterized by impermanence, inconsistency, part-time work, unprotectedness, insecurity, etc. New capital accumulation processes have changed the labor's position with respect to informalization. In many cases, workers have participated into workforce as contractual and temporary laborers in the formal sector. They might not be organized laborers.

Informalization processes have changed the earlier conceptualization of the informal sector. The classical understanding of it has failed to explain new developments. In the 1970s, the informal sector was seen as the traditional economy and to be marginally productive. It was thought that it existed separately from the formal economy and represented a reserve pool of surplus labor. However, it is now expanding with industrial growth. In contrast to the marginally productive sector, it is a major provider of employment, goods and services for lower-income groups. It is not separate from the formal economy. It is linked with formal economy with respect to capital accumulation. The decline in formal employment, or the informalization of previously formal employment relationships, has affected the rise in informal employment. In addition to the old occupation forms in the informal sector, such as casual day labor in construction

and agriculture, informalization of formal employment have differentiated the informal occupations like temporary and part-time jobs, homework for high tech industries. It was thought before that entrepreneurs in this sector behave or act in an illegal and unregistered way in order to avoid regulation and taxation. However, informal economy is made up of non-standard wage workers as well as entrepreneurs and the self-employed. They produce legal goods and services but with irregular or unregulated means. Informal employment includes not only self-employment but also wage employment, especially regular wage workers.

In this research, the working positions of women and men are examined with respect to the regularity or irregularity of income flows. Women may work in informal sector but earn income in a regular way. For example, a domestic female servant might work as wage laborer for many years in order to subsidize her family. Kalaycıoğlu and Rittersberger-Tılıç's (2001) research about domestic servant reflect this position in the context of Turkey. With respect to income, it may be regular but she may not have any social protection or social insurance. In other cases, a male may be self-employed but may not earn income in a regular way. Both regular and irregular working forms exist in the formal and informal sectors.

6.3.1. Regular Women Laborer

One of the basic conditions of reproduction of labor is the wage work form in capitalist societies. In return for the wage, labor will provide for the necessary goods and services from the market for the reproduction of the laborer himself and his family. Labor, which itself has turned commoditized in the process of capitalist production, always gets lower than the value it creates in return for the commodities it produces. In other words, the wage paid to men who are responsible for making a living for the household is below the necessary amount to the family to reproduce... In Turkey, the proportion that women contribute to production process as active workforce is still lower than that of men. Of women, 15% of city dwellers and 51.9% of rural residents are in labor force. Moreover,

67.5% rural female migrants in shanty-house (*gecekondu*) settlements do not participate in paid work (Directorate General on The Status and Problems of Women, 1994; Gökçe, 1993; Şenyapılı, 1982 cited in Baysu, 2002). According to official statistics, only three out of ten adult women in Turkey, and seven out of ten adult men join working life outside the home. About seven out of every ten women who are within the workforce work as a family worker too, the proportion for men is only one out of ten (SSI, 1996, cited in İlkaracan, 1998: 285). Although women's proportion of participation in the workforce is still very low, financial conditions and hardship of making a living create a pressure on women's labor to become commoditized in urban areas. It is possible to consider women's employment in three different groups. Women taking place in the first group work as free family workers in their family agriculture sector. The women in the second group represent those poor laborer class women who are employed in cities for low wages intense-labor jobs. The others, on the other hand, comprise women with a profession, high education or middle class women (İlkkaracan, 1998: 286). The women who took place in this study concern those who come from poor labor class women.

In this research, 35 regular working women have been interviewed. Of the 35 women, the husbands of 15 participants earn regular wages like themselves. Other fifteen women's husbands work irregularly. Five women who work regularly fall under the single mother category. The majority of women have worked in the service sector (27 women). There are only seven women that work in the manufacturing sector. Only one woman has been working regularly as an unpaid family worker for ten years. The majority of women work in a small number of occupations, particularly in occupations where the workers are predominantly women. All women use their labor power in low status jobs that do not require knowledge or skills. Women's jobs overlap with their positions at home. The majority of women work as cleaners (17), cooks (1), dishwashers (4), and domestic servants (1). There are only three women who work as civil servants in the public sector. All women have social insurance. Regular women

laborers participate in paid work because of economic hardships.

There are only five women who have worked regularly for at least 3 years. While 13 women are in the labor market for between 5 and 9 years, 17 women have worked for over 10 years. The majority of women entered paid work after marriage.

Mesude is 42 years old. She has two daughters (17 and 18). She has been working regularly in a restaurant as a cook since the year 2000. Her husband is a civil servant in the public sector. One of the main reasons for her participation into the paid work is insufficiency of her husband's wage. Indeed, she began to earn money irregularly ten years before. She used to clean offices at weekends.

One salary is not enough nowadays any more. I had to work. My husband is only a civil servant. His earning is too low. My two children are students. If I did not work, what would we do? What can I do without work?¹

Ayşe is one of three civil servant women. She (38 years old) has been working in a public institution for 19 years. She began to work before getting married. Her husband works in a medicine firm. She said:

Our income is not sufficient to live. We stay at my husband's family house. It has two rooms. There is no separate room for my son and daughter. At least, we don't have to worry about rent. Being a civil servant is to be hungry in Turkey. We constantly live on credit card. There is no another alternative. Sometimes I wonder if we spend too much. I am not sure. Shoes, they are necessary. I have to buy.²

¹ Tek maaş artık günümüzde yetmiyor ki. Çalışmak zorunda kaldım. Kocam sadece bir memur. Kazancı çok az. İki çocuk okuyo. Eğer ben çalışmasaydım napardık. Çalışmanın dışında ne yapabilirim ki?

² Gelirimiz yaşamamız için yetmiyor. Kocamın annesinin babasının evinde oturuyoruz. İki odası var. Kızım ve oğlum için ayrı bir oda yok. En azından kir derdimiz yok. Memur olmak Türkiye de aç olmaktır. Devamlı kredi kartına bağlı yaşıyoruz. Başka seçenek yok ki. Bazen acaba çok mu harcıyoruz diye merak ediyorum. Bazen düşünüyorum. Emin değilim. Ayakkabı almak almak zorundayım.

She earns around 450 YTL. per a month. Limitations of public spending and decreasing real wages have affected many families as did hers. Despite the fact that she entered labor force many years before, she still has to examine whether shoes are a necessity or luxury.

A significant number of women considered as working regularly in this research works in the service sector as cleaners. Women fall into two categories from the viewpoint of work status. The women in the first group are on the laborer status within the institution they work for and therefore have relative work security and union rights. They have more social rights. The women in the second group have no other affiliations other than the job they perform within the institution in which they work. They are laborers on temporary contract tied to a private cleaning company. They have social security but they are laid off once every year (for a month). The employer registers them in the records to show as if these women have newly been employed a month later. This is an important policy applied by the employer to reduce labor costs. Like the women in the first group, although the workers appear to be making a regular living, there is no guarantee within the job itself. Women have the fear of being laid off every day. The women working on temporary contract status are laborers who only have regular payments with insurance coverage during the time they are actively working; however, they have no other security for their future. Although women do the same work in the same institution, one of the important deprivations of women's experiences is work insecurity.

Emine works as a cleaner at a public institution. She is a private company personal as a laborer on temporary contract status. Each year her contract is cancelled. A month later, she is re-employed as if she were starting this job just newly. Her husband works at the same place with a permanent laborer status. Her greatest wish is to work on permanent contract like her husband, yet her old age and that she is a primary school graduate prevent her from becoming a permanent laborer.

At first, it wasn't so hard to be a permanent laborer. My children were small then. There was no one to look after them. My husband works here. I regret it now. I wish I had started to work here then. When I started (work) in the company my young girl was eight years. My other two girls were grown then. But when the small one started school I started working. School expenses increased. It's not enough. If I didn't work we wouldn't have been able to buy this house. I endured a lot. Thank God now I work. No one knows what will become of us. One day we may find that we are sacked from work.³

Employment of laborers on temporary contract policy is practiced in manufacturing sector quite common too. One of the important characteristics of post-fordist production process is the flexible use of labor in production process. As Atkinson stated, labor in the new production processes undergo change in itself depending on the place within production process. Labor has been divided into two in factories. First, labor involves safe and orderly organized and constant regular work. The other covers laborers who are employed when there is work depending on the product that the employer produces, but then who are laid off once the work is done.

Halime (41 years old) is a woman representing the laborers who fall into the first category. She has been working at a factory producing stoves on temporary contract. There are about 250 laborers in the factory where she works. However, the number of laborers who work on permanent laborer status is not high (under 100). Halime feels that she is quite lucky compared to temporary workers. "When the work is finished, so does their wage. I feel sorry. They have a family and children too. If they laid me off, they will still have to pay me". There is not a union syndicate in the factory where Halime works. She said that "the boss says he will close this place down if the union gets in there". Halime's husband is a

³ Önceleri kadrolu işçi olmak bu kadar zor değildi. O zamanlar çocuklarım küçüktü. Onlara bakacak kimse yoktu. Kocam burda çalışıyor. Şimdi çok pişmanım. Keşke o zamanlar buraya başlasaydım. Şirkete başladığımda küçük kızım sekiz yaşındaydı. Diğer iki kızım büyümüştü. Ancak küçük kız da okula başlayınca çalışmaya başladım. Okul masrafları çoğaldı. Yetmiyor. Ben çalışmasaydım bu evi de alamazdık. Çok çektim. Allah'a çok şükür şimdi çalışıyorum. Ne olacağımız belli değil. Bir bakmışsın yarın işten çıkardılar.

laborer in the same factory as well. He got laid off in 1994 while he was working there as a laborer in the factory. Halime started to work just because her husband got sacked from his job:

They sacked my husband while he was working at the factory. They paid compensation. We got by with that for a while, we managed. Then I started to work. At fist I didn't know anywhere. Now I know everything. I wore out but I can still manage. The kid has got used tot it. S/he (gender not indicated) used to stay alone. S/he was small. We had the house done. We got this land with the money my husband got. I worked hard. I worked in the factory at night. I carried bricks during the day. Cooking meals for the laborers, making the tea. I endured a lot to reach these days. I wish I had started to work the first time I came here (1981).⁴

Her family's state is a relatively better among those in the labor categories. She has two daughters (22 and 20) and a son (13). Both of her daughters work regularly. Her older daughter is a worker in a textile factory. Although she saves her wages for her portion in wedding expenses, she gives it to her parents to save for difficult times. As it is known, traditional network is very important with respect to finding jobs in Turkey. Thanks to her mother, she began her work in the factory. Getting more than one salary has improved her family's life a lot. Halime's labor has enormously affected her family's life course. Although she has worked as a wageworker for 10 years, she has changed her family's destiny at the expense of her hard work. Throughout her life, she has used her labor power in both the production and reproduction processes.

Although Emine (30) has realized her labor power like Halime in domestic and production spheres, her labor is not remunerated. She works as unpaid family labor. Her husband is self-employed. They financially support themselves by

⁴ Kocam fabrikada çalışırken işten atıldılar. Tazminat verdiler. Bir süre onunla idare ettik, geçindik. Sonra çalışmaya başladım. İlk bir yer bilmezdim. Şimdi her şeyi biliyorum. Yıpranıyordum ama idare ederim. Çocuk alışı. O zamanlar yalnız kalırdı. Küçüktü. Evi yaptırdık. Kocamın aldığı parayla bu arsayı aldık. Çok çalıştım. Gece çalışırdım fabrikada. Gündüzleri tuğla taşırdım. İşçilere yemek yap, çay yap. Bu günlere gelene kadar çok çektim. Buraya (Eskişehir'e 1981 yılında göç ediyorlar) ilkin geldiğimde çalışsaydım keşke.

selling eggs. They migrated to Eskişehir in 1995 from a village near Eskişehir. Talking with men, I learned his work history. After migrating, he changed many jobs from 1995 to 1997. He began to sell cracked eggs. Then one day a self-employed woman said to him: “You are an honest person. We can run a business together. Here is the deal: I give you eggs, and then you sell them. Your face shows you are a peasant. So, everyone will think that your eggs are fresh from village”. He accepted her idea and began selling eggs. Emine and her husband go to district markets to sell them three times a week. Cracked eggs are separated from uncracked ones, and then they are put in boxes. Emine does all these tasks. Then she goes to markets to sell them. He said, “If my wife comes with me, it is easy to sell them. As we sell them, we say that they are village eggs and are very fresh. She impresses buyers by looking like a peasant woman.’ He adds, “My wife helps me”. In fact, Emine is involved in all processes of the work. She spends enormous efforts in packing and selling. She never gets any money from her husband. She gives all the money earned from selling eggs to his husband after coming back home in the evening. She has four sons. She is also responsible for the domestic chores. Moreover, she sometimes cleans the stairs in the apartment block at the weekends. She has internalized all these things. The effort she spends is very normal for her. In the meantime, they bought a house in a very bad condition. However, owning a house is very important for them.

Like Emine’s family, Kezban migrated to Eskişehir with her husband and children ten years before but they did not have a chance like Emine’s family in terms of earning income. Her husband works irregularly. She said “He was unemployed for three months. He has just found a job. He has been working as a construction worker for 20 days”. Kezban (40 years old) has been working as a cleaning attendant in a public hospital for 5 years but she is not personnel or in a permanent position. She is a worker in a private cleaning company. She works as a contractual worker in the hospital. She is laid off for a month every year. After a month, she renews her contract with her firm. She earns approximately 400 YTL. per month. She said, “I wish I worked with the state. I am thinking of my

future. It would be guaranteed”. They live in a very small house in which there are only two rooms. The toilet is outdoors. She says:

I am tired of living in this house. All day I work, I do not come home. It is so old. Clean. Clean but it is unseen. My daughter cannot invite her friends. I am tired of everything. Sometimes I think of suicide. I am suffering. You’ve seen it all. I’ve just come in. He is out. Worries...Worries. Everyday, it is the same. I get headaches thinking about what to cook.⁵

For Kezban, the most important reason for participating in working life is her husband’s irregular work. Aynur (37) has been working as a cleaning worker for 6 years. Her husband is a seasonal worker. He works for six months a year, and then he is unemployed during the other six months. At first, her husband did not let her work. But eventually she began to work ten years ago. “I went to clean houses secretly. I hid it from my husband at first, but then he saw that extra money was good. Three children are going to school in this house. I had to work”. In spite of the poverty condition, patriarchy is still an important obstacle for women’s working as a waged worker. Aynur’s highly suffering from poverty caused her to fight against her husband’s power.

Economic crisis in Turkey has also affected many small-scale entrepreneurs or small-scale producers. Reyhan’s husband had a small coffee store. He received bank loan but then he could not pay it back, so he had to close down his shop. That is why Reyhan began to work after the age of 40. She has been working as a contractual cleaning worker in a public institution. “I wish I were a civil servant. I graduated from high school but because of my age, it was too late”. Her husband has been unemployed for four months. Her children (17 and 10) go to school. After her husband went bankrupt, they settled in their parents’ home.

When my husband went bankrupt our life was also over. It is

⁵ Bu evde yaşamaktan bıktım artık. Bütün gün çalışıyorum. Eve bile dönmek istemiyorum. Çok eski bir ev. Temizle temizle görünmüyor bile. Kızım eve arkadaşlarını bile çağırıyor. Her gün aynı. Ne pişireceğimi düşünmekten başıma ağrılar giriyor.

impossible to pay our debts with 400 YTL. I make with that we can only fill our stomach. We have no rent to pay. That is all.

The majority of regular women laborers with irregularly working husbands joined the production sphere after they got married (14 women). The working period of majority of regular women laborers (10 women) varies between five and seven years. There are only five women who worked for more than ten years. All of these women's husbands are irregular workers, especially seasonal workers (13 men) in the construction sector. The other three men are self-employed but do not earn money in a regular way. Because of the irregular income transfer into the household from male work, women's regular wages become very important for a household's well-being. However, the women's working period is also important on the degree of the family's welfare. Women who started working life many years ago have increased their families' welfare relatively more than women who joined the production sphere later. House ownership can be given as an example of a welfare indicator. It was very important to be saved from paying rent for all households in this research.

As different from Kezban and Reyhan, Neriman (42), Ayhan (47), Gülperi (35), Tenzile (52), Behice (51) have been regularly working for more than 10 years. Their husbands have always worked irregularly. They have subsidized their families for many years. Tenzile has been working since she was 22. She has been working in a factory as a worker for 16 years. She has got social insurance and she is a member of the trade union in the factory. She is an organized worker. Her husband is a seasonal worker in the construction sector. It was her who mainly subsidized the family. "I bought this house. I did everything. I bought this car for my son. If I hadn't been working, this would have been impossible. Women must be thrifty. She has got money today, tomorrow maybe not. Now he is ill". Having a regular work by all these women has made an important impact on the welfare of their family. Their common idea is that women have to save money.

Habibe (31, civil servant), Gülhan (35, cleaning worker), Vasfiye (48, cleaning worker), Meryem (39, cleaning worker) and Nurcan (37 dishwasher) are single mothers working in a regular way. Except for Nurcan (widow), all of them are divorced. Only Habibe had begun to work before her marriage. Other women had to get into the workforce after a divorce or the loss of their husband. Vasfiye got divorced from her husband 15 years ago. She lives with her son. He has been working in a factory for two years. She said:

My husband left us suddenly. We came to Eskişehir. My sister lives here. I did not have money. I cried every day. My son was 9 nine years old. My relative found a job for me. I have changed many jobs since then. Thank God. I am better than in the past. I suffered. I am waiting for my retirement.⁶

Except for Gülhan, other single mothers have received support from their young children and relatives. Habibe began to live with her mother after the divorce. As she is only a civil servant in a public institution, her mother's income is very important for her. Meryem, Vasfiye and Nurcan have young children. They also work like their mothers, and their income has helped lift the burden off the shoulders of their mothers. Among divorced women, excluding Habibe, no one has any financial aid from a man for their children. Habibe struggled incredibly to get alimony from ex-husband in the court. She states:

His job is very good. He earns more money but he is not giving any money for his son. At first, I did not want to take any money. Later, I started to think that he is his son too. We got divorced five years ago. He began to pay regularly only in the last ten months.⁷

Among the regular single mother laborers, Gülhan lives in the worst condition.

⁶ Kocam bizi aniden terk etti. Eskişehir'e geldik. Kardeşim burada yaşıyordu. Her gün ağlardım. O zaman oğlum 9 yaşındaydı. Akrabalarım benim için iş buldu. O kadar çok iş değiştirdim ki bu zamana kadar. Allah'a şüktür. Öncesinden daha iyiyim şimdi. Çok çektim. Emekliliğimi bekliyorum.

⁷ Onun işi çok iyi. Çok para kazanır fakat çocuğu için para vermez. İlk başta hiç para almak istememiştim. Sonra düşündüm ki çocuk onunda çocuğu. Beş yıl önce boşandık. Son altı aydır düzenli para ödemeye başladı.

She got divorced from her husband 3 years ago. She does not take any financial support from her family, and from her ex-husband. She has got two children (17 and 12). Her income is only 450 YTL. She is also a tenant. She said, “When I find an extra job, I work at the weekends”. Her participation in labor force is not as long (3 years) as other women. She is the sole earner. The income that flows into her household is not as high as others. Moreover, lack of additional income transfer has deeply worsened her living condition. It can be said that if one or more members of the household are regularly employed, income flows into the household become higher. This relatively increases the household welfare.

6.3.2. Irregular Women Laborer

That the new labor processes are becoming more flexible and job areas are getting narrower creates a significant amount of stress on women working in temporary jobs. Women’s responsibilities within the house are among the important factors that make them enter irregular jobs. Women’s level of education and their age prevent them from taking place in labor market as regular, secure and organized workforce. This situation has affected women’s working in the areas, which are insecure, low-paid, and irregular jobs (Kalaycıoğlu and Rittersberger-Tılıç, 2001). Women generally work as cleaning workers. They view their job in a low status. They define themselves as a housewife but not as a paid worker (Ecevit, 1990).

Interviews were held with 34 women who have irregular jobs. The husbands of these 15 women also have irregular jobs like themselves, and the husbands of the other 15 women make a regular living. Among 34 regular women laborers, four women are single mothers. Most of the women with irregular jobs work as housecleaners (18) and as seasonal workers in fields (12). Other women work as a baby-sitter (1), cook/dishwasher (1), street peddler, (1) and massager and bathing attendant in a Turkish bath (1 female). 58% of the women have been earning money for more than 5 years. The majority of regular working men work

as workers in the manufacture sector (21). Other regular men laborers work as civil servants (1), janitors (3), self- employed workers (3), drivers (1) and cooks (1). Irregular men laborers work as drivers, seasonal workers, and painters. The majority of women began to work after getting married.

Most of the women started to work because the money that their husbands make is not sufficient for a living. The cleaning job is not a continuous regular job for women. The working period of those women who work as seasonal workers in fields ranges between May and September. Women in cleaning and fieldwork exert intensive labor. The women earning their wages based on the number of days that they work in a field do not have any social security. The money they are paid ranges between 12 and 15 YTL. for a day's work. The work time they spend in the field is around 12 hours. Since the interviews took place while the women were working in the field, it was possible to observe their working conditions. These women make great effort under very harsh conditions and work full-time 7 days a week.

Arzu (41 years old) has been working as seasonal worker for eleven years in the field. Her husband earns minimum wage. She has two sons (21 and 16 years old.). Her elder son has been working in a medicine firm for a year.

What are you gonna do if you don't work? I have healthy arms and legs. Will one man's wage be ever enough... I don't have to rely on his money. Work and work in the fields till evening. One of the boys is going to school. The other has just started a job. Life is expensive. Two children. You need to know the value of money. Now I look around me, I say to my man am I a fool. For God's sake I work and I work. I say I wish I had gone to school. I suffered so much hard times. I didn't have water; I washed laundry in the snow. That's why I know the value of my things.⁸

⁸ Napcan çalışmayıp. Elim ayağım tutuyor. Bir adamın maaşı yeter mi...onun eline bakmıyorum. akşama kadar çalış. çalış toprakda. Oğlanın biri okuyo. Diğeri daha yeni işe girdi. Hayat pahalı. iki çocuk. Paramın kıymetini bilecen. Ben şimdi etrafıma bakıyorum, adama diyom ki, ben enayimiyim. Allah aşkına çalışıyom çalışıyom. Keşke okumuş olsaydım diyom. Ben çok çile çektim. Benim suyum yopktu, ben karın altında çamaşır yıkadım. Onun içinde malımın kıymetini bilirim.

Hatice (45 years old) has been working for 17 years in the field as a seasonal worker like Arzu. Her husband is a laborer at a construction company. He earns 450 YTL. His 23-year-old son is unemployed.

See this boy isn't working. No jobs. No occupation. He didn't read at school. They don't take him to a state job. He couldn't even finish high school. I have to work. He will get married soon some day. How can you get married? No money. This man's wages is short of filling our mouths. I have rheumatism. My legs hurt. I have been working in the fields for 17 years in water. You saw our state in the fields. There is no money for no work.⁹

Hatice's 17 years of work has had an important impact on the family's welfare. Hatice and her husband moved from one of Eskişehir's villages to the city 17 years ago with their children. Ever since they settled down in Eskişehir, she has been working in the fields as a seasonal worker. She has relations in the same district. They are buying over the land that their house is located on with the help of Hatice's father. Since her husband's wage is not sufficient to meet the household expenses and the house construction costs, she is obligated to work. Although Hatice has been working for 17 years, she still suffers from lack of social security. "If only I had insurance. All those years that I worked went for nothing. Now I would have gotten retired. I trust my husband's insurance too. The retirement money will be enough for us when he retires." Her son does not work so he does not have health insurance. He cannot rely on his father's insurance because he is over the age limit. He was operated on his kidneys six months ago. They owe 2, 000 NTL to the hospital but they cannot afford to pay it. They applied to be given a Green Card (Health Aid Card for poor) but they did not get a positive reply.

Besides Hatice, none of the other women who have irregular jobs has social security. Those whose husbands have a regular job rely on their husband's health

⁹ Bak bu oğlan çalışmıyor. İş yok. Mesleği yok. Okumadı. Devlet işine almıyorlar. Liseyi bile bitiremedi. Mecbur çalışıyorum. Yarın bir gün evlenecek. Nasıl evlensin. Para yok. Bu adamın maaşı boğazımıza yetmiyor. Romatizmam var. Bacaklarım ağrıyor. 17 senedir tarlalarda çalışıyorum. Suların içinde. Tarlada halimizi gördün. Çalışmaya para yok.

insurance coverage. Fatma (30 years old) has been working as a house cleaning lady 3 days a week for a year. She makes 250 YTL. Two years ago she worked as a shop assistant for four months. Her husband has a shop selling electronics parts. His earnings just meet the shop's rent and expenses. Fatma spends her earnings on the kitchen expenses of the house. Neither of them has social security.

Sıdıka (42 years old) has been living in Eskişehir for 21 years. She has three children. Her husband works in a factory. She began to work twelve years ago in the field as a seasonal worker. She has been working for ten years in a Turkish bath. She works in the ladies Turkish bath 2 days a week. Her income for a day has changed (between 30 and 75 YTL.) She works around 15 hours a week. She works from 5 in the morning till 7 or 8 in the evening in the Turkish bath.

We were having a house constructed. We were tight. Then I went to fields. We had a lot of debts. As the children grew up, their expenses grew. All three children go to school. I pay the private course expenses for my daughters. If only I had insurance. We failed to have it done externally. I never made enough to afford it. There is no end to needs.¹⁰

The biggest problem in the households where both women and men work irregularly is the lack of social security. Except for one, none of the women working in irregular jobs have social security (33 women). Although women have jobs to bring in wages, they miss out on the security of retirement. The number of men with social security among the men with irregular jobs (15 men) is very low (5 men). These men pay externally for retirement. However, since their income is irregular they have difficulty paying their monthly premium.

Sebahat (52 years old) is the only woman who pays her retirement insurance premiums externally. She and her husband together were self-employed up to five

¹⁰ Ev yaptırıyorduk. Elimiz dardı. O zaman bahçelere çalışmaya gittim. Borcumuz çoktu. Çocuklar büyüdükçe masrafları arttı. Çocukların üçü de okula gidiyor. Kızların dersane paralarını ben ödüyorum. Sigortam olaydı. Dışarıdan yatıramadık. O kadar çok kazanmadım. İhtiyaçlar bitmiyor ki.

years ago. They had a shop in which they sold clothes. However, they went bankrupt in 2000, when they could not pay their debts to the bank. They sold all their possessions to be able to cover their debts (their house, summer house, and car). Now she has been making a living by street peddling, selling clothing items at the district she lives for four years.

There are four single mothers among the irregular women laborers. Nuriye (35 years old, divorced) is one of them who goes to the field to work in the summer. She lives with her two children and her mother. Indeed, she began to work before she got married.

I was single. It was 1987 I guess. I work as a sales representative. I started to work in a shop. I worked there for six years. I had insurance. They reported a shorted period though I worked a longer time for them. We argued for this. I left. Then I worked as short as 6 months in a temporary job, at a girls dormitory, in around 1992-1993. Then I went to a construction company. I worked in the construction company for a longer time. I worked there until 2000. The work system there was good, the money I got was good too. I saved some money. Then the company went bankrupt. I entered another company. Then I got married. I should not have quit my job even after I got married. Leaving my job was a big mistake. Because you need to have your personal financial power, whether you are a woman or a man. I should not have had to leave my job anyhow. The reason for my leaving my job is my husband. Even after I had left that job, I would still have been able to find a job easily for I had experience. Now I regret that of course. Then we separated. Now I live with my mother with my two kids. I go to the fields in the summer. I am looking for a job but it is very hard to find one now.¹¹

¹¹ Bekardım. 1987 idi heralde. Satış temsilciliği yapmışım. Bir mağazada başladım. Orada altı sene çalıştım. Sigortam vardı. Uzun zaman çalışmama rağmen, az çalıştı gösterdiler, bu yüzden tartışmalara girdik. Oradan ayrıldım.. Sonra 6 ay gibi bir süre geçici çalıştım, kız yurdunda. 1992-1993 gibi. Daha sonra inşaat şirketine geçtim. İnşaat şirketinde daha uzun çalıştım. 2000'e kadar orada çalıştım. Orda çalışma sistemi güzeldi, aldığım para da çok iyiydi. Para biriktirmiştim. Sonra şirket iflas etti. Başka şirkete işe girdim. Sonra evlendim. Evlensem de işimi bırakmamam gerekiyordu. İşimi bırakmam çok büyük hata. Çünkü, kadın olsun erkek olsun kendi parasal gücü mutlaka olması gerekiyor. İşimi bırakmak zorunda kalmamalıydım işte. Benim işi bırakmamdaki sebep eşim. Ben işten çıkmış olsaydım bile deneyimim olduğu için çok rahat iş bulabilirdim. Şimdi pişmanın tabii ki. Sonra ayrıldık. İki çocuğumla beraber annemle oturuyorum. Yazları tarlaya gidiyorum. İş arıyorum ama bulmak çok zor artık.

Even if women join the production process, getting married and patriarchal relationships can still have an impact on staying back home. The women with no financial liberty struggle to recreate a life on their own after they get separated or their husbands die. Ayşe's story is one of the most significant examples for how poverty turns into a family drama. Ayşe and her husband together work in a butcher's shop they own for 24 years. Ayşe's husband commits suicide since he cannot pay the debts they have to the bank two years ago. Ayşe has four children. The bank takes over the house following her husband's death. Ayşe is 42 years old and now lives with the problems and hardships of looking after four children following her husband's suicide. What makes Ayşe sad is that her daughter cannot go to the university she has been accepted to. Her daughter has been working in a cleaning company for two years for 290 YTL. a month.

We had no other choice. She says mother don't be sorry, it's all right if I don't go to school, but this mother's heart cannot take it. This daughter of mine (7 years old) found her father hanged. She is not psychologically fine. Her teacher is taking care of her. God bless her. It is hard to endure this.

Women were asked whether working helps them lift the hardships of living off their shoulders. In spite of the fact that their earning is very low, a little more than half of the women (55%) agreed. Among the regular women laborers, the amount of women who stated that they were free from hardships of living because of their work is 30%. The answers "yes" and "no" are structured and have a limiting content. Most of the women who replied with "yes" make a comparison with the time when they were not working. On the other hand, such statements as "eases a little bit", "better than nothing", "of course it frees you, you cannot do without work, at least the market costs are earned" indicate that they still have difficulty making a living. Choosing to use the word "hardship in living" instead of "poverty" is a purposeful preference. Most of the women refrain from describing themselves as poor. Working women consider the meaning of "poor" to mean those who are generally hungry, homeless and jobless.

Among the regular women laborers, the 40% of women are doing extra work in their leisure time, especially on the weekends. Among the additional jobs that women do, house and office cleaning are at the top of the list. Kadriye works as a cleaning worker at a state institution. Besides this, she contributes to the family income by tailoring for money. Like Kadriye, Özlem works five days a week. She also works as a seasonal laborer at the fields on the weekends. While Emine works as a family laborer selling eggs in the market with her husband, she also goes to weddings to wash the dishes. Both women carry coal for money. All of the single women who work regularly (5 women) are compelled to do extra work in order to enable reproduction of themselves and their children.

Among irregular women laborers, the 17% do embroidery at home for money. Women earn 10 YTL. per ball from the embroidery they make. The money that women and men earn in the production process falls below the efforts they make. The working women who do additional jobs exert a significant level of effort doing house chores as well in the production process. The distinguishing factor of women poverty is the loss of value of women's work in both areas.

Most of the working women are not content with the jobs that they do (88,4 %). Women suffer from serious deprivation, as they cannot work at the jobs that they would desire. Two women laborers are satisfied with their jobs. They are organized and regular workers in the factory. Six women said that they wished that they did not have to work. Women who do not work any more now work as cleaning workers.

The regularly working women express their wishes on the jobs that they would like to do in the following way:

“I would have liked to open a store. With a high rate of profits, I would like to do a job of my own”.

“I wish I were working at a desk”.

“I would have liked to be a nurse or a teacher, to be useful for people” .

“I wish I had had schooling and done better to reach better positions, I would have liked to work as an official”.

“I would have liked to work at a more comfortable job and less tiring job with fewer hours”.

“I would have liked to be so many things, a bank clerk, a teacher, a doctor, I mean so many things”.

“I wish I were working in a state position at a secure job, I would think about my future, it would be guaranteed”.

“I would have liked to do a real estate agent”.

“I would have preferred to go to school and become a civil servant; it is regular, guaranteed, secure. I was my greatest dream”.

“I would work at an insured job”.

“I would work at a comfortable job that would keep my head dry” (She works at a sugar factory in the fields from day till evening).

The women with irregular jobs express their wishes of the jobs they wish they could do in the following:

“I would have liked to work in food business kneading dough, and open a shop making savory rolls (simit), pastries”.

“I would prefer to work at an insured job, cleaning at a hospital or planting saplings in the forest”

“I would do a virtuous and honest job”

“I would do confectionary job, work with machinery”

“At a comfortable job where it is dry and not wet or there is no rain, a cleaning job for instance”

”I wish I were working at an insured job”

“I would work at a secure and guaranteed job”

“I would work at a job with regular wages and insurance. At least I would have had 10 years of insurance”

“I would start my own business, like a restaurant”

“I would not mind what the job would be so long as it had insurance”

“If I had gone to school, I would have wanted to get a good profession, a job with a salary, high wages”

“I would work at a job with insurance, then I would have retirement”

“I would have liked to be a laborer or a civil servant; at least there would be health insurance, retirement, a guaranteed job”

“I wish I had gone to school and had a position, to work at a better job, I passed the exam to enter medicine school but my family could not send me because of any money”.

As can be seen, it is important to work at regular jobs with high pay, an insurance and retirement security for women. Most women are aware that education plays an important role in finding better jobs and lack of education is a significant deprivation. The jobs that women are working in now lack security and provide low pay and status; for this reason, they would like to work as teachers, nurses, civil servants or factory workers.

6.3.3. Are Non-Working Women Housewives or Unemployed?

The women who cannot work or those who are unemployed lead their lives as dependent on their husbands' income as they cannot join the reproduction process by getting a job for their families or themselves. One of the important factors preventing women in Turkey from working outside the home is gender-based work distribution. Most of the women whose positions in society and their family have been that of a wife and a mother cannot join in the workforce. Patriarchal ideology evaluates women's place to be inside the home. On the other hand, men's position is seen as the breadwinner. Women's participation into workforce is thought as a threat to the male image as the breadwinner as well as to the family honor (Erman, Kalaycıoğlu and Rittersberger-Tılıç, 2002). Depriving women of educational opportunities is another factor that pushes them further away from work. In addition, traditional relationship networks and social pressure prevent women from actively participating in the production process (Akın, Kardam and Toksöz, 1998). Although the patriarchal structure and Islamic values that prevent women from workforce are significant, the structural features of economy are also important (Ecevit, 1990).

