Feminization of poverty: Does it really exist in Turkey?

Ummuhan Gökovalı
Aysun Danışman

Abstract

This paper discusses two issues, the first being whether "feminization of poverty" in Turkey exists at all, and the second the reasons behind the feminization of poverty. The Household Budget Survey (HBS) for the years 2004 and 2006 serves as data to investigate similarities and contrasts between men and women in terms of poverty and other socio-economic and demographic factors. Furthermore, econometric estimation techniques (logit and probit) have been employed to find out the determinants of poverty for men and women separately and together. Findings indicate that feminization of poverty does indeed exist in Turkey; however, a number of social, economic and demographic factors are universal determinants of poverty indifferent to sex.

Keywords: *Poverty, feminization of poverty, alleviation of poverty, Turkey, Household Budget Survey*

Introduction

Although rates of poverty around the globe have been declining over the last several decades (except for Sub-Saharan Africa), the share of people living on less than $1-a-day accounts for 21 percent of the world population—that is, approximately one billion people—and there are substantial "inequalities among and within countries and regions."[1] The

Ummuhan Gökovalı, Muğla University, Economics Department, Kötekli, Muğla, ummuhan@mu.edu.tr.
Aysun Danışman, Muğla University, Economics Department, Kötekli, Muğla, aysund@mu.edu.tr.

Authors' Note: We would like to thank the anonymous referee for valuable comments on a previous version of this paper.

1 Noeleen Heyzer, "Poverty and Women's Work in the Informal Economy," (United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM), 2006), 1.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0896634600005628 Published online by Cambridge University Press

poorest 20 percent, approximately equal to the population living on less than $1-a-day, receive 1.5 percent of world income, whereas the poorest 40 percent, approximately equal to those under the $2-a-day poverty threshold, receive 5 percent of the world income.[2]

In recent decades, women have been overrepresented among the world's poor, and the term "feminization of poverty," coined by Diana Pearce,[3] has been the major perspective through which to explain this phenomenon. "Feminization of poverty" emphasizes the fact that poverty has progressively turned into a women's problem in that an increasing share of women and their children are falling below the poverty line. Single motherhood and households headed by women seem to be explanatory factors as to why so many women live below the poverty line.

The feminization of poverty is a worldwide issue, although women in developing countries experience more severe conditions than their counterparts in developed countries. There are several indicators that can signal the feminization of poverty, such as gender differences in employment status, wage and education level. The rate of employment for women is less than that of men; one of the reasons behind this stems from the interaction between the sides of demand and supply. If and when women find jobs, it is more likely that they will be paid less. Heyzer has suggested that there exists a gender gap in earnings across almost all employment categories and that in developing countries women are employed in the informal sector more than in the formal sector.[4] Within the informal sector, women's working conditions are insecure, and they are poorly paid. Furthermore, around the globe women are less educated, and women account for about two-thirds of adult illiteracy.[5] The severity of the conditions for women further increases in developing countries that experience economic crises. Women are the most likely group to be made redundant during crises.

The literature concerning poverty in general and the feminization of poverty in particular begins to fill the gap in our understanding of the reasons behind poverty in Turkey; however, several important aspects of this understanding remain underdeveloped. In particular, most research within the area of female-headed families has focused on the sociological aspects of poverty.[6] As far as we know, there are no empirical stud-

2 UNDP, "Beyond Scarcity: Power, Poverty and the Global Water Crises," *Human Development Report* (New York, 2006), 269.

3 Diana Pearce, "The Feminization of Poverty: Women, Work and Welfare," *Urban and Social Change Review* 11, no. 1 (1978).

4 Heyzer, "Poverty and Women's Work in the Informal Economy."

5 UNDP, "Beyond Scarcity: Power, Poverty and the Global Water Crises."

6 For instance, see Bora Aksu, "Olmayanın Nesini İdare Edeceksin? Yoksulluk, Kadınlar ve Hane," in

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0896634600005628 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ies that investigate the determinants of poverty among female-headed households in Turkey.

This paper puts forth two important questions with respect to the feminization of poverty in the country: Does feminization of poverty exist in Turkey? The second question follows the first one: If this is indeed the case, what are the main factors behind this trend? For this purpose, we have used the Household Budget Survey (HBS) for the years 2004 and 2006. We have investigated determinants of the feminization of poverty by employing regression techniques. Specifically, logit and probit regression techniques have been utilized to measure the effects of socio-economic, employment and demographic characteristics of households on poverty rates of women. Separate and combined regressions for women and men have been estimated for Turkey by using the HBS. The second section of the article briefly reviews trends in poverty around the world and Turkey. The third section reports the empirical investigation and the results.

Trends in poverty

There are a number of controversies concerning the definition of poverty and its measurement. Absolute poverty (measured according to what households need in order to meet their basic food needs and/or non-food needs) and relative poverty (measured in relation to the overall distribution of income or consumption in a country) are two different measures in this regard. While measuring absolute poverty, the cost of minimum calorie intake requirement (food energy intake) or the basic requirements approach (food energy intake plus the costs of other necessities such as clothing, shelter, and the like) are calculated, whereas in measuring relative poverty, the mean income level is taken as a reference.

Measurement techniques based on economic criteria only have been criticized on the grounds that human needs are not limited to food, shelter and clothing, but that these include access to electricity, clean water, healthcare and education. Hence, it has been proposed that social, cultural and even political criteria should be included in poverty measurements. Table 1 reports the poverty head count ratio for all world regions. Figures indicate that almost all regions have been able to decrease their poverty rates over the years. However, poverty rates in Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia are so high that, as of 2005, over 70

Yoksulluk Halleri: Türkiye'de Kent Yoksulluğunun Toplumsal Görünümleri, ed. Necmi Erdoğan (İstanbul: de ki, 2002).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0896634600005628 Published online by Cambridge University Press

percent of people there live under the $2-a-day threshold. More than half of the population in sub-Saharan Africa and more than one-third of the population in South Asia live on $1.25-a-day. The most striking development has taken place in East Asia and the Pacific region. The poverty rate measured at $1.25-a-day dropped by almost 38 percentage points (from 54.7 to 16.8), whereas the poverty rate measure based on $2-a-day dropped by 41.2 percentage points.

Europe and Central Asia have the lowest poverty rates among all regions and over time. However, there are slight increases in poverty rates based on both measurements. The poverty rate based on $2-a-day increased from 7.1 percent to 9.2 percent in 2005 for the whole region.

Table 1: Poverty Headcount Ratio by Regions (PPP) (% of Population)

Countries	1990		2002		2005	
	$1.25–a-day(1)	$2–a-day(2)	$1.25–a-day	$2–a-day	$1.25–a-day	$2–a-day
East Asia and the Pacific	54.7	79.8	27.6	51.9	16.8	38.6
Europe And Central Asia	2.0	7.1	4.8	12.5	3.8	9.2
Latin America and the Caribbean	11.3	21.9	10.7	21.5	8.2	17.1
Middle East and North Africa	4.3	19.7	3.6	17.6	3.6	16.8
South Asia	51.7	82.6	43.8	77.0	40.3	73.9
Sub-Saharan Africa	57.6	76.0	55.0	75.6	50.9	72.8

Source: World Bank, http://ddp-ext.worldbank.org/ext/DDPQQ/showReport.do?method=showReport (24 September 2009).

(1) Population below $1.25-a-day is the percentage of the population living on less than $1.25-a-day at 2005 international prices.

(2) Population below $2-a-day is the percentage of the population living on less than $2-a-day at 2005 international prices.

