

Linking Vulnerability to Poverty and Domestic Labor: A Case Study in Turkey

Hande Togrul¹

Section 1: Introduction

Unpaid domestic labor cannot be counted as economic activity because it is not paid. If an activity or labor time is not paid it is not an economic activity. Economics discipline has become scientific with numerous dichotomies, paid –unpaid labor being one that is central in this study. Understanding dichotomies and going beyond its rhetorical level may be possible through lived experiences. Lived experiences that inform us about the complexities of gender, class, race, ethnicity, age, religion, and locality and their cross-cutting For instance, increasing participation of women in the labor force and adverse conditions for women in poor and/or lower class households brought unpaid-paid discussion into economics. Advances in economic analysis always happen after major socio-economic observations, changes, or major crises. It is a well known fact that majority of unpaid domestic laborers are women. If these women are recognized as “paid workers” and included in working-class, there would be less poverty both in income and human dimension. More importantly, women would be less vulnerable to personal or socio-economic crises through their life cycles.

How can we push the boundaries of dichotomies in the domain of economics, philosophy of science, methods and methodology and above all in practice? Over the centuries, economists, philosophers, sociologists have sought to establish and show the extent of how dichotomies create artificial barriers in capturing socio-economic realities. Contemporary feminist economists have been deconstructing dichotomies both in theoretical and methodological ways. Since feminists in general and feminist economists in particular have varying political philosophy stances², they take different approaches for deconstruction while taking social stratifiers such as gender, race, ethnicity, age, religion, and locality very seriously. However, there are differences in theoretical applications of these categories within feminist economics. First approach concentrates on gender and/or race as central analytical category to point out the shortcomings of Marxists concept of class. Domestic labor becomes a key concept in this critique. Second approach questions the dominant economic method and methodologies from the viewpoint of feminist theory and research methods/methodologies. Underlying main premise for both approaches is to re-establish connection between (false) dichotomies such as reproduction³-production, paid-unpaid labor, monetary-non-monetary, economic-non-economic, private- public and so on. Opening up and talking about so called non-economic, unpaid, reproductive activities,

¹ Department of Economics, University of Utah, hande.togrul@economics.utah.edu

² Feminist economists are influenced by different feminist theories (see Tong 1989 and Jaggard 1983). Tong (1989) “*Feminist Thought; A Comprehensive Introduction*” discusses different feminist approaches: liberal, radical, Marxist, socialist, psychoanalytic, existential, and postmodern. Quite a number of feminist economists base their methodological/philosophical stance on liberal feminism. In this paper methodological/philosophical stance is socialist feminism.

³ Lourdes Beneria (1979) defines reproduction in three ways; biological reproduction, reproduction of labor power and reproduction of communities and societies (social reproduction).

that takes place in the private sphere helps us to show in what ways they do not contradict with economic, paid, productive activities that takes place in the public sphere. They are all two sides of one coin. It is crucial to understand the coexistence of so called “opposites⁴”.

The main premise motivates me to emphasize *the invisible* groups, mostly women who are embedded deeply in socio-economic and politico-cultural infrastructure. Their invisibility i.e. acceptance of status by other groups of women perpetuates inequalities. This paper is a short version of my dissertation. My aim is to present the framework which helps me to interpret empirical evidence, stories of women who worked as unpaid live-in domestic workers. I benefit from socialist feminist approach which is “nothing less than the confluence of Marxist, radical and more arguably, psychoanalytic streams of feminist thought⁵” (Tong 1989p. 173). Class has been a very important concept for feminist economists given differences in interpretation of gender, class and race relations. I will be pondering on gender and class relations while bringing domestic labor at the center once again with a twist. Marxian understanding of exploitation has been the central discussion either as increased surplus extraction by dominant classes and/or surplus extraction of wives by their husbands. In this study, I explore domestic labor relation between women of different classes. The group of women who were engaged in unpaid domestic work (i.e. evlatlik institution in Turkey) is an intermingling of all three phenomena: child labor, rural-urban migration and informality of domestic labor. Conflict between lower class women and the middle and upper-middle class women depends on many complicated push and pull effects on both sides. Poverty and vulnerability of rural women gives relative control to urban women and households in terms of decision-making. Domestic labor is the link between these groups. As a working conclusion, in support of emancipation of all domestic laborers as well as all other working-class men and women, I advocate “wages of the housework” as a perspective in shifting debates in gender and class relations.

Section I summarizes how domestic labor is central in feminist thought in linking class and gender and my direction within the debate. Section 2 elaborates on the central role of domestic labor in feminist thought and class and gender analysis: direction within the debate. Section 3 briefly comments on method-methodological issues since gender and class analysis, particularly with domestic labor debate at the center, pushes

⁴ Cartesian view of reality has divided process of thought. Dualism separates abstract thought mechanisms as well as concrete phenomenon experienced by people. There are many propositions of dualism such as objective/subjective, emotional/rational, precise/vague, public/private, productive/reproductive, rigorous/intuitive, formal/informal, agent/structure, masculine/feminine, scientific/non-scientific that frequently discussed in social sciences as well as in feminist economics (Nelson 1999, 2003). Scientific/non-scientific duality is indeed the over arching duality which has occupied the minds and hearts for centuries. Questioning “scientific knowledge” has been a methodological, philosophical and practical matter for feminist economists (Barker and Kuiper 2004, Barker 2003).

⁵ There has been great resistance against synthesizing Marxism and psychoanalysis due to Marxist understanding revolutionary change (See Ann Foreman 1977). According to Marx revolutionary change comes from the struggle between the working class and the capitalist class. Change depends on struggle between groups not individuals, therefore social consciousness rather than individual consciousness plays the significant role. However, inspiring work of “Rethinking Marxists” continues to explore so-called “incompatibility” between Marxism and psychoanalysis (See, Fraad, Resnick and Wolff (1994) and Gibson-Graham, Resnick and Wolff (2000)). I would argue that so-called incompatibility lies in Marxist concept of class rather than Marxist understanding of social consciousness and its incompatibility with psychoanalytical individual consciousness. Social-individual dichotomy will be discussed in section 1.

the boundaries of economic analysis. Section 4 covers a short summary of my empirical analysis. Section 5 will concludes with “wages for housework” as a perspective in social feminist thinking and possible road for emancipation of working class and men.

Section I: Central role of domestic labor in feminist thought and class and gender analysis: direction within the debate

Unpaid housewives and paid domestic workers constitute two main groups in domestic labor discussions. Many contemporary strategies observed in “developing countries,” had their precedents in the history of what are now advanced capitalist countries. Employing domestic servants was an important class-status characteristic both in Great Britain during the Victorian era and the Post-Civil War after mid 19th Century in the United States. Live-in domestic workers were very common. There were generally multiple domestic servants in large households. Girls and women, especially from rural origins, did not have many other options for work. In the late 20th century, entry of middle-class women into the workforce raised the demand for paid household work. Thus the anatomy of domestic labor changed. Today, at the beginning of 21st century, affluent women and/or men are no longer able or willing to do household work or even raise their children, take care of the elderly or the sick. Yet, payment for domestic services have not made significant hike. This international movement of domestic workers can be seen as a narrative of one group needing help and the other needing jobs. Yet, it is not that simple. A number of recent case studies focus on the complexities of these arrangements. A major focus of these studies is the informality of the arrangements and the implications of informality about the conditions of work. Another serious issue is that those who work as paid domestic laborers outside their own households and in overseas countries, may have their own children, elderly or sick parents needing care. Although these cases are about paid domestic labor in contrast to the case study in this paper, which is about unpaid domestic work performed by non-family members, there are many similarities about the informal nature of the arrangements and conditions of work.