The term housewife is a concept that ideologically conceals the relationship between women and joblessness. Women's unemployment is concealed both in studies on poverty and in macro scale statistical analyses. Women's status is indicated in statistical terms as that of a housewife. Yet all women want to have a place in the production process actively. Behind the answer "no" that women give to the question "Do you want to work in a paid job?" lie factors that prevent women from working. "No, my children are an obstacle for me to work", "no, because my husband does not let me" or "because of my age, I am not capable of working". Actually, most women are a part of the unemployed crowd, who would like to work as paid workers although they may not be actively looking for a job. The women who are invisibly unemployed are those who live as dependent on their men's income, laborers who are in the domestic sphere of the labor process.

In the study interviews were held with 51 unemployed women. Among them, fifteen women's husbands work in a regular way. Regular male laborers work as laborers in the factory (10 men), civil servants in public institutions (2 men) and petty-commodity producers (3 men). Their working period has been longer than ten years. The average of earnings varies between 400 and 800 YTL. The other fifteen women's husbands work in an irregular way. The majority of men (7 men) work as temporary workers in the construction sector. The others work at whatever job they can find. Fifteen women's husbands are unemployed. There are six non-working women who are single mothers.

The women were asked if they wanted to work. The majority of the women answered "yes" (84.3%). Indeed, women who said "no" would like to participate into the workforce (15.7%). Most of the women have worked at a job to earn income at some point in their lives (66%). There are still women who do work at home for money (such as embroidery, lace crocheting, and knitting) (31%).

The women want to work for particularly in order that they get out of hardship of living, gain independence, have their own money, build security for their future and contribute to home economy. Among the reasons that prevent them from working are caring for their children, husbands' not letting them work, being at an age inadequate for starting to work and having an ailment. Among the women who have husbands with regular jobs, there are only three women who expressed that they did not want to work. "No, my husband's income is enough, he will not let me" or "No, my baby is newly born, too young".

Ayşe's husband works in a regular way.

My husband won't let me, I would have some money in my pocket, I would spend it as I wished. Now I am doing lacework at home, 5 YTL. per ball. I worked before I got married but I quit

because my husband did not allow me to.¹²

Aynur is 30 years old. Her husband is a regular worker. She says:

I want to work so much but I cannot work because of my children. There is no one to leave them to. My husband gets minimum wage. I would have my own income instead of depending on my husband; I would buy whatever I wanted. I had worked in the fields before I got married. I made my bridal case with that.¹³

Sevgi is 33 years old. She has three children. Her husband is a regular worker.

I wish to work for money; I would have social security, a future for the children, security when I grow old. A woman should be able to stand on her own feet. My children are barrier. They take a lot of time. Sometimes I go for cleaning stairs. I went to do cleaning for a year two years ago. I am looking after old mother-in-law. The children are small.¹⁴

Among the non-working women, whose husbands work as an irregular way and who do not have another female at home, all women want to work as a laborer on wages. For Fatma (31 years old) working is so important. She says:

My husband doesn't let me. I would have been able to earn financial income to manage and straighten out my children's state; I would have benefited a lot as well. I tried it last year for a year; I worked as a cashier at a bread factory. At the time I had attempted to leave my husband but my mother-in-law didn't look after my children. I went to my mother's for 7 months; maybe if I had

¹²Eşim izin vermiyor, cebimde param olurdu, özgürce harcardım. Şu anda evde dantel örüyorum, yumağı 5 YTL. Evlenmeden önce çalışmıştım ama kocam çalışmama izin vermediği için ayrılmıştım.

¹³Çalışmayı çok istiyorum ama çocuklarımdan dolayı çalışmıyorum. Onları bırakacak kimse yok. Eşim asgari ücret alıyor. Eşime bağlı olmaksızın kendi gelirim olurdu, istediğimi alırdım. Evlenmeden önce köyde tarlada çalıştım. O parayla da çeyizimi yaptım

¹⁴ Maddi açıdan çalışmak isterdim, sosyal güvencem olurdu, çocuklara gelecek, yaşlanınca geleceğim olurdu. Bir bayan iki ayağının üzerinde dikilebilmeli. Çocuklarım engel. Onlara çok zaman gidiyor. Bazen merdiven silmeye gidiyorum. İki sene önce bir sene temizliğe gittim. Yaşlı kaynanama bakıyorum. Çocuklar da küçük.

found a job, I wouldn't have come back; I came back because of financial reasons; now my husband and I are together. My husband makes such pressure.¹⁵

In addition to financial conditions, women's poverty deepens through patriarchal structures and relations. Men's power over women's life deprives them from participating in the production process. Although women are aware of men's oppression, they cannot do any thing. They are also aware of the necessity of working to free them of their husband's oppression but it is not easy to find jobs for them. Moslem's husband is a casual worker. She is 28 years old. She is conscious of most things. She states:

I would like to work. Particularly to break free from the house, but they don't let me. We live 3 families together. If I need to leave my husband one day, I need to make enough money to keep my children with me. That is why I am attending the municipality's courses. I should learn about these things so that I can make money in the future. It is so difficult to find a job. I am doing lace work and knitting at home but the money is not much. I had worked as a shop attendant for 3 months before I got married.¹⁶

There are only 3 women who have applied to the employment office to find a job. Selma is 30 years old. She has two children. Her husband is a worker in a public institution. She said:

I want it to become economically free from hardships, for myself and to be creative. I have been looking for a job for 6 months. I have applied to the employment office. I don't do much work at

¹⁵ Eşim izin vermiyor, çocuklarımın durumunu toparlamak için, ekonomik gelir elde ederdim, bana da çok faydası olurdu. Geçen sene bir yıl denedim, ekmek fabrikasında kasiyer olarak çalıştım. O sıralar eşimden ayrılmaya kalkmıştım ama kaynanam çocuklarıma bakmadı. 7 ay annemin yanına gittim, belki bir iş bulsaydım geri dönmezdim, ekonomik nedenlerden dolayı geri döndüm, şu anda eşimle beraberiz. Eşim çok baskı yapıyor.

¹⁶ Çalışmayı istiyorum. Özellikle evden kurtulmak için, ama izin vermiyorlar. 3 aile birlikte oturuyoruz. Yarın bir gün kocamı terk etmek gerekirse, çocuklarımı yanıma alabilmek için para kazanmam lazım. Belediyenin kurslarına bu yüzden geliyorum. Bu işleri öğreneyim ki para kazanayım ileride. İş bulmak zor. Evde dantel, örgü oya yapıyorum ama parası çok değil. Evlenmeden önce sadece 3 ay tezgâhtarlık yapmıştım.

home for now. I have done ironing work for 15 days, worked at a kindergarten.¹⁷

Ümmühan is 37 years old. Her husband is a civil servant in a public institution. She has got two children. She says:

I want to work for economic reasons. My husband is a civil servant. His salary is not enough. We cannot make it for the children's school expenses. I have applied to the employment office but no reply has come yet. I will do whatever job comes. I have never worked before. I do lacework, embroidery at home. At least this brings money for the bread.¹⁸

Most of the women whose husbands are unemployed (14 women) stated that they wanted to work outside the home. However, their children's young age prevents them from working. Only one woman wants to work, as she wants to ease the hardships of managing a living. 'I am looking for a job in order to find a way out of making a living. I have applied to confectionary and sewing ateliers. My friend has a small tailoring shop; I am going to work for her until I find a job'.

Among the women who do not work outside the home, 2 are widows and the other 4 are divorcees. Of these, there is only one female who wants to work outside the home. She (25 years old) is divorced and has two children. She depends on her father's wage. Other women do not want to work because their age (between 45 and 52) and health barriers from doing paid work. The widows sustain their life through their husbands' wage. The two divorcees depend on their father's wages.

All of the women who do not work outside the home rely on the man's (husband

¹⁷ Ekonomik sıkıntılardan kurtulmak için, kendim için, yaratıcı olmak için çalışmak istiyorum. 6 aydır iş arıyorum. İş ve işçi bulma kurumuna başvurduğum. Şu an da evde bir iş yapmıyorum. Daha önce 15 gün ütü yaptım, anaokulunda çalıştım.

¹⁸ Maddi nedenlerden dolayı çalışmak istiyorum. Eşim memur. Maaşı yetmiyor. Çocukların okul masraflarını yetiştiremiyoruz. İş ve işçi bulma kurumuna başvurduğum ama hala bir cevap gelmedi. Ne iş olursa yapacağım. Daha önce hiç çalışmadım. Evde oya, dantel yapıyorum. Hiç olmazsa ekmek parasını çıkarıyor

and father) income for a living. The economic states of the single mothers and women with regular working husbands are not different (from the viewpoint of wages entering the household). Among those who do not work outside the home, the women with the relatively worst economic state are those whose husbands are unemployed and those who have irregular jobs.

In conclusion, the high costs of living and the living conditions create a pressure on women's commoditization. Those women have low level of education lead them to work in jobs, which do not require knowledge or skills. This very same reason applies for men as well. Hardships of living and economic difficulties take the first place among the reasons why women work. Most women started work after they got married. As this study showed, women use their workforce in areas, which overlap their work within the house. None of the women who have irregular jobs have any social security. Women labor constitutes a significant portion within the unorganized workforce. The most serious problem that women with irregular jobs face is being deprived of retirement rights and benefits. The biggest fear that women with regular jobs on contract basis suffer from is to be taken out of their jobs. Those women work as a family laborer exert enormous amounts of effort, though they have no saying in the way that the money is spent. Some women are in a battle against patriarchal relationships in order to participate in the working life. The money that women get is minimum wage level or below. The daily pay (12-15 YTL.) of the women spending effort in the seasonal jobs is rather low. The women in the poor laborer class working outside the home receive salary that is below the value that they deserve. The underlying financial basis for women's poverty (also men's poverty) in production process is the loss of value of their labor. Most of the housewives want to work for reasons of hardships of living. Women's age, their obligation to look after children and that men do not allow them to work all prevent them from working. Their household duties, patriarchal relationships and structure are factors effective in their becoming poor. Women's labor that they expend in the house aside from the production process loses value as well, unlike men. The most distinguishing

aspect of women's poverty (for both working and non-working women outside home) is that their efforts inside the home lose value. Likewise, the labor of working women loses value from both sides.

6.4. Women's Labor and Domestic Sphere: Women's Heavy Burden In Order to Sustain Family Needs in Reproduction Process of the Household

Since 1980, new capital accumulation processes have deteriorated the living standard of the majority of working class families in Turkey. Women and men have experienced the impact of capital accumulation processes differently and responded differently to changing conditions. Women and children in particular are more vulnerable to deterioration in welfare and living conditions. In addition to their productive work, women have also used their labor power within the reproduction process to respond to or cope with poverty conditions.

The poverty line approach is gender-blind. It ignores women's poverty experiences in the household. Women's domestic labor in food preparation, cleaning and other household tasks has an important role in decreasing the cost of living under poverty conditions. In addition to paid work, women's heavy burden in the reproduction processes has also affected their living standards in a negative way. Thus, it is important to open the 'black box' in order to understand whether and how women's poverty is hidden. There are inequalities in terms of the acquisition and expenditure of resources within the household. Therefore, the question of how resources are allocated, controlled and consumed is needed to examine with respect to women's poverty experiences.

Reductions in real income, the loss of male income and increasing prices have affected the expenditures of households. Because of the increasing living costs, women have a disproportionate burden. Under these conditions, how women use their labor to sustain family members' re-production needs is analyzed in this subsection. It is thought that statistical analysis has some inadequacies in terms of

exploring women's poverty experiences. The aim is to present how they experience and struggle against poverty conditions in their own words.

6.4.1. Division of Labor in Domestic Sphere

Women have used their labor power not only through income generating activities but also in reproduction processes in the domestic sphere. The range of daily social reproductive tasks involves three main categories, the first of which involves reproductive adult labor power on a day-to-day basis. These are food preparation, clothing care, washing, ironing and house cleaning. The second one relates to generational reproduction, for example childcare tasks and activities, and the last one is related to the structural upkeep of the household, such as decorating and repairs.

As it is known, women play an important role in terms of realization of these tasks. In addition to the examination of who takes the most responsibility in these tasks at home, the study of who helps women most was also conducted. While the majority of women still clean the house (87 %), in some households, girls take the responsibility of cleaning the house (11 %). If they think that the physical condition of the house is not in good shape, women spend enormous efforts to clean it under poverty conditions. The study did not find any important differences among labor categories with respect to cleaning home but girls help their mothers on weekends in some households in which women are regular laborers. All non-working women clean their home by themselves. In addition to home-cleaning, such house chores as doing the laundry and ironing (90%), washing the dishes (85%), cooking (92.5%) looking after children (94 %), preparing and servicing the tea, coffee and water (83%) are among the work that women do in the home. In none of these is male labor used. The daughters of the house are the ones to help with these jobs most of the time. This process has a strong influence in girls' socialization as related to social gender.

Shopping for food and paying the bill are chores that are done in the public sphere. In most homes, women undertake shopping for food (77 %). The proportion of homes where in general the elder daughters (3 %), men (9 %), young boys (2 %), and men and women together (6.7%) take on these chores is very small. Women (44 %), men (31 %) and adult boys (31%) mostly pay. This indicates that women's relationship with public institutions is relatively weaker. The only area where male labor is used mostly (65%) is house maintenance and repairs. The percentage of those who have the repairs and maintenance jobs done in return for payment is low (14 %). However, women have also used their labor for upkeeping house (20%).

Although the level of education of women is low, the %age of those who help their children with their lessons is not small (60 %). Among the members of the house who help with children's lessons are the other siblings (14 %), the father (10 %), and neighbors' children (15 %). Moreover, again mothers build and maintain the relationship with the school and the teacher (85 %). Men's relationship with the school and the teacher is rather little (10 %).

A majority of working and non-working women still exert an intense labor in the process of reproduction. No significant difference was found among the labor categories with respect to the realization of these jobs. All house chores are regarded as a fundamental duty for non-working women. However, working women, too, have to do domestic work, although they work all day just like their husbands do, no matter how much they complain about it. Emine works as a cleaning worker at a public institution.

He joined the workforce when her children grew up. She explains her situation as the following:

Since I had never worked before, for me, house work is like I have not work at all. When he comes home, he can slip into his pajamas, grab the remote control and go to bed. Me, soon as I

come in, I change my clothes and start in the kitchen, and then the meal, dishes, cleaning, and all of that, of course responsibilities. The girls have grown now so they help me but still I endured a lot of difficulties. My husband does not help me with these things at all¹⁹

İsmihan works in a factory as a laborer. She said that she had been working in the factory on the weekends too. Her mother looks after her children in her own home. She goes to her mother's home to see her children on the weekends after she finishes her house chores.

I don't have a weekend. I am almost never free. I work all the time. Sundays go by doing the cooking, washing, the laundry, cleaning. He is comfortably resting on weekends. . He doesn't understand. He cannot understand my situation. He is more comfortable he can spare time on the weekends. I don't have any activity like that. I mean I don't have any personal thing. No going to the shops. Going to the shops to stroll around is different; going there to buy things just because I need to is totally different. I go there for work. No time left. No time is left for me.²⁰

Rabia has been working as a seasonal worker on farm-fields for more than 20 years. Her experiences are not different from other women who use their labor power in both production and reproduction spheres.

Time is not enough. I get up at 8 in the morning. The day I am at home, I have my breakfast, do the cleaning, and then do the cooking. I mean the day is enough. Even more than enough. When I work, then of course the work in the garden is not finished. I get up at 5. Working in the field until evening, of course that work will

¹⁹ Ben daha önce hiç çalışmadığım için, benim işim ev işleri, sanki hiç çalışmamış gibi. O eve geldiği zaman çekip pijamasını, kumandayı alıp yatağa yatabiliyor. Ben daha kapıdan girip üzerimi çıkarıp doğru mutfağa, yemek bulaşığı, temizlik yani her şey, sorumluluk tabii. Kızlar büyüdüğü için yardımcı oluyorlar bana yinede çok çektim zorluklarını. Eşim o konuda işlere yardımcı olmuyor bana

²⁰ Benim hafta sonum falan yok. Genelde hiç boş kalmıyorum. Hep çalışıyorum. Pazar günleri de yemek, çamaşır, bulaşık, temizlik öyle geçiyor. O rahat hafta sonları dinleniyor. Anlamıyor. Benim durumumu anlayamaz ki. Eşim daha rahat o hafta sonu vakit ayırabilir. Benim öyle hiç etkinliğim yok. Yani hiç özel bir şeyim yok. Çarşıya gitmek falan yok. Çarşıya dolaşmaya gitmek ayrı, ben işim olduğu için bir şeyler almaya gitmek için ayrı. İş için gidiyorum. Kalmıyor. Vaktim kalmıyor

never end. I come home very tired. I mean it is like I am fed up with working. My daughter was born in April and I started to go to the field. The kid grew up in fields. When I was stuck I took her to my mother's. Ever since those times I suffered a lot working both in the home and the field. I mean no one probably suffered as much as I did.²¹

As can be seen in Emine's and İsmihan's experiences, both get aid from their daughters and mothers in order to reduce their domestic obligation loads. That is, some domestic tasks are transferred to elder and younger women rather than equally distributed between men and women. The same conclusion about women's workload distribution has also been reached in other researches (Moser, 1996). Moser found that women's domestic work was reorganized among other household's members, such as daughters and grandmothers.

Women's poverty experiences are different from men's in terms of the time dimension. A great number of activities are carried out by women on a daily basis, such as caring of children, domestic chores, income-earning home production, and leisure activities such as sleeping, and eating, resting (King and Evenson, 1983:37-38). Compared to men, women spend all of their time dealing with the reproduction process. In Haddad's research in Ghana (1991), it was found that women had to work longer hours to do both productive and reproductive work. With respect to time, women are poorer than men.

With all of the women in this study, discussions have been held on the importance and value of domestic work. Women were asked: "As you know, nowadays, such jobs as cleaning the home, washing the clothes, ironing, caring the child, cooking, shopping for food and etc are paid work in the market. If we suppose that you had more money or were a rich person and someone was doing

²¹ Zaman yetmiyor. Sabah sekiz de kalkıyorum. Evde kaldığım gün, kahvaltımı ederim, temizliğimi yaparım, sonra da yemeğimi yaparım. Yani günüm yetiyor. Artar bile. Çalıştığım zaman tabii bahçede iş bitmiyor. Sabah 5 de kalkıyorum. Akşama kadar tarlada çalış, o bahçenin işi hiç bitmez. Eve çok yorgun geliyorum. Çalışmaktan bıktım gibi bir şey yani. Kızım Nisan ayında doğdu ben Mayıs ayında bahçeye gitmeye başladım. Çocuk bahçelerde büyüdü. Çok sıkıştığında annelere götürüyordum. O zamandan beri hem evde hem tarlada çok çile çektim. Benim çektiğim çileyi hiç kimse çekmemiştir yani.

all these jobs for you, how much would you pay? How much would these services be worth? How would you decide on their charge?" Most women said, "I would give at least minimum wages", "By God, at least, I would give the amount of money that was sufficient for her subsistence and would ease her hardship", "It is very difficult to do these chores, I need to give all my energy and power to do them. It takes too much time. I would give at least 500-600 YTL.". "I would give the person at least the minimum wage and I would help her". "If I were rich I would pay 1000 YTL.". "Domestic tasks are too difficult. It cannot be measured by money". "I would both pay more money and give other items like clothing and food". "I would pay at least 600 YTL. and put her on social insurance".

All women appear to be aware of the importance of domestic work. However, when they are told that "Yes, you are not a paid worker outside the home as your husband but you have contributed by at least minimum wages. Are you aware of your contribution to your family? In addition, have you ever thought in this way? Except for two women, all women said, "No!" At first, they were surprised and they smiled. Then, most of them began to talk about their husbands' attitudes and behaviors on domestic work that women perform. "Men do not understand these jobs, according to my husband, I do nothing at home. When he comes back in the evening, he says that 'what you have been doing all day is only cooking and dishwashing".

Working women, too, were told about the significant value of their labor: "You are working both at home and outside. Your contribution to your family is more than your husband's. Let's say that your wage was almost at the minimum wage level and in addition to earning income, you do domestic work. You spend more effort for your family's subsistence." Many women recognized that indeed, their labors in reproduction sphere have a value in terms of saving money and decreasing the living cost of the household. They saw after long discussions that all these types of work have a value in the market.

6.4.2. Reduction of Living Costs Through Women’s Labor and Deprivation

Households’ monthly income has remained below the poverty line in Turkey. While the highest regular income is 950 YTL, the lowest regular income is 400 YTL, within the labor categories. All of the households have been having difficulty in meeting their needs. That is why households have used formal and informal networks in order to sustain themselves. Besides the earned income through working, households have also used other supporting systems that depend on assistance and debt. Kalaycıoğlu and Ritterseberger-Tılıç (2002) have developed a model on the coping strategies with poverty. In this model, “Family Pooling” is an important solidarity form. “Family Pooling” is a system which depends on reciprocal relations among family, relative, hemşehri (people of same place of origin). In their model, women’s labor and effort play an important role in order to fight against poverty. Women do not only make contribution into “Family Pooling” through income earning activities but also they spend immense labor to get aid from relatives, neighbor, state institutions (e.g. municipality, governorship). Their labor is so important to reach these supporting systems. In this research, it is seen that women have important contribution into the “Family Pooling”.

Households have received cash aid mostly from their families when they were in economic hardship (34%). In addition to this, of the 120 households, 32% received assistance from the local municipality and governorship. They received food, coal and clothes. A majority of the women receiving aid from the municipality and governorship belong to the labor category (G) where women do not work outside and the men are unemployed (14 households). The other households fall in the F (non-working female outside home, irregular male laborer: 7 families) and E (female and male irregular laborers: 6 families) labor categories. There are 7 single-mother households that received aid from the municipality and governorship. In all the households that received aid, women made the application. For most men, asking for help is a matter of pride. It is the

women who go to soup kitchens to get food every day regularly. In some households, girls go to soup kitchens to fetch the daily food supply.

The relationship of the households with the hometown in the village is not quite strong. Among the 120 households; only 17% received provisions, especially milk, yogurt, vegetables and fruit from their relatives who stayed in the village. When families need money, they most often borrowed from their families (43%) and from their neighbors/friends (42%). The rate of families that use credit cards is not high (17%). In general, it is the regular working families that have made use of credit cards among the labor categories.

Because of economic hardship, all households ran into debt to banks (28%), grocery stores (30%), retail stores (42%), and their friends/families (27%). Among the labor categories, especially irregular male laborers, there are households which have debts to the Social Security Foundation (SSK) and Foundation for Social Security for Tradesmen, Artisans and other Independent Workers (Bağ-KUR) Being able to pay up the monthly installments regularly to these institutions to secure the retirement and healthcare services. However, the irregular and low incomes make it difficult to make the necessary payments in time for these households. Among 105 men, most of them have health insurance (SSK) (47%), Bağ-KUR (3%), Retirement Chest (7%), Green Card (poverty health benefit card) (27%).

In addition to getting into debt, cutting down on the use of cleaning materials, clothing, electricity, water, transportation, phone, heating and food is another means in lowering the living costs, especially through women's labor. They spend enormous effort and time to manage all these tasks.

Privatizations of social services, especially public services, and infrastructures have negatively affected the working class families. More than half of the families have always restricted and saved on using electricity/water at home

(68%). Majority of the women who limit the use of electricity/water are in the researched categories of G, F, E, D and H (Table.23). Because of their economic hardship, of 120 households, 25% failed pay the electricity/water bills. Zahide's husband is unemployed and she has got 8 children. She said:

Our electricity bill is 150 YTL., we owe them people. I'll get them here for you if you don't believe me. He is on our backs till the 5th this month. No water in the house. We haven't paid since December (for seven months). 50 YTL. ²²

İsmihan and her husband are workers in a factory. She said:

Of course, I am very careful about electricity... water. I swear I never leave a tap on. I turn on the light wherever I am sitting. I don't use unnecessary electricity water. I pay special attention. I think how am I going to pay the bills, that's what I think. ²³

Sevgi works in has irregular jobs. Her husband earns less than minimum wages. Her experience is the same as the other women in terms of the limitation of basic needs.

My husband is amazed at me. I fill in a card for YTL. in two months for water. Them others can't make it with 10 YTL. for a month. My electricity bill believe me won't go over 15. I don't bake a pie for fear of electricity cut. I wash clothes by hand mostly. I heat water on the stove. I use that for dishes. I flush the toiled with the laundry water, why should it go to waste? ²⁴

Gül is a single mother and a regular worker. She said:

²² Elektrik faturamız 150 YTL ha şunlara borçluyuz. Bak inanamıyorsan çağırayım. O şimdi o bizi sıkıştırıyor ayın 5'ine kadar. Su evde yok. Aralıktan bu yana vermiyoruz (for 7 months). 50 YTL.

²³ Elektrik, su onlara tabii ki çok dikkat ederim. Valla, hiç açık musluk bırakmam. Oturduğum, nerede oturuyorsam elektriği orda yakarım. Gereksiz elektrik su kullanmam, özellikle dikkat ederim. Faturalar gelince nasıl ödeyecem diye, ben düşünüyorum

²⁴ Kocam bana şaşıyo. İki ayda 10 YTL.lik kart dolduruyorum, yükletiyorum su için. Millet ayda 10 milyonu yetiremiyormuş. Elektrik param inan olsun 15'i geçmez. Elektrik gidecek diye börek yapmıyorum. Çamaşırı çoğu zaman elimde yıkarım. Suyu sobanın üzerinde ısıtırım. Bulaşığa hep ordan harcarım. Çamaşır suyunu tuvalete dökerim, niye boşa gitsin ki.

I watch out for everything. Look this is how I do it. To be honest, I wash the laundry, the colored clothes and all that by hand. Washing the whites, I do them when I turn on the bathroom boiler and I wash them, immediately spread them. Same with electricity, I don't turn on the TV much. I listen to the radio.²⁵

Transportation is an important means for social reproduction. Due to their economic difficulty, women prefer walking rather than taking the public bus or tramway. Most women have always kept their transportation expenses to a limit (80%). When they go shopping or to work, they prefer walking. Majority of the women, who restrict their transportation expenditure, are in the G, F, E, D, and H research categories (Table.24).

Fatma is a cleaning worker and her husband is a civil servant in a public institution. Although both are regular laborers, they have to cut their transportation expenditure. She said:

We cut from transportation like anything else. You know ticket prices. 1.25 YTL. When we as a family attempt to go somewhere, it starts from 20 YTL. About 20 YTL. We are 4 here. I don't get on something for the shops of anything like that. I mean we don't, anyway. Not if I don't have to. My kids I swear walk to their courses in the evenings.²⁶

The majority of women who do not work outside the home said, they would not go out if there were not anything, important they had to do. Eleven women said that they always walked to work. "If I paid every day it would cost an extra 20 NTL. You can get a gas tube for this, can't you?" (regular laborer). "Many times I walked from here home too. I would walk when my husband didn't work too. One, one and half hours." (regular worker).

²⁵ Her şeye dikkat ederim, zorundayım. Şimdi nasıl yaparım bak. Açıkçası, çamaşır falan renkli çamaşırı elimde falan yıkarım. Beyazı yıkarken, banyo kazanını yaktığım zaman onları elimde yıkar, sererim hemen. Elektriği öyle, televizyonu fazla filan açmam. Radyo dinlerim

²⁶ Her şeyden olduğu gibi ulaşımdan da kısarsız. Bilet paralarını biliyorsunuz. 1.25 YTL. Biz ailecek bir yere gitmeye kalktığımız zaman bir yere gideceğimiz zaman, 20 YTL'den açılıyor kapısı. Yaklaşık 20 YTL. 4 kişiyiz. Genelde böyle çarşıya falan hiç binmem, binmeyiz yani kolay

Households also limit their heating expenditures. Eskişehir is a very cold city in the winter. For Eskişehir, under normal conditions of winter, the average consumption of coal varies between 2 to 3 tons, but the households' consumption level remains under 2 tons. Women always save from heating (69%) (table.25). The majority of women who manage coal use are in G, F, E, D, and H research categories. The proportion of those who pay for their heating expenses in installments (40 %) is higher than those who pay in full (31%). 27.5% of the households do not pay for the coal since they get them from the municipality and governorship as aids (tables.26). When children are at school, they usually close the stove. Besides coal, some women use the wood pieces that they collect from the garbage and streets for heating.

I didn't pay for coal this year I didn't buy coal. They gave it from municipality. They gave 1 tone. I used it sparingly. I don't burn it at nights anyway. The house is full of holes I said we'll be poisoned at night to my man, I said I'll ruin you in the morning, he said you fool you'll be dead how can you ruin me when you're already dead. It's blowing inside holes are everywhere, the door the window are all cracked (her husband is unemployed).²⁷

Hatice is an irregular worker. Her husband is a regular worker. He earns at least minimum wages. She said:

We bought 15 tonnes of coal this year. I don't burn it when the kids are at school. I collected the wood thrown at the market at night everyone does it. You have to. We are in debt. I burn it economically. It burns in one room anyways. We all sleep in one room in winter, in very cold weather. I dress the kids, very warm. They are used to it now. At nights, I turn on the small gas tube in the room. I make tea there. The room gets warm.²⁸

kolay. Mecbur kalmadıkça binmem. Çocuklarım hafta sonu dersane kursuna valla hep yürüyerek gidiyor.

²⁷ Bu sene kömüre para vermedim, hiç kömür almadım, belediyeden verdiler, 1 ton verdiler, idareli kullandım, geceleri yakmam zaten. Ev delik deşik adama dedim ki zehirleniriz valla gece, sabah seni mahvederim dedim, o da saf dedi öldükten sonra nasıl mahfedecen. İçeride her taraf açık rüzgâr yapıyor, kapı pencere çatlak (her husband unemployed).

²⁸ Bu sene 1,5 ton kömür aldık. Çocuklar okuldayken yakmıyorum. Akşam pazara atılan tahtaları topladım. Herkes yapıyor. Mecbursun. Borcumuz var. İdareli yakıyorum. Zaten bir odada yanar.

In some cases, families used social support system and took aid from their relatives when they did not have money, as did Zahide:

In the winter, my man's boss gave him construction wood where he works. He brought 1-2 cars full. My brother got 3 sacks of coal. I borrowed coal. I said I'd give some back when I get some. God bless them, that neighbor of mine across here helped us manage. In summer, that old man would give it secretly. He would bring it and throw it to the garden so that his wife would not see. He would put it inside I swear. We had some time our stove did not burn. No lies, maybe because this is bronchitis disease that's why this happened no lies even my stove didn't burn (her husband irregular laborer).²⁹

There is no difference among women with respect to limitation of heating or other necessities in order to manage the family budget.

In addition to heating and other necessities, because of the economic hardship, more than half of the women limited *mostly* the cleaning materials (69%). The majority of women who restricted spending on those items are in the G, E, F, B and H categories (table.27). Few of the women never restricted on cleaning materials (20%) especially in regular income earning families (D, C, A). Indeed, the majority of women said that they buy the cheaper cleaning refills.

Özlem and her husband are regular workers. She said:

I don't cut from cleaning materials. Nevertheless, I don't get the expensive ones either. I buy the open detergents when I am short of cash. Just as much as I need. Nevertheless, it is more economical to buy in bulk. We can't do that all the time. The wage

Kışın hepimiz aynı odada yatarız, çok soğuklarda. Giydiriyom çocukları, sıkı sıkı. Alıştılar ama. Küçük tüpü odaya yakarım akşamları. Çay yaparım onda. Oda sıcak olur.

²⁹ Kışın adam çalıştığı inşaatta patronu ona inşaat odunları verdi. 1-2 araba getirdi. Kardeşimde 3 çuval kömür aldı. Borç kömür aldım. Aldığım zaman veririm dedim. Allah razı olsun şu karşıdaki komşu bizi idare etti. Yaza o yaşlı adam gizli verirdi. Getirir bahçeye atardı. Karısı görmesin diye. İçeriye koyardı valla. Bazen oldu sobamız bile yanmazdı. Niye yalan söyleyeyim, belki de bu bronşit hastalığı ondan oldu niye yalan söyleyeyim sobam bile yanmadı

runs dry the day I get paid. Cleaning is important. This government didn't provide even this for us.³⁰

Ayşe does not work outside home. Her husband is unemployed. She said:

I can't do cleaning properly for everything is expensive. The shop owner got angry with us last month, we owe his. Two weeks ago I washed the dishes with hand soap but I don't feel this is good enough. I like using the bleach. Sometimes we don't even have 1 YTL, then I can't get it.³¹

All families restricted *mostly* on their clothing needs (82%). A few of the women said that they sometimes could not buy clothes they need (12%). They were asked about where and how often they would usually shop for their families' clothes needs. Of the 120 women, the ratio of using ward market is 45 % (mostly) and 19 (rarely). On the other hand, due to lack of money, 36 % of women never buy from the ward market (table.28). In addition, when they need clothes, women usually (37%) and sometimes (14%) buy clothes from export stores or other places (such as store, haberdasher and etc) where clothes are cheaper than other stores (table.29). Some women usually get their clothes from acquaintance/friends/relatives (34%) (table.30). 15% use second-hand clothes (table.31). Few of the women mostly buy from the big stores where brand products are sold (6 %). In fact, because of economic hardships, many women could not meet their clothing needs.

Neriman and her husband are regular workers. She said:

You work but money is not enough when it comes to clothes to wear. Children come first, then us. I buy in installments. I don't

³⁰ Temizlik malzemelerinden kısmam. Ama pahalı olanı da almam. Param olmadığı zaman açık deterjan alırım. İhtiyacım kadar. Toptan alışveriş yapmak daha hesaplı ama. Her zaman yapamıyoruz. Maaşı alınca para o gün bitiyor. Temizlik önemli. Bu devlet bunu bile bize çok gördü

³¹ Temizlik doğru düzgün yapamıyorum ki, her şey pahalı olduğu için. Bir ay önce bakkal kızdı bize, borcumuz var 2 hafta önce bulaşıkları el sabunuyla yıkadım ama içime sinmiyor. Ben çamaşır suyu kullanmayı çok severim. Bazen günde evde 1 YTL olmadığı gün olur alamıyorum.

find any in the workplace. You look around. Everyone has nice clothes on. I get them from the market sometimes they are cheaper there. I might get some from stores too occasionally. I know how to sew but I don't. The labor goes for nothing. Ready made is cheaper.³²

Ayşe and her husband are irregular workers. She said:

We gave up on clothing now. You can't even get socks for your feet sometimes. My brother/sister (gender not indicated) lives in Germany. Brings some when coming to us in the summer. Gives me the clothes not fitting anymore. All new. You can wash and wear again and again. When it is holiday celebration time, I got to the market and buy things for my kids there.³³

Hatice does not work outside the home and her husband has been unemployed for 3 months. She said:

I can't buy proper clothing. I can't send them kids to school in a proper state. Kids don't have proper shoes. The aid from the municipality or the school is clothes, if they are any. I can't buy things to wear on us. I can't buy socks, bear-foot kids; I can't even get them for myself. I'm wearing clothes from 5-6 years ago.³⁴

Fatma is an irregular worker and her husband is self-employed. She said:

I get things for my kids. So that I don't leave them deprived. For instance, I was going to buy slippers for myself today. I gave up

³² Çalışıyorsun ama üst başa gelince para yetmiyor. Önce çocuklar sonra biz. Taksitle alıyorum. İşyerinde olmuyor. Bakıyorsun çevrene herkes güzel giyinmiş. Pazardan alıyorum bazen ucuz oluyor. Mağazadan aldığımda olur. Dikiş bilirim ama yapmıyorum. Emeğe yazık. Hazır daha ucuz

³³ Giysiden vazgeçtik artık. Yeri geliyor bir çorap alamıyorsun ayağına. Kardeşim Almanya'da yaşıyor. Yazın tatile gelirken bize getirir. Kendinin olmayanlarını bana verir. Hepsi de yeni. Yıka yıka giy. Bayram geldi mi pazara giderim, çocuklar için ordan alırım.