There are very few studies on poverty in Turkey. These studies usually calculate poverty rates by using different measurements. The absolute poverty rate was estimated to be around 32 percent in 1973, 25 percent in 1978, and 30 percent in 1983.[7] The absolute poverty ratio, based on consumption expenditure at the household level in 1987, was around 25.54 percent.[8] Erdoğan has found that around 19.31 percent of households were poor according to this basic requirements cost approach by using the 1994 household income and consumption survey.[9] By using the same survey, the World Bank found that 2.4 percent of the popula-

7 Merih Celasun, "Income Distribution and Domestic Terms of Trade in Turkey, 1978-1983: Estimated Measures of Inequality and Poverty," *METU Development Studies* 13, no. 1-2 (1986).

8 Ercan Dansuk, "Türkiye'de Yoksulluğun Ölçülmesi ve Sosyo-Ekonomik Yapılarla İlişkisi" (Thesis for Planning Expertise, Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı, 1997).

9 Güzin Erdoğan, *Türkiye'de Yoksulluk: Boyutu ve Profili*, Araştırma Dizisi (Ankara: DİE, 1998).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0896634600005628 Published online by Cambridge University Press

tion is poor and living under the $1-a-day threshold, whereas 18 percent of the population is poor and living under $2-a-day.[10] All these figures indicate that, over the years, poverty rates in Turkey have been declining.

There are several studies that have specifically dealt with the differences of poverty rates across different regions in Turkey. The eastern and southeastern regions, followed by Central Anatolia, were found to be the poorest according to the poverty ratio based on consumption expenditure for 1987.[11] Similar findings were evident for 1994; East and Southeast Anatolia, followed by Central Anatolia, were the poorest regions according to absolute poverty ratios based on the minimum calorie intake requirements,[12] and the basic needs and food ratio approach.[13] The Aegean and Marmara Regions had the lowest poverty ratios among all regions for 1987,[14] and for 1994.[15]

Overall, empirical findings for Turkey suggest that poverty rates are higher in rural than in urban areas, for less educated people, for casual workers (or workers without social security) when compared to people with regular wages/salaries,[16] for unemployed people, for people who have serious illnesses, for elderly people,[17] and for those who work in the informal sector.[18]

Feminization of poverty

More recently, many scholars have investigated the feminization of poverty.[19] Moghadam (2005) has suggested that "women are severe victims

10 World Bank, *Turkey Economic Reforms, Living Standards and Social Welfare Study* (Report no. 20029-TU, 2000).

11 Dansuk, "Türkiye'de Yoksulluğun Ölçülmesi ve Sosyo-Ekonomik Yapılarla İlişkisi."

12 Recep Dumanlı, "Yoksulluk ve Türkiye'deki Boyutları" (Thesis for Planning Expertise, Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı, 1996); Güzin Erdoğan, "Türkiye'de Bölge Ayrımında Yoksulluk Sınırı Üzerine Bir Çalışma" (Expert Thesis, DİE, 1996).

13 Erdoğan, "Türkiye'de Bölge Ayrımında Yoksulluk Sınırı Üzerine Bir Çalışma."

14 *Dansuk, "Türkiye'de Yoksulluğun Ölçülmesi ve Sosyo-Ekonomik Yapılarla İlişkisi."*

15 Dumanlı, "Yoksulluk ve Türkiye'deki Boyutları"; Erdoğan, "Türkiye'de Bölge Ayrımında Yoksulluk Sınırı Üzerine Bir Çalışma."

16 Dansuk, "Türkiye'de Yoksulluğun Ölçülmesi ve Sosyo-Ekonomik Yapılarla İlişkisi"; Erdoğan, *Türkiye'de Yoksulluk: Boyutu ve Profili.*

17 Erdoğan, *Türkiye'de Yoksulluk: Boyutu ve Profili.*

18 Dansuk, "Türkiye'de Yoksulluğun Ölçülmesi ve Sosyo-Ekonomik Yapılarla İlişkisi."

19 There are some arguments about the definition of the feminization of poverty. For example, Sakiko Fukuda-Parr has argued that the "incidence of income poverty among female-headed households is an unsatisfactory measure of feminization of poverty." (Sakiko Fukuda-Parr, "What Does Feminization of Poverty Mean? It Isn't Just Lack of Income," *Feminist Economics* 5, no. 2 (1999): 102.) Rather, Fukuda-Parr has suggested using standardized indicators of human poverty, which show gender disparities in deprivation. Sylvia Chant has also suggested that there are deficiencies in the definition of the feminization of poverty based on income measure: Sylvia Chant, "New Contributions to the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0896634600005628 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of poverty in at least three ways."[20] First, women's entitlements and capabilities in many countries are low compared to that of men. Second, although women work longer, they still earn less than men. Third, women's capacity to escape poverty is further constrained by cultural, legal and labor market conditions.

Most of the findings indicate that there is a gender gap between men and women, which is more pronounced across ethnic groups in some countries.[21] Mobility out of poverty over time has declined for female-headed households; this is more pronounced for black females in the US.[22] Also, an intergenerational inheritance of poverty exists.[23] Several factors cause the feminization of poverty, such as changes in family structure and household composition (marital disruption and single parenthood), and an increase in the propensity to establish independent households.[24] Empirical findings suggest that inequalities in wage rates,[25] female employment in low wage occupations,[26] as well as lower wage rates in female occupations,[27] are the main determinant factors of the feminization of poverty.

Analysis of Poverty: Methodological and Conceptual Challenges to Understanding Poverty from a Gender Perspective," (Santiago de Chile: Unidad Mujer y Desarrollo, 2003). In another study, Chant has suggested to use the term "feminization of responsibility and obligation," instead of feminization of poverty: "Re-Thinking the "Feminization of Poverty" in Relation to Aggregate Gender Indices," *Journal of Human Development* 7, no. 2 (2006).

20 Valentine M. Moghadam, "The Feminization of Poverty and Women's Human Rights," *Papers in Women's Studies/Gender Research* (UNESCO, Social and Human Sciences Sector (SHS), 2005), 31.

21 Elizabeth M. Almquist, "Labor Market Gender Inequality in Minority Groups," *Gender and Society* 1, no. 4 (1987); Yuval Elmelech and Hsien-Hen Lu, "Race Ethnicity, and the Gender-Poverty Gap," (The Levy Economics Institute of Bard College, 2002); Sara S. McLanahan and Erin L. Kelly, "The Feminization of Poverty: Past and Future," in *Handbook of Gender Sociology*, ed. J. Chafetz (New York: Plenum, 1999).

22 Ann Huff Stevens, "The Dynamics of Poverty Spells: Updating Bane and Ellwood," *The American Economic Review* 84, no. 2 (1994).

23 Sara S. McLanahan, "Family Structure and Dependency: Early Transitions to Female Household," *Demography* 25, no. 1 (1988); Kelly Musick and Robert. D. Mare., "Family Structure, Intergenerational Mobility, and the Reproduction of Poverty: Evidence for Increasing Polarization?," *Demography* 41, no. 4 (2004).

24 Lynne M. Casper et al., "The Gender-Poverty Gap: What We Can Learn from Other Countries," *American Sociological Review* 59, no. 4 (1994); Mary Daly, "Europe's Poor Women? Gender in Research on Poverty," *European Sociological Review* 8, no. 1 (1992); Sara S. McLanahan et al., "Sex Differences in Poverty, 1950-1980," *Signs* 15, no. 1 (1989); Musick and Mare, "Family Structure, Intergenerational Mobility, and the Reproduction of Poverty: Evidence for Increasing Polarization?"

25 Casper et al., "The Gender-Poverty Gap."; Daly, "Europe's Poor Women?."; Leslie McCall, "Spatial Routes to Gender Wage (in)Equality: Regional Restructuring and Wage Differentials by Gender and Education," *Economic Geography* 74, no. 4 (1998).

26 Casper et al., "The Gender-Poverty Gap."; Daly, "Europe's Poor Women?."; Sara Lichtenwalter, "Gender Poverty Disparity in Us Cities: Evidence Exonerating Female-Headed Families," *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare* 32, no. 2 (2005).

