T.R.
YILDIZ TECNICAL UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES MASTER'S PROGRAMME

MASTER'S THESIS

DOMESTIC WORKERS AND POVERTY: A COMPARATIVE APPROACH ON TURKISH AND MIGRANT WOMEN

SAFİYE GÜL AVCI
11728011

THESIS ADVISOR
Assoc. Prof. SETENAY NİL DOĞAN

İSTANBUL
2019

T.R.
YILDIZ TECNICAL UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES MASTER'S PROGRAMME

MASTER'S THESIS

DOMESTIC WORKERS AND POVERTY: A COMPARATIVE APPROACH ON TURKISH AND MIGRANT WOMEN

SAFİYE GÜL AVCI
11728011

THESIS ADVISOR
Assoc. Prof. SETENAY NİL DOĞAN

İSTANBUL
2019

TC
YILDIZ TEKNİK ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
İNSAN VE TOPLUM BİLİMLERİ ANA BİLİM DALI
TEZLİ YÜKSEK LİSANS PROGRAMI

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

DOMESTIC WORKERS AND POVERTY: A COMPARATIVE APPROACH ON TURKISH AND MIGRANT WOMEN

Tezin Enstitüye Verildiği Tarih: 19.12.2018
Tezin Savunulduğu Tarih: 16.01.2019

Tez Oy birliği ile başarılı bulunmuştur.

	Unvan Ad Soyad	İmza
Tez Danışmanı:	Doç. Dr. Serenay Nil Doğan	
Jüri Üyeleri:	Prof. Dr. Ayşegül Baykan	
	Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Aslı Tolseren Örengin	

İSTANBUL
OCAK 2019

ÖZ

EV İŞÇİLERİ VE YOKSULLUK: TÜRK VE GÖÇMEN KADINLAR ÜZERİNE KARŞILAŞTIRMALI BİR YAKLAŞIM

Safiye Gül Avcı

Ocak, 2019

Bu tez, Türk vatandaşı ve yabancı uyruklu göçmen ev işçisi kadınların çok boyutlu yoksulluğunu anlamayı amaçlamaktadır. İstanbul'da gerçekleştirilen yarı yapılandırılmış mülakatlara dayanan bu çalışma, ev işçisi kadınların yoksulluğuna yol açan çeşitli ama birbiriyle ilişkili nedenleri toplumsal cinsiyete duyarlı bir yaklaşımla anlamayı hedeflemektedir. Bu amaçla, ev işçisi kadınların yoksulluk deneyimleri alt başlıklarıyla birlikte üç ana bölümde analiz edilmektedir: Birinci bölüm, ataerkinin ve maddi yoksunluğun ev işçisi kadınların yaşam tercihleri –eğitim ve evlilik- üzerindeki yoksullaştırıcı etkilerine odaklanmaktadır. Çalışma, bu yolla, maddi yoksulluğun, eğitimden yoksunluğun ve geleneksel değerlerin kadınları nasıl güçsüzleştirdiğini ve iş gücü piyasasına katılımlarını nasıl etkilediğini anlamayı amaçlamaktadır. İkinci bölüm, ev işçisi kadınların işteki deneyimlerinin ve buna bağlı sorunlarının üzerinde durmaktadır. Bu bölümde, özellikle enformel bir istihdam alanı olarak ev hizmetlerinin etkileri ve kadınları nasıl yoksullaştırdığı üzerinde durulmaktadır. Üçüncü bölümde ise, çalışma ev işçiliğinin kadınların bireysel ve aile yaşamına ve gelecek beklentisine etkilerini odak noktası yapmaktadır. Burada, yaptıkları işin kadınların hayatına bireysel temelde bir katkıda bulunup bulunmadığına dikkat edilirken, aynı zamanda kazandıkları gelir üzerinde kontrolleri olup olmadığı sorgulanmaktadır. Bu analizler yoluyla, bu tez ev işçisi kadınların yoksulluğunu çok boyutlu çalışmakta ve yoksulluk tartışmasını yalnızca parasal konulara sıkıştırmak yerine, kadın yoksulluğunun önemli bir parçasını oluşturan yoksullaştırıcı ve güçsüzleştirici etkenleri anlamayı ve keşfetmeyi mümkün kılmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yoksulluk, Ev Hizmetleri, Ev İşçisi Kadınlar, Toplumsal Cinsiyet, Çok Boyutlu Yoksulluk

ABSTRACT

DOMESTIC WORKERS AND POVERTY: A COMPARATIVE APPROACH ON TURKISH AND MIGRANT WOMEN
Safiye Gül Avcı
January, 2019

This thesis aims to understand multi-dimensional poverty of local and foreign female domestic workers. Based on semi-structured in-depth interviews conducted in İstanbul, it aims to discover multiple but interrelated causes of their poverty through a gender-sensitive approach. To this end, domestic workers' narratives are analysed under three main parts along with the sub-headings: The first part focuses on the impoverishing effects of the patriarchy and the material deprivation on domestic workers' life choices - education and marriage. In this way, the study aims to understand how material poverty, lack of education and conventional values weaken women and affect their participation into the labour force market. The second part dwells on domestic workers' experiences while performing their job and the related problems in detail. In this part, especially the effects of domestic service as an informal employment field is analysed to understand how it impoverishes their lives. The third part concentrates on the influences of the job on women's individual and family life and their future prospects. While giving considerations to whether the job enhances their lives on an individual basis, the study also questions if female domestic workers have a control over their income. Through these analyses, this thesis studies women domestic workers' poverty multi-dimensionally and does not trap the poverty discussion only into monetary issues, and thus making it possible to understand and explore other impoverishing and weakening factors which comprise an important part of women's poverty.

Keywords: Poverty, Domestic Service, Women Domestic Workers, Gender, Multi-dimensional Poverty

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I must express my very profound gratitude to my thesis advisor Assoc. Prof. Setenay Nil Doğan, without whose guidance, support and patience this thesis might have been incomplete.

I am grateful to Prof. Dr. M. Sait Özervarlı, who always supported me throughout my thesis. Special thanks to Assoc. Prof. Didem Gürses, whose lectures provided the initial inspiration for this thesis.

I owe thanks to Prof. Dr. Ayşegül Baykan and Faculty Member Aslı Telseren Ömeroğlu for their encouragement and support.

I am indebted to all participants of this study who not only shared their life stories and tears with me but also provided sincere help to support this study. Without their participation, this thesis would not have been possible.

İstanbul; January, 2019 Safiye Gül Avcı

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ÖZ iii
ABSTRACT iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ..... **v**
TABLE OF CONTENTS ..... **vi**
1. INTRODUCTION **1**
1.1. The Aims of the Study and the Research Questions 1
1.2. The Significance of the Study 3
1.3. Methodological Framework 5
1.4. Research Design 6
1.5. Limitations of the Study 7
2. POVERTY 8
2.1. What is Poverty? 8
2.2. An Overview of Attempts to Define and Measure Poverty 9
2.3. New Poverty, the Working Poor and Social Exclusion 11
2.4. The Appearance of Poverty in The World 15
2.5. The Appearance of Poverty in Turkey 16
2.6. Women's Poverty 18
2.6.1. What is Women's Poverty? 18
2.6.2. Women's Poverty in Turkey 23
3. DOMESTIC SERVICE 26
3.1. What is Domestic Service? 26
3.2. Domestic Service in Turkey 30
3.2.1. Legal Framework and Social Security Coverage 33
3.2.2. Organization and Unionization of Domestic Workers in Turkey 42

4. A DISCUSSION ON DOMESTIC SERVICE: THE INTERSECTION OF POVERTY AND GENDER 44
5. THE RESEARCH RESULTS 55
5.1. Demographic Information of the Interviewees 55
5.2. The Beginning of the Story: The Effects of Patriarchy and Material Deprivation on Life Choices 55
5.2.1. How Do They Decide To Become A Domestic Worker? 59
5.3. Being A Domestic Worker 62
5.3.1. Why Do They Prefer Domestic Service? 62
5.3.2. Working Conditions and Types of Employment 66
5.3.3. Relationships with Employers and Violence at Work 72
5.3.4. Social Security Coverage, Occupational Health and Safety and Union Participation 74
5.4. The Influences of the Job on Domestic Workers 80
5.4.1. The Meaning of the Job 80
5.4.2. The Effects of the Job on Personal and Family Life 81
5.4.3. Domestic Workers' Control over Their Income 84
5.4.4. Future Plans 86
6. CONCLUSION 89
BIBLIOGRAPHY 99
APPENDICES 110
Appendix 1. Interview Questions 110
Appendix 2. Interview Details 111
Appendix 3. Demographic Information of the Interviewees 112
Appendix 4. Quotations From the Interviewees 113

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. The Aims of the Study and the Research Questions

Domestic service which can be defined as the employment of workers mostly in private households to do tasks like cleaning, cooking, child care or personal service is almost exclusively performed by women both in Turkey and the world. ILO (2010) estimates that women comprise 83 per cent of domestic workers in the world. As for Turkey, although TUIK predicts the number of domestic workers as 121,000, Erdoğdu and Tokgöz (2013) put forwards that the number is far higher as the domestic work market is mostly an informal employment field and women are predominantly employed as domestic workers. Undoubtedly, the main reason lying behind this fact is the gender roles attributed to women and men by patriarchy. As housecleaning, child care, cooking or more precisely maintaining a house are the foremost duties assigned to women, and consequently they are believed and even are made to believe that they are naturally qualified in such tasks, women then fit paid domestic service perfectly.

When bringing female domestic workers into focus, it is seen that they perform their job in an informal employment area. This mostly means low social status and heavy working conditions predominantly without any social security. So, it can be said that as they work in the domestic service market that is dominated by traditional gender roles to improve their material conditions, they come across new deprivations and new dimensions of poverty which cannot be explained merely on an income basis.

This study aims to explore and understand local and foreign female domestic workers' poverty in Turkey in a multi-dimensional way. Although the most common connotation of poverty is low income or the absence of it, as Townsend (2006, 5) suggests "income is itself no less problematic a concept than poverty". In relation with this, Sen (2009) points out that each person has different needs and in terms of attaining similar standards of living, the resources they should have vary in accordance with these requirements.

Buğra (2007, 75) states that poverty is related to both economic issues and the political, cultural and social conditions which affect poor people, and therefore related solutions should go beyond income. As it is put forward by Gündoğan (2007), Şenses (2008) and Suğur et al. (2010), traditional views that employment, hence having income will save people from poverty have been invalid in that the changes in economic structures, starting from the 1980's, have brought about the working poor who work mostly under heavy conditions, without any social protection and cannot escape from permanent poverty.

Studies have also shown that the influences of poverty on women and men are different (Chant, 2006; Sen, G. 2008; Bora, 2007), and hence have brought to the fore the concept of women's poverty. The focus on insufficient income has also been criticized harshly in women's poverty studies: As Fukuda-Parr (1999, 99) and Chant (2008, 26) point out, women's poverty cannot solely be based on insufficient income and we should focus on various deprivations in many dimensions to understand it. Medeiros and Costa (2008, 25) maintain that "If intra-household inequalities were taken into consideration, we would probably find that the current figures of the levels of income or consumption poverty among women are underestimated."

Hence, this study also intends to shed light on women domestic workers' poverty with a gender-sensitive approach. Regarding the relationships between women domestic workers and poverty, this study argues that domestic workers' poverty is closely related to the nature of the job they perform. That is, they perform domestic work which is attributed to any woman by nature. Since domestic work is mostly undervalued and is invisible even when performed by the lady of the house due to the fact that it is based on the repetition of household chores and/or care work, the result does not change when it is performed in return for money. As a consequence of this and as it will be discussed in the following chapters, the undervaluation and invisibility of domestic service can be seen both in laws and workplace in many forms, which comprise different aspects of domestic workers' poverty. Furthermore, in order to attain a complete picture of women domestic workers' various poverty experiences, the processes which take them to this job and the effects of the job on their lives should also be taken into account, as none of these are free of traditional gender roles.

To this end, this study analyses local and foreign domestic workers' multi-dimensional poverty in Turkey on three levels: Firstly, the study focuses on the processes domestic workers go through before they start domestic service. That is, it specifically dwells on their educational background and marriage decisions and the effects of patriarchal order and material poverty on these life choices. In this way, the study also aims to find out whether these processes have an influence on their choice to be a domestic worker.

Secondly, the study concentrates on domestic workers' position and their experiences in the domestic service market in Turkey. While examining the working conditions, their relationships with employers and different forms of violence they face at work to determine the impoverishing effects of these factors, the study also deals with legal issues like social security coverage, occupational health and safety, and related laws to find out whether domestic workers are represented adequately in laws and if they are aware of their legal rights.

Lastly, the study analyses the effects of the job on domestic workers' lives and tries to discover how it influences their individual, social and family life; whether they have control over their income and if this income helps them ameliorate their life conditions and future prospects.

1.2. The Significance of the Study

The literature available on domestic workers in Turkey mostly concentrates on local and migrant domestic workers separately. The main focus of the existing literature can be categorized into three main categories: Firstly, defining the working conditions of domestic workers and related problems;[1] secondly, analysing and defining employee-employer relationship[2] and thirdly, their social networks which help them find a job.[3] As for the poverty literature, domestic workers are generally covered in the research related to the working poor and women's poverty. While in women's poverty studies domestic service is handled as a strategy to cope with

[1] See, for instance: Karaca and Kocabaş, (2009); Karadeniz, (2008); Erdem and Şahin, (2010).
[2] See, for instance: Kalaycıoğlu and Rittersberger-Tılıç, (2001); Özyeğin, (2005); Bora, (2005)
[3] See, for instance: Kalaycıoğlu and Rittersberger-Tılıç, (2005)

poverty, the research on the working poor focuses on economical, social and legal aspects of domestic service.[4]

This study aims to contribute to the field mainly in three points: Firstly, as domestic service is performed by both local and migrant women in Turkey, this dissertation holds a holistic stance on women domestic workers without excluding any group. Although the existing studies, which concentrate on local and foreign domestic workers separately with differing aims, provide significant information about them, this viewpoint may lack such a comparative perspective and miss the common grounds where both groups meet while turning their gender roles into a labour-intensive business. So, this dissertation brings local and foreign women together in the research with a view to understanding the dynamics and the impoverishing effects of the domestic service market in Turkey better.

Secondly, this study considers domestic service not as a strategy which provides women a way out of their poverty, but rather regards it as a new source of poverty in their struggle to ameliorate their material conditions, because domestic service market basically operates on the basis of informality. While doing this, the study does not only focus on the work life, but it also gives consideration to its effect on domestic workers' lives on individual, familial and social levels.

Thirdly, although this dissertation particularly dwells on female domestic workers' poverty, it also aims to unveil the hidden/unseen aspects of women's poverty in general. This study argues that any poverty study which concentrates on a specific group of women will be inadequate as long as it does not take into consideration all the processes which constitute the background of women's poverty. To be more precise, instead of taking a picture of the current situation, it is essential to find out and understand the effects of the factors like traditional gender roles on their poverty. Besides, in accordance with a gender-sensitive approach, this study deliberately neglects the amount of the income domestic workers earn. Instead, it is interested in whether this income helps them transform their lives meaningfully on an individual level and whether they have a control over it, which is of crucial importance in women's poverty studies and yields the invisible nature of women's deprivations.

[4] See, for instance: Kardam and Yüksel, (2004); Suğur et al. (2008)

As a result, this study provides a relatively broader picture of domestic service which operates on the processes at the intersection of gender and poverty, hence sheds light on local and foreign domestic workers' multi-layered and multi-dimensional poverty experiences in Turkey.

1.3. Methodological Framework

Studying poverty only through quantitive methods will be incomplete, as poverty is a multi-dimensional phenomenon which requires paying attention not only to monetary issues but also to the specific conditions of the poor. This study focuses on poverty experiences of both local and foreign domestic workers in İstanbul in order to give them voice and understand their poverty from their own perspectives.

As Chambers (2006, 4) puts it, when the meaning(s) or definition(s) of poverty are produced by the non-poor through their mindsets in a patronizing manner, they do not reflect the reality and what actually matters is to give the poor themselves the chance to express it. Hence, in order to achieve this, a qualitative data collection method should be adopted, and that is why this study also adopts a qualitative method to analyse and understand the relationship between poverty and women domestic workers.

This study's stance on poverty analysis is shaped and informed by Amartya Sen's "Capability Approach" to poverty. Sen (2009) argues that when analysing people's well-being, one should focus on the opportunities they have instead of being trapped into the means they possess, like income. Sen (1995, 15) considers poverty as a combination of different deprivations

> "from such elementary physical ones as being well nourished, being adequately clothed and sheltered, avoiding preventable morbidity, and so forth, to more complex social achievements such as taking part in the life of the community, being able to appear in public without shame, and so on".

In this way, Sen (2000, 3) highlights the need to focus on people's "impoverished lives" rather than solely looking into their "depleted wallets".

Furthermore, Sen's approach provides important insights in terms of gender-sensitive poverty analysis. Robeyns (2001; 2003) maintains that the Capability Approach is both "an ethically individualistic and ontologically non-individualistic theory" in that it enables us to address every person in our normative judgements; however it does

not separate them from the social and environmental spheres they interact with. As a result, she proposes that the approach should be embraced by feminist research since

> "ethical individualism rejects the idea that women's well-being can be subsumed under wider entities such as the household or the community, while not denying the impact of care, social relations, and interdependence between family or community members" (2003, 65).

With this aim, this study is based on semi-structured in-depth interviews which are conducted with 14 domestic workers in İstanbul between August and October in 2017. During the interviews, the interviewees were asked eight questions[5] and these questions were elaborated in detail in accordance with respondents' answers.

1.4. Research Design[6]

The research was carried out with 14 domestic workers in İstanbul, 7 of whom are Turkish citizens and 7 of whom are foreign. Since domestic work is predominantly performed in informal sector, I reached the interviewees with the help of my social network and some of the interviewees who participated in the study.

The interviews were conducted in different districts of İstanbul: Gaziosmanpaşa, Beylikdüzü Gürpınar, Bağcılar, Avcılar, Fatih, Kağıthane Çeliktepe, Sefaköy, Mecidiyeköy, Göztepe Merdivenköy and Ataköy. While arranging the interviews, the time and the place were determined by the interviewees themselves. Seven interviews were made outside in a café or a restaurant, 2 in employers' houses, and the rest were carried out in domestic workers' houses.

All the interviewees participated in the study are currently working domestic workers and self-employed, although some of the foreign participants were tied to an agency before. The interviewees were informed about the aims of the research before the interviews. After assuring them confidentiality and anonymity, I wanted them to choose a pseudo-name for themselves. Before the interviews, I also asked their permission to use my mobile phone to record their voice. Except for 2 foreign and 2 local domestic workers, the others gave permission.

I completed the interviews within approximately three months. The interviews lasted between 45-120 minutes. 13 interviews were conducted in Turkish and 1 in English.

[5] See, Appendix 1.
[6] See, Appendix 2 for interview details.

I myself transcribed and translated the recordings. Along with the transcriptions, I also made use of my field notes to get them ready for analysis.

1.5. Limitations of the Study

Firstly, this study is limited to a group of domestic workers who perform their job in İstanbul. Although İstanbul as a metropolitan city creates a big market for domestic service, expanding the research to other cities may yield additional outcomes, which may have gone unobserved in this study.

Secondly, this study does not include any domestic worker who is a member of domestic workers' unions operating in Turkey. During my field work, I had the intention of meeting with the union leaders of Evid-Sen and İmece in order to have information about their activities in detail and get in touch with some members for an interview; however as one of them stated that they were too busy and the other accepted my request at first, but then did not keep in touch, it was not possible to arrange a meeting. Including some members from these unions may have yielded some important data about how their activities benefit domestic service sector; in what respects and to which extent domestic workers can seek help from these unions and whether being a union member really provides them with necessary tools to cope with problems they face.

Thirdly, although some of the foreign interviewees were previously tied to a domestic work agency and shared their related experiences, none of the local interviewees work or have any experience of that kind in this respect. As a result, the study does not provide information about the specific conditions of local domestic workers who work with an agency in Turkey.

2. POVERTY

2.1. What is Poverty?

Townsend (2006, 5) maintains that the most common connotation of poverty has always been "low income", yet "income is itself no less problematic a concept than poverty". Considering the "1 dollar a day" poverty line, for example, Mowafi (2004, 4-5) states that this provides a problematic results in terms of poverty as any person with "3 dollars a day" can be poor, too. Undoubtedly, monetary definitions and related solutions prove to be insufficient as it has been observed that enhancing economic growth hasn't eradicated poverty, and found solutions to the individual and social needs of the poor. (Townsend, ibid.; Mowafi, ibid.) As Wagle (2002, 156) points out apart from economic means, individuals also need some other resources such as social, psychological or political means to maintain their lives.

Buğra (2007, 75) states poverty is related to both economic issues and the political, cultural and social conditions which affect poor people, and therefore solutions to poverty should go beyond income and employment opportunities should be put forward accordingly. She highlights that taking into account the problems women or ethnic minorities face due to some traditional, cultural or political reasons, raising their income will not be sufficient to alleviate their poverty, for example. When income increases in a household where men are given priority, there will be no or little chance for a woman to acquire necessary capabilities to deal with poverty (Buğra; ibid.). Or, in case of ethnic minorities, the problems they face are different and likely to cause their exclusion from society in different aspects (Buğra, ibid.)

Similarly, studies by Gündoğan (2007), Şenses (2008) and Suğur et al. (2010) show that traditional views that employment will save people from poverty have been invalid in that the changes in economic structures have brought about the working poor who work mostly under heavy conditions, without any social protection and cannot escape from permanent poverty. Hence, it has been seen that a poor quality job mostly worsens the condition of the poor rather than ameliorate it.

As a matter of fact, poverty studies have shown that just as there is not a clear-cut definition of poverty nor can there be a simple solution to it, since poverty varies according to specific circumstances and individuals experiencing it (Alkire and Sarwar, 2009, 3-5). Therefore, for the purpose of uncovering its multi-dimensional and multi-layered aspects, efforts have been initiated to analyse poverty in different contexts and under various sub-categories, each of which sheds light on from differing perspectives and offers related solutions (ibid.).

2.2. An Overview of Attempts to Define and Measure Poverty

Poverty has long been focused on by world governments and institutions. In an attempt to reduce poverty, different definitions and various tools have been developed and adopted to measure it.

In income-based approaches which study poverty, two definitions of poverty have been proposed: absolute poverty and relative poverty. In general terms, Wagle (2002, 156-157) states that absolute poverty refers to the deficiency of fundamental needs, mostly physiological, for survival while relative poverty can be defined as lack of income in comparison with others in the society. That is, in relative poverty, people are considered poor when they fall under the overall living standard of a society they belong to, and therefore relative poverty varies from one society to another (Wagle, ibid.) While absolute poverty has been an international tool to measure poverty, as it is the case in the World Bank, which devised 1 dollar/a day poverty line in 1990, relative poverty measurement has been adopted by national governments for reaching domestic data (Mowafi, 4-5).

In the following years, as it was understood that income-based approaches are not adequate to bring solutions to poverty, multidimensional approaches were sought for, one of which is Human Development Index (HDI) concept developed by United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (Mowafi, ibid., 11). In 1990, UNDP started to publish Human Development Reports (HDP) and later integrated Human Poverty Index (HPI) in those reports (Alkire and Sarwar, ibid, 7). With this approach, the aim was moving beyond economic concerns in terms of development and enlarging people's choices and freedoms to live a decent life (Bhardwaj, Ansari, Rajput, 2012, 303).

HDI was first developed by Mahbub ul Haq with the aim of putting people at the center of development discourse instead of economic concerns (Bhardwaj, Ansari, Rajput, ibid, 306) To produce the Human Development Reports, Mahbub ul Haq brought together a group of well-known development economists; however, the Capability Approach of Amartya Sen, provided the underlying conceptual framework for the HDI (Bhardwaj, Ansari, Rajput, ibid.). As it is stated by Mowafi (ibid., 18), Sen emphasized the importance of increasing people's abilities to have "a life they value" and believed that this is the core of the development.

In accordance with this idea, three basic concepts ("life expectancy, education and decent standards of living") were included in HDI and these have been used to evaluate long-term progress among countries (Mowafi, ibid, 11). In 2010 HPI was replaced by Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI), which identifies multi deprivations in the same household in terms of "education, health and standards of living" (UNDP, [13.04.2015]). In addition to MPI, UNDP incorporated Gender Inequality Index (GII) into HDR's, which analyses gender-inequality in terms of "reproductive health, empowerment and economic activity" (UNDP,[14.04.2015]).

Apart from objective measurements such as absolute poverty, relative poverty or HDI, subjective poverty perspectives were also developed to gather information about poverty from the poor themselves (Wagle, 2012, 158), as it is the case in this study, too. To that effect, "participatory poverty assessments" were put into use and one of the most outstanding examples of this approach was the World Bank's effort in 1998, which resulted in the publication of "Can Anyone Hear Us? Voices from 47 Countries" (Narayan et al, 1999).

Poverty has also been expressed and studied with respect to location, as rural and urban poverty. The first, as the name suggests, focuses on rural population, economy and political systems and their effects on poverty (IFAD, 2011). Studies show that global poverty mostly is a rural phenomenon as 70 per cent of the developing world are poor people who live in rural areas and the global percentage of poor people in rural areas will not fall below "50 per cent before 2035" (IFAD, ibid.). This high poverty rate in rural areas generally results from five challenges: 1) reliance on natural resources to attain livelihood 2) informal economy 3) cultural and linguistic differences 4) low population density and geographical constraints 5) women's lack of access to income generating programmes and social services (ibid, 42-69).

Like rural poverty, urban poverty also has its own intricate and multidimensional features. The related research reveals that the world's urban population will equal to its rural population and this rise is expected to reach nearly 5 billion in 2030 (Baker, 2008,1). Baker (2008) points out that this increasing rise in urban population basically stems from both natural population growth and rural-to-urban migration. He explains that as those in rural spaces are attracted by job opportunities and services in cities, and sometimes escape from social and cultural limitations in rural areas, they migrate to urban locations, and as a result it is clearly seen that as long as rural poverty continues and is not reduced, it also affects and adds to urban poverty. Hence, as an outcome of this population growth, while some benefit from opportunities here, others especially with low skills face new challenges and a new form of poverty here, as it will be discussed in the following section (ibid., 4-5). Among those challenges, the most important are "inadequate employment, unsatisfactory working conditions and lack of social protection; insecure and unhealthy living conditions, and inequality and exclusion in social sphere" (ibid, 4-10).

2.3. New Poverty, the Working Poor and Social Exclusion

Işık and Pınarcıoğlu (2001a, 70-73) and Erdem (2006, 344-345) state that new poverty, which is basically a result of the transformations in economy, differs from earlier poverty phenomenon and definitions. They also highlight that new poverty is not simply related to only income problems; but it is rather a condition in which people are devoid of necessary capabilities, social and family ties to enhance their current situation, and hence are excluded from the system socially, politically and economically.

Within the context of Turkey, new poverty has arisen as a result of the urbanization and transformations in the economy and it has been discussed with its social exclusion aspect. Buğra & Keyder (2003, 6-9) and Işık & Pınarcıoğlu (2001a, 40, 77; 2001b, 32, 37) explain this process as below: The mechanization in agriculture and the industrialization in cities during the 1950's started a rural-to-urban migration. The migrants, who participated in the labour market in urban settings, settled in the outskirts of cities and built shantytowns (*gecekondu mahalleri)* here, which enabled them to establish solidarity networks for both the current residents and new-comers.

While this mechanism provided the newcomers with a shelter, it also helped them find a job easily and be informed of employment opportunities with the assistance of early-comers. Considering all these, the poverty experienced in that context had a transitory nature, which could be "transmitted" from early to new migrants in Buğra and Keyder's terms (2003) or the poor could experience "poverty in turns" as Işık and Pınarcıoğlu (2001) put it.

After the 1980's, however, the temporary poverty changed into new poverty which is characterized as permanent by nature. Buğra and Keyder (2003), Erman (2003) and Adaman and Keyder (2006) maintain that that transformation can be said to have resulted from such inter-related factors as de-industrialization in cities, transformation in the economy, globalization and capitalism. They maintain that during import-substitution period, producing goods for internal market created employment opportunities with social protection in both state institutions and private sector; yet in subsequent years, the privatization of state enterprises, globalization and increased competition led to decrease in formal employment. These processes, therefore, resulted in the expansion of informal employment, which means temporary jobs with low wages.

Hence, those transformations that brought about a new poverty definition introduced new concepts into the field such as the working poor and social exclusion (Suğur et al., 2010). "The working poor" refers to economically active population who has difficulty with making ends meet (Gündoğan, 2007, 1-2). Over the past 30 years, it has been observed that poverty does not only affect the unemployed, and the traditional view that engagement in any employment would lift the poor out of poverty has been questioned (Kapar, 2010, 53). Basically, this situation can be said to stem from three causes: "low income, high number of dependants in a family and low labour force attachment" (Crettaz&Bonoli, 2010, 10). While all these factors can cause in-work poverty altogether, sometimes one or two of them lie behind it (ibid.)

To begin with, one point to be elaborated here is low income. Crettaz and Bonoli (ibid., 10-12) state that what is meant by low income in case of in-work poverty is not the individual earnings of a worker but rather the total income of a household s/he is responsible for. They highlight that whether low income causes in-work poverty is actually related to household size, its needs and characteristics and add

that the number of people in a household, their employment status, other social transfers they receive, namely their total income determine in-work poverty. So, a household in which there is more than one person working with even low wages may not be considered poor, whereas a crowded household in which there are dependants such as children, the old or the disabled with only one person working with even relatively high income on a full-scale job covered by social security is included in in-work poverty category (Crettaz&Bonoli, ibid.).