³⁴ Üst-baş düzgün alamıyorum. Düzgün okula yollayamıyorum. Çocukların düzgün ayakkabısı yok. Belediyeden ya da okuldan bazen yardım verirlerse giyecek oluyo. Üst-baş alamıyorum, çorap alamıyorum, yalınayak çocuk, kendime bile çorap alamıyorum. 5-6 sene öncesinin kıyafetlerini giyiyorum.

and bought shoes for my husband instead. He works till 11 at nights. We talked last night. He said I have shroud for the grave but not shoes. I said let's have him use them. He never goes out on his own to buy things. I gave myself up for him.³⁵

Nejla is a single-mother. She is a civil servant in a public institution. She said:

I get things for my kid first. I am a civil servant I have to be careful about my clothes. Before I got separated from my husband, I could easily buy things. Now only one salary. There are so many needs; clothing comes the last in the list. I occasionally buy from a store in installment. It's not like the old times anymore. I cut down; there is no other way.³⁶

More than half of the women mostly hold back on the food items because of the economic burden (69 %). The majority of the women who have to limit food supplies are in the categories of G, E, F and H (45%). While some women sometimes limited food expenditures (17%), some never cut down on food expenses (14%). Limiting food expenses is very low for the households in which the female or the male earns a regular income (A, D and B) (table.32).

Women were asked about what kind of food they could not buy for breakfast because of economic hardships. Mostly, women suffered from not being able to meet their children's hankering for 'sucuk' (spicy Turkish sausage), beef sausage, salami, and chocolate spread for breakfast. They usually consume cheese, eggs, butter, olives, potatoes, for the breakfast. Besides, when they have money, they mostly buy such cheap fruit as apples and oranges. The majority of children do not drink milk regularly either. Of the 45 children, whose ages were between 0 and 6, regular milk consumption is too low (27%) (table.33). Because of the income shortages, women could not buy meat or fish for their children. This is in

³⁵ Çocuklara alıyorum. Onları mahrum bırakmamak için. Mesela bu gün terlik alacaktım kendime. Vazgeçtim kocama ayakkabı aldım. O da akşam 11'lere kadar çalışıyor. Akşam konuştuk onunla. Kefenim var ayakkabım yok demişti. Hadi dedim o yararlanınsın. O gidip kendi başına bir şey almaz. Ben kendimden vazgeçtim ona aldım

line with the literature (Florence, 1996; Gonzales de la Rocha, 1995; Rodriguez, 1994). Women have to allocate a larger amount of income for food at the cost of deprivation from clothing, recreation and other needs. They also have to reduce expensive food items such as meat, fruit, milk and etc.

Güलगül is a housewife and her husband is an irregular worker in the building. She said:

The man brings some money, then we might profit. For instance from bread, milk, water. Then we will get by, we'll try. Soon as the man comes I'll get by, I'll eat cheese, bread, I'll have a breakfast instead of making a meal. My husband brings the money, what can I do, he tells me to buy this and that, I make a list. I list I bought this for such and such and I did that in this or that way. Of course we don't have many luxuries, but bread sugar and mostly cheese, the cheap ones.³⁷

Hediye is a seasonal worker in the field. Her husband is an irregular worker.

I can't go to the market much. I buy things from my neighbor. They have a field. Their things are cheaper. I bring from the field I work in summer. I buy bread sometimes some yogurt from the shop. I mean I get the bread from the municipality. We don't get cheese or olives much. Honey we can never get. I mainly make fry things. In winter I make dough mostly.³⁸

³⁶Önce çocuğuma alıyorum. Memursun kıyafetine dikkat etmen gerekiyor. Kocamdan ayrılmadan önce daha rahat alabiliyordum. Şimdi tek maaş. O kadar çok ihtiyaç var ki kıyafet en son sırada artık. Mağazadan taksitle aldığım olur. Eskisi gibi değil artık. Kısıtlıyorum, mecbur.

³⁷ Adam bir miktar para getirecek kar edicez. Mesela ekmekten süttten sudan. Ondan sonra yetirmeye idare edicez, gayret edicez. Adam geldi mi gayret ederim peynir, ekmek yerim, bugün yemek yerine kahvaltı yaparım. Beyim para getirir, eee ne yapayım, bana der şunu şunu al, liste yaparım. Şunu şu kadar aldım, bunu böyle yaptım, ee öyle lüksümüz yok da ekmek, şeker en çok da peynir ucuzundan ama

³⁸ Pazara doğru dürüst çıkamıyorum. Komşudan satın alıyorum. Bahçeleri var. Onlar daha ucuza veriyor. Yazın çalıştığım tarladan getiriyorum. Bakkaldan ekmekle bazen yoğurt alıyorum. Ekmeği de belediyeden alıyorum yani. Peynir, zeytin doğru dürüst alamıyoruz. Balı hiç alamıyoruz. Kızartma yapıyorum genellikle. Kışında hamur yapıyorum çoğunlukla.

As for the place for shopping for food, they generally use the ward markets and big shopping places. More than half the women always shop from the ward market markets, 8 % of them who receive food from municipality's soup kitchen everyday on a regular basis, never use it (table.34). Most of the females go to the ward market especially (53%). While 38 % of females sometimes buy food from ward after 5 p.m. and just before its closing time (70 %), because the groceries are cheaper and some women pick up surplus produce left by the sellers. Some women said that they did not have money to go and shop at ward markets (18%) (table.35). "The last time I went shopping was three months ago. I went to the ward market a month ago. Look! I have not been to the ward market for four weeks. This week, it will have been five weeks since I last went shopping" (irregular female laborer).

Similarly, half of the females always use big shopping places to buy food (56 %). Shopping from these places is more widespread among the regular income earning families, especially in the ones in the G, F, E and D research categories (Regular, irregular, and unemployed) (table.36). The rate of always using other places such as grocers (19 %) and street peddlers (6 %) and green grocers (3 %) is very low. The grocer's is used sometimes, especially for daily shopping by women, such as buying bread. In general, females buy bread from the municipality bakery shop (27%) and the grocer's (40%). There are only three females who always buy bread from big markets. Other 30% of the females take bread as aid from soup kitchens or bake them at home themselves.

Of 120 females, 42 % bake bread at home. Emine buys a sack of flour. The bread she bakes with this flour lasts the family for 6 weeks. If Emine (non-working outside home and her husband is irregular worker) does not bake bread herself, she will have to pay more money for the bread she will buy from the shop. Since bread consumption in some households is high, they buy the bread produced a day before from the bakery. The bakery cannot sell such bread so they sell it for below the regular price.

Gülperi is a regular worker, while her husband is a irregular worker. Her experience is similar to Emine's and also those of other women who produce bread at home. She said:

We produce 4 loaves on average a day. We cannot buy from the municipality store since it is too far. I generally bake the bread myself. And also I bake dough every week. I buy 50 kilos of flour. If I bake all the time then that makes a sack full of flour a month. I pay 28 YTL. for 50 kg of flour. If I paid money for bread every day, what would that make? 48 YTL. see I profit 20 YTL. a month. I can buy other things with that 20 YTL.³⁹

The rise of living costs has led to the production other food materials in order to sustain life. Subsistence production is also widespread in urban areas. In this research, women used their labor power not only in daily activities and production processes but also in the subsistence production in the domestic sphere. Women make tomato paste (44%), 'tarhana' soup (dried soup material made from yogurt, flour, tomatoes, and spices) (74%), homemade pasta (59%), pickles (42%), bread (42%), yogurt (60%), jam (54%) and preserves (52 %) in order to meet their basic family needs. This is in line with the literature (Moser, 1992). The researcher in that study found that women spent more time preparing food. Likewise, this research shows that they buy raw ingredients and cook themselves. They spend more time doing the shopping to save money; they have to walk rather than using transportation.

In addition to these, more than half of the women also knit sweaters to meet especially their children's needs (56 %). While some women do the darning the old clothes (34 %), some of them meet the needs of clothes by sewing (28 %). The number of the families which upkeep their house by themselves is not high (23%) (Table 37-37-38-40-41-42-43, see Appendix A).

³⁹ Günde ortalama 4 ekme  tüketiyoruz. Belediye b fesi uzak olduĐu i in gidip alamıyoruz. EkmeĐi genellikle,  oĐunlukla kendim yaparım. Ayrıca, her hafta hamur iŐi yaparım. 50 kiloluk un alıyorum Devamlı yaparsam ayda bir  uval un gider. 50 kg una 28 YTL para  d yorum. EĐer her g n ekmeĐe para versem ne yapar. 48 YTL bak ayda 20 YTL karım oluyor. O 20 YTL ile ben baŐka Őeyler alırım

The production of tomato paste, 'tarhana' (dried soup material made from yogurt, flour, tomatoes, and spices), homemade pasta, pickles, yogurt, jam and preserves is at the very low level in household where men are unemployed and women do not work outside home. One of the most important reasons is that for these households, the level of earning income is too low. Women do not have money to meet the costs of these products.

In addition to limitation and decreasing of the costs of basic consumption goods or needs, there is also inequality in terms of the allocation of food. In this research, the majority of women (85%) give priority to, firstly, their children, and then to their husbands, especially for food that is expensive and thus can be bought in small amounts (e.g. fruit, meat, etc.). On the other hand, some women do not give priority to their husbands (15%). This is in line with the literature (Charles and Kerr, 1988; Graham, 1987, Brannen and Wilson, 1987; Osmani, 1998). In their researches, it was found that food especially goes to men first and children.

Women's reasoning for giving priority to their children is mainly the motherhood instinct. Most women say that children are small and they need more food and energy. Their reason for giving priority to their husband is that men work hard at work and earn money for the family. For women, their attitude is positive and very natural.

Because of the increasing of the living cost and economic burden, women also have to withdraw from many things that they need, they want to do or want to buy. The majority of women withdraw from their clothes' needs (92%), personal needs (93%) and social activities (87 %). On the other hand, of the 105 men, 82% could not meet their clothes' needs. Some men, as different from women, participated in some social activities like visiting their friends/relatives (37%) and going to a cafe (38%). Moreover, some men spend money to drink alcohol (23%).

Women spend immense labor and energy in the effort for decreasing living costs with the result that these efforts affected women's health physically and psychologically. When women became ill, very few women went to a private doctor (4 %), state hospital (9%) and local health clinic (*sağlık ocağı*) (2%) without delay. When they are ill, more than half of the women do not go to any health institutions (63%). They always wait to recover from their ailment and try to treat themselves at home. If their health becomes so bad or if their disease is serious, then they said they have had to go to a private doctor (one female), a state hospital (14%) or a local health clinic (7%). Almost half of the women have seen their health get badly (40%) or very bad (6%).

Indeed, most of them have to delay dealing with their health problems. In the in-depth interview, the majority of women told about their health problems such as headaches, rheumatism, diseases particular to the womb, dental disturbances etc. Although, most of the women have health insurance (SSK) (55%), Green Card (poverty benefit card) (28%), Bağ-KUR (4.2%) and Retirement Chest (5%). They do not give attention to their health problems. There were only 10 women who did not have any health insurance. For these women, lack of money is the main obstacle to go to the doctor. On the other hand, women say that the Green Card is not sufficient to get treatment. They only receive consultation with it but it does not help them with getting medication. They add that the government has just given the right to get medicine through the Green Card.

Although women have health insurance, many women do not want to go to state hospitals. They prefer going to a private doctor. Because of lack of money, they delay getting treatment for their health problems. In addition to these, according to some women, their husbands are not concerned about wives' health problems (38%). For example, one female says, "his health is more important than ours all the time. If I have a headache, he tells me to take medicine and go to sleep, and I will be fine. If he is ill, he goes to the doctor without delay".

When women fall ill, almost half of the women do not receive help from another person (46%). There is nobody else to come to offer care for women. They have to look after themselves. Although women spend immense labor for their husbands, in cases of illness, the rate of men who look after their wives is low (14%). In general, when they are ill, the women's mother or sisters (24.2%) and daughters (11%) look after them.

Domestic management affects women's psychological health under the poverty conditions. Moreover, almost all women suffer from not meeting their children's education needs. Because of lack of money, they are in difficulty with respect to meeting their children's desires and educational necessities. Children, young girls and boys mostly will need these things and items: a holiday, a computer, a bicycle, a mobile phone, toys, a daily allowance, children's room, a brand marked outfit and shoes, participation in a private course (*dersane*), social activities like sports or music, or the cinema. Alev (she and her husband both regular laborers) says, "They want to go on holiday, want to have expensive brand marked things. It is impossible for us to provide them". Arzu (an irregular worker, her husband a regular laborer) says, "Children always want everything, they are right but I try to buy the cheapest ones. Last month, I paid 3-4 NTL for her clothing. It was not quality stuff. I could not buy brand marked things that she wanted." Halime is a housewife and her husband is unemployed. She says, "They see, their father is not working. But they do not understand. They are small. When they want something, I say, I will pay the bill, the rent and buy some food. I am suffering".

The cutting of funding in social reproduction spheres, or in other words, declines in social sector funding, especially in education, health, public transportation system, transportation provided by the government and decreasing in wages have also led to the fall in the quality of life. Since 1980, researches on poverty and household responses to new structural adjustment programmes have been discussed around the concept of 'family or household survival strategy'.

Especially poor women have exerted immense labor to cope with poverty. This situation is also defined as ‘household restructuring’ and ‘privatization of economic crisis’ (Beneria, 1992; Gonzales de La Rocha, 1995, 2001). Gonzales de La Rocha points out (2001) that poverty literature stresses ‘household survival strategies’ and ‘social capital of the poor’, which overemphasized the resourcefulness of the poor and promoted the myth of survival. Since 1990, the logic of new capital accumulation process has impacted deeply on the households. As she says, labor exclusion, precarious employment and extreme hardship make ‘resources of poverty’ argument empirically not viable. She defines the situation as ‘poverty of resources’, which is better than ‘resources of poverty’ in describing a new stage. In this research, it is seen that women try to manage the ‘resources of poverty’.

6.5. Social Reproduction and Women’s Deprivation of Social Life

In conventional poverty studies, reproduction of labor is only understood with respect to physical reproduction such as food, water, clothing, fuel, shelter and so forth. However, the sphere of reproduction is wider than physical needs. Reproduction of labor consists of other activities or needs such as cultural activities, recreation, reaching knowledge, going to the cinema, the theater, and so on. Townsend states (1979: 915) that poverty consists of “the absence or inadequacy of those diets, amenities, standards, services and activities which are common or customary in society”. There is inequality between women and men in terms of the realization of these activities or reaching them. In addition to this, the meaning of leisure activities is different for women and men.

The term of leisure is seen as opposed to the ‘work’, which means paid employment. If it is thought in this way, “leisure means time which belongs to the individual, as opposed to the time which belongs to the employees, and leisure activities are those which people choose for themselves as opposed to activities which are an obligatory part of doing a particular job” (Pahl, 1989: 146). From

the feminist perspective, this dichotomy as work and leisure can be criticized. It is argued that for married women, it is inaccurate, if the work is used as a synonym for paid employment (Deem, 1986 cited in Pahl, 1989).

Most women have no time because of the paid work, domestic work and child care. Women take on the responsibility for children throughout the twenty-four hours of every day. Women with children have no time that is freely available to men. For many women, work means to spend twenty-hours of every day doing work. Women are involved in fewer activities outside the home. The distinction between leisure time and work does not meaningfully distinguish many married women who have also got small children and have to work outside the home as paid workers.

The growth in intensity in women's labor in both productive and reproductive processes, economic hardship prevents them from social life. Women's trips to relatives, friends and social activities are also affected by economic burden and jamming of their labor. The majority of women in this study can visit their friends/relatives who live in Eskişehir sometimes (29%) and rarely (32%). While 24 % of women always meet them, 15% of women never visit their friends and relatives in Eskişehir. Mostly, the lack of money (37%), and shortage of time (32%) have obstacles on women to visit and meet with their friends and relatives. Some women said that both lack of money and lack of time prevented them from visiting their friends/relatives (25%). On the other hand, few women's husbands do not let them go outside the home (6%).

Of the 120 women, there were only four women who had gone to the cinema two or three times and one female who went to the theatre only once. All women were asked if they had gone to the cinema or the theatre, and if so, what they have gained, what this has given to them, whether it had made changes in their lives, if so, what kind and how.

For the majority of the women, going to the cinema or theatre means escaping from stress, being relaxed and comfortable, learning new things, participation in social activities, building relationships with other people, bringing a new perspective to life and the world, having some culture and knowledge and seeing different places. On the other hand, for some women, going to the cinema or the theatre does not give them anything (16%). It is not a good thing and it means to spend money unnecessarily.

It can be said that for many women, going to the cinema or the theatre is important to feel better. Many women live under stress. They do not feel at ease or in comfort. Life struggle and hardships have affected their psychological position and health deeply. Most of them want to escape from daily stressful life. They want to clear their heads from problems.

Women are not only derivated from the social life and cultural activities that are necessary to life as human beings but also from behaving freely and the knowledge that is an important power to realize oneself. It was also asked if they went walking or went out alone in the evening or at night, if so what they felt or got out of it, and if not what would they feel and what would that get out of this activity.

They said, “I feel free”, “I feel happy”, “I would become free”, “It may be good, but I am not sure, streets are so dangerous for women”, “I would become like a man”, “I have not thought about this until now, I am surprised, it may be different, I don’t know” and “my self-confidence would increase”.

At first many women were surprised because the idea of walking alone in the street at night or after dark like men do is a remote thing to them. Then the majority of women began to talk about the importance of independence. Deprivation of security is common for all women. Although their economic states are similar, women and men’s life styles are formed differently in society.

Women's participation in activities outside the home is inhibited or limited by the disapproval of husbands, by the possible dangers involved in going out alone at night, and also by lack of money. In spite of the lack of money, for men, there are no barriers to participating in activities like going to cafes and meeting with their friends.

They were asked what they gained from reading a book, the newspaper or a journal. The majority of women do not read books. They sometimes or rarely read the newspaper, that is, when they buy it. The common answer about the gains is that they gain knowledge from reading books. They said, "I would learn new things and I would become a cultural person." "I would catch up with the times"; "I would learn what was happening in Turkey and the World".

Thus, although women are deprived of social and cultural activities and knowledge, they do not see these as a necessity. In their view, all these activities are a luxury for them because their priority is not to go outside but to manage family budgets in order to sustain the reproduction of the household. Capital accumulation process not only affects on the level of wages but it also ideological limited the reproduction spheres. In the case of sufficient amounts of money, patriarchal relationships and structure also prevent women from participation in social activities for reproduction of themselves. For many women, watching television, especially women's programmes, is the main activity at home.

6.6. Women's Position With Respect to Power Relations

In addition to women's position related with the unequal access to resources, consumption, responsibilities, deprivation of social life, the power relations within the home is another area to understand women's poverty experiences. Women's position with power is examined with respect to decision-making processes and their reactions concerning children's education, marriage, using money, and violence.

The question was whether women did anything for themselves in their life and whether women had positive “ability to create and sustain both material and cultural autonomy and to subvert, adopt or resist within the structures of male power” (De Groot, 1991:125-126). In some cases, women may not be absolutely passive. “Even though these individual power tactics do little to alter the structurally unfavorable terms of the overall patriarchal script, women become experts in maximizing their own life chances” (Kandiyoti, 1988:230). In this research, it is seen that women (42 %) relatively have more power than men (35 %) on their children’s education life. In other words, women are dominant in decision-making related with children’s educational decisions. Because women were denied the education opportunities earlier in their own lives, they give more value to education especially for their children. On the other hand, some women said that they decide together with their husbands about children’s education (26 %). Ayşe said, “My husband sometimes forgets which class she goes. I do not want my daughter to become like me. She has to be successful in her class. She has no other chance”. Children are important capital for parents. Nejla said, “I only live for my children. I only work for them in the field. I enrolled him in a private course (dersane). I did not ask or say anything to my husband”. According to Aynur, the wife and the husband should decide together about their children’s future. They must take their children’s responsibilities together. “Maybe I will make the wrong decision. He also makes the wrong decisions, so I should consult him and he consults me, too”. Most of the women said that education was more important than marriage. Things have changed. Nowadays, education comes first, before marriage. For most of the women, their children must make the decision for their marriage. They should not marry at a younger age. The main reason behind their ideas is women’s past marriage experiences. More than half of the women had married outside their decision (59 %). Their parents had been influential in the decision of their marriage. Because of cultural values, they had not had a chance to decide with whom they got married.

The women were asked who always decided to buy important property or home goods like furniture, or other consumption goods. In contrast to the decision on education, men relatively had more the power to decide on buying home objects (40%). İsmihan and her husband are regular workers in a factory. She said, “I always tell him. We need this and that for the house. Then he goes out only to buy a different unnecessary thing. Then we fight. I have to endure this thing”. Yet, women also have an important power to buy those (36%).

Some of them said that they decided together with their husbands. Indeed, women have invisible power in order to buy some necessary home commodities, such as furniture, and small kitchen objects. Many of the women said that men did not know what they needed at home. For example, Emine (regular worker) said, “We need a bed for children. I bought it with my credit card then I paid it off. At first, he was not concerned but later, he had to accept it”... Some women buy some things that are necessary according to them but not to their husbands. They get them secretly from their husbands. For example, Fatma said (irregular worker), “If I want something, I certainly get what we need. Last month, I told him, we need a small carpet. He says I have no money and objects to it. I bought it secretly but I paid for it from my money. I had earned that from the field”.

The earning power of women affects their power in decision-making within the purchasing process. Earning money give relatively more power to working women than women who depend on the husband’s money. Working women make their decisions more easily than non-working women. In the last instance, they rely on their money. Some of the non-working, especially those whose husbands work regularly, affects their husbands’ decisions. For example, Sevgi said, “At first, he objects to what I want to buy but later I persuade him”. Women’s common experience is that all realize their power through enormous effort in order to get something. Beside patriarchal pressure over the women, material conditions and economic hardship play a critical role in the decision-making process.

Power relations are also examined with respect to the allocation of money in this research. Women's access to money is realized through paid work and their husbands. Non-working women whose husbands are regular workers take allowance from their husbands especially on daily or monthly basis for housekeeping expenses. Non-working women whose husbands are irregular workers or unemployed get allowance, if men have money. Among the 105 married couples, the majority of women have taken the responsibility for family budget (65%). The number of households where men have taken the responsibility is quite low (15%). On the other hand, in some families, women and men manage the family budget together (18 %).

In in-depth interviews with women, it is seen that, almost all women have to manage the kitchen budget. According to women (90%), women manage money better than men because it is women's responsibility and many men do not know what necessities are within the house. For women, men spend more money unnecessarily. Mesude is a regular worker and says, "I manage better than my husband. He finishes his money in a day". Ayşe is an irregular working woman. She states, "I have been responsible for the kitchen, he is concerned with the outside. He pays the bills". The majority of working women spend their income on kitchen-related consumption and children's needs while men spend his income especially on the rent of the house and the bills. In general, although women and men spend their income on family's basic needs, in some cases, men have more power to control money than women with respect to where the money is spent. Control is related with power and making decisions about how the money is distributed and how it is spent. For example, Aynur says, "I give all my income to my husband. He makes the plan, and then he gives me some amount for kitchen needs". On the other hand, 'management is the job at the executive level'. It is the process through which decisions are made. All women manage low income to make ends meet in the household under difficult and stressful conditions. They exert immense labor and energy both mentally and physically to meet or decrease living costs.

In same case, some women keep money secretly from their husband. The amount of keeping money is not so much. For example, Hatice says “I keep at least 20 YTL, for difficult days”. In case of keeping money in their own, women give priority of household consumptions. Keeping money does not refer to woman’s positive power but it means that it a kind of resisting against to poverty conditions. Women’s effort and contribution to household’s reproduction does not mean that they have greater power within the household.

When women and men discuss about something and if there is a conflict between them, the majority of men say the final word at the end of the discussion (66%). For example, Mesude (regular worker) said, “In fact I am right. I say the truth but he is a stubborn person. He always believes himself. I stop talking. Because if I continue to fight with him, I am going to feel bad”. Some women believe that men are always outside and they know better than women. İsmihan does not work outside home. She says, “Although I am right, he often justifies himself. Because men always encounter good and bad persons in the streets. He has superiority over me”. In addition to lack of access to decision-making and power within the household, women have to deal with enormous disadvantages that are embedded in gender relations like domestic violence.

Due to the economic hardship, women are to subject to domestic violence within the household. Because of the financial difficulties, more than half of the women always quarrel with their husbands (57%). Many women have faced physical and verbal violence. The rates of women who were beat from their husbands are 33% (always), 9% (sometimes) and 7% (rarely). The rates of men who curse their wives are 31% (always), 17% (sometimes) and 8% (rarely). Many women did not want to talk about the physical violence except for divorced women (ten women). These women faced physical and verbal violence from their ex-husbands. Because of violence, they got divorced from them. For example, Döne (seasonal worker) got divorced two months before, and she says, “He had no job. He drank alcohol every day. He beat me. Everything was because of being without

money”. Vasfiye got divorced 15 years before. She had been working regularly for 14 years. Her experiences are similar with Döne with respect to violence. She says, “He ran away from responsibility. She beat me everyday. He deserted us one day. Since then, we have never seen him”.

After divorces, all these women feel better now than they did in their earlier life due to becoming freed from patriarchal authority at the domestic level. Gülhan divorced 3 years previously. She says “I am fine now. At least, I escaped from his violence. I gained self-esteem. I stand on my feet”. They experience greater self-esteem, a more personal freedom. Despite economic hardship, they have more power over their lives with respect to financial control and arrangement. However, the cost of their empowerment is rather heavy. After the divorce, they faced many difficulties. Aysel does not work in a paid job. She depends on her father’s remittance. She says “After the divorce, I fell into financial hardship. You live as a divorced woman. People give me bad looks as a divorce”. Meryem had been a regular worker for ten years. She got divorced 12 years before and she says that:

At first, I could not find a job easily. I did not get any support from my family. They did not want my children. I had to migrate to Eskişehir. It took a long time to get used to living here. You participate into society as a divorced woman but later, quite later, you are empowered”.⁴⁰

Single-mothers, especially divorced women; escape from patriarchal authority at the domestic level and they have more power over their lives than do married women but both single-mothers’ and married women’s experiences are in common with respect to using immense labor. Both of them try to manage ‘poverty of resources’ in order to sustain their households’ reproduction under poverty conditions.

⁴⁰ Başta iş bulmakta zorlandım, ailemden destek almadım. Çocuklarımı istemediler. Eskişehir’e gelmek zorunda kaldım ama buraya uyum sağlamakta zorlandım. Toplum içine dul olarak, göze batıyorsun, sonra sonra güçleniyorsun.

6.7. Poverty, Deprivation and Women's Perception

In this subsection, women's opinions and appreciation about poverty and women's poverty are presented. It examines these questions: how do women evaluate their living conditions as related to their husbands, single-parents, married women, non-working women outside the home, and women in paid employment? At what level do they share or agree with mainstream poverty explanation? What is their opinion about propositions concerning women's poverty and about women's position in the society in general?

6.7.1. Women's Evaluation of Their Situation

Married women were asked whether they compared their lives with their husbands, and if so, whose life was better, hers or his. Married women compared their lives with their husbands' with respect to economic hardship, paid employment, psychological situation, personality, taking responsibility, participation in social life and health. The majority of women see their husbands' living conditions better than theirs (70%). Some women evaluate their life to be better than their husband's (20%). Few women say that their living conditions are the same as their husband's (10%).

22 regular working women, whose husbands were regular and irregular laborers, evaluate their husbands' life better than their. They express their opinion about their life in this way. Aynur and her husband are regular workers. According to her, "he lives better than me. He is egotistic. I always think about my children. He is not concerned with them. What they need, he does not know". Like Aynur, Alev's and her husband's working positions are the same. She says, "According to me, he is free at least. He does not take housework responsibility. I cook food. I take care of children. I clean the home. He goes to visit his friend on the weekends but I do not". Emine (cleaning worker) compared her working conditions with her husband's. "My husband is a civil servant. I do not have job

security. We work together in the same institution but I get tired more than him. His job is clean”. In general, regular women laborers evaluate their life compared to their husbands with respect to work burden, so that they feel less free than men. They feel deprived of doing many things outside the home.

Some women (5 women) especially whose husbands are irregular workers see their life better than their husbands’ with respect to earning money. For example, one woman says, “My life is good. I am better than him. He feels worse compared to me. I earn much more money than him. He is ashamed and bruised”. Kezban says, “I earn regular money, spend regularly, pay the bills regularly but he is deprived of them”. There are only three women who see their life conditions the same as those of their husband’s with respect to being in difficulty, strain and distress.

23 irregular women laborers, whose husbands are regular and irregular workers, see their husbands’ life to be better than theirs but five women do not. Their expression in their own words is that, “His life is better because he works. He has got social insurance. There is no future for me”; “My husband is so good, he is older than me but his health is better. He does not let me go outside”. “I am worse off than him. I cannot sleep for 8 hours due to my baby”; “I become nervous. I work almost 24 four hours in a day”; “My life is worse. He does what he wants. I have the responsibility of the home. My health is not good”.

29 non-working women outside the home, whose husbands are regular or irregular workers and unemployed, see their lives, as worst than their husbands’. On the other hand, eleven women see their life better than men. They appraise their lives with respect to especially participation in social life and freedom. The latter group’s evaluation of their lives in their own words was that: “He has a community. He clears his mind with his friends. I could not do anything at home”; “Worse. I have no social activity. He does what he wants. He goes out without permission”; “He is better. He works and I am at home”; “I am worse off

than him. I am not free. I have to manage his allowance for necessities. We cannot enquire about him but he can”; “I have to care for my children. He sees his friends easily but I am limited. He meets new people outside the home. I am bored doing management of the budget. I have no social life”. On the other hand, some women who see their lives as better than men express their ideas saying, “I am so good and comfortable because I am at home. No restrains in my life. No work. No getting up early for work”; “I can express myself better than my husband in the community. I am more sociable than him”; “I am free more than him. He has to work outside. He has to earn money”; “I am good and comfortable. He works in the dust, smoke and dirty conditions at the factory”.

All women evaluate their living conditions as worse than those of men due to the deprivation from social life, freedom, and earning money, enough time, and health and sharing responsibilities at home. Patriarchal structure and power contribute to women’s deprivation in their life. Patriarchal power over women’s labor makes women’s poverty and deprivation experiences deeper. Although participation in the work force gives them relative power, it does not emancipate them under poverty conditions. Women do not escape from their domestic role. On the contrary, they have to spend immense labors to meet family’s needs in the reproduction process. Non-working women outside the home have to sustain their lives through their husband’s wages, which justifies men’s power over women.

Women’s perception toward and ideas about working women in paid employment are also examined (non-working women as wage worker). Of 51 women, more than half evaluate their living conditions worse than women in paid employment (76 %). On the other hand, few women see their lives better than those of working women as wage workers (14 %). There are only 5 women, who value working women’s life as both good and bad. They evaluate working women’s lives with respect to material conditions, decision-making process, and empowerment, personality merits such as self-esteem, dignity, freedom, health,

social participation, and domestic labor. Their evaluation in their own words is seen in the following:

“My life is worse than theirs. I lost my self-assurance and self-esteem. I feel dependent. I am restrained. If I worked, I would have voice in the home”; “I am not doing well because I see few friends around me. I’m restrained by money”; “Working women have a voice in every issue, they have material freedom. I am worse off. There are free with respect to spending money”; “At least, they have material power. They are self-assured and they create a proper order in their daily life”; “Working women can buy everything. When I buy, I think about how I buy and how I do. I go through severe trials at home”; “Bad. If I worked, I would earn money and I would buy what my children wanted”; “Being a working woman is all good because she contributes to her family”; “I always take pains in working women, and their clothing. They stand on their feet. They may be tired but earn money”; “They are better than me. If I worked, I would be able to provide a good future to my children. My psychology would be better than now. If I earned money, I would struggle more”.

On the other hand, few non-working women see their lives as better than women in paid employment. According to these women, working women do not have enough time for their children. “I am doing better because I can look after my children. They see children only in the evening”. A widow says, “I am doing better because I have wages from my husband”. Moreover, some women think that working women’s lives are better with respect to earning money but they are worse off for the domestic work. “They may be fine. They earn money but they are worse off because they do all the work at home, cooking, cleaning, looking after the child”. It is seen that non-working women outside the home are deprived of earning money, freedom, and self-assurance. They have to sustain their life through their husbands’ wages.

The same question is also asked to both regular and irregular female laborers. How do they see their lives compared to non-working women who do not work outside the home; better or worse? Almost all the working women in paid employment see their lives better than those of housewives (90%). Very few women evaluate their life to be worse than those of housewives (1 %). Women mostly explain their ideas with respect to material freedom, purchasing power, psychological well-being and empowerment. Their opinions on their life in comparison with those of housewives are in the following way:

I see my life better with respect to material sense. I work but I can rest in the evening. I do not have to rest on my husband for money. My mind is fine because I do not think how much money my husband is going to give me. Women who stay at home always think how they can do shopping and what to buy but I know, I can do everything freely (regular female laborer more than 10 years in the factory).⁴¹

Working women feel stronger than housewives with respect to freedom of movement and decision-making process. “I have material power. When I want I can go everywhere easily. In this situation material freedom means everything but a housewife has to ask her husband. She depends on husband”; “I earn money by myself and I spend by myself”; “Being in work is good. When I stay at home I suffer from everything. Think, think. At least, I clear my brain outside”; “Thinking about housewives, I think, I am free. I am more secure. This affects my decisions”.