27 Casper et al., "The Gender-Poverty Gap."; Daly, "Europe's Poor Women?."; David A. Macpherson and Barry T. Hirsch, "Wages and Gender Composition: Why Do Women's Jobs Pay Less?," *Journal of Labor Economics* 13, no. 3 (1995).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0896634600005628 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In order to measure the extent of these gender disparities exist, several indexes have been calculated. Two of the most widely used indexes are the Gender-Related Development Index (GDI) and the Gender Empowerment Measurement Index (GEM). These two measures were introduced in the 1995 Human Development Report. The GDI is based on the Human Development Index (HDI) and adjusted for gender inequality, whereas the GEM is based on women's participation in economic, political and professional life compared to the same participation of men. Other widely used indexes are the Human Poverty Index (HPI) and the Gender Parity Index (GPI). The HPI was introduced in the 1997 Human Development Report in order to build a composite index by using three basic elements of human life: survival, knowledge, and decent standard of living. This index is calculated separately along the division between developing countries (HPI-1) and a group of select high-income OECD countries (HPI-2).[28] The GPI, on the other hand, tries to measure "progress towards gender parity in education participation and/or learning opportunities available for women in relation to those available to men";[29] however, this index can be calculated for any other indicators.

GDI values across countries for the year 1992 reveal several emerging facts. First, "no society treats its women as well as its men."[30] Second, there is no strong relationship between gender equality and the income level of a country. Third, although there has been significant progress from 1970 to 1992, there still exists gender inequality across countries.[31] The HDR (1995) estimates values for GEM as well. Index values for the GEM are very low in most countries, whether they are industrial or developing. The HDR reports that "women are not yet allowed into the corridors of economic and political power."[32]

Table 2 presents HDI, GDI and GEM values for the year 2005. The HDI and GDI are highest for Iceland, Norway, Australia, and Canada.[33] Turkey is ranked 84th among 177 countries in the HDI and 79th among 157 in the GDI.[34] There is a somewhat different trend in terms

28 UNDP, (2009), http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/indices/hpi/.

29 UNESCO, (2009), http://www.uis.unesco.org/glossary/Term.aspx?name=GENDER%20PARITY%20INDEX%20%28GPI%29&lang=en.

30 UNDP, *Gender and Human Development*, Human Development Report (New York: 1995).

31 Ibid.

32 Ibid., 86.

33 The HDI is the lowest for Mali, Niger, Guinea-Bissau, Burkina Faso, and Sierra Leone, whereas the GDI is the lowest for Burkina Faso, Niger, Guinea-Bissau, and Sierra Leone.

34 UNDP, "Fighting Climate Change: Human Solidarity in a Divided World," (Human Development Report, 2007/2008).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0896634600005628 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 2: Development Indices for the Year 2005

	Human Development Index		Gender-Related Development Index		Gender Empowerment Measure		Human Poverty Index (HPI-1)		Human Poverty Index (HPI-2)	
Countries	Rank	Value	Rank	Value	Rank	Value	Rank	Value (%)	Rank	Value (%)
High Human Development										
Iceland	1	0.968	1	0.962	5	0.862	...	...	...	...
Norway	2	0.968	3	0.957	1	0.910	...	...	2	6.8
Australia	3	0.962	2	0.960	8	0.847	...	...	13	12.1
Canada	4	0.961	4	0.956	10	0.820	...	...	8	10.9
Ireland	5	0.959	15	0.940	19	0.699	...	...	18	16
Medium Human Development										
Dominica	71	0.798	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Saint Lucia	72	0.795	...	...	66	0.502	8	6.5	...	...
Kazakhstan	73	0.794	65	0.792	74	0.469	...	...	...	...
Venezuela	74	0.792	68	0.787	56	0.542	21	8.8	...	...
Colombia	75	0.791	66	0.789	69	0.496	14	7.9	...	...
Turkey	84	0.775	79	0.763	90	0.298	22	9.2	...	...
Lowest Human Development										
Mali	173	0.380	151	0.371	...	...	107	56.4	...	...
Niger	174	0.374	155	0.355	...	...	104	54.7	...	...
Guinea-Bissau	175	0.374	156	0.355	...	...	99	44.8	...	...
Burkina Faso	176	0.370	154	0.364	...	...	106	55.8	...	...
Sierra Leone	177	0.336	157	0.320	...	...	102	51.7	...	...

Source: UNDP, *Fighting Climate Change: Human Solidarity in a Divided World*, Human Development Report 2007/2008, pp. 229-333.

of the GEM, which is highest for Norway, Sweden, Finland, Denmark, and Iceland, and lowest for Yemen, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Turkey.[35] Turkey is classified within medium human development groups; however, in terms of the GEM Turkey did worse than in the HDI.[36] Indeed, among 93 countries, in terms of the GEM, Turkey is ranked 90th.

The Human Poverty Index (HPI-1) for developing countries indicates that Turkey is ranked 22nd among 108 countries. The HPI for

35 Ibid.

36 As of 2007, in terms of economic participation rate, the rank of Turkey is 183 among 189 countries, whereas these figures are 181 for women and 132 for men (UN, (2009), http://unstats.un.org/unsd/Demographic/products/socind/inc-eco.htm.).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0896634600005628 Published online by Cambridge University Press

developed countries (HPI-2) ranks Sweden, Norway, the Netherlands, Finland, and Denmark as the highest among 19 countries.

There are several studies on the feminization of poverty in Turkey. One of the findings posits that there exists a gender difference in favor of men in terms of educational attainment, employment status and type of work,[37] and wage earnings in the manufacturing sector.[38] Furthermore, there is an indication that gender discrimination occurs between men and women in hiring.[39] Poverty as calculated for basic needs expenditure was higher for women than for men,[40] and most of those who receive poverty alleviation aid were women who live in absolute poverty.[41]

Table 3 presents individual poverty rates for all of Turkey, including urban and rural areas for the latest years, where data was available. Compared to 2002, poverty rates declined in 2007. This decline is most pronounced for the urban areas in comparison to rural areas. One explanation for the reason of decline in complete poverty rates may be the pronounced increase in economic growth in these years. The 2002 rates must be considered in the light of the 2001 financial crisis in Turkey. Hence, figures pertaining to 2002 may partly represent the effects of the crisis. The rate of economic growth was -9.5 percent in 2001. From 2002 to 2008, Turkey experienced a boom cycle in its economy. Indeed, economic growth averaged about 7 percent for the years between 2003 and 2007; this was the most probable reason for the decrease in poverty rates, especially in urban areas.

37 Fikret Adaman and Çağlar Keyder, "Türkiye'nin Büyük Kentlerinin Gecekondu ve Çöküntü Mahallelerinde Yaşanan Yoksulluk ve Sosyal Dışlanma," *Tes-İş Dergisi* (2007); Ayşe Buğra Kavala and Çağlar Keyder, "Kent Nüfusunun En Yoksul Kesiminin İstihdam Yapısı ve Geçinme Yöntemleri," (TÜBİTAK Projesi, 2008); Gülfer Dikbayır, "Gender and Poverty: Further Data Requirement to Measure the Gender Dimension of Extent and Incidence of Poverty,"(2000), http://www.portal-stat.admin.ch/iaos2000/dikbayir_final_paper.doc; İpek İlkkaracan and Raziye Selim, "The Gender Wage Gap in the Turkish Labor Market," *Labour* 21, no. 3 (2007); Serap Palaz, "Discrimination against Women in Turkey: A Review of the Theoretical and Empirical Literature," *Ege Akademik Bakış* 2, no. 1 (2002); Raziye Selim and İpek İlkkaracan, "Gender Inequalities in the Labor Market in Turkey: Differentials in Wages, Industrial and Occupational Distribution of Men and Women," (2002), http://www.econ.utah.edu/~ehrbar/erc2002/pdf/P405.pdf..