Marxian and mainstream economists delved into domestic labor debate during 1960s and 70s broadly for similar reasons (Jefferson and King 2001). At the end both schools were unable to deal with theoretical problems that domestic labor raised. Therefore, domestic labor could neither find a home in Marxian economics (ME), nor in the neoclassical economics (NE). In this paper, I will not able to present a critique of the neoclassical approach for space limitation. But mainly, NE has limited capacity to understand the dynamics of “the household”. The NE approach to the household can be summarized under the rubric of New Household Economics (NHE). This approach was spearheaded by Gary Becker, in his earlier work, following Margaret Reid, Becker recognizes time and its allocation within the household as an economic problem. The NE approach has been criticized by many feminist economists extensively (e.g. Bergmann 1995 and Folbre 1982, Nelson 1996, Ferber and Nelson 1993 and others).

Class is the central analytical category across different heterodox schools in economics, sociology, and anthropology to study capitalist system. Gender, on the other hand is used as the main category of analysis for feminists to study patriarchy across social sciences. While Marxists, socialist, radical and psychoanalytical feminists consider class and gender as main categories with in their economic analysis to understand how the forces of patriarchy and capitalism work, liberal feminist do not ask the same questions, in most cases, they investigate discrimination, occupational segregation, wages differentials in the labor market. At the same time, feminists in variety of other social science disciplines⁶ investigate the complex relationship between gender and class processes.

The domestic labor debate was on the complex nature of the relations between patriarchy and capitalism. Margaret Benston's (1969) research into the relationship of **unpaid** domestic labor and the economic system particularly raises the question of why women still spend much of their time on domestic labor and stay in subordinate positions in society. These questions led British Marxist feminists to a debate on the significance of unpaid domestic labor performed by women in the analysis of capitalism, which was overlooked in Marxist economics theory (Gardiner 1998)⁷. Domestic labor debate was highly abstract. Although abstraction is needed in theoretical work, it cannot provide rich, textured, nuanced analysis. This is not to say that the debate was not rich. On the contrary, the debate led to a better understanding of intricate mechanisms, simultaneous processes and tendencies between capitalist accumulation and domestic labor. It is important to mention that the theory behind this debate was based on the UK and the US experiences. Gardiner states that "it is impossible to analyze domestic labor in abstraction from the social relationships to which it is linked, relationships between wives, husbands, mothers, fathers, children and other dependent household members" (Gardiner 1997, p.10).

Two main positions emerged from the domestic labor debate: 1) domestic labor subsidizes capitalist production and enhances productivity by means of reproducing labor power 2) domestic labor is essential for the reproduction of labor power, as such, it is not a subsidy. The debate branched into two cross-cutting systems of social power discussion: a patriarchal system of gender oppression and a capitalist system of economic class exploitation. A few socialist feminists retreated into an economic reductionism, while others moved increasingly toward a purely cultural explanation of women's oppression that has culminated in feminist postmodernism. In the late 1990s, however, within a discussion of globalization, postmodern feminists have started to look into materialist explanations.

“Although economic reductionism has little to offer in this regard, one often neglected strain of socialist feminism - social reproduction theory - is more promising. If socialist feminism is to exist as anything more than

⁶ Maria Mies, bell hooks, Harriet Fraad, Christine Delphy, Kyra Sedgwick, Paula England, Ann Ferguson, Iris Young, Sylvia Walby, Lise Vogel, Diane Reay, Lydia Sargent are few names in this endeavor

⁷ Jean Gardiner (1997) bases her definition of domestic labor on Margaret Reid's definition of household production: domestic labor is therefore, defined as those unpaid household activities which could be done by someone other than the person who actually carries them out or could be purchased if a market for those activities existed, i.e. the third party criterion.

an intellectual artifact, it is essential to engage with the anti-capitalist insights promoted by those working within the social reproduction framework” (Ferguson 1998 p .22)

The debate was able to identify the problems, but lost its momentum in the 1980s and 1990s. Maxine Molyneux (1979) points out the limitations of this effort: economic reductionism, functionalist mode of argument in constructing the relationship between capitalism and domestic labor, narrow focus on the labor performed in the domestic sphere at the expense of theorizing the wider familial/household context. At the same time, the domestic labor debate tended to assume that performers of unpaid domestic labor are members of the family. Following from these limitations of the domestic labor debate, this study is formulated to consider the wider familial/household context by situating the discussion of unpaid domestic work in family and household level economic strategies. By going beyond economic reductionism and consider the ideological and emotional aspects of domestic labor and reproduction. Reproduction of class relations within households and families through **unpaid** domestic work, in particular through the relationship between pseudo mothers and the evlatliks.

Domestic labor debates explained husbands control over wives as well as capitalists’ increased surplus extraction of wives. Therefore, it doesn’t not explore class concept given women to women conflict. Women to women conflict have emerged as an important issues in domestic labor debate to integrate into gender and class analysis. If we don’t discuss this conflict, it continues to feed into the perpetuation of class differences and devaluation of housework. If housework cannot be acknowledged as “real” work, housewives and domestic laborers in general cannot unite with working class men and women as “workers” there will never be class transformation. Such perspective if acquired will eventually transform meaning of “work” and alter our understanding of gender and class. The wages for housework idea was put forward by Mariarosa Dalla Costa and Selma James (1972)⁸. Result of my empirical work, growing number of studies about domestic workers in the context of globalization and migration⁹ (Ehrenrich and Hochschild 2003; Hondagneu-Sotelo 2001; Parrenas 2001; Anderson 2000, Chin 1998; Phyllis 1989, Silvera 1983) and literature on child domestic laborers¹⁰ (Anti-Slavery 2000, 2002a, 2002b, and 2006, ILO 2004a, 2004b, ILO 2005a, 2005b) give me the reasons to bring back “wages for housework” argument once again

⁸ The “wages for housework” idea is taken to practice by the Global Women Strike Campaign”. Inclusion of women’s unpaid work in Venezuelan constitution as economic activity is one their most important achievements in their domestic labor related work. Constitution of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela Article 8: “The State guarantees equality and equity between men and women in the exercise of their right to work. The State recognizes work at home as an economic activity that creates added value and produces social welfare and wealth. Housewives are entitled to Social Security in accordance with the law.” According to www.globalwomenstrike.org articles of the constitution are printed on milk cartons and food wrappings.

⁹ During the last two decades scholar have been arguing about “feminization of migration.” Throughout 1990s, more than half of the migrants to the United States, Canada, Sweden, the United Kingdom, Argentina and Israel were women (Ehrenrich and Hochschild 2003). Migrants from South Asia to Gulf States and Europe are also prominently women and almost all are domestic workers. In official documents it is argued that illegal migration takes place at least as much as legal migration and includes mostly domestic workers. Migrant domestic workers also end up at very low paying jobs or without cash income, benefits and long-term security.