Nuriye is a divorced female. She works irregularly. She stays with her mother with two children. According to her, woman in paid employment “is doing very well. Housewifery has no feature. A housewife is like a property at home for husbands. Women’s work is underestimated by men, cleaning, washing dishes...” Rabia works as a seasonal worker in the field. She says, “Housewives are

⁴¹ Maddi anlamda hayatımı iyi görüyorum. Çalışıyorum ama hiç olmazsa akşamları dinlenebiliyorum. Kocama maddi açıdan bağımlı değilim. Kafam rahat. Kocam bana ne kadar para verecek diye düşünmüyorum. Evde oturan kadınlar nasıl alışveriş yapacaklarını ve ne alacaklarını düşünüyorlar. Fakat ben özgürce her şeyi yapabilirim, hiç olmazsa bunu biliyorum.

cureless with respect to financial hardship. At least, due to my earning, I can pay electricity and telephone's bills. It is so important for me to meet these needs". Very few women see housewives' life better than working women with respect to time. One female says, "I am working from morning until night. They are comfortable. They care of children. They have time. I am tired out working".

Although working women spend immense labor, they see themselves better than housewives with respect to earning money that gives them an important power. However, deprivation of quality of life is quite common between both working women in paid employment and non-working women outside the home. Working women's situation may be better in terms of earning money but they have to spend rather much labor for meeting family's needs in daily life. Patriarchal authority at home restricts working and non-working women's lives.

Lastly, the following question is asked to married women: compared to women who live alone/without a husband, is your situation better or worse in your opinion? Why? The majority of the women assess their situation as better than single-mothers (85%). On the other hand, very few women see single-mothers' living situation to be better (12%). Their appreciation in their words is that, "Their situation is bad because they look after children by themselves. They are alone"; "I am better. Because I can share hardships with my husband"; "Of course, I am well. In Turkey, the perception to the women alone is very different from that to the married woman. They are not seen good, especially divorced women"; "Women living alone is excluded by her family"; "My children are with their fathers but the children of women who live alone are deprived from their father's love"; "Divorced and widows are under a heavy burden. Their situation is worse. One salary, children, so difficult"; "My husband is my reassurance, guarantee. His support is important for us and me".

On the other hand, few women see single-mothers' life well, due to being released from patriarchal authority. In their own words, "In my opinion, they are

better. They can behave in their own way. They can do what they want without their husband”; “If I were a single woman, I would be more independent. I would develop myself; he prevents me from many things. Now I could not do anything because of my husband”; “Sometimes, I regret being a married woman”. Some married women view especially widows’ lives as better because “They get pension through their husbands”.

Social and cultural values affect their evaluation about women who live alone. It is seen that men provide an important feeling of assurance materially and morally. Although they have difficulty with patriarchal authority, men are seen as an important support for the family. The family institution keeps its importance with respect to solidarity not only among married women but also among single-mothers. Of the 15 single mothers (10 divorced and 5 widows), some women evaluate their lives worse compared with married women with respect to economic difficulty and sustenance of the family’s needs alone. Especially widow women suffer from caring for their children without a father. In their own words, “It is difficult to bring up children alone. They feel they want their father. Lack of money, life struggle. I am so tired”.

However, all divorced women (10) view their lives better than those of married women with respect to patriarchal authority. Especially regular working divorced female workers evaluate their lives better than those of married women. The factor of economic independence affects their opinion. They feel better due to being released from patriarchal authority. For example one divorced female says:

I found my personality after the divorce. There is no man who waits for my service. There is no stress for me. I may be in economic difficulty but my mind is at rest. In my opinion, most married women want to be divorced from their husbands but because of economic reasons they could not do it”.⁴²

⁴² Boşandıktan sonra kişiliğimi buldum. Benden hizmet bekleyen bir erkek yok. Stres, sıkıntı yok. Ekonomik zorluk çekiyorum ama hiç olmazsa kafam rahat. Bence evli kadınların çoğu boşanmak istiyor ama maddi zorluklardan dolayı bunu yapamıyorlar.

Although they are in financial difficulty and short of time in daily life, they feel better in terms of emancipation from patriarchy. Having escaped from patriarchy makes them empowered but does not prevent them from struggling against poverty conditions because they have to sustain their household only with one salary.

In spite of the fact that women's living experiences can be different with respect to being married and being in paid employment, they share common deprivation experiences in terms of recreating themselves as human beings. The following question is asked to all women: What do you think you are deprived of as a woman? This question helps to explain why poverty and deprivation are so common among all women.

Their words comprise similar deprivation forms. They are deprived of education, time, social life, freedom, clothing, a proper house holiday, going out, working in paid employment, special necessities like a hairdresser; make-up, house goods, love, power, shopping, decision-making processes, respect, future security, money, and so forth.

In their own words: "I am so sad because of being uneducated. I would love to go to school"; "I do not have time. I am always working"; "I do not have any social activity. I wish I had gone out to eat in a restaurant and to a place of amusement"; "I am deprived of freedom. I am not free. My husband does not take my opinion into consideration"; "I have been married for ten years. I have never gone out. Ten years passed empty for me"; "I am deprived of everything. Good clothes, make-up, a good house, home materials"; "Because of economic difficulty, I could not buy what I want. I have to buy things that are poor quality, cheap, worthless"; "From everything. For me, not only I but also all women fail to do what they want".

As a result, married women see their lives more deprived of power, freedom and material things than do their husbands. On the other hand, they see their lives relatively better than single-mothers due to sharing of some difficulties with their husband. Non-working women view working female's lives to be better in terms of earning money and spending it freely. Especially divorced single mothers feel themselves better due to the escaping from patriarchal authority. However, all women share common experiences with respect to deprivation of many things.

6.7.2. Women's Opinion on Explanation of Poverty

In this part, women's understanding of poverty in their own views is represented. How women see their households' economic and social status is examined. How they explain the reasons for economic hardship or sustenance difficulty with respect to their families is investigated. To what extent they share or agree with the mainstream poverty explanation is studied.

The perception of women on poverty refers to the manifestation of poverty forms like unemployment, not having money, inability to afford food, shelter, clothing, transportation and children's education. Women were asked what level they see their family's status, based on their household's income. Of the 120 women, almost half of them (48 %) see their economic level as average (mid-way: neither poor nor high) (table.44). According to women who classified themselves as average, they may meet the basic needs but not in a quality way. For example, they say, "we are not hungry and do not stay in the street, thank God, we work and earn money".

While 21 % of the respondents view their family's status below the middle level, 29 % of the women assess their households' position as poor. Women who classified themselves as below middle are close to the poor. The concepts of poverty and being poor are frequently experienced as stigmatizing labels. Thus people may not easily define themselves as poor. Classification of oneself as

below average refers to the idea that meeting basic needs is difficult. They are in hardship sustenance. In this labor category, women describe a poor as one who can not afford basic needs of food, clothing, shelter and children's higher education. Women who receive aid from the municipality and whose husbands are unemployed easily classified themselves as poor. Some women define themselves as poor work irregularly. Among labor categories, 49% of housewives define themselves as poor. On the other hand, the majority of regular (65%) and irregular women laborers (54%) define their family's status as average (mid-way: neither poor nor rich) (table.45).

The reason why the households were in sustenance hardship was asked. Women were asked in their opinion what the main reasons for sustenance hardships were for their households. There were only five women who said that they were not in financial difficulty. Except for these, all women accept their sustenance hardship. According to women, the reasons of sustenance difficulty are these: unemployment, low-wages, and lack of money, high costs of living, governments, irregular work, economic crisis, poverty, men's irresponsibility, no awareness of money spending, and no awareness of money management, class-discrimination, and having one earner.

"My husband's irresponsibility, his drinking. If he weren't like this then I would not have to work." "The government feels 350 million of wages much for us."; "Crisis unemployment high living costs" (regular female and male laborers).

"Class discrimination has always existed in Turkey. The rich can have anything anytime in Turkey but we work as 5 people and even so we cannot afford most things"; "because of one income, even when we both work regularly, minimum wage is not enough"; "See her (husband), we all see him work for minimum wage. See if that was a little higher would I ever go to the fields, honey? Would I give such pain to myself? His money is enough for us. It would be appreciated. Would I go out to work?" (Irregular female and regular male laborer)

“Living conditions, high expenses, low income, all this is not enough for my kid’s school”; “Insensible spending, spending without thinking” (housewife and male regular laborers). “Because of lack of money. If we had money, there is no fight at home or hardship of making ends meet. Everything is tied to money. My man does not have a proper job. His income is irregular (Female and male irregular laborers).

According to fifteen women, whose husbands are unemployed, the most important reason for their sustenance difficulty is their husbands’ unemployment.

It is because wages are below standards, even way below standards because we work for one wage. I work on my own. At first, I did not feel I got divorced, separated. In that first year, I tried to put together a home again, at work, with my sister’s support I am trying to stand on my two feet (regular single-mother laborer).

Women’s attitudes towards the mainstream poverty explanation are also examined. A more common approach to explaining poverty among mainstream poverty literature is based on the individual’s attributes. The individualistic explanation for why the poor are poor is that they are lazy, that they have low self esteem, and that they lack education (Wright, 1994: 34). On the other hand, the structural explanation of poverty sees poverty as inherent and a feature of society. For example, it is thought that poverty is caused by state policies or low wages and inefficiency of market. The Marxist tradition sees

Poverty is in contemporary capitalism as generated by the core dynamics of class exploitation. Poverty is not an accident; it is not a by-product. It is an inherent, and crucial, feature of a society whose economic structure is grounded in class and exploitation (Wright, 1994: 37-36).

Women are told that one of the main reasons for poverty is laziness. I asked the women what they thought, and whether they agreed or disagreed with this explanation (Table 46, see Appendix A). The majority of women strongly agreed (21%) and somewhat agreed (54%) with this kind explanation. On the other hand,

a few women disagreed with laziness as the reason of poverty (23%). In addition to laziness, they were asked whether lack of education was seen as one of the main reasons for the explanation of poverty. They were asked what they thought, and whether they agreed or disagreed with this explanation. Most women strongly agreed (41%) and somewhat agreed (47%) with the reason of education. Very few women did not accept lack of education as a reason for poverty (8%).

The same question was also asked for unemployment, low-wages, and poor policies of the state (Table 46, see Appendix A). The majority of women see unemployment as a reason for poverty (89 %). While 49 % of women strongly agreed and 40% somewhat agreed; 10.8 % disagreed with unemployment as the reason for poverty. Moreover, the majority of the women see low wage as one of the main reasons for poverty (64 % strongly agreed and 33 % somewhat agreed). There were only two women who did not accept low wages as a reason for poverty. Most women strongly agreed (33 %) and somewhat agreed (48 %) with the poor state policies as the explanation of poverty. The 16 % of the women have no ideas on state policies.

Lastly, the women were asked about exploitation as seen to be one of the main reasons for poverty (Table 46, see Appendix A). They were asked what they thought, and whether they thought agreed or disagreed with this explanation. Most women strongly agreed (38 %) and somewhat agreed (42 %) with the idea of exploitation as a reason for poverty. Very few women did not accept lack of education as a reason for poverty (8 %).

Although the majority of the women see the reasons of poverty as laziness, education, unemployment, low-wages, poor state policies and exploitation, according to women, the most important reason for poverty is unemployment (38%) (Table.47, see Appendix A). Other women view the most important reason as low-wages (18%), poor state policies (15%), lack of education (13%) laziness (12%) and exploitation (4%) for poverty (table.47). Especially housewives (43%)

and irregular women laborers (42%) see unemployment as the most important reason for poverty (table.48).

The majority of the women explained the reasons for poverty from the structural perspective. Both the rates of non-working women outside the home and irregular female laborers and unemployed and irregular male laborers are high among the labor categories. Therefore, unemployment is a serious experience for the household members. In addition to this, regular male and female laborers' wages are low. Their economic status has affected their explanation of the sources of poverty.

Women would like to escape from sustenance hardship. The wage-level should be increased. Each member of the household should work in paid employment. The money should be managed sensibly. Men have to be responsible. It is necessary to work so hard continuously. Both the woman and the man are required to work. Women should work like men (especially housewives' solution). The state should create new working areas for the poor. The high cost of living should be decreased.

6.7.3. Respondents' Attitude to Women's Poverty

This subsection endeavors to examine women's attitudes to propositions, which are related to women's poverty experiences and their social position in the society. First, women's attitudes are examined with respect to the factors that are affect women's poverty such as working or non-working, being married or single, living in rural or urban areas. Secondly, their attitude to domestic labor, which is the most important manifestation of female poverty, experiences are presented. Thirdly, female attitudes to the propositions about women's paid employment are examined. Finally, women's attitude towards the effect of poverty or sustenance hardship on women and households' lives with respect to violence and social network in Turkey are shown.

According to women, the main reasons for women's poverty is not working outside the home as a wage worker (97 %), lack of education (99 %), men's irresponsibility in terms of spending money (96 %), earning less than men (68 %), and women's working both in reproduction and production processes (56 %) (Table 49, see Appendix A). As can be seen, most women are against the proposition that one of the reasons for women's poverty is working at home and being in paid employment. According to them, domestic activities are their main responsibilities. Women understand poverty as lack of material things. They say, "Housework is the main duty for women"; "Housework makes me only tired, not poor"; "To work at home let me deteriorate not poor". Neriman has been working as a worker for more than 10 years. She strongly disagrees with this proposition. She says, "Of course not. Why should it make us poor? I am content. Both housework and work, I do these because I want to. I do not feel tired at all. In fact I like doing them. I am nice". İsmihan has also been a worker in a factory more than 10 years like Neriman. Her attitude is similar with hers. She says, "We do house chores this way or that. We get more tired. Psychologically, physically, morally you get more tired but this does not make you poorer, this makes it better".

Although the majority of the women see such reasons for women's poverty as not working outside the home as a wage worker, lack of education, men's irresponsibility in spending money, earning less than men, and women's working both in reproduction and production processes, for them the most important reason for women's poverty is men's irresponsibility in terms of spending money (for personal necessities as alcohol, cigarettes etc) (43 %). On the other hand, few women see the most important reason for women's poverty as not working outside the home as a wage worker (25 %), lack of education (17 %), working both at home and in paid employment for sustenance of the family (12 %) and earning less than men (4 %). According to almost half of the female opinion, patriarchy is more influential on women's impoverishment. With respect to labor

categories (being a worker in paid employment or not), no important difference is seen.

Besides the determinants of women's poverty, women's attitudes to the factors that affect women's poverty experiences are also examined (table.50). According to the majority of women, women and children suffer more than men from poverty conditions. They live under a heavier burden than do men (94 %). On the other hand, they think that women who live in the urban area suffer from sustenance hardship more than women who live in the rural area (81 %). Hatice's words reflect other women's reasons about why rural women are poorer than urban ones.

Those who live in the city suffer more. If you were in the village, you would have your eggs, butter and yogurt. At least you would not have rent. There electricity bills, phone bills are lower. But let me say this. Everywhere you step is money in the city. I am sorry but even the toilets are charged with money. I mean you pay right up even for your toilet. I mean for a well-off person there would be no problem in the city (irregular female laborer).⁴³

The majority of the women strongly agreed (45%) and somewhat agreed (40%) with the idea that according to working women in paid employment, the housewife is poorer due to having to depend on the husband's wage. Few women reject this idea (14.1%). For them, if the husband's wage is so high, housewives are not poor inversely they are more comfortable. The majority of the women somewhat agreed (51 %) and strongly agreed (35 %) with the idea that women who were widowed and divorced were poorer due to being deprived of their husband's wage. Few women disagreed with this idea (13 %). According to them, single-mothers receive aid from the public institutions (e.g. municipality) and their relatives.

⁴³ Şehirde yaşayan daha çok çekiyor. Köy yerinde olsan, bir yumurtan oluyor, yağın, yoğurdun oluyor. Hiç olmazsa ev kiran olmaz. Cereyan faturası, telefon faturası düşük gelir orda. Ama şöyle diyim. Şehir yerinde adım attığın yer para. Affedersin ama tuvalet bile parayla. Tuvaletine kadar para veriyon yani. Yani şimdi varlıklı biri olsa şehirde sıkıntı çekmez

This is not true for everyone. I mean if there is someone in the family to help now, there are people whose families help after their husbands die. For example, we have one. My brother died. The wage was left to my sister-in-law. Now she is more comfortable after my brother died. There is support from the family, from us for instance. There is support from her own family and sisters and brothers. There is the wages from mother and father. Therefore, she has more.⁴⁴

Powerlessness is one of the important manifestations of women's poverty experiences. Women were asked about their attitudes with the question whether living without a man and being in paid employment make women powerful in their own life. The majority of the women strongly agreed (41%) and somewhat agreed (39%) with the idea that although single mothers suffered from sustenance hardship, they felt more powerful due to escaping from the man's oppression. However, some women do not accept this idea (17%). According to their view, single-mothers live under social pressure. They are restrained by social and cultural values. For example, a woman says, "She may have ran away from male oppression but this time she will have pressure from her circles, I mean she will be branded as a bad woman".

They were asked their opinions on the statement that "man is seen as a breadwinner for the family". They were asked what their opinion about this idea was and whether they agreed or disagreed with it. More than half of the women did not accept man's position as the breadwinner. They somewhat disagreed (34 %) and strongly disagreed (20%) with it (table.51). Women participation into paid employment affected their ideas. On the other hand, of the 51 non-working women as a waged worker, the majority of women see men as the breadwinner for the family (66 %) (Table 53).

⁴⁴ Herkes için geçerli değil. Yani şimdi aileden yardımcı olan biri varsa kocası öldükten sonra aile desteği çok olanlar var. Mesela bizim başımızda var. Abim öldü. Yengeme maaş kaldı. Abim öldükten sonra çok daha rahat şu anda. Aileden destek var, bizlerden destek var mesela. Kendi aile, kardeşlerinden destek var. Anne, babadan maaş var. Yani daha imkânlı.

As it is known, as cultural and ideological; man's wage is seen as the main sources for the household sustenance. Women's domestic labor is still invisible and less valued in society. The majority of women have rejected the idea that men's working outside and women's working at home have the same respect in society (91%). Few women see men's labor as more important than women's domestic labor in terms of household sustenance (9%) (Table 51, see Appendix A). The respondents were told that men's earning money by itself is not sufficient for household sustenance. In order to sustain family's sustenance, woman's housework is important as much as a man's earning money. Most of the women strongly agreed (52 %) and somewhat agreed (46 %) with this idea. Although almost all women accept the importance of the women's domestic labor in order to sustain household sustenance, of 120 women, 72 % of the women agreed with men's working outside and woman's working at home contribute to family sustenance at the same level (Table 51, see Appendix A). In other words, 28 % of women do not accept the importance of women's domestic labor with respect to contribution to the household sustenance. Moreover, the women's attitudes to women's exerting labor for caring of children were examined. They were asked who mostly keeps up children's sustenance in their opinion, the mother's exerting labor or the father's working outside the home. The majority of women see that mother's labor is more important than the father's working outside (69.2%).

Besides the woman's domestic labor, women's status in the production process is important to understand their poverty experiences (Table 52, see Appendix A). The respondents were also asked about their attitudes to the relationship between women and work life. The majority of the women (93%) agreed with the idea that in the last years, it had been difficult to find a job easily for both educated and uneducated women in Turkey. They also strongly agreed (57%) and somewhat agreed (39%) with the idea that women had been employed by the employers in jobs which were low-status, low in wages, insecure and lacking social insurance. Women's work experiences affected their ideas. The most of the women strongly

agreed (49 %) and somewhat agreed (35%) with the idea that all workers should be unionists (84%). However, few women had any idea about unions (14%).

Although women have worked in paid employment, her wage is seen ideologically as supplementary income for the family because the man's position is evaluated as the breadwinner in the society. In this research, half of the women view that women's work contributes only as a supplement to the family (55 %). However, regular and irregular female laborers do not see women's work as a supplementary contribution (32 %). For women (also for men), being in paid employment does not mean to escape from sustenance hardship. However, women used their labor power in the domestic sphere to meet the needs with low wages. Thus, it is asked whether they escaped from sustenance difficulty although women worked in paid employment.

In recent years, lack of money, increasing of poverty and economic difficulties has affected women's participation in the paid work in Turkey. This causes to increase the quarrelling between women and men as well as the domestic violence in the household. Moreover, it constitutes a reason for the decrease in solidarity among relatives, friends and neighbors. Almost all women agreed (98%) that because of the financial difficulties, women have to work in paid employment in Turkey. According to the majority of the women, sustenance hardships have caused to an increase quarrels between women and men (98%) and raised domestic violence (93 %). Moreover, most women accepted that poverty causes a decrease in the solidarity among relatives, friends and neighbors (95%) in Turkey (Table 53, see Appendix A).

Lastly, the statement "Turkey is a country where poor demand their right!" was examined. The majority of the women strongly disagreed (41%) and somewhat disagreed (38 %) with this idea (Table 54, see Appendix A). Moreover, more than half of the women do not rely upon the state in the struggle against poverty (55 %). Few women rely on the state (16 %).

As result, although women accept the reasons of women's poverty as not working outside the home as a waged worker, lack of education, women's working both in reproduction and production processes and men's irresponsibility in terms of spending money, they see the most important reason of women's poverty is men's irresponsibility. The majority of the women accept the women's poverty burden and particularly women who live in the urban. Both housewives and single parents are evaluated poorer than employed and married women. Women who are in paid employment are thought as powerful. Although single- parents are seen as poorer, they think that single-parents escaped from the man's oppression. On the other hand, it is thought that they live under the social pressure in the society. Being in paid employment affect the women's idea on the men's breadwinner position. Women's domestic labor is recognized as important for the family sustenance. For the majority of the women, lack of money, increasing poverty and economic difficulties have affected on women's participation into work force, decreased in solidarity among relatives, friends and neighbors, increased quarrels between women and men.

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

The poverty question has become more popular in the last two decades and extensive bodies of research and discussion have emerged on the analysis of poverty in both underdeveloped and advanced capitalist societies. The mainstream poverty studies have involved important limitations both theoretically and methodologically to make visible women's poverty. The main aim of this study is to reveal critically the relation between women and poverty as depending on labor forms that women use in production and reproduction processes. As this is a basic background of my approach, four main questions follow my view point: First, how do poor women fight against poverty by using their labors in production and reproduction processes? Second, which mechanisms of these processes affect the impoverishment of women? And third, are there significant differences among women's poverty experiences from men's? And fourth and the most important is; are there any differences for women's poverty among women as categories which I try to give throughout in this study?

In the second chapter, poverty literature in relation to its limitations and its gender-neutral analysis has been critically reviewed. It is argued that the conceptualization and explanation of poverty are insufficient in order to understand women's poverty. One of the deficiencies of the poverty conceptualization is the determination of a poverty line in terms of making a distinction between the poor and the non-poor according to income, consumption level or other social indicators. It consists of ideological and political dimensions

in itself. It tries to reflect the number of people who fail to sustain their lives under capitalist conditions as minimal a number as possible. This approach reduces poverty to a social problem applying only to certain groups. It does not question the mechanisms of the capitalist production system that creates poverty. Poverty studies focus on the household as the unit of consumption. It is assumed that resources are shared equally between the household members. Therefore, it fails to take into account not only inequalities based on gender and age among the members in terms of the distribution of resources but also women's labor in the reproduction process. To think household as a homogenous unit leads to masking important differences and inequality among members of the households under poverty conditions.

Poverty line approaches are deficient not only in reflecting inter-household income inequality but also in the distribution of resources and it says little about how individuals access income and resources. When women participate into the labor market, they earn low wages than men. In addition to these, according to men, they have an unequal position in terms of access to income and resources, and in terms of the control of resources and income. Besides, they have different sets of expenditure obligations and responsibilities. The poverty line approach assumes that all members of a poor household are poor and no one is poor in an affluent household.

The main problem in the social exclusion approach is the dualism at its heart, as exclusion and inclusion that turn into an insider/outsider distinction. The formulation of exclusion and inclusion suggests a unitary notion of power. It means those included are powerful and excluded are powerless. Moreover, women's domestic labor is ignored within the social exclusion framework. Their unpaid works of reproduction and voluntary activities are discounted and effectively devalued. Women are not categorically excluded but they are integrated through reproductive labor for the reproduction of life in an unequal way.

The social exclusion frame does not take into consideration the conditions of employment for women. They are included in the labor market through marginal, low paid, insecure jobs under poor working conditions, which is not questioned by the social exclusion approach. There is no positive relationship between the inclusion of women into paid employment and their well-being. The gender aspect of intra-household relationships has not been accounted for in terms of controlling money. Income-generating activities do not prevent women from poverty. Conversely, women spend immense labor to meet household needs with low income.

Even though the role of the capability approach is to rethink women, solidarity conflicts and household bargaining, focus attention to the women element which is missing in poverty analyses, and understand entitlements and justice, it focuses on the symptoms of poverty rather than challenging its roots. The cause of poverty is not only the lack of entitlements and capabilities, but also the structurally reproduced distributional inequalities such as gender and class. The capability approach emphasizes the legal basis of command over commodities. For example, informal rights, which are embodied in norms and social notions of legitimacy, have more effect on the inter-household distribution of food. More importantly, to enhance women's capabilities will ameliorate women's poverty in the short term rather than transforming the conditions that generate poverty.

Sen's idea deeply affected the evaluation of the human development approach in terms of refining and broadening the basic concepts and measurement tools. This led to the understanding of women's poverty by Gender-related Development Index (GDI) and the Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM). Women's well-being has been measured at the national level according to three main indicators: "longevity", "knowledge" and "decent standard of living". For example, education in the GDI may show gender inequalities between women and men. Nevertheless, it does not inform about quality of education and gender bias in education choices. Moreover, the GDI focuses on the formal labor processes but

women take place in formal production processes. It has limitations in providing an accurate picture of inequalities between women's and men's earnings. Like the GDI, the GEM has limitations in revealing women's poverty. Quantitative measures of political participation in formal politics do not say anything about the degree of power women are able to exercise. Empowerment is thought as individual rather than as collective. The main idea behind the GEM is related with a liberal approach democracy that emphasizes individual rights and participation in decision-making through the electoral process.

Consensual poverty measurement and the Participatory Poverty Assessments, which are assumed to be 'democratic' measurements of poverty, are also based on the views of population or poor people. However, the identification of necessities is the arbitrariness in the consensual method. It concerns with the possession of items rather than their quality. It takes them into consideration in a sex-affecting nature. Lacks of the items affect women and men differently. Participatory Poverty Assessment is gender-blind. The type of questions asked, the issue explored and the range of information obtained do not depend on women's interests. The World Bank's PPAs do not involve a feminist interest. Women are taken into account in the research process as an added category and as an instrument in order to reduce poverty.

Poverty definitions confuse both the reasons and the indicators of poverty. While unemployment or low income is seen as indicators of poverty, they are also seen as reasons of poverty. Poverty definitions arbitrarily determine a poverty line, which serve to divide the poor from the non-poor. The explanations of poverty as male-centered do not involve women's specific positions in society. For the human capital approach, the causes of poverty are lack of employment and low-wages. The responsibility of unemployment and low wages are attributed to workers. In other words, the reasons of poverty are explained according to individuals' weaknesses such as lack of education, of training, of jobs skills, and laziness. In short, the lack of human capital prevents women from economic

mobility. The new home economists consider women's lack of employment or employment on low wages by their rational choices. They ignore occupational segregation and discrimination in the market but focus on their primary responsibilities at home. It is assumed that women and men behave in a rational way in terms of the household interests. Division of labor between sexes is explained according to economic principles of comparative advantages. Moreover, individualistic approaches blame women for creating poverty and transmitting it to the next generation by using the culture of poverty and the concept of the underclass. It is thought that women transmit their lives, the way they live and their values to children. Women are seen as the main actors to produce poverty by their pathological motherhood. They are integrated into the explanation of poverty as the blame of poverty.

In the third chapter, the relationship between women and poverty in the Third World context has been critically revealed by drawing upon literature. First, the historical background of women and poverty is critically reviewed by drawing upon welfare, equity and anti-poverty approaches. Development policies have viewed poor women as the welfare sector of the population since 1950. Women's role in the domestic sphere is strengthening through population programs. Although women's poverty is not directly addressed in welfare approach, woman's reproductive role in the household is reproduced by development policies. The liberal feminist approach criticizes the welfare approach in terms of seeing women as passive beneficiaries of development. The liberal trend focuses on both women's productive and reproductive roles. Women's poverty is taken into consideration indirectly through women's unequal position in relation to men in the development process.

Second, the poverty understanding of development institutions and their response to women's poverty have been presented in a critical way. Neo-liberalism as a political and economic project has altered relationship between states and citizens since 1980. It emphasizes market competition and alters state regulations. It

focuses on the central value of individualism over collective action. The neo-liberal project serves capital accumulation and capital valorization through privatization, the establishment of new property rights, the new labor forms in the production process and decreasing the real-wages. The essential areas of social reproduction and reproduction have been imposed on labor. The neo-liberal policies have deeply affected the working classes and especially women's labor in the reproduction process. Decreases in real wages force women to use their labor power in both the production and reproduction processes in order to decrease living costs. Development agendas respond to women's poverty through women's labor power, social investment in basic health and education to improve labor productivity. They use women's labor as an instrument against poverty. They distort and assimilate women's position in the poverty issue.

Third, how feminists frame women's poverty has been discussed. Most feminist researches have revealed the relationships between labor market, household and women's poverty in the Third World context. Informalization of women's labor, occupational segregation, wage inequalities between women and men, unemployment and underemployment has been empirically indicated in order to understand women's impoverishment. Moreover, in contrast to the neo-household economic model, which is based on the classical economic principles of firm, feminists conceptualize the household as cooperative-conflict in order to reveal women's poverty experiences. The household is seen as an arena of competing claims, rights to power, interests and resources. Thus, women's poverty has mostly been discussed by most feminists around the empirical indicators of women's impoverishment. Although empirical indicators reflect women's poverty, they have limitations with respect to the theoretical basis that explains why women experience poverty differently from men.

Lastly, in the third chapter, poverty studies have been critically reviewed in Turkey. Poverty in Turkey was discussed as a structural problem within the framework of the issue of underdevelopment after 1950. The elimination of

poverty and the thought that poverty will be resolved within the framework of economic growth and development has endured as a common tendency up to the present time. The negative impact of the crises created by the process of reformation on the social classes and the decline in the quality of life led to an increase in the interest in the topic of post-1990 poverty in Turkey, leading to a growth in the volume of research in this area. Nevertheless, the studies looking into the effects of the crises on women becoming poor and the relationship between women and poverty from a gender perspective are rather limited.

Studies of poverty undertaken on macro and micro levels in Turkey can be categorized into two basic groups, though they concern the aims and policies towards the reasons of poverty and means of decreasing it. Macro level studies generally analyze the extent of poverty in Turkey based on the income/consumption and social indicators. In all these studies, poverty lines reflect the lowest level of the physical reproduction conditions of the individuals and households. If the necessities list is enlarged for people's social reproduction requirements, the above listed poverty percentages will increase. One of the most significant limitations of these studies which take poverty line as the basis is that the poverty experiences of the poor and particularly of the women are neglected. Although these studies provide information about poverty in Turkey in general, they lack the social and associative dimensions of poverty. The focal points of the micro level researches are rather the survival strategies developed in response to poverty, urban poverty and/or "new urban poverty". All these studies have reached notable results about the sociological states of urban poverty or "the new urban poor" in Turkey; nevertheless, the common point of all is thus: how poverty differentiates from the perspective of gender and how the women that fall into one of the above cited different poverty categories (e.g., in the poverty-in-turns process, new urban poor, doers, losers, accommodators, working poor) are affected by impoverishment processes, and how they respond to these processes have not been addressed by these studies. Moreover, in most of these researches, men were the interviewees to provide the information on households. The

experiences of women, who both work in jobs to supply income and decide every day how the sources of the house will be used under poverty conditions, have been neglected. Although there are limited researches related with women and poverty, they focus on women's role with respect to the survival of the family or to cope with poverty.

In the fourth chapter, the feminist debates on women and poverty are framed by four approaches called "feminization of poverty thesis" and/or gender dimension of poverty", "the system of patriarchy", Marxist-feminist class perspective and Socialist-feminist perspective. While the feminization of poverty thesis focuses on the female-headed households, in addition to single-parents, the gender dimension of poverty discussion takes into account women's poverty in the households where women and men live together. Women's poverty is explained by these factors: the increasing rate of female-maintaining household, out-of-wedlock births, divorce, the loss of husband's wages, women's low-wages, lack of adequate child support payment, inadequate Social welfare Programs. The gender dimension of poverty refers to the argument that women are also poorer than men in the families where they live together. Women's poverty is explained by gender of division and women's dependency upon men. While feminist studies about women and poverty cause to bring into existence an important and rich literature and to bring into attention the relationship between women and poverty, they mainly focus on the empirical manifestations of women's poverty under the three issues: the household, labor market and welfare-system.

Susan Thomas (1994) uses the system of patriarchy to explain women's poverty. She explains the nature and causes of women's poverty with the gender relations that are constructed and maintained under the system of patriarchy. "Only when these relations are factored into poverty equation can a through understanding of women's impoverishment be gained" (Thomas, 1994:73). According to her, the feminization of poverty framework ignores the analysis of the system of patriarchy. She argues that men oppress women as a gender class. She sees

women's poverty as a function of the social processes of gender stratification. The gender-class model explores the distinctions among women in terms of the work they do within the economy as a whole. It also shows how these women in various economic class categories share similarities with other categories of women in the activities they perform in the gender-class model. Pauperization of women is a result of a product of the complex interaction of forces, both public and private in nature. In the Marxist-feminist framework, Gimenez's (1993, 1999) ideas have been presented. She discusses the relationship between women and poverty within the context of class analysis. According to her, poverty and the poor are ideological concepts. The poverty concept has been mystifying broader processes of impoverishment. It obscures its structural roots in the economic organization of society, and especially its class dimensions as well. Poverty is thought as a problem that affects primarily women, the elderly, racial and ethnic minorities. Economic determinants of poverty are related with decline in family wages. Poor families are often identified as the 'working poor'. The terminology of working poor reflects the relative power of different strata within the working class according to their wages but their class location is ignored. For her, "if social class is taken into account, the phenomena called 'poverty' can be best understood as the fate of the most vulnerable sectors within working class" (1993: 194). She focuses on the class location that makes people vulnerable to poverty. On the other hand, she thinks that age, gender, race and ethnicity are relevant correlates of poverty, not determinants of it. For her, the concept of class is necessary to explore its implications for the life chances of people in different social classes. The ultimate determinant of women's relative vulnerability to poverty is their class location.