38 İlkkaracan and Selim, "The Gender Wage Gap in the Turkish Labor Market."; Palaz, "Discrimination against Women in Turkey: A Review of the Theoretical and Empirical Literature."; Selim and İlkkaracan, "Gender Inequalities in the Labor Market in Turkey: Differentials in Wages, Industrial and Occupational Distribution of Men and Women."

39 İlkkaracan and Selim, "The Gender Wage Gap in the Turkish Labor Market."; Selim and İlkkaracan, "Gender Inequalities in the Labor Market in Turkey: Differentials in Wages, Industrial and Occupational Distribution of Men and Women."

40 Dikbayır, "Gender and Poverty: Further Data Requirement to Measure the Gender Dimension of Extent and Incidence of Poverty."

41 Songül Sallan Gül, "Eşitsizlik, Yoksulluk ve Yoksulluğun Kadınsılaşması: Ankaralı Yoksul Kadınlar" (paper presented at the Değişen Dünya ve Türkiye'de Eşitsizlikler: IV. Ulusal Sosyoloji Kongresi, Sivas, 16-18 October 2003).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0896634600005628 Published online by Cambridge University Press

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0896634600005628 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 3: Individual Poverty Rates According to Different Poverty Lines

Methods	Individual Poverty Rates (%)																	
	Turkey						Urban						Rural					
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Complete Poverty (Food+non-food)[1]	26.96	28.12	25.60	20.50	17.81	18.56	21.95	22.30	16.57	12.83	9.31	10.61	34.48	37.13	39.97	32.95	31.98	32.18
Relative poverty based on expenditure[2]	14.74	15.51	14.18	16.16	14.50	14.43	11.33	11.26	8.34	9.89	6.97	8.20	19.86	22.08	23.48	26.35	27.06	25.89
Poverty rates for males[1]	26.72	27.92	25.20	19.97	17.32	18.27	21.88	22.32	16.24	12.77	8.84	10.78	34.02	36.59	39.11	31.79	31.61	31.30
Poverty rates for females[1]	27.19	28.31	25.98	21.01	18.27	18.83	22.03	22.29	16.87	12.89	9.76	10.44	34.92	37.65	40.79	34.03	32.32	32.97
Employed individuals at ages 15 and over																		
Agriculture	36.42	39.89	40.88	37.24	33.86	30.22	33.74	26.42	19.59	15.43	24.56	14.78	36.77	40.91	42.32	38.80	34.89	31.42
Industry	20.99	21.34	15.64	9.85	10.12	10.13	18.75	19.31	11.86	8.47	6.04	6.49	25.87	28.02	27.69	14.44	21.71	20.24
Service	25.82	16.76	12.36	8.68	7.23	7.83	21.90	16.03	10.62	7.07	4.99	5.31	34.16	18.95	18.01	13.76	13.54	16.53

Source: TURKSTAT, www.tuik.gov.tr/VeriBilgi.do?tb_id=23&ust_id=7.

(1) Poverty rates are calculated based on food (80 different items in the food basket) and non-food expenditure.

(2) This is based on 50 percent of the equivalenced median consumption expenditure.

On the other hand, relative poverty based on expenditure has remained almost the same. However, this trend is different between urban and rural areas. An increase in relative poverty based on expenditure in rural areas has been outweighed by a large decrease in this ratio for urban areas. Poverty rates for females are slightly higher than that of males for the years considered. Poverty rates for both genders are almost equal in urban areas, whereas they are slightly higher for females in rural areas for the same period. Those employed in the agriculture sector experience higher poverty rates compared to those employed in either the manufacturing or services sectors.

Empirical investigation for Turkey

We have used the Household Budget Survey of the years 2004 and 2006 for our empirical investigation.[42] People are considered poor if their household's disposable income is less than 50 percent of the mean of the disposable income for all households.[43] Differences in family size are adjusted by using an equivalence scale developed by the OECD.[44] Table 4 presents several summary statistics for 2004 and 2006. There were 8,544 households surveyed in 2004, of which 10.55 percent were female-headed households. Overall, the poverty ratio was calculated as 27.6 percent; this ratio breaks down to 27.4 percent and 27.6 percent for women and men, respectively, for the year 2004. The gender-poverty ratio is 0.99. In 2006, there were 8,558 households surveyed, of which 10.14 percent were female-headed households. Overall the poverty ratio declined in 2006 to 24.6 percent; however, this ratio increased to 28.6 percent for women and decreased to 24.2 percent for men, as observed for the year 2006. Therefore, the gender-poverty ratio increased to 1.18. Although the total poverty rate dropped by 3 percentage points, this ratio increased for women while it decreased for men in 2006 compared to 2004.

Although the poverty rate declined in 2006 compared to 2004, some universal facts remained the same.[45] The poverty rate is lower for those

42 The Household Budget Survey has been conducted regularly since 2002 in order to obtain not only information about consumption expenditure, but also about income distribution. The sample size of the Household Budget Survey varied in 2002 and 2003. Since in 2004 the sample size of the survey was 8,640. The Household Budget Survey is representative of all of Turkey.

43 We employed the relative poverty measure for the head of households.

44 Equivalence scale assigns to each household type in the population a value in proportion to its needs, by taking into account the size of the household and the age of its members. For more information see OECD, "What Are Equivalence Scales?," (2009), http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/61/52/35411111.pdf.

45 There are differences among poverty rates reported by TURKSTAT in Table 3 and ours reported in Table 4. The reason is the fact that TURKSTAT calculated poverty rates based on consumption expenditure, while our poverty measure is based on net disposable income.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0896634600005628 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 4: Summary of Statistics of the Data (2004–2006)