¹⁰ According to the International Labor Organization’s International Program on the Elimination of Child Labor (ILO-IPEC), there are more than 212 million child laborers in the world. Various other estimates go up to 250-260 million. Domestic workers and child prostitutes are the least researched category though researchers are showing an increased interest. Comprehensive statistics do not exist for these categories. Estimates for child domestic labor are as high as three million if not more (ILO 2004, UNICEF 2004). According to ILO, most of the statistics are compiled through local studies and more likely underestimate the situation. There are no figures for North America and Europe.

in gender and class analysis. Dalla Costa and James (1972) argued that domestic labor (except it was unpaid), similar to wage labor, produced surplus value. Benston (1971) also argued that women should demand for pay for the work they do at work. Historically, but especially after industrialization, domestic sphere was pushed outside economic system. Public- private dichotomies accentuated with changes in productions system as well as cultural, social, religious terrains. The ideology of the family being the social factory residing in private household strengthened. Of course, their argument attracted substantial criticisms. Peterson and Lewis (1999), Mallos (1980) argue that wages for housework would strengthen gender division of labor even further. They also emphasized difficulties in assigning¹¹ a proper wage for housework. Existing schemes of state contributions to social reproduction provisioning¹² needs close attention in building the argument for housework wages.

A couple of current studies (Jefferson and King 2001, Armstrong and Armstrong 2005) revisit the debate. While former offers concessions for neoclassical and Marxian economics, latter one urges for sex-conscious¹³ analytical framework in political economy. Other studied in domestic labor debate are Fraad, Resnick and Wolff (1994) and Gibson-Graham, Resnick and Wolff (2000). Fraad, Resnick and Wolff (1994) present exploitation both in the sense of oppression and surplus extraction in the household and the firm. Household is described as a feudal space where wives are not only oppressed but their surplus labor is extracted by a husband who is linked to the capitalist system. Their approach represents similarities with the Marxist- feminist dual systems theory (Young 1983). Arguments are based on the US experiences and tensions, contradictions are discussed given different scenarios. Ancient as well as communist household types are discussed as emerging household models. Although, in one of the scenarios, they discuss an increase in the number of individuals who do surplus labor in the household (which is the scenario in this case study), they do not carry on this discussion. Gibson-Graham, Resnick and Wolff (2000) edited version presents various articles on the experiences of laboring body. Their aim is to enlarge to domain of class concept by exploring th class processes i.e. the process of producing, appropriating and distributing surplus labor. These processes are surrounded by social practices, personal experiences, violence, political and emotional possibilities. Such analysis “offers new possibilities for connecting class to its historical “others”- sites from which class has been excluded, subjects to whom class has been denied, activities that have been seen as “non-economic”, identities that have been devalued and subordinated to class. In the process it may create a desire for new forms of class politics, perhaps even in those with no desire for that desire” (Gibson-Graham, Resnick and Wolff 2000 p.2)

¹¹ Beneria (2003) summarizes alternative valuation methods of unpaid work.

¹² Antonopoulos (2007)

¹³ Argument is **not** about the biological determination of sexual division of labor that justifies separation between home and work. On the contrary, it is an effort to explain how sexual division of labor is fundamental to class divide through women’s reproductive capacities. Understanding this process breaks the dichotomy between production and reproduction.

Section 2 will elaborate on the linkage between domestic labor and vulnerability and poverty.

The gender – based divisions of labor within and outside households has meant that women are more vulnerable to poverty compared to men even when they reside in the same household and are members of the same family (Cagatay 1998).¹⁴ Thus, feminist economists emphasize the fact that poverty within households is both a shared experience and an experience that differs by gender and age. While gender-based power relations render women’s experiences of poverty different from men’s, class- based relations create divisions and conflicts among women. Acknowledging that labor is reproduced partly within households by unpaid work (as well as by paid work) has paved the way to studies on gender and class relations within economic life (Sacks 1974; Beneria 1979 and 1995; Hartmann 1981), discussed in previous section. This is because domestic labor, while performed mostly by women, is not always performed by women who are family members. Upper- or middle-class women, in particular, may bring in another female to substitute for them in childcare and household work. Females brought into the household in this way can be divided into two categories: those who are paid, and those who are unpaid¹⁵. Paid domestic labor includes recognized ‘jobs,’ for example those of cleaner, housekeeper, nanny and gardener. Paid workers may live with the family, or come into the household each day, living elsewhere. The second category, unpaid workers, may consist of distantly related family members, or they may be people who have no blood relationship with the family. Unpaid domestic workers are usually female, and enter the household as children from, in most cases, income poor rural areas. While supply of domestic labor is almost an “*instinctual*”, “*natural*” coping mechanism for girls and women, demand side has its own agenda, i.e. solidarity between women as the employee and employer is hardly possible. Especially, in this situation where there is no binding contracts, terms of employment. Everything depends on verbal promises and understanding or lack there of. Paid domestic laborers have been noticed lately within economic development studies, especially in the context of migration.

A major goal of economic development policies¹⁶ in the last ten years has been the reduction and elimination of poverty and reduction of gender inequality. However, top-down policy making does not automatically translate into the achievement of time-bound goals. A major emphasis is on the achievement of sustained growth, which is

¹⁴ The concept of vulnerability involves being at risk of becoming poor as a result of natural or socially induced crises. It is associated with insecurity and defenselessness in the face of crises (Chambers 1989).

¹⁵ Male domestic workers are prevalent in South Asia and Haiti in household tasks that can be perceived as “manly” such as shopping, gardening, washing cars, small scale maintenance etc.

¹⁶ The Millennium Declaration signed in 2000 by member states of the United Nations is the most visible manifestation of the international consensus on the urgent need to eliminate extreme forms of poverty through a variety of policies. With the Millennium Declaration, member states agreed on the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) which consist of 8 goals: 1. eradication of extreme poverty and hunger; 2. achievement of universal primary education, 3. promotion of gender equality and empowerment of women, 4. reduction of child mortality; 5. improvement of maternal health; 6. combatting HIV/AIDS, Malaria and other diseases; 7. environmental sustainability; 8. formation of global partnerships for development. In addition there are 18 time-bound targets and 48 indicators to monitor these time-bound targets, the details of which can be found at <http://www.unmillenniumproject.org/goals/index.htm> .

often seen as the most important factor for poverty reduction.¹⁷ As experience from around the world shows, the benefits of growth do not always trickle down to poor segments of the population. It is increasingly recognized that poverty is not “just” a shortfall in income or consumption. Poverty is a multidimensional concept that involves not only income and consumption shortfalls, but also others dimensions such as assets (social and material), self-esteem, dignity, autonomy, lack of time. It is acknowledged that poverty is about powerlessness even by mainstream institutions such as the World Bank (World Bank 2000).

Formulation and implementation of a coherent policy framework for poverty elimination requires a comprehensive understanding of both material and non-material aspects of poverty. Use of qualitative methods of poverty assessment alongside quantitative methods¹⁸ used in traditional approaches to poverty measurement can be important for such an understanding. Bringing the voices and realities of those who live under poverty and in vulnerable contexts into the center of debates on poverty and policy-formulation is a crucial aspect of effective policy formulation (Chambers 1996, Narayan 2000, among others).