In the Socialist-feminist approach, the relationship between women and poverty has been discussed within the context of women's labor that is used in the production and reproduction processes. It is discussed that it requires a theoretical perspective including a total analysis of forms of labor realized in the production and reproduction processes in order to understand women's poverty. At the

theoretical level, both analyses of capitalism and domestic labor debates constitute an important starting point in order to go further to the holistic analysis on the material basis of women's poverty. The specific determination of women's poverty is a two way devaluation of their labor power that is used in the social reproduction process. Sarvasy and Van Allen define women's labor as an unjust dual role in the reproduction process. For them, "the concept of unjust role captures the condition whereby many women combine unpaid labor with under wage labor" (1984:92). Their main argument is that "dual role does not determine that all women will be poor but we call the unjust dual role make women vulnerable to poverty". In this study, instead of unjust dual labor, the two way devaluation (exploitation is used) of women's labor in the social reproduction process has been used with respect to women's poverty. In addition to the material basis of women's labor, patriarchy deepens and prolongs women's poverty at the second level. Hartman's definition of patriarchy and her connection that she makes between patriarchy and capitalism is useful to interpret the women's poverty experiences.

In the fifth chapter, the methodological stance of this study, the limitations of the mainstream poverty studies and the strength of feminist methodology in exploring the women's poverty experiences have been presented. Mainstream poverty measurements, such as income/consumption, basic needs, and Human Development and Poverty Index, involve deficiencies with respect to the determination of the poverty line, which reflect the technocratic needs of experts. Moreover, their premise is on the concept of a male actor and male centered notions of well-being and agency. They do not tend to ask questions in areas concerning women and they have limitations in addressing the gender dimension of poverty. In contrast to mainstream poverty measurements, feminist methodology has important power in understanding women's poverty. Feminist research is significantly different from malestream research. It involves the alternative origins of problems that concern women rather than men. There is no power relationship in the feminist research process. Feminist critiques of

hegemonic malestream science open a door to the development of an alternative in order to understand women's life experiences, and in particular their poverty experiences.

What makes this research feminist depends on the origin of the problem that is concerned with poor women, who are oppressed and exploited in the capitalist society. The selected topic or concern with women in poverty on a different basis from non-feminists does not make this study feminist. Moreover, in this research, evidence and data are based on the experiences of poor women and their views. Lastly, the nature of the relationship between me as the researcher and the women participants is different from the mainstream poverty research. It has been aimed to be an interactional research process. As a researcher, I and women participants take place as subject positions. Being free of hierarchy, creating an interactional relationship and the sharing of experiences, which are important principles of feminist methodology, have been tried to be applied.

In this research, interviews were held with 120 women in Eskisehir in order to reveal women's poverty experiences in their own views and words. When households were chosen, they were categorized according to the realization forms of women and men's labor. In addition to this, marital status of women was taken into consideration. There are eight researched categories. In the first category, both women and men are regular laborers. In the second category, women are irregular and men are regular laborers. In the third category, women are housewives but men are regular laborers. In the fourth category, women are regular workers but men are irregular laborers. In the fifth category, women and men are irregular laborers. In the sixth category, women are housewives and men are irregular laborers. In the seventh category, women are housewives and men are unemployed. In the eighth category, single-mothers take place. The last category consists of the women who are single and live with their children.

Women's poverty is related with their material conditions in which they sustain their lives. In addition to this, women are not thought independent from their social position in the family. The labor categories of the research are mostly nuclear families with respect to household types. They have become urbanized. Women's position is relatively worse in the crowded families in which men and women are unemployed. With respect to age composition, both women and men have potential to use their labor power actively. In the households, few young children are available for active employment. Most of them work irregularly without social security. The majority of the children in the households are school aged and dependant.

There is no significant difference between the labor categories according to the education of women. The majority of women have primary school degrees that affect their position in the production process. They were unable to have educational opportunities due to economic difficulties of their families. Although women and men's education levels are not so high, the rate of having degrees from secondary and high school is higher for men than women.

The majority of women were born in towns and villages. They migrated to Eskişehir from the neighboring provinces, its counties and villages. Most of the women settled in this city with their families before marriage, and some of them migrated to Eskişehir due to reasons like new job opportunities and marriage. Migration is a way selected to find better jobs for the reproduction of labor. While the migrants who migrated after 1950 have relatively more accommodating conditions (jobs, dwelling places, a web of contacts) to survive in the city, the conditions became more inconvenient for the migrants who migrated after 1980 than did the past period. During and after migration the strength of the traditional web of contacts developed on the basis of cooperation and solidarity has weakened. Progresses after 1980 made living conditions of the working class harder and constricted the conditions to use their labor in the production process. The individuals in the households are either unemployed or

generally employed in unorganized, casual, irregular and low-wage jobs without social securities. As the educational level of the households is low, most of them are causally employed in unqualified jobs without social securities.

The ratio of ownership of houses is low. Most of the households decrease their cost of sustenance by residing in the properties of their relatives. A statistically significant relationship was found between labor categories and tenancy. The ratio of tenancy is high among the labor categories where women and men are unemployed and irregular income earners. The physical conditions of the houses are unhealthy. Rooms are generally small. Negative physical conditions of the houses and heating problems force the household members to mostly live in one room. A significant proportion of the households has toilets outside the house and utilizes toilets as bathing rooms. Most of the women are not content with the house they live. Poor quality and insufficiency of the houses create a pressure on the labor of women. Women spend most of their time within the house. They intensively strive for daily works under such inadequate physical and substructure conditions. All works necessary for the reproduction of labor are carried out through endless efforts of women under conditions of deprivation. The endeavor and effort exerted by women keep them deprived of humane living conditions.

Most of the households do not possess immovables like a house, a car, a store in the city and in the rural. While few households own a field or a house in the village, these assets do not provide any revenues. Poverty is commonly analyzed depending on the wage and consumption in the classical poverty studies, other resources (e.g. real estate) of the household are not included in the analyses. These resources are among the important supportive elements for the reproduction of the household. When these resources are considered in the poverty studies, it is generally quantitatively measured on whether they exist or not. However, the process and quality of acquisition of these resources are important to determine the living standards of the household. Women endeavor

an invisible labor especially during the acquisition or building of a house. In addition to this, only few women have entitlement on these resources.

Durable consumer goods are an indicator of living standards on the one hand, while being important and necessary tools for the reproduction of living on the other. There may be an inversely proportional relationship between their quality and acquisition, and general welfare indicators like in the ownership of other assets' (immovables) quality. Lack of and/or low quality of necessary house ware negatively affects the labor and time spent by women especially according to their domestic position. Lack of and/or low quality of necessary house ware negatively affect women's psychology, causing them to and feel destitute and disadvantageous compared to wealthier women. Among the labor categories, the unemployed, irregular income earners and single parents relatively are in a relatively worse condition than others in terms of durable consumer goods.

The high costs of living and the living conditions create pressure on women's commoditization. These women having low level of education leads them to work in jobs, which do not require knowledge or skills. This very same reason applies for men as well. Hardships of living and economic difficulties take the first place among the reasons why women work. Most women started work after they got married. As this study showed, women use their workforce in areas which overlap with their work within the house. None of the women who have irregular jobs have any social security. Women labor constitutes a significant portion within the unorganized workforce. The most serious problem that women with irregular jobs face is being deprived of retirement rights and benefits. The biggest fear that women with regular jobs on contract basis suffer from is to be laid off of their jobs. These women work as family laborers, exert enormous amounts of effort, though they have no saying in the way that the money is spent. Some women are in a battle against patriarchal relationships in order to participate in the working life. The money that women get is minimum wage level or below. The daily pay (12-15 YTL.) of the women spending effort in the

seasonal jobs is rather low. The women in the poor laborer class working outside the home receive wages that are below the value that they deserve. The underlying material basis for women's poverty (also men's poverty) in the production process is the loss of value of their labor. Most of the housewives want to work for reasons of hardships of living. Women's age, their obligation to look after children and that men do not allow them to work all prevent them from working. Their domestic work, patriarchal relationships and structure are factors effective in their becoming poor. Women's labor that they expend in the house aside from the production process loses value as well, unlike that of men's. The most distinguishing aspect of women's poverty (for both working and non-working women outside the home) is that their efforts inside the home are devalued. Likewise, the labor of employed women is devalued from both sides.

In addition to women's position in the production process, they have taken on the responsibility of the daily social reproductive tasks, such as reproductive adult power on a day-to-day basis, childcare and other activities, and upkeep of the household. In the case of women's participation into labor force, some domestic tasks are transferred to elder and younger women rather than being equally distributed between women and men. The experiences of women's poverty are different from men's in terms of time dimension. In this research, the majority of women recognized that their labor power that is used in the domestic sphere is important in terms of saving money and decreasing the living costs of the household.

All of the households have been having in difficulty in meeting their needs but few households used supporting systems that relies on assistance and debt. The relationship of the households with the hometown in the village is not so strong. Due to the economic difficulties, almost all women have cut down on the use and the consumption of cleaning materials, clothing, electric power, water, transportation, phone, heating and food.

Women use their labor power also in the subsistence production due to the rise of living costs. They make tomato paste, 'tarhana' soup, homemade pasta, pickles, bread, yogurt, jam and preserve in order to meet the family's needs. They spend more time preparing food. They spend more time doing the shopping to save money. Mostly, they prefer walking rather than using transportation. However, the production of tomato paste, 'tarhana', homemade pasta, pickles, yogurt, jam and preserves is at the very low level in households where men are unemployed and women do not work outside the home. One of the most important reasons for this is that in these households, the level of earning income is too low. Women do not have sufficient money to meet the costs of these products.

In addition to the limitation and decrease in the costs of basic consumption goods or needs, there is also inequality in terms of the allocation of food. The majority of women give priority, firstly, to their children, and then to their husbands, especially for food that is expensive and thus can be bought in small amounts (e.g. fruit, meat, etc.). Women's reasoning for giving priority to their children is mainly the motherhood instinct. Most women say that children are small and they need more food and energy. Their reason for giving priority to their husband is that men work hard at work and earn money for the family.

Because of the increase in the living costs and economic burden, women also have to withdraw from many things that they need, they want to do or want to buy. The majority of women withdraw from their clothing needs, personal needs and social activities. On the other hand, some men, as different from women, participate in some social activities like visiting their friends/relatives and going to coffee houses. Moreover, some men spend money to drink alcohol.

Women spend immense labor and energy in the effort for decreasing living costs with the result that these efforts affect women's health physically and psychologically. When women fall ill, very few women go to a private doctor, a state hospital or a local health clinic (*sağlık ocağı*) without delay. When they are

ill, more than half of the women do not go to any health institutions. They always wait to recover from their ailment and try to treat themselves at home. Most of them have to delay dealing with their health problems. The majority of women have had health problems such as headaches, rheumatism, diseases particular to the womb, dental disturbances etc.

In the mainstream poverty studies, reproduction of labor is only understood with respect to physical reproduction such as food, water, clothing, fuel, shelter and so forth. However, the sphere of reproduction is wider than physical needs. Reproduction of labor consists of other activities or needs such as cultural activities, recreation, accessing information, going to the cinema, the theater, and so on. There is inequality between women and men in terms of the realization of these activities. The majority of the women do not visit their friends, relatives who live in Eskişehir and participate in the above activities due to the economic burden and jamming of their labor. For many women, going to the cinema or the theatre is important to feel better. Many women live in stress. They do not feel at ease or in comfort. Life struggle and hardships have affected their psychological state and health deeply. Most of them want to escape from daily stressful life. They want to clear their heads of problems.

Women are not only deprived of social life and cultural activities that are necessary to life as human beings but also from behaving freely and knowledge that is an important power to realize oneself. Deprivation of security is common in all women. Women's participation in activities outside the home is restricted or limited by the disapproval of husbands, by the possible dangers involved in going out alone at night, and also by lack of money. In spite of the lack of money, for men, there are no barriers to participating in activities like going to coffee houses and meeting with their friends. Although women are deprived of social and cultural activities and knowledge, they do not see these as a necessity. In their view, all these activities are a luxury for them because their priority is not going outside but managing the family budget in order to sustain the reproduction

of the household. The capital accumulation process not only affect them on the level of wages but it also ideologically limits the reproduction spheres. In the case of sufficient amounts of money, patriarchal relationships and structure also prevent women from participation in social activities for reproduction of themselves. For many women, watching television, especially women's programs, is the main activity at home.

The power relationships have been examined in order to explore women's poverty. Women have relatively more power than men on their children's educational development. In other words, women are dominant in decision-making related with decisions on children's education. Because women were denied the educational opportunities earlier in their own lives, they give more value to education especially for their children. In addition, the earning power of women affects their power in decision-making in the purchasing process. Earning money gives relatively more power to working women than women who depend on their husband's money. Working women make their decisions more easily than non-working women. In the last instance, they rely on their money. Some of the housewives, especially those whose husbands work regularly, have an effect on their husbands' decisions. Women's common experience is that all realize their power through enormous effort in order to get something. Besides patriarchal pressure over women, material conditions and economic hardships play a critical role in the decision-making process.

Power relations have also been examined with respect to the allocation of money in this research. Women's access to money is realized through paid work and their husbands. Housewives whose husbands are regular workers take allowance from their husbands especially on daily or monthly basis for housekeeping expenses. Housewives whose husbands are irregular workers or unemployed get allowance, if men have money. The majority of married women have taken the responsibility of the family budget. Almost all women have to manage the kitchen budget. For them, women manage money better than men because it is

women's responsibility and many men do not know what the necessities are within the house. For women, men spend more money unnecessarily. The majority of working women spend their income on kitchen-related consumption and children's needs while men spend their income especially on the rent of the house and the bills. In general, although women and men spend their income on the family's basic necessities, in some cases, men have more power in the control of money than women with respect to where the money is spent. Control is related with power and decision making about how the money is distributed and how it is spent. On the other hand, "management is the job at the executive level". It is the process through which decisions are made. All women manage low income to make ends meet in the household under difficult and stressful conditions. They exert immense labor and energy both mentally and physically to meet or decrease living costs. In addition to lack of access to decision-making and power within the household, women have to deal with enormous disadvantages that are embedded in gender relations like domestic violence.

Due to the economic hardships, women are subjected to domestic violence within the household. Because of the financial difficulties, more than half of the women always quarrel with their husbands. Many women have faced physical and verbal violence. Divorced women feel better now than they did in their earlier life due to becoming freed from patriarchal authority at the domestic level. They experience greater self-esteem, a more personal freedom. Despite economic hardships, they have more power over their lives with respect to financial control and arrangement. However, the cost of their empowerment is rather heavy. Single-mothers, especially divorced women, escape from patriarchal authority at the domestic level and they have more power over their lives than do married women but both single-mothers' and married women's' experiences are in common with respect to using immense labor. All of them try to manage 'poverty of resources' in order to sustain their households' reproduction under poverty conditions.

Married women see their lives more deprived of power, freedom and material things than do their husbands. On the other hand, they see their lives relatively better than single-mothers due to sharing of some difficulties with their husbands. Housewives view working women's lives to be better in terms of earning money and spending it freely. Especially divorced single mothers feel better due to escaping from patriarchal authority.

Although the majority of the women see the reasons of poverty as laziness, education, unemployment, low-wages, poor state policies and exploitation, according to women, the most important reason for poverty is unemployment. The majority of the women explained the reasons for poverty from the structural perspective. Both the rates of housewives and irregular women laborers, and unemployed and irregular men income earners are high among labor categories. Therefore, unemployment is a serious experience for household members. In addition to this, regular men and women laborers' wages are low. Their economic status has affected their explanation of the sources of poverty.

For women, the most important reasons for women's poverty are not working outside the home as a wage worker, lack of education, men's irresponsibility in terms of spending money, earning less than men, and women's working both in reproduction and production processes. Women see the most important reason of women's poverty as patriarchy. According to them, the most important reason for women's poverty is men's irresponsibility in terms of spending money (for personal necessities as alcohol, cigarettes etc).

The majority of the women accept the burden of women's poverty, particularly women who live in the cities. Both housewives and single parents are evaluated as poorer than employed and married women. Women who are in paid employment are thought as powerful. Although single-parents are seen as poorer, they think that single-parents escaped from the man's oppression. On the other hand, it is thought that they live under the social pressure in society. Being in

paid employment affects the women's idea on the men's breadwinner position. Women's domestic labor is recognized as important for the family sustenance. For the majority of the women, lack of money, and increasing poverty and economic difficulties affect women's participation into work force, decrease solidarity among relatives, friends and neighbors, and increase quarrels between women and men. Moreover, most women do not believe that the poor demand their right in Turkey and they do not rely on the state for fighting against to poverty.

Women would like to escape from sustenance hardships. According to women, the wage-level should be increased. Each member of the household should work in paid employment. The money should be managed sensibly. Men have to be responsible. Moreover, for them, it is necessary to work so hard continuously. Both women and men are required to work. Women should work like men (especially housewives' solution). The state should create new employment areas for the poor. The high cost of living should be decreased.

As a result, all women who participated in this research share common experiences with respect to deprivation of many things. Despite relative differences between them, all are part of the same labor process under the same capitalist condition from the viewpoint of the intense workforce they exert. In addition to this, all women have common experiences with respect to patriarchal relationships and structure that oppresses and exploits women's labor. On women and poverty, researches should be applied to different spaces in order to contribute action and policy oriented solutions for women's emancipation. The poverty question may be thought as an important area in which woman's movement can be developed in order to create one of the common feminist projects.

REFERENCES

- Abramovitz, M. (1991) "Putting an End to Doublespeak About Race, Gender, and Poverty: An Annotated Glossary for Social Workers", *Social Work*, 36(5): 380-384.
- Açıklık, N. (2003) "Çalışan Kent Yoksulları İstanbul ve Gaziantep Örnekleri", in A. E. Bilgili and I. Altan (eds.) *Yoksulluk*, İstanbul: Deniz Feneri Yardımlaşma ve Dayanışma Derneği Yayınları, 368-385.
- Adrich, B. and Sandhu, R. (1997) (eds) *Housing the Urban Poor*, London: Zed.
- Akın, A.; Kardam, F.; Toksöz, G. (1998) "Kadın Araştırmalarında Yöntem Sorunu ve Kadın İstihdamının Geliştirilmesi (KİG) Projesi", *İktisat Dergisi*, 377(Mart): 16-25.
- Albelda, R. and Tilly, C. (1996) "It's a Family Affair: Women, Poverty, and Welfare", in D. Dujon and A. Withorn (eds.) *For Crying Out Loud: Women's Poverty in the United States*, Boston: South End Press, 79-85.
- Albelda, R. (2002) "Under the Margins: Feminist Economists Look at Gender and Poverty", *Dollar and Sense*, October: 30-35.
- Alcock, P. (1997) *Understanding Poverty*, London: Macmillian Press.
- Alıcı, S. (1998) *Türkiye'de Yoksulluğun Sosyo-Ekonomik Analizi*, Ankara: DİE Yayınları.
- Ardıç, M. N. (2003) *Household Survival Strategies of The Urban Poor In Turkey*, Unpublished MA Thesis, Ankara: Bilkent University.
- Arriagada, I. (1998) "Latin American Families: Convergences and Divergences in Models and Policies", *CEPAL Review*, 65: 85-105.

- Ayata, S. and Ayata, A. G. (2003) "The Benefit Dependent and the Regular Income Earning Poor: Analysis of the Interview Data", in *Turkey: Poverty and Coping After Crises* (Report No: 24185), Washington: World Bank Human Development Unit, Europe and Central Asia Region, 139-200.
- Baden, S. (1993) "Gender and Adjustment in Sub-Saharan Africa", *Bridge Report*, No. 8, Sussex: Institute of Development Studies.
(download free from www.ids.ac.uk/bridge/report_gender-pov.htm.)
- Baden, S. and Milward, K. (1997) "Gender, Inequality and Poverty: Trends, Linkages, Analysis and Policy Implications", *Bridge Report*, No. 30, Sussex: Institute of Development Studies.
(download free from www.ids.ac.uk/bridge/report_gender-pov.htm)
- Bakker, I. and Stephen, G. (eds) (2003) *Power, Production and Social Reproduction: Human Insecurity in the Global Political Economy*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bakker, I. (2003) "Neo-liberal Governance and the Reprivatization of Social Reproduction: Social Provision and Shifting Gender Orders", in I. Bakker, & G. Stephen (eds.) *Power, Production and Social Reproduction: Human Insecurity in the Global Political Economy*, London: Palgrave Macmillan
- Bane, M. J. (1986) "Household Composition and Poverty", in S. Danziger and Weinberg, D. (eds.) *Fighting Poverty: What Works and What Doesn't*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Banfield, E. (1970) *The Unheavenly City and Future of Our Urban Crisis*, Boston: Little, Brown and Co.
- Bardhan, K. and Klasen, S. (1999) "UNDP'S Gender-Related Indices: A Critical Review", *World Development*, 27(6): 985-1010.
- Baulch, B. (1996) "Neglected Trade-Offs in Poverty Measurement", *IDS Bulletin*, 27(1): 36-42.
- Baysu, G. (2002) *Looking at Women's Poverty in Poor Households*, Unpublished Master Thesis, Ankara: Bilkent University.
- Becker, G. (1965) "A Theory of Allocation of Time", *Economic Journal*, LXXX(200): 493-517.

- Beneria, L. and Feldman, S. (eds.) (1992) *Unequal Burden: Economic Crisis, Persistent Poverty and Women's Work*, Boulder, CO, USA: Westview Press.
- Beneria, L. (1992) "The Mexican Debt Crisis: Restructuring the Economy and the Household", in L. Beneria and S. Feldman (eds) *Unequal Burden: Economic Crises, Persistent Poverty and Women's Work*, USA: Westview Press, 83-104.
- Beneria, L. and Bisnath, S. (1996) "Gender and Poverty: An Analysis For Action", *Development Monography Series*, No. 2 New York: UNDP, 1-31.
- Beneria, L. (1999) *Structural Adjustment Policies* (download free from www.arts.cornell.edu/poverty/Papers/Beneria_SAPs.pdf)
- Benston, M. (1969) "The Political Economy of Women's Liberation", *Monthly Review*, 21(September).
- Boserup, E. (1970) *Women's Role in Economic Development*, New York: St Martin's Press.
- Bora, A. (2002) "Olmayanın Nesini İdare Edeceksin?: Yoksulluk, Kadınlar ve Hane", in N. Erdoğan (ed.) *Yoksulluk Halleri- Türkiye'de Kent Yoksulluğunun Toplumsal Görünümleri*, Istanbul: Demokrasi Kitaplığı, 65-88.
- Bradshaw, J.; Finch, N.; Kemp, P.; Mayhew, E. and Williams, J. (2003) "Gender and Poverty in Poverty", *Working Paper Series* No. 6, Equal Opportunities Commission.
- Brannen, J. and Wilson, G. (eds.) (1987) *Give and Take in Families in Resources Distribution*, London: Allen and Unwin.
- Bryson, V. (1992) *Feminist Political Theory*, London: MacMillan
- BRIDGE (2001) *Briefing Paper on the "Feminization of Poverty"* (Prepared for The Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency), No. 59. Sussex: Institute of Development Studies
- Bruce, J. (1980) *Market Women's Co-operatives: Giving Women Credit*, New York: Population Council.

- Buğra, A. (2001) "Kriz Karşısında Türkiye'nin Geleneksel Refah Rejimi", *Toplum ve Bilim*, 89(Yaz): 22-30.
- Burchardt, T.; Grand, J. L. and Piachard, D. (1999) "Social Exclusion in Britain 1991-1995", *Social Policy and Administration*, 33: 227-244.
- Burnham, L. (1985) "Has Poverty Been Feminized in Black America?", *Black Scholars*, March/April: 14-24.
- Buvinic, M. (1983) "Women's Issues in The Third World Poverty: A Policy Analysis", in M. Buvinic and W. McGreevey (ed.)) *Women and Poverty in the Third World*, Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Buvinic, M. (1986) "Projects for Women in The Third World: Explaining Their Misbehavior", *World Development*, 14 (5).
- Buvinic, M. and Gupta, G. R. (1997) "Female-headed Households and Female Maintained Families: Are They Worth Targeting to Reduce Poverty in Developing Countries?", *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 45(2): 259-80.
- Cantillon, S. and Nolan, B. (1998) "Are Married Women More Deprived Than Their Husbands?", *Journal of Social Policy*, 21(2): 151-171.
- Cantillon, S. and Nolan, B. (2001) "Poverty Within Households: Measuring Gender Differences Using Non-Monetary Indicators", *Feminist Economics*, 7(1): 5-23.
- Carr, M.; Chen, M. A; Tate, J. (2000) "Globalization and Home-Based Workers", *Feminist Economics*, 6(3): 123-142.
- Chambers, R. (1995) "Poverty and Livelihoods: Whose Reality Counts?", *Environment and Urbanization*, 7(1): 173-204.
- Chant, S. and McIlwaine, C. (1995) *Women of a Lesser Cost: Female Labour, Foreign Exchange and Philippine Development*, London: Pluto.
- Chant, S. (1997) "Women-Headed Households. Poorest of the Poor? Perspectives From Mexico, Costa Rica and Philippines", *IDS Bulletin*, 28(3): 26-48.

- Chant, S. (2001) "Female Household Headship, Privation and Power: Challenging the Feminization of Poverty Thesis", *Working Paper*, No. 01-09, Princeton: Center for Migration and Development: University of Princeton.
- Chant, S. (2003a) "Female Household Headship and the Feminization of Poverty: Facts, Fictions and Forward Strategies", *New Working Paper Series*, Issue 9, Gender Institute.
- Chant, S. (2003b) "The 'Engendering' of Poverty Analysis in Developing Regions: Progress Since the United Nations Decade For Women, and Priorities for the Future", *New Working Paper Series*, Issue 11, Gender Institute.
- Chant, S. and Craske, N. (2003) *Gender in Latin America*, London, New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Charles, N. and Kerr, M. (1987) "Just the Way It Is: Gender and Age Differences in Family Food Consumption", in J. Brannen and G. Wilson (eds.) *Give and Take in Families: Studies in Resources Distribution*, London: Allen and Unwin.
- Cheal, D. (1996) *New Poverty: Families in Postmodern Society*, Greenwood Press West Conn.
- Crompton, R. (1997) *Women and Work in Modern Britain*, New York: Oxford University Press Inc.
- Çağatay, N. and Özler, S. (1995) "Feminization of the Labor Force: The Effects of Long-Term Development and Structural Adjustment", *World Development*, 23(11): 1883-1894.
- Çağatay, N. (1998) "Gender and Poverty", *Working Paper Series*, WP 5. UNDP.
- Çam, S. (1999) "Sınıf-Altı Kavramına Kuramsal Bir Yaklaşım", *Mürekkep*, No. 2
- Dağdemir, Ö. (1999) "Türkiye Ekonomisinde Yoksulluk Sorunu ve Yoksulluğun Analizi: 1987-1994", *H.Ü. İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi*, 17(1): 23-40.
- Dağdemir, Ö. (1992) *Türkiye Ekonomisinde Yapısal Değişim ve Gelir Dağılımı*, Unpublished Ph. D. Thesis, Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi.

- Dalla Costa, M. & James, S. (1972) *The Power of Women and the Subversion of Community*, Bristol: Falling Wall Press.
- Daly, M. (1989) *Woman and Poverty*, Dublin: Attic Press.
- Dansuk, E. (1997) *Türkiye’de Yoksulluğun Ölçülmesi ve Sosyo-Ekonomik Yapılarla İlişkisi*, Uzmanlık Tezi, Ankara: DPT.
- De Groot, J. (1991) "Conceptions and Misconceptions: The Historical and Cultural Context of Discussion on Women and Development", in H. Afshar (ed.) *Women, Development and Survival in the Third World*, Harlow: London, 107-135.
- de Haan, A. (1998) "Social Exclusion: An Alternative Concept for the Study of Deprivation?", *IDS Bulletin*, 29(1): 10-19.
- de Haan, A. (2000) *Social Exclusion: Enriching the Understanding of Deprivation in Social and Political Thought*. No.2: 22-40. (download free from) <http://www.sussex.ac.uk/Units/SPT/journal/archive/pdf/issue2->
- Demir, E. (1993) "Ekonomi Politikalar ve Kent Emekçi Aileleri", *Birikim*, (48): 68-77.
- Demir, E. (2002) "Yeni Kentli ailelerde Geçimlik Üretim ve Yoksulluk", in Y. Özdek (ed.) *Yoksulluk, Şiddet ve İnsan Hakları*, Ankara: TODAİ Yayınları, 291-302.
- Deprez, L. S. (1998) "Classist Conceptions of Dependency: Conservative Attacks on Poor Women With Children", in A. K. Rhoades and A. Statham (eds) *Speaking Out: Women, Poverty, and Public Policy*, University of Wisconsin System Women’s Studies Librarian Madison, 23-34.
- DeVault, M. (1996) "Talking Back to Sociology: Distinctive Contributions of Feminist Methodology", *Annual Review Sociology*, 22: 29-50.
- Directorate General on the Status and Problems of Women (1994) *The Status of Women in Turkey*, The Turkish National Report of the Fourth World Conferences on Women, Ankara.
- Dumanlı, R. (1996) *Yoksulluk ve Türkiye’deki Boyutları*, DPT Uzmanlık Tezi, Yayın No: DPT- 2449, Ankara.

- Duncan, G. and Hoffman, D. (1991) "Teenage Underclass Behavior and Subsequent Poverty: Have the Rules Changed?" in C. Jencks. and P. E. Peterson (eds.) *The Urban Underclass*, Washington, D. C.: The Brookings Institution.
- Dwyer, D. and Bruce, J. (1988) *A Home Divided: Women and Income in the Third World*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Ecevit, Y. (1990) "Kentsel Üretim Sürecinde Kadın Emeğinin Konumu ve Değişen Biçimleri", in Ş. Tekeli (ed.) *Kadın Bakış Açısından Kadınlar*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 117-128.
- Ecevit, M. and Ecevit, Y. (2002) "Tarımda Mülksüzleşme ve Aile Emeğinin Metalaşması", in Y. Özdek (ed.) *Yoksulluk, Şiddet ve İnsan Hakları*, Ankara: TODAİ Yayınları.
- Ehrenreich, B. (1983) *Hearts of Men: American Dreams and the Flight From Commitment*, Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday.
- Ehrenreich, B. and Piven, F. F. (1984) "Women and the Welfare State", I. Howe (ed.) *Proposals for America from the Democratic Left*, New York: Foundation for the Study of Independent Social Ideas.
- Eisenstein, Z. (1984) *Feminism and Sexual Equality: Crisis in Liberal America*, New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Erder, S. (1996) *İstanbul'a Bir Kent Kondu: Ümraniye*, İstanbul: İletişim.
- Erder, S. (1995) "Yeni Kentliler ve Kentin Yeni Yoksulları", *Toplum ve Bilim*, 66: 106-119.
- Erdoğan, G. (1998) *Türkiye'de Yoksulluk: Boyutu ve Profili*, Ankara: DİE.
- Erdoğan, G. (1996) *Türkiye'de Bölge Ayrımında Yoksulluk Sınırı*, Ankara: DİE.
- Erman, T. (2003) "Poverty in Turkey: The Social Dimension", in *Turkey: Poverty and Coping After Crises* (Report No: 24185), Washington: World Bank Human Development Unit, Europe and Central Asia region, 42-71.

- Erman, T.; Kalaycıođlu, S. and Rittersberger-Tılıç, H. (2002) "Money Earning Activities and Empowerment of Rural Migrant Women in the City: The Case of Turkey", *Women's Studies International Forum*, 888(1): 1-16.
- Ertin, G. (1994) *Eskişehir Kentinde Yerleşmenin Evrimi*. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayını.
- ETO. (2004) *Sosyo Ekonomik Profil ve Yerel Yönetime Bakış*, Eskişehir: Eskişehir Ticaret Odası Yayını.
- ETO. (2003) *Eskişehir'in Sosyo-Ekonomik Göstergeleri*, Eskişehir: Eskişehir Ticaret Odası Yayını.
- ETO. (1973) *Sosyal ve Ekonomik Yönüyle Eskişehir*, Eskişehir: Ülkü Matbaası.
- Evans, A. (1991) "Gender Issues in Rural Household Economics", *IDS Bulletin*, 22(1): 51-59.
- Ferguson, S. (1999) "Building on the Strengths of the Socialist Feminist Tradition", *New Politics*, 7(2): 1-12.
- Fine, B. (2001) *Social Capital versus Social Theory: Political Economy and Social Science at the Turn of the Millennium*, London: Routledge.
- Fitzgerald, J. (1991) "Welfare Durations and the Marriage Market: Evidence from the Survey of Income and Program Participation", *Journal of Human Resources*, 26: 545-561.
- Florence, B. E. (1996) "After the Revolution: Neo-Liberal Policy and Gender in Nicaragua", *Latin America Perspectives*, 23(1): 27-48.
- Folbre, N. (1991) "Women on Their Own: Global Patterns of Female Headship", in R. S. Gallin and A. Ferguson (eds.) *The Women and International Development Annual*, Vol. 2 Boulder: Westview, 69-126.
- Folbre, N. (1986) "Cleaning House: New Perspectives on Households and Economic Development", *Journal of Development*, 22(1): 5-40.
- Fraser, N. and Gordon, L. (1996) "The Genealogy of Dependency: Tracing A Keyword of the U.S. Welfare State", in D. Dujon and A. Withorn (eds.) *For*

Crying Out Loud: Women's Poverty in the United States, Boston: South End Press, 235-267.

Fuwa, N. (2000) "The Poverty and Heterogeneity Among Female-headed Households Revisited: The Case of Panama", *World Development*, 28(8): 1515-1542.

Gimenez, E. M. (1993) "The Class Nature of Poverty in America", in B. Berberoğlu (ed.) *Critical Perspective in Sociology*, Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, 193-203.

Gimenez, E. M. (1999) "The Feminization of Poverty: Myth and Reality?", *Critical Sociology*, 23(2/3): 336-351.

Glendinning, C. and Millar, J. (1992) *Women and Poverty in Britain the 1990s*, London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Goldberg, S. and Kremen, K. (1990) *The Feminization of Poverty: Only in America?*, New York: Praeger Publishers.

Gonyea, G. J. (1994) "The Paradox of the Advantaged Elder & The Feminization of Poverty", *Social Works*, 39(1): 35-41.

Gonzales, de la R. M. (2001) "From The Resources of Poverty to The Poverty of Resources: The Erosion of A Survival Model", *Latin American Perspectives*, 28(4): 72-100.

Gonzales, de la R. M. (1994) "Household Headship and Occupational Position in Mexico", in E. Kennedy and Gonzalez de la Rocha M. (eds.) *Poverty and Well-Being in The Household: Case Studies of Developing Worlds*, San Diego: University of California.

Gonzales, de la R. M. and B. B.Gantt (1995) "The Urban Family and Poverty in Latin America", *Latin American Perspective*, 22(2): 12-31.

Gordon, D. and Spicker, P. (1999) *The Glossary on Poverty Concepts*, London and New York: IPSR Books.