Another underlying factor of low labour force attachment is to be discussed in relation with informal employment. Within the context of economy, informality means the absence of registration of firms, social security coverage or employment contracts (ILO, 2014, 5). In other words, those activities are either not included in the law; thus performed informally or although they are included in law, the law is not put into use, so they are not covered in practice (ibid.). With regard to the definition of informal employment, although it can vary according to national circumstances, the Seventeenth International Conference of Labour Statisticians defines it in general terms as below (ILO, 2014):

> "the total number of informal jobs, whether carried out in formal sector enterprises, informal sector enterprises or households, during a given reference period. These comprise: own-account workers and employers employed in their own informal sector enterprises; contributing family workers, irrespective of whether they work in formal or informal sector enterprises; employees holding informal jobs, whether employed by formal sector enterprises, informal sector enterprises or as domestic workers employed by households; members of informal producers' cooperatives; and own-account workers engaged in the production of goods exclusively for own final use by their household"

Globalisation, capitalism and the transformations in economy which increased the presence of informal employment in the market also made the presence of the working poor more visible. As it is stated in the report prepared by ILO (2014), "workers in the informal economy face higher risks of poverty than those in the formal economy". Considering the studies by ILO (ibid), Gündoğan (2007) and Şenses (2008), this can be attributed to two reasons: Firstly, it is seen that those who are employed in informal sector are characterized by "high illiteracy rates, low skill levels, insufficient training opportunities, deunionization and the decreasing collective bargaining power". Secondly, informal employment brings along many impoverishing effects for the employees like low and irregular income, long working hours, poor and unsafe working conditions, vague employment status, the absence of employment contracts, exclusion from or partly inclusion in social security schemes,

and the lack of other labour protection legislations (ILO, ibid; Gündoğan, 2007; Şenses, 2008).

While all those precarious and unsecure characteristics of informal employment add to the vulnerability and invisibility of the working poor in urban sphere, they also bring along the risk of social exclusion. EU social inclusion process defines social exclusion as;

> "[…] a process whereby certain individuals are pushed to the edge of society and prevented from participating fully by virtue of their poverty, or lack of basic competencies and lifelong learning opportunities, or as a result of discrimination. This distances them from job, income and education opportunities as well as social and community networks and activities. They have little access to power and decision-making bodies and thus often feeling powerless and unable to take control over the decisions that affect their day to day lives"(Eurostat, 2010, 7).

At this point, it is noteworthy that there is a reciprocal relationship between income poverty and social exclusion. In some cases like religious or ethnic discrimination or insufficient capacity, exclusion can lead to income poverty; yet income poverty itself may be the cause of exclusion and thereby discrimination as the poor do not have sufficient and necessary means to keep in touch with the society economically, politically or culturally.

Studies conducted by Eurostat (ibid.), Ekim (2007) and Adaman and Keyder (2006) shed light on different aspects of social exclusion: Economic exclusion occurs in case of unemployment or loose relationships with labour market (Eurostat, ibid.). While lack of political representation or access to decision-making bodies stands for the political part of the exclusion; differences like ethnicity add a cultural dimension to the problem (Ekim, ibid.). Given the fact that the poor concentrate in neighbourhoods where people with similar profiles live, it is also possible to mention spatial exclusion (Eurostat, ibid.). When analysed in more depth, income poverty causes education-related exclusion especially with respect to children, gender-related exclusion with regard to women and health-related exclusion due to the absence of health care services or social security (Eurostat, ibid.; Ekim, ibid.; Adaman&Keyder, ibid.).

Considering the multi-dimensional and multi-layered features of the working poor, informal employment and social exclusion, a unique and agreed-upon solution is out of reach (Gündoğan, 2007, 99). The concept of working poor itself comprises a large number of different profiles. For instance, the working poor in Turkey can categorized as "casual workers, unpaid family workers, those who work in

agriculture and construction sector, informal employment or small-scaled businesses, foreign and women workers" (Gündoğan, ibid.). Similarly, workers in informal economy differ widely in many respects such as income, status in employment, sector or location. Their income can be regular or seasonal; they can be employee, employer, own-account workers, casual workers or domestic workers; they can work in agriculture, industry or trade or they can work in urban or rural areas (ILO, 2014). With regard to social exclusion, the severity and underlying causes of exclusion will be different in cases like gender, ethnicity, disability or lack of education and necessary skills (Buğra, 2007). Taking into account this diversity, each category or group has its own problems that require different solutions. Therefore, in an attempt to ameliorate the poor's working and living conditions and to include them into society as equal citizens, all those aspects should be handled in a broad perspective by social policy-makers.

2.4. The Appearance of Poverty in The World

The study conducted by Olinto et al. (2013) reveals that the number of people living in extreme poverty by more than 700 million has been reduced over the last decade; however, nearly 1.2 billion people were still captured in poverty in 2010. It is stated in the study that although the fight against poverty in the developing world has been successful as a whole, in Low Income Countries (LICs) the progress has been much slower and while poverty has fallen by more than a half in middle and high income countries since 1981, extreme poverty has fallen by less than a third in LICs. In other words, despite the falling rates of extreme poverty, the number of poor people in LICSs has increased by 103 million between 1981 and 2010, and this results from the average income among the poor that remains almost as low as it was in 1981. Thus, LICs include most of the extremely poor in the world (Olinto et al. , ibid.)

World Bank (2016) reports that considering the profile of the poor in the world, it is seen that they predominantly live in rural areas in large households with high number of children and are mainly young people with low education who are frequently employed in agriculture. According to the report, this means that rural inhabitants are more than three times poorer than the urban residents and the likelihood of people who work in agriculture to be poor are more than four times when compared to people working in other sectors.

Olinto et al. (2013) also show that poverty rates are specifically high among children. A third of all poor in developing countries are children aged between 0-12. They also draw attention to the gender gap in education among the poor and highlight that women aged 15-30 have less schooling than men of the same age group, and this rate is less than half among the non-poor. However, the report prepared by World Bank (2016) suggests that global studies do not include complete data on gendered poverty as these studies focus on the total and per capita household income/consumption and lack information on the intra-household discrimination and unequal practices within the household. Furthermore, with respect to access to basic services, there are large gaps between the poor and the non-poor. While 87 percent of the latter group has electricity and is twice more likely to have water and three times more likely to have sanitation, among the poor just under half has electricity (Olinto et al., ibid).

2.5. The Appearance of Poverty in Turkey

The 1980's were an important structural transformation period for Turkey in that the new economic programme led to essential changes in social structure, and poverty which was prevalent in rural areas during that period became visible also in urban settings due to the obligatory migration in the 1990's (Taş & Özcan, 2012). The economic crisis between 2001 and 2009 caused bankruptcy and layoff on a large scale and poverty risk increased for the majority of people in the society (ibid.) As a result, Taş and Özcan (ibid) state that the process of globalization, neoliberal policies and the economic crisis resulted in an increase in poverty, and thus in income inequality. However, during the years between 2010 and 2011 there was a rapid improvement in economic field and the effects of the economic crises decreased (ibid). On the other hand, Gürsel, Anıl and Acar (2013) point out that regardless of the decline of poverty especially among low income groups, poverty was notwithstanding prevalent in 2010 due to the fact that one out of every five people were unable to meet their basic needs such as food, shelter and clothing.

The study conducted by Acar and Başlevent (2014) with a view to analysing in which situations households experience or escape poverty shows that the household head's employment status, schooling rate and household size are mostly connected to poverty status changes. Furthermore, in the study, they reveal that home ownership

and “the number of different types of income such as social welfare, rental or retirement contribute to the probability of moving out of poverty”.

As for child poverty, Gürsel, Uysal and Köksal (2016) maintain that seven million out of twenty million children experience poverty and this case is mostly common in regions such as Mediterranean, Central Anatolia, Northeast Anatolia and South East Anatolia. In line with this result, they maintain that income inequality between regions affects children and gives way to deprivation of certain basic needs.

The study on income and living conditions by Turkish Statistical Institute in 2015 points out that the share of the top quintile is 46 per cent whereas the share of the bottom quintile is 6.1%, indicating that income inequality between the richest and the poorest has increased by 0,006 point in comparison to the previous year (TUIK, 2016a). In terms of regional results, while Ankara, İstanbul and İzmir have the highest average annual income, regions including provinces such as Diyarbakır, Mardin or Siirt have the lowest average annual income, which refers to income inequality also among regions (TUIK, 2016b). Similarly, the persistent at-risk-of-poverty rate and severe material deprivation are also reported to increase in 2015. Another significant result in terms of schooling shows that while illiterate or literate groups with no education have the highest poverty rate, the group with the lowest poverty rate is higher education graduates. So, considering the statistics it is possible to say that material poverty is still common in Turkey, which requires attention and anti-poverty programs to gap the bridge between the rich and the poor (TUIK, 2016a; TUIK 2016b)

2.6. Women's Poverty

2.6.1. What is Women's Poverty?

Diana Pearce, who coined the term "the feminization of poverty" emphasizes that poverty affects women and men differently (Pearce, 1978). In her article, she explains that

> "Poverty is rapidly becoming a female problem. Though many women have achieved economic independence from their spouses by their participation in the labour force (and in some cases, by divorce), for many the price of that independence has been their pauperization and dependence on welfare" (Pearce, ibid., 28).

Although poverty has always "had a woman's face"[7] as long as people have experienced it, this fact was previously ignored, and that is why Pearce's effort was an important starting point with respect to drawing attention to gender dimensions of poverty. The term "the feminization of poverty", thus, was used and discussed among scholars and in 1995, it entered development lexicon at "the Fourth UN Conference on Women as one of the 12 critical areas of the Beijing Platform for action" (Chant, 2006, 5-6).

Breakthrough as it was, the feminization of poverty as a term was later criticized since its main connotations were female-headed households and insufficient income. As regards the female-headed households, four points have been problematized:

First, Chant (2006) points out that when the feminization of poverty is used interchangeably with female-headed households, we talk about a homogenous women group which ignores the differences and specific conditions among them. However, Chant (ibid) states that female-headed households can include women living on their own as well as those who care for dependent children or older members in the family or even male spouses who do not work due to several reasons such as health or physical disabilities. Yet, as there is not a systematic collection of data disaggregated by such indicators, the results are far from context-specific (ibid.).

Secondly, it is maintained that there is not sufficient or reliable data which proves that female-headed households are always materially poor or vulnerable to material poverty in relation to male-headed households. (Kabeer, 2008; Medioros&Costa, 2008) As United Nations (2010) states that the incidence of poverty are country-

[7] This expression is attributed to human rights activist Tahira Abdullah.
See, Abdullah, [03.02.2015].

specific. In the report, it is stated that whereas female-headed households are more likely to be poor in some areas, in others male-headed households are more prone to poverty. In case of female-headed households where the male partner is absent for a while or work somewhere away, for example, he can contribute remittances to the household and the total income of the family could be quite high (United Nations, 2010). In some other cases, women themselves can choose household headship to have more control over their own lives thanks to the opportunities they acquire through employment (ibid.) As Chant (2006) suggests, proposing female-headed households are poorer or more vulnerable also implies that women cannot do without men, which contradicts everything said in feminist literature.

Thirdly, when the term "the feminization of poverty" simply refers to or overemphasizes female-headed households, this means turning a blind eye to other women living in poor male-headed households or to those in non-poor families. For example, Jackson (1996, 493 as cited in United Nations, 2010, 166) states that in case of non-poor households where women cannot benefit from income or resources adequately and equally to satisfy their own needs, then women's poverty gets concealed under the cover of total family income. As Medeiros and Costa (2008, 25) suggest, "If intra-household inequalities were taken into consideration, we would probably find that the current figures of the levels of income or consumption poverty among women are underestimated."

Lastly, in relation with all these points, the method used to analyse poverty is problematic. Çağatay (1998) explains that it measures the incidence of income poverty among female-headed households and compares it with male-headed ones. She points out that when the unit of analysis is the household, the total family income is divided by the number of people in the household to come up with per capita estimates. She, therefore, maintains that the available data only reveals who is the head of the household, but it does not account for the real situation of women themselves and how equal the intra-household allocation of the income is.

Insufficient income, another focus of interest that came along with "the feminization of poverty", has also been criticized as Fukuda-Parr (1999, 99) points out women's poverty "isn't just a lack of income" and as Chant (2008, 26) suggests "feminization should refer to privation in many dimensions, not just to income poverty". Therefore,

in order to reveal women's privations and understand their poverty experiences better, a gendered poverty analysis has been proposed.

In its broadest sense, gender can be defined as socially constructed roles and expectations attributed to biological sex (Ecevit, 2003, 83). Although gender roles can vary from one culture to another or they can be context-specific such as rural-urban, the most common roles assigned to women are care work and reproductive labour in the household, and the outer world and productive labour is allocated to men as the breadwinner of the family (Sen, G., 2008).

So, the fact that gender roles bring along different expectations from women and men forms the basis of gendered poverty analysis, since those differences go on operating in case of poverty, too. As Whitehead (2003, 8 as cited in Chant, 2006, 30) suggests "men and women are often poor for different reasons, experience poverty differently, and have different capacities to withstand and/or escape poverty".

In line with this observation, gendered poverty studies conducted, for example, by Chant (2006), Sen, G. (2008) and Bora (2007) show that men, for instance, have a tendency to leave their families or absent themselves from the household as much as possible in case of poverty, mostly due to the fact that their image as the breadwinner of the family is damaged and feel a loss of self-respect, though that is not applicable to all of them.

In respect of women, since gendered division of labour causes "the inequality of opportunities for them, as a gender, to gain access to material and social resources (ownership of productive capital, paid labour, education and training) and to participate in decision making in the main political, economic and social policies" (Bravo,1998, 63 as cited in Cepal, 2004, 13), they become much more vulnerable and helpless in case of poverty.

Considering the interrelationship between gender and poverty in terms of women and what it takes from and brings for them, then it is possible to discuss the issue on two levels: 1) how this interrelationship makes them more vulnerable to poverty, 2) what it means to be a woman in poverty.

How gender roles assigned to women make them more vulnerable in case of poverty can be based on the fact that they are rendered devoid of necessary means to integrate into society as an independent individual by means of assigning them

reproductive labour and care work which trap them within the borders of a house as well as devaluing their labour and making it invisible.

Gender roles, mostly in traditional families or developing countries, result in limiting women's access to education which prevents them from having a good educational backgorund and career prospects (United Nations, 2010). Also, as women have no or limited access to income cash, ownership of land/property and inheritance rights, and since they cannot participate actively in intra-household decisions on spending money, their vulnerability increases (Ecevit, 2003).

Women's main responsibility for care work also affects their employment choices. As Kabeer (2008) states that since this responsibility cannot simply combined with the workload and working conditions that formal occupations bring, they mostly choose to be in informal employment, which allows them much more flexibility in terms of time. So, when they work or have to work - in case of divorce, financial troubles in the household or in the event that their spouses die- they enter the labour market at a disadvantage (Addati and Cassirer, 2008 as cited in United Nations, 2010, 98).

Considering their employment, women are mostly seen as own-account workers, contributing family members, street vendors, part-time/home-based workers or domestic workers, which take place in informal employment field (United Nations, 2010). Informal employment means low earnings and -in case of contributing family members- no cash returns for women, and that leads to reinforcing male "bread-winner" model (Heintz, 2008, 13).

ILO (2004) points out that gender roles, not only affect women who are uneducated and lack of necessary skills for a qualified job, but they also have a direct impact on those who work in a qualified job as full-time workers. It is stated that in case of a childbirth, women may resort to part-time work as a solution to balance childcare, family and work responsibilities, if they cannot afford private childcare, nursery schools or count on a relative to do this or if they have no or limited maternity leave and are not provided with related-rights and convenience by their employers. In that case, Razavi and Staab (2008 as cited in United Nations, 2010, 98) state that along with low income and mostly no social benefits, their career advancement is

hampered because part-time work gives the impression that they are not serious about their jobs, thereby pushing them into secondary position in labour market.

All in all, taking into account these outcomes, it is clearly seen that gender puts women in a disadvantageous position in the market, increase their risk of poverty while at the same time decreasing their rights and opportunities when in poverty.

When they are in poverty, women's lives become much harder; as they shoulder more responsibilities and they play an active role in dealing with it (Chant, 2006; Sen, G. 2008). As Pineda-Ofreneo and Acosta (2001, 3 as cited in Chant, ibid, 26) maintain, "the poorer the household, the longer women work". Female altruism which defines "good woman" as "self-sacrificing" can be said to be the main reason behind this notion and it mainly causes women to pay no attention to their own needs such as nutrition, leisure and etc. at the expense of their well-being (Chant, ibid., Sen, G., ibid.).

In relation with this issue, Bora (2007) points out that in times of financial difficulties, women are also mostly responsible for establishing and benefitting from social solidarity networks (informal relationships among neighbours, relatives and fellow countrymen). According to Bora (ibid.), in these reciprocal relationships, they can acquire benefits such as food and clothes, for example, in return for helping with childcare or housework, or in some other examples, poor women help each other bake bread, prepare canned food at home instead of buying them at a higher cost. She highlights that these networks may also bring them or their husbands extra job opportunities such as piece work at home or part-time jobs. In addition, women are known to take active roles in asking for social aid either from governmental bodies or charities since men see poverty as a personal failure due to their gender roles (Bora, ibid.)

This being the case, women whose responsibilities multiply find themselves also in time poverty and as a solution they mostly expect their daughters to take on housework responsibilities by restricting or taking away their play time and education opportunities (Gita, S., 2008). Looking from that perspective, it is clearly seen that poverty not only affects adult women in poor families but in some cases it can also deprive girls of their education rights, which pushes them into vicious circle of poverty in the future.

2.6.2. Women's Poverty in Turkey

Women's poverty in Turkey is closely related to low education and gender roles, which bring along such phenomena as "low labour force participation, low income, being an unpaid family worker in rural areas" or working in informal sector without social security in urban areas (Şener, 2009). In order to highlight the effect of patriarchy on women's poverty, Kümbetoğlu (2002, 130) states that "women's poverty is a result of the unequal gender relation patterns which are confirmed socially".

It is possible to say that inequality in education is one of the most important reasons contributing to the feminization of poverty as women with low education mostly tend to participate in unqualified jobs in informal employment, which means low income and no social or job security (Yıldırımalp & Özdemir, 2013). DPT and World Bank (2009 as cited in Topgül, 2013, 292) suggests that this, in return, gives way to low labour force participation, and thus "under-participation trap" which lead to a vicious circle of poverty for especially poor women who emigrated to urban settlements.

Another important reason that creates this interrelated relationship between education and women's poverty is the traditional view that boys are a good investment for future as they will take care of their parents at their old ages whereas girls are a vain investment since they will be a part of another family (Şener, 2009) Also, the gender roles attributed to women as the care giver of the family determine the fate of girls from an early age and they are assigned to take care of their siblings which can be another obstacle to their education (Sallan Gül, 2005; Tokgöz 2007).

This being the case, those women who are deprived of their rights to education, trapped into the house and made dependant on their fathers and husbands in all aspects are dragged into another trap at times of financial difficulties as they have no eligible marketable skills, and consequently they are doomed to working in poor conditions, which multiply their deprivations (Ulutaş, 2009). For instance, the study conducted by Gürsel, Kolaşin and Dinçer (2009) on female employment reveals that there was an increase in "women's labour force participation" while the percentage of male employment decreased as a result of the global crisis and the condition of Turkish economy. They conclude that nearly all of those women sought for self-

employment such as “house-cleaning, baby-sitting or home production jobs and 121 thousand out of 136 thousand women took part in informal sector”.

So, informal economy which is one of the factors that constitutes both the reason and the result of women’s poverty happens to be another trap for women. As Şener (2009) and Sallan Gül and Ergun (2009) state the more women accept the unfavourable working-conditions of unsecured jobs with low income as a result of their helplessness, the more informal economy develops and the more informal economy develops, the more women maintain their lives as working poor. As a consequence of this fact, Ulutaş (2009) says that women are also pushed out of social security system, which renders them vulnerable to risks in case of sickness, job-related disabilities or deprives them of pension rights.

Considering the gender statistics in Turkey, this interrelationship between education, gender roles, poverty and labour force participation can also be seen clearly. For example, TUIK (2016c) shows that illiterate female population was 5 times more than illiterate male population in 2014. Also, while the proportion of high school and equivalent graduates in 25 and over age group was 23.2% for males and 15% for females, a similar gender gap is also observed in the proportion of higher education graduates as 16.2% for males and 11.7% for females in the same year.

As for the employment and labour force participation statistics, TUIK (ibid) reveals that females’ rate is half of males’ rate. The employment rate was 64.8% for males and 26.7% for females and labour force participation rate was 71.3% for males and 30.3% for females. When labour force participation rate by education status is analysed, it is seen that the higher education status of women increases the participation rate. The participation rate was 16% for illiterate women, 25.8% for women graduated less than high school, 31.9% for women graduated from high school, 39.8% for women graduated from vocational high school and 71.3% for women graduated from higher education in 2014. However, regardless of this increase by education status, women earned less income than men in all education levels. According to Income and Living Conditions Survey 2014 results, a working woman who graduated from higher education has 1.3% lower income than a working man having same education level. The education level in which there is the most income difference between genders is level of less than high school with 1.8% difference.

Another statistics about the reasons of not being in employment clearly reveals the direct effect of gender roles on women as 57.6 % stated that they were busy with household responsibilities (TUIK, 2014). The study by Kolaşin et al. (2015) analysing the labour force participation decisions of high school and college graduate women in Turkey has similar results which are in line with this rate. The results show that gender roles which impose the responsibility of child care and household production on women cause them to have inner conflict when it comes to working, and as a result they mostly absent themselves from labour force.

Given the statistics about the employment status of people who are not registered to any social security institution in October 2016, it is seen that 42,5% is women and 27,1 % is men. Among those women, 94,5 % is employed in agricultural area and a big majority of them works as an unpaid family worker (TUIK, 2014), which is a clear indication of how women's labour is exploited both inside and outside the house especially in rural areas by their families. The rate of those who are employed in non-agricultural area is 24,2 %, most of whom work as a regular and casual employee. This shows that those women are employed in informal sector to earn money with the aim of meeting their temporary needs without having any social security which will protect them against future risks (ibid).

According to the statistics on poverty obtained in 2009, the poverty rates in Turkey are 17,1% and 19% for men and women respectively. However, when they are analysed in terms of rural and urban areas, it seen that women's poverty rate is 40,2% in rural areas while it is 9,3% in urban areas, which supports and shows a similar trend with statistics about unregistered employment (TUIK, 2014).

3. DOMESTIC SERVICE

3.1. What is Domestic Service?

Domestic Workers Convention (No.189), adopted by International Labour Organisation (ILO) on 16 June 2011, defines domestic service as "work performed in or for a household or households" (ILO, 2011a). ILO (2009) states that this work generally includes cleaning, cooking, taking care of children or old members of a family, gardening, driving or caring of household pets. In domestic service, while women are concentrated in cleaning and care services, men generally tend to have the better paying jobs as gardeners, drivers, or security guards (ILO, 2009). Besides, children can be employed in the sector, which comprises another serious and problematic part of the issue.[8]

Chen (2011, 172) points out that domestic workers can be employed directly by a household or through a third-party agency. While live-ins work for a single employer, live-outs tend to work for multiple employers (Chen, ibid.). She also states that they are mostly employed to perform multiple tasks, though they can also be rarely hired for a single task.

ILO (2009) points out that the need for domestic service generally comes from demographic, social and employment trends in the world. The growing number of women participating in labour force outside home creates the biggest demand for this work. Furthermore, ILO (ibid.) highlights that "the ageing of societies, the lack of policy measures to facilitate the reconciliation of family life and work" account for the growing of domestic service. Although domestic service plays a significant role for the economy outside the household to function, it is still "undervalued, poorly regulated, and many domestic workers remain overworked, underpaid and unprotected" (ibid,1). Since domestic service is performed in a house, the employees are mostly women, and since domestic workers provide care to household, thus

[8] As men and child domestic workers are beyond the scope of my research, I will not make a detailed discussion on them.

doing the unpaid labour traditionally performed by women, it is undervalued in monetary terms and is often informal and undocumented (ibid).

Ramirez-Machado (2003) maintains that for women domestic workers, there are several reasons contributing to their participation in domestic service: 1) Being a member of poor family, 2) having little education and few marketable skills or despite medium/high education level, the high unemployment rate in their countries, 3) rural poverty in many countries, 4) devastation of agricultural sector and 5) economic crises (Ramirez-Machado, ibid.). He points out that as result of those main factors, most women in the world are pushed into domestic service market both in their own countries and internationally with a view to supporting their families and providing a better future for their children by turning their traditional gender roles into labour.

ILO (2010) points out that statistical data concerning domestic service, though not conclusive due to its informality, indicates the number of adult domestic workers, regardless of their sex, between 52.6 million worldwide. Considering the data available, it is seen that domestic service comprises 1.7 per cent of total employment in the world, and while domestic work is less prevalent in advanced countries, Eastern Europe and CIS countries, it is much more common in developing and emerging countries (ILO, 2010). As for child domestic workers, Thorsen (2012) states that it is estimated they comprise a high proportion of 250 million child workers in developing world, and domestic work is the largest employment category for girls under 16. This estimation along with other studies which show that domestic service is predominantly performed by women who comprise 83 per cent of domestic workers in the world (ILO, ibid), actually account for why the issue should be handled with a gender-sensitive approach.

Ramirez-Machado (2003) states that given the vulnerable and unequal conditions of domestic service, domestic workers especially women, confront various problems. Long hours of work and heavy workload are the most frequently experienced ones (ibid.) He points out that as domestic service is generally performed on an informal basis and mostly there is no contract to which employers and employees refer, they do not specify a time limit and make a specific job description. Or, even if there is a contract which is prepared by a third party agency, it is to the detriment of employees (ibid.).

This being the case, as ILO (2011b) points out, domestic workers are generally forced to do anything employers demand and cannot leave till they finish the job although they work for low wages, which do not correspond to their efforts. What is more, although they engage in tasks that expose them to risk of injuries or long-term health problems, they cannot seek redress for the harms they receive (ILO, 2011b).

ILO (2013a) shows that another ambiguity that creates trouble for domestic workers is the absence of weekly, monthly, annual or maternity leave periods. When they want to benefit from that right, they mostly face the threat of losing their job. In case of live-ins and migrant workers, ILO (2013b) states that the problem becomes much more serious: As the work place is at the same time where they live, live-in domestic workers are continuously on duty mostly without rest whenever the employer needs them. Furthermore, they lack of a private sphere of their own and mostly face interference in personal affairs. Low quality of accommodation and food are also among the problems they encounter (ILO, 2013b).

Reports by ILO (2009) and Human Rights Watch (2009) reveal that the most common threat foreign domestic workers face is employers' or agencies' confiscating their passports, immigration documents or work permit, and therefore, in the event of an abusive situation they are left helpless. Also, when they leave or lose their job, they are repatriated as work permits are tied to the individual employer or agency; or they face salary reduction if they leave before completing their employment contract (ILO, 2009; Human Rights Watch 2009).

Human Rights Watch (2006) points out that in some cases, foreign migrant domestic workers are even restricted in terms of reproductive, marriage, sexual and religious matters. When they become pregnant, they can be forced to make a choice between having an abortion and going on their job or in case of Saudi Arabia, it can be difficult for them to have an abortion even if the pregnancy results from rape (ibid.). The report also shows that in relation with marriage, foreign migrant women are forbidden to marry local men in Singapore, for example. What is more, regardless of their religion, migrant workers can also be forbidden from freely practicing their own religion (Human Rights Watch, ibid.). Another problem observed in this type of employment is human trafficking, which specifically drives young girls and migrants into forced labour (ibid.). The last but not the least, whether they are local or resident, or work as live-ins or live-outs, the most important and urgent problem that

women domestic workers encounter is physical, psychological and sexual abuse (Human Rights Watch, ibid.).

As Ramirez-Machado (2003) suggests all these problems and disadvantages mentioned above undoubtedly stem from two basic interrelated reasons: As domestic service is performed inside a house far from public eye and is undervalued due to its being a feminine task which is otherwise done without any payment by the lady of the house, it is mostly excluded from labour laws and social protection schemes in many countries, and as it is not frequently handled by legal bodies and not included in labour laws, women domestic workers are deprived of the power to bargain for their own rights (Ramirez-Machado, ibid.).

ILO (2009) states that with the aim of fighting for domestic workers' rights, gender-based discrimination in the sector and improving their conditions, domestic workers have sought for and gathered in collective organizations as of the 1990's in national, regional and international level. The Latin American and Caribbean Confederation of Household Workers, which has member organizations from 13 countries, Canada and an organization of migrant workers in Europe and The Asian Domestic Workers' Union whose members are from Philippines, Thailand, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka can be given as examples for these efforts (ILO, 2009). However, the most important and comprehensive initiative has come from ILO on June 16, 2011 with the adoption of Domestic Workers' Convention, (No. 189) along with Recommendation (No. 201).

It is stated by ILO (2011a), aiming to achieve "Decent Work for Domestic Workers", the treaty has laid down the first global standards for domestic workers, and thus entitling them to the same basic rights as other workers covered in labour laws. In Domestic Workers Convention, protection of the human rights of all domestic workers; their freedom of association and right to collective bargaining; elimination of all forms of forced labour and discrimination; effective protection against abuse, harassment and violence; and fair terms of employment and decent living conditions are set as basic rights of domestic workers (ILO, 2011a). Besides, the treaty stipulates terms concerning hours of work, remuneration, occupational safety and health, and social security. Special standards concerning child, migrant and live-in domestic workers and private employment agencies are also covered in it (ILO, 2011a).

All in all, domestic service, though having a long history[9] and being an ongoing growing market in the world, did not receive attention both in national and international law until a short time ago. ILO (2009) shows that over last years, more countries have begun to pass laws to protect domestic workers or started efforts to handle the issue legally. The report points out that despite all these efforts, however, today in many countries domestic workers are partly covered under labour laws and social protection policies. Even in countries where domestic workers are covered by minimum wage legislation or social protection schemes, they are not covered in practice because of implementation and enforcement (ibid.)

3.2. Domestic Service in Turkey

Domestic service in Turkey has gone through transformations since the Ottoman period. Özbay (2012, 119-120) states that the transformation of domestic service can be categorized under four phases: 1) Pre-capitalism period during which house slaves performed domestic service 2) Nation formation period during which foster children served as maids 3) Capitalist period during which daily domestic workers were hired 4) Advanced capitalism during which foreign migrant women served as nannies and maids (Özbay, ibid.)