Historically and across countries, households and families living under poverty have developed a variety of livelihood strategies, which are ways of combining and using assets, inside and outside markets.¹⁹ Coping strategies emerge in response to livelihood crises, which result from short-term “shocks” such as natural disasters, political crises, civil strife and violence, and economics crises that put livelihoods in jeopardy and increase vulnerability. People adapt their livelihood strategies to a ‘reduced situation’, but slowly as the system recovers, households employ a new strategy composed of elements from the former livelihood strategy and the coping strategy to develop a new portfolio of livelihood activities (Benedikt 2002).

Livelihood and coping strategies of poor people are often invisible to policy makers or sometimes they appear as marginal to the workings of the economy. Contradictions between the realities of those who experience being poor and the presumptions of those who are trying to “help” them have become much more obvious over the last two decades. Substantial efforts have been underway to identify these contradictions and to design new models of poverty reduction. However, a growing literature devoted to understanding the livelihood strategies of poor people shows the variations in and the dynamic nature of the strategies employed. Through participatory poverty studies around the world, complex lives of millions of underprivileged men, women and children are informing new approaches to policy – making. Feminist economists and other feminist social scientists have been working toward this goal of understanding the nature and dynamics of poverty in term of power imbalances that

¹⁷ E.g. Dollar and Kraay (2000) argued in a controversial paper that growth is good for the poor. A growing literature now focuses on pro-poor growth acknowledging that not all types of growth are conducive to poverty reduction or ‘good for the poor’. For example, see Klasen (2003), Van der Hoeven (2004), and others.

¹⁸ Qualitative and quantitative dichotomy is discussed in section 3

¹⁹ “A livelihood comprises of capabilities, assets (including material and social resources) and activities required for a means of living. A livelihood is sustainable when it can cope with and recover from stresses and shocks and maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets both now and in the future, while not undermining the natural resource base.” (DFID 1999 p.2 based on Chambers and Conway 1992).

create vulnerabilities.

Vulnerability to Poverty

Vulnerability²⁰ refers to individuals or groups lack of coping ability with unforeseen events, pressure and stress due to ingrained inequalities in societies. Therefore peoples and/or group's situation can worsen if vulnerabilities stay unchecked. This leads to economic deprivation, social dependency, oppression, exploitation, psychical violence, and psychologically harm. Therefore understanding and working on vulnerability is an important way to prevent poverty. Treatment of domestic labor can make or break vulnerability-poverty connection.

Vulnerability studies emerged as risk management strategies for natural, environmental or economic disasters for rural development, especially for basic needs. Vulnerability basic needs approach focuses on people's minimum requirement for survival. Risk management is an insurance like approach similar to human welfare approach, people are recipients not as active participants in shaping their lives. The World Bank raising interest in people-centered approaches use social risk management based on human resources concept where human capital is envisioned as input into the production process. None of these approaches open vulnerabilities into a broader context human development and capabilities approach.

Vulnerabilities find better articulation in non-monetary aspect of poverty (e.i. in human development and human capabilities approaches that are discussed in next section). Work of Amartya Sen (1981) on famines and the notion of food entitlement underlined how income was valuable as long as it increased the capabilities of individuals and contribute in functionings of a society. A broadening of the concept of poverty to a wider construct; livelihood strategies, coping mechanism, rapid increase in the study of gender and policies followed to empower women and find ways to underpin autonomy, or agency, lead a long, healthy, creative life and to enjoy a decent standard of living, freedom, dignity and self-esteem (Philip and Rayhan, 2004)²¹. Those who thrive for exact measurements would argue that the notion of 'vulnerability to poverty' is elusive just like human poverty and human capabilities. According Kanbur and Squire (2001), poor households often identify vulnerability as a condition that takes into account both exposure to serious risks and defenselessness against deprivation seen as a function of social marginalization that ultimately results in economic marginalization. Similar to poverty measurement researchers are trying to isolate simple set of measures of vulnerability for cross-time, cross-space analysis. This is taking backward steps. Vulnerabilities are mostly hidden in behavioral, mental, psychological terrains, which eventually connect to our material life. The presence of poverty traps and other forms of persistence means that reducing vulnerability will have an important impact on poverty reduction (Dercon 2001).

²⁰ Meaning of vulnerability is discussed in Philip and Rayhan (2004), Dercon (2001) and others.

²¹ Philip and Rayhan (2004) proposes indicators for measuring the multiple dimensions of vulnerability under the following categories: ecological security, economic efficiency, social equity, empowerment, poverty, and food absorption

Multidimensionality, Capabilities Approach to Human Poverty

Measurement of human development and poverty has been operationalized within international development organizations²². Gradually more, economists and social scientists recognize human development and multidimensional approach to poverty. Yet, still income-based measurement²³ are influential in policy (Aisbeitt 2004, Dollar 2002). Efforts to formulate coherent policy framework require conceptual and measurement shifts in poverty discussions. Such shifts in conceptualizations of poverty have taken place during the last two decades especially with the work of Amartya Sen leading to broader understandings of poverty and vulnerability.). His critique of income-based analysis of poverty led to capabilities approach²⁴. Instead of what people can **gain** has become to what people can **become** (“functionings”, i.e. what people can be and do, what people can achieve. With such framework, income and resources are necessary but not sufficient aspect of poverty analysis, especially in the context of quality of life and well-being. Therefore, income and human poverty approaches are not dichotomous. They are not contradictory but complimentary, income is needed for people to achieve doings and beings, to achieve combination of capabilities. Different doings and being bring people fulfillment and satisfaction. People flourish more as they figure out the missing dimensions and achieve them, well-being is more than material gain.

“...neither opulence (income, commodity command) nor utility (happiness, desire fulfillment) constitute or adequately represent human well-being and deprivation. Instead what is required is a more direct approach that focuses on human function(ing)s and the capabilities to achieve valuable function(ing)s” (Clark 2005, p.4)

The capabilities approach emphasizes people’s good health, avoidance of premature death, self-respect, dignity, to be able to appear in public without shame, to take part in community and public life. Naussbaum (2004) further outlines basic capabilities as follows: life, bodily health, bodily integrity, senses- imagination and thought; emotions; practical reason, affiliation and empathy; being able to live with other species, play, control over one’s political and material environment. The capabilities approach brings into discussion social and other material dimensions that perpetuate poverty alongside income and consumption. Income and consumption measures do not recognize unequal distribution of resources. Amartya Sen shows that these measures are not good measures of individual’s and groups’ well-being. Domestic

²² Construction of human development index (HDI) has been useful to get the word out, non-monetary dimensions of economic development. At least, given many other multidimensional quality of life/human development indices, HDI, Human Poverty Index (HPI) and gender related indices Gender Development Index (GDI) and Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM) are now widely used at least in governmental reports as well as among international researchers.

²³ *Relative poverty line* defined in relation to the overall distribution of income or consumption in a country; for example, the poverty line could be set at 30 percent of the country’s mean income or consumption. *Absolute poverty line* is the standard monetary measure based the cost of basic food needs of an household (i.e., the cost a nutritional basket considered minimal for the healthy survival of a typical family), to which a provision is added for non-food need (See Ravallion 1994).