Gökçe, B. (ed) (1993) *Gecekonduklarda Ailelerarası Geleneksel Dayanışmanın Çağdaş Organizasyonlara Dönüşümü*, Ankara: T.C. Başbakanlık Kadın ve Sosyal Hizmetler Müsteşarlığı Yayınları.

- Graham, H. (1987) "Being Poor: Perceptions and Coping Strategies of Lone Mothers", in J. Brannen and G. Wilson (eds.) *Give and Take in Families: Studies in Resources Distribution*, London: Allen and Unwin.
- Graham, H. (1984) "Surveying Through Stories", in C. Bell and H. Roberts (eds.) *Social Researching: Politics, Problems, Practice*, London: Routledge & Keagan.
- Greeley, M. (1994) "Measurement of Poverty and poverty of Measurement", *IDS Bulletin*, 25(2): 50-58.
- Güneş, F. (2004) "Poverty and Households Which Receive Aid From Municipality: The Case of Eskisehir", presented at *I. International Symposium on Eskisehir Throughout History: Political, Economical, Social and Cultural Aspects, 12-15 May 2004*, The Republic of Turkey, Anadolu University Publisher: Eskisehir.
- Haddad, L. (1991) "Gender and Poverty in Ghana: A Descriptive Analysis of Selected Outcomes and Processes", *IDS Bulletin*, Volume 22 No.1.
- Halleröd, B. (1994) "A New Approach to the Direct Consensual Measurement of Poverty", *SPRC Discussion Paper*, 50(October): 1-39.
- Haralombos, M. (1984) *Sociology: Themes and Perspectives*, University Tutorial Press.
- Harris, O. (1981) "Households as Natural Units", in K. Young; C. Wolkowitz and C. B. McCullagh (eds.) *Of Marriage and the Market: Women's Subordination in International Perspective*, London: CSE Books.
- Harding, S. (1991) *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge? Thinking From Women's Lives*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Harding, S. (1987) *Feminism and Methodology*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Harding, S. (1986) *The Science Question in Feminism*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Hartmann, H. (1992) "Marxsızmlle Feminizmin Mutsuz Evliliği", in G. Savran & N. Tura (eds.) *Kadının Görünmeyen Emeği*, Istanbul: Kardelen Yayınları

- Hartsock, N. 2004 "The Feminist Standpoint: Developing the Ground for a Specifically Feminist Historical Materialism", in Sandra Hardinh (ed.) *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies*, New York and London: Routledge.35-54.
- Ho, C. and Schraner, I. (2004) "Feminist Standpoint, Knowledge and Truth", Working Paper Series, School of Economics and Finance Paper No:2004/02, 1-26.
- Holman, R. (1978) *Poverty: Explanation of Social Deprivation*, New York: St.Martin's Press.
- ILO (1976) *Employment Growth and Basic Needs: A One World Problems*, ILO, Geneva.
- Işık, O. and Pınarcıoğlu, M. (2001) *Nöbetleşe Yoksulluk: Gecekondulaşma ve Kent Yoksulları*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- İlkkaracan, İ. (1998) "Kentli Kadınlar ve Çalışma Yaşamı", in A. B. Mirzaoğlu (eds.) *75. Yılda Kadınlar ve Erkekler*, İstanbul:Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, 285-302.
- Jackson, C. (1998) "Rescuing Gender From Poverty Trap", in C. Jackson and R. Pearson (eds.) *Feminist Vision of Development: Gender Analysis and Policy*, London & New York: Routledge.
- Jackson, C. (1998a) "Women and Poverty or Gender and Well-being?", *Journal of International Affairs*, 52 (1): 67-81.
- Jackson, C. (1999) "Social Exclusion and Gender: Does One Size Fit All?", *The European Journal of Development Research*, 11(1): 125-146.
- Jackson, C. and Palmer-Jones, R. (1999) "Rethinking Gendered Poverty and Work", *Development and Change*, 30(3): 557-83.
- Jefferson, T. and King, J. E. (2001) "Never Intended To Be A Theory of Everything: Domestic Labor in Neoclassical and Marxian Economics", *Feminist Economics*, 7(3): 71-101.
- Jennings, J. (1999) "Persistent Poverty in the United States Review of Theories and Explanation", in L. Kushnick and J. Jennings (eds.) *A New Introduction to*

Poverty: The Role of Race, Power, and Politics, New York & London: New York University Press.

Joekes, S. and Watson, A. (1994) *Women and the New Trade Agenda*, New York: UNIFEM.

Joekes, S. (1995) "Trade Related Employment for Women in Industry and Services in Developing Countries", *Occasional Paper*, No. 5, Geneva: UNRISD.

Joshi, H. (1992) "The Cost of Caring", in C. Glendinning & J. Millar (eds.) *Women and Poverty in Britain the 1990s*, London: Harvester-Wheatsheaf.

Kabeer, N. (2003) *Gender Mainstreaming in Poverty Eradication and the Millennium Development Goals: A Handbook for Policy-makers and Other Stakeholders*, London: Commonwealth Secretariat.

Kabeer, N. (1998) "Jumping to Conclusion? Struggles Over Meaning and Method in the Study of Household Economics", in C. Jackson & R. Pearson (eds.) *Feminist Vision of Development: Gender Analysis and Policy*, London: Routledge.

Kabeer, N. (1996) "Agency, Well-Being and Inequality: Reflection on the Gender Dimension of Poverty", *IDS Bulletin*, 27(1): 11-21.

Kabeer, N. (1992) "Feminist Perspective in Development: A Critical Review", in H. Hinds, A. Phoenix and J. Stacey (eds) *Working Out: New Directions for Women's Studies*, London: The Falmer Press.

Kabeer, K. (1991) "Gender, Production and Well-Being: Rethinking the Household Economy", *IDS Discussion Paper*, No. 288, Brighton: IDS.

Kalaycıoğlu, S. and Rittersberger-Tılıç, H. (2001) *Evlerimizdeki Gündelikçi Kadınlar*, İstanbul: Su.

Kalaycıoğlu, S. and Rittersberger-Tılıç, H. (2002) "Yapısal Uyum Programlarıyla Ortaya Çıkan Yoksullukla Başetme Stratejileri" *Kentleşme Göç ve Yoksulluk* 197-247.

Kandiyoti, D. (1988) "Bargaining with Patriarchy", *Gender and Society*, 2(3): 274-290.

- Karpat, K. (1976) *Rural Migration and Urbanization*, Cambridge: Cambridge Press.
- Katz, E. (1997) "The Intra-Household Economics of Voice and Exit", *Feminist Economics*, 3(3): 25-46.
- Kaygalak, S. (2001) "Yeni Kentsel Yoksulluk ve Yoksulluğun Mekansal Yoğunlaşması: Mersin Demirtaş Mahallesi Örneği", *Praksis*, 2(Bahar): 124-172.
- Kemp, A. A. (1995) "Poverty and Welfare for Women", in J. Freeman (ed) *Women: A Feminist Perspective*, California: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Keleş, R. (1972) *Türkiye'de Şehirleşme, Konut ve Gecekondular*, Ankara: Gerçek Yayınları.
- King, E. & Evenson, R. E. (1983) "Time Allocation and Home Production in Philippine Rural Households", in M. Buvinic; M. A. Lycette and W. P. McGreevey (eds) *Women and Poverty in the Third World*, Baltimore & London: The Johns Hopkins University.
- Laderchi, R. C.; Saith, R. and Stewart, F. (2003) "Does It Matter That We Do Not Agree on the Definition of Poverty? A Comparison of Four Approaches", *Oxford Development Studies*, 31(3): 243-274.
- Land, H. (1983) "Poverty and Gender: The Distribution of Resources Within Families", in M. Brown (ed.) *The Structure of Disadvantage*, London: Heinemann.
- Land, H. (1986) *Women and Economic Dependency*, Manchester: Equal Opportunities Commission.
- Letherby, G. (2003) *Feminist Research in Theory and Practice*, Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Levitas, R. (1998) *The Inclusive Society: Social Exclusion and New Labour*, Basingstoke: Macmillan.

- Levitas, R. (1999) *New Labor and Social Exclusion* (download free from <http://www.psa.ac.uk/cps/1999/levitas.pdf>)
- Levitas, R. (2000) "What is Social Exclusion?", in D. Gordon and P. Townsend (eds), *Breadline Europe*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- Lewis, O. (1968) "The Culture of Poverty", in D. P. Moynihan (ed.) *On Understanding Poverty*, New York & London: Basic Books Inc. Publishers.
- Lewis, J. and Piachaud, D. (1992) "Women and Poverty in the Twentieth Century", in C. Glendinning and J. Millar (eds.) *Women and Poverty in Britain the 1990s*, London: Harvester-Wheatsheaf.
- Lipton, M. (1997) "Defining and Measuring Poverty: Conceptual Issues", *Human Development Papers*, UNDP/HDRO: New York.
- Lister, R. (2004) *Poverty: Key Concepts*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Lonsdale, S. (1992) "Patterns of Paid Work", in C. Glendinning and J. Millar (eds.) *Women and Poverty in Britain the 1990s*, London: Harvester-Wheatsheaf.
- MacPherson, S. and Silburn, R. (1998) "The Meaning and Measurement of Poverty", in J. Dixon and D. Macarow (eds.) *Poverty A Persistent Global Reality*, London: Routledge.
- Mack, J. and Lansley, S. (1985) *Poor Britain*, London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Magnet, M. (1993) *The Dream and the Nightmare: The Sixties' Legacy to the Underclass*, New York: William Morrow.
- Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1968) "Manifesto of The Community Party", *Selected Works*, New York: International Publishers
- Marx, K. (1970) "Exploitation and the Accumulation of Misery", in R. E. Will & H. G. Vatter (eds.) *Poverty in Affluence*, New York, 33-36.
- Mead, L. (1986) *Beyond Entitlement: The Social Obligations of Citizenship*, New York: Free Press.

- Mies, M. (1983) "Towards a Methodology for Feminist Research", in G. Bowles and R. D. Klein (eds), *Theories of Women's Studies*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Mies, M. (1991) "Women's Research of Feminist Research? The Debate Surrounding Feminist Science and Methodology", in M. M. Fonow, J. A. Cook (eds) *Beyond Methodology: Feminist Scholarship as Lived Research*, Bloomington: Ind. University Press.
- Millar, J. and Glendinning, C. (1989) "Gender and Poverty", *Journal of Social Policy*, 18(3): 363–81.
- Millar, J. (1992) "Lone Mothers and Poverty", in C. Glendinning and J. Millar (eds.) *Women and Poverty in Britain the 1990s'*, London: Harvester-Wheatsheaf.
- Morçöl, G. and Gitmez, A. S. (1995) "A Typology of the Urban Poor in Turkey", *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 17(4): 413-422.
- Morris, M. (1989) "From the Culture of Poverty to the Underclass: An Analysis of a Shift in Public Language", *The American Sociologist*, Summer: 123-133.
- Moser, C.O.N. (1998) "Reassessing Urban Poverty Reduction Strategies: The Asset Vulnerability Framework", *World Development*, 26(1): 1-19.
- Moser, C.O.N. (1993) *Gender Planning and Development: Theory, Practice and Training*, London: Routledge.
- Moser, C.O.N. (1992) "Adjustment From Below: Low-Income Women, Time and Triple Role in Guayaquil, Ecuador", in H. Afshar and C. Dennis (eds.) *Women and Adjustment Policies in the Third World*, Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Moynihan, P. D. (1967) "The Negro Family: The Case for National Case", in L. Rainwater and W. Yancey (eds.) *The Moynihan Report and the Politics of Controversy*, Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Murray, C. (1984) *Losing Ground: American Social Policy, 1950-1980*, New York: Basic Books.
- Nolan, B. and Watson, D. (1999) *Women and Poverty in Ireland*, Dublin: Oak Tree Press

- Norton, A. and Stephens, N. (1995) "Participation in Poverty Assessments", Social Policy and Resettlement Division Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- Novak, M. (1987) (ed.) *The New Consensus on Family and Welfare: A Community of Self-Reliance*, Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.
- METU-Kentsel Politika Planlaması ve Yerel Yönetimler Ana Bilim Dalı (1999), *Kentsel Yoksulluk ve Geçinme Stratejileri-Ankara Örneği*, Ankara: ODTÜ Mimarlık Fakültesi Basım İşleri.
- Öğretmen, İ. (1951) *Ankara'da 158 Gecekondu*, Ankara: SBF Yayınları.
- Oppenheim, C. and L. Harker (1996) *Poverty*, CPAG Ltd., 92-113.
- Opping, C. (1982) "Family Structure and Women's Reproductive and Productive Roles: Some Conceptual and Methodological Issue", in R. Anker, M. Buvinic, N. H. Youssef (eds.) *Women's Role and Population Trends in The Third World*, London: Croon Helm, 133-50.
- Osmani, L. N. K. (1998) "The Gramen Bank Experiment: Empowerment of Women Through Credit", in H. Afshar (ed) *Women and Empowerment*, London: Macmillan, 67-85.
- Özgen, H. N. (2001) "Kentte Yeni Yoksulluk ve Çöp İnsanları", *Toplum ve Bilim*, 89: 88-101.
- Oxaal, Z. and Baden, S. (1997) "Gender and Empowerment: Definition, Approaches and Implication for Policy", *Bridge Report*, No. 40, Sussex: Institute of Development Studies.
- Pamuk, M. (2000) "Kırsal yerlerde Yoksulluk" *DİE, İşgücü Piyasaları Analizleri* 1999 (1), Ankara: Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü Matbaası.
- Pahl, J. (1989) *Money and Marriage*, London: Macmillan.
- Pahl, J. (1983) "The Allocation of Money and The Structuring of Inequality Within Marriage", *Sociological Review*, 13: 237-62.
- Pahl, J. (1980) "Patterns of Money Management Within Marriage", *Journal of Social Policy*, 9(3): 313-335.

- Payne, S. (1991) *Women, Health and Poverty: An Introduction*, Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Pearce, D. (1978) "The Feminization of Poverty: Women, Work and Welfare", *Urban and Social Change Review*, 11(1-2): 28-36.
- Pearce, D. (1993) "The Feminization of Poverty: Update", in M. J. Alison and P. S. Rothenberg (eds.) *Feminist Frameworks: Alternative Theoretical Accounts of the Relations Between Women and Men*, United States of America: McGraw-Hill, 290-298.
- Piachaud, D. (1982) "Patterns of Income and Expenditure Within Families", *Journal of Social Policy*, 11(4): 469-81.
- Ramazanoğlu, C. (1989) *Feminism and The Contradictions of Oppression*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Razavi, S. (1999) "Export Oriented Employment, Poverty and Gender: Contested Accounts", *Development and Change*, 30: 653-683.
- Razavi, S. (1997) "From Rags to Riches: Looking at Poverty From a Gender Perspective", *IDS Bulletin*, 28 (3): 49-62.
- Reddy, S and Pogge, T. (2002) *How Not To Count The Poor* (download free from www.socialanalysis.org).
- Reinharz, S. (1992) *Feminist Methods in Social Science*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Robeyns, I. (2004) The Capability Approach: A Theoretical Survey (download free from http://www.unipv.it/webdept/p_8_23.pdf)
- Rodgers, Jr. H. R. (1990) *Poor Women, Poor Children: American Poverty in 1990's*, New York: Sharpe.
- Rodriguez, L. (1994) "Housing and Household Survival Strategies in Urban Areas: A Case study of the Solanda Settlement, Quito, Ecuador", in M. Fatima (ed) *Poverty in the 1990's: The Response of Urban Women*, UNESCO and International Social Science Council, Paris, 135-150.

- Room, G. (1995) *Beyond the threshold: The Measurement and Analysis of Social Exclusion*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- Roes, H. (2004). "Hand, Brain, and Hearts: A Feminist Epistemology for the Natural Sciences" in S.Harding (ed.) *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies*, New York and London: Routledge, 67-80.
- Ruspini, E. (1999) "The Contribution of Longitudinal Research to the Study of Women's Poverty", *Quality and Quantity*, 33: 323-338.
- Sadasivam, B. (1997) "The Impact of Structural Adjustment on Women: Governance and Human Right Agenda", *Human Rights Quarterly*, 19(3): 630-665.
- Safa, H. and Antrobus, P. (1992) "Women and the Economic Crisis in the Caribbean", in L. Beneria and S. Feldman (eds.) *Unequal Burden: Economic Crises, Persistent Poverty and Women's Work*, Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Sarvasy, W. & van Allen, J. (1984) "Fighting the Feminization of Poverty: Socialist-Feminist Analysis and Strategy", *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 16(4): 89-110.
- Scott, J. (1994) *Poverty and Wealth: Citizenship, Deprivation and Privilege*, London: Longman Sociology Series.
- Secombe, K. (1999) *So You Think I Drive A Cadillac? Welfare Recipients: Perspectives on the System and Its Reform*, The United States of America: Allyn & Bacon.
- Sen, A. (1993) "Capability and Well-Being", in M. Nussbaum & A. Sen (eds) *The Quality of Life*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Sen, A. (1992) *Inequality Re-Examined*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Sen, A. (1990) "Gender and Cooperative Conflicts", in I. Tinker (ed.) *Persistent Inequalities: Women and World Development*, New York: Oxford University.
- Sen, A. (1987) *Hunger and Entitlements*, Amsterdam: North Holland Press.

- Sen, A. (1987a) "The Standard of Living", in G. Hawthorn (ed.) *The Standard of Living*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sen, A. (1983) "Poor, Relatively Speaking", *Oxford Economic Papers*, 35(1): 153-169.
- Seiz, J. (1992) "Gender and Economic Research", in N. de Marci (ed.) *Post-Popperian Methodology of Economics Recovering Practice*, Boston: Kluwer Nijhoff.
- Shaffer, P. (2001) "New Thinking on Poverty: Implications for Poverty Reduction Strategies", Paper Presented for the United Nations Department for *Economic and Social Affairs* (UNDESA) Export Group Meeting on Globalization and Rural Poverty United Nations, November 8-9: 1-44.
- Silver, H. (1994) "Social Exclusion and Social Solidarity", *International Labour Review*, 133 (5/6): 531-78.
- Smith, M. D. (1994) "Enhancing the Quality of Survey Data on Violence Against Women: A Feminist Approach", *Gender Sociology*, 8(1): 109-27.
- Spicer, P. (1993) *Poverty and Social Security*, London & New York: Routledge.
- SSI. (1998) *Ekonomik ve Sosyal Göstergeler*. Ankara: DİE Yayını.
- Stacey, J. (1990) *Brave New Families: Stories of Domestic Upheaval in Late Twentieth Century America*, New York: Basic Books.
- Stacey, J. (1988) "Can There Be A Feminist Ethnography?", *Women's Studies International Forum*, 11(1): 21-7.
- Standing, G. (1989) "Global Feminization Through Flexible Labor", *World Development*, 17(7): 1077-95.
- Stanley, L. and Wise, S. (1990) "Method, Methodology and Epistemology in Feminist Research", in L. Stanley (ed.) *Feminist Praxis*, London & New York: Routledge.
- Strassmann, D. (1993) "The Stories of Economics and The Power of the Story-Teller", *History of Political Economy*, 25(1): 147-65.

- Şenyapılı, T. (1982) "Economic Change and Gecekondu Family", in Ç. Kağıtçıbaşı (ed) *Sex Roles, Family and Community in Turkey*, Bloomington: Indiana University Turkish Studies 3, 237-248.
- Şenyapılı, T. (1978) *Bütünleşmemiş Kentli Nüfus Sorunu*, Ankara: ODTÜ, Mimarlık Fakültesi Yayını.
- Taylor, B. K. (1990) *Imagine No Possession*, Harvester Wheatsheal.
- Tekeli, Ş. (1982) *Kadınlar ve Siyasal-Toplumsal Hayat*, İstanbul: Birikim Yayınları.
- Tekeli, İ. (2000) "Kent Yoksulluğu ve Modernitenin Bu Soruna Yaklaşım Seçenekleri Üzerine", in A. H. Akder & M. Güvenç (eds.) *Yoksulluk: Bölgesel Gelişme ve Kırsal Yoksulluk, Kent Yoksulluğu*, İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Sosyal Etüdler Vakfı.
- Thomas, L. S. (1998) "Race, Gender and Welfare Reform: Antinatalist Response", *Journal of Black Studies*, 28(4): 419-446.
- Thomas, L. S. (1994) *Gender and Poverty*, Manufactured in the United States of America.
- Thomas, L. S. (1994a) "From the Culture of Poverty to the Culture of Single Motherhood: The New Poverty Paradigm", *Women & Politics*, 14(2): 65-97.
- Tinker, I. (1976) "The Adverse Impact of Development on Women", in I. Tinker and M. Bromson (eds.) *Women and Development*, Washington, D.C: Overseas Development Council.
- Tinker, I. (1990) *Persistent Inequality: Women and World Development*, NY: Oxford
- Tokman, V. E. (1989) "Politics for A Heterogeneous in Formal Sector in Latin America", *World Development*, 17(7): 1067-1076.
- Tong, R. (1989) *Feminist Thought: A Comprehensive Introduction*, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Townsend, P. (1987) "Deprivation", *Journal of Social Policy*, 16(2): 125-146.

- Townsend, P. (1985) "A Sociological Approach to the Measurement of Poverty- A Rejoinder to Professor Amarty Sen", *Oxford Economic Papers*, 37: 659-668.
- Townsend, P. (1979) *Poverty in United Kingdom*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Turak-Feymi, P. (2004) *Yoksulluğun Sosyolojik Analizi: Bursa Örneği*, (Unpublished Ph.D Thesis), Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi.
- Türkyılmaz, S. (2004) *The Experiences of Two Generations of Women in Poverty: A Case Study in Çandarlı, Altındağ in Ankara*, (Unpublished MA Thesis), Ankara: METU.
- UNDP (1990) *Human Development Report 1990: Concepts and Measurement of Human Development*, OUP: New York.
- UNICEF (1987) *Adjustment With A Human Face*, vol.1, Clarendon Press.
- UNIFEM (United Nations Fund for Women) (1995) *The Human Cost of Women's Poverty Perspectives From Latin America and The Caribbean*, Mexico City: UNIFEM.
- Uygur, S. and Kasnakoğlu, Z. (1998) *Estimation of Poverty Line: Turkey 1994*, Ankara: SIS.
- Veit-Wilson, J.H. (1987) "Consensual Approaches to Poverty Lines and Social Security", *Journal of Social Policy*, 16(2): 183-211.
- Vogler, C. and Pahl, J. (1994) "Money, Power and Inequality Within Marriage", *Sociological Review*, 42(2): 263-288.
- Vogler, C. (1998) "Money in the Household: Some Underlying Issues of Power", *Sociological Review*, 46(4): 687-713.
- Walby, S. (1988) "Segregation in Employment in Social and Economic Theory" in S. Walby (ed.) *Gender Segregation at Work*, Milton Keynes: Open University, 14-28.
- Walker, R. (1987) "Consensual Approaches to the Definition of Poverty: Towards an Alternative Methodology", *Journal of Social Policy*, 16(2): 213-226.

- Weitzman, L. (1985) *The Divorce Revolution: The Unexpected Social and Economic Consequences for Women and Children in America*, New York: The Free Press.
- Whitehead, A and Lockwood, M. (1999) "Gender in the World Bank's Poverty Assessments: Six Cases from Sub-Saharan Africa", *Development and Change*, 30(3): 525-55.
- Wilson, W. J. (1987) *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, The Underclass, and Public Policy*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wilson, J. B. (1987) "Women and Poverty. A Demographic Overview", *Women and Health*, 12: 21-40.
- Wolf, D. (1992) *Factory Daughters: Gender Household Dynamics, and Rural Industrialization in Java*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Wong, F. K. (2003) "Empowerment As A Panacea for Poverty-Old Wine in a New Bottles?: Reflection on the World Bank's Conception of Power", *Progress in Development Studies*, 3(4):307-322.
- World Bank (1990) *World Development Report*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- World Bank (2000) *Turkey: Economic Reforms, Living Standards and Social Welfare Study*, Report No: 20029-TU, Washington: World Bank Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Unit.
- World Bank (2000) *World Development Report 2000/2001: Attacking Poverty*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wright, E. O. (1994) *Interrogating Inequality: Essay on Class Analysis, Socialism and Marxism*, London-New York: Verso.
- Yasa, İ. (1966) *Ankara'da Gecekondu Aileleri*, S.S.Y.B. Sosyal Hizmet Genel Müdürlüğü, Ankara.
- Young, B. (2003) "Financial Crises and Social Reproduction Asia, Argentina and Brazil", in I. Bakker & G. Stephen (eds.) *Power, Production and Social Reproduction: Human In/security in the Global Political Economy*, Great Britain: Palgrave Macmillan.

Zopf, Jr. P.E. (1989) *American Women in Poverty*, New York: Greenwood.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Tables

Table 1. The age distribution of women

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Between 18-29	15	13
30-39	66	55
40-49	35	29
50-53	4	3,3
Total	120	100

Table 2. The age distribution of men

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Between 25-29	3	3
30-39	52	50
40-49	42	40
50-57	8	7
Total	105	100

Table 3. The education status of women

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Illiteracy	2	2
Literacy	7	7
Primary School	91	76
Secondary School	4	3
High School	16	13
Total	120	100

Table 4. The education status of men

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Illiteracy	3	3
Literacy	61	58
Primary School	14	23
Secondary School	15	14
High School	2	2
Total	105	100

Table 5. The birthplace of women

	Frequency	Valid Percent
City	45	37
Township	31	26
Village	43	36
Abroad	1	,8
Total	120	100

Table 6. The birthplace of men

	Frequency	Valid Percent
City	26	25
Township	27	26
Village	49	47
Abroad	3	2
Total	105	100

Table 7. Living duration of women in the city

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Less than 10 years	12	10
Between 11-20 years	35	29,2
21-30	28	23,3
31-40	34	28,3
41-52	11	9,2
Total	120	100

Table 8. The tenant position of the households

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Tenant	52	43,3
House owner	28	23,3
Non-house owner / non-pay rent	40	33,3
Total	20	100

Table 9. Tenant positions of the households by labor categories

Labor categories	Renter %	Not-pay rent %	Total N	Total %
A	27	73	15	100
B	27	73	15	100
C	20	80	15	100
D	60	40	15	100
E	40	60	15	100
F	60	40	15	100
G	73	27	15	100
H	40	60	15	100
Total N	52	68	120	
Total %	43,3	56,7		100

$$\chi^2 = 15,747 \quad df = 7 \quad p = 0,028$$

- A: Women and men are regular income earners.
 B: Women are irregular and men are regular income earners.
 C: Women are housewives and men are regular income earners.
 D: Women are regular and men are irregular income earners.
 E: Women and men are irregular income earners.
 F: Women are housewives and men are irregular income earners.
 G: Women are housewives and men are unemployed.
 H: Single-mothers.

Table 10. The rent per a month

	Frequency	Valid Percent
85 YTL and less than	24	46
Between 100-199 YTL.	24	46
Between 200-350 YTL	4	8
Total	52	100

Table 11. The number of rooms

	Frequency	Valid Percent
1 room	3	2
2 rooms	45	38
3 rooms	50	42
4 rooms	22	18
Total	120	100

Table 12. The heating system by labor categories

Labor categories	Stove %	Central heating system %	Total N	Total %
A	60	40	15	100
B	73	27	15	100
C	67	33	15	100
D	73	27	15	100
E	93	7	15	100
F	100	-	15	100
G	100	-	15	100
H	93	7	15	100
Total N	99	21	120	
Total %	83	17		100

$$\chi^2 = 18,413 \quad df = 7 \quad p = 0,010$$

- A: Women and men are regular income earners.
 B: Women are irregular and men are regular income earners.
 C: Women are housewives and men are regular income earners.
 D: Women are regular and men are irregular income earners.
 E: Women and men are irregular income earners.
 F: Women are housewives and men are irregular income earners.
 G: Women are housewives and men are unemployed.
 H: Single-mothers.

Table 13. Infrastructure of the households

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Toilet outside the house	52	43
No separate toilet and bathroom	14	12
Separate toilet and bathroom	54	45
Total	120	100

Table 14. Separate room for children

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Exist	80	67
Non-exist	40	33
Total	120	100

Table 15. The ownership of refrigerator by labor categories

Labor categories	Non-owner %	Owner %	Total N	Total %
A	0	100	15	100
B	0	100	15	100
C	0	100	15	100
D	0	100	15	100
E	0	100	15	100
F	7	93	15	100
G	20	80	15	100
H	13	87	15	100
Total N	6	114	120	
Total %	5	73		100

$$\chi^2 = 13,333 \quad df = 7 \quad p = 0,064$$

- A: Women and men are regular income earners.
 B: Women are irregular and men are regular income earners.
 C: Women are housewives and men are regular income earners.
 D: Women are regular and men are irregular income earners.
 E: Women and men are irregular income earners.
 F: Women are housewives and men are irregular income earners.
 G: Women are housewives and men are unemployed.
 H: Single-mothers.

Table 16. The ownership of durable consumption goods

	Non-owner	%	Owner	%	Second hand	%	Total Number	Total %
Vacuum cleaner	17	14,2	96	80	7	5,8	120	100
T.V	3	2,5	111	92,5	6	5	120	100
Washing machine	107	89,2	8	6,7	5	4,2	120	100
Automatic washing machine	24	20	92	76,7	4	3,3	120	100
Dishwasher	108	90	11	9,2	1	,8	120	100
Sewing machine	74	61,7	43	35,8	3	2,5	120	100
Little bottle gas	8	6,7	111	92,5	1	,8	120	100
Female hand phone	74	61,7	35	29,2	11	9,2	120	100
Hall suite	83	69,2	35	29,2	2	1,7	120	100

Table 17. The ownership of bathing stove by labor categories

Labor categories	Non-owner %	Owner %	Total N	Total %
A	40	60	15	100
B	53	47	15	100
C	33	67	15	100
D	47	53	15	100
E	67	33	15	100
F	67	33	15	100
G	93	7	15	100
H	73	26	15	100
Total N	71	49	120	
Total %	59	41		100

$$\chi^2 = 24,526 \quad df = 14 \quad p = 0,040$$

- A: Women and men are regular income earners.
 B: Women are irregular and men are regular income earners.
 C: Women are housewives and men are regular income earners.
 D: Women are regular and men are irregular income earners.
 E: Women and men are irregular income earners.
 F: Women are housewives and men are irregular income earners.
 G: Women are housewives and men are unemployed.
 H: Single-mothers.

Table 18. The ownership of DVD/VCD by labor categories

Labor categories	Non-owner %	Owner %	Total N	Total %
A	27	73	15	100
B	27	73	15	100
C	20	80	15	100
D	13	87	15	100
E	40	60	15	100
F	40	60	15	100
G	67	30	15	100
H	80	20	15	100
Total N	47	73	120	
Total %	39	61		100

$$\chi^2 = 31,002 \quad df = 14 \quad p = 0,006$$

- A: Women and men are regular income earners.
 B: Women are irregular and men are regular income earners.
 C: Women are housewives and men are regular income earners.
 D: Women are regular and men are irregular income earners.
 E: Women and men are irregular income earners.
 F: Women are housewives and men are irregular income earners.
 G: Women are housewives and men are unemployed.
 H: Single-mothers.

Table 19. The ownership of mobile phone (male) by labor categories

Labor categories	Non-owner %	Owner %	Total N	Total %
A	32	68	15	100
B	13	87	15	100
C	20	80	15	100
D	33	67	15	100
E	40	60	15	100
F	27	73	15	100
G	73	27	15	100
Total N	37	71	120	
Total %	32	68		100

$$\chi^2 = 16,703 \quad df = 6 \quad p = 0,010$$

- A: Women and men are regular income earners.
- B: Women are irregular and men are regular income earners.
- C: Women are housewives and men are regular income earners.
- D: Women are regular and men are irregular income earners.
- E: Women and men are irregular income earners.
- F: Women are housewives and men are irregular income earners.
- G: Women are housewives and men are unemployed.
- H: Single-mothers.

Table 20. The ownership of home phone by labor categories

Labor categories	Non-owner %	Owner %	Total N	Total %
A	7	93	15	100
B	7	93	15	100
C	7	93	15	100
D	13	87	15	100
E	20	80	15	100
F	20	80	15	100
G	53	47	15	100
H	47	53	15	100
Total N	26	94	120	
Total %	22	78		100

$$\chi^2 = 21,015 \quad df = 7 \quad p = 0,001$$

- A: Women and men are regular income earners.
- B: Women are irregular and men are regular income earners.
- C: Women are housewives and men are regular income earners.
- D: Women are regular and men are irregular income earners.
- E: Women and men are irregular income earners.
- F: Women are housewives and men are irregular income earners.
- G: Women are housewives and men are unemployed.
- H: Single-mothers.

Table 21. The ownership of bedroom by labor categories

Labor categories	Non-owner %	Owner %	Total N	Total %
A	27	73	15	100
B	67	33	15	100
C	67	33	15	100
D	60	40	15	100
E	53	47	15	100
F	67	33	15	100
G	93	7	15	100
H	93	7	15	100
Total N	79	41	120	
Total %	66	34		100

$\chi^2 = 21,599$ $df = 7$ $p = 0,003$

- A: Women and men are regular income earners.
- B: Women are irregular and men are regular income earners.
- C: Women are housewives and men are regular income earners.
- D: Women are regular and men are irregular income earners.
- E: Women and men are irregular income earners.
- F: Women are housewives and men are irregular income earners.
- G: Women are housewives and men are unemployed.
- H: Single-mothers.

Table 22. The ownership of children room by labor categories

Labor categories	Non-owner %	Owner %	Total N	Total %
A	80	20	15	100
B	67	33	15	100
C	53	47	15	100
D	67	33	15	100
E	87	13	15	100
F	87	13	15	100
G	100	-	15	100
H	93	7	15	100
Total N	95	25	120	
Total %	79	21		100

$\chi^2 = 15,714$ $df = 7$ $p = 0,028$

- A: Women and men are regular income earners.
- B: Women are irregular and men are regular income earners.
- C: Women are housewives and men are regular income earners.
- D: Women are regular and men are irregular income earners.
- E: Women and men are irregular income earners.
- F: Women are housewives and men are irregular income earners.
- G: Women are housewives and men are unemployed.
- H: Single-mothers.

Table 23. The limitation of using electricity / water by labor categories

Labor categories	Never %	Mostly %	Sometimes %	Total N	Total %
A	47	40	13	15	100
B	20	60	20	15	100
C	40	40	20	15	100
D	20	73	7	15	100
E	7	80	13	15	100
F	13	73	14	15	100
G	-	93	7	15	100
H	-	87	13	15	100
Total N	22	82	16	120	
Total %	18	68	13		100

$\chi^2 = 25,468$ $df = 14$ $p = 0,030$

- A: Women and men are regular income earners.
- B: Women are irregular and men are regular income earners.
- C: Women are housewives and men are regular income earners.
- D: Women are regular and men are irregular income earners.
- E: Women and men are irregular income earners.
- F: Women are housewives and men are irregular income earners.
- G: Women are housewives and men are unemployed.
- H: Single-mothers.