Erdem and Şahin (2010) maintain that the need for daily domestic workers is a result of the capitalist mode of production that undoubtedly caused many changes with respect to women's roles not only in the world but also in Turkey. Since women who were previously expected to stay at home and look after the household started to work out, the need for an outsider arouse to bridge the gap between their responsibilities both at home and work (Erdem& Şahin, ibid.). In relation with this issue, Bora (2005) also argues that hiring domestic workers is a strategy adopted by working women who want to be equal to men without defying the gender-based division of labour.

Akalın (2007) suggests that daily domestic workers generally come from families who migrated from rural areas to urban settings as a consequence of changing social and economic conditions of the 1950s. She explains that those women who do not have any other marketable skills and have not worked out apart from agricultural

[9] For a detailed historical account of domestic service, see: Lutz, (2008a).

field have mostly worked as domestic workers in order to support their poor family budgets. Özbay (2012) states that the main reason why daily domestic service is mostly performed by local migrants is related to urban poverty they experience in the cities they arrive, and thus women who are not migrants but experience urban poverty also work in daily domestic service.

Research shows that local domestic workers are mostly self-employed and while some of them work for a single household, most of them prefer multiple employers (Kalaycıoğlu&Rittersberger-Tılıç, 2001; Özyeğin, 2005). Furthermore, as those women come from traditional families and are under heavy control of their husbands/fathers or other male relatives, they work as live-out domestics and generally engage in daily cleaning chores and sometimes as part-time care-givers for children. (Kalaycıoğlu&Rittersberger-Tılıç, 2001; Özyeğin, 2005; Akalın, 2007; Suğur, N., Suğur, S. Gönç-Şavran, 2008). Özyeğin (2005) suggests that the patriarchal control on women's employment can vary in relation to where they live. That is, those who live in shanty (gecekondu) districts or different buildings can be restricted by their husbands since they do not want their wives to work for a stranger. However, janitors' wives are free from this restriction as their husbands allow them to work for households in the building they live in, because they can control them easily (ibid).

Kalaycıoğlu and Rittersberger-Tılıç (2001) state that domestic workers are generally employed by middle-class families. This fact can be attributed to two basic reasons: Firstly, domestic workers are mostly uneducated and unskilled, and consequently they do not have many job opportunities in urban settings (ibid.) Secondly, domestic service is undocumented and out of legal protection in Turkey like many other countries in the world (ibid.). As a result of these factors, Özyeğin (2005) suggests that domestic workers create cheap labour force in the market and even middle class families can afford them. Regarding this fact, hiring domestic workers can also be a sign of status for their employers even if they do not need them (ibid.).

Domestic service generally proceeds on the basis of informality, which means that both domestic workers and employers connect each other through their social networks, namely acquaintances (Kalaycıoğlu&Rittersberger-Tılıç, 2001). By this way, both groups make sure that their employers or employees are reliable. In their study, which examines the relationship between the domestic workers and their

employers, Kalaycıoğlu and Rittersberger-Tılıç (2001) find that a kind of kinship that can be described as imaginary is established between employers and employees, which makes it possible for domestic workers to share their personal problem with their employers and benefit from their social ties. According to Suğur, N., Suğur, S. and Gönç-Şavran (2008), this may sometimes be to the disadvantage of domestic workers as employers can demand for additional tasks and extended working hours in return for their assistance by exploiting that pretended familial relationship.

As for the foreign migrant domestic workers, their participation in domestic service market in Turkey dates back to the 1990's (Özbay, 2012). According to Weyland (1994 as cited in Özbay, 2012, 145), when employees working at multinational companies brought along Filipino domestic workers to Turkey, the hiring of irregular, foreign migrants in domestic service started. However, it is possible to say that foreign migrants became widespread with women coming from former soviet countries (Erdem&Şahin, 2010). Kümbetoğlu (2005) and Kaşka (2009) state that Turkey, which was generally migrant-sending country before, has been a migrant-receiving one since those times; and it has received migrants mostly from Eastern European countries, many of whom are irregular. The reason behind this phenomenon is the economic problems in those countries and the hope of finding a better job in a geographically close country, though some of them have a university degree and a qualified job (Kümbetoğlu, 2005; Kaşka, 2009). Although there is not reliable and conclusive data about those migrants' number, it is estimated that women comprise the majority of them, and a high number of those is employed in domestic service, most of whom are Moldovan, Ukrainian, Bulgarian, Romanian, Georgian, Azerbaijani and Uzbek women (Kümbetoğlu, 2005; Kaşka, 2009).

Foreign domestic workers usually work as live-in domestics, especially as care-givers for children due to the fact that they are not bound by family ties like local domestic workers who themselves have household responsibilities and a patriarchal control over their labour (Akalın, 2007). Akalın (ibid.) maintains that live-in domestic workers are mostly preferred by middle-upper families and these households also hire daily local domestic workers, which means that there is a distinction between both groups in terms of job description. She states that while daily chores and child-care are assigned to foreign migrants, harder tasks are performed by local domestic workers.

Research by Erdem and Şahin (2010) and Özbay (2012) show that most of these live-in domestics are employed through third-party agencies. However, still many of other migrant women who live in lodging houses or get married to a Turkish man are self-employed and work for multiple workers by performing household chores (Erdem&Şahin, 2010). Whatever their type of employment is, yet, it is known that many migrant women, who commonly enter Turkey with a tourist visa, are devoid of work or residential permit; and therefore, they can work under heavy conditions or go through hard experiences due to being irregular (Erdem&Şahin, ibid.) The most common threat migrants face is employers' or agencies' confiscating their passports, immigration documents or work permit, and therefore, exploit them easily (ibid.).

It is possible to say that the main reason behind the problems which domestic workers face is that the job description is not clear, and therefore it is mostly determined by employers. This, in turn, makes domestic workers vulnerable to exploitation easily in terms of jobs to be done and the time spent at work (Erdoğdu&Tokgöz, 2013). This situation worsens in case of live-in foreign migrants; since they are expected to be at hand any time of the day, as Akalın (2007) suggests they are "hired as care-givers, demanded as housewives".

3.2.1. Legal Framework and Social Security Coverage

Erdoğdu and Tokgöz (2013) state that despite the fact that there is a legal framework with respect to domestic workers in Turkey; it cannot be applied because it is both intricate and ineffective. Therefore, the big majority of domestic service in Turkey, whether performed by locals or migrants, is within the sphere of informal economy and undocumented (Yıldırımalp, 2014; Ulutaş&Öztepe, 2013).

Considering the Turkish laws, domestic service is excluded from Labour Law and, as a result, the law does not define domestic service and domestic workers (Karaca&Kocabaş, 2009; Akbıyık, 2013). However, there is a need for a comprehensive legal definition as to what domestic work is and who is called a domestic worker considering that domestic service varies in terms of type of work, e.g. live-in, live-out, one employer or multiple employers (Okur, 2004) Although domestic workers are excluded from the Labour Law and are subject to Law of Obligations, nurses who take care of care of a sick person at home or janitors are included in the Labour Law (ibid.)

Domestic workers in Turkey are covered by Law of Obligations. The work that is not covered by labour laws and transitory work which lasts for less than 30 days are included in this law (Akbıyık, 2013, 217; Yıldırımalp, 2014, 53). The law stipulates that there must be a service contract between the employer and the employee and it defines the" rights, obligations and working conditions of workers" who are included in it (Ulutaş and Öztepe, 2013, 48). In addition, it enforces employers to ensure workplace safety and health; take necessary precautions in order to prevent any harm to workers and protect them against psychological and sexual harassment (ibid.). However, there are not clear specifications peculiar to domestic workers, such as what kinds of risks they have about health and safety issues and what precautions to be taken by employers in domestic work (Erdoğdu and Tokgöz, 2013). Besides, the law does not provide any supervision by authorities and training programmes for domestic workers to make them aware of these matters and their rights (ibid.)

Erdoğdu and Tokgöz (ibid.) state that the reason for this vagueness arises from the fact that domestic service is also excluded from the Law on Occupational Safety and Health, most probably because the work place in domestic service is a private house which cannot be inspected by legal authorities.

Manav (2015) points out that there have been many amendments in Social Security Law about domestic workers since 1964. All domestic workers were excluded from social security coverage in the related law dated 1964; however, with an amendment in 1977, domestic workers *who were employed continually* were included (ibid.)

However positive this change could seem, studies by Okur (2004) and Karadeniz (2008) show that the expression of "continually employed" itself actually excluded the big majority of domestic workers from this right. What was meant by "continually employed" workers was those who worked for a monthly wage and on a basis of service contract (Okur, 2014). Yet, as Manav (2015) states, most of the domestic workers work for more than one employer and although they do not work every day, they perform domestic service on some days of the week or the month regularly, which means that they work continually.

It is stated by Erdoğdu and Tokgöz (ibid) that another change made in 2006 actually worsened the situation for domestic workers, because not only those who were employed temporarily, but also those who worked continually but had "thirty times

lower earnings than the lowest limit of daily earning taken as basis of security contribution" were excluded from the short and long term social security coverage on the grounds that their total working hours in a week were shorter than the working hours determined in Labour Law (4857). With a new amendment in 2008, the previous provision which states that only those who are employed continually was adopted and with Law No:5510 it was acknowledged that as long as it is performed regularly, continual employment could be shorter than 30 days a month (Manav, ibid; Erdoğdu&Tokgöz, ibid). As a result of this amendment, those who work shorter than 30 days a month were hold responsible for paying the remaining social security contributions, and with the Omnibus Law in 2011, it was stated that this would start as of 1 January 2012 (Erdoğdu&Tokgöz, ibid).

As for foreign domestic workers, although Turkish Law on Work Permit for Foreigners (Law No. 4817) enforces both employers and employees to apply for work and residence permit, they mostly work informally and without social security coverage (Kaşka, 2009; Etiler&Lordoğlu, 2010). In 2012, the changes in Turkish Visa Rules aimed at preventing migrants' illegal employment especially in domestic work sector and it was planned to grant residence and work permits especially to migrant women giving care services on the application of their employers (Erdoğdu&Tokgöz, 2013). According to these rules, tourists can stay in Turkey for 90 days in a 180 day period; hence, while previously migrants who entered Turkey with a tourist visa could leave the country for a few days and return again, now in every 6 months period they have to be out of the country for 90 days, which will force them to obtain work and residential permit in order not to lose their jobs (Sabah, [07.06.2015]). Also, with this law, employers are encouraged to register the foreign employees into the social security system, because the premium employers had to pay before this law was indexed to an amount which equalled to one and half times higher than the minimum wage whereas this amount was reduced to minimum wage only (ibid.).

Other regulations concerning foreign domestic workers are about the residential and work permit. In 2012, the Ministry of Internal Affairs declared an amnesty for those illegal immigrants and granted them residential permit for six months on condition that they pay the necessary penalty, and henceforth the procedures concerning residential permit were facilitated (Demirdizen, 2013). With this improvement, it was

also stipulated that the residential permit could only be renewed for four times (ibid.). As for the work permit, the Ministry of Labour and Social Security states that foreign domestic workers have to apply for it with their employers, whether it be in Turkey or in their countries, which means that as Demirdizen (2013) also says they are rendered dependent on employers in term of work permit although the procedures are easy to follow and can be done through the Internet.[10]

The latest change in Social Security Law concerning domestic workers came into force on 1 April, 2015 with Omnibus Law No. 6552. In accordance with this regulation, a new distinction was brought up: Those who work for 10 days or more a month and those who work for less than 10 days a month (Çakar, 2015). The criterion of 10 days is calculated on the basis of the total working hours of a worker in a month. So, if the total working hours add up to 10 days or more, the worker who are employed by one or more employers will be included in social security system; however if the total is under 10 days, the worker will only benefit from occupational accident and disease insurances (Caniklioğlu&Özkaraca, 2016). Manav (ibid.) states that in line with this distinction, a new categorization was also made among people who hire domestic workers. While those who employ domestic workers for 10 days or more are acknowledged as "employers", those who employ them less than 10 days are not considered as such (ibid.).

Çakar (ibid) states that those who work for 10 days or more can benefit from both short and long term security branches, general health insurance and unemployment insurance. He also explains that each employer who employs a domestic worker within this context has to make notification to Social Security Institution with a form specifically prepared for this type of employment. In doing this, the employer has the responsibility of paying 34,5 % of the premiums, 20 % of which is for long term security branches, 12.5 % of which is for general health insurance, and 2 % of which is for occupational accident and health insurance (Caniklioğlu&Özkaraca, 2016). The employer also has to pay a premium by 3 % for unemployment insurance. In case of any occupational accident or disease problems, the employer must make notification through submitting a form to the institution or to e-state database. Those who work

[10] For more information see:
https://www.csgb.gov.tr/uigm/news/evhizmetleribasvuruklavuzu/

for 10 days or more, but not a total of 30 days can pay social security contributions for the remaing days (ibid.).

For those who work than less than 10 days, each service receiver has to pay premiums for occupational accident and occupational disease insurances, which is 2% of the lower limit of daily earnings (Manav, ibid). Service receivers make notifications by submitting a form to the Social Security Institution or through e-state database. With recent amendments in 2016, service receivers can now also submit these notifications through SMS (Esin, [13.02.2017]; Hürriyet, [13.02.2017]). Individuals first register themselves as "service receivers", and then they make notification by providing necessary information about the domestic worker and the employment dates. In this way, the premium expense is included in the telephone bill (ibid.). Domestic workers who want to benefit from long term security branches and general health insurance can pay premiums themselves (Güzel, Okur, Caniklioğlu, 2014).

A last point to be noted about this new regulation is that migrant domestic workers cannot be employed less than 10 days. That is because foreign workers are granted work permit for 1 year, and as a result they cannot be employed as part-time workers according to Law 4817 (SGK, [13.02.2017]). So, people who employ migrants have to register them under the category of "those who work for 10 days or more".

Considering the latest changes in social security coverage of domestic workers, it is possible to say that there are only two positive improvements: First, with this law, it is seen that the procedures to be followed for registration to social security system have been made easier when compared to the past. Prior to this regulation, employers had to follow several steps such as submitting a Workplace Declaration, getting an e-declaration code, arranging a Job Recruitment Declaration and sending it to the relevant Social Security Directorate as well as arranging a "Monthly Contribution and Service Document" and sending it to the same office until the end of the next month (Erdoğdu&Tokgöz, ibid.). However, now they only have to fill in a form through e-state database and in case of those who work less than 10 days, it is as simple as sending a SMS. Thus, this improvement made procedures simpler for "employers or service receivers". Secondly, since the day the law was discussed and put into force, there has been an increase in the news and public service announcements with respect to the issue in terms of domestic workers' rights,

procedures to be followed by employers/service receivers and the sanctions they will face. So, it can be said that these contributed to the encouragement of employers/service receivers to register domestic workers into the social security system.

As to what the law has brought along for domestic workers themselves, there is not too much to say. To begin with, as mentioned before, domestic service is excluded from the Labour Law and the Law on Occupational Health and Security. So, in accordance with laws, domestic workers are not "workers" in legal terms, but they are insured in social security system (Manav, ibid.). Given that this is the case since 1977, there has not been an improvement in this respect. In other words, domestic workers are still excluded from these laws and their right to social security coverage is not new.

Before 2015, the common point in all regulations on social security coverage of domestic workers was that those who worked continually were included into the system, but those who worked on transitory basis were excluded. So, it can be said that the latter group is now given their rights with the distinction of working less than 10 days; however, when analysed closely, the new law is also problematic within itself.

First, a domestic worker who works for "10 days or more" will benefit from both long and short term security branches on condition that she works for the same employer(s) (SGK, [13.02.2017]). That is to say, in order for a domestic worker to benefit from this right, she has to work for only "one employer" at least for "10 days" in a month, which means she can only have three employers totally. It is possible to see examples of those who work for the same employer(s) for many days in a month or only one employer for 30 days; however, this is not common in our country and the big majority of domestic workers work for more than 3 employers in a month (Bianet, [10.02.2017]). So, it is understood that a large number of domestic workers are deprived of their right to fully benefit from social security coverage once again due to the fact that when they work for more than 3 employers, they fall into the category of "those who work less than 10 days". Because, according to the law, if a domestic worker works for a person less than 10 days in a month, she can only benefit from occupational accident and disease insurances. Hence, the result is that even if a domestic worker actually works more than 10 days or even every day

throughout one month for more than 3 employers, she will not be able to benefit from long term security branches.

Taking into account all these, the misleading heading in the law should be highlighted here. When we say "those who *work* for less than 10 days or 10 days or more", we clearly expect a distinction in terms of time spent at work. Yet, in fact the distinction is implicitly based on how many days an employer or a service receiver employ a domestic worker, which implies that the focal point is the employer/service receiver, not the domestic worker. In this respect, maybe such a distinction would be better in order to prevent misunderstandings and wrong interpretations: Those who *are employed* for less than 10 days by one person and those who *are employed* for 10 days or more by one person.

As stated before, those who employ a domestic worker less than 10 days are not deemed an "employer". Thus, as Manav (ibid) points out, according to Law 5510, they do not actually have a legal responsibility of making notifications to Social Security Institution, but they have to pay the premiums for occupational accident and disease insuranse. She also highlights that for those who employ a domestic worker for 10 days or more and do not pay the necessary premiums, the sanctions are stated in the law; however what kind of sanctions, those who are not deemed employers will face is not stated in the law if they do not pay the premiums.

Another problem in relation with this group, as Manav (ibid) states, is that domestic workers can only benefit from occupational accident and disease insurances only if they are registered 10 days before the incident. Supposing that they have an occupational accident or health problem before this duration is completed, they will not be able to get any permanent or temporary incapacity benefits (ibid.). Besides, as the service receiver is not considered as an employer, s/he does not have any legal responsibility in case of any occupational accident in terms taking necessary precautions. Lastly, regardless of how they are included into the social security system, as Ulutaş and Öztepe (ibid.) maintain, all domestic workers are still unprotected against occupational accidents, risks or health problems as a result of being excluded from the Law on Occupational Health and Safety.

Briefly, it is clearly understood that the latest law facilitated the registration process for employers/service receivers and it is possible that it will encourage some of them

to include their employees into the system given that the previous procedures were too complicated for them. Also, making a distinction between individuals on the basis of how many days they employ a domestic worker can be considered as a favourable improvement as those who really received domestic service not continually bu at intervals have been freed from relatively high premium expenses and they only have to pay approximately 1 Turkish Lira for one day service. However, those who get domestic service continually still have to pay around 477 Turkish Liras for 30 days (SGK, [13.02.2017]), which can be considered high by most people and this is in fact one of the basic reasons of why a big majority of people have employed domestic workers informally although they have been legally hold responsible to do so since 1977.

In relation with this, domestic workers have also been given the right to pay premiums to benefit from long term security branches if they do not work for totally 30 days a month since 2012. As a matter of fact, this cannot be thought as a novelty that brings along benefits specific to domestic workers, because there has already been a social security implementation known as "optional insurance" for everybody since 2008 (İşkanunu, [09.02.2017]. As Erdoğdu and Tokgöz (ibid) suggest, considering that domestic workers perform this job to deal with economic difficulties, they do not want to spend money for this. They also point out that, in this case, while local domestic workers can benefit from their husbands or fathers' social security coverage if there is any, foreign migrants totally become devoid of this right.

All in all, despite all the legal framework concerning domestic service, it is seen that only a small number of domestic workers are included into the system and the big majority of domestic service is still performed within the sphere of informal economy (Erdoğdu& Tokgöz, ibid). Erdoğdu and Tokgöz (ibid) attribute the reason basically to three facts: First, domestic service is multi-faceted by its nature; however the relevant laws (Law of Obligations and Social Security Law) have been inefficient, superficial and far from being problem-specific (ibid.). Secondly, they have not been implemented to a large extent as there is not an official supervision mechanism (ibid.). Thirdly, as they are complicated and vague in terms of such issues as job description, occupational health and safety precautions, they deter domestic workers from seeking their rights (ibid.).

Apart from these three basic facts, considering the relevant literature discussed up to that point, it is clear that household responsibilities are undervalued as they are attributed to women as a consequence of gender roles. Even if people get this service in return for money, this attitude continues to exist among even women themselves as employers/service receivers. Also, as a high number of women, whether they are locals or foreign migrants, resort to working as domestic workers in case of financial difficulties, they create a cheap labour force for service receivers, which renders them dispensable easily. So, this creates another dilemma for them: In the event that they want to negotiate for their rights such as working conditions, payment or social security coverage they face the danger of losing their job. Lastly, domestic workers themselves can sometimes be the reason of informality as some of them think that they do this job temporarily till they get out of financial difficulties and find it unnecessary to deal with legal issues.

Hence, it is clear that the state should take on a more active role to include domestic workers into the system. First, it is necessary that the state sign and adopt the Domestic Workers Convention No: 189 prepared by ILO in June 2011. Secondly, domestic service must be included into the Labour Law and the Law on Occupational Health and Security and new regulations specific to this type of employment should be made. Thirdly, the current social security law should be revised in a way that will address the specific working conditions of domestic workers (Bianet, [09.02.2017]).

With regard to the Social Security Law, initially it is significant that the premium expenses should be lowered for those employers who receive this service continually and the state itself ought to contribute to the premium expenses of domestic workers who do not work for totally 30 days a month. Secondly, as it is mentioned above, the law actually makes a distinction on the basis of how many days an individual employs a domestic worker. Although this is important in terms of employers/service receivers, it does not serve domestic workers' needs and conditions as they are deprived of the right to full social security coverage in the event that they work for more than 3 employers a month. So, a better option may be to amend the current law under two categories with respect to employers and domestic workers separately: First, the liabilities of individuals who employ a domestic worker sporadically and those who employ them continually. Second, domestic workers who work

continually and those who work part-time regardless of the number of employers they work for.

Other steps to be taken by the state can be as such: while making all these regulations, it is important that the state also confer with the domestic workers' unions (Evid-Sen and Imece) in order to bring realistic solutions to the problems. In addition, the state should set up a kind of "domestic workers agency or unit", which will provide consultancy both for locals and foreign migrants in case of any problem and run training programmes in relation to their job. Lastly, private intermediacy agencies which make domestic workers work for lower earnings and even confiscate foreign migrants' passports have to be supervised strictly and necessary sanctions must be enforced to prevent the exploitation of domestic workers' labour.

3.2.2. Organization and Unionization of Domestic Workers in Turkey

Domestic workers' organization efforts can be said to have started in 1999, when a group of researchers and activists came together and started "Women Home-Based Workers Study Group" with the aim of increasing the visibility of home-based workers, the majority of whom are women and help them organize in order to empower them (Çarhoğlu, 2011).

However, organizations specific to domestic workers started with the initiatives of Evid-Sen and İMECE. As it is stated in Erdoğdu and Tokgöz (ibid.) and Yıldırımalp and İslamoğlu (2015), a group of domestic workers who participated in meetings held by Genel-İş Trade Union decided to set up their own union in 2009 and as a result they applied to İstanbul Governorate in 2011 under the name of "Ev İşçileri Dayanışma Sendikası" (Domestic Workers Solidarity Union). Later, the governship started a legal action against the union in order to suspend its activities due to the fact that trade unions can only be set up in line with the trades listed in the Law No. 2821, which excludes the domestic service (Erdoğdu&Tokgöz, ibid.). As a result of the judicial processes, however, the Court of Appeal decided that domestic workers can also establish a trade union and Evid-Sen has gained its legal entity in 2014 (Birgün, [12.10.2014]).

As for İMECE, it takes its roots from the "Kadın Çalışmaları ve Dayanışma Derneği" (Women's Studies and Solidarity Centre), which was founded in İstanbul in 2001 with the purpose of fighting for women's rights (Erdoğdu&Tokgöz, ibid.). Later, in

2006, they directed their attention specifically to domestic workers and set up the "İmece Women's Solidarity Association" (ibid.). In following years, with the new Trade Union Law in 2012, they also officially founded the "İMECE Domestic Workers Union" in 2014 (Radikal, [01.04.2014]).

4. A DISCUSSION ON DOMESTIC SERVICE: THE INTERSECTION OF POVERTY AND GENDER

As it is discussed in Chapter 2, starting in late 1980's and throughout the 1990's, globalization, liberalization and privatization in economy brought along many unfavourable consequences all over the world which are all interrelated. The neoliberal policies and structural adjustment programmes changed the agricultural production deeply. The presence of the state diminished in the market as a result of the liberalization policies and manufacturing processes transformed from an organized to a disorganized mode in Turkey in the 1990's (Buğra&Keyder, 2003).

All these basically caused an increase in unemployment and poverty, which in turn forced many people to internal/external migration in search of new job opportunities. Those who tried to integrate into the new economic order mostly found themselves in informal economy whose growth was accelerated by above mentioned processes and which meant new types of employment, poor working conditions, low wages, lack of social security and a decrease in bargaining power of workers (Işık&Pınarcıoğlu 2001; Adaman&Keyder, 2006).

During those processes, the presence of women increased in the labour market, however the new order put most of them at a disadvantage. Ecevit (2007) analyses this phenomenon under three categories: First, women provided cheap, flexible and disorganized labour force for labour-intensive manufacturing industry in export-oriented countries (Ecevit, ibid.). Secondly, they concentrated in new types of employment such as part-time, home-based or other flexible working areas, the majority of which took part in informal economy (Ecevit, ibid.). Thirdly, in countries where sources of income decreased as a result of the structural adjustment policies, migration increased among women, most of whom worked in service sector and domestic service (Ecevit, ibid.).

Ecevit (2007) and Topgül (2013) state that as women worked in informal sector, did flexible jobs or accepted working without contracts they were pushed out of legal protection and social security, and thus were deprived of such benefits as retirement

or general health insurance. So, as Hattatoğlu (2007) suggests although the increase in women labour force was blessed by the supporters of globalization and was shown as a positive improvement for the development of countries, it did not bring benefits to women themselves except for low or temporary monetary relief for their financial problems.

As a result of these developments, migration flows were also observed in Turkey. Considering the internal migration, a flow from the east to the west was observed between 1950-1980's due to economic reasons as a result of the modernization in agriculture (Özbay & Yücel, 2001; Buğra&Keyder, 2003). During the period between 1980 and 1990, there was also a migration flow especially among Kurdish people due to the conflict in eastern and south-eastern regions (Adaman&Keyder, 2006). So, as a consequence of these processes, many women engaged themselves in domestic service in urban settings (Kalaycıoğlu & Rittersberger-Tılıç, 2001; Özyeğin, 2005; Bora 2005).

In addition to local migrants, Turkey also became a migrant-receiving country for foreigners in terms of domestic workers whose participation in domestic service market in Turkey dates back to the 1990's. According to Weyland (1994 as cited in Özbay, 2012, 145), when employees working at multinational companies brought along Filipino domestic workers to Turkey, the hiring of irregular, foreign migrants in domestic service started. However, it is possible to say that foreign migrants became widespread with women coming from former soviet countries, many of whom are irregular (Erdem&Şahin, 2010).

In this context, both local and foreign women found themselves striving in the domestic service market; however, as a result of being an informal employment field, it brought along many new disadvantages for them, which comprises one of the focal points of this study.

Considering the current profile of foreign domestic workers, Sarti (2008) and Lutz (2008) maintain that they are mostly educated and middle-class women, who have to leave their qualified jobs in their countries due to economic problems and come to work as domestic workers to earn higher salaries with the purpose of maintaining their families left behind. Lutz (2002) states that although they have professional skills, those skills are not required in the destination countries, either and what they

are expected to do here is to return to their "natural capacity": cleaning and care work. Friese (1995 as cited in Lutz, 2002, 98) suggests that this is a consequence of devaluation of women education, which leads to "brain waste in the destination countries" and makes them face "the risk of losing their social standing".

In such an atmosphere, foreign domestic workers often face abusive treatment from employers or agencies as they are frequently undocumented workers. This is mostly due to "the strict immigration policies and a relaxed attitude towards the enforcement of the laws against the employment of undocumented migrants" (Sarti, 2008, 90), which forces many women to work as live-ins in order to secure themselves and thus creates a kind of "modern slavery" (Lutz and Schwalgin, 2005 and Sarti, 2005 as cited in Sarti, 2008, 90) on parts of foreign migrants.

Whether they are local or foreign, domestic workers meet on a common ground in terms of financial difficulties and migration in domestic service market in Turkey, and as Wong (2012, 40) states they are mostly exposed to long working hours, physically demanding jobs or low payment, which basically takes its roots from the undervalued nature of domestic labour making them invisible. However, it should not be forgotten that their differences also play a key role with respect to their poverty experiences. Therefore, it is crucial to shed light on domestic workers' poverty and deprivations in a way which will give them voice so as to suggest relevant solutions on a political level, as this study will do.

As it is stated by Townsend (2006), traditional income-based poverty measurement methods fall short of revealing and understanding causes of poverty. The main problem with those methods is that they quantify poverty, which is problematic in many ways: In poverty line measurement, for example, an acceptable line of income is determined; however considering the different contexts and situations people live in, what is satisfactory for one might be unsatisfactory for another (Mowafi, 2004). Also, when taking the household as the basis of analysis, the result does not reveal how equal the income is distributed among family members and particularly hides the real situation of women (Çağatay, 1998). So, it is possible to say that quantitive methods give only numbers and percentages which conceal different experiences and deprivations of the poor. That is why; this study adopts a qualitative method to unveil the unseen deprivations of women domestic workers with a view to understand whether their income contributes to their well-being or not.

As it is stated by Kaga (2012), the development discourse which tries to define and measure poverty cannot succeed in producing solutions to it basically due to two main reasons: First, focusing on only visible signs of poverty and quantifying it means constructing and objectifying the poor, the real subjects of the poverty, who are mostly treated as "helpless and unproductive" part of the society (ibid.). Secondly, approaching poverty only in monetary terms and defining it as an economic problem means turning a blind eye to the political, social and cultural processes which also have a major part in creating it (ibid.)

In this comprehensive study on domestic work, Kaga (ibid.) also states that domestic workers' poverty takes its roots fundamentally from three factors which have many interrelated causes and effects with respect to this issue: citizenship, informal sector and gender.