²⁴ Human Development and Capabilities Association (<http://www.capabilityapproach.com/>)

labor discussion and my case study situate in the nexus of vulnerability, and coping strategies in gender and poverty discussions. Historically, vulnerable and poor families have found a variety of coping mechanisms to address hardship and stress. Such mechanisms often assign very different kinds of work and functions to women and men and to girls and boys within families and households. Scott and Tilly (1987) emphasize the importance of shared values having to do with collective commitment to economic survival. “If we want to understand how and under what conditions women worked, it seems advisable to examine family economic strategies” (Scott and Tilly 1987, p. 7).

Multiple dimensions of vulnerabilities and poverty can be substitutes or complements of each other. However, complementarity’s or substitutability do not always work in harmony. For instance, peoples vulnerabilities within the household, community and society at large change and contradict. Therefore, short terms needs and long term interests (Moser 1993) of same groups for instance “poor women” contradict. People are usually trapped between short-term needs and long-term interests, choice of food and shelter over loss of autonomy is a repeated theme in development field. Important task for those who study and advocate multidimensional aspect of poverty and human development is to explain, to write about those contradiction. Therefore, descriptive work, narratives are necessary methods for such analysis. Use of qualitative methods of poverty assessment alongside quantitative methods used in traditional approaches to poverty measurement can be important for such an understanding. Bringing the voices and realities of those who live under poverty and in vulnerable contexts into the center of debates on poverty and policy-formulation is a crucial aspect of effective policy formulation (see Chambers 1996, Aryan 2000, among others).

Unfortunately, recognition of human poverty and its multi-dimensional aspect do not guarantee that studies and research methods will capture the dynamic, structural and relational factors that give rise to poverty. For instance, cultural identity and politics are important part of peoples’ lives but demarcation between scientific and non-scientific stops different type of research in social science. Solution for poverty or other socio-economic problems is sought in scientific knowledge. As Alice O’Connor (2001) argues scientific knowledge long been an article of faith in American liberalism. If only poverty could be understood as the failure of the system rather than a riddle for scientific curiosity, those who are poor and working poor could be more active demanding better conditions. Technical solutions to a structural, historical, moral problem does not really have any options in eradication of poverty. So, what to do about the science-non-science dichotomy? This is certainly another paper topic but next section will briefly raise some relevant points.

Section3: How can alternative method/methodology discussions play catalytic role

Feminist conceptual discussions create natural alliance with non-positivist qualitative methodologies. Non-positivist qualitative methodologies²⁵ are central in

²⁵ Non-positivist qualitative methodological stance which I take is constructivist grounded theory that celebrates first hand knowledge of empirical world, while taking a middle ground between postmodernism and relativism. Denzin and Lincoln (2003)

exploring, understanding and defining human development, human poverty, and vulnerabilities. Feminist economists (Pujol 1997, Nelson 1998) have been writing on the dichotomy that leaves feminist way of thinking and accumulating knowledge out of what is called “science.” Sandra Harding (1993) questions science and knowledge accumulation. What is knowledge, scientific knowledge, can science be value-free? Feminist economists try to make visible unexcavated knowledge, knowledge about oppression, domination, and power. As Harding argues, this act is not a political act, it is bringing existing knowledge out, un-boxing, unearthing. Questioning “scientific” knowledge, “what science is”, “ what economists understand as science” has paused difficulties during the fieldwork. Harding’ s understanding of scientific knowledge provided encouragement to conduct my interviews. A complete socio-economic study needs emotions, intuition, conscience, moral back into knowledge accumulation and production/reproduction of societies. Production boundary, in fact, is a historically fluid concept. It is crucial to see progression of boundaries and definitions in the context of history of economic thought. Major dichotomy between productive and unproductive (reproductive) labor; how do economists define economic activity has been an evolving issue. Brennan (2006) investigates selected writings of Adam Smith, Thomas Malthus, Nassau Senior, W. Stanley Jevons, Alfred Marshall and presents how over time meanings given to “labor”, “employment”, “income”, “consumption”, “capital” have paved the way for a production boundary. He argues that historically economic boundaries have never been clear cut and often been in state of flux. Only in recent past, since post II WW “production boundary” that dominates economic inquiry. Therefore, there is always room within these fluid boundaries. This gives me more hope for pushing the idea of wages for the housework.

Section 4: Empirical Work

While theoretical approaches to domestic labor debate situates women’s **unpaid** household work at the center of accumulation processes, the literature on domestic workers problematizes arrangements and conditions of **paid live-in or live-out** domestic workers in national and international contexts. Thus, domestic labor in general is identified with two categories. This study will introduce a third category in this discussion. **The first category** is unpaid domestic labor of mothers, daughters, sons and husbands, extended family/kin and other household members. Time use surveys²⁶ are sources to capture allocation of time within the household by each or specific household member. For instance, Ironmonger (1996) shows how significant domestic labor for national production is, when counted in the gross domestic product **The**

argue that “constructivism assumes the relativism of multiple social realities, recognize the mutual creation of knowledge by the viewer and the viewed, and aims toward interpretive understanding of subjects’ meanings” (Denzin and Lincoln 2003, p.250). Thus, we need an approach similar to Max Weber’s understanding of sociology “Verstehen²⁵” to explore multiple truths of the researcher and the participants’. It is the interpretation of stories collected and researcher’s long-term lived experience. Both approaches require empathy. This ability of understanding other people’s inner feelings and difficulties gives the researcher a lever to explore different socio-economic worlds. Grounded theory often comes closer to traditional positivism in that it does not consider multiple realities. Methods that consist of systematic data collection and analytical interpretation of data to develop, refine and inform theory with assumptions of an objective, external reality. A *neutral* observer discovers data.

²⁶ Time use statistics provide measurements of unpaid work by using input and output methods based on market valuations. (Beneria2004).

second category identifies paid domestic labor done by non- family members such as cleaner, housekeeper, nanny, and gardener. They may live-in or live-out of the home in which they work. This category can be observed in two distinct ways, local domestic workers and migrant domestic workers. Locals who supply their labor use word of mouth; as soon as one person makes an arrangement this creates opportunities for others within her family and community. Similar personal and community connections work at an international level. However, limitations on the movement of labor between borders create middlemen, usually agencies organizing movement of people. There may be serious repercussions for laborers during the course of action. These laborers may find themselves in the middle of a scam.

This study identifies the **third category** that is unpaid non-family/non-kin members of the household as domestic workers as in the case of Turkey, where such arrangement is known as “*evlatlik*”. Although *evlatliks* are fed, clothed, and given a basic education, they usually experience a lack of freedom and are unable to earn money of their own. They may not accumulate material assets, yet *evlatliks* may (do) utilize pseudo family’s social networks. Access to pseudo families’ network may ease access to education, health, and labor market opportunities. Given the goodwill of the families, complexity of the emotional terrain is hard to navigate. The emotional bond between *evlatliks* and the pseudo household members creates burden for *evlatliks* due to power imbalances²⁷. There are similar practices around the world²⁸, however, there is lack of research on why such practices emerge, evolve, disappear and reappear. Qualitative research strategies such as field study, case study, small sample surveys, oral history, participant observation, and variety of other strategies could be used.