Table 24. The limitation of transportation by labor categories

Labor categories	Never %	Mostly %	Sometimes %	Total N	Total %
A	33	60	7	15	100
B	13	60	27	15	100
C	13	67	20	15	100
D	-	87	13	15	100
E	-	93	7	15	100
F	7	93	-	15	100
G	-	100	-	15	100
H	7	80	13	15	100
Total N	1	12	2	120	
Total %	9	80	11		100

$\chi^2 = 26,326$ $df = 14$ $p = 0,024$

- A: Women and men are regular income earners.
- B: Women are irregular and men are regular income earners.
- C: Women are housewives and men are regular income earners.
- D: Women are regular and men are irregular income earners.
- E: Women and men are irregular income earners.
- F: Women are housewives and men are irregular income earners.
- G: Women are housewives and men are unemployed.
- H: Single-mothers.

Table 25. Saving of heating by labor categories

Labor categories	Never %	Mostly %	Sometimes%	Total N	Total %
A	33	53	13	15	100
B	27	47	27	15	100
C	40	33	27	15	100
D	13	67	20	15	100
E	-	87	13	15	100
F	7	87	7	15	100
G	-	100	-	15	100
H	13	80	7	15	100
Total N	20	83	17	120	
Total %	17	83	14		100

$\chi^2 = 29,484$ $df = 14$ $p = 0,009$

- A: Women and men are regular income earners. G: Women are housewives and men are unemployed.
 B: Women are irregular and men are regular income earners. H: Single-mothers.
 C: Women are housewives and men are regular income earners.
 D: Women are regular and men are irregular income earners.
 E: Women and men are irregular income earners.
 F: Women are housewives and men are irregular income earners.

Table 26. The provisions of heating

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Installment	48	40
Paid cash	37	31
Credit Card	2	1
Aid from state institutions	33	28
Total	120	100

Table 27. The limitation of cleaning materials by labor categories

Labor categories	Never %	Mostly %	Sometimes %	Total N	Total %
A	33	60	7	15	100
B	20	67	13	15	100
C	33	27	40	15	100
D	33	60	7	15	100
E	13	80	7	15	100
F	7	87	7	15	100
G	-	100	-	15	100
H	20	73	7	15	100
Total N	24	83	13	120	

$\chi^2 = 30,672$ $df = 14$ $p = 0,006$

- A: Women and men are regular income earners.
 B: Women are irregular and men are regular income earners.
 C: Women are housewives and men are regular income earners.
 D: Women are regular and men are irregular income earners.
 E: Women and men are irregular income earners.
 F: Women are housewives and men are irregular income earners.
 G: Women are housewives and men are unemployed.
 H: Single-mothers.

Table 28. The ratio of the households that meet clothes from weekly local markets by labor categories

Labor categories	Never %	Mostly %	Sometimes %	Total N	Total %
A	13	53	33	15	100
B	33	60	7	15	100
C	27	67	7	15	100
D	53	40	7	15	100
E	27	53	20	15	100
F	20	40	40	15	100
G	73	7	20	15	100
H	40	40	20	15	100
Total N	43	54	23	120	
Total %	36	45	19		100

$\chi^2 = 27,718$ $df = 14$ $p = 0,016$

- A: Women and men are regular income earners.
- B: Women are irregular and men are regular income earners.
- C: Women are housewives and men are regular income earners.
- D: Women are regular and men are irregular income earners.
- E: Women and men are irregular income earners.
- F: Women are housewives and men are irregular income earners.
- G: Women are housewives and men are unemployed.
- H: Single-mothers.

Table 29. The ratio of the households that meet clothes from export stores or other places where clothes are cheaper than other stores by labor categories

Labor categories	Never %	Mostly %	Sometimes %	Total N	Total %
A	13	67	20	15	100
B	40	40	20	15	100
C	20	47	33	15	100
D	40	53	7	15	100
E	40	40	20	15	100
F	80	20	-	15	100
G	93	7	-	15	100
H	67	20	13	15	100
Total N	59	44	17	120	
Total %	49	37	14		100

$\chi^2 = 28,164$ $df = 14$ $p = 0,001$

- A: Women and men are regular income earners.
- B: Women are irregular and men are regular income earners.
- C: Women are housewives and men are regular income earners.
- D: Women are regular and men are irregular income earners.
- E: Women and men are irregular income earners.
- F: Women are housewives and men are irregular income earners.
- G: Women are housewives and men are unemployed.
- H: Single-mothers.

Table 30. The ratio of the households that meet clothes from acquaintance/relatives/friends by labor categories

Labor categories	Never %	Mostly %	Sometimes %	Total N	Total %
A	73	13	13	15	100
B	53	20	27	15	100
C	60	13	27	15	100
D	73	13	13	15	100
E	40	47	13	15	100
F	20	73	7	15	100
G	-	67	33	15	100
H	53	27	20	15	100
Total N	56	41	23	120	
Total %	47	34	19		100

$\chi^2 = 28,164$ $df = 14$ $p = 0,0001$

- A: Women and men are regular income earners.
- B: Women are irregular and men are regular income earners.
- C: Women are housewives and men are regular income earners.
- D: Women are regular and men are irregular income earners.
- E: Women and men are irregular income earners.
- F: Women are housewives and men are irregular income earners.
- G: Women are housewives and men are unemployed.
- H: Single-mothers.

Table 31. The ratio of the households that use second hand clothes by labor categories

Labor categories	Never %	Mostly %	Sometimes %	Total N	Total %
A	93	7	-	15	100
B	80	-	20	15	100
C	93	7	-	15	100
D	87	7	7	15	100
E	80	13	7	15	100
F	73	20	7	15	100
G	13	60	27	15	100
H	87	7	7	15	100
Total N	91	18	11	120	
Total %	76	15	9		100

$\chi^2 = 28,164$ $df = 14$ $p = 0,0001$

- A: Women and men are regular income earners.
- B: Women are irregular and men are regular income earners.
- C: Women are housewives and men are regular income earners.
- D: Women are regular and men are irregular income earners.
- E: Women and men are irregular income earners.
- F: Women are housewives and men are irregular income earners.
- G: Women are housewives and men are unemployed.
- H: Single-mothers.

Table 32. The ratio of the households that limit food consumption due to economic hardship by labor categories

Labor categories	Never %	Mostly %	Sometimes %	Total N	Total %
A	47	33	15	15	100
B	7	53	40	15	100
C	20	60	20	15	100
D	20	47	33	15	100
E	7	87	7	15	100
F	7	87	7	15	100
G	-	100	-	15	100
H	7	87	5	15	100
Total N	17	83	15	120	
Total %	14	69	5		100

$\chi^2 = 37,874$ $df = 14$ $p = 0,001$

- A: Women and men are regular income earners.
- B: Women are irregular and men are regular income earners.
- C: Women are housewives and men are regular income earners.
- D: Women are regular and men are irregular income earners.
- E: Women and men are irregular income earners.
- F: Women are housewives and men are irregular income earners.
- G: Women are housewives and men are unemployed.
- H: Single-mothers.

Table 33. The frequency of children drinking milk

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Regularly for each day	12	27
1-2 for a week	13	29
1-2 for a month	9	20
Never	11	24
Total	45	100

Table 34. The ratio of using weekly local markets for food shopping

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Never	10	8
Mostly	64	53
Sometimes	46	38
Total	120	100

Table 35. Shopping time in weekly local markets

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Morning	2	12
Just before its closing	95	70
Not having money to go to there	23	18
Total	120	100

Table 36. The shopping ratio of food from gross markets by labor categories

Labor categories	Never %	Mostly %	Sometimes %	Total N	Total %
A	-	80	20	15	100
B	27	67	7	15	100
C	27	53	20	15	100
D	13	87	-	15	100
E	27	53	20	15	100
F	47	40	13	15	100
G	73	7	20	15	100
H	33	60	7	15	100
Total N	37	67	16	120	
Total %	31	56	13		100

$\chi^2 = 28,164$ $df = 14$ $p = 0,0001$

- A: Women and men are regular income earners.
- B: Women are irregular and men are regular income earners.
- C: Women are housewives and men are regular income earners.
- D: Women are regular and men are irregular income earners.
- E: Women and men are irregular income earners.
- F: Women are housewives and men are irregular income earners.
- G: Women are housewives and men are unemployed.
- H: Single-mothers.

Table 37. The ratio of production of tomato paste at home by labor categories

Labor categories	Never %	Mostly %	Total N	Total %
A	67	33	15	100
B	40	60	15	100
C	60	40	15	100
D	53	47	15	100
E	27	73	15	100
F	47	53	15	100
G	87	13	15	100
H	67	33	15	100
Total N	67	53	120	
Total %	56	44		100

$\chi^2 = 14,565$ $df = 7$ $p = 0,042$

- A: Women and men are regular income earners.
- B: Women are irregular and men are regular income earners.
- C: Women are housewives and men are regular income earners.
- D: Women are regular and men are irregular income earners.
- E: Women and men are irregular income earners.
- F: Women are housewives and men are irregular income earners.
- G: Women are housewives and men are unemployed.
- H: Single-mothers.

Table 38. The ratio of production of “tarhana” at home by labor categories

Labor categories	Never %	Mostly %	Total N	Total %
A	13	87	15	100
B	7	93	15	100
C	7	93	15	100
D	27	73	15	100
E	13	87	15	100
F	13	87	15	100
G	93	7	15	100
H	33	67	15	100
Total N	31	89	120	
Total %	26	74		100

$\chi^2 = 45,538$ $df = 7$ $p = 0,0001$

- A: Women and men are regular income earners.
- B: Women are irregular and men are regular income earners.
- C: Women are housewives and men are regular income earners.
- D: Women are regular and men are irregular income earners.
- E: Women and men are irregular income earners.
- F: Women are housewives and men are irregular income earners.
- G: Women are housewives and men are unemployed.
- H: Single-mothers.

Table 39. The ratio of production of homemade pasta by labor categories

Labor categories	Never %	Mostly %	Total N	Total %
A	60	40	15	100
B	13	87	15	100
C	27	73	15	100
D	20	80	15	100
E	33	67	15	100
F	33	67	15	100
G	80	3	15	100
H	60	40	15	100
Total N	49	71	120	
Total %	41	59		100

$\chi^2 = 23,421$ $df = 7$ $p = 0,001$

- A: Women and men are regular income earners.
- B: Women are irregular and men are regular income earners.
- C: Women are housewives and men are regular income earners.
- D: Women are regular and men are irregular income earners.
- E: Women and men are irregular income earners.
- F: Women are housewives and men are irregular income earners.
- G: Women are housewives and men are unemployed.
- H: Single-mothers.

Table 40. The ratio of production of pickles at home by labor categories

Labor categories	Never %	Mostly %	Total N	Total%
A	13	87	15	100
B	7	93	15	100
C	7	93	15	100
D	13	87	15	100
E	-	100	15	100
F	13	87	15	100
G	60	40	15	100
H	20	80	15	100
Total N	20	100	120	
Total %	17	83		100

$\chi^2 = 25,920$ $df = 7$ $p = 0,001$

- A: Women and men are regular income earners.
- B: Women are irregular and men are regular income earners.
- C: Women are housewives and men are regular income earners.
- D: Women are regular and men are irregular income earners.
- E: Women and men are irregular income earners.
- F: Women are housewives and men are irregular income earners.
- G: Women are housewives and men are unemployed.
- H: Single-mothers.

Table 41. The ratio of production of yogurt at home by labor categories

Labor categories	Never %	Mostly %	Total N	Total %
A	27	73	15	100
B	27	73	15	100
C	27	73	15	100
D	60	40	15	100
E	27	73	15	100
F	33	67	15	100
G	73	27	15	100
H	47	53	15	100
Total N	48	72	120	
Total %	40	60		100

$\chi^2 = 14,444$ $df = 7$ $p = 0,044$

- A: Women and men are regular income earners.
- B: Women are irregular and men are regular income earners.
- C: Women are housewives and men are regular income earners.
- D: Women are regular and men are irregular income earners.
- E: Women and men are irregular income earners.
- F: Women are housewives and men are irregular income earners.
- G: Women are housewives and men are unemployed.
- H: Single-mothers.

Table 42. The ratio of production of jam at home by labor categories

Labor categories	Never %	Mostly %	Total N	Total %
A	33	67	15	100
B	20	80	15	100
C	47	53	15	100
D	40	60	15	100
E	33	67	15	100
F	47	53	15	100
G	93	7	15	100
H	53	47	15	100
Total N	55	65	120	
Total %	46	54		100

$\chi^2 = 20,106$ $df = 7$ $p = 0,005$

- A: Women and men are regular income earners.
- B: Women are irregular and men are regular income earners.
- C: Women are housewives and men are regular income earners.
- D: Women are regular and men are irregular income earners.
- E: Women and men are irregular income earners.
- F: Women are housewives and men are irregular income earners.
- G: Women are housewives and men are unemployed.
- H: Single-mothers.

Table 43. The ratio of production of preserves at home by labor categories

Labor categories	Never %	Mostly %	Total N	Total %
A	40	60	15	100
B	27	73	15	100
C	67	33	15	100
D	47	53	15	100
E	20	80	15	100
F	40	60	15	100
G	93	7	15	100
H	53	47	15	100
Total N	58	62	120	
Total %	48	52		100

$\chi^2 = 22,825$ $df = 7$ $p = 0,002$

- A: Women and men are regular income earners.
- B: Women are irregular and men are regular income earners.
- C: Women are housewives and men are regular income earners.
- D: Women are regular and men are irregular income earners.
- E: Women and men are irregular income earners.
- F: Women are housewives and men are irregular income earners.
- G: Women are housewives and men are unemployed.
- H: Single-mothers.

Table 44. Women's evaluation of their families' economic level

	Number	Valid Percent
Above middle	2	2
Middle	58	48
Below middle	25	21
Poor	35	29
Total	120	100

Table 45. Evaluation of family's economic level

	Above middle %	Middle %	Below middle %	Poor %	Total N	Total %
Housewives	2	33	15	49	51	100
Women at irregular works	-	54	26	20	35	100
Women at regular works	3	65	23	9	34	100
Total	2	58	25	35	120	
%	2	48	21	29		100

Table 46. Women's opinion about the reasons of poverty

	No idea %	Strongly agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Total Number	Valid Percent
Laziness	2	21	54	23	120	100
Lack of education	4	41	47	8	120	100
Unemployment		49	40	11	120	100
Low-wages	1	64	33	2	120	100
Bad-state policies	16	32	47	4	120	100
Exploitation	16	37	42	5	120	100

Table 47. The most important reason of poverty in women's opinion

	Number	Valid percent
Laziness	14	12
Unemployment	46	38
Lack of education	15	13
Bad-state policies	18	15
Exploitation	5	4
Low wages	22	18
Total	120	100

Table 48. The most important reasons of poverty for labor categories

	Laziness %	Unemployment %	Lack of education %	Bad-state policies %	Exploitation %	Low-wages %	Total N	%
Housewives	12	43	16	12		18	51	100
Women at irregular works	14	43	14	3	6	20	35	100
Women at regular works	9	26	6	32	9	18	34	100
Total N	14	46	15	18	5	22	120	
Total %	12	38	12	15	4	18		100

Table 49. Women's opinion about the reasons of women's poverty

	No idea %	Strongly agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly disagree %	Total N	%
Non-working outside the home as wage worker	-	44	52	3	-	120	100
Lack of education		47	42	10	1	120	100
Earning less than males	12	23	44	20	-	120	100
Women's working both in employment and in the house for family's sustenance	2	26	30	41	1	120	100
Men's irresponsibility in spending money	2	57	39	2	-	120	100

Table 50. Women's opinion on women's poverty experiences

	No idea %	Strongly agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly disagree %	Total Number	Valid Percent
Women and children are suffer more than males under the poverty conditions	-	66	28	6	-	120	100
Rural women have more sustenance difficulty than city-dweller women	2,5	7,5	27,5	52,5	10	120	100
Housewives are poorer due to depending on husband's wage	1	45	40	13	1	120	100
Women who are divorce or widow poorer due to deprivation from husband's wages	2	35	51	10	2,5	120	100
Single mothers suffer from sustenance hardship but they feel more powerful themselves due to escaping from men's oppression	3	41	39	17	-	120	100

Table 51. Women’s opinion about the sustenance of family and domestic labor

	No idea	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total Number	Valid Percent
Men are seen as breadwinners for the family in the society		17	29	34	20	120	100
Men’s working outside and the women’ working at home have not the same respectful in the society.		30	61	8	1	120	100
In order to sustain family’s sustenance women’s housework is important as much as men’ earning money.		52	46	2		120	100
Men’s working outside and women’s working at home contribute to family’s sustenance at the same level.	1	28	43	25	3	120	100

Table 52. Women’s opinion on working life

	No idea %	Strongly agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly disagree %	Total Number	Valid Percent
In the last years, it has been difficult to find job easily for both educated and uneducated women in Turkey	1	48	45	5	1	120	100
Women have been worked by the employers in jobs which are low-wages, insecure and without social insurance	3	57	39	1		120	100
All workers should be unionist	14	49	35	1	1	120	100
The work of women contribute only as supplement to the family		12	41	32	16	120	100
Although women work in paid employment, they don’t escape from sustenance hardship		16	51	27	6	120	100

Table 53. Women’s opinion about the results of poverty

	No idea	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total Number	Valid Percent
In the last years, poverty, lack of money, sustenance hardship cause housewives’ working in paid employment	1	64	33	1	1	120	100
They also have decreased the solidarity and helping among relatives and neighbors.		60	35	4	1	120	100
They have caused increasing family quarrels		2	66	32	1	120	100
They have caused increasing domestic violence	3	52	40	4		120	100

Table 54. Women’s opinion about the poor’ right in Turkey

	No idea %	Strongly agree %	Agree %	Disagree %	Strongly disagree %	Total Number	Valid Percent
Turkey is a country where the poor demand their rights!	4	1	17	37	41	120	100

APPENDIX B: Interview Questions

I. SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC FEATURES

KADIN: 1. 1 Evli. 2 Bekar

Kadın 2. 1. Düzenli çalışıyor. 2. Düzensiz. 3. Çalışmıyor. 3.1 İşsiz.
3.2 Ev kadını

Erkek 2.1. 1. Düzenli çalışıyor. 2. Düzensiz. 3. Çalışmıyor. 3.1 İşsiz

3.

	Kadına yakınlığı	Yaş	Eğitim*	Doğduğu Yer** 1. İl 2. İlçe 3.Köy
Kadın				
Erkek				
Çocuk				
Çocuk				
Çocuk				
Çocuk				
Diğer				
Diğer				
Diğer				

4. Kaç yıldır şehirde yaşıyorsun (**kadın**)?

4.1. Bu sürenin ne kadarını Eskişehir’de (merkez) geçti?

Konut – Mülkiyet

5. Oturduğunuz ev

1. kira: 1.1. aylık kirası ne kadar?
- 2 mülk sahibi
- 3 mülk sahibi değil / kira ödemiyor (**kimin olduğunu belirtiniz**)

6. Evin tapusu kimin üzerinde (**mülk sahibi olanlar için**)

1. Kocasını 2.kadını 3.kadın/erkek 4. anne/baba 5. Diğer.....

7. Yaşadığınız evin ne tür eksikleri, olumsuzlukları var?

.....

.....

7.1. Oda sayısı 7.2. Çocukların ayrı odası 1. Var 2. Yok

7.3. Isınma : Soba () Kalorifer () Diğer ()

7.4. Tuvalet dışarıda () Banyo tuvalet bir () Banyo Tuvalet ayrı ()

8. Oturduğunuz mahallenin olumsuzlukları, sorunları nelerdir?

- 8.1. Yol, asfalt çöküntüsü () 8.4. Çöplerin toplanması, çöp kokusu ()
8.2. Kanalizasyon taşması () 8.5. Hırsızlık ()
8.3. Su-elektrik kesintisi ()

9. Hangilerine sahipsiniz (sahibi olduğunuz oturduğunuz konutun dışında)?

10. Son yıllarda (5 yıl) ekonomik sıkıntıdan dolayı hanede sattığınız şeyler oldu mu? (ev, araba, işyeri, arsa, vb).

8.Soru için	Var	Yok	Bedeli YTL	9. Soru için	Evet	Hayır
Köyde tarla ev				Köyde tarla ev		
Şehirde ev				Şehirde ev		
Şehirde arsa				Şehirde arsa		
Dükkan				Dükkan		
İşyeri				İşyeri		
Araba				Araba		
Kooperatif ev				Kooperatif ev		
Diğer				Altın		

EŞYA SAHİPLİĞİ

11. Aşağıdakilerden hangilerine sahipsiniz ?

	var	yok	İkinci el		var	yok	İkinci el		var	yok
Buzdolabı				Dikiş makinesi				Erk.cep		
Elektrikli süpürge				Şohpen				Kız.Cep		
TV kaç tane				Fırımlı Ocak				ErÇ.Cep		
Çamaşır makinesi				Küçük tüp				Diğ.Cep		
Otomatik çamaşır makinesi				DVD/VCD				S.tak		
Bulaşık makinesi				Bilgisayar				Y.Od.T		
Telefon				Kadın cep				Ç.Od.T		

II. PRODUCTION SPHERE:

ÇALIŞMAYAN KADIN (ev kadını- işsiz)

12. Çalışmak istiyor musun? Neden?

E ()

H ()

13. Çalışmış olsaydın ne elde ederdin, sana ne kazandırır ? (12. soruya hayır diyenlere sorulacak)

14. İş arıyor musunuz ? Evet () Hayır () (12. soruya evet diyenler için)

14.1. Ne zamandan bu yana iş arıyorsun ?

14.2. Nerelere başvurduunuz ?

15. Evde gelir getiren bir iş yapıyor musun ?

1. Evetse ne tür iş/işler?

2. Hayır

16. Daha önce hiç gelir getiren bir iş yaptın mı ? (evetse aşağıdaki tablo doldurulacak, zamanı/yapılan işler)

17. Kadının yaptığı iş/işler nedir? Çalışmadığı zamanlarda neden çalışmadığı?

KADIN (gelir getiren kadın)

2005

2004

2003

2002

2001

2000

1999

1998

1997

1996

18. Varsa gelir getiren başka ne tür işler yapıyorsun ? (+evde para getiren iş yapıyor mu?)

.....
.....
.....

19. Eğer elinde imkan olsaydı şu ana kadar yaptığın işler/iş dışında ne iş yapmak isterdin ?

.....
.....
.....

20. Çalışıyor olman seni geçim sıkıntısından kurtarıyor mu? 1. evet 2. hayır

.....
.....

(**çalışan kadınlar** için bu sorudan sonra, 21. soruya geçiniz)

(**çalışan boşanmış/ayrı yaşayan/dul** kadınlar için bu sorudan sonra, 24.soruya geçiniz)

ERKEK

21. Eşinizin yaptığı iş/işler nedir? Çalışmadığı zamanlarda neden çalışmadığı?

2005
2004
2003
2002
2001
2000
1999
1998
1997
1996

22. Eşiniz, varsa gelir getiren başka ne tür işler yapıyor?

.....
.....
.....

23. Hanede gelir getiren işlerde çalışan diğer kişiler ve yaptıkları işler?
2005
2004
2003
2002
2001
2000
1999
1998
1997
1996

(**Evli kadınlar için**, bu sorudan sonra 31. soruya geçiniz)

(**Çalışan boşanmış kadınlar için** 25. soruya geçiniz)

Dul Kadınlara Sorulacak

24. Eşinizi kaybedeli ne kadar oldu?
- 24.1. Eşinizden maaş alıyor musunuz ? 1. Hayır 2. Evet. Ne kadar?.....
Çocuklar

(**29 ve 30. soruya geçiniz**)

Boşanmış - Ayrı Yaşayan Kadınlara Sorulacak

25. Eşinizden ne zaman boşandınız/ayrıldınız?
26. Boşanma/ayrı yaşama kararını kim verdi ?
1. kadın 2. erkek 3. kadın/erkek birlikte 4. Diğer
27. Boşanma/ayrı yaşama nedenleriniz nelerdir?
.....
.....
28. Nafaka alıyor musunuz? 1. Hayır 2. Evetse: Ne kadar?

(**29-30. sorular boşanmış / ayrı yaşayan / dul kadınların hepsine sorulacak**)

29. Boşandıktan/ eşinizi kaybettikten sonra kendi düzeninizi kurmanız kaç ay/yılımızı aldı?

30. Bu süre içinde karşılaştığınız en önemli zorluklarda, güçlüklerden 3 tanesini söyler misiniz?

1.
2.
3.

II. REPRODUCTION

YAŞAM MALİYETLERİNİN AŞAĞIYA ÇEKİLMESİ

31. Geçiminiz için gelirinizi kimlerden/nerelerden sağlarsınız? (hane) Tablo A'yi işaretleyiniz!!

32. Nerelere/kimlere, ne kadar borcunuz var? (hane) Tablo B'yi işaretleyiniz !!

33. Yapabildiğiniz ne tür tasarruflar var? (hane) Tablo C'yi işaretleyiniz!!

31. Soru için TabloA	Çoğunlukla	Ara-sıra	Çok nadir	Hiç	32. Soru için Tablo B	YTL, Dolar, Euro, Altın
Kadının çalışması D+ () D- ()					Bankaya	
Erkeğin çalışması D+ () D- ()					Kredi kartına	
Çocuğun çalışması D+ () D- ()					Bakkala	
Yardıma dayalı gelir kaynakları					Mağazaya	
Kadının ailesinden yardımı					Kooperatife	
Erkeğin ailesinden yardım					Elden arkadaşlar	
Belediyeden yardım gıda					Elden akrabalara	
Belediyeden yardım yakacak					Diğer.....	
Belediyeden yardım Giysi					33. Soru için C	Çok - Az - Hiç
Köyden erzak, yiyecek vb.					Banka faizi	
Diğer					Repo	
Borçlanmaya bağlı gelir kaynak					Borsa	
Erkeğin ailesine borçlanarak					Devlet tahvili	
Kadının ailesine borçlanarak					Döviz	
Komşu/arkadaşlara borçlanarak					Altın	
Kredi kartından borçlanarak					Gayrimenkul (ev, arsa, vb)	
Diğer Kaynaklar					Diğer.....	
Faiz					Diğer.....	
Tarla-arazi					Diğer.....	
Kira	Evet	hayır			Diğer.....	

Hanenizin aylık ortalama geliri nedir?

34. Kocanızın geliri / Geliriniz hane ihtiyaçlarının ne kadarını sağlamaya yetiyor?
1. Kira 2. Elektrik/su/telefon 3. Gıda 4. Giyim 5. Eğitim
6. Sosyal faaliyetler

35. Geçim sıkıntısı, hayat pahalılığı,

	Evet, çoğunlukla	Bazen	Hayır
Gıda ürünlerini azaltmanıza neden oldu mu?			
Temizlik ürünlerinin azaltmanıza neden oldu mu?			
Giysi ihtiyaçlarınızı kısmanıza neden oldu mu?			
Elektrik/su kullanımını azaltmanıza neden oldu mu?			
Ulaşımдан kısmanıza neden oldu mu?			
Telefon kullanımını kısmanıza neden oldu mu?			
Isınmadan kısmanıza neden oldu mu?			

36. Gıda alışverişlerinizde aşağıdaki yerleri kullanma sıklığınız nedir?

GIDA	Genellikle	Ara sıra	Hiç
Pazar			
Seyyar satıcı			
Bakkal			
Market			
Manav			
Diğer			

37. Mahalle pazarına çoğunlukla günün hangi saatinde çıkarsınız? Neden?

1. Sabah erkenden 2. Öğlen 3. Öğleden sonra /akşam üzeri
4. Pazar kapanırken 5. Pazardan alışveriş yapacak durumum yok.
6. Diğer

38. Günde ortalama kaç ekmeği tüketiyorsunuz?

- 38.1. Ekmeği genellikle nereden alırsınız?

1. Belediyenin büfelerinden 2. Bakkaldan 3. Marketten 4. Diğer

39. Hayat pahalılığından dolayı sabah kahvaltısı için isteyip de alamadığımız ya da ara-sıra alabildiğiniz yiyecek ürünleri nelerdir?

.....
.....

40. Sabah kahvaltısında genellikle (ağırlıklı) olarak tükettiğiniz yiyecekler nelerdir?

.....
.....

41. Aşağıdakilerden hangileri yemek tüketiminde ağırlıklı olarak yer almaktadır?
1. Çorba 2. Sebze 3. Nohut/ fasulye 4. Makarna-Pilav 5. Patates
6. Kırmızı ete göre tavuk ürünleri

42. Hayat pahalılığından dolayı alamadığınız, ya da ara-sıra alabildiğiniz meyve ürünleri nelerdir?
.....

43. Çocukların süt içme sıklığı nedir? (0-7 yaş arası)
1. her gün 2. haftada 1-2 3. ayda 1-2 4. hiç içmez

44. Giysi ihtiyaçlarınızı nerelerden karşılıyorsunuz?

	Coğunlukla	Arasına	Hiç
1. Pazardan			
2. Seyyar satıcıdan			
3. Exportation			
4. İkinci el kullanılmış			
5. Eş-dost-tanıdıktan yardım			
6. Markalı satış yapan büyük mağazalardan			
7. Diğer			

45. Aşağıdaki ihtiyaçlarınızı genellikle taksit, peşin yoksa kredi kartıyla mı yaparsınız ?

	Taksit	Peşin	Kredi Kartı	Diğer
Gıda				
Giysi				
Isınma				
Sağlık				
Eğitim				

46. Sen geçim sıkıntısından dolayı hangi ihtiyaçlarından vazgeçiyorsun?

1. Giyim ihtiyaçlarımdan 2. Kişisel bakım ihtiyaçlarımdan (kuaför, makyaj vb.)
3. Sosyal ihtiyaçlarımdan (arkadaş, akraba ziyaretleri vb.)
4. Sigara harcamalarımdan 5. Diğer.....

47. Geçim sıkıntısı çekmenize rağmen kocanız hangi harcamalarından kısıntı yapmaz, vazgeçmez?

1. Giyim ihtiyaçlarımdan 5. Kişisel sağlık harcamalarımdan
2. Kahveye gitmekten 6. Şans oyunları
3. Sigara harcamalarımdan 7. Kumar
4. Sosyal ihtiyaçlarımdan (arkadaş, akraba ziyaretleri vb.) 8. Diğer

48. Çocuklarınızın istediği fakat geçim sıkıntısı, hayat pahalılığından dolayı alamadığınız neler var?

.....
.....

49. Çocuğunuz eğitim ihtiyaçlarından neleri karşılamakta zorlanıyorsunuz ?

.....
.....

50. Hayat pahalılığından dolayı, satın almamak için evde yaptığınız ne tür işler var?

- Salça Tarhana Erişte Turşu Ekmek Yoğurt
 reçel konserve peynir bahçede sebze yetiştirme
 Örgü dikiş elbise onarımı tamirat gibi.....
 bahçede sebze yetiştirme

51. Evde herkese yetecek kadar yiyecek olmadığı zamanlarda kadınlar yemeyerek fedakarlık yapar. Size göre bu neden böyledir?

.....
.....

EV İÇİ İŞBÖLÜMÜ

52. Aşağıdaki işleri (1) çoğunlukla kim yapar (3) az yardım eder
(2) en fazla kim yardım eder (4) hiç yapmaz

	Kadın	Kız çocuk	Erkek Çocuk	Erkek	Diğer	Diğer
Temizlik						
Çamaşır/ütü						
Bulaşıkların yıkanması						
Yemeğin pişirilmesi						
Çocukların bakımı						
Yiyecek alışverişi						
Fatura (tel,su, elt.) ödenmesi						
Evin tamir işleri						
Çocukların derslerinde yardım						
Okul-öğretmen ile ilişkiler						
Taksit yatırma						
Çay,kahve, su servisi						
Hasta, yaşlı bakımı						

53. Temizliği sizin yerinize para karşılığı başkası yapmış olsaydı bu iş için bütçenizden ayda ne kadar para ayırmak zorunda kalırdı? YTL

III. SOCIAL REPRODUCTION

54. Eskişehir’de akraba ve arkadaşlarınızla görüşme sıklığınız nedir?

Genellikle	Ara sıra	Çok nadir	Hiç

55. Neden görüşemiyorsunuz? (Ara sıra, çok nadir ve hiç görüşmeyenler için)

1. Eşim izin vermiyor 2. Parasızlık 3. Zaman yok 4. Diğer

56. Tatil için bütçenizden para ayırabiliyor musunuz?

1. Hayır hiçbir zaman 2. Her zaman 3. Nadiren 4. Diğer

57. Geçen yıl tatile gittiniz mi? Nereye? Ne kadar süreliğine?

.....

58. Son bir yıl içinde kaç kere sinemaya / tiyatroya gittiniz?

0. hiç gitmedim 1. Sinemaya kere gittim.
0. hiç gitmedim 1. Tiyatroya..... kere gittim

59. Sinemaya, tiyatroya gitmiş olmakla ne elde edersin, sana ne kazandırır ?

.....

.....

.....

60. Kadın olarak, erkekler gibi akşam tek başına korkmadan dışarıda dolaşmak, sana ne kazandırır? Kendini nasıl hissedersin ?

.....

.....

.....

61. Gazete, kitap, dergi okumakla ne kazanırsın, ne elde edersin?

.....

.....

.....

IV. POWER: (KARAR VERME SÜREÇLERİ, PARANIN İDARESİ VE KONTROLÜ)

62. Kocanla nasıl evlendin?

1. Görücü usulu 2. Anlaşarak 3. Kaçma / kaçırılma

63. Kaç yaşında evlendin

64. Sizin evde aşağıdaki konularda genellikle kimin dediği olur?

	Erkek	Kadın
Çocuklarla ilgili önemli bir kararda (evlilik, eğitim)		
Eve alınacak önemli bir mal, mülk, eşya konusunda		
Kocana ait önemli bir kararda		
Yapılan önemli bir tartışmada		
Senin kendine ait önemli bir kararda		

65. Eve gelen parayı kim idare eder? Neden?

.....

.....

.....

.....

66. Az da olsa kenara ayırdığın para oluyor mu? Bunu genellikle nereye harcıyor ne yapıyorsun ?

.....

.....

.....

.....

67. Kazandığın para ailenin zorunlu ihtiyaçlarına gitse bile bunun kullanımında ne kadar söz sahibisin ? (Ç.K)

.....

.....

.....

.....