	Above the Poverty Line			Below the Poverty Line			Grand Total	Poverty Ratio (%)		
	Women	Men	Total	Women	Men	Total		Women	Men	Total
Number of households headed by	655 (620)	5533 (5833)	6188 (6453)	247 (248)	2109 (1857)	2356 (2105)	8544 (8558)	27.4 (28.6)	27.6 (24.2)	27.6 (24.6)
Number of persons with social security coverage	582 (537)	4774 (5137)	5356 (5674)	104 (93)	766 (697)	870 (790)	6226 (6464)	15.2 (14.8)	13.8 (11.9)	14 (12.2)
Number of green card holders	4 (24)	59 (152)	63 (176)	41 (82)	342 (644)	383 (726)	446 (902)	91.1 (77.4)	85.3 (80.9)	85.9 (80.5)
Number of persons without social security	69 (59)	700 (544)	769 (603)	102 (73)	1001 (516)	1103 (589)	1872 (1192)	59.6 (55.3)	58.9 (48.7)	58.9 (49.4)
Number of illiterate persons	158 (133)	99 (123)	257 (256)	133 (128)	268 (214)	401 (342)	658 (598)	45.7 (49.04)	73.02 (63.5)	60.9 (57.2)
Number of persons with less than high school education	368 (389)	3407 (3728)	3775 (4117)	105 (113)	1680 (1494)	1785 (1607)	5560 (5724)	22.2 (22.5)	33.02 (28.6)	32.1 (28.1)
Number of persons with high school and/ or university degree	129 (98)	2027 (1982)	2156 (2080)	9 (7)	161 (149)	170 (156)	2326 (2236)	6.5 (6.7)	7.4 (6.9)	7.3 (7)
Number of persons who never married	51 (30)	55 (61)	106 (91)	5 (5)	18 (12)	23 (17)	129 (108)	8.9 (14.3)	24.7 (16.4)	17.8 (15.7)
Number of persons married or in domestic partnerships	102 (115)	5366 (5680)	5468 (5795)	67 (85)	2042 (1807)	2109 (1892)	7577 (7687)	39.6 (42.5)	27.6 (24.1)	27.8 (24.6)
Number of widowed persons	434 (392)	82 (68)	516 (460)	145 (130)	43 (35)	188 (165)	704 (625)	25.04 (24.9)	34.4 (33.9)	26.7 (26.4)
Number of divorced persons	53 (61)	27 (19)	80 (80)	15 (17)	5 (1)	20 (18)	100 (98)	22.1 (21.8)	15.6 (5)	20 (18.4)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0896634600005628 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Number of persons separated from their spouses	15 (22)	3 (5)	18 (27)	15 (11)	1 (2)	16 (13)	34 (40)	50 (33.3)	25 (28.6)	47.1 (32.5)
Number of persons working in agriculture or mining	17 (29)	620 (641)	637 (670)	29 (57)	642 (542)	671 (599)	1308 (1269)	58.7 (66.3)	50.9 (45.8)	51.3 (47.2)
Number of persons working in the manufacturing sector	19 (20)	801 (902)	820 (922)	7 (7)	200 (172)	207 (179)	1027 (1101)	26.9 (25.9)	19.9 (16.01)	20.2 (16.3)
Number of persons working in the service sector	71 (52)	1600 (1726)	1671 (1778)	10 (18)	370 (348)	380 (366)	2051 (2144)	12.3 (25.7)	18.8 (16.8)	18.5 (17.1)
Number of persons working in other sectors	10 (15)	1090 (1177)	1100 (1192)	4 (2)	439 (413)	443 (415)	1543 (1607)	28.6 (11.8)	28.7 (25.9)	28.7 (25.8)
Number of persons with skilled labor	95 (99)	3766 (4077)	3861 (4176)	37 (65)	1275 (1157)	1312 (1222)	5173 (5398)	28.03 (39.6)	25.3 (22.1)	25.4 (22.6)
Number of persons with unskilled labor	22 (17)	345 (369)	367 (386)	13 (19)	376 (317)	389 (336)	756 (722)	37.1 (52.8)	52.2 (46.2)	51.5 (46.5)
Number of persons who live in urban areas	561 (504)	4190 (4396)	4751 (4900)	154 (118)	1080 (912)	1234 (1030)	5985 (5930)	21.5 (18.9)	20.5 (17.2)	20.6 (17.4)
Number of persons who live in rural areas	94 (116)	1343 (1437)	1437 (1553)	93 (130)	1029 (945)	1122 (1075)	2559 (2628)	49.7 (52.8)	43.4 (39.7)	43.9 (40.9)

Source: Authors' own calculations from HBS, 2004-2006.
* The first figures in the cells belong to HBS 2004, and the figures in the parentheses belong to HBS 2006.

who have social security coverage, which includes healthcare benefits, when compared to green card holders (free healthcare for the poorest segments of the population) or to those who do not have any social security at all. The educated, the skilled, and urban dwellers experience lower poverty rates when compared to the uneducated, the unskilled, and rural dwellers. Unmarried persons experience lower poverty rates,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0896634600005628 Published online by Cambridge University Press

whereas persons living alone have higher poverty rates. However, these figures differ between men and women. Women living apart (separated but not divorced) from their husbands have much higher poverty rates when compared to men. Divorced women and women who are married or live with a partner also have higher poverty ratios compared to men, as can be seen from Table 4. Furthermore, people who work in the agriculture or mining sectors have a higher poverty ratio compared to people who work in any other sector.

Determinants of poverty in Turkey

The reasons for poverty can be grouped into two categories.[46] The first is related to household (HH) and an individual's private characteristics (such as income, education, and age), where an individual's circumstances both victimize the person as well as perpetuate poverty. The second category is related to the economic, political, and social characteristics of the country. These can include inefficient employment opportunities, low wage rates, insufficient resources for and opportunities to access to education and health facilities,[47] and inequalities in income distribution.[48] The types of available jobs and methods of employment in the informal sector are the other reasons for poverty.[49]

Considering the scholarly literature on the subject, other empirical studies, and the availability of the data, three sets of independent variables are of special interest here. These are: family structure, human capital, and labor market characteristics. Family structure includes variables such as age of the head of household, marital status, and the number of persons in the household. Human capital characteristics include the level of education attained (illiterate, less than high school, high school, and more than high school), whereas job characteristics include the sector of employment (agriculture, manufacture, service, and other sectors) and social security coverage (with social security coverage, green card holders, and without social security). Other employment characteristics include the type of skills needed to do a job. Hence, jobs are grouped as skilled and unskilled ones and include regressors. Further, to control the effects of urban and rural areas, a dummy variable has been used. The model has been estimated for women and men separately, as well as

46 Fikret Şenses, *Küreselleşmenin Öteki Yüzü Yoksulluk* (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002).

47 Adaman and Keyder, "Türkiye'nin Büyük Kentlerinin Gecekondu ve Çöküntü Mahallelerinde Yaşanan Yoksulluk ve Sosyal Dışlanma"; Şenses, *Küreselleşmenin Öteki Yüzü Yoksulluk*.

48 Raziye Selim, "Türkiye'de Bir Gelir Dağılımı Eşitsizliği Olgusu Olarak Yoksulluk," *İktisat Dergisi*, no. 418-419 (2001).

49 Buğra Kavala and Keyder, "Kent Nüfusunun En Yoksul Kesiminin İstihdam Yapısı ve Geçinme Yöntemleri."

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0896634600005628 Published online by Cambridge University Press

pooling them together, by employing both logit and probit models for the years 2004 and 2006.[50] Tables 5 and 6 present the estimated results. According to estimation results for 2004 and 2006, it can be stated that the sign and significance level of the coefficients are almost similar.

Combined estimation results indicate that age has negative and significant coefficients in all models for both years. This indicates that, as the age of the household head increases, the probability of becoming poor decreases. This must be so because, as age increases, employment opportunities as well as experience increase so that becoming poor will be less likely. On the other hand, as the size of household increases, the probability of becoming poor increases as well. Obviously, more people in the household means that more income is needed for food, shelter and clothing; therefore, it increases the probability of becoming poor.

Education attainment has negative and significant coefficients, as expected for all models for both years for pooled regressions. Illiterate persons are taken as the reference group. Persons with less than high school education and persons with high school diplomas or higher education degrees have less of a probability of being poor when compared to the illiterate. Furthermore, people who work in the manufacturing, service and other sectors are less likely to be poor when compared to people who work in the agriculture and mining sectors, which were also used as the base dummy variable. Coefficients on skilled labor are all negative and significant, indicating that people who hold skilled jobs have less of a probability of becoming poor when compared to those who hold unskilled jobs. Unskilled jobs were used as the base dummy variable.