With the purpose of "repoliticising domestic work", she first attracts attention to the issue of citizenship by defining it on two levels: First, the formal rights and entitlements a person has; secondly, the ability of people to exercise these rights and entitlements. She also highlights that this is the most important point to be focused on, as the majority of poor -although they are considered unproductive and out of political and economical system- actually strive in informal sector and lack the ability to benefit from the legal rights actively, which affects their life opportunities and restrict their representation and recognition politically, economically and socially. Within this respect, domestic workers set a true example for the "structural discrimination" and their situation worsens when combined with a historical degradation of gender, class and race, which brings unfavourable inclusion of women into the system (Kaga, ibid.).

As Wong (2012, 43) suggests while this ideological exclusion contributes to their invisibility more, it has also severe outcomes for domestic workers. In relation with this issue, Parrenas (2001 as cited in Lutz, 2002, 101) states that in case of foreign domestic workers, for example, as long as financial dependencies and new consumption requirements emerge in their families left behind, they have to lengthen their stay in the destination countries, and as long as they are not granted citizenship here, they become devoid of old-age pension, which makes them in return dependent on other family members, for instance their daughters for whom they migrated and worked, in the future.

When considered within this framework, the current situation of domestic workers in Turkey is not an exception, and therefore, this study aims to dwell on and explore all these interrelated and intricate processes with a specific reference to local and foreign domestic workers in an urban setting. As it is discussed in Chapter 4, the legal framework concerning domestic workers excludes them from the Labour Law and the current regulations in terms of social security mostly benefit employers, not domestic workers themselves. This, in turn, causes the majority of them to stay out of the formal system and be stuck in informal sector. So, "these exclusions and 'unfavourable inclusions' may be experienced simultaneously, or not, by different individuals, yet in any form they limit the opportunities and are often causal components of poverty" (Sen 2000; Kantor 2009, as cited in Kaga, 2012).

While analysing domestic workers' multidimensional poverty, Amartya Sen's Capability Approach lays a fruitful ground for this, because it attaches significance to the causes and processes creating poverty and thus aiming to empower the subjects of it with an emphasis on freedom, differences and individuality.

Sen (2009) argues that when analysing people's well-being, one should focus on the opportunities they have instead of being trapped into the means they possess, like income. Sen (1995, 15) considers poverty as a combination of different deprivations ranging from *basic physical needs to social ones like participating in society with dignity.* In this way, Sen (2000, 3) highlights the need to focus on people's "impoverished lives" rather than solely looking into their "depleted wallets".

Sen (1999a; 1999b) discusses that in order to deal with poverty and enhance a real development in that sense, it is important to focus on two interrelated basic concepts: the functionings and capabilities of people. It is possible to define functionings as "what people are and do". Having education, being healthy or benefiting from health services, being adequately nourished or participating in political processes can be given as examples for functionings (ibid.) Capability, in relation with this issue, means having a wide range of functionings which give people choices in order to "have a life they value" (ibid.)

Comparing people who are apparently in similar, but actually different situations can be helpful to illustrate the point. For example, a person who suffers from hunger due to famine in his/her country and a person who is hungry because of going on strike

are different in terms of capabilities. Both of them lack the functioning of being sufficiently nourished; however the former does not have the opportunity to achieve this functioning, while the other has the capability to do it, but chooses to be hungry owing to a cause s/he believes in (Robeyns, 2006).

In this way, Sen (1999b) proposes that in order to enhance people's well-being and take them out of poverty, it is important to provide them with necessary functionings and increase their capabilities, which will give them freedom to choose from many options that fit their lives. While doing this, the focus should be on individuality not equality. That is, there are many variables which shape one's life conditions like family, political or social environment, religion, ethnicity, gender, traditions or individual differences (Semerci, 2007; Robeyns, 2003).

In this way, Sen directs the attention away from traditional poverty measurement methods which only diagnose people with poverty by constructed tools. Within this respect, as Kardam and Yüksel (2004) state his approach is also of crucial importance for a feminist and gendered analysis of poverty.

Robeyns (2001; 2003) maintains that the Capability Approach is both "an ethically individualistic and ontologically non-individualistic theory" in that it enables us to address every person in our normative judgements; however it does not separate them from the social and environmental spheres they interact with. As a result, Robenyns (2003,65) proposes that the approach should be embraced by feminist research because "ethical individualism" supports the idea that women well-being cannot be shadowed by larger bodies like family or society; however it, at the same time, accepts the influence of interrelations between family and society.

Women, who are placed at a secondary position in relation to men and cannot attain basic functionings such as education, property rights, equal and favourable employment or the right to work, active participation in decision making processes in family, society or political area, are therefore devoid of choices, opportunities and obviously capabilities to escape from unfavourable conditions in case of financial difficulties. Besides, it should not be forgotten that gender roles as an impoverishing force can also be at work for all women. As Sen (1999) puts forward, it is not possible to assume that power relations are unbiased in any house, because even if

the household is considered rich, some members are likely to encounter inequity in term of the distribution of income.

Considering the effects of Sen's approach on women's poverty studies, firstly, he opens up the private sphere to discussion and evaluation to bring up solutions in political area, which is a relevant point of view to the idea developed by second-wave feminism - "The personal is politic"- , with his suggestion that women may have many deprivations and different experiences of poverty within the boundaries of home.

This stance enables the researcher to reveal the hidden and different sides of women's oppression and deprivations whether in a poor or non-poor environment, and it is specifically important in terms of evaluating the poverty experiences of domestic workers, which constitute the major focus of this study. The fact that domestic workers perform their job within the boundaries of home and far from public eye has always been an obstacle for them to attain their rights and gain full recognition on a political level. Considering the legal framework, which is discussed in previous sections, domestic workers in Turkey are still excluded from the Law on Occupational Safety and Health since the work place in domestic service is a private house which is beyond the scope of inspection.

Also, working in a private sphere, domestic workers can face many difficulties and abusive treatment such as physical/psychological violence, rape, being accused of theft or confiscating passports in case of foreign migrants. As Becker-Schmidt (1992, 221 as cited in Lutz, 2002, 97) suggests "'What is 'home' to affluent white women has an entirely different meaning for her domestic staff, who experience it as a place of social alienation and exploitation". So, Lutz (2002) maintains that it is important to reconsider the labour theories which "separate the cultural from the political, the private from the public and the reproduction from production", thus causing the invisibility of domestic workers in academic field.

This being the case, as domestic workers cannot prove the unfavourable conditions they are subjected to due to their invisibility, they are not able to demand justice except for some rare cases which receive media coverage. To set an example, a video of an Ethiopian domestic worker, who was dangling from the balcony, was shared in social media by her employer. While she was calling for help, the employer just shot

the video. Although it was initially supposed that the girl was trying to commit a suicide, after she was rescued, the girl claimed that she was trying to escape from being killed by her employer, which might be an indication of why the employer did not help her (Middleeasteye, [15.04.2017]).

Secondly, by maintaining that each person should be evaluated on the basis of their unique circumstances, such as ethnicity, gender, age, culture or geographical regions, Sen avoids ready-made constructions and prioritize differences and diversity to empower the poor accordingly. An approach of that kind is closely related to the ideas put forward by third wave feminism. With a rejection of "a universal female identity and over-emphasizing of the experience of the upper-middle class white woman" (Beingfeminist, [01.04.2017]), "third wave feminism foregrounds personal narratives that illustrate an intersectional and multiperspectival version of feminism and as a consequence of the rise of postmodernism, third-wavers embrace multivocality over synthesis; action over theoretical justification" (Snyder, 2008, 175).

So, the realization that women are of many colours, ethnicities, nationalities, religions and cultural backgrounds helps us understand the uniqueness of their deprivations, poverty experiences and possible causes instead of trying to fit them all in one category as "the poorest of the poor"[11]. That kind of depiction is misleading and futile, because it implicitly suggests that women are poor due to their own characteristics and weaknesses instead of emphasizing the unequal gender relations that constrain the inclusion of women in social, economic and political spheres (Kaga, ibid.).

These two notions, the denial of a general "woman" category and emphasis on diversity, have many implications in terms of understanding domestic workers' poverty. To begin with, paying attention to the language used by many employers in relation to domestic workers in Turkey today, as Özbay (2012, 142) also states, they are mostly called as "woman" among employers. One can easily hear sentences as such: "I need a 'woman'/ The 'woman' will come today". That generic language is not only common in daily life but it is also reproduced in media. One of the most pitiful examples of these is the one written by Hasan Bülent Kahraman in 2010

[11] Chant (2006) criticises the depiction of women as the poorest of the poor in poverty studies instead of focusing on the underlying factors and processes which lead them to poverty.

(Kahraman, [12.01.2014]). Starting with a title of "It is difficult to find a 'woman'", Kahraman goes on calling them "a type of women"; define "that type of women" as reckless (özensiz), unruly (serkeş), pert (laubali); complains about his sorrowful experiences by using a vulgar and sexist language and finishes his story with a sentence of "I am looking for a 'woman'".

In her column, titled "Daily Domestic Workers" (Suda, [12.01.2014]), Pakize Suda similarly shares her encounters with domestic workers. Calling them "my women", Suda criticises domestic workers she employs for being childish (çocuksu), behaving in a know-it-all (her şeyi bilen) manner and ultimately label them as weird (tuhaf). Actually, it is of significant importance to notice that how the word "woman" has come to be an umbrella term which is loaded with many connotations of gender roles, stereotypical expectations from all women and inequalities. As it is also stated by Wong (2012, 41), because domestic work is seen as "intrinsic" to women, in the event that "liberated" women participate in labour force, other women compensate for them within the household. So, using "woman" as a descriptive term for domestic workers is not surprising in itself. As any woman is inherently laid with the responsibility of domestic work, then any domestic worker who performs it will no wonder be called a "woman".

Also, considering the language used to describe domestic workers as reckless, unruly, weird or know-it-all, "woman" becomes a benchmark through which behavioural patterns associated with women is projected onto domestic workers, and thereby criticized. As a "woman", domestic workers should be obedient, undemanding and do not need to know too much. Consequently, the word itself becomes a melting pot where all gender duties and stereotypes meet and thereby erasing the differences, voices and experiences, which neutralizes the "domestic worker" only as a "woman" with negative connotations of a degrading language.

In case of migrant domestic workers, "woman" becomes "foreign woman", which also brings along xenophobic discourse into the field. Banton (1997, 44 as cited in Jureidini, 2003, 1) defines xenophobia as hostility "that is based upon the beliefs around cultural differences". Jureidini (2003) states that xenophobic practices in terms of foreign domestic workers manifest themselves in forms of physical, psychological or sexual abuses; denial of freedom of movement for fear that they may contact other foreign domestics and demand higher wages or have sexual

relationships and get pregnant; exploitative working conditions which means working 16-17 hours a day doing "everything" from cleaning, shopping to care giving.

In 2010, for example, a website by the name of "anneyiz.biz" was taken to the court and closed due to an article titled "Mothers, your attention!". In the article, mothers are advised to confiscate foreign migrants' passports and 20 per cent of their salary for the first three months and not to pay them more than 500 TL (Bianet, [07.01.2014]). In another website called "kadınlarkulubu.com", where women ask and answer questions on common topics, it is also possible to observe how foreign migrants are treated like slaves and exposed to exploitation. Here, while women express their satisfaction with foreign migrants due to the fact that they "do everything" like cleaning and looking after children half the price local domestic workers demand, they also warn each other to be careful about their employees' private life and not to allow them stay outside at nights on their day off (Kadınlarkulubu, [07.03.2014]).

Considering the discourse surrounding domestic workers, another important point to be realized in relation with this issue is that domestic workers are stripped of all their differences and needs by women employers themselves, except for some examples like Kahraman. In her column, titled "It seems that nannies also dance and swim" (Arna, [07.03.2014]), Sibel Arna sets another example for this situation. While Arna is recounting her holiday, she harshly criticizes the nanny and describes her as trouble due to the fact that she also wants to swim. In addition to her own experiences, Arna also mentions her friends' nannies and goes further to such an extent to say "I will bury her head without a diving tube into water" for a nanny who wants to attend a diving course.

In her insightful study, which is based on the premise that understanding domestic labour is not only about a simple distinction like the inequality between women and men, Bora (2005) sheds light on this issue and states such kind of approach will veil other aspects of power relations, namely the power relations between different classes of women. Similarly, as Alarcon (1990 as cited in Wong, 2012, 41) maintains it is erroneous to assume that all women have the same relationship to the household and this stands in opposition to the feminist understanding of heterogenous identities "in a society of asymmetric gender, race and class hierarchies".

With a view to analysing how women build their subjectivity within this context, Bora (ibid) focuses on the social aspect of gender, which, she suggests, is shaped in daily practices, and maintains that gender does not only refer to differences between women and men, but it also includes the differences among women. Analysing the interviews she conducts with both domestic workers and their employers, Bora concludes that different social classes create different "womanhoods", which define and reconstruct *themselves and the other* in daily encounters. This, as a result, invalidates the supposition that "despite all differences, we have something in common: womanhood".

All in all, it should not be forgotten that all that derogatory discourse, the privacy behind the closed doors, power relations and the structural discrimination in economic and political spheres have basically two interrelated effects on domestic workers' poverty: First, they overshadow domestic workers' individuality, differences and needs, which fits them all into one broad category and renders them invisible. Secondly, these factors themselves become the causes of domestic workers' poverty as well as their financial problems. In other words, as it is discussed before, poverty is a multidimensional phenomenon, which takes its roots from various reasons in addition to monetary issues and among these reasons are poor health, low education, unfavourable working conditions, violence, social exclusion and attack to human dignity.

In the end, analysing domestic workers' poverty in such a context by adopting the qualitative method with a multidimensional and feminist approach, as this study will do, is important and necessary, because as Ecevit (2007) states that kind of stance enables us to read women's poverty from the inside. This, as a result, helps us understand how unequal gender and class relations weaken them in addition to the fact that it shows us how poverty affects their lives, in which aspects it makes them helpless, and how they cope with it in a unique way. In Ecevit's terms, this approach makes it possible to "accumulate the feminist knowledge of poverty". So, with this knowledge at hand, feminist strategies and policies can be brought up and suggested on a political level in order to produce unique and realistic solutions to women's poverty.

5. THE RESEARCH RESULTS

5.1. Demographic Information of the Interviewees[12]

The research is conducted with fourteen domestic workers who currently work in İstanbul. The age of the local interviewees ranges between 27- 60. Four out of seven local interviewees are married, whereas the other two are widow and one is divorcee. The working years of the local interviewees range between 2 and 36 years. As for the foreign interviewees, their ages range between 29 and 46. Three out of seven foreign interviewees are married, three are divorcee and one is single. The working years of the foreign interviewees range between 2 and 13 years. In order to assure their privacy, the interviewees will be referred by their pseudo-names which they chose throughout the study.

5.2. The Beginning of the Story: The Effects of Patriarchy and Material Deprivation on Life Choices

One of the focal points of the research is to understand the processes which have taken the interviewees to domestic service. With this aim, they were first asked to tell their life stories and as a result of their accounts, it is seen that traditional family structure and economic problems have a direct impact on women domestic workers' education and marriage decision, which affect and shape their lives.

Considering the interviewees' educational background, local domestic workers have a lower education level when compared to foreign domestic workers. Among seven local domestic workers, only one woman graduated from high school and the rest either finished or dropped out of primary/secondary school.

As for seven foreign domestic workers, except for one who graduated from secondary school, the lowest educational level is high school degree. Out of these seven women, while one got her bachelor's degree in Geology, another one is still having her education at Open University in International Relations field in Turkey.

[12] See, Appendix 3.

Given the responses obtained from local domestic workers, it is clearly seen that the traditional family structure plays a key role in building their lives. Three local interviewees told that they were deprived of their educational right by their fathers against their own will and Lale, who is a high school graduate, stated that although her family did not actually prevent her, she did not continue her education, explaining that she thought if she had worked and earned money instead of going to school, she could have escaped her father's pressure and had more freedom.

Although the other three local domestic workers stated that they did not continue their education due to economic problems in their families, the effects of patriarchy can be obviously observed on all of the locals' marriage decision: Lale, Gülay and Kevser stated that as they felt their lives were restricted, they considered marriage as an escape from the pressure they were exposed to in their families. The other four women were married off to a man chosen by their fathers.

"I got married at the age of 16 and gave birth to my first child the same year. My husband was 10 years older than me. I joined a crowded family and everything was worse than before. A lot of responsibilities, problems… Actually, I escaped from my father's oppression. I was inexperienced then and thought that if I had married, I would have had freedom." (Gülay)

"*I got married at the age of 14. In fact, I was obliged to do so because I was abducted by my husband. What was worse, he was an acquaintance of my father."* (Tülay)

In case of Tülay, who stated that she got married to the person who abducted her, traditional values like "honour" stand out apparently at the expense of marrying a girl to her rapist at an early age, even if she is still a child. Actually, it can be said that "the concept of honour" is the main determinant of why interviewees' lives were restricted in terms of education and marriage. The reason why fathers do not allow their daughters to go out and have communication with others, especially men and why they do not let them go to school or decide to whom they will marry can be attributed to this. The accounts of Ayşe's father, who says "you do not need to go to school be a good woman" is an example for this.

Işık and Sakallı-Uğurlu (2009, 17) maintain that in Turkey, "honour" is closely associated with women's "sexual purity" and their honour represents their families'-

specifically male members'- honour. In relation with this, Kandiyoti (1997) puts forward that because of this reason, women are restricted in many ways from their clothing to their participation in public life and they lead their lives under pressure.

Taking into account all these, it can be understood that women are considered to be ineligible to make decisions on their own even about their own lives, and this, in turn, weakens them especially in times of crisis in their lives as it is also observed in case of the participants of this study.

With respect to foreign domestic workers' accounts, it is seen that the economic hardships in their families have a direct effect on their education life except for Elanur, who is a university graduate. As it will also be discussed in the following sections, all of the foreign domestic workers stated that people earn very little money in their countries even if they work day and night regardless of their education level. Nazlı, who currently continues her education at Open University in Turkey while performing domestic service, said that one could not go to university in Uzbekistan if s/he was not rich enough and highlighted that the poor economy in her country restricts the life choices of the citizens and allows only a limited group of affluent people to lead a life they want.

Among seven foreign domestic workers, only Elanur, who is from Turkmenistan, stated that she got married to someone chosen by her family. Considering the fact that she was a university student, her mother was a doctor and her father was a policeman, it is revealed that conventional family values can be still at work regardless of the education level of the woman and the family. When she was asked why she had not opposed to this, she explained that it was impossible to resist the elders' decision in their culture.

In relation with marriage, although the others stated that they got married of their own will, it is possible to trace the signs of traditional family structure especially in Turkic Countries like Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan. Gül, who is also a Turkmen like Elanur, stated that she met her husband on the recommendation of her family. Esra, who is from Uzbekistan, told that as she herself chose her husband and then divorced him, her family did not support her during the hard times she went through. Although she is single yet, Nazlı, who is also an Uzbek, mentioned that she does not want to go back to her country or marry to someone from there in that women in her country are

mostly doomed to lead a traditional life like maintaining the household and looking after children.

Leyla and Lora, who are from Georgia, told that they wanted to get married because they needed someone who would share their responsibilities, and they would have a more comfortable life:

"I was really tired of working. I needed a rest and an easier life. I fell in love with my husband and I got married without taking into account his life style and bad habits." (Lora)

"You want to breathe a sigh of relief after a while if you have started working hard at an early age. If I had not been in this situation during those times, maybe I wouldn't have got married or would have chosen someone else." (Leyla)

Although she did not want to elaborate on her first marriage, Roni, who is from Phillipines, similary implied that she made a wrong decision in terms of getting married and having a child at an early age while she was trying to cling and adapt to life here in a foreign country.

All in all, it is apparently seen that the pressure that comes from patriarchal structure of the families and material deprivation put a big strain on women's lives. Firstly, women, who cannot continue their education either because of family pressure or material poverty, are deprived of their educational rights and thus are rendered devoid of necessary tools to build a career for themselves. In case of some foreign domestic workers who are able to have a degree, the poor economy in their countries constrains their career choices. Secondly, in relation with marriage, women in traditional societies do not have the freedom to decide for themselves or consider marriage as an escape. Also, severe material deprivation and working conditions similarly lead to marriage decisions which are not given careful consideration. While these mostly bring about unhappy marriages, many of the women may also be exposed to physical violence by their husbands.

When pieced together, all these show that women in this situation lack the capabilities of having education, working in desired jobs, protection of their bodily-integrity in a marriage and having freedom to shape their lives as they envision. This, in turn, creates new dependencies and deprivations on behalf of women while they are maintaining their lives and getting into unexpected developments.

5.2.1. How Do They Decide To Become A Domestic Worker?

In this section, it will be concentrated on the processes which caused the interviewees to become domestic workers. After analysing the life experiences of the interviewees which took them to this job, in the following section, it will be focused on the specific reasons why they chose domestic service instead of any other job and how they found a job to work.

Considering the responses obtained from the interviewees, it is clearly seen that the fundamental reason why all of the interviewees began this job is due to economic hardships they experienced. Except for Pembe, who started doing domestic service at the age of 12, and Roni and Nazlı, who began to work as a domestic worker to support their families when single, the other eleven interviewees made a start in domestic service after they got married and had children.

Among those interviewees, while six of them had previously worked in different jobs due to the economic hardships in their families when single, the other five did not have any job experience. However, whether or not they had worked before, it is apparently understood that all of these eleven interviewees started domestic service by necessity after they got married, although they did not have the intention or desire to do so at the beginning.

Firstly, it is noteworthy to underline that there is a distinct emphasis on their children's well-being and future in the interviewees' accounts. The desire to protect their children against absolute poverty and give them a good future is seen to be the underlying cause behind the interviewees' working as domestic workers and tolerating the unfavourable conditions whether in their life, marriage or at work. In other words, as a result of their narratives, motherhood stands out as a powerful bond which makes "the intolerable" tolerable in their lives. Keeping this in mind, here it is significant to dwell on the reasons and the key developments in their lives which brought them to this point and how motherhood and traditional gender roles affect these processes.

Whether they are local or foreign, it is clearly seen that women have to struggle alone to deal with material poverty in case of unexpected events such as the death of the spouse or his irresponsibility in terms of sharing the responsibilities of the household. In case of two interviewees, they told that they had to start working all of

a sudden in the face of their spouses' death. The other eight interviewees felt the necessity to work in domestic service due to their husbands' irresponsibility and "bad habits" like gambling, alcohol or drug addiction. Among all, only Ayşe, Lale and Roni stated that they do this job in order to support their spouses' earnings which are little.

"*After my husband died, I had to work to look after my children. There was nobody who would help me. I was all alone and started working"* (Ülkü)

"*My husband has never been a responsible man. If he works for 2 or 3 days, he does not work for the rest of the week and he spends what he earns for gambling. There were times when I was not able to buy even bread or napkins for my child. I used my undershirts instead of napkins."* (Kevser)

In any case, all the interviewees told that although they expected to be supported by their families at least psychologically, they did not receive any support from them or their families-in-law basically because of two reasons:

Firstly, the families themselves did not back them thinking that it was not their responsibility. In other words, now that the women had children and were "mothers", it was their duty to find solutions and take care of their children. Like Gülay who related that "they said you are a mother and you have to do this", the other five interviewees indicated similar reasons when asked detailed questions about the issue.

Secondly, the women themselves did not want their families to help them or make their families completely aware of the hard conditions they were experiencing. Kevser, for instance, explained that her father provided a conditional support saying that she should left her children behind if she wanted to go back to her family. Tülay, Elanur, Pembe, Ayşe and Lale did not prefer their families' backing and when they were asked the reason they implied that they did not want to be seen "weak" and "needy".

Another point that should be highlighted here is the decision made by women about whether to divorce their spouses or continue their marriage despite the plight they experience. Once again, one can notice that having children plays a key role in this decision. Tülay, who had been married to the man that abducted her for 22 years before her divorce, told that she was a traditional woman and would have continued her marriage in spite of her husband's irresponsibility if he had cared about their

children. Elanur, who was exposed to physical violence by her husband due to his heroin addiction, said that she tolerated everything for years as her family always discouraged her from divorcing; however when her husband left their son as hostage to drug dealers, she did not listen to anybody in her family. Leyla and Lora, who are from Georgia, also gave the same reason for their divorce. Kevser, who is still married despite the violence she experiences and pays the gambling debt of her husband, explained that the main reason why she had not separated from her husband was the fact that he had good relations with their children and she did not want to bring them up without a father figure. Similarly, Pembe, who has been performing domestic service for 36 years, indicated the same reason as to why she did not divorce. Also, Gülay and Ülkü, whose spouses already died, stated that although they had problems in their marriages, they continued it for the sake of their children.

Also, even though three interviewees started domestic service with the aim of supporting their families when single, Pembe went on working during her marriage for her daughter since her husband never works. Likewise, although Roni had started domestic service with the same purpose, she stated that she later continued this job specifically to look after her children. The only interviewee still performing domestic service to back her family as well as earning money to get her own life to a better position is Nazlı, who is single.

Taking into account all these, it should be highlighted that women who are crippled by being deprived of the right to make decisions on their own lives in terms of education or marriage due to family pressure or economic hardships are this time left alone to deal with heavy responsibilities in the face of material poverty because of the reasons stated above. Here, the sacredness attributed to motherhood and traditional gender roles, which mostly control women' lives in every aspect and dictate them to give up their own good for the sake of their families, as two interwoven factors seem to be the main determinants in women's lives. Ironically, for all that sacredness ascribed to motherhood, they are mostly obliged to continue their struggle on their own by their families. Also, as a continuum of traditional gender roles cast on them, they are required a selfless devotion to their families or spouses no matter what they are exposed to. In accordance with this expectation, as self-sacrificing and obedient women, they predominantly put up with every unfavourable treatment by their spouses only with one exception: When their

husbands give up their children, that is the breaking point and in turn, women give up their marriages, too.

All in all, all the interviewees, except for one who is single, narrated that they got into a struggle primarily for their children both at and outside home, which increases their responsibilities in the face of material poverty. Since they do a job which brings along many new unfavourable conditions into their lives, they meet different aspects of poverty, as it will be discussed in the next section. In case of foreign domestic workers, these conditions worsen as they immigrate to a country they do not know anything about and work illegally in -without a residential and work permit-, which means a different fight in their way[13].

5.3. Being A Domestic Worker

5.3.1. Why Do They Prefer Domestic Service?

The responses obtained from the interviewees, whether they are local or foreign, show that they all found their jobs through acquaintances, which reveals the informal nature of the domestic service, the details of which will be discussed in the following sections.

When asked questions as to why they preferred domestic service to any other job, the local domestic workers basically stated three reasons: Firstly and mainly, they told that since they did not have sufficient education, they decided on this job as it was the best thing they could do. Secondly, in relation with this, they explained that as a woman without qualifications required in professional life, they could only find disqualified jobs which earn them very little money, like minimum wage, and although that kind of jobs provided social security, it was impossible to get by with this, as they were responsible for the livelihood and needs of more than one person in the family. Thirdly, four of them who work as a live-out pointed out that this job provided them flexibility, because in the event that their children were ill or they were not able to arrange someone to look after them, they could delay the job for that day, but in formal jobs, it was not always possible to do this.

[13] As this study and the other studies discussed before reveal, foreign domestic workers work illegally when they first arrive in the countries they immigrate to. As they gain experience and expand their network, they may find a chance to attain necessary permits.

As for the foreign domestic workers, all of them stated that they chose to immigrate to Turkey, saying that no matter which job it is, they earned very little in their own countries even though they worked for long hours. Here, it is essential to note that unlike Turkey, having an educational background does not have an effect on earning a satisfactory income in their countries as it is understood in case of Elanur and Nazlı, who are graduates of Geology and Nursery Teaching respectively.

When foreign domestic workers were asked why they did not consider working in any other job in İstanbul, they specified four reasons: First, other jobs like salespersonship in shops, dish washing in restaurants or ironing in dry cleaners did not earn them a lot in addition to the fact that they had to work in these jobs illegally, too. Therefore, as in either case -working in other jobs or as a domestic worker- they would work illegally, they preferred domestic service in that they could earn much more. Secondly, they told that there was a higher demand for domestic workers in Turkey and thought that as they gained experience, they might have a chance to obtain residential or work permit, because if their employers accept it, the procedures to get a work permit for a domestic worker and insure her were much easier compared to other jobs in accordance with Turkish Laws. Thirdly, since they overstayed their visa and worked illegally at the beginning of their arrival, they wanted to work in a house which would provide them a shelter and secure them against the threat of being caught and deported. Lastly, and in relation with security, because they were striving "as lonely women" in a foreign country, some people, including ones from their own community, tried to lead them to prostitution and domestic service was the best alternative to earn money in an honourable way.

Given all the reasons and accounts of the foreign domestic workers, one can obviously notice that they go through hard experiences as irregular workers on their first arrival and they deal with these on the basis of informal relationships unless they gain a legal status: It is understood that each community –Uzbeks, Turkmens, Georgians, Filipinos- has founded a social network and domestic workers' agencies in İstanbul, from which new comers benefit when/before they arrive in Turkey. These communities can provide solidarity among their members, especially in terms of finding a job or supplying consultation with each other in times of conflicts/problems at work since they cannot refer to legal authorities due to being irregular. However, these mechanisms operate on the basis of mutual interest and can

sometimes be to the detriment of the workers. Out of seven interviewees, six stated that they had to pay commission to the person who found them a job even if s/he was not tied to an agency. In relation with this, they all expressed their sorrow explaining that it was disappointing because people from the same country should not make money off each other especially in a foreign country. As for the agencies, all of the interviewees told that they asked for a lot of money and in the event that they have problems at work, they mostly stand by the employers and sometimes deduct money from their salaries.

In addition, since they want to free themselves of the threat of being deported, foreign domestic workers can resort to other solutions like sham (fake) marriage to attain residential permit at least for a while. In connection with this, two interviewees, Elanur and Roni, explained that this type of marriage causes new troubles, as the person they marry to ask for more money after a while by taking advantage of their obligation. Furthermore, some agencies which do not have a legal status may deceive new comers into paying money by promising that they will get a residential permit for them.