SIYASET

68. Sendikaya üye misiniz? (İŞÇİ, MEMUR)

1. sendika yok, üye değilim 2. sendika var, üye değilim 3. üyeyim

69. Herhangi bir dernek, partiye, üye misiniz? 1. Evet 2. Hayır

70. Son yerel/ genel seçimlerde oy kullandınız mı ? 1. Evet 2. Hayır

71. Eşiniziz verdiği partiye mi oy verirsiniz? 1. Evet 2. Hayır

72. Hayatınızda hiç mitinge/protesto eylemine katıldınız mı? 1.Evet 2. Hayır

73. Herhangi bir partinin seçim çalışmalarında yer aldınız mı? 1. Evet 2. Hayır

ŞİDDET

74. Ekonomik sıkıntılar nedeniyle;

	Genellikle	Ara sıra	Çok nadir	Hiç
Kocanızla tartıştığımız kavga ettiğiniz zamanlar olur mu?				
Kocanızın size küfür ettiği olur mu?				
Kocanızın size fiziksel şiddet uyguladığı olur mu?				

SAĞLIK

75. Varsa sağlık güvence türünüz nedir?

	SSK	Bağ-Kur	Emekli.San	Yeşil Kart	Diğer
Kadın					
Erkek					
Çocuklar					
Diğer					
Diğer					

76. Genel olarak sağlık durumunuz?

	Çok İyi	İyi	Kötü	Çok Kötü
Kadın				
Kocanızın				
Çocuklarınızın				
Diğer				
Diğer				

77 Hastalandığınızda ne yaparsınız?

1. Hemen doktora giderim
 2. Hemen hastaneye giderim
 3. Hemen sağlık ocağına giderim
 4. Geçmesini bekler, evde tedavi etmeye çalışırım
 5. Ancak çok önemli bir hastalığım olursa doktora giderim
 6. Ancak çok önemli bir hastalığım olursa hastaneye giderim
- Diğer

78. Sağlık güvenceniz olmasına rağmen sağlık sorunlarınızı çözebiliyor musunuz? Karşılaştığınız zorluklardan bahseder misiniz?

.....
.....

79. Sağlık sorunlarınızı nasıl çözüyorsunuz? (herhangi bir güvencesi olmayanlar için)

.....
.....
.....

80. Son 1 yıl içinde parasızlık nedeniyle tedavisini ertelediğiniz hastalığınız oldu mu?

.....
.....

81. Hastalandığınızda size kim bakar?

1. Hiç kimse 2. Ailem 3. Komşular 4. Çocuklarım 5. Kocam 6. Diğer.....

82. Eşinizin sağlık sorunlarınızı hafife aldığı, önemsemediği zamanlar olur mu?

Genellikle	Ara sıra	Çok nadir	Hiç

V. YOKSULLUK

83. Gelirinize göre ailenizi hangi ekonomik düzeyde görüyorsunuz?

1. Ortanın üstü 2. Orta 3. Ortanın altı 4. Yoksul 5. Diğer

84. Ailenizin geçim sıkıntısı çekmesinin nedeni nedir?

.....
.....
.....

85. Ailenizin geçim sıkıntısından kurtulması için ne yapmak lazım?

.....
.....
.....

86. Kendi yaşantını kocana göre kıyasladığında daha mı iyi yoksa daha mı kötü durumdasın? Neden? (EVLİ KADINLAR)

.....
.....
.....

87. Kendi yaşantını çevrendeki kocası olmayan kadınlara göre kıyasladığında daha mı iyi yoksa daha mı kötü durumdasın? Neden? (**EVLİ KADINLAR**)

.....

.....

.....

88. Kendi yaşantını çalışmayan ev kadınlarına göre kıyasladığında daha mı iyi yoksa daha mı kötü durumdasın? Neden? (**ÇALIŞAN KADINLAR**)

.....

.....

.....

89. Kendi yaşantını çevrendeki çalışan kadınlara göre kıyasladığında daha mı iyi yoksa daha mı kötü durumdasın? Neden? (**ÇALIŞMAYAN KADINLAR**)

.....

.....

.....

90. Kendi yaşantını çevrende kocası olan kadınlara göre kıyasladığında daha mı iyi yoksa daha mı kötü durumdasın? Neden? (**DUL-BOŞANMIŞ KADINLAR**)

.....

.....

.....

91. Kadın olarak kendini nelerden mahrum, yoksun bırakıldığını düşünüyorsun?

.....

.....

.....

YOKSULLUK – GENEL

92. Türkiye’de fakirliğin önemli nedenlerinden biri;

	Kesinlikle Katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Fikrim yok	Katılmıyorum	Kesinlikle katılmıyorum
1. Tembelliktir					
2. İşsizlik					
3. Eğitimsizlik					
4. Devletin yanlış politikaları					
5. Sömürü					
6. Ücretlerin düşük olması					

Bunların arasında fakirliğin **en önemli** nedeni size göre hangisidir?

93. Türkiye’de kadınların fakir olmalarının önemli nedenlerinden biri;

	Kesinlikle Katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Fikrim Yok	Katılmıyorum	Kesinlikle katılmıyorum
1.Ev dışında para getiren işlerde çalışmıyor olması					
2.Eğitimsizlik					
3 Erkekler göre daha az ücret alması					
4.Evin geçimi için hem işte hem evde sürekli çalışması					
5.Erkeğin sorumsuz para harcaması (içki, kumar, vb.)					

Bunların arasında kadın fakirliğinin **en önemli** nedeni size göre hangisidir?.....

KADIN YOKSULLUĞU

94. Fakirliğin (geçim sıkıntısının) yükünü ve çilesini en çok kadınlar ve çocuklar çeker!

() kesinlikle katılıyorum () katılıyorum () fikrim yok () katılmıyorum () kesinlikle katılmıyorum

95. Köyde yaşayan kadın, kentte yaşayan kadına göre daha çok geçim sıkıntısı çekmektedir

() kesinlikle katılıyorum () katılıyorum () fikrim yok () katılmıyorum () kesinlikle katılmıyorum

96. Ev kadını kocasının gelirine bağımlı olduğu için çalışan kadına göre daha fakirdir!

() kesinlikle katılıyorum () katılıyorum () fikrim yok () katılmıyorum () kesinlikle katılmıyorum

97. Kocasını ölen-eşinden ayrılan kadınlar, erkeğin gelirden yoksun kaldıkları için daha çok geçim sıkıntısı çekmektedir.

() kesinlikle katılıyorum () katılıyorum () fikrim yok () katılmıyorum () kesinlikle katılmıyorum

98. Kadın boşandıktan sonra daha çok geçim sıkıntısı çekmesine rağmen, erkeğin baskısından kurtulmuş olmasından dolayı kendini daha özgür hisseder!

() kesinlikle katılıyorum () katılıyorum () fikrim yok () katılmıyorum () kesinlikle katılmıyorum

99. Çalışmayan kadın erkeğin gelirine bağımlı yaşadığı için, kendisine ait kararlarda çalışan kadın kadar özgür değildir !

kesinlikle katılıyorum katılıyorum fikrim yok katılmıyorum kesinlikle katılmıyorum

100. Evi geçindirmekle sorumlu kişi erkektir!

kesinlikle katılıyorum katılıyorum fikrim yok katılmıyorum kesinlikle katılmıyorum

100.1 Sizin evde aileyi geçindirmekle sorumlu kişi kim?

ben kocam birlikte diğer

101. Erkeğin dışarıda çalışması ile kadının evde çalışması toplumda aynı saygınlığa sahip değildir

kesinlikle katılıyorum katılıyorum fikrim yok katılmıyorum kesinlikle katılmıyorum

102. Tek başına erkeğin kazancı ailenin geçimi için yeterli değildir. Evin geçiminin sağlanmasında kadınların evde yaptığı işler, erkeğin kazancı kadar önemlidir!

kesinlikle katılıyorum katılıyorum fikrim yok katılmıyorum kesinlikle katılmıyorum

103. Erkeğin dışarıda çalışması ile kadının evde çalışması ailenin geçimine aynı düzeyde katkı yapmaktadır!

kesinlikle katılıyorum katılıyorum fikrim yok katılmıyorum kesinlikle katılmıyorum

104. Geçim sıkıntısına karşı kadının erkeğe göre daha çok emek harcaması kadın yoksunluğunun (fakirliğinin) önemli bir özelliğidir !

kesinlikle katılıyorum katılıyorum fikrim yok katılmıyorum kesinlikle katılmıyorum

105. Kadın olarak erkekler gibi dışarıda çalışmama rağmen halen ev işlerini (yemek, bulaşık, temizlik vb) yapıyor olmam benim önemli bir yoksunluğumdur (fakirliğimdir) **Ç.K**

kesinlikle katılıyorum katılıyorum fikrim yok katılmıyorum kesinlikle katılmıyorum

106. Çocuğun geçimini kim sağlamaktadır?

1. Annenin harcadığı emek 2. Babanın dışarıda çalışması

107. Geçim darlığı kadınların ruh sağlığını erkeklere göre daha olumsuz etkilemektedir!

kesinlikle katılıyorum katılıyorum fikrim yok katılmıyorum kesinlikle katılmıyorum

108. Erkekler kadınların hastalıklarını çoğu zaman önemsemezler

() kesinlikle katılıyorum () katılıyorum () fikrim yok () katılmıyorum () kesinlikle katılmıyorum

109. Son yıllarda Türkiye’de, hem eğitimli hem de eğitimsiz kadınların iş bulmaları zorlaşmaktadır.

() kesinlikle katılıyorum () katılıyorum () fikrim yok () katılmıyorum () kesinlikle katılmıyorum

110. İşverenler daha çok kar elde etmek için kadınları genellikle sigortasız, sosyal güvencesi olmayan düşük ücretli işlerde çalıştırırlar.

() kesinlikle katılıyorum () katılıyorum () fikrim yok () katılmıyorum () kesinlikle katılmıyorum

111. Kadınların çalışması aileye sadece ek gelir sağlamaktadır.

() kesinlikle katılıyorum () katılıyorum () fikrim yok () katılmıyorum () kesinlikle katılmıyorum

112. Kadınlar para getiren işlerde çalışsalar bile geçim sıkıntısından kurtulamıyorlar !

() kesinlikle katılıyorum () katılıyorum () fikrim yok () katılmıyorum () kesinlikle katılmıyorum

113. Türkiye’de son yıllarda, parasızlık, geçim sıkıntısı, (fakirliğin artması);

	Kesinlikle katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Fikrim Yok	Katılmıyorum	Kesinlikle katılmıyorum
Ev kadınlarının da çalışmasına neden olmuştur					
Akrabalar-komşular arası yardımlaşmayı azaltmıştır					
Aile içi kavga ve tartışmaların artmasına neden olmuştur					
Kadınlara yönelik ev içi dayak ve şiddeti artırmıştır					

114. Bütün çalışanlar sendikalı olmalıdır!

() kesinlikle katılıyorum () katılıyorum () fikrim yok () katılmıyorum () kesinlikle katılmıyorum

115. Türkiye yoksulların haklarını aradığı bir ülkedir!

() kesinlikle katılıyorum () katılıyorum () fikrim yok () katılmıyorum () kesinlikle katılmıyorum

116. Geçim sıkıntısına karşı mücadelede, devlete;

1. Güveniyorum 2. Güvenim azaldı 3. Güvenim arttı 4. Güvenmiyorum

APPENDIX C: Turkish Summary

Klasik yoksulluk çalışmaları hem kuramsal hem de metodolojik düzeyde kadınların yoksulluk deneyimlerini açığa çıkarmada önemli sınırlılıklara sahiptir. Bu çalışmanın temel amacı, kadın ve yoksulluk arasındaki ilişkiyi kadınların üretim ve yeniden üretim süreçlerinde kullandıkları emek kullanım biçimlerine dayanarak eleştirel bir bakış açısından analiz etmektir. Bu çalışmada, kadın yoksulluğu temel olarak dört soru etrafında sorgulanmaktadır. Birincisi, kadınlar üretim ve yeniden üretim süreçlerinde gerçekleştirdikleri emekleriyle yoksulluğa karşı nasıl mücadele etmektedir. İkincisi, bu süreçlerin hangi mekanizmaları kadınların yoksullaşmasını etkilemektedir. Üçüncüsü, kadınların yoksulluk deneyiminin erkeklerden önemli farklılıkları nelerdir. Son olarak, çalışma sırasında ele alınan farklı emek kategorileri açısından kadınların yoksullaşma süreçleri ve yoksulluk deneyimleri arasında önemli bir farklılık var mıdır.

Çalışmanın teorik çerçevesi üç bölümden oluşmaktadır. Bu çerçevenin ilkinin tartışıldığı ikinci bölümde, yoksulluk literatürü kendi içindeki sınırlılıkları ve toplumsal cinsiyet tarafsızlığı açısından eleştirel olarak gözden geçirilmektedir. Yoksulluk tanımlarının hemen hepsi yoksul olanla olmayanı ayırmaya yarayan bir yoksulluk eşiği anlayışını içermektedir. Bu anlamda yoksulluk kavramsallaştırmaları kendi içinde ideolojik ve siyasal bir içeriğe sahiptir. Kimlerin yoksul olup kimlerin yoksul olmadığı belirlenen yoksulluk tanımına bağlı olarak farklılaşmaktadır. Bazı tanımlara göre en temel fiziksel ihtiyaçlarını karşılayamayanlar yoksul olurken, diğer bir tanımda yoksulluk tanımının genişletilmesine bağlı olarak yoksul insanların sayıları artabilmektedir. Klasik yoksulluk anlayışları haneyi ortak tüketim alanları olarak homojen bir yapı olarak ele almaktadır. Bu anlayış, hane içindeki kaynakların aktarım ve tüketim süreçlerinde yaşanan eşitsizlikleri gizleyen bir içeriğe sahiptir. Bu hem hane içinde, yoksulluğun toplumsal cinsiyete bağlı eşitsizlikleri nasıl derinleştirdiğini hem de kadınların hanenin yeniden üretim sürecinde kullandıkları emeklerini gizlemektedir.

Yoksulluğu gelir ve tüketime bağlı analiz eden yaklaşımlardan farklı olan toplumsal dışlanma kavramı da kadın ve yoksulluk arasındaki ilişkinin anlaşılmasında kavramsal olarak sınırlılıklara sahiptir. Yoksulluğu çok genel olarak ekonomik, toplumsal ve siyasal alanlardan dışlanma olarak ele alan bu yaklaşım, yoksulluğun azaltılmasını bu alanlara dahil olma çerçevesinde düşünmektedir. Kavramsal ikililiği dahil olanları güçlü dışarıda olanlar güçsüz kılan bir içeriğe sahiptir. Bu anlayış, kadınların ev içi emeklerini toplumsal dışlanma kavramıyla ihmal etmektedir. Kadınların yeniden üretim sürecinde karşılığı ödenmeyen emeği dikkate alınmamakta ve değersizleştirilmektedir. Ayrıca kadınlar üretim sürecine düşük ücret ve güvencesiz işlerde çalışarak dahil olmaktadır. Ücretli çalışma hayatına dahil olmakla kadınların refahı arasında olumlu bir ilişki yoktur. Kadınların gelir getiren işlerde çalışması evdeki güçsüz konumlarını ortadan kaldırmamaktadır.

İnsani kalkınma yaklaşımı içinde geliştirilen toplumsal cinsiyet ilişkili kalkınma endeksleri ve kadının güçlülüğünü ölçen analizler kadın yoksulluğunun anlaşılmasında yeterli çerçeveyi içermemektedir. Bu ölçümler kadınların toplum içindeki eşitsizliklerinin çok genel resmini vermektedir. Örneğin, eğitim göstergesi kadın ve erkek arasındaki eşitsizlikleri göstermesine rağmen, eğitimin niteliği ve eğitim sürecinde kadınların karşılaştıkları ayrımcılığı anlatmamaktadır. Aynı şekilde, kadınların politik kurumlara olan katılımlarının niceliksel oranları buralarda kadınların güçlendikleri anlamına gelmemektedir. Kadınların güçlenmesi liberalizmin bireysel hak ve özgürlükleri etrafında ele alınmaktadır. Oysa kadınların eşitsizlik ve yoksulluktan kurtuluş projesi bireysel güçlenmenin ötesinde kolektif güçlenmeyi hedeflemelidir.

Yoksulluğun tanımlarında olduğu gibi, yoksulluğun kaynaklarını açıklayan teoriler kadınların yoksulluk deneyimlerinin ayırıcı yönlerini açığa çıkarmada sınırlılıklara sahiptir. Yoksulluğun hem bireysel hem de yapısal açıklamaları teorik çerçeveleri içinde kadınların toplumsal konumları ile yoksulluk deneyimleri arasındaki ilişki ihmal edilmektedir. Yoksulluk açıklamaları içinde

yoksulluğun nedenleri ve sonuçları birbirine karıştırılmaktadır. İnsan sermayesi yaklaşımı, yoksulluğun azaltılmasında bireyin eğitimine önem vermektedir ancak yoksulluğun kendisinin eğitimsizliğe neden olduğu gözden kaçırılmaktadır. Yoksulluk insanların eğitim, bilgi ve beceri eksiklerine dayandırıldığı için sorumluluk bireylere yüklenmektedir. Cinsiyete dayalı işbölümü ve kadınların eviçi konumları onların rasyonel tercihleri olarak sunulmaktadır.

Çalışmanın teorik çerçevesinin ikinci kısmında, az gelişmiş ülkelerde kadın ve yoksulluk arasındaki ilişki literatüre dayanarak eleştirel bir şekilde değerlendirilmektedir. 1950 sonrası, kalkınmanın pasif alıcıları olarak değerlendirilen kadınların yeniden üretim sürecindeki konumları güçlendirilmiştir. Kadın emeğinin ekonomi açısından yarattığı değer fark edilmesi ile birlikte kadınların üretim sürecine eşit koşullarda katılmasına yönelik üretilen liberal feminist politikalar, kadınların yoksullaşmasını ve eşitsizliğini önleyememiştir. Bu yaklaşım, 1980 sonrası kalkınma söylemi içinde yoksullukla mücadele programları çerçevesinde yeniden üretilmektedir. Yeni liberal politikalar ya da yeniden yapılanma süreci az gelişmiş ülkelerde çalışma alanlarını daraltmış, işsizliğin artmasına, yaşam kalitesinin düşmesine ve yoksulluğun artmasına neden olmuştur. Yoksullaşma sürecinden en çok etkilenen ve bunun yükünü taşıyan toplumsal kesim özellikle kadınlar ve çocuklardır. Az gelişmiş ülkelerde kadın yoksulluğu kadınların hane ve işgücündeki konumları çerçevesinde ele alınmaktadır. Erkeğin işsiz kalması ve gelirin azalması kadınların ailenin geçimi için gelir getiren işlerde çalışması üzerinde baskı yaratmaktadır. Kadınlar genellikle düzensiz, düşük ücretli, güvencesiz işlerde çalışarak hanenin geçimi üzerinde önemli katkılar sağlamaktadır. Bunun yanı sıra kadınlar ev içi emekleriyle yoksulluk koşullarına karşı sürekli mücadele vermektedirler. Kadın yoksulluğu üzerine Türkiye’de yapılan çalışmalar az olmasına rağmen kadın ve yoksulluk arasındaki ilişki geçim stratejilerinde kadınların rolü etrafında ele alınmaktadır.

Feminist çalışmalar kadın yoksulluğunun görünür kılınmasına önemli bir katkı yapmasına rağmen, kadın ve yoksulluk arasındaki ilişkinin kurulması kuramsal düzeyde zayıf kalmıştır. Liberal feminist eğilim içinde, 'yoksulluğun kadınlaşması' ve 'yoksulluğun toplumsal cinsiyet' tartışmaları etrafında kadın yoksulluğunun ampirik yönü ön plana çıkmaktadır. Yoksulluğun kadınlaşması kavramı çocuklarıyla yalnız yaşayan kadınların yoksullukla ilişkilerini anlatırken, yoksulluğun toplumsal cinsiyet boyutu kadın ve erkeğin birlikte yaşadığı hanelerde kadınların yoksulluk deneyimi üzerine durmaktadır. Kadın yoksulluğu, evlilik dışı doğumlar, boşanma, hane yapısı, erkeğin ve kadının düşük ücreti, kadının erkeğe olan bağımlılığı gibi faktörler etrafında açıklanmaktadır. Radikal feminist yaklaşımdan kadın yoksulluğu ataerkillik kavramı tarafından kavramsallaştırılmaktadır. Kadınların yoksulluk nedenleri ataerkil sistem altında inşa edilen toplumsal cinsiyet ilişkileri etrafında açıklanmaktadır. Kadınlar bir sınıf olarak erkekler tarafından ezilmektedir. kadınları ayrı bir sınıf olarak bir araya getiren harcadıkları emekleridir. Bu, farklı sınıflarda yer alan kadınları bir araya getiren ortak bir özelliktir. Bir sınıf olarak kadınların yoksulluğu ataerkil sistemin kadın emeği üzerindeki egemenliği etrafında açıklanmaktadır. Marksist-feminist yaklaşımdan kadın yoksulluğunu sınıf kavramı tarafından açıklanmaktadır. 'Yoksulluk' ve 'yoksul' kavramları ideolojik kavramlardır. Toplumun ekonomik örgütlenmesinin yapısal köklerini ve süreçlerini gizleyen bir içeriğe sahiptir. Yoksulluk birincil olarak kadınları, yaşlıları ve etnik azınlıkları etkileyen toplumsal bir sorun olarak düşünülmektedir. 'Çalışan yoksullar' terminolojisi toplumsal sınıflar arasında görece güç farklılıklarını anlatmakta ve bu kesimlerin sınıfsal konumlarını dikkate almamaktadır. Oysa toplumsal sınıf kavramı dikkate alındığında, yoksulluğun işçi sınıfının bir kaderi olduğu açığa çıkacaktır. Yaş, eğitim, hane yapısı gibi yoksulluğu açıklayan faktörler yerine, sınıfsal konum dikkate alındığında yoksulluğun belirlenimlerinin sınıf yapısı olduğu görülecektir. Marksist-feminist yaklaşım içinde kadınların yoksullaşmasını belirleyen en son nokta olarak kadınların sınıfsal konumları ele alınmaktadır.

Marksist-feminist yaklaşım yoksulluğun kaynaklarını belirlemede önemli kavramsal araçlara sahiptir. Ancak bu kavramsal çerçeveye kadınların yoksullaşmasını üretim süreçlerinde bize anlatırken, yeniden üretim süreçlerinde kadınların yoksullaşmasını anlatmakta sınırlılıklara sahiptir. Bu çalışmada kadın yoksulluğu sosyalist-feminist bir perspektiften kadınların hem üretim hem de yeniden üretim süreçlerinde gerçekleştirdikleri emekleri çerçevesinde analiz edilmektedir. Kadın yoksulluğunun kavramsal çerçevesi için, toplumsal yeniden üretim süreçlerinde gerçekleştirilen kadın emeğinin maddi temelini bütünsel analizini gereklidir. Bütünsel analize ulaşmak için hem kapitalizm analizi hem de eviçi emek tartışmaları önemli bir başlangıç noktasıdır.

Bu çalışmada kadın yoksulluğu, hem üretim hem de yeniden üretim sürecinde kadın emeğinin çift yönlü değersizleşmesi olarak kavramsallaştırılmaktadır. Yoksullaşma kadın emeğinin metalaşması üzerinde baskı yaratmaktadır. Ancak, kapitalist üretim sürecinde kadının kazancı ailesinin ve kendisinin geçimi için gerekli geçimlik malların maliyetinin altında kalmaktadır. Ataerkil, kültürel ve ideolojik yapı ve ilişkiler kadının eviçi konumunu ve toplumsal cinsiyete dayalı işbölümünü güçlendirmektedir. Bu kadınların üretim sürecindeki konumunu güçlendirmektedir. Kadınları, düzensiz, güvencesiz, düşük ücretli ve ev eksenli işlerde çalışmaktadır. Kadınların kazancı ideolojik ve kültürel olarak ailenin yeniden üretimi için ek bir gelir olarak dikkate alınmaktadır. Kadın emeği sermaye açısından yedek-işgücü ordusunun bir unsuru olarak dikkate alınmaktadır. Kadınların üretim sürecine katılması ile ailenin yendiren üretimi gerekli geçim mallarının maliyetlerinin aşağıya çekilmesi ve hanenin görece refahının artması arasında önemli bir ilişki vardır. Kadınların üretim sürecine katılması, ev içindeki rollerini ve sorumluluklarını değiştirmemektedir. Kadın ve erkeğin kazancı geçimlik mal ve hizmetlerin karşılamaya yetmediği için kadınlar ihtiyaçların karşılanması için yaşam maliyetlerinin aşağıya çekilmesinde yoğun emek harcamaktadır. Ev dışında gelir getiren bir işte çalışmayan ev kadınları erkeğin ücretine bağlı olarak yaşarlar. Kadınların üretim süreci ve ev içinde kullandıkları emekleri ve bunları gerçekleştirme koşulları kadınların kendilerini

insan olarak geliştirme süreçlerinde mahrum bırakmaktadır. Sonuç olarak sermayenin yanı sıra, ataerkil yapı ve ilişkiler kadın emeği üzerinde yoğun bir baskı yaratmaktadır. Bütün bunlar kadınların yoksullaşmasının ve toplumsal olarak dışlanmalarının temel belirlenimleridir.

Bu kavramsal çerçeveye dayanarak, kadın yoksulluğu Eskişehir’de farklı emek kategorilerinde yer alan (düzenli ve düzensiz gelir kazanan, evkadınları, evli ve bekar anneler) 120 kadınla gerçekleştirilen alan araştırmasına bağlı olarak sorgulanmaktadır. Kadın yoksulluğunun sorgulandığı alan ve konular şunlardır: Farklı emek kategorilerinde yer alan hanelerin sosyo-ekonomik durumları. Kadınların üretim süreçlerindeki konumu. Kadınların yeniden üretim sürecinde emek kullanım biçimleri: yaşam maliyetlerinin aşağıya çekilmesi, borç, tasarruf, kadının ev içi sorumluluğu. Kadınları toplumsal yaşamla olan bağlantısı. Kadın ve güç ilişkileri: ev içindeki kara verme süreçlerindeki konumu, şiddet, sağlık. Kadınların yoksulluk ve kadın yoksulluğu hakkındaki düşünceleri.

Kadınların erkeklere göre eğitim düzeyleri daha düşüktür. Kadınların çoğu Eskişehir’in çevre il, ilçe ve köylerinden kentte göç etmişlerdir. Konut sahipliği oranı düşüktür ancak bir çok hane tanıdıklarının evinde kira vermeden oturmaktadır. Düzensiz gelir kazanan ve işsiz hanelerde kiracılık oranı yüksektir. Konutların fiziksel koşulları yetersiz olması kadın emeği üzerinde olumsuz bir baskı yaratmaktadır. Kırdan ve kentte mülkiyet taşınmaz gayrimenkul sahipliği oranı çok düşüktür. Hanenin yeniden üretimi için gerekli ev eşya sahipliği oranı (buzdolabı, çamaşır makinesi vb) bekar anne, düzensiz ve işsiz hanelerde düşük olduğu olması bu hanelerde kadınların daha çok emek harcamasına neden olmaktadır. Yaşam maliyetlerinin yükselmesi, erkeklerin düşük ücretleri ve işsiz kalmaları kadın emeğinin metalaşması üzerinde baskı yaratmaktadır. Kadınların çoğu geçim sıkıntısından dolayı ve evlendikten çok sonra çalışma yaşamına katılmıştır. Kadınların eğitim düzeyleri düşük olması onların geçici, düzensiz ve güvencesiz işlerde çalışmalarına neden olmaktadır. Düzensiz işlerde gelir kazanan kadınların çoğu temizlik işçisi ve tarlada mevsimlik işçilik yapmaktadır.

Ev kadınlarının çoğu gelir getiren bir işte çalışmak istemektedir. İş piyasalarının yapısal nedenlerinin yanı sıra, çocukların küçük olması ve erkeğin baskısı kadınların çalışmasının önünde hala önemli bir engeldir. Ev dışında çalışan kadınlar ev içinde de yoğun bir emek harcamaktadır. Bu anlamda kadınlar erkeklere göre zaman açısından önemli bir yoksulluk yaşamaktadır. Hanelerin çoğu ekonomik zorluk içinde yaşamakta ama çok azı yardıma ve borca dayalı destek sistemlerini kullanabilmektedir. Hanelerin çoğunun kırla olan bağlantıları zayıftır. Ekonomik zorluklar nedeniyle kadınların hemen hepsi temizlik malzemesi, giysi, elektrik, su, ulaşım, ısınma ve gıda gibi tüketim kaynaklarının maliyetlerini aşağıya çekmek için yoğun emek ve çaba harcamaktadır. Kadınlar ayrıca ev içi geçimlik ürünlerin üretimi için de emek kullanmaktadır. İşsiz, düzensiz ve bekar annelerin yer aldığı hanelerde bu ürünlerin üretimi düşüktür. Geçim sıkıntısından dolayı kadınların çoğu, kendi özel ihtiyaçlarını ertelemekte ve önceliği çocuklarına ve eşlerine vermektedir. Kadınların yaşam koşulları fiziksel ve ruhsal sağlıklarını olumsuz etkilemektedir. Bir çok kadın ekonomik nedenlerden dolayı sağlık sorunlarını ertelemektedir. Parasal sıkıntı akraba, komşu ve arkadaşlarla olan görüşmelerin azalmasına neden olmaktadır. Toplumsal ve kültürel faaliyetler kadınlar için lüks tüketim olarak görülmektedir. Kadınlar çocukların eğitimi üzerinde erkeğe göre görece daha fazla güce sahiptir. Çalışan kadınlar ev kadınlarına göre paranın kontrolünde görece daha güçlü konumdalar ancak kazandıkları para öncelikli olarak evin ihtiyaçlarına harcanmaktadır. Ekonomik nedenlerden dolayı kadınlar sözlü ve fiziksel şiddete maruz kalmaktadır. Bekar kadınlar ekonomik sıkıntı içinde olmalarına rağmen, erkeğin baskı ve şiddetinden kurtuldukları için kendilerini evli kadınlara göre daha güçlü hissetmektedir. Evli kadınlar, güç, özgürlük ve maddi açıdan kendilerini kocalarına göre daha kötü görmektedir. Bunun yanı sıra evli kadınlar bekar kadınlara göre kendi durumlarını daha iyi görmektedir. Ev kadınları, çalışan kadınları ekonomik özgürlükleri olduğu için daha iyi durumda görmektedir. Bekar kadınlar kendi yaşamlarını evli kadınlara daha iyi görmektedir. Bunun nedenini, erkeğin baskısından kurtulmuş olmaları olarak ifade etmektedirler. Kadınlar yoksulluğun en önemli nedeni işsizlik olarak

düşünülmektedir. Kadınlara göre, kadın yoksulluğunun en önemli nedeni erkeğin sorumsuz para harcamasıdır. Kadınlara göre, yoksulluktan kurtulmak için, ücretler seviyesinin artması, hanede birden fazla kişinin çalışması, erkeğin sorumluluk sahibi olması ve paranın idareli kullanılması, sürekli ve çok çalışmak, ev kadınlarında çalışması, devletin yeni iş alanları yaratması ve hayat pahalılığının azaltılması gerekmektedir.

Sonuç olarak, kadınların varolan eşitiz konumları yoksulluk koşulları altında daha da derinleşmektedir. Özellikle işsiz ve düzensiz gelir kazanan hanelerde yaşayan kadınların durumu görece olarak daha kötüdür. Bunun yanı sıra, kadınların çoğu ataerkil yapı ve ilişkilerin baskı ve sömürüsü açısından ortak bir deneyime sahiptir.

VITA

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Surname, Name: Güneş, Fatime
Nationality: Turkish (TC)
Date and Place of Birth: 12 September 1965, Bolu
Marital Status: Single
Phone: +90 222 226 86 13
email: fgunes@anadolu.edu.tr

EDUCATION

<u>Degree</u>	<u>Institution</u>	<u>Year of Graduation</u>
Ph.D	METU, Sociology	2006
MS	METU, Sociology	1997
BS	METU, Sociology	1990

WORK EXPERIENCE

<u>Year</u>	<u>Place</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>
Ongoing– 1995	Anatolian University, Sociology, Eskişehir	Full-Time Lecturer
1995-1992	Acikalin High School, Ankara	English Teacher

PUBLICATIONS/CONFERENCE PAPERS

- 2005 : "Poverty and Households which Receive Aid from Municipality: The Case of Eskişehir", *I. International Symposium on Eskişehir Throughout History: Political, Economical, Social and Cultural Aspects, 12-15 May 2004*, the Republic of Turkey, Anadolu University Publisher: Eskişehir.
- 2003 : "Women and Poverty." Poverty and Social Services Symposium, Hacettepe University, Social Services High School Publisher: Ankara.
- 2002 : "Poverty Phenomena and Women's Poverty Experience", ." *ALMANAK 2002, Sosyal Araştırmalar Vakfı (SAV, Social Research Foundation)*.

PRESENTATIONS

- 2005 : *Critical Evaluation on Women and Poverty Discourse in Advanced Capitalist and Under-Developed Countries*, Presentation at the Open Refereed Paper Feminism Session at the American Sociological Association Annual meeting in Philadelphia.

- 2005 : *Misinterpretation of Poverty by Poor Women in Turkey: Eskisehir Case*”, Presented at the Society for the Study of Social Problems meeting, Inequality, Globalization, and Empire session in Philadelphia.
- 2005 : *Poverty, Social Exclusion, and Women*, Presentation at Informal Discussion Roundtables: Race, Gender, Inequality, and Sexuality Session at the American Sociological Association annual meeting in Philadelphia.
- 2004 : with Konak, Nahide, *Ecologically Just Sustainable Politics and Policies: Possibilities and Obstacles in the Age of Economic Globalization*, Presented at the Society for the Study of Social Problems meeting in San Francisco.
- 2004 : *Poverty and Households Which Receive Aid from Municipality: The Case of Eskisehir*, Presentation at I. International Symposium on Eskisehir Throughout History: Political, Economical and Cultural Aspects, 12-15 May, Eskisehir, Turkey.
- 2003 : “*Women and Poverty*.” Presentation at Poverty and Social Service Symposium Meeting 2003, 9-11 October, in Antalya, Turkey.
- 2003 : “*Women in Poverty*.” Presentation at Informal Discussion Roundtables. Race, Gender, Inequality, Sexuality session at the American Sociological Association annual meeting in Atlanta.
- 2003 : with Konak, Nahide, “*Global Political Economy, Political Opportunities, Norms, and Social Movement Success: the Case of Bergama, Turkey*.” Presentation at the Open Refereed Paper session at the American Sociological Association annual meeting in Atlanta.

AWARDS AND FELLOWSHIPS

Lee Student Support Fund, SSSP (Society for the Study of Social Problems) meeting, 2005.
 Anatolian University Research Funds, 2003-2005

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS

Turkish Sociological Association
 American Sociological Association
 Society for the Study of Social Problems