People with social security coverage have less of a probability of being poor when compared to people without coverage. Yet, green card holders have a higher probability of being poor when compared to people without social security. Lack of social security has been used as the base dummy variable. This is not a controversial result, because the green card scheme is designed for those who live in significant poverty. In all models, people who live in urban areas are less likely to be poor when

50 Due to the characteristics of our data, a standard estimation technique of linear regression is not appropriate. Our dependent variable takes the value of 1 if the household is below the poverty line and 0 otherwise. When the dependent variable takes the value of either 0 or 1, the linear regression model is not appropriate, since OLS creates the following problems: (i) it may give non-normal error terms, (ii) it may yield unbounded predictions, (iii) even the predictions can be constrained within the prediction range (0 or 1), and the error term will be heteroscedastic, and (iv) functional form is not appropriate. Rather, maximum likelihood estimation is used. If the distributions of errors are assumed to be normal, then the probit model is used; on the other hand, if the distributions of errors are assumed to be logistic, then the logit model is used J. Scott Long, *Regression Models for Categorical and Limited Dependent Variables* (Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 1997).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0896634600005628 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 5: Estimation Results for the Year 2004

Variable	Logit Coefficients			Probit Coefficients		
	Women	Men	Combined	Women	Men	Combined
Age	-0.15*** (0.05)	-0.09*** (0.02)	-0.09*** (0.02)	-0.09*** (0.03)	-0.05*** (0.01)	-0.06*** (0.01)
Household size	0.26*** (0.06)	0.39*** (0.02)	0.38*** (0.02)	0.15*** (0.03)	0.22*** (0.01)	0.21*** (0.01)
Less than high school	-1.04*** (0.23)	-1.23*** (0.16)	-1.16*** (0.13)	-0.60*** (0.13)	-0.71*** (0.09)	-0.67*** (0.07)
High school and above	-2.09*** (0.52)	-2.29*** (0.19)	-2.22*** (0.16)	-1.09*** (0.26)	-1.29*** (0.11)	-1.25*** (0.09)
Unmarried	0.65 (0.70)	-0.17 (0.33)	0.01 (0.30)	0.32 (0.36)	-0.12 (0.19)	0.02 (0.17)
Widowed	0.57* (0.33)	0.08 (0.25)	0.17 (0.13)	0.28 (0.18)	0.04 (0.14)	0.09 (0.07)
Divorced	0.49 (0.53)	-0.62 (0.56)	-0.05 (0.34)	0.24 (0.27)	-0.36 (0.31)	-0.002 (0.19)
Living alone	1.22** (0.57)	0.63 (0.74)	0.88** (0.45)	0.64** (0.32)	0.33 (0.47)	0.48* (0.25)
Manufacturing	-0.20 (0.58)	-0.37*** (0.12)	-0.36*** (0.12)	-0.16 (0.32)	-0.22*** (0.07)	-0.22*** (0.06)
Service	-1.04** (0.52)	-0.58*** (0.09)	-0.59*** (0.09)	-0.62** (0.27)	-0.34*** (0.06)	-0.35*** (0.05)
Other sectors	0.20 (0.85)	-0.49*** (0.09)	-0.49*** (0.09)	0.14 (0.46)	-0.29 (0.06)	-0.28*** (0.05)
Skilled labor	-0.43 (0.58)	-0.91*** (0.10)	-0.87*** (0.10)	-0.34 (0.32)	-0.53*** (0.06)	-0.51*** (0.06)
Social security coverage	-1.73*** (0.24)	-1.56*** (0.08)	-1.55*** (0.07)	-1.00*** (0.14)	-0.92*** (0.04)	-0.92*** (0.04)
Green card holders	1.99*** (0.56)	1.29*** (0.17)	1.36*** (0.16)	1.16*** (0.31)	0.75*** (0.09)	0.79*** (0.09)
Urban	-0.97*** (0.22)	-0.43*** (0.07)	-0.48*** (0.07)	-0.57*** (0.12)	-0.25*** (0.04)	-0.27*** (0.04)
Constant	2.34 (0.88)	1.76 (0.28)	1.75 (0.25)	1.46 (0.49)	1.04 (0.16)	1.04 (0.14)
N	902	7642	8544	902	7642	8544
Wald chi2(15)	209.25***	1766.53***	1969.39***	255.68***	1972.51***	2220.53***
Pseudo R2	0.3244	0.3373	0.3337	0.3257	0.3385	0.3348
AIC	747.4761	5998.647	6737.39	746.1079	5988.4	6725.579

Note: Numbers in parenthesis are robust standard errors. The signs ***, ** and * indicate significant at 1 percent, 5 percent and 10 percent, respectively.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0896634600005628 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 6: Estimation Results for the Year 2006

Variable	Logit Coefficients			Probit Coefficients		
	Women	Men	Combined	Women	Men	Combined
Age	-0.07 (0.06)	-0.18*** (0.02)	-0.16*** (0.02)	-0.05 (0.03)	-0.10*** (0.01)	-0.09*** (0.01)
Household size	0.32*** (0.06)	0.31*** (0.02)	0.31*** (0.02)	0.19*** (0.03)	0.18*** (0.01)	0.18*** (0.01)
Less than high school	-1.19*** (0.24)	-1.03*** (0.17)	-1.06*** (0.13)	-0.69*** (0.13)	-0.59*** (0.09)	-0.61*** (0.07)
High school and above	-2.29*** (0.59)	-2.01*** (0.19)	-2.02*** (0.16)	-1.29*** (0.29)	-1.13*** (0.11)	-1.14*** (0.09)
Unmarried	0.01 (0.64)	-0.66* (0.38)	-0.45 (0.32)	0.02 (0.35)	-0.39* (0.21)	-0.26 (0.18)
Widowed	-0.22 (0.32)	0.51** (0.25)	0.01 (0.13)	-0.11 (0.17)	0.29** (0.14)	0.01 (0.07)
Divorced	0.08 (0.44)	-2.00 (1.41)	-0.16 (0.36)	0.09 (0.23)	-0.89 (0.67)	-0.08 (0.19)
Living alone	-0.83 (0.59)	1.02 (0.79)	-0.49 (0.57)	-0.44 (0.32)	0.55 (0.47)	-0.26 (0.29)
Manufacturing	0.42 (0.61)	-0.36*** (0.13)	-0.24* (0.13)	0.24 (0.33)	-0.21*** (0.07)	-0.14** (0.07)
Service	0.68 (0.46)	-0.57*** (0.11)	-0.45*** (0.10)	0.35 (0.25)	-0.33*** (0.06)	-0.26*** (0.06)
Other sectors	-0.39 (1.36)	-0.38*** (0.11)	-0.29*** (0.10)	-0.14 (0.58)	-0.22*** (0.06)	-0.17*** (0.06)
Skilled labor	0.06 (0.35)	-0.56*** (0.09)	-0.49*** (0.09)	0.02 (0.19)	-0.31*** (0.05)	-0.28*** (0.05)
Social security coverage	-1.55*** (0.25)	-1.52*** (0.09)	-1.52*** (0.08)	-0.92*** (0.14)	-0.89*** (0.05)	-0.89*** (0.05)
Green card holders	0.79** (0.35)	1.11*** (0.12)	1.09*** (0.11)	0.45** (0.19)	0.66*** (0.07)	0.64*** (0.07)
Urban	-1.21*** (0.21)	-0.64*** (0.08)	-0.72*** (0.07)	-0.7*** (0.12)	-0.36*** (0.04)	-0.41*** (0.04)
Constant	1.38 (0.65)	2.09 (0.29)	1.89 (0.25)	0.84 (0.36)	1.19 (0.16)	1.09 (0.14)
N	868	7690	8558	868	7690	8558
Wald chi2(15)	214.67***	1750.79***	1975.51	267.84	2051.19***	2323.28***
Pseudo R2	0.3379	0.3227	0.3202	0.3408	0.3254	0.3230
AIC	719.638	5790.53	6523.203	716.6934	5767.322	6495.944

Note: Numbers in parenthesis are robust standard errors. ***, ** and * indicates significant at 1 percent, 5 percent and 10 percent, respectively.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0896634600005628 Published online by Cambridge University Press

compared to people who live in rural areas (the rural area has been used as a base dummy variable).

In all the estimations for both years for women, those with education, those who have social security, and those who live in urban areas are less likely to be poor. However, women who are green card holders and heads of larger households are more likely to be poor when compared to households without social security coverage and to smaller households.

In terms of the difference between female and male estimates, there is an indication that women who live alone have a higher probability of being poor when compared to women who live with a partner, according to the 2004 survey. However, this result is not confirmed for women in the data for 2006. A higher probability of being poor for men who live alone is not confirmed for either year.