In the case of Turkey, such arrangements culminated in an institution called “*evlatlik*”, a word that can be translated imperfectly as the diminutive of the word child (*evlat*). *Evlatliks* are mostly orphan and/or poor peasant girls, who are brought into upper and middle class households under conditions of “quasi – adoption.”²⁹ While *evlatliks* are distinct from legally- adopted children, they are given familial attributes, reside with their quasi- adoptive families and their basic material needs are provisioned by the quasi-adoptive family until they form their own households through arranged marriages. Although they are brought into their new homes under the pretext of “charity” and “protection”, a central aspect of this arrangement is the performance of domestic work by the *evlatliks* starting at the age of five or six until marriage.

Just as poor households, which have their livelihood strategies for alleviation of poverty and improvement of well – being, middle and upper class households have strategies of reproduction and improvement of overall well- being. The *evlatlik* institution is a result of the interface between the rural poor and /or vulnerable

²⁷ We accept the fact that power imbalances do exist between biological family members . In fact, power (in)balance are at the center of the discussions on gender division of labor. However, this study will bring out subtle nuances that perpetuates gender

²⁹ The phrase “quasi-adoption” is used to distinguish between the status of *evlatliks* and legally- adopted children, who acquire the legal rights, such as inheritance rights, of biological children. *Evlatliks* are not children who are legally-adopted at the time of arrival to the quasi-adoptive family. The practice continues to exist, but it is rare. *Evlatliks* are also different from “foster children”, who live with a family other than their biological family for a temporary period of time. Foster parenting (*koruma aileciligi*) is a form of child protection which was recently introduced into law in 2000. The practice is not widespread.

households' strategies alleviate poverty and urban middle class households' strategies to reproduce themselves through the use of unpaid domestic labor and fulfill their class identity by engaging in what appears to be charity and "giving" at first sight. Pushing and pulling forces of gender and class relations in Turkish society created this institution. On the one hand, middle and upper middle class households needed help for reproductive household labor. On the other hand, poor and /or vulnerable rural households with multiple children needed better living conditions for their children in urban households. Their intention was to have, at least, one less mouth to feed (*bir agiz eksiltmek*).

By tracing the life cycles of evlatliks through different households, I hope to develop a dynamic understanding of poverty, well-being and social reproduction.

The first set of questions will explore the transfer of the young female children from rural households to middle and upper class urban families in order to live/work until marriage. Was such a transfer part of a widespread "livelihood approach" for rural people in Turkey? Or, was it a coping strategy in response to an economic, political, ecological crisis or stress in households and/or communities which at a certain juncture made it very hard for families to reproduce themselves in particular the girls who were sent away as evlatliks? Do rural families have the sufficient material assets and resources to sustain their families? Were the biological households poor in absolute or relative terms? Did they perceive themselves as poor in relative or absolute terms? Was the evlatlik phenomenon a common misfortune? How is the evlatlik practice perceived by poor rural families? Is it seen as a misfortune or an opportunity for young girls? Is there a stigma attached to the institution from the point of view of poor rural communities? Do evlatliks have both of their parents at the time when they leave their biological homes to go to their pseudo-families? Are they orphaned? What were the assets of the biological family? How did the remaining siblings fare economically in comparison to the evlatliks? How was the well-being of evlatliks affected by the move to the pseudo-family? Did it improve or decline? Do biological family members benefit from evlatliks' new networks that developed during their life in pseudo family households in the urban areas?

Historically, reproductive labor has always been women's and girls' responsibility while intensifying during economic crises. In fact, household members can cope with external shocks by increasing household activities by female members. Needs that are provisioned through the market before the shocks can be provisioned within the household using more time of the female members. Why did the biological families not use the labor of the girls without sending them away? Do rural poor and vulnerable households see the need for reproductive labor in middle and upper middle class households? Do rural families see their daughter's reproductive labor as girls' assets? What are the decision-making mechanisms? How do the biological families find/identify the pseudo-households? What would happen to evlatliks if this institution did not exist?

The second set of questions will probe reproduction issues through the lens of class and gender relations within the pseudo households. In order to assert their roles within the household especially in relations to the husband and/or elder parents, women from middle and upper class households organized household tasks that are done by lower class women, both paid and unpaid. Do pseudo families make use of paid

domestic labor while they have evlatliks in their households? What are the differences between these two forms? Why and how do both forms co-exist? How are evlatliks different from paid domestic laborers? Are evlatliks treated differently than pseudo families' children? Do they go to school? Do evlatliks acquire skills, job training? What is their relation to the pseudo parents? Do pseudo parents provide them with assets, money transfers? What kind of other social networks can evlatliks use while they are living with the pseudo family as well as after forming their own households? Do they have close relations with pseudo families' children? What are the processes through which emotional attachments are created? Can we observe non-material dimensions of poverty, vulnerability and the coping mechanism?

Biological relations to a poor rural household, and institutional relation to a well-off urban household creates ambiguous results for evlatlik in her own household. The third set of questions will emphasize the evlatliks' relations within their own nuclear households. The pseudo family as well as the biological family may strengthen or weaken evlatlik's bargaining power within her own household vis-a-vis her husband. How do the relations with the biological and pseudo family develop after evlatliks form their own households? Can she claim any assets, resources from her biological family? Does she benefit from rural relatives' agricultural activities? Are there any in kind transfers to her own household? Can evlatlik's children benefit from the social networks of their pseudo families? How does the well-being of evlatliks compare to the well-being of their biological siblings?

The fourth set of questions will examine the processes through which such an institution appears, evolves and disappears. How and why did it disappear? Did it indeed disappear or get transformed into a different practice? Does the disappearance or transformation signal a change in the livelihood strategies of poor rural families, or demographic changes or the rise of new opportunities for poor rural households? Or does it signal a transformation in the provisioning of reproductive labor for middle and upper class households?

Section 5: Conclusion

Increased criticisms about neoclassical economics, emergence of the human development approach, open-ended discussions in domestic labor debate, and above all rapid socio-economics around the world, open up spaces to consider old ideas such as "wages for housework" in the new context.

Unfinished

REFERENCES:

Anderson, B. 2000. *Doing the Dirty Work? The Global Politics of Domestic Labor*, London: Zed Books Limited

Anti- Slavery International (Maggie Black).2000. An In-Depth Study on Domestic Workers in the World, Social Alert Edition: Series: Research on Human Rights, Brussels

-----2002a. A Handbook of Advocacy; Child domestic workers, finding a voice, W. Sussex: The Printed Word

-----2002b. Child Domestic Workers: A handbook for Research and Action, ILO-IPEC

-----2006. Child Domestic Workers: A Handbook on Good Practice in Programme Interventions, ILO-IPEC

Antonopoulos, R. 2007. The Unpaid Care Work –Paid Work Connection, The Levy Economics Institute, Working Paper

Aslop, R. 1993. “Whose Interests? Problem in Planning for Women’s Practical Needs”, *World Development*, Vol 21, no.3, pp. 367-377.

Barker, D. 2003

Barker, D. and Kuiper, 2004,

Beneria. L. 1979. “Reproduction, production and the sexual division of labor” *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, vol. 3, pp. 203-225

Benston, M. 1971. “The Political Economy of Women’s Liberation” In *Voice from Women’s Liberation*, edited by Leslie Tanner, New York , New American Library.