Additionally, as foreign domestic workers cannot speak Turkish when they first arrive, they do not have any chance to negotiate working conditions with the employers. All of the interviewees also stated that until they learnt Turkish, they communicated with their employers through body language or a foreign language like Russian or English if someone from the household could speak. Consequently, being irregular workers who seek for a shelter and cannot express themselves due to language barrier, foreign domestic workers accept the first job they find as Esra explains:

"*The employers come and tell what you are supposed to do. You do not understand anything actually, but you nod in agreement in order not to lose the chance. You do not have somewhere to stay in for a long time; you are here to earn money. What else can you do*?"

To recap, it is clearly seen that both local and foreign domestic workers enter the domestic service sector at a disadvantage due to its informal nature. Considering locals, as they do not have any other marketable skills required in professional life, they have to choose between earning little in a job with social security and earning

relatively more in domestic service without social security. Also, since they are responsible for looking after their children and there is not a well-established child care system financed by the state, they prefer informal employment which provides them flexibility they need.

As regards foreign domestic workers, they have to choose between working in their own countries in return for little money and working in a foreign country to earn more despite its all troubles. Their inclusion into the field is far more painful in every aspect beginning from the migration process to getting a job. In addition to working in an informal job, they have to deal with problems arising from being an illegal worker in a foreign country both psychologically and materially and all these make them more vulnerable to abuse and exploitation.

Considering all the processes and the reasons discussed from the beginning up to that point, both local and foreign domestic workers are actually led to be included in informal sector, which is unregulated and as a consequence impoverishing as it does not give the employees their legal rights. It is essential to highlight that domestic workers turn their gender roles into a business as result of supply and demand in the market. As it is stated by Wong (2012, 41), because domestic work is seen as "intrinsic" to women, in the event that "liberated" women participate in labour force, other women compensate for them within the household. The point to be noted is that due to this intrinsicness, domestic work is invisible and undervalued in any circumstances even when performed by the lady of the house, and this does not change when it is done by someone else in return for money. Hence, the invisibility of domestic work by its nature brings along the invisibility of domestic workers in the market, too. This invisibility is especially apparent in laws, as domestic service is not included in the Labour Law and the Law of Occupational Health and Safety. Although domestic service is covered by Social Security Law, since there is not a strict supervision mechanism, domestic workers' inclusion into the system is left to the arbitrary decision of the employers. This, in turn, causes the majority of them to stay out of the formal system and be stuck in informal sector. So, although they start this job out of necessity to bring a solution to their material poverty, it introduces them to different aspects of poverty because of its informality. As Sen (2000) and Kantor (2009), as cited in Kaga, 2012) state "these exclusions and 'unfavourable

inclusions' may be experienced simultaneously, or not, by different individuals; yet in any form they limit the opportunities and are often causal components of poverty".

5.3.2. Working Conditions and Types of Employment

The focus of this section will be on working conditions of domestic workers. The analysis and comparison of the conditions will be made on the basis of their type of employment, as live-outs (*gündelikçi)* and live-ins (*yatılı)*, rather than their position in the market as locals and foreigns. Because, as it will be discussed later in this section, this study argues that the working conditions in domestic service are affected and determined by the type of employment irrespective of whether the employees are local or foreign. In the study, "live-out" will be used for domestic workers who perform their job on daily basis for multiple employers, and "live-in" will be used to refer to those who do domestic service for only one household and live in the same house.

To begin with live-outs, the foremost problem is that although they try to specify the working hours, they mostly have to exceed it; however they are not paid in turn. All the interviewees pointed out that most employers want them to clean every part of the house as well as ironing, wiping the armchairs, carpets and sometimes even the walls in a limited time regardless of the house size, and this being the case they have to work overtime without being paid extra money. Another problem stated by the interviewees is that they are never paid carfare, and sometimes they are not served food or paid money for it, which means working all day hungry.

When they were asked why they did not negotiate with the employers, all of them told that they had to accept the conditions as they needed to earn money and when they did not want to comply with employers' wishes, most employers implied that they would not ask them to work again as there were many women in the market who would do the same job.

It should be noted that the income of live-out domestic workers who work for multiple employers depend on the number of them. Since they work for a different employer on each day of the week, the more they have employers, the more they will have a regular and relatively satisfactory income. For instance, two of the interviewees Lale, who has just started working as a domestic worker and only have a few employers, and Ülkü, who similarly works for few houses due to her old age

(60), stated that they earn very little and this amount varies each month in accordance with how many employers called them. On the other hand, the other five interviewees who work six or seven days a week related that they have a steady income. It is worth noticing that those who work on a regular basis told that they put up with every order and bad treatment of the employers at the beginning, as they did not have any other choice, but as they expanded their network, they at least eliminated those who treated them inhumanely. On that premise, it is apparently clear that live-out domestic workers do not have the luxury to choose the employers, especially at the beginning, in order to have a place in such an unregulated and competitive market until they expand their network.

When the interviewees were asked whether eliminating some employers had an effect on ameliorating their working conditions, their response was negative. They explained that having good relationships with employers did not change the conditions, but it only made it more tolerable. In relation with this, Kalaycıoğlu and Rittersberg-Tılıç (2001) state that domestic workers form a kind of "imaginary kinship" with the household they work for, and as Suğur, N., Suğur, S. and Gönç-Şavran (2008) put forward this may sometimes be to the disadvantage of domestic workers as employers can demand for additional tasks and extended working hours in return for their assistance by exploiting that pretended familial relationship. Similarly, all the interviewees in this study told that they become like a family or friends with some of their employers, and they cannot resist their additional requirements even if it means working overtime. All of the live-out interviewees pointed out that they only expected the employers to behave them like a human being, and when the employers treated them like a potential thief or despised them brutally, which is something they are exposed to by some employers especially when they first entered the market, everything was much more difficult.

With respect to live-ins, it is obviously recognized that their working conditions are far heavier than live-outs as they reside in the house they work for. Given this fact, they are demanded to be in service at any time of the day, which means sleeping too little, working without rest and having no special time allotted to their personal needs. In this regard, the common point in all live-out interviewees' accounts is that employers always want to see them on their feet, otherwise they accuse them of ignoring their duties. They are expected to make a ceaseless effort, which disregards

the human dimension. All of the respondents complained about the food problem both because they are mostly not allowed to cook for themselves and are obliged to eat the left-overs, if any, and when they are hungry they have to eat by standing up as they are allowed to sit around the table and relax. Another problem that stands out among live-ins is the accommodation problem, which signifies that they are not even able to relax in decent conditions in the little time they have for sleep. The room they are given is not actually designed for them and they mostly have to sleep in a place like a machine room or depository under unhealthy circumstances.

"*When I first started this job, I thought that this should be a lie or nightmare. They want you to wipe the walls, clean the whole house, cook and take care of the child in one day. A normal person cannot do this. In this job, people see you like a rechargeable gadget. When your battery is off, you will charge it and go on from where you have left off. You are sleepless, but the next day you have to continue your job."*(Tülay)

When they work for upper-class houses where more than one domestic worker work, live-ins also have to deal with the competition among the employees. The interviewees explained that while some of them help and support each other, others may defame one another in order to be the favourite of the employers, which aggravates the working conditions. They also stated that some employers benefit from this situation and create a competitive environment deliberately to make use of their labour more. As for the weekly leave, they are given 24 hours a week and the day is mostly determined by the employers themselves.

Taking live-outs and live-ins into account, one can conclude that they are all vulnerable to exploitation by employers. Despite this important commonality, however, the problems and the outcomes differ in both types of employment. Firstly, it is obvious that live-ins put up with more severe working conditions as they nearly "work 24 hours" in their own terms, and therefore they do not have an escape from the job and the working environment, except for the weekly leave they have, if any. On the other hand, however hard they work, live-outs have a chance to move away as they work on daily basis for different employers and even if they are usually made to work overtime, they eventually go to their own houses, which frees them of the burden of being at someone's service all day. Also, as live-outs are not tied to one house, they have an opportunity to delay the job and not to go to work sometimes. In

this respect, it is revealed that live-ins are much more worn-out both psychologically and physically.

Secondly, in relation with income, it is seen that live-outs may earn less and might not have a steady income when compared to live-ins. Their earnings depend on the number of the employers they work for and how many times they are called to work in a month. Also, their employment is affected by seasonal variables. With this regard, the live-out interviewees pointed out that they work less in summer time as most of the employers go on holiday in this period. As for live-ins, as long as they do not leave their job or are dismissed by employers, they earn relatively more and secure a steady salary.

Thirdly, although it will be discussed in detail in a separate section below, social security coverage of domestic workers differs in accordance with their type of employment. The interviews conducted reveal that while live-outs who work for multiple employers do not stand a chance of being insured, live-ins may have that opportunity, especially when they work for upper-class households and gain experience in the market. For instance, among eight live-in interviewees, four of them have recently been insured although they worked without social security for a long time.

In connection with this, the findings of the study also display that live-ins may have the prospect of improving their working conditions after they gain experience and expand their network by switching to working as a live-out for one employer. Three of the live-in interviewees, Gülay, Esra and Roni, have just started working in this type of employment[14]. When compared to other types of employment discussed above, it is seen that working as a live-out for one employer is much more preferable since domestic workers get rid of the burden of heavy conditions in live-in employment while they are going on having a steady income, are insured and are tied to one employer unlike live-outs who work for multiple employers and may not have a regular income and employment opportunity.

[14] These inteviewees participated in the study under the category of live-ins as they have just changed their type of employment and wanted to elaborate on their experiences as live-ins due to their long involvement in this field. On that premise, while I have included and analysed their accounts under the category of live-ins throughout the study, their current type of employment as a live-out working for one employer has only been taken into account in "Social Security Coverage" section.

Another point to be conferred is that the choice of type of employment is determined by the life conditions of domestic workers. Among the participants of the study, six women, one of whom is foreign, work as live-outs. The other eight interviewees, two of whom are Turkish citizens, work as live-ins. Those who are married or under the control of man domination like their adult sons or partners though not married, work as live-outs. On the other hand, especially foreigns who need a shelter on their first arrival and locals who are divorced/widow and free of man dominance and want to earn relatively more work as a live-in. After a while, however, as live-ins cannot tolerate the heavy conditions and the employers' expectations, they want to switch to working as a live-out for one employer as it is discussed above. This happens either when they get married or when they can afford to buy/hire a house of their own.

Last but not least, as I stated at the beginning of this section, the working conditions of domestic workers are determined in accordance with the type of employment. That is, being a local or a foreign domestic worker does not have a direct effect on what they are expected to do. Although, as it is discussed above, the life conditions and male dominance are important factors in determining local and foreign women's type of employment, the working conditions in these types of employment (working as a live-out or live-in) is not shaped by the person who performs it. Considering the interviewees joined in the study and the information obtained from them both about their own experiences and their knowledge in the domestic service market, it is concluded that both locals and foreigns perform the same duties under the same conditions in conformity with their type of employment. Neither is expected to do something different just because they are foreign or local.

At first glance, foreign domestic workers can be said to be at a greater disadvantage in domestic service market on the grounds that they work illegally, and therefore some employers confiscate their passports, exploit their labour, thus making them work more or sometimes for free by accusing them of theft under the threat of reporting them to the police. However, these painful occurrences are neither peculiar to domestic work market itself nor are they a direct result of it. When considered in a broader perspective, foreign migrant women may be exposed to that kind of treatment in any type of informal employment in Turkey. The foreign interviewees participated in the study pointed out that they themselves or their acquaintances went through similar experiences when they tried working in other jobs. Then, it should be

noted that the severe psychological and physical abuse of foreign migrant women is an consequence of being a worker who tries to find a way out of her poverty in a foreign country as a result of the globalization of the labour market, which promotes cheap labour force and thus obliges workers to work illegally in informal sector that does not protect them under national and international laws adequately. Therefore, these harsh experiences of foreign domestic workers should be handled on the big picture of their multi-dimensional poverty experiences rather than trapping the issue into domestic service market.

All in all, it is seen that whether being a foreign or a local, domestic workers have to put up with heavy workload as there is not a clear-cut limit to what they are expected to do. While these expectations increase and worsen in case of live-ins, live-outs also tackle similar experiences in different forms. The reason for this must be read on two interrelated bases:

Firstly, the domestic service market is under the heavy influence of traditional gender roles and the domestic worker is the person who substitutes for the lady of the house. Cleaning, cooking and care work, which are attributed to women by nature, are performed every day repeatedly without a clear output, thus being considered unproductive and invisible. To quote Beauvoir (1989), "Few tasks are more like the torture of Sisyphus than housework, with its endless repetition: the clean becomes soiled, the soiled is made clean, over and over, day after day." This being the case, the undervalued nature of the domestic work and the requirements related to it do not change whether it is performed by the lady of the house or a domestic worker.

Secondly, as a result of this, domestic service mostly takes its place in informal sector, which operates in harmony with domestic work's inherent characteristics. That is, the invisible, undefined and degraded nature of domestic work brings along the same results in the domestic service market in Turkey, too. In addition to the fact that they are invisible in the Labour Law and the Law of Occupational Health and Safety, domestic workers have to deal with the unregulated market by themselves as they work without a labour contract, and consequently are devoid of a job description. So, due to this arbitrariness, it is clearly seen that with its informality, the domestic service market constitutes an important part of domestic workers' multi-dimensional poverty as they are made to work under unfavourable conditions without a legal standing to seek their rights.

5.3.3. Relationships with Employers and Violence at Work

Evaluating domestic workers' relationships with employers and their experiences of violence at work is of importance in terms of shedding light on their multi-dimensional poverty. As domestic workers perform their job within a private house far from public eyes, these experiences are mostly gone without seen by legal authorities.

The accounts of the interviewees show that the most frequent treatments they are exposed to are the neglect of their needs as an individual and being accused of theft unfairly. When added to the fact that they are extremely worn-out physically, domestic workers also have to deal with psychological elements at work, which harm their well-being in both aspects.

Considering the responses of the participants, one can see that these treatments by the employers constitute a significant part of violence they experience at work. Taken into account together with their working conditions discussed in the previous section, it should be highlighted that domestic workers go through different forms of violence. Among these, psychological, emotional, verbal and sexual violence are the ones that come to the forefront.

To begin with psychological violence, it happens in the event that people are intimidated into doing things by the threat of an undesired result on their part and/or controlling their doings (Defining Violence, [19.06.2017]). Given the accounts the interviewees provided, all of them tolerate the unfavourable treatment and working conditions, especially when they first start working, for fear of losing their job and all of them stated that employers take advantage of this on purpose by implying that there are many women in the market who will do the same job. Also, in case of live-ins, thinking that they do not have a private room of their own, special time appointed to their personal needs such as having a bath or eating and they are mostly "followed in their every step" in their own terms, they do not have privacy and the control of their life is out of their hands at work.

As for emotional and verbal violence, which generally go hand in hand, the former takes place as result of talking to someone or treating them in a way which makes them feel useless and "worthless" (ibid.). Interfering in personal possessions, degrading and threatening the person with deportation, in case of migrants, are

among the examples of emotional violence. Considering the expressions of the interviewees that some employers rummage through their possessions, they humiliate their personal capacity or origins and their strong emphasis on "being treated like a machine without feelings", one can see that domestic workers are exposed to that kind of violence. As regards verbal violence/abuse, it is the usage of language which aims to cause harm to the person (ibid.). Shouting at someone, ordering continuously even when not necessary and asserting disbelief in one's honesty are forms of verbal abuse, and these are the points which the interviewees complain about most.

With respect to sexual violence, it happens when the person is compelled to take part in sexual intercourse or someone makes physical contact with them like kissing or touching without their consent (ibid.). Among the participants, three interviewees stated that they were exposed to sexual violence at work. While two foreign interviewees told that they experienced sexual harassment for a few times in different houses and left the job immediately, one local interviewee related that she was exposed to that kind of treatment many times, but tried to protect herself with her strict manners.

As it is discussed in the previous section, domestic workers can only have the power to deal with these unfavourable treatments in the event that they expand their network and have a chance to find other employers to work for. In relation with this issue, it can be said that live-outs hold a higher possibility of doing this as they work for multiple employers and there is higher workforce mobility in the live-out market. In case of live-ins, this is more difficult as they are tied to one employer and besides, working as a live-in mostly brings along the same working conditions. As it was stated before, live-ins have the opportunity to ameliorate their conditions when they switch their type of employment as a live-out working for one employer if they are lucky to find a job. To set an example, one of the interviewees, Tülay, who is 46 and has an experience of 15 years as a live-in, told that one day she left her job as she was extremely tired of all the burden, but since she was not able to find a better alternative, she had to go back to working as a live-in and on the first day of the job, she went to the house where she was employed by crying desperately.

As a result of the responses obtained, it is also understood that those who manage to choose their employers after a while may also develop good relationships with them. In that case, domestic workers can benefit from payments in kind such as

new/second-hand clothes or furniture or they can borrow some money when they need. Furthermore, employers can contribute to domestic workers in different ways. A few foreign interviewees, for example, stated that their employers helped them with legal issues. Furthermore, some employers provided help to local domestic workers' children with respect to their education or introducing them to social activities such as going to the cinema or theatre.

Lastly, it should be emphasized once again that working in an employment area loaded with traditional gender roles –maintaining the needs of a household-, domestic workers can never get rid of the related expectations and problems at work. As their job is based on an endless repetition of cleaning and/or care work which is required from "any woman" with a selfless devotion, domestic workers are also supposed to comply with these roles and they shoulder the accompanying responsibilities accordingly. When it comes to maintaining a house which is considered as their primary duty, women are traditionally expected to demonstrate self-sacrifice and are patronized by patriarchal order with minimum consideration to their personal needs and feelings. In case of domestic workers, the perpetrator of patronizing becomes the female employer herself and as Bora (2005) points out, domestic service turns into a field where different social classes meet and construct different womanhoods. At this point, this study argues that, this field, where power relations operate, usually works at the disadvantage of domestic workers, since they are the ones who are trapped into the broad category of womanhood which stripes them out of their individual needs and that is why, they are mostly called only "woman" by employers, which implicitly signifies and accentuates their job definition that has neither beginning nor end, and thus impoverishing them.

5.3.4. Social Security Coverage, Occupational Health and Safety and Union Participation

Being employed in informal sector is one of the impoverishing factors as it mostly deprives the employees of their legal rights and decreases their visibility in laws. Therefore, while studying the multi-dimensional poverty of any group employed in this market, it is significant to direct attention to their inclusion/exclusion into/from the legal system.

To begin with the social security coverage of the interviewees, while nine out of fourteen participants have never been insured up to now, five of them have recently been insured after a long period of working without social security coverage. Considering the type of employment, it is seen that none of the live-outs who work for multiple employers have been included in the social security system whereas all those who are insured work as live-ins or have just switched from live-in to live-out who works for one employer. Among the insured interviewees, two of them are local and the other three are foreign. As for those who do not have any social security coverage, five is local and four is foreign. Out of those nine interviewees, six of them work as a live-out and the other three work as a live-in.

Considering the insurance status of the interviewees, it is clear that live-outs who work for multiple employers are absolutely excluded from the social security system. This data is no surprising in that, as it was discussed in Chapter 4, the current Social Security Law concerning this type of employment is not efficient. The latest change in the related law which came into force on 1 April, 2015 with Omnibus Law No. 6552 brought up a distinction between those who work for 10 days or more a month and those who work for less than 10 days a month (Çakar, 2015). The criterion of 10 days is calculated on the basis of the total working hours of a worker for one employer in a month. So, if the total working hours add up to 10 days or more, the worker who is employed by one or more employers will be included in social security system; however if the total amount spent for one employer is under 10 days, the worker will only benefit from occupational accident and disease insurances (Caniklioğlu&Özkaraca, 2016).

Given this information, a live-out domestic worker who works for multiple employers is able to benefit from full social security coverage on condition that she performs her job for "one employer" at least "10 days" a month, which means she can only have three employers totally. Although there is not certain data about the number of domestic workers in this category, it is pointed out that working for one employer more than 10 days is not common in Turkey (Bianet, [10.02.2017]) and this is in complete harmony with the findings of this study as all the live-out interviewees who work for multiple employers have at least four or more employers. This being the case, as they work for more than 3 employers a month, they fall into the category of "those who work less than 10 days", and consequently, they only

have the right to benefit from occupational accident and disease insurances. Hence, the result is that even if a domestic worker actually works more than 10 days or even every day throughout one month for more than 3 employers, which is valid in case of four participants of this study, she will not be able to benefit from long term security branches.

In relation with these, the interviewees working in this category were asked whether they are informed about the change in the law and if they demanded their employers insure them. The interviewees stated that they heard about it through public service announcement broadcast on TV. As for the second question, they pointed out that although they asked some employers, whom they work for at regular intervals, to insure them, nobody accepted it .When they were inquired about why they did not insist or sought for their rights, they explained that if they were insistant they would lose their jobs, and as this type of insurance does not provide them with long term benefits and they could not afford to pay for the remaining premiums, it was not worth risking their job.

Given all these, it is obvious that domestic workers who work for multiple employers have a right to social security to some extent on paper, but due to the inefficiency of the related law and the lack of an official supervision mechanism, they do not benefit from it in practice. Also, as those who employ a domestic worker less than 10 days are not deemed an "employer", they do not actually have a legal responsibility of making notifications to Social Security Institution according to Law 5510 (Manav, 2015). Although they have to pay the premiums for occupational accident and disease insurance in accordance with the latest change in Social Security Law, there are not specified sanctions in the law, if they do not fulfil this requirement (ibid.)

As regards live-ins and live-outs who work for one employer, since they fall into the category of "those who work for 10 days and more a month", they have the right to full social security coverage. However, it should be noted once again that because there is not a legitimate mechanism which inspects the field, the insurance of domestic workers completely depends on the arbitrary decisions of employers. Out of eight interviewees who work in this category, three foreign live-in domestic workers do not have any social security coverage although they have been doing this job between 2-8 years, which means that they perform their job illegally and face the risk of deportation in the event that their illegal employment is found out. With

respect to the others who are insured, Tülay was included into the system after 12 years she started doing this job, for example. The other four interviewees were similarly insured after a period of service between 2-7 years. Considering that being included into the system by one employer does not ensure that they will be insured by another one in case they change their workplace, they mostly cannot make use of long-term benefits as their premiums have not been paid regularly/continuously in a certain period of time which is determined by the law, and as a result they cannot qualify for old-age pension.

Hence, as a result of the deficiency in control mechanism and employers' arbitrary decisions, domestic workers cannot fully benefit from their social security right and they are left alone to produce possible solutions. In case of live-outs who work for multiple employers, if they want to have full coverage they have to pay the remaining premiums themselves. Thinking that they are never included in the system due to the reasons discussed above, then they are left with only one choice, "optional insurance", which means they have to pay all the premiums on their own. The same thing is valid for live-ins in both cases whether when they are not insured or are insured for a while. As Erdoğdu and Tokgöz (2013) suggest, considering that domestic workers perform this job to deal with economic difficulties, they do not want/cannot afford to spend money for this.

In case of foreign domestic workers, things get much more difficult. First, as they are not Turkish citizens, they do not have the right to optional insurance even if they afford it. As foreign workers, they completely depend on employers in terms of work permit and social security coverage. In accordance with the current laws, foreign domestic workers have to apply for work permit with their employers, whether it be in Turkey or in their countries, and then they are insured. In the event that employers do not apply for work permit, they work illegally and are deprived of every legal right.

Another important issue in domestic service is occupational health and safety. As domestic service is not included in the Labour Law and the Law of Occupational Health and Safety, it is covered by Law of Obligations (Akbıyık, 2013, 217; Yıldırımalp, 2014, 53). The law stipulates that there must be a service contract between the employer and the employee and it defines the rights, obligations and working conditions of workers who are included in it (Ulutaş and Öztepe, 2013, 48).

In addition, it enforces employers to ensure workplace safety and health; take necessary precautions in order to prevent any harm to workers and protect them against psychological and sexual harassment (ibid.). However, there are not clear specifications peculiar to domestic workers such as the risks about health and safety issues and necessary precautions to be taken by employers, because the work place in domestic service is a private house and it is beyond the scope of inspection (Erdoğdu and Tokgöz, 2013).

With respect to the issue, out of fourteen interviewees, eleven domestic workers stated that they had minor accidents such as falling down while cleaning slippery grounds like bathroom, falling off the ladder or injuring their wrist/finger and most of them told that they came down with back/neck related problems as a result of carrying or dragging heavy furniture items and working for long hours. In addition, three participants reported they had serious accidents apart from these. Elanur, who is from Turkmenistan and works as a live-out, recounted that she injured her back severely in one of her jobs while Pembe expressed that she broke her finger. As a result, they were not able to work for a long time, but their health expenses were not compensated by the employers, let alone their loss during the time they did not work. Another interviewee, Tülay, who works as a live-in, said that she slipped while cleaning the windows and dangled outside until people around noticed and saved her. Another problem which risks their health is the detergents they use and as they are exposed to these chemicals for long hours and nearly every day they develop respiratory or dermatological diseases. One of the interviewees, Kevser, who works as a live-out, told that she developed wounds on her hands due to the bleach one of her employers preferred and although she wanted to change it, she was not allowed, and therefore she had to leave the job.

Taking into account all these, it is apparent that domestic workers are vulnerable to many health and life risks while performing their jobs; however as their workplace cannot be inspected and there are not clearly specified sanctions which oblige the employers, they do not take necessary precautions and even support them financially in case of severe accidents. Under these circumstances, domestic workers are left alone to deal with the contingencies of the job and in the event that they are not registered to the social security system, their situation worsens and this affects them financially, too.

Regarding union membership and participation of the interviewees, none of them have heard about the two unions, Evid-Sen and İmece, which operate in Turkey, up to now. Also, based on the responses and reactions given, it is understood that they do not know what a trade union is and what kind of benefits it may provide. Upon the question whether they want to have more information about the unions and perhaps apply for a membership now that they have been informed about them, only three participants replied positively and told they may consider it. Among those who responded negatively, five local domestic workers stated that they cannot become a member of such an organization even if they want, as their husbands/adult sons will not allow them. Out of six foreign interviewees, three of them implied that they do not dare it as they work illegally while the other three showed no interest or willingness in the issue.

Hence, considering the data obtained, it can be concluded that domestic service area is devoid of collective action and domestic workers lack awareness of the issue. This can be attributed to several reasons: Firstly, domestic service which is mostly characterized by its informality is unregulated and disorganized as there are not specific regulations in laws which meet the needs or respond to the problems in the field. So, this vagueness in laws and the informality which dominates the market lead to the deunionization of domestic workers. Secondly, since domestic service is heavily performed by women employees, the effect of patriarchal order is prevalent here, too. In harmony with the gender roles attributed to women to be obedient, they do not seek for their rights persistently and male domination in the family also prevents them from doing so. Thirdly, it is clear that the domestic workers' unions in Turkey have not developed strong networks in the field yet, as even the interviewees who have performed this job for approximately twenty years have not heard of them. Furthermore, considering that domestic workers work under heavy conditions for long hours, which does not leave them time even for themselves, they may not have the opportunity to keep up with the current developments in the field. Therefore, the unions should operate proactively and devise different ways to introduce themselves to more domestic workers and raise awareness among them.

To conclude, it is clear that the current legal regulations concerning domestic workers are both ineffective and insufficient. This increases and brings about their vulnerability in the field. While the inefficiency of the Social Security Law regarding

live-out domestic workers who work for multiple employers causes them to be out of social security coverage, the lack of an official supervision mechanism affects all domestic workers, thus leading to the arbitrariness of employers in terms of including them into the system. Also, because domestic service is excluded from the Law of Occupational Health and Safety and there is not specific regulations peculiar to domestic workers in the Law of Obligations, domestic workers face many risks while performing their jobs. When all these are added to lack of collective action in the field, domestic workers are rendered invisible, voiceless and weak, which deprives them of representation on both legal and political level.

5.4. The Influences of the Job on Domestic Workers

5.4.1. The Meaning of the Job

The issues, which have been discussed up to that point in relation with domestic workers' experiences both before they start working and while performing their jobs, reveal that they go through hard times and work under heavy conditions with many disadvantages. As a continuation of these, it is also important to give consideration to how the job affects and in what aspects it contributes to their lives in order to have a more inclusive picture of their situation. That is why, the focus of this section and the next ones will be henceforth devoted to this concern.

The responses given in terms of what it means to be a domestic worker show that none of the interviewees have developed personal connection with their job and it is not possible to mention the presence of job satisfaction of any kind among domestic workers. All of the interviewees emphasized that domestic service only provides them with money for their material needs, however it has a negative effect on their health both physically and psychologically.

When considered together with the previous responses obtained with respect to the job, this result is not surprising at all and the job dissatisfaction can be ascribed to several reasons: Firstly, as the interviewees have stated, being a domestic worker earns them the material tool they need; however they are mostly overworked and as a result underpaid actually. All of the participants, especially live-ins, pointed out that what they earn does not the meet their labour, indeed. Secondly, since domestic service is based on gender roles associated with women and is repetitive by its nature

with no clear output, it is undervalued even by the employers themselves. So, it does not give them a feeling of fulfilment which is appreciated, and consequently they cannot attach a meaning to the job they perform apart from earning money.

Thirdly, as a result of not having a full recognition on legal and political levels, domestic workers do not feel secure. In case of any disagreement, they can easily be redundant or they may not be able to perform their job in the event of an occupational accident or disease since they are not completely protected against such risks. Fourth, as domestic workers work under heavy conditions for long hours and thus are worn-out, they cannot maintain a healthy work-life balance, which will be discussed in the next section.

Last but not least, it is apparently clear that domestic service affects their well-being seriously. There is a distinct stress on the deterioration of their bodily health especially among those who have done this job for long years. Besides, it is easily noticed that domestic workers, particularly live-ins and those who have a long experience as a live-out, suffer from emotional exhaustion. As well as pointing out they are not treated with respect they deserve, most interviewees expressed that they have developed a sense of lovelessness and distrust, and consequently feel like being stripped of their feelings as a result of the adverse attitudes of employers and unfavourable working conditions, which influences their life both at work and in general.