There is no indication that either labor characteristics (skilled labor) or sectors in which women work matters. Only in the estimation for 2004, women who work in the service sector have less of a probability of being poor when compared to women who work in the agriculture and mining sectors. In other estimates, coefficients on sectors in which women work are not significant.

Estimation results indicate that, irrespective of gender, widowed persons have a higher probability of being poor when compared to those married/living together with a partner. Estimation results for the year 2004 indicate that women who live alone have a higher probability of being poor. However, this result has not been verified for the year 2006. On the other hand, empirical findings suggest that unmarried men have less of a probability of being poor for the year 2006.

Since in our dataset the number of households headed by men is large (almost 90 percent), combined estimation results are, by and large, similar to those obtained for men from the logit and probit models for both years. Therefore, arguments made for combined estimations are applicable to the results of the estimations for men.

Conclusion

Investigation of household survey data for the years of 2004 and 2006 and the results of our econometric calculations yield some robust results as far as the determinant factors of poverty and the feminization of poverty are concerned. Three main findings merit attention. First, family structure matters for both men and women as determinants of poverty. There is some indication that marital status only matters for women. That is, women who live alone are more likely to be poor when compared to their married counterparts. This is not a surprising result, because married

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0896634600005628 Published online by Cambridge University Press

women (or women who live with a partner) have the opportunity to access more income from their husbands (or partners).[51]

Second, human capital characteristics matter for both men and women. As education level increases, people are less likely to be poor. Increase in education level is the common factor that decreases poverty rates irrespective of gender. The other common factor indifferent to gender is social security coverage. This result indicates that, as more people are included in the social security system rather than the green card scheme, poverty rates can be decreased. Social security coverage acts as an indicator of employment in the formal sector as well. Hence, increase in health coverage reads as an increase in employment in the formal sector. It also means decreasing the share of employment in the informal sector.

Third, labor market characteristics matter only for men. Sectors in which people work and in which their job characteristics have significant coefficients are only relevant for men. No empirical support has been found for women. This result may be due to the fact that women's labor force participation rate is very low in Turkey, and therefore it is difficult to acquire any statistically meaningful results.

Data analysis and empirical findings indicate that there is some evidence as to the feminization of poverty in Turkey. However, when looking at the broader picture, it may be concluded that poverty is an issue concerning the general population, rather than being feminized. Hence, policies should be designed to cover first the overall population; then, specific policies can be designed for women.

Macro-economic aspects of poverty reduction should not be forgotten. Macro-economic instabilities directly affect poverty because of declining economic growth rates. The subsequent effects of slow growth are fewer employment opportunities, decreased transfer payments and expenditures on basic health and education facilities. Hence, a stabilized and growing economy is a first condition for fighting poverty in providing employment opportunities, access to healthcare, and education.

In our analysis, lack of social security coverage is found to be one of the most robust determinants of poverty. Hence, policies aimed specifically at the expansion of the social security system, which includes healthcare benefits, is a potential policy proposal that emerges from our data analysis. Furthermore, healthcare policies specifically designed to cover more women would not only be beneficial to women, but also to the children who are under their care.

51 This finding is in line with what Casper et al. has found for Italy. See Casper et al., "The Gender-Poverty Gap."

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0896634600005628 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The other robust finding of our study pertains to the effects of education on poverty. As education level increases, poverty rates decline. This finding is supported by both HBS data and the results of all estimations for the years considered. Hence, government action is needed in this area. Compulsory education should be extended from the current eight years to eleven or twelve years. However, the extension of compulsory education on its own is not enough. Vocational education should be expanded, and vocational training made available through government support in order to increase the skilled labor force. Further steps, in addition to the existing government campaigns to increase the schooling of girls, are necessary to raise the education level of women in Turkey.[52]

Particular to women, there are at least two ways to decrease the poverty rate. First, the labor force participation of women should be promoted. The labor force participation rate greatly differs between men and women in Turkey. It was calculated at around 80 percent and 33 percent in 1992 for men and women, respectively, and declined to around 71.5 percent and 24.9 percent in 2006.[53] The labor force participation rate by gender differs according to education level as well. The labor force participation rates of men and women who have less than high school education are 70 percent and 21 percent, respectively, for the year 2008. These rates are 75 percent and 34 percent, respectively, for persons who have high school diplomas. University degree holders have higher labor force participation rates; however, gender difference remains an important issue. The labor force participation rate of university degree holders for women is 72 percent, whereas it is 84 percent for men.[54]

One of the main reasons for the feminization of poverty is the low labor force participation rates of women. Hence, in order to decrease poverty, government action targeted at increasing the participation rates of women is needed. Gender equality should be prevalent in every aspect of social as well as political life. Monetary and fiscal policies should be prepared accordingly.[55] Since poverty is not just defined according to low income, but includes other aspects of life (such as dignity, self-

52 For an excellent discussion of how education and healthcare policies can be used to alleviate poverty, see Fikret Şenses, "Yoksullukla Mücadelenin Neresindeyiz? Gözlem ve Öneriler," in *İktisat Üzerine Yazılar. Küresel Düzen: Birikim, Devlet ve Sınıflar*, eds. A.H. Köse, F. Şenses, and E. Yeldan (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2003). For an excellent discussion of how social assistance policy complemented by free educational supplies and free meals at school can be used to alleviate poverty, see Ayşe Buğra and Çağlar Keyder, "New Poverty and the Changing Welfare Regime of Turkey," (UNDP Report, 2003).

53 TURKSTAT, (2010), http://nkg.die.gov.tr/goster.asp?aile=2.

54 KEİG Platformu, "Türkiye'de Kadın Emeği ve İstihdamı Sorun Alanları ve Politika Önerileri," (KEİG, 2009).

55 For instance, see the recommendations of the Women's Labor and Employment Initiative Ibid. http://www.keig.org.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0896634600005628 Published online by Cambridge University Press

esteem and power), other policies are needed to decrease the poverty of women. These are "public support for parenting, equalization of responsibilities and power among parents, and bolstering the socio-economic status and rights of female heads of household."[56]

Single parenthood is increasing in Turkey. The percent share of female-headed households increased from 8.7 percent in 1990 to 12.2 percent in 2003, and then decreased to 11.3 percent in 2004.[57] This situation affects women's poverty rates much more than that of men's. The empirical findings of this study suggest that women living alone are more likely to be poor when compared to those who are married or living with a partner. It is more likely that the poverty threshold for women is higher than that for men due to the discrepancy between the wage rates of men and women and the effects of dependent children on female-headed households. In order to decrease the poverty rate of female-headed households, in addition to the above-mentioned policy actions, the public sector should assume a larger role in providing free or subsidized childcare and healthcare. To fight against poverty in general and the feminization of poverty in particular, the optimal solution involves measures regarding all of the above-mentioned policies. The incidence rate of poverty in Turkey should be considered a crucial warning to policy-makers.

References

Adaman, Fikret, and Çağlar Keyder. "Türkiye'nin Büyük Kentlerinin Gecekondu ve Çöküntü Mahallelerinde Yaşanan Yoksulluk ve Sosyal Dışlanma." *Tes-İş Dergisi* (2007): 83-89.

Aksu, Bora. "Olmayanın Nesini İdare Edeceksin? Yoksulluk, Kadınlar ve Hane." In *Yoksulluk Halleri: Türkiye'de Kent Yoksulluğunun Toplumsal Görünümleri*, edited by Necmi Erdoğan. İstanbul: de ki, 2002.

Almquist, Elizabeth M. "Labor Market Gender Inequality in Minority Groups." *Gender and Society* 1, no. 4 (1987): 400-14.

Buğra, Ayşe, and Çağlar Keyder. "New Poverty and the Changing Welfare Regime of Turkey." UNDP Report, 2003.