Clark, D.A.2005. *The Capability Approach: Its Development, Critique and Recent Advances*, Global Poverty Research Group, Working Paper 032

Chin, C. B.N. 1998. *In Service and Servitude: Foreign Female Domestic Workers and the Malaysian Modernity Project*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Dalla C. and J. 1972. “*The Power of Women and the Subversion of the Community*”, Bristol, Falling Wall Press.

Dercon, D. 2001. *Vulnerability to Poverty: A Framework for Policy Analysis Assessing Vulnerability to Poverty*, DfID paper.

Gardener, Jean. 1997. *Gender, Care and Economics*, London, Macmillan Press Limited.

Kanbur and Squire .2001.

Jaggar, A. 1983. *Feminist Politics and Human Nature*. Totowa NJ: Rowman and Allenheld.

Jefferson, T and John E. K. 2004. "Never Intended to be a Theory of Everything": Domestic Labor in Neoclassical and Marxian Economics" in *Feminist Economics Vol.7 No. 3*

Mallos, Ellen (1980) The Politics of Housework

Molyneux, Maxine. 1979. "Beyond the Household Debate" *New Left Review, number 116, July-August*.

Moser, C. 1989. "Gender Planing in The Third World: Meeting Practical and Strategic Gender Needs", *World Development, Vol.17, no 11, pp.1799-1825*

Nelson 1999, 2003

Qizilbash, M. 2001 "A Note on the Measurement of Poverty and Vulnerability in the South African Context" Paper Prepared for the Development Studies Association Conference 2001: "Different Poverties, Different Policies", University of Manchester

Sen, A. 1981.

Sen, A. 1992. *Inequality Reexamined* (Oxford, Clarendon Press).

_____.1993. Capability and Well-being, In M. C. Nussbaum and A. K. Sen (Eds), *The Quality of Life* (Oxford, Clarendon Press).

_____.1999. *Development as Freedom*, (Oxford, Oxford University Press).

Statistics South Africa (1996) *Census in Brief*, (Pretoria, Statistics South Africa).

Foreman, A. 1977. "Femininity as Alienation: Women and the Family in Marxism and Psychoanalysis. London, Pluto Press.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, P. 2001. "Domestica: Immigrant Workers Cleaning and Caring in the Shadows of Affluence". Berkeley: University of California Press.

ILO 2004. Understanding Child Domestic Labor and Responses to it: Helping hands or Shackled Lives. International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC)

-----2005a Against Child Labor: Progress and Future Priorities, ILO-IPEC , Geneva.

-----2005b . Every Child Counts: New Global Estimates on Child Labor, ILO-IPEC, SIMPOC , Geneva

Palmer, P. 1989. *Domesticity and Dirt: Housewives and Domestic Servants in the United States, 1920-1989*. Philadelphia. Temple University Press.

Parrenas, R.S. 2001. *Servants of Globalization: Women Migration and Domestic Work*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Philip, D and Rayhan, I. 2004. "Vulnerability and Poverty: What are the causes and how are they related, Term paper for Interdisciplinary Course, International Doctoral Studies Program at ZEF, Bonn

Ravallion, M. 1998. "Poverty Lines in Theory and Practice," Living Standards Measurement Study Working Paper 133, World Bank, Washington DC.

Silvera, M. 1983. *Silenced: Talk with working class Caribbean Women about their lives and struggles as DWs in Canada*. Toronto: Sister Vision.

Tong, R. 1989. *Feminist Thought: A Comprehensive Introduction*, Boulder Colorado, Westview Press.

Young, I. 1981. *The Limits of Dual Systems Theory*. In Sargent 1981

APPENDIX A

Table 1: Identified Persons:

NAMES	Search for participant	City of current Residence	Contact	Accepts/Reject participation or NA *
P1	Own experience	Mersin	D	A
P2	Exfam	Mersin	D	A
P3	Exfam	Mersin	D	A
P4	Exfam	Mersin	D	A
P5	Exfam	Tarsus	D	A
P6	Community	istanbul	I	A
P7	Community	Mersin	I	A
P8	Community	Mersin	I	A
P9	Snowball	Adana	I	A
P10	Snowball	Ankara	I	A
P11	Snowball	Mugla	I	A
P12	Snowball	Alanya	I	A
P13	Snowball	Alanya	I	A
P14	Snowball	Alanya	I	A
P15	Snowball	Alanya	I	A
P16	Snowball	Mersin	I	A
P17	Snowball	Mersin	I	A
P18	Snowball	Ceyhan	I	A
P19	Snowball	Tarsus	I	A
P20	Snowball	Tarsus	I	A
P21	Snowball	Mersin	I-i	A
P22	Snowball	Mersin	I-i	A
P- 1	Exfam	Deseased	NA	NA
P-2	Exfam	Cyprus	NA	NA
P-3	Snowball	Silifke	I	R
P-4	Snowball	Mersin	I	R
P-5	Snowball	Anamur	I	R
P-6	Snowball	Anamur	I	R
P-7	Snowball	Anamur	I	R
P-8	Snowball	Antalya	I	R
P-9	Neighbor	Avusturalya	NA	NA
P-10	Neighbor	Not found	I	NA
P-11	Snowball	Tarsus	I	NA
P-12	Community	Not found	I	NA
P-13	Snowball	Istanbul	I	R
P-14,15	Snowball	Mersin	I	R
P-16	Snowball	Adana	NA	NA
P-17,18	Snowball	Kadirli	I	NA
P-19	Snowball	Mugla	I	R
P-20 to -26	Snowball	Alanya	I	R

KEY TO TABLE 1

P1: Participant 1 (to participant 22, P22)

P-1: prospect participant 1 who did not participate (to prospect participant -26, P-26)

Exfam: Extended family

Community: where researcher grew up

Snowball sampling is a special non-probability method to reach desired sample characteristic due to its rare existence or invisibility. It may be extremely difficult and costly to locate respondents in such situation. This method relies on referrals from initial persons (participants) to generate additional subjects. In case of accurate referrals cost of search may be reasonable (less than expected). The most critiqued issue is sample bias. The technique itself reduces the likelihood that the sample will represent a good cross section from the population. (Denzin and Lincoln 1998, 2003)

EMPIRICAL NOTE:

As discussed in empirical section, *evlatliks* as non-family members of households³⁰ cannot be traced through larger surveys such as labor force, census and demographic and health surveys (DHS) since their status is ambiguous. In a best-case scenario, censuses should be ultimate sources to trace information; education, employment, health status of this non-family members, the invisible population³¹. The study is based on open-ended unstructured interviews³² with *evlatliks* and personal experience³³. Pre-field work activities started over the long distance phone conversations with own family members and childhood community members who currently live in Turkey as well as extensive use of electronic mail through different networks in Turkey. After starting actual fieldwork, snowball method³⁴ was used to find prospective participants.

Out of 48 prospective participants, 20 participants were directly and 2 women were indirectly³⁵ interviewed and interviews were tape-recorded³⁶(see table 1 in Appendix A). 26 prospect participants gave different reasons for not participating (see table 2 in Appendix A). 8 out of 26 argued that their lives were not relevant to the study. During initial conversations with prospective participants, a lot of similarities regarding their experiences and current state emerged. However, this does not detract from the rich variations among the individual stories of the participants. (Miles and Huberman 1994, Lincoln and Denzin 2003).