5.4.2. The Effects of the Job on Personal and Family Life

Although domestic workers start working with the aim of bringing a solution to their material poverty and improving their life conditions, the job may indeed be the cause of new deprivations and forms of poverty in their family and individual life.

Initially, it is noticeable that working as a domestic worker has a deep effect on the relationships and the quality of time spent with their children. Considering the accounts of the interviewees, one can see that domestic workers' obligation to earn money forces them to entrust their children to somebody else, if any or leave them alone even at very early ages, which can be quite destructive in many aspects. Sometimes, they do not even have the chance to take care of their children in the event of a serious illness, as it is observed in case of Pembe, who sent her daughter to her family in Samsun and was not able to attend the funeral when she died.

With regard to live-ins, the situation takes on a more serious dimension as they can only be at home once a week or sometimes never, and thus can rarely enjoy the mother-child relationship in addition to the fact that they always have worries about their well-being. It should be highlighted that foreign domestic workers are at a distinct disadvantage in this aspect, as they cannot take their children into the country they immigrate to, because they all start this job illegally and they cannot also afford to take them; hence they only have chance to meet them if they are able to go to their countries for a while.

In this respect, it could be said that their type of employment is not only determinant of their working conditions but also influential in their life on the whole. Although all live-out domestic workers complain about not having enough energy and time to take care of their children in every aspect when it is combined with their responsibilities at home, they can at least be together with them in the evenings; however local live-ins have that opportunity only once a week while foreign live-ins are completely deprived of this except for some cases when they are able to take/keep their children with them during their stay in the country.

Having in mind that all the interviewees, except for Nazlı, who is single, started or continued this job specifically for their children, domestic workers find themselves in an agonizing dilemma and question their motherhood as they have to sacrifice the special care they should provide for their children for the sake of their future. In this light, it should be noted that the working conditions and the unregulated nature of domestic service is also the cause of inner/immaterial deprivations in private sphere and as Robeyns (2003) points out the obstacles arising from the paid work to bringing up one's own child is one of the factors that comprises gender inequality.

Apart from child-care, it could be said working as a domestic worker has an influence on their family life as a whole due to the fact that they do not manage to spare special time for other members in the family, too and do not have the opportunity to do extra activities except for sharing a house together. Handling the issue specific to live-ins, it is obvious that the family integrity is damaged much more as local live-ins cannot even stay in their house except for one day a week while foreign live-ins completely lose touch with their families.

With regard to effects on individual life, one of the striking outcomes is time poverty, which should be discussed in two aspects - work and private sphere-. To begin with the former, as it was mentioned before, live-outs work during day and are able to go back to their homes in the evening, whereas live-ins are completely devoid of time autonomy and have very little time even for their basic needs such as personal care or eating at work. As for the latter, it is possible to make a distinction between those who have household responsibilities in their private lives and those who do not. That is to say, in addition to live-outs, local live-ins also maintain a separate house which they go once a week and as a result, the burden of responsibilities allows both groups limited time for their personal use in private sphere. In case of foreign live-ins, as they do not have a responsibility for another house, they may have the chance to relax during their weekly leave.

Given that domestic workers cannot spare sufficient time for their children, families and even themselves, it is not possible to mention a social life which they can participate in actively. All of the interviewees emphasized that they are not able to maintain social ties with their environment due to their obligation to work, the lack of time autonomy and economic concerns. Most interviewees stated that they have not met their friends/relatives or done leisure activities for months as they do not have enough time and energy. Also, they pointed out that even if they can occasionally get a chance for this, they mostly abstain from it as doing extra activities or gathering with others means spending money, which affects their limited budget. In addition to these, three irregular foreign interviewees explained that as they are afraid of being caught by the police, they try not to spend too much time outside and prefer to come together with friends from their community in a house.

Considering annual leave, as live-outs are not tied to one employer and they work on daily basis, the decision to take an annual break depends on them; however all of them explained that since they need money to maintain their lives, they do not prefer this as long as they do not have an obligation to do so. As for live-in domestic workers, benefitting from their right to annual leave relies on the employers. Out of eight live-in interviewees, only two stated that they were able to take an annual break, while the others were not allowed for this.

5.4.3. Domestic Workers' Control over Their Income

The distribution of income is one of the most important focal points of qualitative poverty analyses, as it provides crucial information about women's control over their income and how/whether it transforms their lives, which is ignored in quantitive poverty studies. As Medeiros and Costa (2008, 25) maintain, in the event that intra-household inequalities are considered, the existing rates/numbers in terms of "income or consumption" will be proved to undervalue women's poverty.

The data obtained in relation with this issue clearly reveals that domestic workers spend the income they earn for other family members and/or the maintenance of the household. In addition to the fact that they mostly refrain from leisure activities in order not spend extra money, all of the participants stated that they do not expand too much for themselves except for very basic and obligatory needs such as health and clothes- if they are very old-.

Out of fourteen interviewees, only four domestic workers are assisted by their husbands financially and the rest are alone in terms of meeting the needs of their families. Three participants who have adult children stated that their children do not contribute to the family budget either because they are unemployed or the money they earn are only sufficient for their personal needs. On that premise, it is seen that especially those who strive alone face more financial problems and as the number of dependants in the family increases, such as mothers, grandchildren or unemployed spouses, they have much more difficulties with making ends meet.

Upon the question about what they do in the event that their income does not suffice, five interviewees told that they use a credit card and the others stated they sometimes borrow money from their employers or acquaintances. It should be noted that debt burden is a significant factor which increases the risk of material poverty of domestic workers and make it difficult for them to find a complete exit from it although they work.

The study also puts forward that women's income is not only spent on the household needs, but it is sometimes extorted by their husbands or the other male members in the family and in that case, they get into huge debts, which aggravates their material conditions. Two interviewees stated that they had to pay their husbands' debt arising from their bad habits like gambling as well as meeting their needs materially for long

years until they divorced. Besides, three participants who are still married told that they are in deep debt because of the same reasons while one interviewee reported she got consumer loan from a bank due to her son's arrears.

Considered in this light, it should be highlighted that when women domestic workers are supported financially by their husbands or others, which is valid in case of four interviewees in the study, their struggle with material poverty becomes more tolerable, even if the income they earn does not have a direct effect on their individual well-being. However, in the event that they continue this struggle alone and sometimes even their income is usurped by other members of the family, their situation takes on a more desperate dimension and their material deprivation worsens.

Handling the issue with respect to domestic workers' experience in the field, namely their working years, and whether it has an effect on their lives in terms of making savings/investments for their future, it is seen that the duration of their involvement in the job does not play a key role in this. Among the interviewees, only four participants, whose experience varies between 2-15 years, have been able to buy a house to secure a shelter for themselves. Among the others, even those who have been working for 25 or 36 years, for example, do not have any savings and still experience serious financial problems.

Considering those who have a house, two of them are backed up financially by their husbands, one was supported by her father when she bought it and the other purchased a house in her country with her own savings. This data is important in that it shows the earnings of domestic workers are not merely sufficient to improve their life conditions as long as they strive alone or the earnings of other members are very little to maintain a family financially. On the other hand, in the event that they are free of this responsibility, namely are single or not responsible for somebody else, they may have a chance to work on their own behalf and spend their income to enhance their lives, which is observed in case of Nazlı, who is the only person to buy a house with her income and make savings for her future.

All in all, firstly it is understood that none of the interviewees, except for one, have currently a complete control over their income and keep their personal expenditure at minimum level for the sake of others' good. Comparing their situation before and

after they start domestic service, it is not possible to mention any individual improvement, which contributes to their personal good either in private or social sphere. Given that they do not spend their income as they want, are not able to participate in social activities, which provides them with a sigh of relief from their responsibilities and have not mostly secured a future life free of financial concerns, working as a domestic worker does not transform their lives for the better. So, it could be said that the money they earn under heavy working conditions with many effects on their physical and psychological well-being primarily benefits the others in the family and their income does not give them, in Sen's terms (1999), " a life they have reason to value" on individual basis. Having in mind the interviewees' strong emphasis on their children's/families' good, one can conclude that the income, instead, helps them prepare/envisage a life they value for their children/families.

Secondly, it is apparent that domestic workers' income is mostly sufficient for the current needs of their families and it does not enable them to make savings for the future, except for a few examples. Also, taking into account that the job is extremely exhausting both physically and psychologically and they hardly hold a chance of retirement and old-age pension due to the deficiencies in law, it is a matter of corcern how they will manage to maintain their lives when they cannot work anymore, even if they have been able to buy a house or make some savings.

5.4.4. Future Plans

When considered together with the previous sections, it can be concluded that the informal nature of domestic service which makes domestic workers vulnerable both in the market and in the laws, the unfavourable working conditions that impoverish their lives on different levels, their ongoing struggle for their families and not having been able to improve their lives meaningfully on individual basis are important factors which deter domestic workers from looking forward to the future with hope.

Given the account of the interviewees, the feeling of despondency prevails among most domestic workers with respect to their own future and their plans are heavily concentrated around their children's well-being once again. It could be said that the processes which took them to work in domestic service are also the cause of their

impotency in the future. That is, the patriarchal order and the economic problems which weakened them in many aspects led them to turn their gender roles into a labour-intensive business to maintain their lives; however since they entered an unprotected and unregulated employment field and worked with a selfless devotion basically for their families, their deprivations and susceptibilities have not decreased.

Among the interviewees, only three participants plan/want to do a different job in the future. Considering their profiles, it could be said that their young age may be a decisive factor in this in addition to the fact that two interviewees' spouses are employed in formal sector and they aim to do something in common while one of them continues her education in Turkey and spend her income primarily for her own needs. As for the other eleven interviewees, whereas nine of them are the only ones who work in the family, two participants' husbands work in informal sector like them and they stated that domestic service/cleaning is the best job they can do as they do not have necessary qualifications for any other. Also, most pointed out that since they feel extremely exhausted, they cannot keep on working once they have provided the needs of their children.

The point that should be emphasized in relation with these interviewees is that they are totally vague on their future prospects and do not have a clear answer as to how they will finance their lives after they do not manage to work. This situation not only causes hopelessness among domestic workers, but it also brings about dependency on others in the future, most probably their children, which is another matter of debate. Remembering that three participants who have adult children stated that their children do not currently contribute to the family budget either because they are unemployed or the money they earn are only sufficient for their personal needs, it is not possible to say for certain that they will take care of their mothers due to these or any other reasons which may arise in the following stages of their lives.

Given all these, it should be restated that the underlying cause behind domestic workers' hopelessness and vulnerability is basically their inadequate representation and protection in the laws. Although they work for many years in domestic service market, they are either not included into the social security system at all or the limited period of time they are registered does not entitle them to retirement/old-age pension as long as they do not compensate for the missing insurance payments themselves. This being the case, they cannot secure a future free of financial

concerns and when they get old or do not manage to work anymore, they are rendered dependent on others, which comprises another deprivation in their lives.

6. CONCLUSION

This study aims to understand the poverty experiences of local and foreign domestic workers in Turkey from their perspectives and thus explore the multi-dimensional processes which impoverish their lives both at private and work spheres with a gender-sensitive approach.

In attempt to break free from the restrictive traditional poverty approaches, which trap the poor into quantitive data and mostly turn a blind eye to the varying deprivations of women by focusing on income, this study intends to construct knowledge together with women domestic workers themselves. Rather than objectifying the interviewees and drawing conclusions about them from the outside, this dissertation regards domestic workers as the subject of poverty experience, hence the source of information. As Ecevit (2007) states that kind of stance enables us to understand how unequal gender relations weaken women in addition to the fact that it shows us how poverty affects their lives, in which aspects it makes them helpless, and how they cope with it in a unique way. In Ecevit's terms, this approach makes it possible to "accumulate the feminist knowledge of poverty". So, with this knowledge at hand, feminist strategies and policies can be brought up and suggested on a political level in order to produce unique and realistic solutions to women's poverty.

Taking a stance shaped and informed by Amartya Sen's "Capability Approach" on poverty, this study focuses on women domestic workers' multiple deprivations which restrict their lives in terms of individual, social and work life instead of concentrating on how much they earn. So, the interviews conducted with this aim unveil the processes and experiences which local and foreign domestic workers have gone through basically on three levels: First, the processes domestic workers undergo before they start this job; second, their experiences in the domestic service market; third, the effects of the job and the income they earn on their lives.

To start with the key points which shape and direct domestic workers' lives by the time they enter the market, the patriarchal family structure and financial troubles are

seen to be at the forefront in terms of affecting their life choices - education and marriage-. While the family pressure largely restrains local domestic workers from their educational right, in case of foreign domestic workers, their education is basically interrupted due the poor economic structure of their countries. As a result, it is seen in both cases that women are rendered devoid of necessary tools to build a meaningful career for themselves.

Regarding their marriage decisions, the traditional family structure of their families either does not give women freedom to decide for themselves or leads them to consider marriage as an escape from the family pressure, which is mostly observed among local domestic workers. In case of foreign domestic workers, it is largely seen that severe material deprivation and the struggle to overcome it exhaust them both physically and psychologically, which results in their need/search for someone who will share their responsibilities and a life with them. In both cases, it is understood that the marriage decision they take or taken on behalf of them is not given careful consideration and this mostly brings about unhappy marriages with such consequences as physical violence and irresponsibility of husbands, mainly arising from "bad habits" like alcohol, drug or gambling.

While being deprived of education, struggling with financial hardships, being devoid of the choice to choose a spouse or being exposed to physical/psychological violence in a marriage constitute different aspects of women's poverty and deprivations independently, their intersection is also decisive in leading them to domestic service.

Considering when women decide to work as a domestic worker, it is seen that their severe material deprivation is the key point for all regardless of their being local or foreign. The material poverty they experience at this stage, however, requires reconsideration in term of its reasons. Firstly, it is observed that the majority of women face material poverty in their marriages as a result of their husbands' addictions or death. While some of them do not have such a problem before their marriage, those who also have economic problems when single, reface it due the reasons stated above despite their expectations. Secondly, a small number of women enter domestic service market to support their husbands' inadequate earnings or to help their mother/father or other members.

With a focus on the former, women have to shoulder the responsibility of their households in every aspect on their own in the event that their husband dies or he evades related duties due to his indulgences, which is the most frequent case observed. Taking into account that these women have also had children within that period and they predominantly ascribe the reason for their employment in domestic service to the needs of their children, the heavy burden of increasing responsibilities is the key factor which impoverishes their lives at this point and thereafter. In accordance with the traditional gender roles attributed to women as being self-sacrificing and obedient, women are either obliged to continue their marriage despite the unfavourable conditions caused by their husbands or they are mostly left alone in their struggle with hard conditions when they divorce or their husband dies.

Regarding the reason why women choose this job, being deprived of education, hence professional skills is the leading factor among local domestic workers. As they do not have any other marketable skill apart from their gender roles such as cleaning and care work and they can only earn very little in other unskilled jobs in formal employment, they prefer domestic service. The second reason that comes to the forefront is that as there is not a well-established child care system financed by the state, they prefer informal employment which provides them flexibility unlike formal employment.

With respect to foreign domestic workers, while the poor economy in their countries which earns them very little despite long working hours, regardless of whether they have professional skills or not, is the key factor of their immigration to Turkey, their preference for domestic service is determined by several interrelated reasons: First, as they enter the country illegally, they cannot work in well-paid jobs and second, considering they migrate with the aim of earning money, domestic service provides them with relatively higher earnings as well as a shelter to take in the event that they work as live-ins.

Hence, it is seen that the lack of education mainly works to local domestic workers' disadvantage when they enter the labour force market whereas in case of foreign domestic workers, the globalization process, which has weakened their countries' economic structure and created a cheap labour force heavily composed of women and immigrants, leads them to find a way out of the material poverty in a foreign

country without well-established and well-supervised laws both at national and international level.

Given all these processes and reasons, both local and foreign women are actually led to be included in informal sector, which is unregulated and as a consequence impoverishing as it does not give the employees their legal rights. So, the second part of the study handles the issue specific to domestic service, which heavily operates on the basis of informality and focuses on its weakening and impoverishing effects that are based on two interrelated reasons:

First, domestic workers turn their gender roles into a business and since such roles as cleaning, cooking and caregiving, which are attributed to women by nature, are taken for granted and not appreciated in the society due to the fact that they are performed by any woman within the borders of a house on a repetitive basis without a clear output, this invisible and undervalued nature of domestic work continues its existence even when it is done by someone else in return for money. Secondly, therefore, this fact brings along the invisibility of domestic workers, too, specifically in laws. Domestic service is excluded from the Labour Law and the Law of Occupational Health and Safety in Turkey. Hence, domestic workers perform their job without a service contract and as there is not a well-defined job description in laws, they have to deal with and work under heavy conditions. Domestic workers are only included in the Social Security Law; however they cannot benefit from it completely due to its inefficiency and insufficiency. As a result, their exclusion from and inadequate inclusion in laws make them vulnerable to abuse in the market and the effects can be seen at both work and private sphere.

As regards working conditions, there are basically two types of employment in domestic service market, as live-outs and live-ins, and the working conditions are determined and shaped accordingly. With respect to live-out domestic workers, they work for multiple employers on daily basis within a limited period time. While those who have just started working have fewer employers, the others who have gained experience in the field have more employers and nearly work every day of the week. The most frequent problem live-out domestic workers face is being overworked by the employers without being paid extra money. They are never paid carfare and sometimes they are not served food or paid money for it. Another important point is that as they work in a competitive but informal field, they cannot negotiate their

working hours or conditions with employers by the threat of losing their jobs. After they gain some experience, they can eliminate some employers; however even in this situation they cannot get extra payment for working overtime.

When compared with live-outs, live-in domestic workers in Turkey are exposed to heavier working conditions on the grounds that they do not have an escape from the working environment. They are expected to be at service nearly at any time of the day. The lack of job description affects them far more and even if they are initially hired as only a caregiver or a house cleaner, they are supposed to do everything apart from their assigned duty. Another important problem they face is that the room they are given is not actually designed for them and they mostly have to sleep in a place like a machine room or depository under unhealthy circumstances. Working under these conditions, live-in domestic workers cannot allocate a special time for their personal needs, even eating, let alone get sufficient sleep and rest. What is more, when they work for upper-class houses where more than one domestic worker work, they also have to deal with the competition among the employees.

In relation with income, live-outs may earn less and might not have a steady income when compared to live-ins, because their earnings depend on the number of the employers they work for and how many times they are called to work in a month. As for live-ins, as long as they do not leave their job or are dismissed by employers, they earn relatively more and secure a steady salary.

It is observed that the type of employment (live-out and live-in) is determined by several factors: Being married or dominated by a man, like an adult son or partner though not married, leads domestic workers –especially locals- to work as a live-out. However, in case of foreign migrant women who need a shelter on their first arrival and locals who are divorced/widow work as a live-in. It is also understood that the working conditions are determined in accordance with the type of employment, not the person who performs it. That is, although it is true that live-out domestic service is mostly performed by locals and live-ins are mostly foreign women; both groups perform the same duties under the same conditions in conformity with their type of employment. Neither is expected to do something different just because they are foreign or local.

Though foreign domestic workers are frequently exposed to cruel treatments by employers, these treatments are not a direct result of being employed in domestic service market. The results show that foreign migrant women face similar treatments in any type of informal employment in Turkey as long as they cannot attain work/residential permit. So, this study maintains that working as a live-in domestic worker only adds to foreign migrant women's social alienation when combined with their fear of being caught by the police in the social sphere; however the severe psychological and physical abuse is an consequence of being a worker who tries to work in a foreign country as a result of the globalization of the labour market, which promotes cheap labour force and thus obliges workers to work illegally in informal sector that does not protect them under national and international laws adequately.

With respect to the relationships between domestic workers and employers, it is seen that they are mostly exposed to unfavourable treatment, which affects them negatively. Irrespective of being a foreign/local or a live-out/live-in, domestic workers are predominantly accused of theft unfairly or their honesty is tested as a result of being considered a potential thief. As well as they are forced to work by exceeding their physical capacity; in case of live-ins, even their basic needs are neglected. Furthermore, all the participants state that they are humiliated by most employers and no consideration is given to their feelings. Hence, all these actually form different types of violence domestic workers come across. Taking into account both their working conditions and the treatment they face, they suffer from psychological, emotional and verbal violence/abuse. Besides, some of them may come across sexual abuse, which completely destroys their sense of security.

Apart from the heavy working conditions and the bad treatment at work, domestic workers' social security coverage is one of the most important problems they experience. It is clear that the current legal regulations concerning domestic workers are both ineffective and insufficient. This increases and brings about their vulnerability in the market. With respect to live-outs, it is seen that they can only benefit from full social security coverage on condition that they perform domestic service for "one employer" at least "10 days" a month, which means they can only have three employers totally. However, as this study also shows, live-outs predominantly work for more than 3 employers a month and they fall into the category of "those who work less than 10 days" for one employer, which means they

only have the right to benefit from occupational accident and disease insurances. Hence, the result is that the current regulations actually deprive “live-outs who work for multiple employers" of their right to full social security benefits, and as domestic workers do not consider this limited right meaningful, they do not even demand it, hence are completely excluded from the system.

Considering live-ins and live-outs who work for one employer, since they fall into the category of “those who work for 10 days and more a month”, they have the right to full social security coverage. However, their insurance completely depends on the arbitrary decisions of employers. It is seen that even those who have a long experience (12-15 years) in the field were included into the system just two or three years ago. As for foreign domestic workers, the social security law makes them dependant on employers in terms of work permit and social security coverage. In order to attain work permit and thus being insured, foreign domestic workers have to apply for it with their employers. So, if their employers do not register them, they have to work illegally and are deprived of every legal right.

Another important issue in domestic service is occupational health and safety. In Turkey, domestic service is not included in the Labour Law and the Law of Occupational Health and Safety, but it is subject to Law of Obligations. However, there are not clear specifications about health and safety issues with respect to domestic service and necessary precautions to be taken by employers in this law, because the work place in domestic service is a private house and it is out of the scope of inspection (Erdoğdu and Tokgöz, 2013).

As for union membership, it is observed that none of the participants have even heard about the domestic workers’ unions in Turkey, let alone have sufficient information about what a trade union is.

The third part of the study concentrates on the effects of the job on domestic workers’ lives. Firstly, it is observed that there is no job satisfaction of any kind among domestic workers, which can be attributed to their working conditions, the unfavourable treatment they face and their underrepresentation in laws. Domestic workers consider their job only as a means of earning money to meet their needs.

Secondly, it is clear that domestic service affects their well-being seriously. All the participants, especially those who have worked for long years, emphasize the

deterioration of their bodily health and express that they feel exhausted emotionally as a result of the hard experiences they go through in the domestic service market.

Thirdly, it is seen that domestic workers suffer from time poverty as a consequence of long working hours and being worn-out. While live-ins are at a greater disadvantage in this respect since they can only have one day-off, in case of live-outs, time poverty largely takes its roots from the fact that they also have the responsibility of maintaining their households. As well as spending very little time for their own personal needs, domestic workers cannot even spare enough time for their children who are largely the main cause of their struggle with material poverty, and this leads them to question their motherhood. Whereas this leads to unhappiness among all, it is much more distressing for foreign migrant women who leave their children and families behind in their own countries. Considering that domestic workers cannot spare enough time even for themselves and their families, it is not possible to mention their active participation in social life and leisure activities. With respect to foreign domestic workers, it is also important to note that as long as they work illegally, they try to abstain from outdoor activities on their weekly leave due to the fear of being caught by the police.

In terms of income, it is understood that domestic workers do not have a complete control over their income and keep their expenditures at minimum except for some basic needs such as clothing and health – only when necessary. They spend what they earn basically for their children and sometimes other dependants in the family like their mothers or grandchildren while in some cases, their husbands also extort their income as a result of their addictions -gambling, alcohol or drugs-. Hence, the result is that their income does not transform their lives for the better and it is not possible to mention any personal improvement which contributes to their individual and social life.

Also, it is clear that domestic workers' income mostly suffices for their current needs and it does not enable them to make savings for the future, except for a few examples that are assisted financially by their husbands/ other relatives or if they are single. Given that the job exhausts them both physically and psychologically and they hardly hold a chance of retirement and old-age pension due to the deficiencies in law, it is a matter of concern how they will manage to maintain their lives when they cannot work anymore, even if they have been able make some savings.

Lastly, most domestic workers are pessimistic about their future life, because they do not know what to do or how to maintain their lives financially when they are not able to work anymore. As well as causing hopelessness among them, this situation also makes domestic workers dependent on others in the future most probably their children.

All in all, this study, which provides a broad perspective to understand local and foreign female domestic workers' multidimensional poverty in Turkey, shows that women domestic workers' poverty is not only related to the job they perform and the income they earn. As the results indicate, women are already weakened in many aspects before they start domestic service, and that is the underlying reason why they take place in informal employment field. After they start performing domestic service, they have to put up with heavy working conditions and unfavourable treatments by employers as they do not have a legal standing in the labour force market.

This study suggests that promoting women's empowerment, especially in terms of education, and encouraging change in conventional values which weaken women in every aspect whether in family or social life are of crucial importance in every society. Also, it is significant for all governments to support families, who experience material poverty, with respect to their children's education so that material poverty will not deprive them of their right to education. In addition, in case of foreign migrant women, it is essential to make new laws and take precautions both nationally and internationally to protect them against all kinds of abuse they may come across during their stay in another country.

The study also recommends that domestic service as a field of informal employment is one of the most important impoverishing factors in domestic workers' lives, and therefore, the state should take some steps to bring solutions to the related problems. Initially, it is essential to sign and adopt the Domestic Workers Convention No: 189 prepared by ILO in June 2011 in Turkey and to include domestic service into the Labour Law and the Law of Occupational Health and Safety so that this field of employment will gain a legal status and domestic workers will be fully represented and protected in laws. Also, the current Social Security Law should be revised especially in terms of live-out domestic service and foreign domestic workers, and most importantly, there should be an official supervision mechanism to promote

domestic workers' inclusion into the system. In this way, domestic workers will have their social security right in practice; not only on paper and thus employers' arbitrary decisions to insure them will be eliminated.

Hence, when domestic service market takes on a formal status and domestic workers gain full recognition legally, the negative effects of the job on their lives may be reduced. In that case, as domestic workers will have a labour contract, a specified job description and specific working hours, the physical and psychological consequences of the job are likely to be less. Also, in the event that domestic service is included into the Law of Occupational Health and Safety, it is supposed that the risks they come across while performing their job will decrease. Last, but not the least, the revision of the current Social Security Law, which will fit their specific conditions, will earn them their right to social security coverage, and thus preventing them from being dependant on others when they cannot manage to work anymore. In this way, while they are going to be able to secure their old age pension, they will also be more optimistic about future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Acar, Ayşenur, Cem Başlevent. 2014. Examination of the Transitions of Households into and out of Poverty in Turkey. **Betam Working Paper Series**. **No.15.** İstanbul.

Adaman, Fikret., Çağlar Keyder. 2006. **Türkiye'nin Büyük Kentlerinin Gecekondu ve Çöküntü Mahallelerinde Yaşayan Yoksulluk ve Sosyal Dışlanma**. Avrupa Komisyonu.

Addati, Laura, Naomi Cassirer, 2008. Equal Sharing of Responsibilities between Women and Men, Including Care-giving in the Context of HIV/AIDS. **The Expert Group Meeting on Equal Sharing of Responsibilities between Women and Men, Including Care giving in the Context of HIV/AIDS**. The United Nations Division for the Advancement of Women, Geneva, 6–8 October 2008. (Cited in United Nations Statistics Division. 2010. **World's Women 2010: Trends and Statistics**. New York).

Akalın, Ayşe. 2010. Yukarıdakiler- Aşağıdakiler: İstanbul'daki Güvenlikli Sitelerde Göçmen Ev Hizmetlisi İstihdamı. **Türkiye'ye Uluslararası Göç.** der. B. Pusch, T. Wilkoszewski. Kitap Yayınevi. İstanbul.

_____. 2007. Hired as a Caregiver, Demanded as a Housewife: Becoming a Migrant Domestic Worker in Turkey. **European Journal of Women's Studies**. Vol.14, No.3: 209-225.

Alarcon, Norma. 1990. The Theoretical Subjects of This Bridge Called My Back and Anglo-American Feminism**. Making Face, Making Soul: Haciendo Caras: Creative and Critical Perspectives by Women of Color.** ed. Gloria Anzaldua. Aunt Lute Foundation Books. San Francisco: 356-369. (Cited in Wong, Elizabeth. 2012. Why Domestic Work is a Feminist Issue. **Intersections**. Vol. 3: 39-44.).

Alkire, Sabina, Moizza Binat Sarwar. 2009. Multidimensional Measures of Poverty & Well-being. **Oxford Poverty & Human Development Initiative.**

Baker , Judy L. 2008. Urban poverty: A Global View. **Urban Papers. No. UP-5.** World Bank. Washington, DC.

Banton, Michael. 1997. **Ethnic and Racial Consciousness**. London: Longman. (Cited in Jureidini, Ray. 2003. **Migrant workers and Xenophobia in the Middle East.** United Nations Research Institute for Social Development. Identities, Conflict and Cohesion Programme Paper No. 2. Switzerland.).

Başak, Ekim. 2007. Sosyal Dışlanma ile Mücadelede Hak Temelli Yaklaşım: Avrupa Yoksulluk ile Mücadele Ağı. **Tes-İş Dergisi**: 81-82.

Beauvoir, Simon de. 1989. **The Second Sex**. New York: Vintage Books.

Becker-Schmidt,Regina. 1992. Geschlechterverhaltnisse und Herrschaftszusammenhange. **Wider das Schlichte Vergessen**. ed. C. Kuhlke,H.K. Degetoff and U. Ramming. Orlanda: Campani: 216–236. (Cited in Lutz, Helma. 2002. At Your Service Madame! The Globalisation of Domestic Service. **Feminist Review**. No. 70: 89-104.).

Bhardwaj, Rahul., Shahanawaz Ansari, Y.S Rajput. 2012. Human Development. **International Journal of Scientific Research Engineering & Technology**. Vol: 1, No. 5: 303-308.