Buğra Kavala, Ayşe, and Çağlar Keyder. "Kent Nüfusunun En Yoksul Kesiminin İstihdam Yapısı ve Geçinme Yöntemleri." TÜBİTAK Projesi, 2008.

Casper, Lynne M., Sara S. McLanahan, and Irwin Garfinkel. "The Gender-Poverty Gap: What We Can Learn from Other Countries." *American Sociological Review* 59, no. 4 (1994): 594-605.

Celasun, Merih. "Income Distribution and Domestic Terms of Trade in Turkey, 1978-1983: Estimated Measures of Inequality and Poverty." *METU Development Studies* 13, no. 1-2 (1986): 193-216.

Chant, Sylvia. "New Contributions to the Analysis of Poverty: Methodological and Conceptual Challenges to Understanding Poverty from a Gender Perspective." Santiago de Chile: Unidad Mujer y Desarrollo, 2003.

——. "Re-Thinking the "Feminization of Poverty" in Relation to Aggregate Gender Indices." *Journal of*

56 Chant, "New Contributions to the Analysis of Poverty."

57 TURKSTAT, (2007), http://nkg.die.gov.tr/goster.asp?aile=4.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0896634600005628 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Human Development 7, no. 2 (2006): 201-20.

Daly, Mary. "Europe's Poor Women? Gender in Research on Poverty." *European Sociological Review* 8, no. 1 (1992): 1-12.

Dansuk, Ercan. "Türkiye'de Yoksulluğun Ölçülmesi ve Sosyo-Ekonomik Yapılarla İlişkisi." Thesis for Planning Expertise, Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı, 1997.

Dikbayır, Gülfer. "Gender and Poverty: Further Data Requirement to Measure the Gender Dimension of Extent and Incidence of Poverty." (2000), http://www.portal-stat.admin.ch/iaos2000/dikbayir_final_paper.doc.

Dumanlı, Recep. "Yoksulluk ve Türkiye'deki Boyutları." Thesis for Planning Expertise, Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı, 1996.

Elmelech, Yuval, and Hsien-Hen Lu. "Race Ethnicity, and the Gender-Poverty Gap." The Levy Economics Institute of Bard College, 2002.

Erdoğan, Güzin. "Türkiye'de Bölge Ayrımında Yoksulluk Sınırı Üzerine Bir Çalışma." Expert Thesis, DİE, 1996.

——. *Türkiye'de Yoksulluk: Boyutu ve Profili*, Araştırma Dizisi. Ankara: DİE, 1998.

Fukuda-Parr, Sakiko. "What Does Feminization of Poverty Mean? It Isn't Just Lack of Income." *Feminist Economics* 5, no. 2 (1999): 99-103.

Heyzer, Noeleen. "Poverty and Women's Work in the Informal Economy." United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM), 2006.

İlkkaracan, İpek, and Raziye Selim. "The Gender Wage Gap in the Turkish Labor Market." *Labour* 21, no. 3 (2007): 563-93.

KEİG Platformu. http://www.keig.org.

——. "Türkiye'de Kadın Emeği ve İstihdamı Sorun Alanları ve Politika Önerileri." KEİG, 2009.

Lichtenwalter, Sara. "Gender Poverty Disparity in Us Cities: Evidence Exonerating Female-Headed Families." *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare* 32, no. 2 (2005): 75-96.

Long, J. Scott. *Regression Models for Categorical and Limited Dependent Variables*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 1997.

Macpherson, David A., and Barry T. Hirsch. "Wages and Gender Composition: Why Do Women's Jobs Pay Less?" *Journal of Labor Economics* 13, no. 3 (1995): 426-71.

McCall, Leslie. "Spatial Routes to Gender Wage (in)Equality: Regional Restructuring and Wage Differentials by Gender and Education." *Economic Geography* 74, no. 4 (1998): 379-404.

McLanahan, Sara S. "Family Structure and Dependency: Early Transitions to Female Household." *Demography* 25, no. 1 (1988): 1-16.

McLanahan, Sara S., and Erin L. Kelly. "The Feminization of Poverty: Past and Future." In *Handbook of Gender Sociology*, edited by J. Chafetz. New York: Plenum, 1999.

McLanahan, Sara S., Annemette Sorensen, and Dorothy Watson. "Sex Differences in Poverty, 1950-1980." *Signs* 15, no. 1 (1989): 102-22.

Moghadam, Valentine M. "The Feminization of Poverty and Women's Human Rights." *Papers in Women's Studies/Gender Research*: UNESCO, Social and Human Sciences Sector (SHS), 2005.

Musick, Kelly, and Robert. D. Mare. "Family Structure, Intergenerational Mobility, and the Reproduction of Poverty: Evidence for Increasing Polarization?" *Demography* 41, no. 4 (2004): 629-48.

OECD. "What Are Equivalence Scales?" (2009), http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/61/52/35411111.pdf.

Palaz, Serap. "Discrimination against Women in Turkey: A Review of the Theoretical and Empirical Literature." *Ege Akademik Bakış* 2, no. 1 (2002): 103-14.

Pearce, Diana. "The Feminization of Poverty: Women, Work and Welfare." *Urban and Social Change Review* 11, no. 1 (1978): 28-36.

Sallan Gül, Songül. "Eşitsizlik, Yoksulluk ve Yoksulluğun Kadınsılaşması: Ankaralı Yoksul Kadınlar." Paper presented at the Değişen Dünya ve Türkiye'de Eşitsizlikler: IV. Ulusal Sosyoloji Kongresi, Sivas, 16-18 October 2003.

Selim, Raziye. "Türkiye'de Bir Gelir Dağılımı Eşitsizliği Olgusu Olarak Yoksulluk." *İktisat Dergisi*, no. 418-419 (2001): 35-38.

Selim, Raziye, and İpek İlkkaracan. "Gender Inequalities in the Labor Market in Turkey: Differentials in Wages, Industrial and Occupational Distribution of Men and Women." 2002, http://www.econ.utah.edu/~ehrbar/erc2002/pdf/P405.pdf.

Stevens, Ann Huff. "The Dynamics of Poverty Spells: Updating Bane and Ellwood." *The American Economic*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0896634600005628 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Review 84, no. 2 (1994): 34-37.

Şenses, Fikret. "Yoksullukla Mücadelenin Neresindeyiz? Gözlem ve Öneriler." In *İktisat Üzerine Yazılar. Küresel Düzen: Birikim, Devlet ve Sınıflar*, edited by A.H. Köse, F. Şenses and E. Yeldan, 319-56. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2003.

——. *Küreselleşmenin Öteki Yüzü Yoksulluk*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002.

TURKSTAT. (2010), http://nkg.die.gov.tr/goster.asp?aile=2.

——. (2007), http://nkg.die.gov.tr/goster.asp?aile=4.

——. (2009), www.tuik.gov.tr/VeriBilgi.do?tb_id=23&ust_id=7.

UN. (2009), http://unstats.un.org/unsd/Demographic/products/socind/inc-eco.htm.

UNDP. (2009), http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/indices/hpi/.

——. *Beyond Scarcity: Power, Poverty and the Global Water Crises*. Human Development Report. New York, 2006.

——. *Fighting Climate Change: Human Solidarity in a Divided World*. Human Development Report. New York, 2007/2008.

——. *Gender and Human Development*. Human Development Report. New York, 1995.

UNESCO. (2009), http://www.uis.unesco.org/glossary/Term.aspx?name=GENDER%20PARITY%20INDEX%20%28GPI%29&lang=en.

World Bank. *Turkey Economic Reforms, Living Standards and Social Welfare Study*. Report no. 20029-TU, 2000.

——. http://ddp-ext.worldbank.org/ext/DDPQQ/showReport.do?method=showReport.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0896634600005628 Published online by Cambridge University Press