³⁰ Population census, demographic health surveys, labor force surveys are major sources to examine non-family member within the households.

³¹ Alternative living arrangements (coping strategies) exist in: old parents live in their children's, relative' and kin's household; young rural girls/boys may live with relatives in the urban area. Unmarried middle aged women may live with relatives; Such coping mechanisms create diverse processes and outcomes for girls and boys for men or women.

³² Prior to the interviews over 40 questions were prepared to give some structure to researcher. However, in order to be able to understand participants' point of view i.e. her world, interview must be flexible, objective, empathetic, persuasive and one has to be a good listener. Unstructured interviews should be creative (Douglas Jack 1985 "creative interviewing") interviews close to oral history. How to rules should not apply (Denzin and Lincoln 1998). Researcher should adapt herself in changing situations. Long hours of socialization is necessary for the participant to feel free and familiar to the researcher. A bond has to be created between the two. Rushing into information gathering would not be fruitful.

³³ Fullbrook (2004) reiterates demands of economics students from 17 countries in an Open Letter to all economics departments calling on them to reform economics education and research by adopting the broadband approach. Interdisciplinary dialogue, empirical grounding are possible through expanded research methods: "procedures such as participant observation, case studies and discourse analysis should be recognized as legitimate means of acquiring and analyzing data alongside econometrics and formal modelling. Observation of phenomena from different vantage points using various data-gathering techniques may offer new insights into phenomena and enhance our understanding of them." (p.5)

³⁴ Snowball sampling is a special non-probability method to reach desired sample characteristic due to its rare existence or invisibility. It may be extremely difficult and costly to locate respondents in such situation. This method relies on referrals from initial persons(participants) to generate additional subjects. In case of accurate referrals cost of search may be reasonable (less than expected). The most critiqued issue is sample bias. The technique itself reduces the likelihood that the sample will represent a good cross section from the population. (Denzin and Lincoln 1998, 2003). A part from telephone and e-mail contacts, I attended some tea parties (kabal gunu) at middle and upper middle class households to be able to reach out to prospect participants.

³⁵ Participants information was gather from their pseudo sibling.

³⁶ On request of five participants tape recording was not used. Instead researcher took notes.

Table 2: Reasons for declined interviews and obstacles for reaching out prospective participants

NAMES	Declined without explanation	Sick	Can not handle	Wrong address	No address and/or phone found	Initial meetings without final interviews	other	moved overseas
P-1							dead	
P-2							M	
P-9								M
P-16								M
P-10					NA/P#			
P-3		S						
P-4	X							
P-6			E					
P-5		S						
P-8						NOFI		
P-7						NOFI		
P-11				WA				
P-17					NA/P#			
P-18					NA/P#			
P-14	X							
P-15	X							
P-12				WA				
P-13			E					
P-20 to26						NOFI		
P-19	X							

X: Declined without explanation

S: Sickness

E: Cannot handle her past

WA: Wrong address

NA/P#: No address and/or phone number

NOFI: No final interview given continued follow up efforts

M: Moved

APPENDIX B

Questions to stimulate open-ended unstructured interviews with the evlatliks:

Participants name, age, sex, date of birth and place

1. Approximate date of becoming a member of the current (past) household? How old were you when you first arrived to the pseudo household?
2. Do you remember why you started to live with this family? Who brought you for the first time?
3. Do you have any contacts with your biological family? Were you able to visit them? Were they able to visit you?
4. Do/did you want to go back to your biological family? Yes or no? why?
5. Do/did you want to stay in this family? If yes, why. If no, why. Until when?
6. Can you describe your life with this family? Do you think your “work” (your experience within the new household has anything to do with economics? What was/is your contribution in this household? (I will try to learn about perceptions of evlatliks about work/life)
7. Did the new household have more than one non-family member? Were there older evlatlik in the new household when she arrived? If yes, how old were the elders when she first arrived?
8. Where did your biological family live? Do they live in rural areas, slum, squatters? Do you send money or in kind presents? to your biological family and/or relatives?
9. Did your biological family own assets? (land, house, farm animals). Did they have access to other resources?
10. How many siblings did you have? What are their ages, educational level, current living arrangements.
11. What is your parents’ educational status?
12. Do you use your birth name? Or, has your birth name been changed after arriving to the new household? Do you have national identity card? When was it issued for the first time?
13. How many biological children did the new household have? Do you remember their ages? (approximately).
14. Do/did both parents in the new household work outside home? What were parents’ occupation?
15. Did/do you go to primary/secondary school or literacy courses? Or, did/do you go attend any skill development courses such as sewing, cooking etc courses?
16. Did you have other opportunities if you decided to leave the new household? What were the alternatives if you had left the new household?
17. When did you first start to do housework? Did you do cleaning, cooking, gardening, shopping, ironing, childcare? Who taught you these activities?

18. Were there other evlatliks in the same household or neighborhood?
19. If other evlatliks exist in the same household and/or neighborhood, did you spend leisure time with them?
20. Did you get any kind of payment (cash or in-kind even if you don't receive daily fee-monthly salary) during certain times of the year such as holidays (bayram), new year? Does the family provide clothing and other personal needs?
21. Can you tell me about your day; when did you wake up and what was the routine? When did you go to bed and when did you eat your meals? Did you take any breaks? Who decided about your rest hours, wake-up and sleep time, breaks?
22. What happened when you got sick and need personal care?
23. Where did you sleep?
24. Did you eat your meals with the family at the same table?
25. Did you have close relations with the members of the family? Who were you most close?
26. Did you travel with the family? Did you go to visitations with them?
27. Did you have an arranged marriage? Did the pseudo household give you gifts such as jewelery, cash, household appliances, furniture etc?
28. What is your husband's occupation? How many children do you have? What are the ages, education and etc.
29. Have you done any work outside home after marriage?

Questions to stimulate open-ended unstructured interviews with the "pseudo household" members who had domestic workers.

1. Why did you prefer evlatliks?
2. Did you work full time outside home when you had evlatliks in the household?
3. What did evlatliks do in your household? What were their primary responsibilities?
4. Do you think this is an historical phenomenon? Do you think it is cultural, regional, religious practice?
5. How did you find evlatliks?
6. Could you compare and contrast paid and unpaid domestic work whom you employed? Did you shift to daily paid workers? Why did you shift to daily paid workers?
7. Did the domestic worker join family events?

8. Did the evlatliks socialize with guests at your house? Did they only take care of domestic chores or able get to know, exchange information.
10. Did you send your evlatlik to your neighbors', relatives' or friends houses to do occasional chores?
11. Did evlatliks have their free time? Who planned their daily schedule? Was there any set schedule?
12. Did you take care of evlatliks personal needs?
13. Do you have same age children/teenagers/young adults in the household how did you treat (evlatliks) and your own children? How did you balance? Draw the lines?
14. Did you take her to vacations, visitations to friends and family?
15. Did you give them daily allowance?
16. Did you provide any opportunity for job training?
17. Were evlatliks counted as your household members during population censuses?