Bora, Aksu. 2005. **Kadınların Sınıfı, Ücretli Ev Emeği ve Kadın Öznelliğinin İnşası**. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

_____. 2007. Yoksulluk ve Kadınlar. **Tes-İş Dergisi**: 95-99.

Bravo, Rosa 1998. Pobreza Por Razones de Género. Precisando Conceptos. **Género y pobreza. Nuevas dimensiones.** No. 26. ed. Irma Arriagada, Carmen Torres. Santiago, Chile: ISIS International, Ediciones de las Mujeres. (Cited in Cepal, NU. (2004). Understanding Poverty from a Gender Perspective. **Serie Mujer y Desarrollo No.52**. Women and Development Unit of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean. United Nations: Santiago, Chile).

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

Buğra, Ayşe. 2007. Yoksulluk ve Sosyal Haklar. **Tes-İş Dergisi**: 75-80.

Çağatay Nilüfer. 1998. Gender and Poverty**. UNDP Social Development and Poverty Elimination Division Working Paper. No. 5.**

Çarhoğlu, Emine. 2011. Bir Esnek Çalışma Biçimi Olarak Evde Çalışma ve Evde Çalışan İşçilerin Korunması sorunu. Ankara: **Çalışma Ve Sosyal Güvenlik Bakanlığı İş Teftiş Kurulu Başkanlığı**: 1-43.

Caniklioğlu, Nurşen, Ercüment Özkaraca. 2016. Ev Hizmetlerinde Çalışanların Sigortalılığı. **İstanbul Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Mecmuası.** Cilt.74: 1133-1161.

Cepal, NU. 2004. Understanding Poverty from a Gender Perspective. **Serie Mujer y Desarrollo No.52**. Women and Development Unit of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean. United Nations: Santiago, Chile.

Chambers, Robert. 2006. What is Poverty? Who Asks? Who Answers?. **Poverty in Focus: What is Poverty? Concepts and Measures.** No. 9: 3-4.

Chant, Sylvia. 2006**. Re-visiting the Feminisation of Poverty and the UNDP Gender Indices: What Case for a Gendered Poverty Index?**. New Working Paper Series. No. 18. LSE Gender Institute.

_____. 2008. Beyond incomes: A New Take on the 'Feminisation of Poverty'. **Poverty in Focus: Gender Equality.** No.13: 26-27.

Chen, Martha Alter. 2011. Recognizing Domestic Workers, Regulating Domestic Work: Conceptual, Measurement, and Regulatory challenges. **Canadian Journal of Women and the Law**. Vol. 23, No.: 167-184.

Crettaz, Eric., Giuliano Bonoli. 2010. Why are some workers poor? : The mechanisms that Produce Working Poverty in a Comparative Perspective. **Working Papers on the Reconciliation of Work and Welfare in Europe REC-WP**. University of Edinburgh Publication and Dissemination Centre.

Çakar, Erden. 2015. Ev Hizmetlerinde 10 gün ve Daha Fazla Çalıştırılanların SGK'ya Bildirimi Nasıl Yapılacak?. **Yaklaşım Dergisi.** s.269: 214-218.

Ecevit, Yıldız. 2003. Toplumsal Cinsiyetle Yoksulluk İlişkisi Nasıl Kurulabilir?. **C.Ü. Tıp Fakültesi Dergisi**. s.25 Özel Eki: 83-88.

_____. 2007. Yoksulluğa Karşı Feminist Strateji. **Amargi.** s. 6: 14-17.

Erdem, Tevfik. 2006. Yoksulluk. **Feodaliteden Küreselleşmeye Temel Kavram ve Süreçler.** ed. Tevfik Erdem. Ankara: Lotus Yayınevi.

Erdem, Ziya., Levent Şahin. 2010. Ülkemizde Ev Hizmetlerinde İstihdam Edilen Yabancı Uyruklu İşgücünün Çalışma Koşulları: İstanbul İli Üzerine Bir Alan Araştırması. **Sosyal Siyaset Konferansları Dergisi.** s.57: 281-325.

Erdoğdu, Seyhan, Gülay Tokgöz. 2013. **The visible Face of Women's Invisible Labour: Domestic Workers in Turkey**. International Labour Organization. Ankara.

Erman, Tahire. 2003. **Poverty In Turkey, The Social Dimension In Turkey: Poverty And Coping After Crisis**. Human Development Unit Report. No. 24185.

Etiler, Nilay, Kuvvet Lordoğlu. 2010. Göçmenlerin Sağlık Sorunları: Ev Hizmetlerinde Bir AlanAraştırması. **Sosyal Haklar Sempozyomu Bildiri Kitapçığı.** İstanbul: Petrol İş Yayını. 93-118.

Eurostat. 2010. **Combating Poverty And Social Exclusion: A Statistical Portrait Of The European Union**. Belgium.

Friese, Marianne. 1995. Modernisierungsfallen Im Historischen Prozess. Zur Entwicklung Von Frauenerwerbsarbeit In Einem Gewandelten Europa. **Berliner Journal Fur Soziologie**. Vol. 4, No. 5: 149–162. (Cited in Lutz, Helma. 2002. At Your Service Madame! The Globalisation of Domestic Service. **Feminist Review**. No. 70: 89-104.).

Fukuda-Parr, Sakiko. 1999. What Does Feminisation of Poverty Mean? It Isn't Just Lack of Income. **Feminist Economics**. Vol.5, No. 2: 99-103.

Gündoğan, Naci. 2007. **Yoksulluğun Değişen Yüzü Çalışan Yoksullar**. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Gürsel, Seyfettin, Bülent Anıl, Ayşenur Acar. 2013. Türkiye'de Yoksulluk Tartışması Kim Haklı? Yoksulluk arttı mı, Azaldı mı?. **Betam Araştırma Notu 13/153**. İstanbul.

Gürsel, Seyfettin, Gökçe Uysal-Kolaşin, Mehmet Alper Dinçer. 2009. Women Are Desperately Seeking Self-Employment. **Betam Research Brief 09/34**. İstanbul.

Gürsel, Seyfettin, Gökçe Uysal-Kolaşin, Selin Köksal. 2016. One Third of Children Live in Severe Material Deprivation. **Betam Research Brief 16/193**. İstanbul.

Güzel, Ali, Ali Rıza Okur, Nurşen Caniklioğlu. 2014. **Sosyal Güvenlik Hukuku.** İstanbul: Beta Yayınları.

Hattatoğlu, Dilek. 2007. Küreselleşme, Yeni Emek Biçimleri: Yoksulluk ve Kadınlar. **Amargi**. No.6: 18-21.

Heintz, James. 2008. Poverty, Employment and Globalisation: A Gender Perspective. **Poverty in Focus: Gender Equality.** No.13: 12-13.

Human Rights Watch. 2006. **Swept Under The Rug. Abuses against Domestic Workers Around the World.** (Vol. 18, No. 7). New York.

Human Right Watch. 2009. **Decent Work For Domestic Workers: The Case For Global Labor Standards Human Rights Abuses, Best Practices, and Recommendations for an ILO Convention.** New York.

IFAD. 2011. **Rural Poverty Report.** Rome.

International Labour Office. 2004. **Making Work Arrangements More Family-Friendly.** Information sheet No. WF-5. Conditions of Work and Employment Programme. Geneva.

_____. 2009. **Decent work for domestic workers, Report IV (1)**. International Labour Conference, 99th Session, 2010. Geneva.

_____. 2010. **Global And Regional Estimates On Domestic Workers**. Domestic Work Policy Brief 4. Geneva.

_____. 2011a. **Convention 189: Decent Work for Domestic Workers**. Geneva.

_____. 2011b. **Measuring The Economic And Social Value Of Domestic Work**. Domestic Work Policy Brief 4. Geneva.

_____. 2013a. **Meeting The Needs Of My Family Too. Maternity Protection And Work-Family Measures For Domestic Workers.** Domestic Work Policy Brief 6. Geneva.

_____. 2013b. **Working Time Of Live-In Domestic Workers.** Domestic Work Policy Brief 7. Geneva.

_____. 2014. **Transitioning From The Informal To The Formal Economy.** Geneva.

Işık, Ruşen, Nuray Sakallı-Uğurlu. 2009. Namusa ve Namus Adına Kadına Uygulanan Şiddete İlişkin Tutumlar Ölçeklerinin Öğrenci Örneklemiyle Geliştirilmesi. **Türk Psikoloji Yazıları**: 16-24.

Işık, Oğuz, M. Melih Pınarcıoğlu. 2001a. **Nöbetleşe Yoksulluk: Sultanbeyli Örneği**. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

_____. 2001b. 1980 Sonrası Dönemde Kent Yoksulları Arasında Güce Dayalı Ağ İlişkileri: Sultanbeyli Örneği. **Toplum ve Bilim.** s. 89.

Jackson, Cecile, 1996. Rescuing Gender From The Poverty Trap. **World Development**. Vol. 24, No. 3: 489–504. (Cited in: United Nations Statistics Division. 2010. **World's Women 2010: Trends and Statistics.** New York).

Jureidini, Ray. 2003. **Migrant workers and Xenophobia in the Middle East.** United Nations Research Institute for Social Development. Identities, Conflict and Cohesion Programme Paper No. 2. Switzerland.

Kabeer, Naila. 2008. Gender, Labour Markets and Poverty: An overview. **Poverty in Focus: Gender Equality**. No.13: 3-5.

Kaga, Midori. 2012. **Domestic Work is Real Work: Repoliticizing the Discourse on Gender, Citizenship, and Global Injustices**. DPU Working Paper No: 147. The Barlett Development Unit. London.

Kalaycıoğlu, Sibel, Helga Rittersberger-Tılıç. 2001. **Evlerimizdeki Gündelikçi Kadınlar. Cömert Ablaların Sadık Hanımları.** Ankara: Su Yayınları.

_____. 2005. İşgücü Pazarında Gündelikçi Olmak, Çalışma Hayatında Kadınlar. ed. Gökhan Atılgan. **Tes-İş Dergisi**.: 70-74.

Kalaycıoğlu, Sibel. 2003. Kadın Yoksulluğu Nasıl Anlaşılmalı. **Türkiye İnsan Hakları Hareketi Konferansı**. ed. Gül Erdost. Ankara: Buluş Yayınları: 286-294.

_____. 2006. Dynamics Of Poverty In Turkey: Gender, Rural/Urban Poverty, Social Networks And Reciprocal Survival Strategies. **Poverty and Social Deprivation in the Mediterranean Area: Trends, Policies and Welfare Prospects in the New Millennium.** ed. Petmesidou M., Papatheodorou C. London: Zed Books: 218-247.

Kandiyoti, Deniz. 1997. **Cariyeler, Bacılar, Yurttaşlar: Kimlikler ve Toplumsal Dönüşümler.** İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Kantor, Paula. 2009. Women's Exclusion and Unfavorable Inclusion in the Informal Employment in Lucknow, India: Barriers to Voice and Livelihood Security. **World Development.** Vol. 37, No.1: 194-207. (Cited in Kaga, Midori. 2012. **Domestic Work is Real Work: Repoliticizing the Discourse on Gender, Citizenship, and Global Injustices**. DPU Working Paper No: 147. The Barlett Development Unit. London.).

Karaca, Nuray Gökçek, Fatma Kocabaş. 2009. Ev Hizmetlerinde Çalışanların Karşılaştıkları Sorunların Türkiye Açısından Değerlendirilmesi. **Kamu-İş.** c.10, s.4:161-176.

Karadeniz, Oğuz. 2008. **Ev Hizmetlerinde Çalışanlar ve Sosyal Koruma Sorunu.** II.Çalışma Yaşamı Kongresi. İş Müfettişleri Derneği. A.Ü. Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi, Sosyal Politika Araştırma Merkezi:176-204.

Kardam, Filiz, İlknur Yüksel. 2004. Kadınların Yoksulluğu Yaşama Biçimleri: Yapabilirlik ve Yapabilirlikten Yoksunluk. **Nüfus Bilim Dergisi**. s.26: 45-72.

Kaşka, Selmin. 2009. The New International Migration and Migrant Women in Turkey: The Case of Moldovan Domestic Workers. **Land of Diverse Migrations**. ed. Ahmet İçduygu, Kemal Kirişçi. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi University Press.

Keyder, Çağlar, Ayşe Buğra. 2003. **Yeni Yoksulluk ve Türkiye'nin Değişen Refah Rejimi**. UNDP.

Keyder, Çağlar. 2005. Globalization and Social Exclusion in Istanbul. **International Journal of Urban and Regional Research.** vol.29, no.1: 124-134.

Kümbetoğlu, Belkıs. 2002. Afetler Sonrası Kadınlar ve Yoksulluk. **Türkiye İnsan Hakları Konferansı 2002 Bildirileri.** Ankara: TODAİE İnsan Hakları Araştırma ve Derleme Merkezi. 129-142.

Kümbetoğlu, Belkıs. 2005. Enformelleşme Süreçlerinde Genç Göçmen Kadınlar ve Dayanışma Ağları. **Folklor/Edebiyat.** s.41: 7-25.

Lutz, Helma, Shwalgin, S. 2005. Irregular Migration and The Globalisation of Domestic Work: Domestic Workers in Germany. **Proceedings of the Servant Project**. Vol. 4. ed. S. Pasleau, I. Schopp, R. Sarti. Liege: Editions de l' Universite de Liege: 225-241. (Cited in Sarti, Raffaella. 2008. The Globalization of Domestic Service: A Historical Perspective. **Migration and Domestic Work: A European Perspective on a Global Theme.** ed. Helma Lutz. Aldershot: Ashgate: 77-97.).

Lutz, Helma. 2002. At Your Service Madame! The Globalisation of Domestic Service. **Feminist Review**. No. 70: 89-104.

_____. (ed.) 2008a. **Migration and Domestic Work: A European Perspective on a Global Theme.** Aldershot: Ashgate.

_____. 2008b. Introduction: Migrant Domestic Workers in Europe. **Migration and Domestic Work: A European Perspective on a Global Theme.** ed. Helma Lutz. Aldershot: Ashgate:1-11.

Manav, A. Eda. 2015. Ev Hizmetlerinde Çalışanların Sigortalılığı**. Türkiye Barolar Birliği Dergisi**. s.120: 509-538.

Medeiros, Marcelo, Joana Costa. 2008. Is There Really a 'Feminisation of Poverty'?. **Poverty in Focus: Gender Equality.** No.13: 24-25.

Mowafi, Mona. 2004. **The Meaning And Measurement Of Poverty: A Look Into The Global Debate.** Development Gateway Foundation.

Narayan, Deepa, et al. 1999**. Can Anyone Hear Us? Voices from 47 Countries.** Voices of the Poor, Vol. 1. Poverty Group, PREM, World Bank.

Nussbaum, Martha. 2000. **Women's Capability and Social Justice**. **Journal of Human Development.** Vol.1, No.2: 219-247. (Cited in Yıldırımalp, Sinem, Akın Özdemir. 2013. Yapabilirlikten Yoksunluk Bağlaminda Türkiye'de Kadin Yoksulluğu. **Hak İş Uluslararası Emek ve Toplum Dergisi.** c.4, s.2: 50-83.).

Okur, Ali Rıza. 2004. Ev Hizmetlerinde (İşlerinde) Çalışanların Sigortalılığı. **Kamu-İs.** c.7, s.3: 1-22.

Olinto, Pedro, Kathleen Beegle, Carlos Sobrado, Hiroki Uematsu. 2013. **The State Of The Poor: Where Are The Poor, Where Is Extreme Poverty Harder To End, And What Is The Current Profile Of The World's Poor?**. Economic Premise. No. 125. Washington DC: World Bank.

Özbay Ferhunde, Banu Yücel. 2001. Türkiye'de Göç Hareketleri, Devlet Politikaları ve Demografik Yapı. **Nüfus ve Kalkınma : Göç, Eğitim, Demokrasi, Yaşam Kalitesi.** ed. Ferhunde Özbay. Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Nüfus Etütleri Enstitüsü.

Özbay, Ferhunde. 2012. Türkiye'de Ev Emeğinin Dönüşümü: Ondokuzuncu Yüzyıldaki Osmanlı Ev Kölelerinden Günümüzde Kaçak Göçmen İşçilere. **Geçmişten Günümüze Türkiye'de Kadın Emeği.** ed. Ahmet Makal, Gülay Toksöz. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Yayınevi.

Özyeğin, Gül. 2005. **Başkalarının Kiri. Kapıcılar, Gündelikçiler ve Kadınlık Halleri**. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Parrenas, Rhacel Salazar. 2001. **Servants of Globalization: Women, Migration and Domestic Work.** Palo Alto: Stanford University Press. (Cited in Lutz, Helma. 2002. At Your Service Madame! The Globalisation of Domestic Service. **Feminist Review**. No. 70: 89-104.)

Pierce, Diane. 1978. The Feminization of of Poverty: Women, Work and Welfare. **Urban Change and Social Change Review.** Vol.11: 28-37.

Pineda-Ofreneo, Rosalinda, Ma Lourdes Acosta. 2001. Integrating Gender Concerns in Anti-Poverty Strategies. **Public Policy (University of the Philippines).** Vol.5, No.2: 1-41. (Cited in Chant, Sylvia. 2006**. Re-visiting the Feminisation of Poverty and the UNDP Gender Indices: What Case for a Gendered Poverty Index?**. New Working Paper Series. No. 18. LSE Gender Institute.)

Ramirez-Machado, Jose Maria. 2003. **Domestic Work, Conditions Of Work And Employment: A Legal Perspective.** Conditions of Work and Employment Series 7. ILO. Geneva.

Razavi, Shahra. and Silke Staab. 2008. The Social And Political Economy Of Care: Contesting Class And Gender Inequalities. **The Expert Group Meeting On Equal Sharing Of Responsibilities between Women And Men, Including Care-Giving In The Context Of HIV/AIDS.** The United Nations Division for The Advancement Of Women. Geneva, 6–8 October 2008. (Cited in United Nations Statistics Division. 2010. **World's Women 2010: Trends and Statistics**. New York.).

Robeyns, Ingrid. 2001. Sen's Capability Approach and Feminist Concerns. **The Conference on Sen's Capability Approach.** St Edmund's College, Cambridge, UK.

_____. 2003. Sen's Capability Approach and Gender Inequality: Selecting Relevant Capabilities. **Feminist Economics**. Vol.9, No. 2-3: 61-92.

_____. 2006. The Capability Approach in Practice. **The Journal of Political Philosophy**. Vol.14, No.3: 351-376.

Sallan Gül, Songül, Cem Ergun. 2009. Kentsel Yoksulluk ve Kadın Yoksulluğuna Çöp Alanlarından Bakış. **Uluslararası-Disiplinlerarası Kadın Çalışmaları Kongresi, c. 3.** Sakarya: Sakarya Üniversitesi: 133-142.

Sallan Gül, Songül. 2005. Türkiye'de Yoksulluğun Kadınsılaşması. **Amme İdaresi Dergisi**. c.38, s.1: 25-43.

Sarti, Raffaella. 2005. Conclusion: Domestic Service and European İdentity. **Proceedings of the Servant Project**. Vol. 5. ed. S. Pasleau, I. Schopp, R. Sarti. Liege: Editions de l' Universite de Liege: 195-284. (Cited in Sarti, Raffaella. 2008. The Globalization of Domestic Service: A Historical Perspective. **Migration and Domestic Work: A European Perspective on a Global Theme.** ed. Helma Lutz. Aldershot: Ashgate: 77-97.).

_____. 2008. The Globalization of Domestic Service: A Historical Perspective. **Migration and Domestic Work: A European Perspective on a Global Theme.** ed. Helma Lutz. Aldershot: Ashgate: 77-97.

Semerci, Pınar Uyan. 2007. Küreselleşme, Yoksullukla Mücadele Amaç Ne Olmalı? Yapabilirlikleri Arttırmayı Hedeflemek. **Amargi.** s.6: 22-24.

Sen, Amartya. 1995. **The Political Economy of Targeting.** Public Spending and the Poor. Washington:World Bank.

Sen, Amartya. 1999a. **Inequality Reexamined.** Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____. 1999b. **Development as Freedom**. New York: Random House, Inc.

_____. 2000. **Social Exclusion: Concept, Application, and Scrutiny**. Social Development Paper No.1, ADB.

_____. 2002. Response to Commentaries. **Studies in Comparative Internaional Development.** Vol.37, No.2: 78-86. (Cited in Yıldırımalp, Sinem, Akın Özdemir. 2013. Yapabilirlikten Yoksunluk Bağlaminda Türkiye'de Kadin Yoksulluğu. **Hak İş Uluslararası Emek ve Toplum Dergisi.** c.4, s.2: 50-83.).

_____. 2009. **The Idea of Justice.** London: Allen Lane.

Sen, Gita. 2008. Poverty as a Gendered Experience: The Policy Implications. **Poverty in Focus: Gender Equality.** No.13: 6-7.

Suğur, Nadir, Serap Suğur, Oya B.Çetin, Gönç-Şavran, Temmuz, Erhan Akarçay. 2008. Hizmet Sektöründe Çalışan Yoksulların Yoksulluk Algıları Üzerine Bir Araştırma. **İş-Güç Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi.** c.10, s.4:1-29.

Suğur, Nadir., Serap Suğur, Temmuz Gönç-Savran, Oya Beklan Çetin. 2010. Hizmet Sektöründe Çalışan Yoksulların Geçim Stratejileri ve Sosyal İlişki Ağları: Eskişehir Örneği. **"İşGüç" Industrial Relations and Human Resources Journal.** Vol.12, No.1: 61-83.

Snyder, R. Claire. 2008. What Is Third-Wave Feminism? A New Directions Essay. **Signs.** Vol. 34, No. 1: 175-196.

Şener, Ülker. 2009. **Kadın Yoksulluğu**. Türkiye Ekonomi Politikaları Araştırma Vakfı.

Şenses, Fikret. 2008. **Küreselleşmenin Öteki Yüzü: Yoksulluk**. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

T.C. Başbakanlık Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı, World Bank. 2009. **Türkiye'de Kadınların Işgücüne Katılımı: Eğilimler, Belirleyici Faktörler Ve Politika Çerçevesi, Rapor No 48508.** (Aktaran: Topgül, Seda. 2013. Türkiye'de Yoksulluk Ve Yoksulluğun Kadınlaşması. **Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi İktisadi Ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi**. c.14, s.1: 277-296.).

Taş, H. Yunus, Selami Özcan. 2012. Türkiye'de Ve Dünyada Yoksulluk Üzerine Bir Araştırma. **International Conference on Eurasian Economies**: 423-430.

World Bank. 2016. **Poverty and Shared Prosperity 2016: Taking on Inequality.** Washington DC.

Thorsen, Dorte. 2012. **Child Domestic Workers: Evidence From West And Central Africa**. Unicef.

Toksöz, Gülay. 2007. **Türkiye'de Kadın İstihdamının Durumu**. International Labour Organisation. Ankara.

Topgül, Seda. 2013. Türkiye'de Yoksulluk Ve Yoksulluğun Kadınlaşması. **Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi İktisadi Ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi**. c.14, s.1: 277-296.

Townsend, Peter. 2006. What is poverty? An Historical Perspective. **Poverty in Focus**, No.9: 5-6.

TUIK. 2014. **Toplumsal Cinsiyet Veri Seti.** Ankara.

_____. 2016a. **Income and Living Conditions Survey, 2015.** TUIK Press Release.

_____. 2016b. **Income and Living Conditions Survey Regional Results, 2015.** TUIK Press Release.

_____. 2016c. **İstatistiklerle Kadın, 2015.** TUIK Press Release.

Ulutaş Ünlütürk, Çağla. 2009. Yoksulluğun Kadınlaşması ve Görünmeyen Emek. **Çalışma ve Toplum**. Vol.2: 25-40.

United Nations Statistics Division. 2010. **World's Women 2010: Trends and Statistics**. New York.

Uysal Kolaşin, Gökçe, Zeynep Hande Paker Uncu, Yasemin Cansuz, Melike Kökkizil. 2015. **Türkiye'de Lise Ve Üniversite Mezunu Kadınların Işgücüne Katılım Kararlarının Incelenmesi.** Program Kodu:1001. Tübitak.

Wagle, Udaya. 2002. Rethinking Poverty: Definition And Measurement. **International Social Science Journal.** Vol.54, No.171: 155-165.

Weyland, Petra. 1994. Gendered lives in Global Spaces. **Space, Culture And Power.** ed. Ayşe Öncü, Petra Weyland. London: Zed Books: 82-97. (Cited in Özbay, Ferhunde. 2012. Türkiye'de Ev Emeğinin Dönüşümü: Ondokuzuncu Yüzyıldaki Osmanlı Ev Kölelerinden Günümüzde Kaçak Göçmen İşçilere. **Geçmişten Günümüze Türkiye'de Kadın Emeği.** ed. Ahmet Makal, Gülay Toksöz. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Yayınevi.).

Whitehead, Ann. 2003. **Failing Women, Sustaining Poverty: Gender in Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers**: Report for the UK Gender and Development Network. (Cited in Chant, Sylvia. 2006**. Re-visiting the Feminisation of Poverty and the UNDP Gender Indices: What Case for a Gendered Poverty Index?**. New Working Paper Series. No. 18. LSE Gender Institute.).

Wong, Elizabeth. 2012. Why Domestic Work is a Feminist Issue. **Intersections.** Vol. 3: 39-44.

Yaşar, M. Ruhat. 2013. Kadınların Yoksulluğu: Kimsesiz Kadınlar Kastı. **Kentsel Yoksulluğu Yeniden Düşünmek.** ed. Ömer Aytaç, Süleyman İlhan. Ankara: Birleşik Yayınevi: 221-276.

Yıldırımalp, Sinem. 2014. Türkiye'de Ev Hizmetlerinde Çalışanların Sorunları. **Karabük Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi.** c. 4, s. 1: 45-59.

Yıldırımalp, Sinem, Emel İslamoğlu. 2014. İnsana Yakışır İş Kavramı Bağlamında Türkiye'de Ev Hizmetinde Çalışan Kadınlar. **Sosyal Güvenlik Dergisi**. c.4, s.2: 145-175.

Yıldırımalp, Sinem, Akın Özdemir. 2013. Yapabilirlikten Yoksunluk Bağlaminda Türkiye'de Kadin Yoksulluğu. **Hak İş Uluslararası Emek ve Toplum Dergisi.** c.4, s.2: 50-83.

Websites

1.1 TL Veren SMS'le Gündelikçi Sigortalayacak. [13.02.2017]. http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/1-1-tl-veren-smsle-gundelikci-sigortalayacak-40268977.

8 Soruda Torba Yasa Ev İşçilerine Ne Getirdi? Ne Götürdü?. [10.02.2017]. http://bianet.org/bianet/kadin/158545.

Anneler Dikkat: Göçmen Kadınların da Hakları Var!. [07.03.2014]. http://bianet.org/bianet/emek/126650-anneler-dikkat-gocmen-kadinlarin-da-haklari-var.

Arna, Sibel. [07.03.2014]. Dadılar da Yüzer Dans Edermiş. http://t24.com.tr/haber/sibel-arna-dadilar-da-yuzer-dans-edermis,80459.

Bakanlık Ev İşçilerini Gördü. [01. 04. 2014]. http://www.radikal.com.tr/turkiye/bakanlik-ev-iscilerini-gordu-1178828/.

Defining Violence and Abuse. [19.06.2017]. https://www.gov.nl.ca/VPI/types/.

Easier to Insure Domestic Servants!. [13.02.2017]. https://www.esin.av.tr.

Ethiopian maid: My Kuwaiti Employer Was Trying To Kill Me. [15.04.2017]. http://www.middleeasteye.net/news/ethiopian-maid-viral-kuwait-video-says-she-was-trying-escape-employer-354761341.

Ev İşçileri De Sendikalarını Kurabilir. [12. 10. 2014]. http://www.birgun.net/haber-detay/ev-iscileri-de-kendi-sendikalarini-kurabilir-69204.html.

Ev İşçileri Yasası Yürürlüğe Giriyor Ama Yönetmeliği Yok. [09.02.2017]. http://bianet.org/bianet/kadin/163402-ev-iscileri-yasasi-yururluge-giriyor-ama-yonetmeligi-yok.

İsteğe Bağlı Sigortalılık Nedir? Koşulları Nelerdir?. [09.02.2017]. http://iskanunu.com/sizin-sorduklariniz/2321-istege-bagli-sigortalilik-nedir-kosullar-nelerdir/.

Today's Feminism: A Brief Look at Third-Wave Feminism. [01.04.2017]. https://beingfeministblog.wordpress.com/2013/05/16/todays-feminism-a-brief-look-at-third-wave-feminism/.

Kahraman, Hasan Bülent. [12.01.2014]. Kadın Bulmak Zor İştir. http://www.sabah.com.tr.

Suda, Pakize. [12.01.2014]. Gündelikçi Kadınlar. http://www.hurriyet.com.tr.

Yabancı Uyruklu Kadınlar Hakkında. [07.03.2014]. https://www.kadinlarkulubu.com.

Abdullah, Tahire. [03.02.2015]. Poverty Alleviation: Hunger, Thy Face İs Woman. https://tribune.com.pk/story/320570/poverty-alleviation-hunger-thy-face-is-woman/.

UNDP Multidimensional Poverty Index. [13.04.2015]. http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/multidimensional-poverty-index-mpi.

UNDP Gender Inequality Index. [14.04.2015]. http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/gender-inequality-index-gii.

Yabancı Uyruklu Çalışanlar Dikkat. [07.06.2015]. http://www.sabah.com.tr.

Sıkça Sorulan Sorular. [13.02.2017]. http://www.sgk.gov.tr.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1. Interview Questions

1) Life story

2) Demographic information

3) Intra-household relationships and relationships with male members in the family

4) Domestic service market and experiences/problems in the field

5) What it means to be a domestic worker

6) The perspectives of local and foreign domestic workers' about each other

7) Discrimination/violence/sexual harassment at work

8) Future plans

Appendix 2. Interview Details

Name	Date of Interview	Place of Interview	Duration of Interview	District
Gül	07.08.2017	Employer's House	00:55	Göztepe, Merdivenköy
Lale	09.08.2017	House	1:10	Beylikdüzü, Gürpınar
Ülkü	10.08.2017	Café	1:00	Gaziosmanpaşa
Elanur	12.08.2017	House	00:59	Fatih
Kevser	17.08.2017	House	1:45	Bağcılar
Roni	19.08.2017	House	1:05	Kağıthane, Çeliktepe
Pembe	30.08.2017	Employer's House	00:53	Sefaköy
Nazlı	08.09.2017	Café	1:37	Ataköy
Tülay	09.09.2017	Café	1:03	Avcılar
Gülay	10.09.2017	Café	1:07	Avcılar
Esra	11.09.2017	Restaurant	1:00	Mecidiyeköy
Ayşe	01.10.2017	House	2:00	Fatih
Lora	12.10.2017	Café	1:50	Fatih
Leyla	25.10.2017	Cafe	1:15	Fatih

Appendix 3. Demographic Information of the Interviewees

Name	**Age**	**Education**	**MaritalStatus**	**Birth Place**
Gül	37	Secondary School	Married	Turkmenistan
Elanur	40	Geology	Married	Turkmenistan
Esra	35	Nursery Teacher (High School Dropout)	Divorcee	Uzbekistan
Nazlı	29	1)NurseryTeacher 2)International Relations	Single	Uzbekistan
Leyla	39	High School Dropout	Divorcee	Georgia
Lora	46	High school	Divorcee	Georgia
Roni	30	High School Dropout	Married	Philippines
Lale	27	High School	Married	Sivas
Ülkü	60	Primary School Droput	Widow	Tekirdağ
Kevser	38	Secondary School Dropout	Married	Kastamonu
Tülay	46	Secondary School Dropout	Divorcee	İstanbul
Gülay	45	Secondary School	Widow	Bursa
Pembe	48	Primary School Drop out	Married	Samsun
Ayşe	43	PrimarySchool	Married	Adana

Appendix 4. Quotations From the Interviewees

Education

Lale (Local)	Call it whatever you want! Ignorance or lack of experience…I was not able to do what I want. I was so afraid of my father. Because of the family pressure, I thought that if I had worked and earned money, I could have been able to escape all these.
Gülay (Local)	My father was an oppressive man. I was not allowed to go anywhere. He did not let me continue my education. I was a successful student and wanted to study a lot. One day, even my school principal called him to speak, but he did not change his mind. He said 'Why should she study? To escape with a man?'
Kevser (Local)	My father was an aggressive person. My elder sister also suffered from his tyranny a lot. He never allowed me to go out alone or with my friends. I was even afraid to look through the window. When my elder sister got married, I left the school and took the responsibility of the housework.
Ayşe (Local)	During my childhood, most girls did not go to school in our hometown. It was seen as something useless. I wanted to go further in my education; I had dreams for my future. However, my father told me that I did not need to go to school to be a good woman and I did not have the power to resist him.
Ülkü (Local)	My mother's life was also bad. She was also a domestic worker. We had a poor life. I never liked school and I left it at the age of 8. If you are poor, you are only interested in how to earn more.
Tülay (Local)	I did not prefer to continue my education. I started working in a factory at the age of 13. My family went bankrupt then. I loved my father so much that I wanted to help him. He did not even speak to me for a while because of this. Now I can see that it was a wrong decision, but my feelings were like that during those times.
Pembe (Local)	I started working at the age of 12. That was my decision. I had to leave the school, because my family was very poor and I had to support them.
Nazlı (Foreign)	I am fond of reading books, learning something new. I was a successful student at high school. I also prepared for national university exam, but in our country even if you get high scores, you cannot start the university education without money. Now, I am studying at Open University in International Relations field while I am working.

Esra (Foreign)	I was about to finish my high school education when my brother died. My mother and father were so affected that I had to shoulder the responsibility of the house and I started working to earn money. I have not still got my diploma.
Roni (Foreign)	My father left us. He did not support us. While I was studying at high school, I was working in a factory for 2 dollars a day. I finished the third year in high school and then came here to work. I had to earn money.
Leyla (Foreign)	It was my second year in high school and my father died suddenly.My mother was all alone with four children. She did not have a job and there was nothing left from my father. I had to do something, so decided to start working.
Lora (Foreign)	After I finished high school, I was not able to study at university though I was craving for it. The money my father earned was never enough and no matter how hard he worked he could not earn much in our country. I felt the responsibility for helping him.
Gül (Foreign)	I wanted to have a career, but we were a crowded family and had difficulty with making ends meet.

Marriage

Lale (Local)	I got married at the age of 18. My husband was very young, too. When I gave birth to my son, he was not with me, because he had joined the army. I lived with my parents-in law for 8 years. Why did not I continue my education? What was my problem? Now I see that it was a wrong decision but the family pressure led me to nonsense things.
Ülkü (Local)	I was married off to a man whom I did not want at the age of 18. I could not stand up to my father. I always prayed to God to send a miracle and separate us. After a while, I put up with him for the sake my children.
Kevser (Local)	It was two months before I turned 18. Our neighbour's son wanted me to go with him. When I did not accept his offer, he threatened me to tell my father that I was dating with him. I froze with fear that moment. I was so afraid of my father and it seemed to me that if he had heard such a thing my life would have collapsed. I went with him. How nonsense! What would have happened if I had not gone with him? Nothing, actually! I jumped out of the frying pan into the fire.
Tülay (Local)	I got married at the age of 14. In fact, I was obliged to do so because I was abducted by my husband. What was worse, he was an acquaintance of my father.
Gülay (Local)	I got married at the age of 16 and gave birth to my first child the same year. My husband was 10 years older than me. I joined a crowded family and everything was worse than before. A lot of responsibilities, problems… Actually, I escaped from my father's oppression. I was inexperienced then and thought that if I had married, I would have had freedom.
Pembe (Local)	At the age of 22, my family wanted me to marry to my cousin (my aunt's son) and I accepted desperately.
Ayşe (Local)	One day my mother came and told me to dress properly. A family would come and see me. I was 15 and all I wanted was to escape from the house, but I could not and married to a man whom I had not seen before.
Elanur (Foreign)	It was my first year at university. I got engaged, but I did not know to whom. My family knew his family, and they arranged our marriage on behalf us. In our culture, you cannot resist your elders' decisions.

How They Started Domestic Service

Lale **(Local)**	After we lived for 8 years with my parents-in-law, we decided to buy a cheap house and took out a mortgage for 10 years. My husband earns 1800 TL monthly. Our payments are 1350 TL. It is impossible to get by with the rest. We have a son. He is a primary school student. I have to work for him, for his education. After we pay off our debt, I will have to go on working, because my husband earns so little.
Ülkü **(Local)**	After my husband died, I had to work to look after my children. There was nobody who would help me. I was all alone and started working at offices to clean and cook. After a while, I went to houses for cleaning and sometimes elderly-care. My children are grown-up now, but one of them is unemployed and the other earns too little.
Kevser **(Local)**	My husband has never been a responsible man. If he works for 2 or 3 days, he does not work for the rest of the week and he spends what he earns for gambling. There were times when I was not able to buy even bread or napkins for my child. I used my undershirts instead of napkins. I have always been overwhelmed by my husband's irresponsibility. … My father sometimes supported me, but mostly I swallowed what I was going through. I did not want to go back to my father's house again, because his oppression was still going on even if I was a mature woman with children. My husband was not a good one, but at least he loves our children. I did not want my children to make wrong decisions because of family pressure like me. So, I thought that at least I have a life of my own. Also, when I sought his help for a few times, he said that 'If you come again, do not bring your children with you'. Considering all these, after I gave birth to my second child I had no choice but start working in domestic service.
Tülay **(Local)**	My husband did not have any income. If he had earned some money, he would have put them into gambling, alcohol etc. I had to start this job, because poverty makes you adapt to everything. He spent all my earnings and what we had because of his bad habits. He did not even show any affection towards our children. Even my daughters did not want to see him. After we spent 22 years together, I divorced him. If he had had a little love for our children, maybe I could have tolerated him, but he did not. After that, I went on working to look after my children. … My family did not support me during those times. Actually, I myself did not want to make them understand what was going on.

Gülay (Local)	Our life was upside down in one night when my husband died suddenly. My elder daughter was studying at university. One of my acquaintances recommended me to go to İstanbul and work as a live-in domestic worker. I moved to here and left my little daughter behind with my mother. My son stayed with his grandparents. Nobody helped me. They told me that 'You are a mother and you have to do this.' Women go through hard times as you see.
Ayşe (Local)	We immigrated to İstanbul, because my husband did not have a regular job in our hometown. After we came here, he started to work as a waiter. However, everything was much worse. Life is expensive in İstanbul. After we paid the house rent, there was so little left that sometimes we could not even buy food let alone pay the bills. We have three children. I could not tolerate seeing them in that situation. Also, I thought that I was not able to go to school, but my children should go and have a career. That is why I started this job.
Gül (Foreign)	My husband was unemployed. I have three children. I had to immigrate here to earn money.
Elanur (Foreign)	After we got married, my husband got addicted to heroin. He started to beat me. I took a loan from a bank to treat him in a hospital, but it was no use. My salary did not suffice neither for the credit loan nor for the money he got from me. I was lost in debt. One day, a man called me and told me that if I had wanted to see my child, I had to give him 50 dollars. My husband had left our son to drug dealers in return for heroin. … Then, I wanted to divorce him, but he did not want to give my children. The judicial process lasted for a long time and in order to get their custody, I needed more money for lawyers. So, I decided to come here and work.
Esra (Foreign)	My marriage lasted only for 3 months, but I got pregnant during that time. My husband had very bad habits. After we divorced, my family did not support me and I threw myself into a country (Turkey) which I did not have the least idea about.
Leyla (Foreign)	Life is hard in our country (Georgia). You work for hours for nearly nothing. If you are a single mother like me, you should search for ways to survive and give a good life to your child.
Lora (Foreign)	My husband was a real trouble-maker. He was not working and beating me every day. Topping it all off, he did not even mind our children. There were days when they slept hungry. I was fed up and had to do something for my children.
Nazlı	I lost my father at the age of 4. My mother brought us up alone. I always tried to help her. After I finished high school, as I was not

(Foreign)	able to go to university, I decided to come to Turkey to earn money both to support my family and have a better life.
Roni **(Foreign)**	My father had left us; my mother was here in Turkey working as a domestic worker. I was taking care of my grandma. She was ill. Instead of working for 2 dollars a day, I decided to come here and earn money.
Pembe **(Local)**	We had some relatives in İstanbul. They found a live-in job for me and at the age of 12 started to work in this sector. My family was very poor and I had to support them.

Working Conditions

Lale **(Local)**	My working hour is between 9 a.m. -6 p.m., but most of the time I exceed it. Because most people exploit you. They think that "I give you money and you have to do everything I want." Some of them pay extra money, some of them do not. For now, I do not have a chance to bargain, because I need money. Sometimes I even go to work or home on foot in order not spend money for transportation but they do not think that much. Sometimes, I work all day without eating anything, because they are not at home mostly and I do not want to eat something in their houses without permission. They cannot think of leaving extra money for lunch or at least preparing something for me to eat.
Ülkü **(Local)**	Sometimes they treat you unfairly. They want you to do something extra, but they do not pay money for it. There are houses which I go only for a half-day, but later I recognize that it has become evening. When you go to people's houses, you become like friends and you cannot resist them.
Kevser **(Local)**	Some people make use of your obligations. One of my early employers was our landlady. She knew how helpless I was. We were paying the rent, but she also wanted me to clean for free. Until we moved to another house, I had to do it. Another employer, for example, never gave me food. I took even my drinking water with me when I went there. One day, to my surprise, she asked me if I was hungry or not and gave me food which had gone stale. Even in houses where they treat you well, they mostly ask you to overwork in return for nothing.
Pembe **(Local)**	I do whatever they want in order to deserve what I earn, but believe me your labour is always undervalued. For example, I go to a triplex house and they pay the same money. When I sometimes feel exhausted and give a break for a few minutes, she says "How come you are tired?" It is hard to understand people. Some of them do not even thank you, because they give you money. The more you work and the longer you stay, the more they like it; however they do not appreciate it.
Ayşe **(Local)**	To be honest, there is no limit to what you do in this job, especially in the first years. If you want to earn money, you accept whatever they want. You are not paid for transportation, sometimes you are not given something to eat. In short, you are at the mercy of your employers.
Tülay **(Local)**	When I first started this job, I thought that this should be a lie or nightmare. They want you to wipe the walls, clean the whole house, cook and take care of the child in one day. A normal

	person cannot do this. In this job, people see you like a rechargeable gadget. When your battery is off, you will charge it and go on from where you have left off. You are sleepless, but the next day you have to continue your job. Especially if you are hired as care-giver, you should be available for 24 hours. If you are hired as a cook, again there is no limit to your working hours. When they have guests or give parties you will be awake till they go in the midnight or if your boss wakes up, let's say at 4 in the morning, you have to be ready. They mostly give you a place to sleep in the basement and it is too small. There is mostly a washing machine or central heating boiler in it and it is difficult to breathe. Sometimes, you have to share this room with another worker, too. In one of the houses I worked, there was a foreign girl. They gave her a place next to the toilet and she slept on a thin floor bed for years.
Gülay **(Local)**	As a live-in, one of your problems is food. In one of the houses where I worked, we were cooking, but we were not allowed to eat. If there is left-over, you will eat; if not, you cannot cook for yourself. Sometimes, it hurts you a lot, you know. They had a dog; they gave him special food, but they do not respect you as much as they value him. Anyway, even if there is left-over or you work somewhere where you can cook for yourself, you do not have special time to eat. They always want to see you around and you mostly eat standing up in a few minutes. You are followed in your every step. Sometimes, you leave the bathroom with foam on your head. For your personal needs, you have to wait until they sleep. You have 4-5 hours to sleep and cater for your needs. Which one will you do in such a short time? When I first started working, there were two more workers in the house, but later they dismissed them. I did the entire job that three people would do; however they did not give me a pay rise. One day I wanted to change my day-off, because I could not see my daughter and spend time with her on that day. They strongly rejected it and add that they do not want to deal with such things in their rest time. Then, they dismissed me all of a sudden without giving a notice in advance. The room you sleep in is mostly a small one with machines in it; you share it with a friend. One day, when we went to their summer house, although there were empty rooms that they do not use, they gave me a tiny room, nearly the same size as a sofa. There wasn't even a window. On top of it, they left their dog with me in the same room.
Nazlı **(Foreign)**	If you work as a live-in, you sleep very little. Most of the time, you eat standing up. They always want to see you standing on your feet. You always have to wake up early. That is an order. Eating is another problem. One of my bosses always implied that I ate too much. If she did shopping, a few days later she would

	come and say “But I have just bought that cheese. There is very little left”. This being the case, you do not want to eat anything. The lady always thought that she had the right to say whatever she wants in front of everybody. In one of the houses where I worked, I did not have even a small room to sleep in. I was sleeping in children’s room with them on the floor. I put my clothes in a small closet in the laundry room, and the lady sometimes rummaged through my possessions. Also, most employers confiscate your passport if you are irregular. The first house I worked for confiscated my passport, too. I could not tolerate their oppression anymore and I wanted to leave. I told them I would send money to my family and asked for it. When I got it, I escaped from the house and found somewhere else to work.
Esra **(Foreign)**	You are always supposed to be available whenever they need you. What I mean is it can be at midnight or very early in the morning. If the family is crowded, you have to meet the needs and orders of everybody. You sleep too little, but you work too much. If you are irregular this is another story. You must do everything for fear that they may report you to the police and you will be deported.
Roni **(Foreign)**	We, Filipinas, are obedient and do everything from cleaning, cooking to child-care. This is an exhausting job, of course. You sleep too little to catch up with everything. It is like you are working 24 hours. You do the job of four people; it is unfair but you have no other choice.
Leyla **(Foreign)**	Working as a live-in is a nightmare sometimes, especially if you are irregular. The first house I worked in was one of those nightmares. The first day I started, they took my passport. I did not have a day-off. You are supposed to do everything without a break and most of the time they do not even care about your very basic, human needs. The room they give me was a dark, small one without a window. One day, when they went on a holiday, they locked me in the house. They took my passport with them, too. I had overstayed my visa; I could not call the police for help or else I would be deported. For one month, I stayed there and managed to survive with little food that they had left at home. One night, after they returned, I found my passport and escaped. Now, I also work under heavy conditions as an irregular worker, but at least I have one day-off.
Lora **(Foreign)**	You should be ready for any order at any time of the day. If you sit down for a few minutes, they are disturbed by this; because they think you neglect your duties. You do not have privacy, a decent room. Sometimes you think if it is worth tolerating all this inhumane treatment, but you have to do it for your children.

Elanur **(Foreign)**	The most common problem is that they make you do everything, but they do not pay extra money. It was especially hard for me when I was living here as an irregular worker. During those times, one woman accused me of stealing her money and made me work for free for 3 months. I was afraid that they would report me to the police.

Relationships with Employers

Lale **(Local)**	Some of them are really nice; some of them treat you as you are nothing. I sometimes chat with some employers and ask for their ideas about my problems. When they give me something such as second-hand clothes, I accept it. If you are needy, why shouldn't you take and appreciate it? Sometimes I borrow money from people I trust, and then pay it back by cleaning.
Ülkü **(Local)**	Sometimes, when you become too close with some, they exploit your labour on purpose or unconsciously. Some of my employers give me alms (zekat/fitre). Sometimes I borrow money and then pay it back.
Kevser **(Local)**	I have known many employers up to now. Some of them were really very bad. One of them never gave me food, treated me like an animal. I had another employer in the building where we lived. I was cleaning the stairs at the same time. We were living in the janitor's flat. She always interfered with our life and even wanted my children to serve them. Many tested my honesty. They were leaving money or jewellery somewhere in the house deliberately to see if I would take them or not. As my network expanded and got to know good people I eliminated the bad ones. The job is difficult enough and you do not want to deal with such things, too. We became like sisters with some of them. Those employers helped me a lot. They gave me clothes for my children, lent me money. Thanks to one of them, my children went to the cinema and the theatre for the first time.
Tülay **(Local)**	If you work as a live-in, your employers never care about you. Mostly, you are humiliated. That is such a bad feeling that I cannot describe it. You have mostly formal relationships which do not leave any space to feelings. In houses where there are more than one worker, the employer tries to make you compete against each other to make use of your labour more. Personally, I have never preferred to accept clothes or anything else from my employers. Sometimes, they give us pocket-money in festivals like Ramadan; then I accept it in order not to be rude. When I need, I borrow money and then pay it back.
Gülay **(Local)**	As I told you before, most of them do not consider that you are a human being with feelings. They see you like a machine. Their pets are more valuable than you are in their eyes. When I needed extra money, I borrowed some and they deducted it from my salary.

Pembe **(Local)**	There are some employers who really respect me and treat me like a human being. The others just treat you like a machine. Those whom I get along with sometimes give me clothes or household goods.
Ayşe **(Local)**	When I first started to do this job, I was humiliated a lot by my employers. Because I had just come to İstanbul and they saw me like an ignorant person who did not know anything. At the beginning, I had to tolerate them, but as I gained experience I left that kind of houses and preferred those who did not at least mock my peasantry. Now, we are like a family with some of them and they give me second hand clothes or furniture sometimes.
Elanur **(Foreign)**	I was mostly accused of stealing something directly or indirectly. One family made me work for three months without paying anything. Some humiliated me in different ways. For example, one of my first employers, one day, told me that "You have a university degree, but work in this job; but I did not go to school and I am in a better position than you." After I settled my life here, I eliminated those people. I have had very good employers who helped me in different ways such as clothes, furniture or teaching me the procedures and laws here.
Nazlı **(Foreign)**	Some people think that they have the every right to interfere with you. Mostly they see you like a person who does not have any capacity apart from cleaning. One day, when I told one of my employers that I wanted to go on my education here, she looked at me with such an expression that I cannot forget it. "You? You will go to university?" she said. Also, you are mostly considered a potential thief and they imply it or they just test your honesty. Some of them really helped me and encouraged me for my dreams.
Esra **(Foreign)**	When you work, more or less you get used to every treatment, but being accused of theft hurts you a lot. However, I have also had very good employers, who helped me a lot when I had some problems as a foreigner in Turkey.
Roni **(Foreign)**	Maybe, that is my luck but my employers have been very nice to me and respected me up to now.
Leyla **(Foreign)**	Relations with my employers? I do not mean anything to them. I am a servant with no feelings and needs in their eyes.

Lora **(Foreign)**	They speak to me too little except for giving me orders. They mostly try to test my honesty by leaving money and jewellery around.
Gül **(Foreign)**	They sometimes interfere with everything you do as if you do not know anything, but now I am happy with the house I work for.

What It Means To Be A Domestic Worker

Lale (Local)	It means nothing actually. However, thank to this job I have learnt how important money is. I don't think that most people respect me in this job. They give you money and they do not care about your feelings. Sometimes I regret doing this job.
Ülkü (Local)	I feel that this job has taken away my health; however it gives you money. I can at least meet my needs. The day I go to work, I can do shopping and buy, for example, 1 kg of something instead of buying less.
Kevser (Local)	I earned money and raised my children. At least, my children did not look to someone else for their needs. My health has really worsened; I feel tired both physically and psychologically. However, earning money gave me a little bit confidence, because I have understood that I can stand on my feet.
Tülay (Local)	This job teaches you not to trust in people. It takes away your feelings, your love. You are worn-out and humiliated. Some women have wrong relationships to suppress those feelings. You earn money, but people sometimes have to put up with swearing and insults for this.
Gülay (Local)	After my husband's death, I started a new life for my children thanks to the money I earned in this job. However, I got to know people better. I learnt that you are not respected if you work in lower positions.
Elanur (Foreign)	I earned money thanks to this job and I took my children here with me. It has affected my health.
Nazlı (Foreign)	When I was in my country, I had not lived apart from my family and I thought that everybody and everything was excellent as in paradise. However, now I know that there are bad people, too and I do not trust people. I approach everything with doubt. This job and my experiences here have taken away my feelings. In this job, you do a lot of things but it is as if you did not do anything. It gives you money to save your life.
Esra (Foreign)	Actually, I do not know if it is true to call it "a job". It is not a job for me; it is a means of earning money. I meet the needs of my child. Sometimes I really feel upset. Always cleaning, cleaning… You do not have time to relax. You do not have any strength left for anything else.
Roni (Foreign)	It gives you the money to meet your needs, to look after your children.

Leyla **(Foreign)**	This is a job which gives you money under very hard conditions. You are exhausted; your health deteriorates day by day and sometimes you hate people.
Lora **(Foreign)**	It is a job which enables me to look after my children and meet their needs. It is a cruel job with a lot of effects on your health and psychology.
Gül **(Foreign)**	Thanks to this job, I earn money. I did not have this chance in my country. I can send money to my children. I feel exhausted mostof the time.
Pembe **(Local)**	It means nothing. It is a dead-end job with no future. You just save the day. What you earn is only enough for your basic needs. It contributes nothing to you, apart from money. It has taken away my health, my life. I feel exhausted. There is no appreciation in this job.
Ayşe **(Local)**	It means money. In this job, you cannot be happy, because you will never be better than this. You always do the same things. Mostly, you do not earn what you deserve.

The Effects of The Job

Lale **(Local)**	I feel very tired on the days when I work. So, when I come back, I do not have the energy to take care of my child. Sometimes, my sisters offend me. They say"You clean other people's houses. Come and clean our houses, too". They think that they are just making jokes, but because of this I do not want to see them.
Ülkü **(Local)**	I have been working for many years and during all those times I have had neither enough time nor energy to care about my children and their lives as I want. I do not usually have time to relax or go out to do different things. If I have time, I do the housework and care about my mom.
Kevser **(Local)**	I have had only one aim since I started this job: to work and earn money for my children. However, while doing this, I have had to give up many things. I have never been able to spend sufficient time with them. Before they started school, I sometimes send them to an acquaintance or left them alone at home. They were so little; they needed me but I had to work. They were sometimes despised in school by their friends because I did this job. "Your mother is a servant!" They told them. On some days, I pray to God that the employer will call and tell me not to go, so I will have a day off to spend with my children or relax. Otherwise, I cannot do this on my own because I feel guilty, because I need to earn money.
Tülay **(Local)**	When you do this job as a live-in, there is not actually such thing as family. During all those years I have worked, I have only participated in funerals of my family and close relatives. I have never been able to take part in important days such as weddings etc. I haven't had a special time or day that I spared for myself. I have worked for my daughters, but I haven't seen them sufficiently.
Gülay **(Local)**	When I first came here to work, I left my son and my youngest daughter at our hometown. My elder daughter was studying at university in a different city. Until my youngest daughter became 17, she was there and I did not see her growing up. I missed them a lot. Sometimes, I questioned myself, my motherhood, but I had no other choice. After I took my youngest daughter here, she slept alone at some nights if I had not arranged someone to stay with her. During all those times, my elder daughter made wrong decisions, because I was not with her. Now, she is with me with her child, and I am responsible for my grandchild, too. My son is still there. He tries to make a life for himself. Before I started this job, I had a family and social environment, but now I don't. I do not have free time. I have

	not gone outside for months for leisure.
Pembe **(Local)**	I have always worked, because I had no other choice. My relatives looked after my children. My first daughter had some health problems; I was not able to take care of her. Because I was not able to stay with her due to my job. I sent her to my hometown thinking that it would be better for her for a while. One day, I came home; it was full of my relatives. "What happened?" I asked. They told me that my daughter had died and already been buried. Can you imagine what I felt? Now, I have another daughter. She studies at high school. I try to care about her needs with little time and energy left from the job. I have one day-off and on that day I do the housework, shopping etc.
Ayşe **(Local)**	If you do this job, your children meet the bitter face of life early with you. They have to shoulder responsibilities of the house and take care of themselves at an early age. They need you, but you have to work for them. I questioned myself a lot, especially when they were young, whether I was doing more harm than good. Now they understand me better, and it makes me feel good. If we can go out altogether once in a blue moon, we consider ourselves lucky, as I work every day of the week and do not have time and energy for that kind of things.
Elanur **(Foreign)**	When I came here first, it was very difficult for me. All your family and your children are far away from you. Although you are here for your children, you have to tolerate this situation. Fortunately, I took my children here with me although I cannot spare them enough time. I do not have free time to go out and do something for myself or meet my friends. As you know, I also have responsibilities at home.
Nazlı **(Foreign)**	Although it still hurts a lot, the first year was the most difficult time of my life here. I cried a lot without showing my tears to anybody. Can you imagine? There is not a single person from your family here. You need them desperately in a foreign country, but your obligations prevent you from being together with them. On my day-off, I sometimes go out and meet my friends.
Esra **(Foreign)**	When you leave your country, you leave your family, too. When I came here, my son was 5 years old, when he needed me most. Anyway, he still needs me. When I think about it, I feel like going crazy. We make video calls every day. "Please, come here!" He says, but I have to stay here for him. I miss him a lot and it sometimes hurts you a lot that you take care of others's children when your own child needs you. Perhaps, I may be able to take him here with me one day. I do not have free time as I

	work every day of the week.
Roni **(Foreign)**	5 months after I gave birth to my first child, I sent him to my country to his father. I could not take care of him; I was working as a live-in. He is still there. I send him money monthly and visit him once a year. I came from a broken family and he is in the same position now. Later, I started a new family here and had one more child. Fortunately, he is here with me and his father.
Leyla **(Foreign)**	When you emigrate to a foreign country in order to work, you feel as if you got lost. Although you know how to go back, you cannot, because you have to stay and work for your children. You are all alone without your family. You have to tolerate it until you reach your aim. As I do not have work and residential permit, I do not go out very often.
Lora **(Foreign)**	Working in a foreign country leaves you no family, although you have one and ridiculously you are here for them. You long for your own family, while you are trying to be attached to a foreign family and their life to earn money. I am looking forward to meeting and hugging them again. Sometimes I meet my friends from my hometown, but we usually spend time at home in order not be caught by the police.
Gül **(Foreign)**	I left my children with their father when I came here. I miss them a lot and whenever we talk to each other, they want me to go back. I am looking forward to returning my country and coming together with them again. I go out only when I need something.

Future Plans

Lale (Local)	I want to work in a better job, but I do not know how to do it. I want my son to have his education and have a good career.
Ülkü (Local)	I can do this job for one or two years more, at most. I want my son to start to work. Then, I am planning to settle into a nursing house and relax.
Kevser (Local)	I want my children to finish their school and have a good job. I do not have many plans. I don't know what will happen when I cannot work anymore.
Tülay (Local)	I am really tired of this job. I do not have any expectation for myself. I want to leave something which my daughters will cling to when I am not with them, and then I wish to close my eyes in peace.
Gülay (Local)	What plan should I have? I am only thinking of now. I don't know what I will do or how I will survive after a certain age. I feel at loose ends.
Pembe (Local)	I do not have any plan. My husband does not work; there is nobody who supports me. Time will show what will happen. I only want my daughter to have her education and lead a good life unlike me.
Ayşe (Local)	If my children complete their education and get a good job, I will be the happiest person in the world. Then, I can stop working, because I am really tired.
Elanur (Foreign)	I want my children to have a good life. If I can also buy a house, that will be enough for me.
Nazlı (Foreign)	I want to complete my education and have a good job. I want to write a book and tell every feeling I have experienced up to now. I am not planning to go back to my country.
Esra (Foreign)	Everybody tells me to get married, because they think things will be easier for me. I don't think so. I want to earn enough money to take my son here with me and settle a life here.
Roni (Foreign)	I do not want to stay here forever. Within 5-10 years, we want to go back to our country after we save enough money and start a business of our own. I want my children to have a good education. Education is the only way for a good life. If you don't have education and money, you will be the same person you are.

Leyla (Foreign)	I do not have any other plan apart from giving a good life to my children. If you ask what will happen to me later, I don't know.
Lora (Foreign)	I live and work for my children. If I can give them what they need, then I will find a way to survive in the future.
Gül (Foreign)	After I save enough money, I want to go back to my country and family. But as long as my husband does not work, I will be here and work for my children.